

CAGER Conference Call
May 3, 2007
Minutes

Present on call:

Lu Ai – FCLA
Teresa Abaid – FAU
Haiyun Cao – UF
Daniel Cromwell – FCLA
Emmett Denny – FAMU
Janice Donahue – FAU
Catherine Gardiner – FGCU
Helen Laurence – FAU
Jimmie Lundgren – UF
Jim Michael – USF
Kim Montgomery – UCF
Lydia Motyka – FCLA
Mary Ann O'Daniel – FCLA
Angela Randtke – UNF
Sue Wartzok – FIU

Discussion centered around the DLU01 database that will house the PALMM records from QF, PALMM DigiTool and records from local digital projects. Only MARC records are to be included in DLU01.

The workflow suggested by Priscilla Caplan's earlier email was: 1) Catalog on OCLC; 2) Import to Aleph; 3) Suppress Aleph record from Endeca; 4) Load content to DigiTool and create a Digital Entity; 5) Copy Aleph MARC to the DigiTool Digital Entity; 6) Endeca uses DigiTool MARC so that Endeca sees the DigiTool URLs.

Kim asked why Endeca would take the QF MARC record from DigiTool rather than from DLU01. Why couldn't the DigiTool URL be placed in the Aleph record? Two purposes for having the records in an Aleph library were: 1) to allow updating of the records without having to delete the old record followed by recreating a new record in DigiTool; 2) to allow us to apply authority control to the QF records. Lu informed us that DigiTool 3.6 will allow for Aleph-DigiTool synchronization, so that the record that is updated in Aleph will be updated in DigiTool as well.

Priscilla had also asked about setting up OWN codes for: 1) QF records; 2) PALMM DigiTool records; 3) Records from local systems. The purpose of different codes appears to be identification of the source of the records. The question was raised about whether

the use of different OWN codes would put up barriers to editing the records. Daniel has assured us that it is easy to set up permissions so that people can edit in multiple OWN codes. The question was asked whether multiple OWN codes could be applied to one record. The answer is that only one OWN code can be used in a record. In later discussion of OWN codes, it was speculated that there might be a separate OWN code for each institution that contributed records for local (non-PALMM) digitization projects.

We heard that people who are digitizing large collections made up of things such as thousands of individual photographs feel strongly that they do not want to use MARC. Digital projects people are typically using Dublin Core or MODS. It would be difficult to create MARC for a lot of the works in DigiTool. We agreed that MARC would be inappropriate for large collections of photographs and similar cases. However, MARC is more useful for digitizations of textual material. Also, when a large DigiTool collection is bound by some collection name and when it has a common entrance webpage, it would be useful to create a collection level MARC record in DLU01 that links to the DigiTool collection entrance page. Perhaps when the Metadata Subcommittee is activated, guidelines will be established about what metadata treatments are appropriate under what circumstances. Most material in DigiTool is unique, so there will be nothing to dedup with in Endeca. The current DLU01 client is 15.5 Aleph.

CAGER members need to examine the DLU01 database to determine whether there should be indexing changes made. The database will be used primarily by technical services staff, so indexing should reflect their needs in dealing with the DLU01 records. This indexing is unrelated to indexing efforts being made for Aleph v.18 or for Endeca. Some examples that might be requested include a classification number index based on call numbers in the bibliographic record as well as any control number indexes that are needed. Additional indexing decisions may be made later because this is a small database that can be reindexed relatively quickly.

On the other hand, there is an urgent need to get our data review completed. We have a deadline of May 17 to get our feedback to FCLA. FCLA needs to be able to roll out the DLU01 database fairly quickly.

The discussion continued on the topic of authority control in DLU01. The database will link to the LCA10 library. The question was asked whether there would be a local authority file paired up with DLU01. So many of the names from the locally digitized works are not in the LC authority file and likely will not be added. If there is a local authority file, then it is more likely that bibliographic records will carry consistent forms and not result in split facets in Endeca. Whether this is feasible depends upon whether the local authority file would be large enough to merit the effort needed to set up the database and whether the authority and bibliographic files would be maintained.

To summarize:

1. We have a deadline date of May 17, 2007 for telling FCLA whether the data is going from QF to DLU01 properly.

2. We should be looking at the MARC data in the client to make certain that we see all data. The OPAC may not be set to display certain fields.
3. We should be looking at:
 - a. Whether the data transferred properly from NOTIS QF to Aleph DLU01.
 - b. Display of data in the OPAC as related to technical services use, including checking our work and whether the MARC view shows what is needed.
 - c. Indexes that would be useful for technical services librarians working with the database.