TO: Enhance Participants

FROM: Ellen Caplan

SUBJECT: Enhance Information, August 1996 (Enhance Sharing Session at ALA)

The following is a brief report of the sharing session held during the ALA conference on July 8, 1996. In addition, I have supplied updates on some of the questions raised during this meeting. My apologies for taking so long to send you this report. If you have any questions about it or would like clarification, feel free to contact me.

• General meeting information

Summary of discussion:

This was the first Enhance Sharing Session held at ALA since 1991. Although turnout was moderate, with 20 participants attending, discussion was quite lively. Those attending liked having the session scheduled at the end of the day and would prefer that future sessions be scheduled for 90 minutes instead of 60.

Update from OCLC:

Although participants preferred that sessions be scheduled during both conferences, OCLC will probably only host one session at the annual conference.

• Enhance Training Outline

Summary of discussion:

Several asked if the Enhance Training Outline could be revised and placed on the Web. The current copy was last issued in 1991. A few wondered if it needed to be updated to include an overview or history of the Enhance Program.

Update from OCLC:

Jay Weitz, Enhance Coordinator, indicated that he plans to revise the document, but does not yet have a date for this. Also, he plans to place it on the Web once it is revised.

• Communications with OCLC

Summary of discussion:

There was some discussion concerning communication with OCLC. Several indicated that it would be more useful to share information with other Enhance users more than once or twice a year. There was some discussion about whether a discussion group via a listsery would be useful to Enhance users and OCLC. Most present thought this was a good idea.

Update from OCLC:

Jay Weitz recently reported that it would be possible to set up an listserv for Enhance. However, this is not something we would be able to successfully manage at the present time.

• Credits for upgrading records; batching files of corrections Summary of discussion:

- Sandy Herzinger (Nebraska) asked that the credit for Minimal Level Upgrade be increased. The reason given was that as much, if not more, work has to be done on minimal-level records. All present agreed with Sandy's comments.
- Sandy also indicated that the Database Enrichment credit is not worth the amount of staff time spent adding call number, subject heading or content information to the OLUC. Several others agreed since they are doing most of their cataloging and upgrading on the local system. Many of the Enhance users present only logon to OCLC for Enhance and it is the first task to go if resources are limited.
- Michael Somers (LSU) asked if there was anyway OCLC could receive replace transactions via ftp from the local system.
- Jain Fletcher (UCLA) noted that it was important to continue enhancing and upgrading. She felt that the quality of the OLUC has improved a great deal because of all cooperative efforts.

Update from OCLC:

- Doug Perkins, Manager, OLUC Database Management Dept., indicated that the request for increased credits would be reviewed. However, we cannot guarantee that there will be any changes in these credits.
- Rich Greene, OLUC Database Management Dept., has passed the request concerning ftp of Enhance work on as a possible enhancement for Batchload. It will be considered in conjunction with other Batchload enhancements.

• Lock and replace mechanism Summary of discussion:

One participant asked if there was anyway a lock could be initiated after one began editing without starting the editing process from scratch. Cut and paste can be used, but it is awkward and time consuming when doing enhance work. Ellen Caplan pointed out that lock and replace was implemented over 15 years ago. Its purpose was to solve the problem of having two users performing replaces on the same record at the same time. At the time it was implemented, there were far fewer users with a replace capability and replace edits were still being lost. When the replaces occurred at the same time, only the last set of edits were retained.

Update from OCLC:

Ellen Caplan, OLUC Database Management Dept., has passed on this request as a possible PRISM enhancement.

• International Databases

Summary of discussion:

- Rich Greene led a discussion on international databases, based on the discussion paper distributed prior to ALA.

 Reaction was mixed concerning these records. Several felt that no record was better than a bad record, but not all agreed.
- Some of the participants indicated that they were not pleased when they spent time upgrading records and helping to maintain the quality of records while OCLC was loading less than minimal-level records. They wondered if these records could be treated as resource files.
- Becky Ringler, UC San Diego, asked about the acquisition-type note which appears in Casalini records. She wanted to know if it should be left in the record or deleted.

Update from OCLC:

Enhance participants who did not attend the Sharing session are welcome to send their comments on the discussion paper to Rich.

Enhance libraries should leave the acquisition-type note which appears in field 938 in Casalini (C3L) and Puvill (PL#) records. In fact, the system will not allow Enhance users to add, change or delete data in field 938. See #35222569, Technical Bulletin 216, and Bibliographic Formats and Standards (field 938).

• Program for Cooperative Cataloging and core-level records Summary of discussion:

Rich Greene was interested in gathering comments about the usefulness and quality of core records from Enhance participants. All agreed that it was too early to discuss and would like to discuss at the next Sharing session

copy: Liz Bishoff

Karen Calhoun

Bill Carney

Martin Dillon

Rich Greene

Marda Johnson

Jean Kahn

Hisako Kotaka

Marianne Kozsely

Network Coordinators

Glenn Patton

Doug Perkins

Jay Weitz

Bing Yu