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Introduction (inˈtrə dukˈshən), introducing or the state of being introduced: an introduction to botany treatise: an introduction to botany treatise; an introduction to biology; an introduction to this subject. 6. something inserted, inserted: an introduction of something inserted; an introduction of new material at the front of a book; an introduction of new material at the front of a book. ME introduccion `< L introductio). See introduce, -tion]

—Syn. 3. Introduction, foreword: material given at the front of a book, introducing it to the reader. A foreword: material and is usually written by someone other than the author, often an authority on the subject.
Introduction - who are we?

Christina Zoricic
czorici@uwo.ca

Leanne Olson
lolson3@uwo.ca

Western Libraries - London, Ontario
Western University
London, Ontario, Canada
www.uwo.ca
We have 3 affiliated University Colleges
About Western Libraries (and its affiliates!)

$13 million annual acquisitions budget

11 million items

60 000 records added annually

8 physical service locations (plus 3 affiliates)

Serving approx. 36 000 FTE

ARL member
Today’s Topic:

Evaluating Authority Control

Questions? Feel free to ask them throughout this presentation. (There will also be time at the end.)
Background
Where we’ve come from
Background

Evolution of authority control at Western
Current authority control process at Western
Why evaluate the authority control process now?
Project planning process
Authority Control at Western

2009
- Authority work done by 1 librarian; 40% of his workload
- Authorities vendor

2010
- 1 librarian, 8 LAs join authority work
- Shelf-ready, outsourced cataloguing for monographs

2011
- Retirement of librarian coordinating authority work

2013
- 2 librarians, 6 LAs; librarian time available: 15-20%
- Switch from Millennium to Sierra
- Begin move to RDA

2013-14
- Authority work evaluation

Increase in batch record loads
Monthly Authority Work

- Cataloguing sent to Backstage
- Matched to authorities
- Authorities loaded in Sierra
- Automatic Authority Control Process
- Headings Reports
- Reports from Backstage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old version of Record:</th>
<th>New version of Record:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001 n 86851214</td>
<td>001 n 86851214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 DLC</td>
<td>003 DLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005 20130103073701.0</td>
<td>005 20140114073659.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 860911</td>
<td>azannaabn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010 $a n 86851214</td>
<td>010 $a n 86851214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035 $a (OCoLC) cca01672561</td>
<td>035 $a (OCoLC) cca01672561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040 $a DLC $b eng $e rda $c DLC $d DLC $d NN-PD $d UPB $d UKCU</td>
<td>040 $a DLC $b eng $e rda $c DLC $d DLC $d NN-PD $d UPB $d UKCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 1 $a Brainard, Ingrid</td>
<td>100 1 $a Brainard, Ingrid, $d -2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370 $b West Newton, Mass. $c Germany</td>
<td>370 $a Göttingen (Germany) $b West Newton (Mass.) $c Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375 $a female</td>
<td>375 $a female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378 $q Ingrid Kahrstedt</td>
<td>378 $q Ingrid Gretia Kahrstedt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670 $a nuc86-82887: Her The art of courtly dancing</td>
<td>670 $a nuc86-82887: Her The art of courtly dancing, 1981- $b (heading on AzU report: Brainard, Ingrid; usage: Ingrid Brainard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... 1981- $b (hdg. on AzU rept.: Brainard, Ingrid; usage: Ingrid Brainard)</td>
<td>... 1981- $b (hdg. on AzU rept.: Brainard, Ingrid; usage: Ingrid Brainard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670 $a NN Dance Coll. files $b (Ingrid Brainard; Ingrid Kahrstedt Brainard; b. 1925, Germany; m. Paul Brainard; d. Feb. 18, 2000, West Newton, Mass.)</td>
<td>670 $a NN Dance College files $b (Ingrid Brainard; Ingrid Kahrstedt Brainard; born 1925, Germany; married Paul Brainard; died February 18, 2000, West Newton, Mass.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670 $a Music, dance and society, 2011: $b title page (Ingrid G. Brainard) page vii (Ingrid Karsten Brainard, November 10, 1921-February 18, 2000)</td>
<td>670 $a New York times, March 13, 2000 $b (Ingrid G. Brainard died on February 18; she was 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670 $a Inventory of the Ingrid Brainard papers 1890-2000, 2006: $b page 2 (Ingrid Gretia Brainard (née Kahrstedt) was born on November 10, 1925 in Göttingen, Federal Republic of Germany)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Librarians

- All headings from batch loads
- All headings from vendor cataloguing
- Any headings requiring authority record modification

Daily Headings Reports in Sierra

Library Assistants

- 1st time headings
  - Check names
  - Spot check subjects
- Invalids
  - Fix individually
  - Pass on Global Updates
- Duplicate entries
  - Fix duplicate barcodes and call numbers
Daily Headings Reports

- Librarians handle large updates
- Library Assistants handle individual records
- Library Assistants
- Librarians

Report Type
- All
- Headings used for the first time
- Invalid headings
- Duplicate entries
- Blind references
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prep:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L all week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Judy Kerry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>George Janice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Christina Joanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C all week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Judy Kerry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>George Janice</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christina Joanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L all week</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Judy Kerry</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>George Janice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Christina Joanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C all week</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Judy Kerry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>George Janice</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Christina Joanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L all week</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Judy Kerry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why reevaluate now?

