

Orbis Cascade Alliance
Authority Control Group: Phase 1 Report
March 29, 2016

The Authority Control Group was created in October 2015 by the Technical Services Working Group of the Orbis Cascade Alliance's Collaborative Workforce Team. The members of the group are:

- Ryan Hildebrand, Chair (University of Oregon)
- Abby Bibee (Reed College)
- Karen Highum (University of Washington)
- Wayne Richter (Western Washington University)
- Andriana Yovcheva (Pacific University)
- Lihong Zhu (Washington State University)
- Bob Thomas, TSWG Liaison (Western Washington University)
- Cassie Schmitt, COE Liaison (Orbis Cascade Alliance)

Charge: The Authority Control Group is charged with exploring and implementing current Alma functionality where it is safe to do so, advocating for improvements in Alma, and recommending an Alliance-wide approach to performing authority control tasks in our Alma environment. To that end, the group will serve as the Alliance body supporting the related Center of Excellence initiative. The group will identify priority consortial activities and develop workflows and documentation to support them; and consider possible efficiencies related to authority control workflows. Activities of the group are expected to be accomplished in three phases.

This report covers the group's phase one work, which will lay the groundwork for the COE Initiative. In addition, the group devoted substantial effort towards identifying the authority needs of individual institutions so that we could direct our future work with these goals in mind. Please note this report covers functionality available through the Alma March 2016 release.

The following topics are covered in this report:

- 1) Alma functionality related to authority control, p. 2
 - 2) Alma functionality gaps, p. 4
 - 3) Review of authority control options available in OCLC's WorldCat/Connexion, p. 4
 - 4) Summary of January 2016 survey on Authority Control, p. 4
 - 5) Report summary, recommendations, and future actions, p. 8
- Appendix A: Alma Authority Resources, p. 10
- Appendix B: Alliance Salesforce cases filed on authority control functionality in Alma, p. 10
- Appendix C: Enhancement requests on authority control functionality in Alma, p. 11
- Appendix D: Survey on Authority Control, January 2016, p. 13

1. Explore current Alma functionality related to authority control

Background: The Orbis Cascade Alliance is a consortium of 39 colleges and universities in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. The Network Zone (NZ) in Alma is the shared bibliographic environment for the Alliance. The goal is to have bibliographic records representing institutional holdings reside in the NZ. NZ records are regularly refreshed based on their corresponding OCLC master records. Such consortial arrangements--particularly those that rely on OCLC master records--are a relatively new development for ExLibris, and the group recognizes that the NZ is very much a work in progress.

Currently available authority control options within Alma include: Link Bibliographic Headings and Preferred Term Correction. When these jobs are activated in the NZ, all records in the IZ linked to the NZ are impacted. Authority processes which run in the IZ impact IZ records which are not linked to the NZ.

a. Link Bibliographic Headings

This job links bibliographic headings to matching authority headings giving priority to local authorities, if enabled. Bibliographic headings that are linked to non-preferred authority headings are marked for preferred term correction.

Processing is handled in the following manner:

- The job searches all authority record fields, including subdivision fields, for complete terms listed in bibliographic records (giving priority to local authorities, if enabled).
- If exact matches are found, the bibliographic records are linked to the corresponding authority records.
- If exact matches are not found, the subdivision fields are disregarded, a search of all authority records is performed once again, and the bibliographic records are linked to the matching authority records that are located during the second search.

b. Preferred Term Correction

This job performs preferred term correction on all bibliographic records that are linked to authority records using the Authorities - Link BIB Headings job.

Based on Alma listserv discussion and presentations at ELUNA, we knew that Preferred Term Correction job may:

- Alter name access points for the wrong entities
- Link unestablished entities with established entities of the same name

- Add incorrect dates and/or qualifiers to instances of common names
- Possibly other things

Either the headings affected need careful review after each heading change job run in Alma, or Alma needs to limit actions for some matched headings to report out the headings for review.

