PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The Automation Contact Directory, 3rd ed., for 1986/1987 was mailed out in June. The editor, Mary Nakagawa, is to be commended for her hard work in putting together what has proven to be the largest edition ever. Within the space of a single year it has grown from 19 to 56 pages.

Because of this increase in size it is necessary for the Executive Board to reconsider the organization and scope of future editions. In order to allow time for this we are planning to issue the 4th edition in 18 months. In the meantime, we hope to accomplish two tasks. First, we plan to appoint an advisory committee to review categories of information to be included within the Directory and the format of the pages as well as to make recommendations as to the most appropriate software for a directory of this size. Secondly, I and other members of the Board are talking to the officers of other library organizations in California in order to determine whether there would be an interest in a jointly sponsored Directory.

In the meantime we would like to hear from any members who have suggestions as to any features they would especially like to see either added or retained.

The Chapter continues to offer a variety of programs. The Discussion Groups in both the North and the South have presented a number of interesting programs. The Chapter program in the North was especially successful, and I have heard innumerable favorable reports on the contributions of Sanford Berman and the many "Lizies" to this program. The Chapter program in the South on the design of local databases was also highly successful. Michael Carpenter and Karen Coyle spoke on problems of access to and design of bibliographic databases, and several librarians described information files that had been developed locally.

Plans for the annual program in November are well underway and details will be given in the next issue of Tech Notes.

D. Kathryn Weintraub
President
CLA Technical Services Chapter
ANNOUNCEMENTS

SERIALS DISCUSSION GROUP-- NORTHERN REGION

A session entitled "The US MARC Format for Holdings and Locations and the ANSI Standard for Serial Holdings Statements: An Introduction and Discussion," is scheduled for the morning of Wednesday, July 29, 1987 in the Biella Room at the Library of California State University, Hayward. Sponsored by the CLA/TSC Northern Region Serials Discussion Group, this meeting will be a repeat of the highly successful one held on May 6 in Southern California by the counterpart Southern Region Serials Discussion Group.

The session is scheduled to begin at 9:00 a.m., with brief presentations on the US MARC Format and the ANSI Standard. These will be followed with time for questions and discussion of these documents and their application to serials activities.

More specific information will be included in the meeting announcements to me mailed in early June. For additional information, contact Priscilla Peters, Serials Librarian, CSU, Stanislaus, at (209) 667-3492.

**********************************************************************
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On May 12, 1987, Tom Johnson, Riverside City and County
Public Library, and Wendy Romano, Downey Public Library,
introduced the following resolution to the CLA Council on
with the support of the Technical Services Chapter. The
resolution passed unanimously.

DISCONTINUATION OF INDIRECT GEOGRAPHIC SUBDIVISION HEADINGS
BY THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WHEREAS, The subject Cataloging Division of the library of
Congress is considering a proposal to discontinue indirect
geosubdivision of headings in favor of direct
subdivision; and

WHEREAS, Direct geographic subdivision would eliminate the
gearthical collocation or placing together of materials on
the same subject which would be a disservice to our users;
and

WHEREAS, The cost and ability to change existing indirect
subdivision to direct subdivision would be significant; and

WHEREAS, The existence of online catalog searching would
not necessarily compensate for the lack of indirect
gearthical collocation, and is not widely prevalent in
California libraries; and

WHEREAS, In the era of shared cataloging, where cataloging
decisions made by the Library of Congress have a significant
impact on cataloging and bibliographic access at most
libraries in California; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the California Library Association at this
time opposes the use of direct geographic subdivision and
supports the continuation of indirect geographic subdivision;
and be it further

RESOLVED, That the President and Executive Director of CLA
be authorized to transmit this position on this matter to the
Chief of the Subject Cataloging Division of the Library of
Congress; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the California Library Association through
the ALA Chapter Councilor urge that the American Library
Association oppose the use of direct geographical
subdivision; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the CLA Council urges all CLA members and
California libraries to communicate directly with the Chief
of the subject Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress
about this matter.

Submitted by: Thomas L. Johnson, CLA Councilor
Wendy Romano, CSL Councilor
SOUTHERN REGION SPRING PROGRAM

ACCESS IN AN ONLINE ENVIRONMENT: PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION

The members of the TSC (Southern Region) met May 15 to discuss some problems of organizing databases for access in an online environment. The two morning speakers were Michael Carpenter, editor of a forthcoming issue of Cataloging & Classification Quarterly on "National and International Bibliographic Databases: Trends and Prospects", and Karen Coyle, Division of Library Automation, University of California.

