The final report from the Higher Education Library Integrated Network (HELIN)'s Task Force on Bibliographic and Authority Control begins with a statement of the charge to the task force. It then summarizes its activities in each of five areas: (1) documentation of local authority control (cataloging) practices; (2) consultation with vendors of authority control data and their customers; (3) identification of national cataloging and authority control standards; (4) recommendations for the ongoing coordination of authority work within the consortium; and (5) recommendations for written HELIN policy and procedures for the creation, update and ongoing evaluation of bibliographic and authority records in the consortium. The report also provides a statement of the HELIN systemwide online cataloging policies for bibliographic, item, and authority records. Lists of authorized cataloging standards and standard cataloging abbreviations are appended. (MAB)
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The HELIN Task Force on Bibliographic and Authority Control (BAC) completed its deliberations at a meeting held at the University of Rhode Island on 15 August 1990. The charge to the committee expressed by the HELIN Management Committee in September 1989 was:

The Task Force is charged with the work of developing recommendations on HELIN policy and procedures for the creation, update and ongoing evaluation of bibliographic and authority records in the HELIN integrated system. Issues related to all types of updates to a bibliographic record in the HELIN database, either through overlay or online update, should be addressed. In the course of its deliberations, the Task Force will research current local and national authority control practice, consult with vendors of authority data, and explore and define the coordination of authority work within the consortium. The Task Force shall consist of one representative from each HELIN member with the chair appointed by the HELIN Management Committee. Recommendations are due to the HELIN Management Committee by July 1, 1990. Interim reports are expected every 90 days. (The date for submission of this final report has been extended to 1 Sept 90.)

Over the course of the 1989/90 academic year, the Task Force has met 12 times on the following dates: 14Sept89, 19Oct89, 7Nov89, 19Dec89, 9Jan90, 13Feb90, 6Mar90, 4Apr90, 9May90, 5Jun90, 10Jul90, and 15Aug90.

The members of the Task Group appointed by the Management Committee are: James Frechette, Community College of Rhode Island; Carol Hryciw-Wing, Rhode Island College; Helena Rodrigues, Roger Williams College and Michael Vocino, the University of Rhode Island. Michael Vocino was appointed Chair. Millie Ywan, Systems Analyst is an ex-officio member of the Task Force. (Robert Asori, Community College of Rhode Island, although not an official member of the Task Force, took part in its deliberations.)
During its deliberations the group sought to summarize its charge into the following segments: (1) documentation of local authority control (cataloging) practices; (2) consultation with vendors of authority control data and, if possible, their customers; (3) identification of national cataloging and authority control standards; (4) suggestion of recommendations for the ongoing coordination of authority work within the consortium; and finally, (5) recommendation of written HELIN policy and procedures for the "creation, update and ongoing evaluation of bibliographic and authority records..." in the consortium.

1. DOCUMENTATION OF LOCAL AUTHORITY CONTROL (CATALOGING) PRACTICES.

Each institution submitted to the Task Force written copies of their respective authority control practices. In order to readily understand those practices, the Task Force created flow charts for each institution. Both the written practices and the flow charts are appended to this report. The Task Force agrees that there is essential uniformity among the HELIN member institutions with regard to authority control practice. Differences do exist, however. Some institutions pre-check during the authority control process while other institutions post-check. The Task Force agrees that each institution will internally decide whether to pre- or post-check during this process. The Task Force further agrees that all institutions are in compliance with national standards in application of their local authority practices and will mesh within the proposed online environment.

2..CONSULTATION WITH VENDORS OF AUTHORITY CONTROL DATA AND THEIR CUSTOMERS.

During its deliberations, the Task Force collected information on the following vendors of authority control data: BNA, Autographics, WLN, and Utlas. In addition, the Task Force met with BNA representatives at our 9 January 1990 meeting, and had an extensive phone conversation with representatives of Autographics. We talked with the following customers of authority control data vendors: Boston University (BNA); University of Lowell (Utlas) and California State University at Northridge (Autographics). Most members of the Task Force also attended an all day seminar on authority control held at NELINET in Newton in January, 1990.

