University of Maryland Libraries, Technical Services Division
Program Review –Cataloging: Subsequent Revisits ("Revisits")

- **WG Members:** Marlene Vikor – Group Leader
  - Jim Alberts
  - Alan Mattlage
  - Chris Nemil (**exited 8/25/00)**
  - Gerry Park
  - Jim Stephenson (**exited 10/13/00)**
  - Loretta Tatum
  - Sarah Wiesner
  - Wilma Bass

Additional assistance from:
Jeanne Baker, Roz Becker, Donna Costa-Leonard, Margaret Cullings, Delores Huff, Donna King, Arlene Klair, Yeo-Hee Koh, Ross Laguerre, Alice LaSota, and Rinette Redmond

- **Original list of Revisits categories assigned to the WG:**
  - revisit to item or bibliographic record or summary
  - authority control
  - recats
  - all adds after the first piece
  - help desk problems
  - transfers
  - withdrawals
  - PromptCat cleanup
  - URL maintenance
  - serial maintenance--*redirected to Serials WG*
  - Global catalog maintenance
  - TCRs
  - projects, e.g., HBK, recon
  - routine data integrity
  - getting reports from ITD

<table>
<tr>
<td>
This report contains accounts of the following activities:

1. Authority control
2. Help Desk
3. ITD Report receipts/reconciliation
4. Global maintenance
5. Transfers
6. Withdrawals
7. Monograph analytic adds
8. Added copies
9. Added vols. & supercedes

Appendix 1--Workflow charts
Appendix 2--Existing online documentation
</td>
<td>
Details amassed for each activity:

1. Major tasks
2. Flow chart/process map for each task, Including,
▪ Where the work comes from
▪ What happens to it in the unit
▪ Where it goes and what 's next
3. Level of staff performing task(s)
4. How many handled; Avg. time it takes; How often task done
5. Bottlenecks / Backlogs / Redundancy of processes
6. Observations by WG or Experts re:
▪ Activities—issues, not suggested solutions
7. Statistics Collection, including
▪ What is counted
▪ How data is collected
8. Parking lot ideas—Ideas/questions/related thoughts
</td>
</tr>
</table>

❑ *General Information on Cataloging Revisits*

- Deciding factor on whether an activity is First-time-in or Revisits:
  Revisits activities are performed on titles that have been included in the institution's new title collection count previously. First-time-in activities are performed on titles, which have not been included in the title count yet.
- Revisit Activities are performed by approximately 40 staff, both library faculty and technicians, in 7 units of 2 departments (Serials revisit work is extensive, involving an additional 10 or so staff; beyond the activities investigated by this working group; government documents also are candidates for revisits work but are detailed by another working group)
- Survey done with Cataloging First Time In WG produced only one instance of recataloging and it was related to serials work--an item processed as a monograph had to be recat as a serial title.
- Results of the Revisits WG's survey of staff in the Catalog Management Department (CATM) & Cataloging Department (CATG) regarding non-serial, non-EPU, non-GovDoc activities produced the following subjective measures of VICTOR maintenance work:

  All staff responding (63% response rate) perform at least occasional VICTOR database corrections, with more than half of CATM respondents performing daily corrections, while 3/4 or more of CATG respondents perform only occasional or weekly corrections. Staff in the two departments make the same sort of bibliographic and item record corrections but the quantities reported by CATM (2-100/ week) are higher than those reported by CATG (1-25/week). Half of respondents report performing non-Help Desk corrections at the request of library staff outside TSD on an occasional to daily basis. While CATM staff regularly keep monthly VICTOR database stats, 20% of CATG staff do not keep monthly statistics on VICTOR database corrections. The most common categories of corrections performed by CATM respondents include: holding edits, bib corrections (including adding notes), and bib deletions. Most common categories reported by CATG respondents include: holding conversions, holding edits, heading corrections, adjustments to content notes, lowering encoding levels (to prepare for record overlay). CATM staff report little to no recataloging or retrospective conversion work, whereas 3/4 of CATG staff report recataloging work occasionally to weekly, and half report retrospective conversion work occasionally to weekly. CATG staff regularly force record overlays in VICTOR by making the corrections in OCLC, while a small number of CATM staff occasionally effect such overlays.

  This data has a high "DUH" factor, meaning, we heard much that we expected.
- PromptCat activity is almost exclusively First-time-in
- Retrospective conversion is revisit work, even if involving original record creation on OCLC
- Revisits WG is reporting on Authority Control in all its manifestations
- Routine monthly statistics taken by Cataloging and Catalog Management staff present difficulties for Revisits measurements. Routine monthly added volume statistics combine new volumes, added copies, as well as added volumes. Routine bibliographic edit stats mix statistics for corrections to descriptive elements with ones for controlled headings, which makes measuring work associated with authorities impossible to track from routine statistics.
- In addition to "**Revisits**", the Revisits WG defined some other terms for our own discussions:

  - ***Recat*** *– Choice of a different bibliographic record from that originally chosen to process the piece, or, extensive revision of the bibliographic description in the local system. Some categories of reclass. There is no one common definition for the term used throughout TSD. All activities staff might call 'recat' can be included in episodic Revisit categories.*

- ***Bounces*** *– delete the term from the Glossary of defined terms. It is a term with various meanings throughout the division—PromptCat "bounces", Call number search "bounces", etc. The word should be avoided by the Revisits WG because it cannot specifically be tied down. Inadequate PromptCat records referred to the Cataloging Dept for remedy will be termed "**PromptCat Incompletes**". These records are incomplete because they are records without LC call numbers and/or LC subject headings, or have some obvious error in a bibliographic access point. Remedial activities on PromptCat Incompletes are first-time-in activities, not revisit activities.*

- ***Item conversion*** *–The process of linking item holdings or copy-level records to a bibliographic record. Performed in the Circulation application or through the bridge to Circulation in the Maintenance, Serials, or Acquisitions applications. (from CARL B500 module glossary appendix G) =* ***Adds***

- ***Item edit*** *– or* ***Holdings edit*** *–The process of making changes to the existing holdings or item-level information in the Circulation application of the local system; holdings record is an item-specific record in Circulation application containing item number, location, call number, control number, status, history, title level information, notes, media, price, and branch. (from CARL B500 module glossary appendix G)*

- ***Item record*** *– A record that represents a physical piece in the library. Linked to a Bib Record, it describes the item and records circulation. (from UM Libraries Data Definitions and Abbreviations:* http://www.lib.umd.edu/STAFF/PAS/MIS/DATADIC/UMLibrariesDataDefinitionsandAbbreviations1.htm*)*

- ***Approval plan*** *– Library material purchased via a contract under which selection and rejection of materials occurs. (from UM Libraries Data Definitions and Abbreviations:* http://www.lib.umd.edu/STAFF/PAS/MIS/DATADIC/UMLibrariesDataDefinitionsandAbbreviations1.htm); *BNA is a major approval plan for the Libraries.*

- ***Reclassification*** *– choice of new call number or cutter for an item in the Libraries' collection*

- ***TCRs*** *– temporary conversion records; created in the local system circulation application in the absence of a full bibliographic record*

- ***Projects*** *–a variety of short-term systematic processes to restore local system data integrity and ensure data completeness –*

Inventory of Projects (provided by Delores Huff, Head CATM Projects Unit)
In Process

- Bad Branch/location/media code – begun June 2000
- Mixed Call Numbers
- No 000 tags
- No 300 Tag (USM)
- No Item/No Summary
- Relinking TCRs
- Deletes from UMCP/USM/OCLC
- Major M-form titles

Complete in Recent Years

- Hornbake transfers/withdrawal from Stacks, Ref and Gen Reading

Abandoned

- UMC99 clean-up

- ***PromptCat*** *– An OCLC service that automatically provides bibliographic records for VICTOR and sets UMC holdings in WorldCat® for material acquired via approval plan; this material generally goes directly from Acquisitions to the Catalog Management Department's End Processing Unit following item conversion.*
  http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/prompt.htm
  Upgraded versions of records are available via a companion subscription process ***OCLC Bibliographic Record Notification ("BibNotification")***
  http://www.oclc.org/oclc/promo/10040bib/10040bib.htm