In his talk on "Access in Large-Scale Bibliographic Databases" Michael Carpenter began by identifying the users as both catalogers and library patrons and then went on to define through examples the ideal type of access for such users. Briefly such access would allow users to access the various "oeuvre" of personal authors as well as the works of an individual corporate body. [Mr. Carpenter has written a book, Corporate Authorships, in which he discusses the possible meanings of this term.] In addition, in an ideal system there would be links defined within authority records so that a user could identify all the works of a personal author or all the works of a corporate body that had changed its name. Thus, in an ideal system a user could retrieve only the mathematical and logical works of Charles Dodgson or only the works written under his pseudonym of Lewis Carroll, or through links the user could retrieve all the works of this author. Similarly in such a system a user could search under LITA and retrieve the LITA Newsletter or under ISAD and retrieve JOLA or, again through links, the user could retrieve all works of the corporate body under both its earlier and later name.

After a review of some of the major databases and a lengthy discussion of UTLAS (which does have one of the more effective systems of authority control), he concluded that we do not yet have the ideal form of access in these large databases.

As the title "Database Design: Options and Tradeoffs" suggests, Karen Coyle emphasized the problems of designing a database where there are tradeoffs between the cost of space and the cost of time to read data in and out and to process data. She also discussed the relationships of these problems to the characteristics of library data. Obviously, data requires space for storage, either in the central processing unit (CPU) or in offline storage devices. It takes time to
process data within the CPU and even more time if the data must first be read in and then read out (I/O operation). Library data is especially complicated because the records are "bulky" (ca. 700 characters/record), include a varying number of variable length fields and consist of text with such extraneous features as punctuation, diacritics, and upper and lower case which are useful for human readers but not for machines.

In addition, library patrons usually want to do their own searching. Since the library public is large, unpredictable, and characterized by varying levels of skill, this usually means that there should be a number of separate indexes to the records. Ideally, these indexes would enable users to do Boolean searches on multiple terms or key words in files such as subject and/or title. For example, a key word search for the term "solar energy" in effect requires a Boolean search through keyword indexes for "solar" AND for "energy." Such a search not only requires internal processing time to match the lists of records indexed by each term but also I/O time to read in the multiple indexes.

Ms. Coyle concluded by suggesting that if librarians understand these problems, it will be easier to deal with the various vendors who would provide both programming and maintenance. In an aside on database management systems, she warned that this software includes many assumptions that often are not appropriate for specific library applications. DBase, for example, requires a fixed number of fixed length fields (apart from the Memo field), and this is not suitable for all library uses.

The afternoon speakers from local libraries all described specific information files that had been developed for local libraries. Tom Johnson reported on the creation of an "Information & Referral File" developed by the Riverside City and County Library using the MARC format. This file lists organizations such as the Children's League and gives directory type information about their services.

Dick Beebe described the Community Access Library Line (CALL) which has been developed in the Los Angeles County Library using the STAR database system. CALL provides data on a large number of community services as well as information on other topics.

Cecelia Wittman, of Kattlove & Associates, described a system which had been developed for accessing a photograph file. In the closing presentation, Bob Bremer, Southern California Rapid Transit Library, described a system he had developed for serials control using dBASE III Plus.
Many of the attendees mentioned files they were thinking of developing locally and, I believe, there was general surprise at the large number and types of local databases that have already been developed.

-- D. Kathryn Weintraub
University of California, Irvine

ACQUISITIONS DISCUSSION GROUP-- NORTHERN REGION

"Acquiring the New Media" was the focus of the CLA/TSC Acquisitions Discussion Group (Northern Region) meeting held Friday, May 15, 1987, at Stanford University. Since this was an open forum, the concerns and comments were diverse.

Nonprint materials have been an integral part of public and community college library collections for many years. Academic libraries are now actively collecting in a variety of nonprint formats. In all types of libraries the acquisition of computer software and video materials has prompted new policies and procedures and also many unanswered questions and headaches.

**Computer Software**

Most software producers license rather than sell software. Purchase by the library signifies the "right to use" rather than possession. Frequently the software is wrapped in clear plastic with a legend stating that opening the package indicates an acceptance of the terms and conditions listed. The terms vary greatly between producers, but many prohibit rental or lending. Others limit the use of the software to one machine or to one individual's personal use. Upon opening the software, are libraries bound by the terms of the agreement, and by circulating the software are libraries violating these terms? Some libraries are noting on purchase orders that the item is being ordered for library circulation and educational purposes.

Two sources of information regarding the copyright/restricted use issue are:

1. The Association of Data Processing Service Organizations (ADAPSO), Arlington, Virginia. This association provides a packet of informational material on the circulation and copying of software.