In its first progress report to the HELIN Management Committee, the Task Force identified BNA as the vendor of choice for authority data. At a subsequent meeting (and in a memo to the Management Committee dated 8 July 1990), the Task Force passed the following resolution:
After further evaluation of Autographics (including its manual review process), this committee recommends Autographics as a possible vendor (with BNA) for authority work to the HELIN Management Committee.

3. IDENTIFICATION OF NATIONAL CATALOGING AND AUTHORITY CONTROL STANDARDS.

The Task Force has identified a group of cataloging and authority control standards and has agreed to recommend them to the Management Committee for use in the HELIN online environment. Appendix A contains our recommendation of "Authorized Cataloging Standards" and "Authorized Authority Lists". The Appendix also contains "Abbreviations for VIPS Information." A "Conversion Table for Designators in the Item Call Numbers," used for conversion of CSLI item records, contains normalized forms of VIPS abbreviations that the Task Force has agreed to use in the new system.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ONGOING COORDINATION OF AUTHORITY WORK WITHIN THE CONSORTIUM.

The Task Force would like to recommend that the HELIN Management Committee create a successor to this Task Force. The Task Force sees this future committee as the arbiter for all bibliographic and authority control questions within the consortium. The Task Force recommends further that this committee which we have tentatively named the HELIN Bibliographic and Online System Supervisors Group be authorized by the HELIN Management Committee to meet as soon as possible and preferably sometime during September 1990.

The Task Force further recommends that the duties of chairing this committee rotate among the four official representatives appointed by the HELIN Management Committee to represent each of the participating HELIN members.

5. RECOMMENDATION OF WRITTEN HELIN POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE CREATION, UPDATE AND ONGOING EVALUATION OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC AND AUTHORITY RECORDS IN THE CONSORTIUM.

The Task Force has spent the lion's share of its time during the past year writing a set of systemwide cataloging policies. Those policies which are an adaptation for HELIN use from a similar set of policies written by the University of Maine system are attached to this report. Although yet not fully developed, "HELIN SYSTEMWIDE ONLINE CATALOGING POLICIES" is considered a document with which we could begin to enter an online catalog in the consortium environment. It is expected that a Bibliographic and Online System Supervisors Group will be created to develop those areas not fully addressed in this original document.
The Task Force has also interviewed staff at institutions where Innovative Interfaces has already been installed and is operational. An onsite visit was made to Wellesley College by the entire group. There, we not only interviewed, but also had the opportunity for hands-on experience. A conference call was made from the Task Force to the University of Maine systems analyst. A telephone call to the Tri-College Consortium (Haverford, Bryn Mawr, Swarthmore) systems analyst was reported on to the group. The Task Force has had the opportunity to question user's of III services from a variety of settings: college library, university-wide system, and several colleges in a consortium configuration.

Also included in this report's appendix are a complete set of our minutes, copies of correspondence from and to the HELIN Management Committee and correspondence and suggestions from Task Force members to the Chair of issues needing further study (similar suggestions are also in the minutes of this Task Group).

The work of the original Task Group is completed with the filing of this report with the HELIN Management Committee. We anxiously await the appointment of our successor, which will be needed to handle ongoing authority and bibliographic questions for the consortium.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Vocino, Chair
15 August 1990
Introduction:

This document covers cataloging policy decisions. For the most part it does not include information on cataloging rules. It assumes that all system libraries will follow national cataloging standards (see Appendix A) and use nationally accepted heading forms where available.

Cataloging procedures, which may vary from library to library, are also generally not included except where needed to achieve a System objective.

Organization is primarily by type of record (Bibliographic, Item, Authority).

The goal is to develop and promote policies that will make the HELIN database database accurate, complete, consistent and easy to understand and use. To that end it is hoped that the HELIN Management Committee will create a Bibliographic and Online Systems Supervisor's Group to oversee the creation and maintenance of the HELIN database.

