

DALNET DATABASE STRUCTURE TASK FORCE MEETING
THURSDAY 23 APRIL 1998, 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
WSU UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY, DEAN'S CONFERENCE ROOM

Present: R. Call, R. Marcelain, J. Houser, DPL; S. Homant, M. Sheble, UDM;
D. Adams, Botsford (part of morning); C. Yonovich, WCCC; K. Bacsanyi,
B. Heath, J. Trzeciak, WSU; A. Fidler, G. Marck, A. Evans, J. Green,
DALNET Office; L. Bugg, Interim DALNET Project Leader; R. Jones, H.
Masek, J. Sheppard, Ameritech

1. **Review of the Purpose of the day:** To develop a recommendation for the Steering Committee regarding the structure of the DALNET bibliographic, authority, and patron databases.
 - a. Recommendations are due to the Steering Committee by Tuesday, 28 April 1998. The Steering Committee must prepare their recommendation for the DALNET Board meeting scheduled for May 13, 1998.
 - b. The recommendations need to take into account the migration schedule.
2. **Database Options Analysis**
 - a. Single database for all DALNET, based on either one or many bibliographic records per title, with shared authority and patron databases;
 - b. Multiple bibliographic databases, one for each DALNET institution, each with its own authority database, with either shared or individual patron databases;
 - c. Multiple databases, as in B, but with some involving groups of libraries.
3. **Indexing recommendations**
 - a. common indexes
 - b. default indexes
 - c. Jan Sheppard will provide background information
4. **Patron file structure**
 - a. one shared file?
 - b. Several files?
 - c. Batch import and matching?
5. **Working teams and task forces**
 - a. Which ones do we need?
 - b. What time line will they be given?
 - c. The Steering Committee can appoint after Board approval

DATABASE OPTIONS

In the sessions on Wednesday, 22 April 1998, three separate bibliographic/authority database options were discussed. Option A is a single shared database which could use either one bibliographic record per title, or multiple bibliographic records as might be required in some circumstances. There was considerable discussion of this option as it presented some opportunities for economies of scale. There were some implications for

serials control, where all copies of a title on a single bibliographic record in DALNET would have to be received using the same prediction pattern. Configuring the tables in option A would have to be done very carefully to insure that location information displayed in the order desired by the individual library. Indexes would have to be agreed upon in common, although individual libraries could decide not to offer some of the indexes to their patrons.

Option B would create a separate bibliographic and authority database for each DALNET institution. Option C is a variant on B in that some libraries could be clustered together. A major consideration here is that authority work would have to be done for each catalog. Another disadvantage of this option is that only broadcast searches using WebPac would give a union catalog view, and then, there would be a clustered display rather than a true union view. The WebPac display would be via Z39.50. The Windows client for staff use would not have a union view. This would require staff to do multiple searches to find the records desired for cataloging. Another disadvantage of options B and C is that any Horizon software upgrade will have to be done individually for each database and all of the upgrades need to be done almost simultaneously. For those libraries that are grouped together, they would have to agree on some common elements such as indexes and bibliographic records. If the groups are selected carefully, this may not be a major issue.

One possible grouping for hospitals might be:

- DMC libraries (7)
- Beaumont Hospitals (2)
- Veterans Administration Hospital
- Botsford Hospital

The real choice is not between options A, B, and C, but rather option A and option B or C.

It was suggested that if Option B or C was selected, one of the databases could be a special union database of periodical records that all libraries in DALNET would contribute records to.

The Task Force came to consensus on a model which combines the best of options A and B/C. This model would have a union catalog supported by an authority file which would contain resource records for use by all libraries in DALNET. Appropriate batch programs would keep the bibliographic records in the union bibliographic file, the union authority file, and the individual files synchronized. This model is very similar to a model being developed by the academic libraries in California, as part of the Sunrise Project. This model would require more disk space and additional databases to be maintained. It will provide patrons the option of searching a union catalog and the option of searching their own libraries' catalogs. Such a database structure would facilitate resource sharing. If DALNET decides to obtain the appropriate resource authority record, shared authority work will be facilitated.