Frequently for a minimal percentage of the original price, libraries can upgrade software, i.e., obtain the current version. When software is received as an accompaniment to a book, some libraries retain the software with the print item while others remove and store it in a central location.

Suggested sources for computer software are: the Menu, available through Dialog, which is a database of computer software; numerous catalogs and directories, some of which list public domain software; and bulletin boards. It was noted that freeware frequently is not high quality and lacks documentation and user support.

It was recommended that the library's collection policy statement incorporate the new technology and serve as a basis for purchase as well as decisions on gifts. It was also suggested that faculty who approach the library with donations of software which have not been distributed and therefore have not been subjected to a level of quality control be encouraged to submit the software to a distribution service or the campus computer center.

Films and Video Materials

These materials are also subject to licensing agreements. Some videos are restricted for "home use only" and cannot be used for public programs. As with computer software, the restrictions, obligations and responsibilities are not always clear. Distributors can also be suspect as to their legal right to material.

A source of video films is the Television Licensing Center. Through the Center the library purchases a license to copy selected PBS programs rather than the film itself. The film can also be rented and sent out to be copied. For heavily used films in support of the curriculum, it may be more economical to purchase the licensing agreement rather than replace the worn films. The BBC'S Shakespeare series was given as an example. Two sources of distributors are The Video Source Book and the NICEM database.

The final comments of the day concerned the relationship of the academic library and the computer center. Several examples of cooperative efforts involved the purchase, housing, and access of software and educational databases and accompanying print sources.

Many thanks to Carol Fleishauer for organizing and coordinating the meeting.

-- Celia Bakke
San Jose State University
CATALOGING DISCUSSION GROUP--NORTHERN REGION

The CLA/TSC Northern Region Cataloging Discussion Group held its spring meeting at Chico State's Meriam Library on May 8. Two dozen librarians from public, academic, and state libraries discussed the development of CLCAT (the CLSI second generation online catalog previously known as PAC II) and participated in hands-on use of the system.

Bill Post, Head of Collections at CSU Chico, described the local history of online catalogs, moving from retrospective conversion and selection of a system (1978-79), to the implementation of PAC I (early '80's), to the development of CLCAT (currently). As PAC I became more popular, use of the card catalog declined, but some people still use it. The two most important aspects of planning for the online catalog were identified as database quality and system capacity.

Catalog Librarian Sarah Blakeslee demonstrated a variety of search techniques using browse (searching indexes of established headings), keyword, and Boolean searching. She showed how to refine searches from existing search data using Boolean logic and limiters for type of material, year of publication, and language.

Barbara Pease, Head of Reference, reported on the power and popularity of keyword searching. She described how the online catalog has led to greater interaction between Cataloging and Reference and how CLCAT can be linked to other databases. Right now, the only CLCAT terminal is at the Reference Desk, but this fall more terminals will be moved onto CLCAT and the changeover to exclusive use of CLCAT will take place in early 1988.

Head of Bibliographic Services Jim Dwyer explained that the database was about three-quarters indexed, that authority tapes would be loaded soon, and that problem records were being identified and corrected.

After lunch we broke up into small groups for hands-on searches and further discussion.

There is a great deal of interest in the general topic of database quality ranging from standards, retrospective conversion, and authority control to record enhancement and database cleanup. That will be the topic of our fall meeting at CLA. Since that program is only an hour long, we are
investigating a longer workshop on the same subject jointly sponsored by the Northern California Technical Processing Group. That would make it a CLATSCNRCDS-NCTPG meeting. Maybe we should do a program on acronym control!

--Jim Dwyer
California State Univ., Chico

CATALOGING DISCUSSION GROUP-- SOUTHERN REGION

The CLA/TSC Southern Region Cataloging Discussion Group met Thursday April 16, 1987, at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. After opening remarks by Sue Lim, Cal Poly Pomona, the first topic to be presented was "Direct vs. Indirect Local Subdivision: Pros and Cons and Impact on the Local Database."

Crystal Graham, UC San Diego, began with the historical background to Library of Congress policies. Prior to 1976, LC practice had been confusing and inconsistent as to which type of headings were to be divided "direct" or "indirect." In 1975, it was decided that all newly created headings would be divided "indirect" with the exception of legal headings and those headings established with a geographic qualifier equivalent to the name of a country, e.g. "Art, French." In 1976, LC decided that all subject headings would be divided "indirect." However, many older LC records still exist in catalogs, and there has been no attempt by LC to systematically update the MARC database in order to eliminate instances of subject headings divided "direct" before 1976. Some individual libraries did make the effort to systematically change their catalogs in this regard. Ms. Graham herself was part of such a project when she was CONSER project director at Cornell University form 1977-79. So it was with great consternation that she read in CSB 33 of LC's proposal to change "indirect" subdivision to "direct."