- ***Supersedes (or supercedes)*** – new volumes to the collection intended to replace an earlier volume of the same title, the processing of which usually necessitates transfer or withdrawal of the earlier volume

❑ General Parking lot items:

- Effect of L&A on level of staff performing activities, currently higher level staff must perform activities which could be done by students, if we had them, releasing the higher-level staff to perform higher functions

- Need for much more technological support for database quality checks & modifications, including:
  - On demand reports without ITD intervention
  - Systematic 019 processing
  - URL checking —currently no systematic means of identifying broken URLs

- Systematic evaluation of PromptCat/BibNotification effectiveness—are they working together as anticipated? Can they be adjusted to work together more effectively? What is the effect of loader overlay hierarchy on their effectiveness? See PromptCat survey statistics, March 2000 located at
  http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/CATDEPT/pcstats000328.html

- Loader specs revision as a Revisits activity--the process by which local system loaders have been revised since original configuration could be considered Revisits activity. For many revisions College Park must give input through LIMS committees and gain support of other LIMS institutions.
  Recent revisions of note: addition of PromptCat 950's to PromptCat loads; overlay hierarchy revision to incorporate EncLvl 4; retention of 245 GMDs in original location. Currently, UM staff add tag 950 with their personal initials to all records they bring into VICTOR. This assists with post-load problem solving. In the last couple of years, "950 PromptCat" has been added to records in PromptCat loads, which helps UM staff identify such records following load. If 950s were added on all bulk loads (Marcive, BibNotification, etc.) it would assist in revisit problem solving; e.g., "950 BibNotification" would appear in records for which pre-existing records have been overwritten by BibNotification records.

1. Authority Control - (Gerry Park, expert)

University of Maryland Libraries, under its own symbol (MdU) and the symbols of the National Funnels for Music (MdU-MU), AV (MdU-MA), and Hebraica (MdU-J) (until Hebraica cataloger's departure in October 2000), creates and modifies authority records for the ***National Authority File (NAF)*** through NACO via OCLC. University of Maryland Libraries also submit Subject and Classification Number proposals through SACO via email to the Library of Congress. There the headings and schedule entries undergo review before being added to the Subject portion of the NAF and the LC classification schedules.

National authority records are employed at University of Maryland to control heading form for the following access points on bibliographic records:

- personal, conference & corporate names,
- uniform titles,
- series, and
- subjects.

In addition to heading form, series authority records dictate cataloging treatment that includes tracing, analysis, and classification practices. For series classed together, the call number is usually present in the authority record. UM Libraries generally follow the NAF for series cataloging treatment, noting any exceptions in the UM Masterfile, a card catalog in the Cataloging Dept. *Basic series policy of UM* exits at:
http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/CATDEPT/QC/qcpolpro.html

National authority records are supplemented by local series authority records found in the UM Master File and by the list of Maryland Names used on Theses and University Publications maintained by the Authority Control Unit of the Cataloging Dept.
(http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/CATDEPT/QC/mdnames.html)

As part of first-time-in or revisit bibliographic processing efforts, authority records may be revisited to make corrections and to add additional reference structure, and information. When duplicate and otherwise inappropriate authority records are discovered, UM sends instructive messages to Library of Congress directing merges and deletions. Authority record and corresponding bibliographic record headings must be in sync. As an Enhance institution, UM performs ***Bibliographic File Maintenance (BFM)*** on bibliographic records in OCLC. Because we are a BIBCO and CONSER institution, we are also an OCLC National Enhance institution, allowing us to enhance national-level bibliographic records for books and serials in WorldCat. We correct local and global databases of VICTOR, and notify the Library of Congress, as necessary, to make the same changes in their local system.

Major tasks

Authority work includes:

- authenticating, or, authorizing headings on bibliographic records destined for /present in the UM database; an activity which includes *verifying attribution and ensuring name differentiation*, as well as verifying compliance of heading form
- bringing out-of-sync headings in the VICTOR UM and global databases into compliance with the authorized heading forms, and, when necessary, notifying other University System owners to do the same in their local databases. ***(BFM)***
- establishing headings in local and /or national authority files prior to their addition to bibliographic records in VICTOR.

UM generates both full and preliminary authority records for the NAF. NACO institutions are usually limited to creating full authority records for the NAF, an activity requiring "piece-in-hand". UM Libraries have LC's permission to *create* preliminary records in conjunction with BNA Reconciliation Project. The preliminary authority record approach may be utilized when associated bibliographic records contain statements of responsibility. Catalogers, working systematically from BNA Exception Reports of Uncontrolled Headings, create preliminary authority records when possible. *In the absence of a statement of responsibility in the bibliographic record, names are controlled for that title with "piece-in-hand". Project documentation is available online at* http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/CATDEPT/QC/qcbnaproc.html

Revisits to catalog records involving authority work of an episodic nature occur also. Some revisits are instigated by Help Desk Reports. Catalogers who do their cataloging against the UM database revisit headings, and discover discrepancies to be remedied. Technicians working in the database notice typos, missing dates, and other inaccuracies in headings. On occasion, users of the database request additional bibliographic access points to be added to records.

Flow chart/process map for each task,
Including,

- **Where the work comes from**
- **What happens to it in the unit**
- **Where it goes and what 's next**

Most UM authority work is performed during the processing of materials new to the collections, coming to the Cataloging Department from Acquisitions, or in the reconciliation of headings appearing in the BNA exceptions reports generated in the mid-1990s, which include headings from other USM databases than UM local.

See Appendix 1 flowcharts 1a. & b. Non-series Name Authorities and UT Workflow, 1c. Subjects Authority Workflow, 1d. & e. Series Authority Workflow.

Catalogers' Authority Control Workflow for Original and Copy Cataloging Records:

1. Search all name, uniform title, series, and subject access points that are utilized on the bibliographic record(s) in the Library of Congress Authority File (LCAF).

   a) For name, uniform title, and series access points found in the LCAF, determine if any updating is necessary to the LCAF record(s). Lock relevant LCAF record(s) and make any needed corrections or additions to the authority record (s) in OCLC. Print out the LCAF record(s), save the record(s) in OCLC, place printouts and piece-in-hand with bibliographic record being processed. Send entire package along with any supporting documentation for the needed LCAF revision to the NACO Liaison for review and contribution.

   b) *For name, uniform title, and series access points **no**t found in the LCAF*, create an authority record for contribution to the LCAF whenever practicable or mandatory (e.g., headings for PCC or CONSER bib. records). Save new authority record(s). Check the Library of Congress Online Catalog and VICTOR and make note of any bibliographic maintenance that needs to be done for these access points on existing bibliographic records in these databases. Place new LCAF(s) in piece-in-hand with bibliographic record being processed. Send entire package along with any supporting documentation to the NACO Liaison for review and contribution.

      I. Series: If no LCAF for series exists, the Masterfile is checked for a local decision. If local decision is found, it is followed. If it is impracticable to make a national decision, a local decision will be made and placed in the Masterfile.

II. Names: Local name authorities for University of Maryland agencies that are not authors are placed in the Maryland Names File (MAF) and the online list of "University of Maryland Names Established for Use on Theses or Upubs: is updated.

c) *For subject access points found in LCAF*, read authority record to verify that subjects are appropriate and used properly on the bibliographic record.

*d) For subject access points **not** found in LCAF,* and not being deleted from the bibliographic record, fill out the SACO subject proposal form. Send subject proposal form(s) with piece-in-hand and supporting documentation for the proposal(s) to the NACO Liaison for review. She e-mails the subject proposal(s) to SACO. SACO does an additional review and either accepts, amends, or rejects the proposed subject(s).

2. The NACO Liaison:
   - reviews and contributes the national-level name, uniform title, and series authority work;
   - files any needed local series decisions in the Masterfile;
   - establishes any needed local authority for University of Maryland agencies; and,
   - emails subject proposals to SACO.

   When she has finished her work, she returns all packages (pieces-in-hand, authority work form(s), supporting documentation, etc.) with printout(s) of the contributed LCAF(s) to the creators of the authority work.

   a) The creator of the authority work then updates their bibliographic records in OCLC and completes his/her responsibilities for processing of the physical pieces.

   b) Catalogers who create new authority records or cause changes to established headings on existing authority records are held responsible for performing or reporting any bibliographic maintenance needed on existing cataloging records in VICTOR and the Library of Congress Online Catalog. They are also responsible for making the corresponding correction to the WorldCat master record for any UMC-sourced cataloging (original or UMC enhance, as well as GKS records (Goldsmiths-Kress Cataloging Project, administered by UMC)).

   c) The NACO Liaison accumulates reports from Catalogers for Library of Congress bibliographic maintenance, and emails a report monthly to the Library of Congress detailing the bibliographic file maintenance needed on their cataloging records.

