AUTHORITY SURVEY COMPOSITE -- JULY 20, 1996

First I would like to welcome a new member to the Authority Committee. Sarah Harmon from USF Health Sciences Library joined the committee and even got her survey returned to me by the July 15 deadline. The return rate was very good, 9 of the possible 10 surveys were returned and numerous constructive ideas were offered. I will attempt to summarize your comments in this composite suvery which is being posted to TS-PLAN. Also I would like to propose that we not set up a separate list--we should all be subscribed to TS-PLAN. However if some of you hesitate to post comments directly to TS-PLAN, I am listing everyone's e-mail address below and comments could be sent to us individually instead. I could then post to TS-PLAN a summary or composite report.

Three general comments merit a short statement in this introduction. The first is that most of the institutions are in a very good position to use CLARR because they are using Windows and many of the staff have workstations on their desks. CLARR also would help with some concerns about creating local authorities. Secondly, automatic derivation and claiming running state-wide by FCLA is strongly desired. Many recognize that that capability would free staff to tackle database cleanup that has not yet been able to be scheduled. And lastly outsourcing authority work raised doubts about its usefulness or sense given the access we have to the total LC authority file in ltlc and our consortia environment that should allow some program development, some of which has been done by UNF for its local use. I want to apologize if I left off one of your ideas or comments. Feel free to mail me additions to the composite or any ideas you have had since you replied to the survey. Thanks. Nancy

The committee members are:

```
UF       Phek Su           pheksu@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu
UF       Nancy Williams    nanwill@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu
FCLA     Mary Ann O'Daniel fclmod@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu
FCLA     Elaine Henjum     fclemh@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu
UF-Law   Jean Bostwick     bostwick@law.ufl.edu
UNF      Linda Smith       lsmith@unf.edu
USF      Susan Heron       sheron@dudley.lib.usf.edu
USF-HSL  Sarah Harmon      sarah@library.med.usf.edu
FSU      Virginia Kuehn    vkuehn@mailer.fsu.edu
FSU-LAW  Alva Stone        atstone@law.fsu.edu
UCF      Linda Sutton      sutton@pegasus.cc.ucf.edu
FIU      Kass Evans        evansk@servms.fiu.edu
UWF      Bob Sun           UWF.LIB#u#PO.rsun@neptune.icd.uwf.edu
```

-------------------------Original message-------------------------

Authority Committee Members--

Phek Su and I would like to assess what you as members feel comfortable with in the sharing of ideas, procedures, etc. We also want to find out if you are willing to participate in the charge that Martha and Rosann have assigned to the committee. We could set up a separate listserve for us to communicate on or we could continue to use the TS-PLAN list- serve. We would like your opinions. We are formulating a rough survey here to gather some information about ourselves, etc. We are also attempting to verify that the email addresses we have for all of you are accurate. Please let us know if we are reaching you. Thanks.

Phek Su 622-0355 (Suncom)

Nancy Williams 622-0351 (Suncom)

Fill in below. Add extra lines if you need to:

```
Your Name:                              Institution:
Suncom No.:                   5 Yes     ___ Prefer separate listserve
                              4 No          (Yes or no in blank)
```

1. About what percentage of your time personally is spent on authority
    work outside of the interactive authority checking involved in day-
    to-day cataloging _____
    Are others involved in authority work? If so what amounts to full
    time equivalent (again disregard authority checking in day-to-day
    cataloging _____
    COMMENTS:

Percentage	50%	5%	0%	2%	10%	100%	2%	2.5%	20%
FTE	.75	2 1/3	1.5	.05	.25	1.45	.25	1.4	1.0

2. Are you using any of the FCLA produced products listed below? Place an X before the item. Any comments can follow below.

        9 A. LTLC for deriving headings
        6* B. Weekly authority printout of changed authority records
        C. Monthly new headings lists
        8 C1 Subjects
        5 C2 Names
        6 C3 Series
        7 D. Error detection reports (produced upon request)

COMMENTS:

*Law and Health Libraries do not get the printed weekly authority report
**Several libraries mentioned that there was not time to work on the new names lists
**The comment was made about the convenience of deriving authorities from the ltlc file
**Request made that we include an Error Detection report for MESH conflicts
**UNF has automated work with the monthly new names and subjects lists
**Name and subject work done post-cataloging--series authority work is done pre-cataloging

3. Until last year we were rather active in global change cooperation system-wide. Would you like to:

Almost everyone agreed on getting this going again

A.

　　　___See us reactivate
　　　___If we reactivate should we make the lists shorter and less time consuming to review
　　　___Run on some agreed upon time schedule

　　　Example: Keep the list to 25 entries. Run the first of every month lists that are complete or not
　　　completed yet. Allow one week for review before the run occurs.

ANY OTHER SUGGESTIONS:
**Would like to be able to run global changes off series authorities for the local database
**Up the global change cooperation to 20 entries in one's database since most institutions have computers
that allow copying and pasting in Windows or Mac environments
**Each library should be able to run its own global changes as needed
**One for one changes need not be reviewed--let FCLA take initiative
**Put one to many heading changes out for discussion and review
**Let each institution handle this catalog maintenance on its own schedule and use glob on authority record
**Develop a masking or "wildcard" technique that would allow the change of heading unit no matter where
they appear
**See if in retrospective projects if FCLA could do the globals in an automated fashion by building files of
headings to be changed

4. UF has been Beta testing the CLARR software from Northwestern. It does require a certain level of
hardware. Would you specify below what your professionals and paraprofessionals have as cataloging
workstations.

