Cataloging and Metadata Common Interest Group (CAMCIG)
Annual Report
July 2009-June 2010

CAMCIG welcomed two new members: Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz (UCB) and Anna DeVore (UCB), and added Patricia Martin as the CDL contact. Due to the reduced staffing at CDL, Patricia did not attend the CAMCIG conference calls but monitored the CAMCIG discussion list. For a short period of time in 2009, Adolfo Tarango represented UCSD while Linda Barnhart was on medical leave.

All CAMCIG business was conducted via email and by conference call, a total of 10 conference calls were held. The minutes can be viewed at the CAMCIG Web site: http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/camcig/.

At beginning of the fiscal year, CAMCIG reviewed its charge and proposed a change to the selection of the chair. HOTs endorsed the proposal. As a result, the chair is no longer an elected position; instead it will rotate among 10 campuses in an alphabetical order by campus initials.

CAMCIG had a busy year. Its activities were driven by the Next-Generation Melvyl project, Next-Generation Technical Services initiative, and the changes occurred within the cataloging community at the national level. Below are the highlights:

Supporting Local Holdings Records (LHRs) implementation

- Provided UC-wide LHRs training for cataloging administrators and managers: PowerPoint slides and webinar recording are posted on the CAMCIG Web site: http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/camcig/UCtraining.html

- Discussed and shared the best practices related to setting up individual campuses' location codes for OCLC to use when loading their LHRs into WorldCat

- Discussed and shared LHRs decisions and/or process logs developed at local campuses

- Reviewed document: "LHR Requirements for UC Campuses" prepared by the Joint Next-Generation Melvyl and Next-Generation Technical Services Task Group on LHRs for Serials

Supporting UC's Next Generation Technical Services initiative

- Responded (individually due to short timeframe) to a 22-question survey issued by Next Generation Technical Services (NGTS) Teams 1 and 2 (Commonly-Held Content in Roman Language Scripts, and in Non-Roman Language Scripts)

- Responded (individually) to *Survey of Metadata Schemes Used in UC Libraries" issued by* the NGTS Enterprise-Level Collections Management Services Task Group

- Discussed and responded (individually) to the question "Database of record and WorldCat" posted by the NGTS Enterprise-Level Collections Management Services Task Group

Responding to the reports generated by several system-wide groups

- *The University of California Library Collection: Content for the 21st Century and Beyond*

- *Final Report of the UC Libraries Collections Space Planning*

- *SOPAG Digital Library Services Task Force Report*

- *Link Types Subgroup Report*

Continuing the effort in coordinating the cataloging of online California Documents (CalDocs)

A conference call where catalogers and California document librarians from each of the five campuses that participated in the CalDocs project, one SCP staff, and one CAMCIG member brainstormed the issues related to the cataloging of California documents published electronically. As a result, the CalDocs project was expanded to include the copy cataloging records created by other libraries as long as the records are reviewed are reviewed by UC catalogers.

There are still two remaining issues which the University of California/Stanford Government Information Bibliographers (GILS) group will investigate: (1) selection - are the right government agencies on the selection list? Should the list be changed or expanded? Should selection be done more systematically across campuses?; (2) archiving – should selected documents be archived? If so, which archiving service should be used, and how? Does it need to be approved by CDC?

Developing and recommending shared cataloging and metadata policies and practices for the University of California Libraries

- Discussed the issue related to searching WorldCat Local for archival materials

- Discussed and shared strategies on how to deal the new cuttering practice implemented by the National Library of Medicine

- Endorsed "Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide"

- Surveyed and discussed in depth about the cataloging of electronic dissertations and theses (Appendix A)

- Discussed in great detail about Resource Description and Access (RDA); developed a RDA webinar (which was held in July 2010); worked with CDL on obtaining a UC-wide consortia license for RDA Toolkit; drafted a statement that outlines UC's concerns about the RDA testing and implementation (Appendix B)

Goals and Objectives for 2010-2011

1. Support Next Generation Melvyl implementation, should it be finalized

2. Support Next Generation Technical Services Initiatives and associated recommendations

3. Collaborate on implementing RDA (including policies, trainings, and licensing), should it be adopted by U.S. libraries

4. Continue to increase collaboration and reduce redundancy across cataloging units

5. Develop and recommend shared cataloging and metadata policies and practices for the University of California Libraries

6. Collaborate on developing and/or implementing new strategies for managing the cataloging and metadata aspects of cooperative or shared initiatives in consultation with the Next Generation Technical Services group(s), the Shared Cataloging Program Advisory Committee (SCP AC), the UC CONSER Funnel, and other groups.