Level of staff performing task(s)

Authority records, Subject Proposals, and Classification Proposals are created by Faculty Catalogers and Cataloging Graduate Assistants and are vetted through the UM NACO Liaison (Lib II) for contribution *to the LCAF via OCLC*. Catalogers and Graduate Assistants affiliated with National Funnels contribute authority records through those funnels.

Authorization is an activity performed by LT 1 & 2s (primarily in Cataloging), Cataloging GAs, and Library Faculty Catalogers. Heading corrections on VICTOR local and global bibliographic records are performed by all previously mentioned levels of staff in both Cataloging and Catalog Management Departments. LT 1 & 2s also report to faculty catalogers the need to revise UMC-sourced bibliographic records, or authority records, or to create or revise authority records to dispense with conflicts or to add references. Heading corrections in OCLC master bibliographic records are performed by Cataloging GAs and Library faculty catalogers. Headings are added to NAF by NACO Liaison, funnel participants, and on occasion, resident regional NACO trainer.

How many handled; Avg. time it takes; how often task done

- **PCC FY1999/2000 (Oct. 1, 1999-Sept. 30, 2000)**

	MdU	***MdU-Mu*** (NACO Music)	***MdU-J*** (Hebraica)	***MdU-MA*** (OLAC (AV))	TOTAL
New NARs	1367	40	39	211	1657
New SARs	142	22	0	0	164
Changed NARs	269	8	11	3	291
Changed SARs	36	5	0	0	41
New Subjects	18	0	0	0	18
Changed Subjects	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1832	75	50	214	2171 √

- **UM FY1999/2000 NACO statistics**:

MdU

1,551 authority records (510 - 33% generated by UM's BNA Project) - 129/mo. Avg.

21% reduction from FY1998/1999 total of 1,981

1,191 new names (77%) 195 additions & corrections to names (13%)

139 new series (8%) 26 additions & corrections to series (2%)

MdU-MU

63 authority records – 5/mo. Avg.

61% reduction from FY1998/1999 total of 104

31-new names (49%) 21-new series (33%) 11-additions/corrections to names/series (17%)

MdU-MA

221 authority records – 18/mo. Avg.

320% increase from FY1998/1999 total of 69

221 New names (100%%) 0-new series (0%) 0-additions/corrections to names/series (0%)

UM Total New Names: 1443 Total new series: 160 Total names/series rev.: 232

- **UM FY1999/2000 SACO statistics**:

15 new subjects 1 subject change 1 classification number proposed

52% reduction from FY1998/1999 total of 34 new subjects

- **UM FY1999/2000 Authority Unit series & name verification statistics**:

3,399 series verifications by Authorities Unit (primarily, one LT 2)

51 local series decisions filed in UM Masterfile

5,087 name verifications by Authorities Unit

189 names (4% of total) were not established in LCAF or were out of compliance

- **Authority work associated with first-time in cataloging:**

  - Jim Stephenson kept statistics on authority work associated with his cataloging for the week of August 14-18, 2000. He primarily handles older imprints.

    20 bibliographic records generated 8 new name records.

    Two of the new names necessitated VICTOR BFM. (2 names generated 8 bib corrections)

One name required changes to 3 local & 3 global bib records

One required changes to 1 local & 1 global bib record

Jim opted to enhance and update the OCLC master records to effect the VICTOR corrections.

- Jim also studied the PCC bib record output of another cataloger for August 2000. In 7 upgrades to PCC-level, 5 new name and series authority records were generated and 2 additional existing authority records were revised. None of this work generated BFM to VICTOR. Jim believes that this data supports the general impression that the cataloging of recently published materials seldom prompts cataloging "revisits".

- Headings Corrections:
  Corrections generated by a month's worth of BNA reconciliation work were examined. By long-standing agreement, these requests for BFM have been referred by CATG to CATM for corrections of both VICTOR UM database as well as global, and any necessary notification of other USM institutions. In UM FY1999/2000 CATG sent on average, 75 records per month to CATM from the BNA Project. While this work has been placed on hold in order for CATM to concentrate their resources on implementation of new GOVDOCS process, Rinette Redmond of the CATM Projects Unit studied the August 2000 name correction requests generated by the BNA reconciliation project. Her work is the source of the following data:

  43 names generated a total 124 corrections in VICTOR (62 each in local and global), including:

  59 heading corrections (1XX, 4XX, 6XX, 7XX & 8XX) in both local & global

  51 - 82% of total corrections were 1XX/7XX (authors)

  6 - 10% of total corrections were 4XX/8XX (series)

  2 - 3% of total corrections were 6XX (subjects)

  3 (5% of total corrections) additional descriptive corrections

  Additionally, all 43 name correction requests required notification of other USM campuses to perform BFM in their local catalogs.

  All this work was completed in 190 minutes, or, 4.5 minutes per name correction requested (43).

Bottlenecks

- single person to check/contribute most of headings,
- long vetting process at LC for subjects,
- not all Rapid LTs check copy headings against LCAF;
- PromptCat/BibNotification and other bulk loads (e.g., Marcive, Major microforms, EBSCO records, etc.) without authorization;
- no authority module to local system to provide automated authorization or explanatory reference structure for opac

Backlogs

- Backlog BNA exception reports stored in basement (c.f., 1 completed box*)

  19 boxes [9 ½" x 17"]➔ original reports

  4 boxes [7 ½" x 17"] ➔ gap reports

  23 boxes ➔ total

  - non match name/series

    14 boxes
  - partial match names/series

4 boxes

- non-match subjects
  2 boxes
- partial match subjects
  3 boxes

* The total number of exceptional headings appearing in one box is not available and may not be consistent among boxes. In addition, in the process of controlling headings for the first box, staff controlled all headings appearing on bib records on which box one headings appeared. This means that a large number of additional exceptional headings were controlled beyond those appearing on printouts in the single box completed.

- Series backlog queue (30 shelf feet) dating from mid-1990s,
- Series incoming queue (no backlog),
- NACO/SACO revision queue (no backlog)

Observations by WG or Experts re:
Activities—issues not suggested solutions

- UM's statistics are not consistent with official stats on PCC Website http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/stats/statsfull.html (due to difference between UM FY which ends in June and PCC FY which ends in September)

- Loss of productive catalogers and authority control librarian, combined with additional duties carried by remaining staff, result in reduction of NACO stats. Authority Unit head no longer has authority control librarian to share burden of NACO revision/contribution, management of BNA Project, training/supervision of Authority GA's, and creation of series records.

- UM's system of overall serial records and reliable corresponding summary holdings for numbered monographic series is compromised by various processes which exempt materials from series authorization process (e.g., PromptCat records, DLC full encoding-level records, Marcive, Major microfilm & other batch-loaded records)

Statistics Collection, including

- ❑ **What is counted**
- ❑ **How data is collected**

- NACO Liaison maintains statistics on new and revised headings contributed, not including statistics for headings contributed by MdU to NACO funnel projects.
- Head of Music/AV Unit keeps statistics on NACO Music & NACO OLAC contributions
- Hebraica cataloger kept her own NACO statistics for headings contributed through the Hebraica funnel project, and was still under review when she departed UM in October 2000.
- LT 2 in Authority Unit reports to the unit head her monthly stats on name & series authorizations she performs since that work is her primary responsibility.
- Faculty Catalogers and GA's record NACO/SACO production on monthly statistics sheets, but the numbers do not correspond to those kept by the NACO Liaison, as Names/Series/Subjects may be set up by a cataloger, but, for various reasons, not contributed to the national authority files.
- LT1s & 2s in Rapid Unit don't all perform series or name authorization nor do they all keep statistics on authorization as it is incidental to their primary activities. Those who do keep authorization statistics report them to the unit head on the monthly Rapid Unit

activity sheet, which is separate from the monthly collection statistics sheet, their primary workload measurement record.