- Decrease in librarian time available
- Increase in AC needed: RDA, vendor cataloguing; batch record loads
- New features and bugs in Sierra
- Library assistants confident with AC
- Librarian with outside perspective
Project Planning

Authorities Evaluation Project

Added by Leanne Olson, last edited by Leanne Olson on May 03, 2014 (view change)

Phase One

Project Team:
Leanne Olson & Christina Zoricic

Planning Documents:
Project Charter
Work Breakdown Structure
Project Plan (GANTT Chart)

Project Documents:
Headings Reports Survey, LA4s - for tracking Metadata Specialist time spent on daily headings reports
Headings Reports Survey, MMLs - for tracking Metadata Management Librarian time spent on daily headings reports

Project Reports:
Interim Report
Final Report
Project Charter

- Background
- Objectives & Scope
- Stakeholders
- Constraints (Time & Workload)
- Communication Plan
- Major Project Tasks & Milestones
Work Breakdown Structure
## Authority Evaluation Project Plan - Phase I Gantt Chart (Weekly)

### Mon Jul 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISO Week</th>
<th>W27</th>
<th>W28</th>
<th>W29</th>
<th>W30</th>
<th>W31</th>
<th>W32</th>
<th>W33</th>
<th>W34</th>
<th>W35</th>
<th>W36</th>
<th>W37</th>
<th>W38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>SEP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gather Information
- Finding comparables
- Literature survey
- Comparable innovative schools
- Schools without authority control
- Summarize findings

#### Current Procedures
- In-house
  - Identify tasks performed
  - Track time spent on daily tasks
  - Track time spent on monthly tasks
  - Discover how authority records are used by LIRM/Affcat
- Outsourced
  - Identify current Backstage services
  - Identify Backstage budget
  - Summarize findings
- Sierra options
  - Develop methodology
  - Investigate headings reports options
  - Investigate review files & global update
  - Investigate other Sierra options
  - Summarize findings
  - Vendor services
The Big Picture
Testing our assumptions
Questions we asked ourselves:

● What does the literature say?
● What do our local (provincial) colleagues do with authority control?
● How do others like us (Academic Library Innovative customers) perform Authority Control?
● What are our vendor options should we consider?
Testing our assumptions: Environmental Scan

- Literature review
- Survey of Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) schools
- Survey of Innovative Users Group (IUG) schools
- Research vendor support options
1990s

Key topics covered:
- Automation of authority control (early 90s)
- Cost benefits of outsourcing (mid to late 90s)
Key topics covered:
- Vended and outsourced authority control (early 2000s)
  - experiences with outsourcing
  - available options
  - cost/benefit analysis
- Consortia Level authority control (early 2000s)

- … and then nothing
2010-2014

Key topics covered:
- RDA, FRAD, linked data
- VIAF and the development of ISNIs
- Future possibilities

The gap:
- Did outsourcing solve our collective problems?
- Improving workflows?
- What are our needs for the future?
Local Consortia Authority Use Survey

Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL)

- Consortium of 21 Universities in Ontario
- Ranging in FTEs from 1,100 to 75,000
- 12 responses from 11 OCUL schools = 52% response rate
OCUL Results

3) Who is responsible for maintaining your school’s authority file?

- many people, [4] 4
- one person (Librarian) 2 (17%)
- one person (cataloguer or library assistant) 2 (17%)
- many people, one coordinator 4 (33%)
- many people, many coordinators 1 (8%)
- Other 3 (25%)

4) If applicable, where is your authority control performed?

- completely in house 9 (75%)
- outsourced partially, partially completed in house 1 (8%)
- outsourced completely 1 (8%)
- Other 1 (8%)
Comments and quotes...

“[Redacted] library has a long-held culture of in-house authority control”

“We had been receiving updates up until we moved to a new ILS hosting service a few years ago. We have done some preliminary investigation of the cost of authorities services, but we have not made this a priority. We are not maintaining our authorities file locally at present.”