The union bibliographic database with multiple bibliographic records was briefly discussed. A single bibliographic record could be used for most monographs and government documents. Multiple bibliographic records might be needed for serials, multi-media materials, electronic resources, and rare materials.

This option was named B+, individual databases for each library which all contribute to a union database. The union database will be supported by a shared authority file which will include such resource files as the electronic version of the Library of Congress Subject Headings, the electronic Anglo-American Authority File (names and series), and the MARC version of the machine readable Medical Subject Headings. In this model, authority work will be done in the union catalog and copied, electronically, into the individual authority databases. This model should allow the greatest amount of autonomy for each library in DALNET. Jan Sheppard will be involved in the design and development of the B+ model. It will require some of the already planned enhancements related to record ownership as well as DALNET's needed authority enhancements.

INDEXING DISCUSSION

After lunch, Jan Sheppard, ALS, reviewed the relationships between MARC maps, indexes and displays. What follows is based on somewhat incomplete notes of her PowerPoint presentation.

1. **Definition of MARC map**
 - A set of MARC tags and subfields used to retrieve data in records

2. **Function of MARC maps**
 - Control indexing and conditions for indexing
 - Control data display in the catalog
 - Define limiting criteria
 - Define linkage and import parameters for linking bibliographic records together

3. **Indexing MARC maps**
 - S = search indexes
 - X = authority index
 - Z = subset of authority indexes
 - D = display
 - L = limit

NOTE: reindexing is not practical especially for large databases but display and limit maps are readily changed.

4. **And conditions for indexing**
 - extract information based on criteria
 - If- Then sequences
 - Specify tag, tag part, and value
(e.g. a name valid to use as a subject heading tag 008, Part/15, value a)
5. **Control PAC data display**
 - Display MARC maps (what shows in the catalog)
 - T780 a general display map
6. **Define link tags and import parameters**
 - Link tag MARC maps
 - Link MARC fields (ISBN, ISSN, other control numbers)

NOTE: One cannot combine authority controlled fields and non-authority controlled fields/subfields in the same MARC maps.

7. **Mq Indexes**

...control the interpretation and creation of index tables for looking up bibliographic and item information, borrowers, purchase orders, etc.
8. **Types of indexes**
 - Browse indexes (alphabetical)
 - Key word
 - Union ID numbers
 - Inverted lists (ISBN, ISSN, LCCN)
 - Call no. lists (LC, DDC, SuDocs)
9. **What the Mq Index does**
 - Defines relationships between index term(s) and data
10. **How Mq Index is applied**
 - Search table
 - Single index
 - Combined index
 - Multiple bibliographic displays

NOTE: One needs to order the list of indexes so that the most commonly searched indexes sit at the top of the list (table driven).

11. PAC flavors

- Control search options
- Bibliographic displays

NOTE: DALNET needs to determine what indexes we really need. The number of indexes created will have an impact on the speed with which records are loaded whether singly or in batches. We will need to remember to add a MeSH index and an NLM call number index. A call number processor and spine breaker for local call numbers will be needed. We must identify our common index needs

12. Indexing

- What are those needed in common
MARC Maps for each index
- For STAFPAC
- For WebPac

NOTE: Begin with defaults and build or subtract from there. The same for displays. Our base searching and indexes should be consistent and we can add some special indexes, but libraries can pick and choose to use each index with their individual databases.

A test file of 500 to 1000 bibliographic records from UDM needs to be selected before 18 May. The full test file can be created after that. We should concentrate on bibliographic records and just a few locations for the test file.

During the visit of ALS staff from 5/18 to 5/22 we will learn more about MARC maps, statistical classes, circulation parameters, and ILL/RSS.

The Steering Committee will need to create a task force related to indexing options. It will be necessary to get client software for selected staff PCs for study/testing purposes.