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS

A. Avoiding duplication:

In the HELIN database, there should be only one bibliographic record for each unique title. Each cataloging library must therefore search the database before adding a bibliographic record, in order to avoid duplication. An item to be cataloged is considered to match an record if the following fields match:

- Author
- Title
- publisher or distributor (except for serials)
- latest copyright date
- edition
- collation
- series (except for serials)
- illustrator or translator

The above list provides general guidelines only. For detailed information about the criteria for matched records, see the appendix "When to Input A New Record" in the OCLC Bibliographic Input Standards manual. If the item and cataloging record meet these criteria to your satisfaction, consider the record matched in. DO NOT create a duplicate record.

B. Editing existing HELIN database bibliographic records

1. Permitted Changes:
Correction of obvious typographical errors
Correction of tagging errors
Updating of obsolete headings
Corrections in descriptive cataloging
Addition of LC or local subject headings
Addition of local holdings data, using an 59X field.
Addition of name or title added entries

2. Do not change:

Legitimate subject headings from other libraries, even if you do not agree with the subject assignment
Main or added entries in the correct form, even if you do not agree that they are appropriate.

3. Guidelines for overlaying:

the Bibliographic and Online Systems Supervisors group will establish guidelines for overlaying bibliographic records at a future date.

4. Guidelines for deletion:

If a library is deleting the last item record attached to a bibliographic record, the bibliographic record should be deleted also. (Tentatively accepted with date qualification to be added by the Bibliographic and Online Supervisors Group at a later date.)

C. Creation of new bibliographic records

As noted above, new records should be created only when the item being cataloged has no matching record in HELIN database. Records may be created in either of two ways: downloading from a bibliographic utility, and keying.

1. Downloading:

   a. In order to keep HELIN database consistent with OCLC, only the following changes are permitted in OCLC records before downloading:

   Correction of typographical errors
   Addition of subject headings
   or corrections of subject headings
   Addition of titles or other added entries
   Date in call number
   Changing obsolete headings
   Completion of missing data in CIP records
   Addition of notes applying to the bibliographic record
   Correction of coding errors
Elimination of 85X fields already in the OCLC record
Elimination of 653 field in a UK MARC record

b. Verification is required for the following fields before downloading an OCLC record:
   - Bibliographic level
   - Record type
   - Material type
   - Language
   - Filing indicators (verification required only in the case of non-English materials)

c. Call numbers in an OCLC record to be downloaded will not be displayed on public access screens. Only item level call numbers will be displayed on public access screens.

2. Keying:

   (the Bibliographic and Online Supervisors Group will establish guidelines for keying records at a later date.)

D. Elimination of existing duplicate bibliographic records

   When duplicate bibliographic records are encountered, the following steps should be taken to eliminate them:

1. If one record is DLC and the other record is not, notify libraries whose holdings are attached to the non-DLC record that a DLC record is available. The last library to transfer its item records should delete the bibliographic record no longer in use.

2. If neither record is DLC, notify the libraries whose holdings are attached to the least preferred (OCLC standards) record. (If the records are otherwise equally valid, the least preferred record would be the one with the fewest item records attached.)

3. If both records are identical (i.e. description is identical AND 001 fields have a matching OCLC number), notify the libraries whose holdings are attached to the record with the highest record number.

4. If two records contain identical 001 fields, but elements of the description do not match, further investigation is needed. For example:

   Two HELIN database records have the same 001 and title and LCCN but the 300 fields do not agree, and the lack of agreement does not seem to be a simple typographical error. Cataloger may search OCLC to determine which of the HELIN database records
most nearly matched OCLC. Libraries whose holdings are attached to the subject record should be notified.

It is difficult to foresee all possible circumstances that may result in near duplicates. However, each library should try to diagnose the problems as they are encountered, and contact the affected parties. Unresolved issues of this nature should be forwarded to the Bibliographic and Online Supervisors Group for final disposition.