“It's easier to maintain the complete authority file than just the ones that we use. It makes for a more automated routine.”
Innovative User Group Survey

Almost identical set of questions asked as in the OCUL survey
- Survey was available for 5 days, with 35 responses recorded
- Targeted at individuals affiliated with an Academic Library
IUG Survey Results

why schools maintained authority control (even if limited):

– Size of catalogue makes authority control vital for discovery
– Consistency, collocation, and quality of catalogue records (x3)
– “After 10 years of not doing much authority work - the database had out-of-date, invalid, wrong, etc. headings and people began to realize that authority control actually had value.”
– “we realize the importance but cost and lack of staff resources causes us to be less than consistent”
45% of respondents indicated that Authority Control is the responsibility of a single person. In most cases, responsibility lies with a Librarian. Of these 11 sites, 6 reported it was the responsibility of the unit Head (called Metadata Access, Technical Services, Cataloging).
– 52% of respondents indicated AC is done completely in house
– Of those that outsourced, almost all comments indicated cost and/or time were primary reasons for outsourcing
A note about RDA in quotes

“in light of RDA heading changes and five years of very little updating we are scheduled to do an update in fy2014-15”

“In the past, we established and enhanced name authority records via the NACO program. Since the implementation of RDA, we are no longer doing that.”

“with all of the changes due to RDA, we have been using Sierra's global update process to edit large numbers of records”
Small Picture
Examining Ourselves

Photo courtesy of Flickr user Abdul Rahman
Small Picture

How & why our staff use authority records
Time spent on aspects of authority control
Local changes to Sierra functions
Suggested changes to Sierra functions
Authority Record Use by Staff

Surveyed 21 staff who worked in technical services at LIRM and our Affiliates.
Authority Record Use by Staff

Do you use/look at authority records in Millennium/Sierra?

- Yes [17] 89%
- No [2] 11%
- Unsure [0]

Do you use/look at authorities from outside sources?
(E.g. Library of Congress, Library and Archives Canada)

- Yes [16] 84%
- No [3] 16%
- Unsure [0]
Reasons Staff Use Authorities

- Verify name, subject, uniform title, and series headings by checking authorities in the index (CTRL-H or CTRL-G)
- Differentiate between different headings (authors, series, etc.) with same/similar names
- Obtain the correct uniform title for music materials
- Keep headings consistent in our catalogue
- Guideline for deciding call numbers and subject headings
Authority Record Use by Staff

“I would have to look elsewhere, taking additional time.”
“I am also concerned about the long-term impact on the quality of our library catalogue.”
“May as well use Google.”
“The purpose of cataloguing is to enable the user to find the item needed. Lack of authority records would, over time, make searching more difficult and confusing.”
“Many authorities have been changed in RDA; the lack of authority control would result in a multiplicity of forms appearing.”
“NOTHING WOULD BE CORRECT!”
Documenting Time Spent on AC

Librarian vs. library assistant time
Time spent and # of fixes on Headings
Reports
Types of records requiring fixes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of report</th>
<th># of headings in report (the total # of headings in each report)</th>
<th># of fixes per report (anything changed in a record, by you or someone else)</th>
<th># of fixes required contacting someone else? (Note who, e.g. LIRM librarian, public side)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headings used for the 1st time: Orderers/processors (the names you remove without checking)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headings used for the 1st time: Cataloguers and Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid headings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate entries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional notes:
# Headings Reports Survey - Librarian Time Spent on Daily Headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role (check one):</th>
<th>Librarian prepping headings</th>
<th>Librarian completing all headings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the week:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total time spent on headings:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of report</th>
<th># Totals</th>
<th>Source of Records: # Fixed / Approx. # Total, e.g. 4/30</th>
<th>Other (e.g. # of records globally updated, downloaded authorities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of headings in report</td>
<td># of headings fixed per report</td>
<td>Orderers / processors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headings used for the 1st time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid headings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate entries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate authority records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated bibliographic records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near matches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-unique 4XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-thesaurus matches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional notes:
Library Assistants:

Daily average is 47 minutes to fix 12 problems.

Overall stats for LAs:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average time spent in minutes</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total # of headings</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total # of fixings</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of headings fixed</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports with the most total fixes</th>
<th>Total headings</th>
<th>Total # fixed</th>
<th>% fixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st time use – Pre-cataloguing</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st time use - In-house cataloguing</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalids</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>158.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate entries</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Librarians preparing headings:

Effectiveness: Daily average is 36 minutes to fix 115 problems, before passing headings to LA4s.

Overall stats for Librarians:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average time spent in minutes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total # of headings</td>
<td>1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total # of fixings</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of headings fixed</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Time varied from 10 to 80 minutes
- Invalids fixed varied from 0 to 727
- 1st time headings fixed varied from 0 to 17, total 1st time headings varied from 88 to 2410.

