**METADATA SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**JANUARY 11, 2012**

**MINUTES**

**Present:**

Brian Falato (USF, chair)

Catherine Gardiner (FGCU)

Daniel Cromwell (FCLA)

Hilary Robbeloth (UNF)

Jamie Rogers (FIU)

Junli Diao (FIU)

Kimberly Montgomery (UCF)

Sue Wartzok (FIU)

Susan Massey (UNF)

Tamara Weatherholt (FSU, chair)

Yue Li (FSU)

**Minutes:**

The minutes of December 14, 2011 were approved with corrections.

**Meeting date/time for 2012 meetings:**

It is agreed by the Subcommittee that meeting date/time for 2012 meetings will remain the same as 2011: second Wednesday of the month at 2:00 p.m.

**Report from Shared Bib Implementation Project Face-to-Face Meeting:**

Sue Wartzok, Susan Massey and Daniel Cromwell attended the Shared Bib Implementation Project Face-to-Face Meeting in Gainesville on January 10, 2012 and they gave a brief report. Regarding the tickler document, Daniel said that TKRs in holding records are searchable and that by using “expand” it will probably be possible to search TKRs in holdings records from the bib library. How to move TKRs to holding records has not yet been figured out but an FCLA programmer is working on it. Although TKRs need to be off bib records for the merge, on an ongoing basis centrally loaded bibs may have TKRs. Susan added that nothing formal came out at the meeting because we are still at an early stage of planning the changes to the system, but the guidelines for future use of TKRs may be turned over to the Subcommittee. Sue mentioned that the meeting had a discussion about suppressed bib records. Because the STA “suppressed” will be deleted from bib records at the merge, suppressed bibs with active holdings will display in the catalog and this will cause problems for our users. Sue also added that the plan is to renumber BIB records when the database is merged. Concern was expressed at the meeting that we will still need to be able to search by the old Aleph system numbers. Daniel explained that a new field, probably 951, will contain the old system numbers from different institutions. Furthermore, holding numbers will be changed too. Sue said based on Mary Ann’s test database, the tickler issue seems to be less crucial because there are only 60 records among millions that exceed the maximum Aleph record length. It was noted that each individual university library should review the tag treatment tables.

**Functional Requirements vs. Guideline Usage for Ticklers in a Shared Bib Environment**

Susan said that the draft ticker document is well written but tentative. It needs to be more affirmative and stronger. Either in the bib or in the holding, tickers must perform certain functions. Functional requirements are the beginning document which lists everything we want ticklers to do and how every institution should handle ticklers properly in a shared bib environment.

Daniel repeated that after creating one shared bib record by merging the 11 SUL databases, we will not keep the existing ticklers from different institutions in the bib; they will be preserved in the holding records. There might be a possibility that in the future ticklers will live on the shared bib for centrally loaded bibs. The guideline that we are preparing is mostly about what recommendations we will have for the usage and form of the ticklers on an ongoing basis after the merge. Ticklers are created to group and draw records together no matter where they are. Ticklers in the holdings will be able to perform the same functions as they do in the bibs, such as pulling out particular record sets for global changes.

Brian suggested that it would be a good idea that *Functional Requirements* and *Guideline Usage for ticklers in a Shared Bib Environment* should be combined into one document and *Functional Requirements* could be used as a preface. Daniel suggested there should be one section included in this document with specific discussion about holdings vs. bibs directly. Brian will work on this modified document and send it to the Subcommittee members. This idea was accepted by the Subcommittee. The final decision will be based on the voting result after the document has been looked at by the Subcommittee members. The due date for the ticklers document has not been finally determined yet. Brian said that based on the original charge, the ticklers document will be discussed at a shared bib meeting on January 27, 2012.

**Holdings vs. bibs**

In response to Kim’s question that FCLA should rewrite GenLoad if ticklers go to the holding records instead of bib records, Daniel explained that a programmer has been working to adjust the new specifications, such as multiple OWN codes within one institution or one per institution. He also stated that in the shared bib environment no institution owns the bib record and accordingly the OWN codes will disappear from the bibs. Ticklers within holdings are either keyword searchable or browseable once we move the status field to holding records and we can also use the expand functionality. Once it is configured, Aleph 20 also offers the option that ticklers can be searched in the bib library without switching to the holdings library before the search is launched.

Whether the MARC organization code will be in a separate subfield or in parentheses before the text of the tickler is still in discussion. There was also discussion whether there will be one OWN code per institution or whether a law or medical library may use its own library’s OWN code.

**Discussion on DLU01**

There was no discussion about DLU01. It was pushed to next month.

Minutes taken by Junli Diao (FIU)