- Many levels of staff perform heading corrections, but bibliographic corrections statistics mix heading corrections with all type bibliographic corrections, and thus are not reliable as a true measure of bibliographic corrections associated with authority work. In addition, staff in the Cataloging Dept. are less likely than those in CATM to keep complete statistics on VICTOR corrections, as CATG activities are oriented to collection statistics more than database statistics as a measure of workload. CATG database correction stats currently are not cumulated for use by TSD, although CATG collection stats are cumulated as a measure of departmental production.

Parking lot ideas—

- **Ideas/questions/related thoughts**

- Series backlog could be handled expeditiously by Rapid Cataloging; processing copy with series not traced (490 blank 0) if series is not in Master file or LCAF
- More Faculty Catalogers could serve as NACO reviewers to share NACO Liaison's burden
- UM could monitor consolidated statistics for MdU contributions to NACO – NACO "regular" & funnel contributions
- Anticipate complications of authority work in a single database local system configuration, with multiple thesauri; might we support a USMAI NACO funnel? Current Systems Training Librarian is a PCC Regional NACO trainer.

2. Help Desk - (Loretta Tatum and Wilma Bass, experts)

<u>Definition</u>

The TSD Help Desk was established as a full time permanent unit within the Catalog Management Department, July 1999, and just completed its first FY of operation. It serves as a central location for staff to send problems for resolution by the division. Materials with questions pertaining to cataloging or items are sent to the Help Desk from any or all of the branches for resolution.

<u>Where work comes from</u>
Any of the branches or from within TSD.

<u>What is included in the workflow</u>
See Appendix 1 workflow charts 2a-b, and TSD Help Desk homepage:
http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/CATM/tsdhelp.html

Materials are sorted by the date the problem was created. Current year problems are sent to the appropriate department within TSD. Older problems are resolved within the Catalog Management Department, sometimes requiring assistance from other TSD departments.

Materials arriving are searched in CARL for clarification of the problem being reported. Once the problem is identified, it's logged into the MS Access database, assigned a number and routed to the appropriate TSD department, depending on the date the problem was created. When the problem is resolved, the database is updated with the resolution date.

Some queries arrive via email (tsd-help@umail.umd.edu) and are logged and follow the same routine for resolution.

At the end of every month, a report is run to identify unresolved entries. Follow up is made to inquire on the status of resolution.

Major Help Desk Unit tasks:
- handling the incoming reports;
- identifying the problem reported;
- logging the reports into a database and assigning a tracking number;
- sorting the reports by date of problem creation (those older than a year are kept for resolution in CATM);
- routing reports to an appropriate TSD Dept. for resolution;
- updating the database when report is returned as resolved;
- maintaining files of returned reports for one year.

Issues discussed by WG:
- What to do with cleanup on PromptCat records? They will be treated as "revisits" work if bib has an item record attached (assume collection count taken). If bib record does not have an item record attached, it is "first-time-in" work, and collection count will need to be taken after the item is converted. A Help Desk report relating to a PromptCat record is the same as any other bibliographic or holding record revisit. However holdings are generally generated by Acquisitions and bibliographic adjustments are performed by Cataloging and assignments of Help Desk reports for resolution can be made accordingly.
- Response time on Help Desk reports is affected by bottlenecks.
- Backlog - reports sent out but not returned as resolved.
- Redundancy – How to identify the by-passers of the Help Desk? (i.e., those who go directly to a staff member in the division who will fix the problems)

<u>What level of staff of staff performs the activity</u>

All incoming material is handled by Help Desk Unit LT 2 who maintains the database and interacts with all staff, at all levels (LTs and librarians sending and resolving problem).
CATM Help Desk reports over one year old are resolved by Help Desk Unit LT2, with occasional assistance of Assistant CATM Dept. Head, (Lib 2), or appropriate staff in other departments, if necessary. CATG Help Desk reports are monitored by the CATG Systems Training Librarian, and assigned to the staff source for the problem (LT 1 or 2, GA, or Lib 1, 2, or 3), or to the head of the Unit best able to resolve the problem.

<u>Where it goes and what happens next</u>

Depending on age of the problem, it is either routed to the source of the problem or most appropriate department to reconcile problem, or else handled by CATM Help Desk.

<u>Identify what data currently exists</u>

The following are tracked in the CATM MS Access database for each Help Desk referral:
- Old or newly created problem
- Type of problem
- Where sent for resolution (by dept., not individual)
- Date received at Help Desk
- Date resolved
- Title of piece
- Who sent problem

Need to identify data that does not exist

- CATM Help Desk is currently unable to perform enough follow-up on assigned referrals.
- Impact of "by-passing" Help Desk on picture of volume of corrections, type of corrections, source of problems

How many

- First year of operation: FY1999/2000

  Total 1375

  Resolved 1326

  Unresolved 49

  Avg. # referrals received per mo.= 114

  Avg. # referrals resolved per mo. = 111

- Sources of referrals:

  1128 from Public Services sites (82%)
  - Large (3-digit) referrals from :

    Art - 235 (17%)
    Engin - 194 (14%)
    Mck Per - 167 (12%)
    NTL - 163 (12%)

  223 from within TSD (16%)
  - Large (3-digit) referrals from:

    EPU - 166 (12%)

  5 from Collection Management
  19 from email

- Four representative months of Help Desk operation:

July 1999	total problems referred	87
November 1999	total problems referred	114
March 2000	total problems referred	110
July 2000	total problems referred	117
	total problems referred	428
Avg. per month		107

Categories of referrals from selected 4 months:

- Referrals concerning **holdings**: 4 month total = 280
  (65% of all referrals in those 4 months)

Select categories--

Duplicate call numbers = 16 (3.7% of all referrals, 5.7% of holdings referrals)
Location problem = 78 (18% of all referrals, 27.8% of holdings referrals)
Item not converted = 55 (12.8% of all referrals, 19.6% of holdings referrals)

- **Non-holdings** referrals: 4 month total = 148
  (34.5% of all referrals in those 4 months)

Select categories--

No UMC on OCLC = 6 (1.4% of all referrals, 4% of non-holdings referrals)
Bib correction = 24 (5.6% of all referrals, 16% of non-holdings referrals)
Label problem = 42 (9.8% of all referrals, 28% of non-holdings referrals)

Bottlenecks --

- unavailability of needed materials;
- analysis/decision making process to disperse Help Desk report to the appropriate department within TSD can sometimes be complicated;
- anything that interferes with staff members' resolution of problems in Help Desk reports and their completion and return of the report forms to the Help Desk;
- filing of completed Help Desk forms is time consuming, however, keeping the initial report form is valuable for tracing what the first person thought the problem was and then seeing how it was actually resolved.
- referrals which are really projects, which cannot be accommodated readily

Parking Lot ideas:

- Need for Students Assistants to locate and retrieve needed materials.
- Study the usefulness of keeping the completed Help Desk reports.
- Need more advertisement of Help Desk to internal customers.
- Have departmental Help Desk contacts log & track referrals to the department using copy of same MS Access database established by Help Desk Unit staff.
- Create clearer contacts in other TSD departments for assistance in resolution of "old" problems assigned to CATM
- Need to reduce number of Help Desk "by-passers"

Cataloging Dept. Response to TSD Help Desk Referrals:
http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/CATDEPT/help_desk.html
See also Appendix 1 workflow chart 2c.

- ❑ All TSD Help Desk referrals for any unit in Cataloging come to Systems Training Librarian (Lib 3) first
- ❑ Beginning 5/00, each referral will be evaluated and assigned to the staff-source, if that can be determined, otherwise to the unit which can best deal with the problem being reported
- ❑ Referrals are logged to allow follow-up with the staff/unit assigned to reconcile the problem
- ❑ Help Desk referrals should be addressed immediately
- ❑ Referrals which cannot be acted upon immediately because the material in question is unavailable (checked out, on trace, being called in from branches, etc.) should be reported to Systems Training Librarian so that the Help Desk can be informed of the delay
- ❑ Completed referral forms, signed, dated & with solution described, should be returned to the hanging file on the wall outside Systems Training Librarian's cubicle labeled "HELP DESK REPORTS-FIXED", and she will return them to the Help Desk
- ❑ Systems Training Librarian will notify all CATG staff of common problems reported so that all may learn from our HELP DESK referrals.