7. Finalizing our recommendations for Caldocs harvesting/cooperative Caldocs cataloging efforts

**Appendix A: UC Libraries Electronic Dissertations and Theses (Digital Originals)
Processing
April 30, 2010**

Summaries

UCB: all doctoral dissertations are required to be submitted in electronic form effective with the Spring 2010 semester.

UCD: Use XSLT stylesheet to convert the ProQuest XML into MARCXML. Manually add 020 (ISBN) and 856 which links to the full-text. Records are in OCLC.

UCI: Use MarcEdit to batch edit ProQuest MARC records. Add a note about the embargo to the 856 field. Records have not been added into OCLC yet, but they will be in the future.

UCM: the Library has not received any dissertation or theses yet.

UCLA: ETDs are not required yet.

UCR: Creates OCLC record based on the PDF file sent by ProQuest (manually). Print copy ordered from ProQuest and cataloged as reproduction. Print copy stored at SRLF. Records are in OCLC.

UCSB: Use ProQuest MARC records. Embargo is noted in the record. Records are not in OCLC.

UCSC: ETDS are not required yet.

UCSD: cataloged using an OCLC Constant Data record. Information is copy-and-pasted from the student's XML form, particularly the abstract. Embargo is noted in the 506 field: *Embargoed until (date)*. Records are in OCLC. LC subject heads assigned to ETDs in humanities and social sciences.

UCSF: Accept ETDs only since 2007. Use ProQuest MARC records (6 month from the time ETDs were submitted). Records are in OCLC.

Issues/questions:
1. Which cataloging guidelines to follow?
2. Should cataloging records been added into OCLC WoldCat so patrons on other UC campuses can access them via NGM?
3. Embargo titles
4. Preservation
5. The 856 field – which subfield(s) can remain in OCLC master record?
6. Source for pagination information
7. Who is publisher: ProQuest or University?

List of Commonly Used MARC Fields for ETDs Cataloging Records

MARC Fields	UCD	UCI	UCR	UCSB	UCSD	UCSF	Provider-Neutral Guidelines*
Type	a	a	a	t	a	m	M
ELvl	K	not coded	I	K	K	I	
Call #	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	
006	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	A/O
007	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	A
008	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	M
020	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	A
100	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
245	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	M
260	$c only	$c only	yes	$c only	yes	$c only	M
300	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	M
500 source of title	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	M
500 (adviser)	no	no	no	yes		yes	
502	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
504	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
520	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
530	no	no	yes	no	no	no	
538	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	
650	no	no	yes	no	no (sciences) yes (HSS)	Yes (in OCLC)	
655	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
710	no	no	no	no	no	yes	
856	full-text	Full-text	Full-text	Full-text	Full-text	Full-text	A

* M=Mandatory   A=Mandatory if applicable   O=Optional

Appendix B: UC's responses to RDA related decisions and policies
By CAMCIG
June 11, 2010

A. Bibliographic Records

We have heard that OCLC has made a policy which will not allow libraries to create parallel records, one under RDA and one under AACR2. Our understanding is that libraries should either plan now to modify their local ILSs to include RDA records; or, may locally modify records to fit local ILS. We have strong reservations about this policy.

The reasons are:

- RDA might not be implemented; or there is a possibility that one cataloging community implements and another does not

- RDA might be implemented with significant changes

- Implementing RDA is about more than updating tag tables to accept new tags-- to implement it completely requires indexing changes as well as display changes in local systems; it seems desirable to wait until the testing period is complete, and we have seen if the testing results in changes to RDA, before making these changes (which might need to be made twice if testing RDA results in significant changes to the implementation of it)

- Maintenance issues have not yet been worked out. The instructions on what non-testing libraries should do if RDA records need to be maintained and on how testing libraries will maintain pre-RDA records have yet to be developed

- Many libraries cannot afford an additional year's subscription to RDA simply to be able to understand RDA records

Therefore, we believe it may be highly desirable (to the library cataloging community) to allow the co-existence of RDA and AACR2 records for the same title in OCLC during the testing period. A benefit to this approach is that side-by-side comparison of AACR2 and RDA cataloging for the same titles would be possible. The temporary existence of some additional parallel records during the testing period, given the extensive number of parallel records already in WorldCat, should not pose significant problems for libraries.