LC maintained that the central reason for making the change was to streamline and simplify cataloging operations and to facilitate machine validation of subject headings. Ms. Graham prepared a selective list of examples of certain geographic subject headings which did indeed seem simpler to construct if used in the proposed "direct" form. Several such examples dealt with islands which involve very complicated rules of "indirect" subdivision depending on political jurisdiction, proximity to a large land mass, or whether they are part of a group of islands.

The recognized advantage of "indirect" subdivision has been the collocation of material in the card catalog. Ms. Graham
maintained that collocation is still valuable in an online catalog because of the "browse" function available to users. With the use of "direct" subdivision, material concerning larger geographic areas would be scattered. LC has suggested that keyword searching could be used to retrieve scattered items since word order does not matter. However, when analyzing the differences between "direct" and "indirect" structures, it is important to note that the same words or forms of words are not necessarily used. Most geographic qualifiers are abbreviations which would not be picked up in a search using the fully written out form of place name. Also, some geographic names are dropped completely when the structure is "direct." The example given was:

(Indirect) Women--Employment--Australia--Sydney (N.S.W.)
(Direct) Women--Employment--Sydney (N.S.W.)

LC has also suggested that scattered records could be retrieved by using specific geographic area codes. Ms. Graham said that she did not know of any online system at this time that had the ability to retrieve geographic area codes. For OCLC users, the 043 field for geographic codes is an optional field, and many online records lack the codes. Depending on such a code seems premature.

In effect, the change to "direct" subdivision would result in loss of access for patrons to supposedly make cataloging easier. The point was made that catalogers normally must investigate where a place is located anyway in order to properly assign a classification number. Therefore, cataloging would not be made significantly easier by adopting "direct" subdivisions. LC also maintains that machine validation of subject headings would be easier if subdivisions were in "direct" order. However, when the technology is in place to flip headings, it could just as easily verify them.

The Librarians Association of the University of California at San Diego has already mailed an institutional response to LC urging that the proposed change not be implemented. One member of the audience mentioned that in a recent conversation with LC she had heard that many other responses opposing the change had been received by LC. DiAnn Iverson, OCLC Pacnet, emphasized the cost of such a drastic change to the database and suggested that librarians send their opinions to Louise Saylor, Eastern Washington University, who represents the Pacific network on OCLC's Cataloging Advisory Committee.

The second topic of the morning was "LC's Subject Cataloging Manual: How to Use It," presented by Pat Luthin, USC. In 1984 the LC Subject Cataloging Manual first became available. LC had received a grant to prepare some staff manuals and realized that these documents could also have
broad use by the outside library community. The Subject Cataloging Manual is actually one of five manuals, and sometimes it refers to numbers contained in other manuals. In 1985, a second edition was published and in February 1987, an update to the second edition appeared. The update contains new terminology for cross references such as:

UF = Used for (formerly x)
USE = Use (formerly see)
BT = Broader term (formerly xx)
RT = Related term (formerly xx and sa).

Ms. Luthin proceeded to give an overview of the organization of the manual and the broad areas it covers. Before the manual was published, librarians were often in the dark about many subject structures and the rules for establishing new subject headings. The manual encompasses a monumental amount of information on specific kinds of headings and procedures which the catalogers at LC must follow in order to establish or change heading. Ms. Luthin described the overwhelming amount of paperwork involved and the tedious and slow nature of the process through which a subject cataloger must go in order to change a subject heading. In addition, the cataloger must maintain certain work quota statistics. This explains why so many headings remain out of date.

Ms. Luthin is currently chair of the Subject Analysis Committee's Subcommittee on Currency of Headings in LCSH. The Subcommittee has discovered that LC users very few periodicals as sources for establishing new headings because LC focuses on cataloging books. Various publishers of indexes such as Information Access Corporation have sent LC lists of new terms used, but LC has not made use of the lists due to their focus on book cataloging, related policies, and also due to staff reductions. Ms. Luthin suggested that perhaps publishers in their CIP could preestablish certain new subject headings or that an outside subject cooperative group similar to the NACO project could help LC improve subject currency. Another Subcommittee on Fiction, chaired by Liz Bishoff, Pasadena Public Library, is investigating the possibility of adding subject headings for fiction, fictional characters, etc., which might be supplied by publishers through CIP. They are also looking into the possible expansion of the fixed field for fiction and its use in subject retrieval for fiction.

Following a lunch break, those who were interested visited the Cal Poly Pomona Catalog Department where they observed a demonstration of editing spine labels downloaded by the OCLC Microenhancer (version 3) software.

--Danette Adamson
Cal Poly, Pomona