How many?

- ❑ Approximately 144 referrals received in CATG since April 2000 (16/mo. Avg.) with vastly varying referral completion times.

What's referred?

- ❑ Data from a report to CATG staff in October 2000:

  From the accounting of the most recent 49 Help Desk problem referrals to Cataloging, the following categories exist:

  - PromptCat bibliographics: 2
  - PromptCat holdings: 3

  - Retro not completed: 8

of these, 5 came from Preservation/Brittle materials and are possibly in the category of "Messaging from Preservation to Cataloging done as a Help Desk problem report"

- Holdings errors total: 25
  ones related to size of item (2 dimensions in 300 $c; e.g., 20 X 29 cm.): 6
  (this "2 dimensions in 300 $c" resulted in one of the PromptCat holding errors also)
  ones needing deletion of holdings note (999): 7
  other 12 errors were:
  catalogue. raisonnés not made non-circ
  vol designation left off
  vol added to wrong record
  added vols w/ wrong circ status
  call # format error
  dup call#
  cuttering error
  wrong barcode on piece
- Transfer disguised as a holdings problem: 1
- Bibliographics errors (missing 599): 1
- New book, no record: 3
- Wrong record chosen: 1
- Policy question (request to cat all items on preservation microfilm purchased for one title--41 additional analytic records, and overall set record with summary holdings and series control needed): 1
- Messaging from Preservation to Cataloging done as a Help Desk problem report: 3
  (see also, "Retro not completed")
- Name "problem" not a problem (authorized name used is different than name on piece): 1

- Regarding referrals of materials never added to UM collections (not yet barcoded; sent for preservation decision by CATG or branch library before being cataloged): these have not necessarily received expedited processing normally given "revisits" referrals.

3. ITD Reports - (Arlene Klair, expert)

- CARL's report generating capabilities are limited to extracting data from one module at a time [i.e. it cannot compare information in SerAcq to information in Circ]
- Canned reports vs. ENFORM reports, written in proprietary language not easy to master

- Routine reports – run by ITD automatically on a regular schedule
  a) **TCR** - daily
  Who gets this report – CATM, Circ depts.?
  -comprised of all TCR' s created in Circ module on preceding day
  -SERAC also has TCR's but no routine report
  - CatM staff process items by linking them to full bib. records
  by following process:

- **Processing the Daily TCR Report**
  http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/CATM/tcr.html

  See also, Appendix 1 Workflow chart 3.

  Temporary Conversion Records (TCR's) are added each day by circulation desk, a procedure developed in cooperation between TSD staff and circulation supervisors. The TCR's added each day appear on a report that is received the following day in Catalog Management. It is the responsibility of CatM staff to review the items on the report, make corrections to the items as needed, link them with appropriate full bibliographic record if it is present in the catalog, and/or determine and carry out any additional follow-up maintenance that may be required.

  Items appearing on the TCR report may be:

  - monographs
  - serials
  - analytics (mono or serial)
  - items not in the cataloged and LC-classified collection, such as course reserve materials, Art Library study prints, Nonprint Library audiovisual equipment, interlibrary loan transactions, etc.

  The entry on the TCR list includes the following data as entered by the staff member creating the record:

  - title
  - call number, including volume designation
  - barcode, followed by the word TEMP
  - CARL branch, location, and media codes status code and date the TCR was created
  - If the item is being rebarcoded, the word "REBARCODED" and the last four digits of the old barcode

  The TCR list may show a status of ST (on shelf; temporary item record) or CT (charged out; temporary item record).

  BASIC STEPS

  1. Search for full record. Do //T search first; if unsuccessful, try //W, then //C.
  2. Get control number from full record.
  3. Make necessary changes to location, buckets, and media on TCR (even if TCR is charged). DO NOT make changes to call number (other than removing "Folio", or moving volume numbering to buckets) without checking actual item first--see "Problems".
  4. MOVE TCR to full record.
  5. Take statistics; mark list to show work completed.
  6. If rebarcode, delete old barcode. Add staff item note to new barcode "Rebarcoded from ...."

If no full record found:

1. Search for full record in USM. If full record is found, and it shows evidence of ownership by UMCP, retrieve in OCLC and update to UMCP database.
2. If no full record with UMCP ownership is found in USM, get copy of book. either from shelf, or by recall.
   There are 2 methods of recalling books:
   a. Use HR (Hold/Recall) command in PAC.
   b. Fill out Hold/Search Request form, and turn in to Circulation
3. If no full record with UMCP ownership is found in USM, OCLC updating must be done. CATM will search OCLC and decide to either find appropriate record and update, or send to CATG for original cataloging.

Return completed list to supervisor for follow-up and archiving.

Problems:

- **Call number and/or bucket discrepancies**:

A common problem with TCR's is that the call number doesn't quite match other holdings on the full record it apparently should be linked; for example, the other holdings on the full record all have a date at the end of the call number, but the TCR call number does not have a date. Or, you can see from the full record that this is a 3-volume set, but there is no volume number on the TCR. To resolve these problems, you must get the piece and examine it. If the item is charged out, you must ask Circulation to recall the piece, as follows:

1. Make a notation of problem on TCR report.
2. Use "TCR Problems" borrower card to place Hold/Recall on item via VICTOR.
3. In HOLD EDIT, attach staff note(s) to the TCR explaining the problem and leaving instructions as needed (be sure to include your name).
4. When notified that the item has returned, take the "TCR Problems" borrower card to Circulation to charge out item. Resolve problem and complete the processing of TCR (refer problem to supervisor if necessary). Be sure to delete the item notes you created in step 3, after the problem is fixed!
5. Be sure to have the item discharged by Circulation before returning it to the shelf, sending it for relabeling, etc. If sending for relabel, set flag to P so that the "being processed" message will be displayed.

- **Rebarcode--old barcode cannot be deleted:**

When rebarcodes appear on the TCR list, the usual procedure is to delete the old barcode after the new barcode is linked. However, some old barcodes cannot be deleted because of outstanding fiscal transactions that are waiting for archiving. We must keep track of these items so that we can go back and delete them after fiscal archiving is complete. At this time archiving has never been done, but in the future, it should occur at regularly scheduled times. For now, we are following this procedure:

1. Select the item with the old barcode in HOLD EDIT. Use F2 to add two notes (see example 2):

a.) a **000** note (PAC shelf status note) that says:
WITHDRAWN [month/year]
(This note will display in the public catalog to show that this item is not available for use.)

b.) a **999** note is used to show withdrawn when item status shows LOST or missing in PAC.
If 000 is used, STATUS stays the same, will not show out to PAC as WITHDRAWN.

c.) a **free text** note that says:
REBARCODED TO nnnnnnnnn; COULD NOT DELETE (XACTIONS)--[YOURNAME]

2. Keep a printout of the item records and the notes, exactly as shown in examples 1 & 2, so that the item can be deleted after archiving. The date stamp on the notes will help identify which items will be eligible for deletion.

EXAMPLE 1

```
*****************************   HOLDINGS  EDIT    **************************

Item #|31430010234740  | Item # |            | Boundwith|  |

Current Branch|ENGIN | Loc|BKSTKS|  Owning Branch|     | Loc|     |

Call#|QA76.5.R36 1982                |

| |       |--| |       |--| |       |--| |       |

LC Card #| 80029510   |               Control #|7197822   |

Status|S |Status Date|033093| Media |MON | Price|      .00|Type|  |

Circ History|    3| Hold History|    0|    Cum History|    3|

Notes |* |                          ( Edit date022593 staff000)

TITLE LEVEL:
Author|Rao Guthikonda V    |            Date| 1982|
Title| Microprocessors and microcomputer systems       |
Branch|ENGIN | Loc|BKSTKS|  Call#|QA76.5.R36 1982                 |

F1=RECOVER  F2=NOTES  F3=NEXT  F4=PREV  F5=MOVE  F6=DEL  F9=WRITE
```

EXAMPLE 2

```
    Item Notes        31430010234740         07/31/1997  12:17:02

000 08/30/93  WITHDRAWN 8/93
  2   08/30/93  REBARCODED TO 034701450; COULD NOT DELETE (XACTIONS)-HH

 -- End of display --
```