In the NZ account, in Resource Management > Resource Configuration > Configuration Menu > General > Other Settings, the `disable_preferred_term_correction_job` parameter is set to "true", so the "Authorities - Preferred Term Correction" process is definitely disabled. In the Monitor Jobs area, on the History tab, you can see many "Authorities - Link BIB Headings" jobs running each day. On the Scheduled tab in the Monitor Jobs area, the following jobs are listed:

- Authorities - Handle Local Authority Record Updates is shown as not active (no yellow check mark)
- Authorities - Link BIB Headings is shown as active and appears to be running based on its presence in the history tab
- Authorities - Preferred Term Correction is shown as active but is disabled in configuration and does not appear in the job history tab

The Alliance's decision to rely on OCLC master records places certain constraints on authority control at institutional and Alliance levels. Automated methods of authority processing that many members are accustomed to are simply not an option, as any changes to access points made locally (excluding changes made to local bibliographic extensions) will be overlaid by OCLC master records. This means that Alma authority jobs, such as Preferred Term Correction and Link Bibliographic Headings, do not represent tenable solutions.

We quickly concluded that Preferred Term Correction is not applicable to the consortial arrangement of the Alliance, as any changes made at member institutions would effectively be undone when the NZ is refreshed each day. However, in ExLibris' Alma March 2016 release notes, mention is made of "Publishing headings enrichment data to Primo" which will be available to collaborative networks in a future release. It is assumed that this functionality will overlap significantly with what the group wished to explore, and the group is committed to exploring this feature as soon as it can. A major question is whether we need to have the linked headings job run in the NZ in order for the headings "enrichment" to publish to Primo.

The group wanted to further explore functions a and b in the NZ, but neither job is available in any NZ sandbox. A Salesforce case was opened to determine whether ExLibris can make these jobs available in one of the sandboxes.

c. Local authorities

If local authorities are enabled for your institution (a task that needs to be initiated by Ex Libris) one can create local authority records, which override the global authority records provided with Alma in the Community Zone. According to the Feb 2016 release notes (page 54) local authority functionality has been enabled for the NZ.

2. Alma functionality gaps

At the time of writing, Alma lacks functionality that would allow us to perform automated authority control within the NZ. As of the Alma March 2016 release there was no ability to browse access points and subject and genre headings in Alma, which would allow users to spot typos and other errors in access points. The Alma April 2016 release added the ability to browse bibliographic headings for authors, subjects, series, and titles from within the MD Editor. This functionality has yet to be tested.

3. Review authority control options available in OCLC's WorldCat/Connexion

In 2012, OCLC announced its program to control more headings in WorldCat via a stand-alone batch service that evaluates all headings in bibliographic records in WorldCat and makes changes based on a rather sophisticated criteria (<https://www.oclc.org/news/announcements/2012/announcement1.en.html>).

Subsequent communication with OCLC have sufficiently addressed Alliance questions or concerns, and this communication is summarized in Tom Larsen's presentation "Authority Work Done by OCLC" given at the Orbis Cascade Alliance Summer Meeting, 2014. No new developments have been announced since then. While the OCLC service does much to improve WorldCat, it does very little to improve authority control in Alma--it certainly does not facilitate any kind of authority processing services--and the group does not imagine that a suitable solution to the needs of the Alliance will be based in OCLC.

The WorldCat Metadata API (<https://www.oclc.org/developer/develop/web-services/worldcat-metadata-api.en.html>) is a read/write WorldCat service that, among other things, makes it possible to add or update master bibliographic records in WorldCat. This could allow the Alliance, or Alliance members, to perform batch updates to WorldCat records. The group feels this service may hold potential for the Alliance, but requires further investigation. It would be desirable to establish Alliance interest in this service before further investigation is undertaken.

4. Summary of January 2016 survey on Authority Control

In order to provide focus for its future work, in January 2016, the group issued a survey to determine the authority-related needs of Alliance member institutions. It sought institution-level responses to six questions. (See Appendix XX for a copy of the survey questions.)

