MARC Tag Usage Webinar Chat 2010-03-18 (Edited)

This is an edited version of the chat room discussion during the *Implications of MARC Tag Usage on Library Metadata Practices* Webinar. Please listen to the second half of the Webinar for other responses that were said during the discussion period.

from Maritta Coppieters to All Participants:Can you define "mixed materials" for me?

from Karen Smith-Yoshimura to All Participants: Marita - Mixed materials used to be called archival and mixed collection records. It's the format where there is no one overriding characteristic for a collection. Thus "Mixed materials". Think of an archive of diaries, photographs, audios, etc. Used primarily by archives.

from Mia to All Participants: Is date of publication taken from DATE1 and DATE2 in 008, or from 260$c?

(Catherine answered during discussion 008/ Date 1)

from carol seiler to All Participants:@Mia, quite often systems do use the 008 and do not use the 260 $c, because it the 008 is numerical and easy for the computer to digest as opposed to the text driven 260$c

from carol seiler to All Participants:thanks, that is scary given how few people fill out the 008/006/007 for content

from Mia to All Participants:Yes, but it isn't harvested for the most part in any useful fashion

from Maritta Coppieters: Catherine - were you looking at these searches using the database providers' search interface, or via remote (z39.50) search?

(Catherine answered during discussion: Via the database providers search interfaces. I did not look at remote search.)

from Policy & Standards Div. Library of Congress to All Participants: How were 52 sample records selected?

from Lisa Rowlison to All Participants: The 52 records were selected according to type and content. A variety of formats, full records, less-full records, old records, new records - we wanted a sampling representing a variety of characteristics. The subject matter of the records however was not selected for any particular content.

from carol seiler to All Participants: What do you mean "limit by content"?

from Catherine Argus to All Participants:"limit by content" means fiction, biography, dissertation, for example

from carol seiler to All Participants:so, is the "limit by content" limit to fiction based on the 655? or a location code? How is it determined?

(Catherine answered during discussion: The majority of limits utilise a combination of data from the Leader, 006, 007 and 008. Only a limited amount of data is utilised from the variable data fields. A fiction limit generally uses a combination of data from the Leader, 006/13-14 and 008/30-31(Music/sound recordings), 006/16 and 008/33(Books).

from carol seiler to All Participants:Is there any project to de-couple MARC? That is, parse out the information more to allow true searching

from Mia to All Participants: Karen Coyle is working on that all the time

from carol seiler to All Participants: She talks about it (and I love reading it) but is there an actual product coming around?

from Mia to All Participants: If national agencies move, others will follow along.

from carol seiler to All Participants: I would LOVE to see (and happy to work on) a format/standard that parses the information and allows easier translation to computer and from system to system

from Laura Akerman to All Participants: If MARC goes away, who is the "we" that will develop something new, and will the replacement try to satisfy all the constituencies that currently use MARC?

from Laura Akerman to All Participants: Is MODS something that could come closer to doing what we need?

from Policy & Standards Div. Library of Congress to All Participants: No, MODS is an extension of MARC in XML. Brings along the problems.

from Laura Akerman to All Participants: I think MODS is a bit more flexible than MARC, but it could be more so.

from carol seiler to All Participants: I very much like what Karen Coycle is saying about pulling the information out of MARC into separately purposed fields. To me this is similar to how an excel sheet works - we specify in xls the field type (numeric, text, date, etc.) I can see this as incredibly wonderful to work with - is there no ILS that does this currently? Takes the text part out of the numeric fields such as a monograph 300 $a ...

from Mia to All Participants: Possibly Talis - they are pretty much out in front on these issues.
from carol seiler to All Participants: Thanks - I'll look to them. I am so frustrated with many of them, why do catalogers today need to understand tags, indicators, etc....?

from Mia to All Participants: Exactly -- good point Karen (during discussion Karen said in defense of vendors that they were only supplying what was required in libraries' own RFPs) -- vendors have given us what we have asked them for.

from carol seiler to All Participants: Exactly!

from carol seiler to All Participants: Even without that, Karen, not bringing in automated information but also the human entry could be faster, and done much easier if we didn't have to have extensive knowledge on the rules, MARC formats, tec.

from carol seiler to All Participants: Good point Michael

from Policy & Standards Div. Library of Congress to All Participants: Hillmann's work on RDA vocabularies was done on contract to ALA Publishing for the JSC.

from Naun Chew to All Participants: I'm not being critical of vendors (well, at least not on this point), only pointing out that there's a limited workforce that is able to work with MARC.

from Policy & Standards Div. Library of Congress to All Participants: The RDA vocabularies are controlled values, not a schema. There is an IFLA ISBD project to develop an XML schema for the ISBD elements.

from carol seiler to All Participants: The interface changes will have to come from the vendors. I think VTLS was working on something that would allow views of non-marc (i.e. 'enter title here')

from carol seiler to All Participants: Good point – thanks

from carol seiler to All Participants: Perhaps the new 64 bit Connexion Client can be the interfact change?

from Mia to All Participants: One of the problems is that the GLUE that holds the metadata together had a shared notion of what a catalogue was/is; that's become undone at the moment and no one can envision what the "new" glue will behavior/look/interact like

from carol seiler to All Participants: No worries, just a thought

from Mia to All Participants: Yes, the model itself was shared (be it on cards or 'traditional' catalogue); now we just aren't sure what the new model is

from Policy & Standards Div. Library of Congress to All Participants: How about a Gates Foundation-funded, international effort to establish an open-source system?

from Laura Akerman to All Participants: Sounds interesting!

from Mia to All Participants: But how to insure that users will "get" the new model when it arrives -- that's the question

from Laura Akerman to All Participants: But what metadata format will it eat?

from Lisa Rowlison to All Participants: We need to ask ourselves: How would we create, capture, structure, store, search, retrieve, and display objects and metadata if we didn't have to use MARC and if we weren't limited by MARC-centric library systems?

from Policy & Standards Div. Library of Congress to All Participants: Labels, labels, labels for the specific building blocks (elements) so users can construct whatever they want (users include machines).

from carol seiler to All Participants:@Policy, totally agree.

from Policy & Standards Div. Library of Congress to All Participants: Need to translate conceptual models (e.g., FRBR) to data models and systems.

from carol seiler to All Participants: MARC was revolutionary ... in the 1960s, 70s and even the 80s but now?

from carol seiler to All Participants Thanks!

from Mia to All Participants: Great discussion