Press to continue, P for , PR to Print <,
Line # to edit or delete (e.g. 1E, 1D), A to ADD new note, Q to

EXAMPLE 3

Transactions outstanding --

Holdings record CANNOT be deleted until transactions are cleared.
Touch to continue in HOLDEDIT

EXAMPLE 4

Item Notes   31430034701450   08/05/1997 13:46:36

1 09/09/93 REBARCODED FROM 010234740

-- End of display --

Press to continue, P for , PR to Print,
Line # to edit or delete (e.g., 1E, 1D), A to ADD new note, Q to >

b) **USM bib. records loaded** - daily
Who gets this report—CatM
- currently this report is used primarily for information only
- CatM staff process records that were loaded to global without a 300 tag

c) **Bib Notification load** – weekly.
- report given to Heidi [as head of CatG?]
-CatM staff process items without 300 tag
- report only includes records in which the encoding level has been increased in OCLC
*** currently nothing is being done to identify and clean up records with 019 tags

d) **Call no. range counts** – monthly based on North American Title Count (NATC) ranges
Who uses this report ?--primarily used by Collection Development [Branch Heads included], Arlene, individual Colleges use statistics in re-accreditation process…
- consists of a count of all titles, volumes, and circ stats for materials within specific LC call no. ranges
- determines which LC ranges are counted
- Circ stats are questionable due to local circulation policies

e) **Branch/Location/Media counts** - monthly
-ITD maintains profile by adding valid codes and deleting obsolete ones

f) **GovDoc full bib records loaded** – monthly - NEW
Who gets this? – Wilma [acting head of CatM]
-process in flux – changed vendors from OCLC to Marcive as of July 1, 2000
-process is still in TEST phase

g) **GovDoc shipping list records loaded** – weekly - NEW
-report given to Wilma
-CatM staff process

- Annual clean-up reports:
  a) **Serial summary SOURCE = blank and ACQ = 4**
  -CatM staff process to code SOURCE as
    - currently received,
    - purchased,
    - membership,
    - gift or

- depository

-clean-up of this field is necessary because we use it to generate paid and unpaid subscription counts; and supports accurate count of current serials for IPEDS, ARL
***direct outcome of this report is that a problem with the GovDoc loader was discovered and corrected

b**) Bad branch/location/media report**

-clean-up is necessary to ensure that collection counts by branch or media are accurate
-report only includes invalid combinations in item records
-valid combination list is updated on a monthly basis by Asst. head of CatM
VICTOR Branch/Location/Media Codes with OCLC Institutional Codes
http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/blm_arch-art.html
-CatM staff process
-50% of problems are quick to fix, and the remainder require research

- MARCOUT support/ Clean-up projects

a) **Tag 000 missing**

-problem from GEAC and early CARL to 1995; total number remaining instances unknown
-CatM staff process report by adding leader tags
-leader tag must be present in bib. record for bib. file maintenance, for records to overlay, and for MARC output; holds bib format code of record

b) **TCR report**

-two varieties. Daily report of temp records created by circ desks
-also run periodically to find old stranded temp records
-processed by CatM staff, except for CJK materials; staff find available full records in VICTOR to link holding, and refer to those without bib records to CATG to have bib created when piece is available

- Requested reports; run as staff time is available to repair

a) **Bad call no.**

– call numbers that have invalid characteristics
-no longer being run; last time 3 years ago
-program is specific to CARL
-processed by CatM

b) **Mixed call no**.

– two different call numbers on one bib record
-rarely run
-less useful now that SUDOC and special local call number schemes are so prevalent in VICTOR
-CatM staff process

c) **Bib. Checker**

– run last year
-reports bibs w/out holdings; holdings w/o display records; holdings with temps
-does not exclude bib. records with summaries

- Situational reports - episodic

Examples:

Pieces in HBK also held in other locations

-weeding project requested by PSD
-CatM staff processed

Serial summaries with certain branches or locations

-transfer projects requested by branches
-CatM staff process

Shelf lists for particular branches, and or locations

-inventory projects requested and processed by branches

- Miscellaneous reports

  019 report

  -generated 4 or 5 years ago
  -snapshot of USM system
  -never processed

  Bib Tag inventory report

  -breakdown of every record in USM system by tag [e.g. how many 100 tags in system]
  -counts obsolete values that are still in system

  UMC99 report

  -no longer considered duplicate records
  -conversion to new system will involve reconciliation with holdings in UMC
  -systematic work by CATM suspended

4. Global Catalog Maintenance – (Arlene Klair, expert)

The Catalog Management Department at University of Maryland Libraries performs bibliographic record corrections and deletions in the VICTOR global database on behalf of the LIMS2 institutions. Corrections are referred by institutions on marked-up printouts with necessary supporting documentation; usually mailed in batches.

These UM responsibilities are not detailed extensively as they are unlikely to continue in the LIMS3 single-database environment.

- Source of requests for database corrections: 25% from College Park , 75% reported by other campuses (most from TU, UMBC).

  - Other campuses are responsible for correcting the Global catalog if they are the only owners

    Most Cataloging staff at College Park make the corresponding correction/deletion to global that they make to CP local database-- an exception includes the CP local & global corrections generated from BNA report reconciliation by the Authorities Unit at College Park. CatM receives printouts of these correction requests monthly from the Cataloging Department's BNA Project.

  - College Park CatM staff correct records for titles with multiple owners

- Quantity of global corrections requested: approximately 250-300 printouts received monthly.

- Problem: overwhelming majority of global corrections requests are requests to correct one access point, the occasional duplicate record is reported. Some field corrections are specifically excluded from global correction efforts, for example tag 504, etc.

- Parking lot idea – Global Maintenance and College Park's role will change with new LIMS

5. & 6. Monograph Transfer and Withdrawals – (Donna King, expert)

Expert provided copies of Transfer and Withdrawal Slips and List of Transfer and Withdrawal Projects (available on Web at http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/TSD/CATM/trans_withd_proj.html)

The Transfer and Withdrawal Clerk is a LT 2; she presently works with two grade 2 students, averaging 20 hours per week during the school year. It takes 6 months to 1 year to train a student to this level.

5. TRANSFER PROCEDURE

See Appendix 1 workflow charts 5a. & b.

The slip must be signed by both the transferring and receiving branch.

The student
- checks that the slip matches the piece and that the proper signature is present.
- searches the piece in VICTOR by title, call # or OCLC#,
- verifies that the piece is a monograph
- checks for the correct bibliographic information (pagination, imprint, edition)
- checks 490 and 440 tags to see if summary holdings have to be adjusted
- puts problems on a shelf for Donna to check.

The circ status is checked. Only "on shelf" can be transferred.
Branch/location/media code combinations are checked for validity. Location and/or branch field is edited.
When appropriate, the note "Some vols. in other locations" added to summary.

Transfer/withdrawal staff
- erases call # with the proper eraser
- removes date due slip if being transferred to non-circ location
- stamps "not to circulate" if being transferred to non-circ location.

End processing staff relabels.

Statistics are kept for all transactions.

Folio to Stacks and Folio to Oversize within the same branch is NOT a transfer.

Problems Donna experiences:
- lack of training for selector in completing transfer form
- lack of signature
- transferring of parts of titles (not index, supplement, part of run)
- getting unconverted titles converted before they can be transferred
- Branches (Art, Arch, Engin) have recently begun doing their own transfers within (e.g., Ref to Stacks). This will affect TSD Transfer stats and the amount of work CATM receives, also trickling down to EPU, which will not receive as much relabeling

6. WITHDRAWAL PROCEDURE

See Appendix 1 workflow charts 6a. & b.

The person selecting the material to be withdrawn is responsible for filling out the form, checking off the appropriate box of serial/monograph. Until recently, "last copy" decisions required 2 signatures, the selector and/or Karla Hahn (Collection Management) or Sue Koutsky (Preservation). Recent CMRAC decision, "For last copy withdrawals, any two signatures from Collection Management are OK. It doesn't have to be signed by Karla or Desi."
Selectors' Directory available at http://www.lib.umd.edu/UMCP/CLMD/cmdstaff.html

Each branch is permitted to send 5 boxes of transfer/withdrawal materials each week. This is in addition to project work that Donna and her staff are working on. 10% of the unit's regular workflow is non-project.