II. ITEM RECORDS

A. Record creation

Note: This refers to item records created by means other than downloading. When a record is downloaded from OCLC, an item record is automatically created. (See I.C.1 for downloading procedures.)

1. General

   a. Dummy item records showing location and call number information may be created. For example, large sets where individual item records are not required for circ or inventory purposes, an 85X (LIB HAS) statement will be created in the bib record. For currently received titles that will eventually be represented by HELIN database checkin records, the LIB HAS statement is not needed.

2. Volume field

   a. For consistency, use the abbreviations found in Appendix A for VIPS information.

3. Call number field

   a. Stamps giving location information should be avoided where the same information is already available in the location field. Each library makes its own decisions about which call number stamps are used.

   b. Call number stamps showing A-V formats are inconsistent between libraries. Consistency is desirable, but this issue has been tabled for future discussion by the Bibliographic and Online Supervisors Group.

   c. Tagging: use 090 for LC call numbers, O8s for Sudoc, and 099 for all others.

   d. The same abbreviations should be used for VIPS information in call numbers as those used in the volume field.
B. Editing existing HELIN database records

1. Call number field
   a. When changing a call number, do not make the corresponding change in the bibliographic record.

III. AUTHORITY RECORDS

A. General
   For the present, only records supporting cross references will be added to HELIN database.

B. Authority source guidelines:
   1. Prefer LC authority if it exists (AACR2 or AACR2 compatible).
   2. If no LC authority exists, create an AACRRII or AACRRII compatible form.

C. Record creation
   1. General
      a. When creating an authority record for a heading with subdivisions, if the main heading is judged to require cross references and is not already in the file, create at the same time a record for the main heading.
   2. Downloading is permissible from OCLC.
   3. Keying
      a. When keying in an original authority record, use the agency OCLC symbol.

D. Editing existing HELIN database records
   1. Permitted changes
      a. Deletion of obscure or superfluous cross references. If this is done, it would normally be done on a record just downloaded from OCLC. To show that the record has been modified, create a 699 field with text "incomplete", and add your OCLC symbol to the 040 field, e.g. DLC:cDLC:dRIU.

      b. Global updating of incorrect or obsolete headings is permissible with approval of the Bibliographic and Online Supervisors Group.
c. Adding cross references is permissible.

d. Minor corrections (spelling, punctuation, etc.) are permissible.

2. Only catalogers or their designees may authorize changes to existing authority records.

E. Review file procedures

1. For the present, since only URI does post checking of headings, the weekly files of new headings will be given to URI.

2. In the post checking process, if there are other than URI libraries holding, those headings will be submitted to the Bibliographic and Online Supervisors Group.

F. Record deletion

1. For the present, if the last instance of a heading is deleted from the PAC, delete the authority record for the heading.
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Appendix A

Authorized Cataloging Standards


Library of Congress cataloging practice, as documented in the LC Cataloging Service Bulletin (LCRI, for example) and in other LC documentation (Subject Cataloging Manual and Bibliographic Description of Rare Books, for example).


OCLC Online Systems Manuals (Rocks Format, Serials Format, etc.), latest editions.

OCLC Technical Bulletins

Authorized Authority Lists

OCLC Authority File

Library of Congress Name Authorities (microfiche ed.)


OCLC-MARC Code Lists
### ABBREVIATIONS FOR VIPS INFORMATION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Short Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appendix</td>
<td>app.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book</td>
<td>bk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulletin</td>
<td>bull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document</td>
<td>doc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edition, -s</td>
<td>ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>index</td>
<td>index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manual</td>
<td>manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number, -s</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opus</td>
<td>op.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part, -s</td>
<td>pt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td>rept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>series</td>
<td>ser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplement</td>
<td>suppl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tome</td>
<td>t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>update</td>
<td>updt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volume, -s</td>
<td>v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AACR2, Appendix B.9*