The group received responses from 28 institutions. A summary of responses follows:

1. What are your chief Alma authority-related concerns?

The overwhelming sentiment among respondents is that there needs to be some kind of authority control in Alma. Specific justifications for this need include:

- Lack of consistency among headings for a single entity, subject, series, etc. (based on master record environment)
- Concerns over increase of workload at member institutions when time is devoted to updating individual master records, while also noting that these updates may be easily undone or changed by other OCLC members
- Checking for authorized forms in OCLC can be time consuming (vs. relying on automated vendor updates)
- Lack of reports/analysis tools (independent of jobs) upon which OCLC updates could be based
- Lack of browsing for authorized fields, which is a useful tool for highlighting inconsistencies
- Support for basic, expected library catalog functionality
- Currently there is no easy way to find authorized access points in Alma
- Difficulty of detecting incorrect coding
- Sophistication of Primo requires authority control in Alma
- Not all Alliance members participate in PCC programs

Six respondents indicated they had no concerns or did not respond. One respondent indicated that authority control is not a priority now and will not be in the foreseeable future.

2. What kind of role do you see authority control having at the Alliance level? Tools needed?

There is a general and strong desire for Alma-based tools that would operate at the consortium (NZ) level. In some cases, it is an expectation. Respondents would like to see the Alliance take some responsibility to ensure Metadata integrity, a responsibility that ideally would be codified in an Alliance technical services position, which seems only natural given our consortium arrangement. Further reasons supporting the above include:

- The existence of the NZ seems to necessitate a centralized governing position
- Alliance libraries are operating at very different levels; not all are participating in PCC programs
- Collocation of resources in the NZ based on individual authorized access points is more an Alliance concern than that of individual institutions
- It would take a position at the Alliance level to review the NZ and resolve discrepancies
- The Alliance needs to ensure that administrators at all participating libraries are familiar with the crucial need for high quality authority control

Additionally:

- Several respondents noted that this is an opportunity for the Alliance to encourage and/or facilitate PCC training opportunities so that more member libraries can contribute

to PCC efforts, the outcome of which would be improved overall quality of records in the NZ

- Mention was also made of potential Alliance NACO/SACO/CONSER funnels; at the same time, concerns were voiced over potentially overloading PCC libraries
- Desire for a Authority Mandate was expressed

Few respondents speculated on the types of tools that might help; this was expected. Several indicated that nuanced reports could serve as the basis for updates to OCLC, which would address the problem only in a minor way. Ten respondents indicated that they do not know; do not have enough information to respond; or did not respond.

3. What kind of role do you see authority control having at your institution? What tools are needed to achieve this?

Most don't envision much of an institutional role aside from baseline attempts to ensure use of authorized headings at the point of cataloging; funnel opportunities; and training issues/opportunities. We assume this stems largely from the fact that our master record environment basically prohibits institutions from doing much of anything beyond the point of cataloging that would affect authority control at the institution level

Specific thoughts and issues identified include:

- Are members cataloging to standards? There is a sense that some don't have capacity, expertise, or time to participate
- Attempting to systematize updates of OCLC masters seems problematic and possibly short-sighted
- Possibility of PCC funnels; authority work distributed among alliance members
- Again, reports were mentioned as important tools upon which OCLC updates might be made
- Some would like the ability to control local access points
- One smaller institution expressed concern over playing an active role in processes

Thirteen don't know, didn't answer, or do not view local authority control as financially justifiable (staffing).

4. Does your institution use local authority records, and if so, for what purposes?

The vast majority of respondents, 26, indicate that they are not using local authority records, or did not respond.

Those who are using local authority records are using them for the following purposes:

- Need to control a festival name by a non-preferred form
- To support consistent and reliable searching
- To control local collection names

Although most institutions are not using local authority records, the question elicited some interesting responses. Series were mentioned several times, with several institutions reporting that they previously maintained local series authority records in Millennium, or that they are considering doing so in Alma. It was noted that it would be useful to identify Alliance libraries trained in the creation of series authority records (presumably for funnel purposes). Several institutions indicate that they do add non-authorized access points for local names to bibliographic records.