Most of the institutions are in a good position to use the CLARR software

　　　A. All cataloging staff have workstations that are 90 MHz Pentiums, 16 RAM
　　　B. In July/August we expect to upgrade all TS workstations for all staff to Windows 95 level
　　　C. A windows 95 level machine is on order. Have been using dumb terminals
　　　D. VT 100 dumb terminals

E. Professional has Pentium PC. LTAs have 486-DX2-66 computers

F. 486s with Windows now being installed

G. All librarians have 486 DX PCs with printers and the USPS soon will

H. Catalogers all have networked 486s, 1-386 which is networked and running McGill and 3 old 286s running EXTRA. Part time staff have dumb terminals. Two general 286s running EXTRA

I. PowerMacs, PC XT computers, two computers running Windows 95 for catalogers. Paraprofessionals have PC XTs or dumb terminals (two have PowerMac)

5. Does your cataloging operation create original authorities for LUIS? If so, about how many are done a month? Are there special areas emphasized, any paramenters applied, etc.

Most everyone creates some local authorities, especially for series or names needing cross references. CLARR would truly speed up this process-- CLARR will manipulate the bibliographic record and present one with a basic authority record to review. Some cross references are automatically created such as in the case of multiple surmanes

Comments follow:

A. 34 NACO contributions, 37 local series, 14 local names average per month

B. 10-20 a month. Would like authority record templates

C. 15-20 a month, mostly for series

D. series authorities, less than one per month

E. Always for series, names or uniform titles when 4xx or 5xx is needed

F. Since November 1995 we created 66 original authorities a month. A big project to create local dissertation subject headings was completed a few years back-since that time very few subject authorities a month

G. No stats. Old NOTIS manual instructions are difficult for learning

H. 1995/96--135 original authorities per month including NACO music, fairly complete series authorities, mostly short personal and corporate name authorities for current cataloging (a lot of videas included)

I. From July 1995 to May 1996 we created a total of 232 original series authority records

6. Would you support an automatic derivation and claiming function when FCLA develops it? Would running monthly prior to the generation of the new headings list be frequent enough for your operation? Headings could still be derived in manually if it was felt to be desirable in certain cases.

**In 1995-96, 18,475 name authorities and 5463 subject authorities were manually derived from LTLC. Probably 18,290 of the names could have been automatically derived. Series probably best manually derived

**We're dying to get this feature up and going. We can't begin to keep up with the New Headings journals. Should run weekly. Emphasis could then shift to conflict and error journals

**Yes, for names and subjects. We will derive series records manually. Weekly would be better than monthly, but monthly is acceptable

**Yes, for names and subjects

**Automatic verification would be better. Or would this be asking for an expert system" to be developed. Question about authorities derived for orders not placed or received--would have to develop a way to delete these authorities to prevent blind references in the OPAC
**We currently derive new names and series authorities within ca. a day of the catalogers use of the entry. Monthly updates seem slow
**Yes, I assume this would function with NLM tapes
**Yes, running it monthly would be frequent enough for our operation
**We already have a local automatic derivation program running for names and subjects which sets use codes. Runs immediately after New headings report is received. Average hit rate (about 83% automatic LC derives) Have done a brief automatic claim on letters A-C for personal names with fantastic results (i.e. a lot of hits)--genrated also a tremendous number of bib corrections

7. Any comments about the printed products we receive from FCLA.

**Would like the possibility of working with a headings list--like the new headings but covering the whole file for certain heading categories. Would help in getting a long view on our names and subjects "after authorities are automatically derived and claimed"
**We don't use every section of every printed product
**We'd like to be able to be more flexible in our selection of the sections we get in any week or month
**"Provisonal" or pre-cataloging reports do not seem to be necessary to us
**They need work--glad to share our developments with other institutions
**We rely on the printed products received from FCLA to identify the first occurrence of name and subject headings. It might be helpful if old heading followed by free-floating subdivisions would not appear on the printout

8. Have you considered outsourcing any authority work. If so would you share your ideas either to the list or with Phek or myself?

**We have not yet considered outsourcing any authority work
**Not considered
**Some of us are considering it--however we'd like to retain our current level of timeliness and quality control
**No
**Consider outsourcing a poor trade off. Can do it better in-house. Authority processes would be a good long-term investment in database quality. Not lose access to bib records at any time, and it could probably be done more cheaply, building upon the access we already have to the ltlc file. We should maximize our investment in that file and our in-state capabilities
**Sent a special purchase of 36,00 records to BNA for authority processing recently. They did not catch some headings that the computer should have caught and flipped with the 4xx field. With batch claiming, not sure why outsourcing authority work would be necessary
**Tentative proposal to do our LTUD file. However probably most of the headings that do have authorities would already have authorities in our file--government corporate entries and subjects. The variant forms for personal names need manual review and most GPO personal names lack

authority records. Believe money could be better spent elsewhere

9. Would you like us to call you for elaboration of any suggestions or comments you have that may seem tentative, in the early stages of formulation, etc. Please indicate your desire for us to call and what times of day are best for you.

THANK YOU for your cooperation and participation.

OTHER COMMENTS:

**If our authority files get updated through automatic derivation and claiming,ongoing cataloging would generate only about one new authority per record

**Would like a workshop that reviewed the AACR2 and LCRI rules for establishing headings

**We find most of our authorities in the NLM tapes (ltmh) and the delayed mounting of these has caused problems

**Like to see more documentation on the FCLA Homepage especially since there are numerous deviations from "vanilla" NOTIS

**Calling together the SUS techies for a face-to-face meeting rather than each of us re-solving the same problems, we should get the authority reps from each school and FCLA together, along with the requisite programmer input, and share information and capabilities to everyone's gain

**About a separate listserv, I don't favor one now because I think authority work at this stage of decision making should be an important issue for all TS members. Once we have the basics in place, detailed development and problem solving and routine housekeeping should probably be a separate list, as needed.