We suggest the use of **936 PR RDA ...** to identify AACR2 parallel records that are equivalent to RDA test records. Any library updating a record with a **936 PR RDA** would also notify the inputting RDA library of updates needed to their record.* At the end of the testing period (or at the beginning of the official implementation period), the records with "936 PR RDA ... " would be merged, with changes made based on the outcome of the testing

*(These are updates triggered by changes to the publication itself that warrant updates to the bib record.)

B. Authority Records

Library of Congress has announced that they will add RDA elements to existing authority records and create new RDA name authority records in the LC/NACO Authority File beginning October 1, 2010. We strongly recommend that any RDA-generated changes to 1xx (or 5xx) fields in authority records be delayed until the U.S. testing is completed and U.S. (i.e., LC) policy decisions have been finalized. We recommend recording RDA forms of existing headings in fields (e.g., 7xx fields) that would not trigger changes to bibliographic records.

Many libraries subscribe to automated authority control services. It would also seem to make sense to wait to make changes to existing authority records until the policy decisions have been finalized and RDA is being implemented, at which point global changes to authority data (e.g., Dept. to Department) could perhaps be made by OCLC as well as by individual institutions.

C. RDA Toolkit subscription pricing and conditions

We understand there will be an open access to the RDA Toolkit from middle June through the end of August. We also understand there will be a double-user offer for those who subscribe to the RDA Toolkit before August 31, 2011.

Is it possible to extend the open access or to offer limited free access to the RDA Toolkit through the entire testing period? It seems quite unjust that during the testing period those institutions that are not testing, but that have to treat "test records" as "real records", must subscribe simply in order to understand these records.

If free (even limited free) access is not an option, maybe ALA would consider letting institutions delay or extend their two-for-one period to coincide more closely with US implementation of RDA so that the libraries would be able to subscribe now, when very few simultaneous users are needed, but would also be able to take advantage of the two-for-one offer at a time close to implementation.

UC CONSER Funnel Annual Report for CAMCIG
Prepared by Valerie Bross, UCLA
12/10/2010

The UC CONSER Funnel organization remained stable this past year. The Steering Group for the Funnel for FY2009/2010 comprised: Renee Chin (Communications Coordinator); Melissa Beck (Training Coordinator); and Valerie Bross (general Coordinator). Funnel Liaisons were: Adolfo Tarango (UCSD), Sarah Gardner (UC Davis), Carole McEwan (UC Irvine), Elaine McCracken (UC Santa Barbara), Lisa Rowlison (UC Berkeley), and Sharon Scott (UC Riverside). This apparent continuity masked significant internal shifts as members took on new roles within our libraries.

Funnel Highlights July 2009-June 2010

Statistics

Between July 2009 and June 2010, UC campuses created original records for 428 serials and authenticated for CONSER over 600 serial records (over 200 from a single campus, UC Davis). UC campuses completed subsequent enhancement of 78 records and maintained a whopping 2866 CONSER records. Finally, while creating & maintaining CONSER records, the campuses enhanced 180 related non-CONSER serial records.

Outreach

UC CONSER Funnel members participated in the following regional Webinars this year:
- "A Passing Interest in Publishers: Multiple 260 Fields" presented September 3, 2009 by Melissa Beck & Valerie Bross;
- "Searching for the Right Word: A 21st Century Overhaul of the HAPI Thesaurus" presented February 9, 2010 by Orchid Mazurkiewicz, Socrates Silva, and Ruby Meraz Gutierrez;
- "BIBCO/CONSER Highlights Webinar" developed by Peter Fletcher, Becky Culbertson, and Valerie Bross; presented May 28, 2010; and
- "Some Like It Hot: Highlights from NASIG and ALA" presented July 16, 2010 by Rhonda Super, Julie Su, and Louise Ratliff.

In summer 2010, Renee Chin organized up a new Moodle site for the UC Funnel and posted recordings of these and other sessions to: http://ccle.ucla.edu/course/view/UC_CONSER.

In addition to these locally-presented sessions, we enjoyed two riveting sessions on NLM Classification developed and presented by Barbara Bushman and Diane Boehr on April 12 and 19, 2010 and hosted at NLM.

Finally, in the category of noteworthy outreach beyond the Funnel itself, Adolfo Tarango--with Meg Mering--completed a much-needed overhaul of the SCCTP Advanced Serials Cataloging Workshop. They presented the SCCTP workshop in Washington, DC, June 24-25, 2010 as a pre-conference to the ALA Annual Meeting. .