5. Ideally, what would be included in an ExLibris authority report?

Responses included:

- Access points that match or do not match authorized headings
- Access points that have been automatically updated but may need additional review
- Access points that cannot be safely updated to an authorized form and need review and/or updating by a cataloger
- Ability to generate a “new headings” report
- OCLC/MMSID numbers for affected records
- Data on authority field tags
- Date of latest change to an access point
- Total number of records changed per heading
- Total number of changes made per each report
- Blind references
- Duplicate authority records
- Data on records (including those for digital content) created using non LCSH schema
- New and invalid subject headings
- New names
- Undifferentiated matches
- Multi-matches (access point matches two or more records or heading is broken up into two or more)
- 880 error report (mismatches, e.g., date left off)
- Geographic subdivision does not match authority record
- Changed headings (e.g. 3XX fields)
- Access point matches 4XX and needs to be flipped
- Unmatched access points (separate reports for each type, e.g., x00, x10, x50, x51, x30, etc.)
- x00 access points with no qualifier (these should not be automatically linked to an authority record, but we should be able to manually link them to an authority record)
- Partial headings which match multiple authority records - Invalid data in numeric fields - Suspicious filing indicators - Possible invalid field tags

The point was also made that Alma authority reports would need to be broken into many separate reports so reviewers can concentrate on one type of heading and one type of issue/problem; that in a consortium effort, reports would need to be distributed in such a way

that the same headings are not being reviewed by multiple people; and in such a way so that all headings reviewed by a library are for bib records to which inventory is attached.

Fourteen respondents were unsure of what should be included in a theoretical authority report, or did not answer.

6. How would information from authority reports be used at your institution?

Responses included:

- Improve access and interoperability, with guidance from the Alliance
- Many respondents indicated systematic review of lists and correction of OCLC masters could be a responsibility shared among Alliance members; some indicated a willingness to participate in such work; at least one respondent advocated against institutions working independently, as work would be duplicated in such cases
- To maintain compliance with Alliance standards for cataloging
- Alliance-wide collaborative review of problematic and unmatched headings
- Some indicated that staffing situations would limit participation
- Focus on unique holdings and control associated names
- Correct typos
- Error reports as a method to see if/where additional training is needed

Fifteen respondents indicated that they did not know, were unsure, or did not answer.

5. Report summary, recommendations, and future actions

There is a very strong desire among Alliance members for Alliance guidance on all things related to authority control. Ideally this guidance would come from a position (or an adequate % of FTE of a position) established at the Alliance-level. Although several respondents advocate for and indicate a willingness to participate in shared workload scenarios, including OCLC enhancement projects and PCC funnels, it seems that even this work would benefit from central guidance. It is also felt that a central figure would have the best perspective and be best positioned to communicate with ExLibris on behalf of all members, and to advocate for future ExLibris enhancements based on a nuanced understanding of our consortial arrangement and various institutional strengths and needs. The group strongly endorses the above sentiment, and is interested in initiating or supporting discussions on this point.

While respondents and group members endorse a focused approach to master record enhancement, we realize this will address only a single facet of Alliance authority needs, and we cannot move forward on such an initiative without more detailed reports available through Alma.

Next steps:

- Develop recommendations for Ex Libris for detailed reports available through Alma
- Explore authority functions in the NZ sandbox

- Explore WorldCat Metadata API (<https://www.oclc.org/developer/develop/web-services/worldcat-metadata-api.en.html>)
- Explore “Publishing headings enrichment data to Primo” for collaborative networks in a future release
 - Determine if feature includes relevant reports
 - If not, develop recommendation for Ex Libris for development of granular reporting features for authorized access points in NZ records
- Keep abreast of ExLibris linked data initiatives as they pertain to authority control.
 - See: “*Putting Linked Data at the Service of Libraries: The Ex Libris Vision and Roadmap*.”: http://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/@api/deki/files/39160/Putting_Linked_Data_at_the_Service_of_Libraries_-_Ex_Libris_Vision_and_Roadmap.pdf
 - More information on plans and approaches to LOD is available via the Developer network
- Investigate and test functionality from Alma April 2016 release:
 - *Browsing Bibliographic Headings* - Alma now supports browse functionality for authors, subjects, series, and titles from within the MD Editor.
 - *Authority Control Task List* - The new Authority Control Task List enables you to review authority control issues and manually handle headings corrections such as splits, ambiguous headings, and date period closures.
 - *Control Global Authorities Displayed/Accessed in the MD Editor* - Support is now provided for controlling which global authorities can be viewed and/or accessed in the MD Editor.
 - *Authority Control Based on Multiple Authority Identifiers in a Bibliographic Record* - With new Metadata Configuration options, you can identify how you want the system to handle matching and linking bibliographic to authority records when there are multiple authority identifiers in the bibliographic record.
 - *Multilingual Authority Record Preferred Term Support* - Alma now supports authority control based on authority vocabularies that contain multilingual preferred terms in one authority record.