75% of the work in the unit is transfers, 25% is withdrawal. **<u>There is a problem with teams/branches sending too much material in a week.</u>**

The student

- checks that the slip matches the piece and that the proper signature is present.
- searches the piece in CARL by title, call # or OCLC#,
- verifies that the piece is a monograph
- checks for the correct bibliographic information (pagination, imprint, edition)
- checks the 490 and 440 tags to see if summary holdings have to be adjusted
- puts problems on a shelf for Donna to check.

As each record is pulled up, the circ status must say "on shelf" to be withdrawn. If lost, charge, intransit or hold status, the piece is put on the problem shelf.

If circ status is not problematic, the piece can then be deleted. However, if "Transactions outstanding" notice comes up at delete function, a note must be added stating ***"Withdrawn mm/yy"***. This note does not display in WebPac. While in WebPac, the public can still put holds on materials that have been withdrawn, because the status displays as "on shelf." **This is necessary because VICTOR does not provide financial archiving.**

For each piece deleted, the barcode and label are marked off and piece is stamped "Withdrawn" on 3 sides. Withdrawn pieces are boxed for disposal, book sale or shipped back to the branch.

During the course of Program Review, procedures changed for Preservation Reformat materials. Brittle/damaged pieces which have been replaced with a microform or preservation photocopy version are now withdrawn before the replacement copy is originally cataloged, rather than after. The withdrawn copy accompanies the new version to Cataloging and is discarded following the cataloging of the microform or photocopy reformat copy. If the Preservation Replacement copy is an exact match to the original, the new copy goes to Cataloging first for item conversion and the brittle/damaged copy is withdrawn after the replacement is cataloged. This prevents the loss of the usable cataloging record, in the event the brittle/damaged piece was the last copy.

If the piece selected to be withdrawn has status

- "Charged" or "Lost", Transfer/Withdrawal clerk contacts the branch to inform them to discharge the piece.
- "Hold", it's placed on recall if piece can withstand another circulation; if it cannot, Transfer/Withdrawal clerk notifies circ desk to remove hold as piece is being withdrawn and Preservations (Sue Koutsky) lets Collection Management know that a desirable title is being withdrawn.
- "In transit" – owning branch must discharge.

If LCD (last copy decision) – record must be removed from VICTOR.

- delete from local – Donna King, Loretta Tatum, Rinette Redmond, or Wilma Bass performs
- delete from global – Loretta, Rinette, or Wilma performs
- delete from OCLC – Loretta, Rinette, Wilma performs

A 910 note is added to global if UMC originally brought the record into database but is withdrawing our last copy from UMCP local.

Statistics are kept for all transactions.

Parking lot --

- Transfer/Withdrawal processes complicated by absence of Financial Archiving in current ILS; increased awareness of TSD interaction with Circ system needed
- Collection Development staff need to communicate better with Transfer/Withdrawal staff: providing accurate transfer/withdrawal slips with proper signatures and sending agreed-upon quantities of materials for processing.

7. Monograph Analytics Adds—(Yeo-Hee Koh, expert)

Activity/task	Mono Adds for "Analyzed"
Where does the work come from?	Acquisition Staff or Rapid Cataloging Staff
What happened to the work in the unit?	***See the Appendix 1 flowchart 7***
Where does it go next?	Rapid Cataloging Staff for next-day revision
How long does this activity take to perform?	15 minutes, if it is simple addition
What statistics are kept and how are they kept. What is not counted?	Count new overall title and new analytic title and volume; title and volume count for analytic adds not reported by branch
What is the volume of the work that comes in? (items[?] per day, week, or month as appropriate)	On the average 3-5 a month UM FY1999/2000 statistics: 127 vols.
What is frequency of the task? (Routine, irregular, once a year?)	Irregular

Is there a backlog? If yes, how big? What is the bottleneck?	No backlog
What are the issues/problems related to this task?	1. Incomplete record must be dealt with by faculty cataloger; 2. UM local may use different call # from Authority record; 3. Need of contacting branch lib for relabeling; 4. PromptCat analytics not checked; 5. Editing management screen in SERAC when set complete
Numbers and level of staff that performs the tasks	One staff - LT II

8. Cataloging Revisits Category: Added Copies process (Donna Costa-Leonard, expert)

- Major Tasks

If the piece is interfiled in the queue, then the initial OCLC search turns up "in UMC," and then the piece is searched in VICTOR. If the item is labeled an "ADD," the VICTOR/CARL search for copy is the first step. In either case, once the record is found in VICTOR, the item records are added, and then the piece is sent to the End Processing Unit or to whence it came (see the flow chart description for options).

- Flow chart/process map for each task, including

- Where the work comes from
- What happens to it in the unit
- Where it goes and what's next

The pieces come into the Rapid Cataloging Unit from three different places: Acquisitions, Special Handling materials from Rare Books/Archives through the Rare Books Cataloger, or direct from special branches (ex. Mauer, LAB, UMUC). The books from Acquisitions are arrive on a separately labeled Adds truck, or are, at times, included with routine processing new titles. In Rapid, the piece is searched in VICTOR for copy and then item information is added directly into VICTOR with barcode information. The piece is then sent to one of three places: the End Processing Unit, a locked cabinet to go back to the Archives, or is returned directly to the special branch.

See Appendix 1 flowchart 8.

- Level of staff performing task(s)

Faculty Catalogers add copies for pieces from the Monographs routine processing queue, while students and LT Is and IIs in Rapid do those from Acquisitions and special branches.

- How many handled

Average time it takes
How often the task is done

During slow periods, as few as 50 added copies per month are handled by the Rapid Catalogers, while on average, 250 are added per month (August 2000 total for Rapid Unit=72; Added copy totals for Rapid Unit, plus work by student for September (53 + 117) and October (106 + 161) = 437 or avg. 218.5) Added copies occur daily, and on average, take 5 to 10 minutes to complete, depending on the difficulty involved and the decision-making required.

- Bottlenecks; Backlogs; Redundancy of processes
  - The major bottleneck to the added copy process is lack of staff. Much of this work could be delegated to students, but at the moment, Rapid Cataloging has no students, and must borrow student time from other units.
  - The major redundancy involved in this process is the multiplicity of searches. While most of the items are searched in Acquisitions, the bibliographic record is not printed, nor is the OCLC number jotted down, so the staff adding copy within Cataloging must search the record again. This could easily be avoided.
  - It seems as though pre-searching and pre-sorting by Acquisitions are inconsistently reliable. An example of this is the Gifts. Gift items are often not pre-searched properly in Acquisitions, and Gift slips are often not properly filled out. To the degree that the pre-search/pre-sorting information is not reliable, catalogers' time is wasted.

- Observations by WG or Experts re:
  Activities – issues not suggested
  Solutions

- Statistics Collections, including
  - What is counted
  - How data is collected

  The VICTOR Adds are included in piece count for collection statistics reported from the Cataloging Dept. whether or not the staff member reports a VICTOR item conversion count. Staff record the number of copies and volumes monthly by branch. Rapid Catalogers count Added volumes separately from Added copies because in the current PRD cycle (4/00-12/00) they get pro-rated production credit at different levels for the two forms of Adds.

- Parking lot ideas –
  - Ideas/questions/related thoughts
    - Parking lot: Acquisition's staff could convert item when they pre-search/sort adds, as they do PromptCat.
    - Consider incorporating Rapid Adds queue into chronological Rapid Routine queue

9. Added volumes and supersedes—(Roz Becker, expert)

<u>PROCEDURES For ADDS</u>

Added volumes come to Rapid Cataloging from Acquisitions. These books have been sort searched by Acquisitions and determined to be an add to a title already held in VICTOR. In most cases they will come over with a ***standing order form (STO)*** as they are published in the same series or we have a multi-volume set which is continuously updated. Examples of updates would be superseded law books and loose-leaf inserts. The STO form includes routing instructions, such as "Send to Holding Unit", i.e., Rapid Cataloging Unit. Adds (copy or volume) may also come over with a ***materials request form (MRF),*** a ***gift acceptance slip***, or an ***approval form (e.g., BNA***). Acquisitions has determined that the piece is an add to a title we hold. It is important for Rapid to search VICTOR to determine if the piece is indeed an add or if a better record needs to be found. All routing slips have a selector's initials/name on them except the STOs. Rapid will not accept any materials without a selector slip in it indicating which Branch/location for which piece was selected. The adds are housed chronologically (by receipt date in Rapid) in their own queue. This queue is comprised of add copies and add volumes. The process for adding volumes and adding copies are similar, but have their differences. Each will be broken out in detail separately.

