CAMCIG Conference Call
Minutes
June 6, 2011, 2:30-4:00 pm

Present: Armanda Barone (UCB), Xiaoli Li (UCD, chair), Wanda Jazayeri (UCI), Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA), Jim Dooley (UCM), Heidi Hutchinson (UCR), Linda Barnhart (UCSD), Bea Mallek (UCSF), Anna DeVore (UCSB, recorder), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC).

Absent: Adolfo Tarango (SCP), Brad Eden (HOTS)

Guests: Shirley Higgins (UCSD), Patti Martin (CDL)

1. Announcements

- Santa Cruz started shelf-ready books in May with a firm order pilot and will add approval books soon; in July technical services staffing will drop to 9.2 FTE; they will be moving into the remodeled portion of the library in June, while Technical Services will stay at their present location in the new addition
- Berkeley is laying off 3 staff in the Transportation Institute, including 2 catalogers
- San Diego has 100+ staff working on “collection reviews” (weeding) to prepare for closing branch libraries as the campus takes over space
- Santa Barbara is “decanting” (weeding) print serial volumes and monographs with duplicates online or in the RLFs in preparation for gutting its two-story building

2. Next Gen Melvyl implementation, with Patti Martin (patricia.martin@ucop.edu)

a. Updates and questions

- Q: Any new information since the NGM May update? A: No, but see the FAQs for tech services (http://www.cdlib.org/services/d2d/melvyl/technical/) and public services (http://www.cdlib.org/services/d2d/melvyl/public/) for more information.
- Q: What is the difference between melvyl@uclib and melvyl@ucdavis? A: The default view is different but the contents are identical.
- Q: Does each campus scope what it wants? A: There is an option for a fourth level of data display. It would involve changing configurations and settings. There is no customization for campuses except “for good business reasons.” CDL/ULs want consistency across the “experience”; customization could happen eventually, but no one knows how it would work or what the costs would be.
- Q: [there was a question about the configuration of the WCL interface done at CDL, but my notes are sketchy and I missed the answer.]

b. What roles should CAMCIG play?
Q: How can CAMCIG help with the development of Melvyl? A: CAMCIG could help with the discussion of local data and whether it is useful and with testing. Patti will transmit CAMCIG’s offer to help.

3. What is your campus plan with respect to the local bibliographic data and local system number enhancements announced by OCLC in the NGM May update? Additional Q &A with Patti Martin.
   - Do campuses need to submit local bibliographic data to OCLC for LHRs? A: Data would go to a local data record; OCLC terminology is confusing, but they are referring to two different data bases.
   - Q: How will local bib data interact with institutional records? OCLC has not been forthcoming with their mental model of how this data will work. Only Berkeley and UCLA’s Film and Television Archive have institutional records. CAMCIG members need to know where the data will live. Xiaoli will attend the WCL user group meeting at ALA and ask, though we generally don’t get good answers from OCLC.
   - Q: At present our link point is the OCLC system number; can we now send our own system number? A: Yes. Q: Where will the data sit? [No answer.]
   - Q: Will we wait for CDL to send local data? A: It is a campus decision as to when and how; see the FAQ (or the cover email that came with the NGM May update).
   - Q: What are CDL’s communication plans during this process? Will there be an email list or some other mechanism? A: There is a role for CDL to communicate with campuses, though communication is complicated by OCLC’s direct marketing to campuses. CDL needs to mediate implementation of features and has asked the ULs to refocus the Melvyl Users Council toward managing communication, input, and feedback.
   - Patti concluded that it was fine to send her further questions as they come up.

4. Follow up with Adolfo’s email regarding the RDA Toolkit: Because CDL does not want to manage a consortial subscription to RDA, individual campuses will need to procure and manage their own subscriptions. Riverside will get a subscription; Irvine nearly has one arranged.

5. RDA implementation - issues, concerns, training, etc.
   - Everyone is awaiting LC’s implementation decision before ALA.
   - Several campuses believe that the more we can do to implement RDA in a uniform, concerted way, the better. To be continued next month.

6. Cataloging statistics - what you count and how you count?

[Condensed discussion:] The consensus of the group was that we collect too many statistics above and beyond what are needed for annual UCOP/ARL requirements, and we need to simplify them. There is a distinction between workload statistics (to gauge a cataloger’s output) and volume counts (for UCOP/ARL). Several campuses have
reduced or are in the process of reducing the categories reported and/or automating statistics collection. Many statistics have been collected for performance reviews, though quantity is only part of a review. Some campuses collect statistical data in a 9xx field on the bib record, including initials, level of cataloging effort, date; then the system aggregates and reports it. We need counts collected electronically—“no more manual counts!” It might be that a more meaningful statistic is how many users we reach. Q: Is there any thought of rationalizing statistics on a system-wide basis? A: No.

7. Other

- Use of relator codes in 100 and 700 fields: Some campuses use them, especially for media and music, but they are generally not required or displayed.
- The present and future of the GMD (246 |h) vs. the new RDA material type fields: UCLA is looking at formulating a consistent display across AACR2 and RDA records. Perhaps an icon could be used. Riverside is also looking at the issue.
- Virtual book plating: Riverside has one for its Sikh collection; Heidi will email a link; users can click from the web OPAC to display the bookplate. Davis also uses virtual bookplates. Irvine and Santa Cruz are working on it.