Appendix A: Alma Authority Resources

Additional resources that explain authority control in Alma

- ExL training video on authorities:
 - http://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Alma/Training/Alma_Essentials/Administration_Fundamentals/RM-05_-_Authorities
- ELUNA presentations:
 - Guidarelli, Ngoc-My (2014) *Implementing Authorities at Virginia Commonwealth University : New Challenges, New Opportunities*. ELUNA 2014, April 29 - May 2, 2014, Montreal: <http://documents.el-una.org/1141/>
 - Hearn, Stephen (2013). *Authority Control in Alma*. Upper Midwest User Group 2013 Conference, October 28-29, 2013, Radisson Hotel, Roseville, MN. (Unpublished): <http://documents.el-una.org/1142/>

Appendix B. Alliance Salesforce cases filed on authority control functionality in Alma Link Bibliographic Headings job

ExL response to Alliance wide case # 00059114

- Authority processes have been activated on production both the Network Zone and institutional Zones. When Authority processes run in the network Zone, all records linked to NZ from all institutions are impacted. Basically, you update an NZ record which is shared by all institutions.
- Authority processes which run in IZ impact IZ records which are not linked to NZ.
- The 'preferred terms correction process checks and fixes (if there is a need) all updated and new records including those records which have been overlaid.

ExL response to Alliance-wide case # 00059114

- There are two way to authorize headings in Alma. You can either use the F3 key in order to display the list of headings and select from the list. If you are working in such a way, the heading you have selected from the list will be automatically linked to the authority record from which it originates.
- If you are loading data, or cataloging manually without selecting authorized heading from the list initiated by F3, then your headings will be authorized by a nightly run of 'Authorities - Link Bibliographic Headings' process.
- The process does not change any data, therefore, it produced no report of the heading which were authorized. The process, however, creates a set with the records the headings of which were not authorized due to multiple matches in the authority file.
- Multiple matches must be resolved manually by choosing the relevant heading from the list initiated by F3.
- There is no way to disable the 'Authorities - Link Bibliographic Headings' process. It is activated for the whole installation and runs by schedule. The assumption is that each library wants to authorize headings. [As of Apr. 2015 Reed had this job disabled by ExL (case# 00144472). This case is linked to the “case to the development item regarding improving the report for the above job”]

- We asked: Is there any difference in how these headings are linked/changed when the job is run in the NZ and when the job is run in the IZ? Or is the sole difference that the IZ records are simply not in the NZ? The sole difference is that the IZ records are simply not in NZ.

Preferred Term Correction job

Response to Alliance wide case # 00059114

- The preferred terms correction is also activated and scheduled for all institutions.
- In order to prompt Alma that the 'Preferred terms correction' must make no data changes, the "disable_preferred_term_correction_job" must be set to 'true'. The process will be running in any case, but, will perform no changes.

Local Authorities

Response to Reed case # 00144472:

First, the configuration for Local Authorities is done by Ex Libris staff. Your configuration enables Local Authorities. This is done on the Institutional level, not consortium.

Note: In Alma February release, p. 54, there was a new functionality--local authority functionality in the NZ. It doesn't really help us much, but it is a new piece to the puzzle.