See also Appendix 1 workflow chart 9.

- **ADD VOLUMES : NOT LAW BOOKS**

  If College Park owns a multi-volume set, Rapid will receive the new item with a selector slip. The selector slip could be a gift slip, STO, MRF (material request form), or BNA (Approval plan) slip. Some selector slips give a call # that the piece is to be added to and others do not. <u>Do not assume</u> the call # is correct. Title search the piece in VICTOR and identify the correct record. Careful attention needs to be paid to different editions and new series when received; these might go on a different OCLC record. If it is determined that the piece goes on the record you found in VICTOR, you are expected to edit the bibliographic record as well as adding the item to the record:

  1. When the last volume to set is received, meaning the record is a closed volume set rather than an open volume set, this must be reflected in the record's fixed field as well as the variable field, e.g. editing the fixed field. DtSt: and Dates: fields will need correcting. Correct the imprint field (260) if needed.
  2. Indicators in the contents tag could change if set is complete and you have all titles listed in 505 tag.
  3. If volumes have individual titles, these should be included in the 505 tag. For extended contents notes where volumes have not been added in numerical order, editing in VICTOR can be problematic. Sometimes it is easier to just import the same record from OCLC with a completed contents note rather than to do all that editing in VICTOR. If there are a lot of titles missing or a lot of diacritics in the titles, it would definitely be more efficient to lower the encoding level in the VICTOR bibliographic record (local & global) and update the OCLC record . This would overlay the original version in VICTOR.
  4. Use of consistent captions on each holdings record is vital to the sort process. Captions are listed on the TSD documentation site.
  5. If piece is part of a numbered series, make sure to edit the volume numbering in the appropriate tags (4XX, 8XX tags). Sometimes the series authority record needs to be reverified.
  6. If the publisher changes, a note should be added to the bibliographic record stating so.
  7. Editor changes need to be traced in the 700 tag.
  8. Every time a barcode is added to the holdings record a sort should be done so items list numerically.
  9. Use good judgement; if a piece comes in for MCK STACKS and all the other items are in MCK REF where you gonna put it?
  10. If set is complete make sure your descriptive tag (300) gives the volume specifics, don't leave it open if it isn't; show how many volumes are in the set. This is only done if it is without a doubt the final volume.
  11. If you add any access tags make sure there's an authority record.
  12. Any and all corrections made to the record must be corrected in global as well except for local tag corrections/additions. When corrections are moved to the global record a print out with the corrected line(s) needs to be

highlighted and taken to CATM. If global corrections are not made, send the local record to CATM with your corrections highlighted. CATM will notify branches of corrections even though their record has already been changed. If UM is the only holding branch in global then notification of changes isn't necessary, but global still has to be corrected in maintenance.

Add volume process is the same for preservation reformatted volumes in sets except the holding note on new item indicates "Preservation reformat". Supercedes require that previous version of volume be withdrawn or transferred to another collection.

- **ADD VOLUMES : LOOSE LEAF INSERTS, LAW BOOKS, AND SUPERSEDED LAW BOOKS**

Law books have their own unique numbering system and new laws are written or rewritten often enough to warrant replacement volumes. In most cases we discard the outdated material and keep only the latest law books. The Maryland Room is an exception and sends their superseded volumes from reference to their stacks for historical purposes.

Acquisitions has established a standing order (STO) to receive these pieces on. The STO has routing instructions in the summary area. If item is a bound volume that will sit in the queue for several years having pocket parts and supplements added to it each year, the bound volume will get a barcode and get entered in CARL. The instructions summary will tell you to send bound volumes to mono adds.
It is important that the temporary pieces (pocket parts and supplements) supplementing the volumes get shelved immediately with the bound volume. This is so we have current laws in our collection. This temporary material doesn't need to go on CARL or have a barcode. It will not go to the EPU for treatment. Acquisitions will pencil the call number on the piece and send it to the holding location. Rapid and the EPU will never see these pieces; reference and stacks staff shelves them immediately with the particular volume. Reference and Stacks staff is responsible for pulling the old material and replacing it with the current material. Withdrawal slips are filled out in rapid and placed in the newest volume after it is added to CARL. This withdrawal slip instructs the ref/stacks staff to pull the previous volume and all pocket parts, supplements, etc. and send to CATM to be withdraw. Tossing supplements is not automatic especially if the copyright on it is the same as the copyright on the latest volume we received. You will make certain by comparing the supplement to the latest volume to make certain that the sections covered in the supplement are included in the bound volume. This really is only a concern if the copyright years are the same. Most times an insert will come with the new volume added instructing what to keep and what to toss, but this is not always the case so you will need to be familiar with how the sequencing of law books works by reading the introductory pages. Since ref/stacks staff seem to overlook the withdrawal slips it has become necessary for me to go pull the SUPERSEDED volumes and give them to CATM a long with a withdrawal slip. Every time a volume is added to a law title careful attention needs to be paid to the current holdings to make sure superseded volumes have indeed been removed. If not removed go pull them to be withdrawn.

The STOs routing instructions indicate that loose-leaf inserts get the call number pencilled on the piece and are sent to reference and stacks supervisors to have students do the pulling and inserting. We should never receive loose-leaf inserts and if we do something needs to be fixed on the STO so that staff are instructed to forward to reference or stacks. Occasionally publishers will send us a new binder to use for all of the inserts we have or will receive. The STO should request that the binder be sent to rapid. Rapid will add the "volume" and send to EPU for routine processing. The binder will then be sent to reference/stacks staff to shelve. These binders will receive the inserts as they come and often inserts are received in reference/stacks long before the binder is received. Reference/stacks staff should shelve this binder even if empty. I have noticed that reference has a queue in their office to house these inserts until a binder is received, but this needs to be amended as patrons must have access to these inserts now and not later when we receive the binder.

Supplements and pocket parts received in Acquisitions per instructions on the STO get the call number pencilled in on the piece and are also sent directly to the reference/stacks staff to put with the piece. They should pull the older ones and toss, but since they don't seem consistent in this routine a sweep of the title is necessary to pull any outdated ones that remain. Remember temporary pieces are not reflected on the holdings record so it is a good idea to check the title occasionally.

Some law books are catalogued as monos and others as serials. I don't know the reason for this. I think the law books that are subject to changes get set up as monos? Regardless, both serial and mono law books are received on STOs.

When viewing the summary holdings of a title make sure the actual holdings are reflected in the summary holdings. If not, give to Acquisitions staff to fix.

We are in the process of trying to establish a procedure to handle problems arising from paperback parts/fascicles received and added to the system. Because a lot of these require free flys they are sent to Preservation where according to our bindery tree get bound. These are not to be bound until all of the parts or fascicles are received and then reference/stacks staff should send to bindery to be bound. These are received in Acquisitions on a STO and sent to rapid to barcode and add to the system. These parts/fascicles do not come on a regular basis and do not always come in order. Since these items will circulate it becomes necessary for us to barcode them. Because they will circulate they have traditionally proceeded to EPU and then sent to Preservation to be bound. The problem arises when the final part/fascicle is received and ready to be bound with the others and we find all the separate pieces have already been bound and now the bindery must tear off the hard covers they put on them and regroup all the pieces to be bound together as one unit. Rapid has sent these pieces to EPU with fliers noting that piece is not to be bound only to be told that EPU trashes these fliers and sends the book to the bindery where they more often than not are bound singularly.

How many added volumes?
Rapid Cataloging added volume production for September, 2000 = 208; October, 2000 = 130; for a two-month avg. of 169

Parking lot items for Add Volumes
- Create an "official" monographic supersedes flyer
- Create an "official" fascicle processing flyer and routine (barcode & add unbound fascicles and rebarcode when a volume is complete and bound?)
- Have process improvement team address problems with stacks maintenance of loose-leaf and superseded material
- Consider incorporating Rapid Adds queue into chronological Rapid Routine queue