PATRON FILES

There was consensus for one shared patron file. We do see the need to add some data to the standard patron record, for example, parent's name for children, multiple addresses, and student ID numbers. We will need to develop codes for borrower types and statistical classes. Concern was expressed over the use of the Social Security number as the primary matching point for batch-loaded patron records.

TIME LINE

4/27-

Server made available

Database of 500-1000 records made available

Control database built

UDM parameters input

Records exported from NOTIS into Horizon

UDM records loaded into test

5/4-5/15

Review test records

Review data (have records of what we extracted to compare)

Study displays

Prepare agenda for the following week

5/18-5/22/98

Jan Sheppard and Valerie Chase come to Detroit to meet with DALNET staff

Profiling questions

UDM questions

Statistical reports

Identify what data we need to get from reports (IPEDS, ARL, etc.)

Get more records to build UDM's test database, reload and do more testing.

30,000 records or less (Jan will check on numbers)

Include records with linking fields

5/25-

Finish changes to database

Data extract programs from Helen Gbala

Canada does updates

Second database updates

6/1-6/26/98

Test, test, test

Questions to Jan and Valerie

Data extracted from NOTIS for UDM for July complete database loading

Begin training

DALNET needs specs for NOTIS to Horizon dataload--data mapping, etc. Randall Jones will send to Louise Bugg.

7/1-

UDM data loaded

Contract signed

Next library begins profile

7/20-UDM data system quality check

More questions

Review WSU and/or DPL test load status

Module training for UDM

Begin training for WSU Horizon site administrators

8/10-

UDM gap tape

Gap tape loaded

UDM goes live on Horizon

9/1

WSU test dataload

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Option B+ (individual and shared bibliographic databases with union bibliographic authority files) and a single, shared patron file**
2. **Policy recommendations**
 - a. DALNET purchase resource authority files
 - i. LCSH (already get)
 - ii. Anglo-American Authority File mr
 - iii. MeSH
 - iv. Others????????
 - b. Software upgrades must be done together for all databases to keep them in synch.
 - c. Separate databases should have some commonly structured indexes.
 - d. Reciprocal borrowing should be pursued.
 - e. Shared statistical categories should be created.
 - f. Recommit to standards for authority work.
3. **Task Forces/Working Groups needed**
 - a. WebPac design (start now and continue indefinitely)
 - i. Overall design
 - ii. Guidelines
 - iii. Z39.50 databases
 - b. Statistics (to work during the next 2 months)

DALNET Database Structure Task Force Meeting Minutes

April 23, 1998

Page 8

- i. For all DALNET
- ii. Local
- iii. Locations
- iv. Item statistical classes
- v. Borrower statistical classes
- vi. Call number ranges (e.g. ARL stats)
- c. Indexing/ Views (next 2 months)
 - i. What indexes
 - ii. MARC maps
 - iii. Basic displays
- d. PAC views (not as urgent, UDM now, union catalog in FALL)
 - i. STAFPAC views for union database
 - ii. Union catalog view/displays
- e. Review cataloging/authority control standards and work flow with regard to Horizon (briefing 5/18-22 session, work over Summer)
Union OPAC/authority resource file design/test. How will shared authority work be done? Database cleanup issues in a shared file.
Hierarchy/merging of bibliographic records for shared union catalog
- f. Patron file (next 2-3 months)
 - i. Additional fields
 - ii. Records for minor children
 - iii. Develop coding
 - iv. Standards
 - v. Import matching
- g. System administrative issues (Late Summer/Fall)
 - i. security
 - ii. profile tables
 - iii. day end procedures
 - iv. reports
- h. Naming conventions (2 weeks)
 - i. locations
 - ii. collections
 - iii. descriptions in OPAC (i.e. long names)

Louise will draft the Task Force report and recommendations and FAX to the members for their review. They should get their comments back to her by the end of the day Monday, April 27. Louise will revise and finalize the report to get it to the DALNET Steering Committee by their Tuesday, April 28, meeting.

Summary notes by,
Anaclare Evans
4/23/98