Appendix C: Enhancement requests on authority control functionality in Alma

Both submitted by University of Minnesota

- #4059 - We request the following improvements to Alma's reports for scheduled authority control jobs. These improvements are needed to enable accurate management of heading changes and updates in local bibliographic records.
 - For Authorities - Link BIB Headings job, the report should be delivered as a spreadsheet instead of or in addition to creating sets in Alma. The spreadsheet should include:
 - Headings matched, with bib record identifiers, authority record identifiers, and 1XX heading
 - Headings not matched, with bib record identifiers and headings from the record
 - Headings multi-matched, with bib record identifiers, authority record identifiers, and 1XX headings
 - The current job report gives numbers of records for each of these categories, but does not provide any detail on matched headings. Unmatched headings and multi-matches are reported more specifically, but only as sets created within Alma. These sets are not really practical to use, since the only way to see which headings are unlinked on is to open each record in the set individually in the Metadata Editor.
 - For Authorities - Preferred Term Correction job, the report should include MARC field tag indicators (in addition to the tag itself, which is already there).
- #4268 - Authority control processes should be enhanced to link to non-LCSH authority records based on coding in subfield 2 of bibliographic record subject fields. Highest priority is validation for LCGFT (Library of Congress Genre/Form Thesaurus) headings, tagged X55 (655

in bib records, 155 in authority records). LCGFT is present in Alma's authority files, but does not currently validate or link to any bib headings.

Authority Control Survey - Jan 2016

1. Welcome to Authority Control Survey

The Orbis Cascade Alliance Authority Control Group has recently been formed and charged with exploring and implementing Alma functionality where it is safe to do so, advocating for improvements in Alma, and recommending an Alliance-wide approach to performing authority control tasks in our Alma environment.

The group is currently attempting to identify solutions to institutional and Alliance authority problems, and would like to gather Alliance-wide input via a brief survey. Response from each Alliance institution is encouraged, even if only to say the institution does not currently have adequate information to provide a response to a specific question. Additional context and limitations are discussed in the following paragraph, which respondents should read before answering the survey questions.

The Alliance's decision to rely on OCLC master records places certain constraints on authority control at institutional and Alliance levels. Automated methods of authority processing that many members are accustomed to are simply not an option, as any changes to access points made locally (excluding changes made to local bibliographic extensions) will be overlaid by OCLC master records. This means that Alma authority jobs, such as Preferred Term Correction and Link Bibliographic Headings, do not represent tenable solutions.

Authority Control Survey - Jan 2016

2. Institution Information

* 1. Select your institution

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Central Oregon Community College | <input type="radio"/> Reed College |
| <input type="radio"/> Central Washington University | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin's University |
| <input type="radio"/> Chemeketa Community College | <input type="radio"/> Seattle Pacific University |
| <input type="radio"/> Clark College | <input type="radio"/> Seattle University |
| <input type="radio"/> Concordia University | <input type="radio"/> Southern Oregon University |
| <input type="radio"/> Eastern Oregon University | <input type="radio"/> The Evergreen State College |
| <input type="radio"/> Eastern Washington University | <input type="radio"/> University of Idaho |
| <input type="radio"/> George Fox University | <input type="radio"/> University of Oregon |
| <input type="radio"/> Lane Community College | <input type="radio"/> University of Portland |
| <input type="radio"/> Lewis & Clark College | <input type="radio"/> University of Puget Sound |
| <input type="radio"/> Linfield College | <input type="radio"/> University of Washington |
| <input type="radio"/> Marylhurst University | <input type="radio"/> Walla Walla University |
| <input type="radio"/> Mt. Hood Community College | <input type="radio"/> Warner Pacific College |
| <input type="radio"/> Oregon Health & Science Univ. | <input type="radio"/> Washington State University |
| <input type="radio"/> Oregon Institute of Technology | <input type="radio"/> Western Oregon University |
| <input type="radio"/> Oregon State University | <input type="radio"/> Western Washington University |
| <input type="radio"/> Pacific University | <input type="radio"/> Whitman College |
| <input type="radio"/> Portland Community College | <input type="radio"/> Willamette University |
| <input type="radio"/> Portland State University | |

* 2. Your name (optional so group can follow up with questions as needed)

Authority Control Survey - Jan 2016

3.

3. What are your chief Alma authority-related concerns?

4. What kind of role do you see authority control having at the Alliance level? What tools are needed to achieve this?

5. What kind of role do you see authority control having at your institution? What tools are needed to achieve this?

6. Does your institution use local authority records, and if so, for what purposes?

7. Ideally, what would be included in an ExLibris authority report?

8. How would information from authority reports be used at your institution?