Reports with the most total fixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports with the most total fixes</th>
<th>Total headings</th>
<th>Total # fixed</th>
<th>Average % fixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st time headings – All, including batch loads, vendor cataloguing, etc.</td>
<td>5442</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalids</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate entries (all passed to LAs)</td>
<td>3772</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind references</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly authority loads (Librarians):

Average time spent with Headings Reports: 6 hours, 45 minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of report</th>
<th>Average # entries</th>
<th>% fixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headings used for the 1st time</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid headings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate entries</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind references</td>
<td>385.5</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate authority records</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated bibliographic records</td>
<td>4715</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near matches</td>
<td>5507</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy records</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-unique 4XX</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-thesaurus matches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to Headings Reports, 2-4 hours spent with Backstage Reports.
## Headings Reports Local Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headings used for the first time</th>
<th>Use Location limit to separate out material not yet catalogued (zzz, hhh, etc.) and not needing authority work (certain online packages) Use Statistics limit to clear Acquisitions records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headings used for the first time – From Acquisitions</td>
<td>Use Limit to these Statistics to move over group 120 (Acquisitions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headings used for the first time – Package Loads</td>
<td>Limit to these Locations can be used to separate out online vs. print, so if vendor cataloguing and PDA is loaded on the same day, these can be distinguished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid headings</td>
<td>Continue as normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate entries</td>
<td>Tweak database management options to filter out field tag o (other number). Leave in barcodes, numbers with field tag j (ISBN, ISSN, etc.) and tag c (call numbers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind references</td>
<td><strong>Consider not deleting blind references.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Switch to LAs checking blinds; many can be resolved or cleared without needing Librarian permissions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Blinds can be placed in review files for bulk deletions using Rapid Update once a month.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate authority records</td>
<td><strong>To generate fewer duplicate authorities, alter load tables to ensure fields with $5 are not overlaid. Stop removing 001s from altered records.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated bibliographic headings</td>
<td><strong>No change - Librarians skim quickly.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near matches</td>
<td><strong>No changes – Librarians needed for Global Updates.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records busy, not updates</td>
<td><strong>Rare.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-unique 4XXs</td>
<td><strong>No change – Librarians scan for non-initialisms as these are generally not real problems.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-thesaurus matches</td>
<td><strong>Rare.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Treatment of Types of Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Record</th>
<th>Process &amp; Suggested Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelf-ready Cataloguing</td>
<td>Continue checking as vendors do not check our authorities. Proposed change: Switch from librarian to LAs, just as they check internal cataloguing. Can be separated out by login of Workflow Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIRM Cataloguing</td>
<td>LA4s check cataloguing done at LIRM; continue. Can be separated out by Statistics – 130 Cataloguing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate Cataloguing</td>
<td>LA4s check cataloguing done at Western’s Affiliated University Colleges; continue. Can be separated out by Statistics – move over all of the Affiliate libraries (750, 770, 780, 790).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-book and e-serial package loads – that will not be deleted/overwritten</td>
<td>Appears under Workflow Coordinator’s name, with location i – can be separated out by “Limit to these locations.” If loads are large, handle invalids but spot check 1st Time Headings. Continue handling by librarian as errors occurring across multiple records may need to be fixed by re-loading and a change to the loader, or Global Updates. For new packages, double check that they should follow this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Record</td>
<td>Process &amp; Suggested Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-book package loads not checked</td>
<td>Decisions not to do authority control are made on a case-by-case basis by the Librarians or the Head, Metadata Access. E.g.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Film Board of Canada (records get overwritten regularly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naxos (records are messy and too numerous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron Driven Acquisitions</td>
<td>Records are temporary and will be removed. No authority control is done on these items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Coutts and Coutts PDA are loaded on the same day, PDA can be separated from other Coutts records (for shelf-ready cataloguing) under Workflow coordinator’s name by limiting location to online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron Driven Acquisitions - Purchased</td>
<td>Records with “Purchased” in the 039 should be checked as with any other cataloguing. Change to LAs checking these.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sierra Issues Affecting AC

- Authorities not distinguishable when browsing index (CTRL-G)
- Headings Reports often not reading past |t, flagging authorities as duplicates
- Glitches in Headings Reports with selecting and checking entries
- RDA |e creates false 1st time headings
- Invalids flagging inappropriate MARC fields (e.g. 245, 246)
Next Steps
Next Steps

Recommendations for Western
Implementing the changes to process, Sierra, and staffing
Evaluating the new changes
Lessons Learned

Allow enough time in project planning

Wait for software stability

Don’t evaluate your processes in the middle of RDA transition
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