

Report of the CAMCIG Subgroup on Preservation Microfilms April 21, 2009

Group members: Colleen Carlton (SRLF); Ryan Finnerty (UC San Diego); Wanda Jazayeri (UC Irvine); Xiaoli Li (UC Davis; Chair); Ginny Moon (NRLF)

I. Introduction

This report responds to the 14 October 2008 charge# 2 developed by CAMCIG in response to SRLF's need to process a large backlog of preservation microfilms. The charge was to:

"Prepare guidelines that will define a common cataloging practice for master negatives (both monograph and serial, including newspaper) sent to the RLFs." (Appendix A)

The background information provided by CAMCIG was very helpful. In order to fully understand campus' current and legacy practices with respect to cataloging of preservation microfilms, we put together a survey which was distributed to CAMCIG members in February 2009. The responses from the campuses were compiled into one Excel spreadsheet (Appendix F).

A set of preservation microfilm usually consists of three generations of film: master negative, printing negative and service copy (for definitions, see Appendix B). The survey results show some of the campuses do possess printing negatives as well as master negatives. The backlogs at SRLF include both master and printing negatives. Therefore, we have decided that we should prepare guidelines that will define a common cataloging practice for all generations of preservation microfilms, not just for master negatives as charged by CAMCIG.

Some campuses have indicated they have preservation microfilm for photograph collections and archival collections. Though those collections were published originally in their own unique formats, they have been filmed the same as traditional print monographs and serials (i.e. multiple generations of film). We believe our recommendations (see below) are applicable to those types of collections.

We have also learned that UC Riverside is in the midst of working with the Center for Bibliographic Studies and Research (CBSR) to adopt the separate records approach. In addition, UCR and CBSR are planning to re-catalog all of their preservation microfilm titles for the California Newspaper Project, following the separate records approach. Given the current budget climate, we realize it may not be feasible for every campus to retrospectively update their legacy single records and have therefore not included this in our recommendations.

II. Recommendations

1. New deposits to the RLFs

Given the importance of preservation microfilm titles and to anticipate the future potential for bringing together the various records for different formats in a FRBR display (i.e. WorldCat Local), we recommend the UC libraries create a separate bibliographic record for a preservation microfilm title, following the national cataloging rules and the OCLC input standards. The depositing campus should add the cataloging record into OCLC database. However, RLFs will not attach ZAP/ZAS holdings symbols to the OCLC record, following the current practice for non-circulating materials at the RLFs.

The separate records approach should be applied to monographs, serials (including newspapers), photographs, and archival materials.

A. The national cataloging and input standards we recommend are:

- CONSER Cataloging Manual, Chapter 32, Microforms
- CONSER Cataloging Manual, Chapter 33, Newspapers
- Guidelines for Bibliographic Records for Preservation Microform Masters (http://www.arl.org/preserv/presresources/Guidelines_microform_masters.shtml)
- OCLC Bibliographic Formats and Standards (4th Edition) Chapter 3. Special Cataloging Guidelines: <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/specialcataloging/default.shtm>

B. Responsibility of a depositing campus:

a. Create a separate bibliographic record for film. The record shall include the following core elements (for examples, see Appendix C):

- 007 for each generation
- 245 #a sample title...#h [microform]
- 533 microfilm reproduction details notes (including the following subfields as applicable):

‡a Type of reproduction

‡b Place of publication

‡c Agency responsible for reproduction

‡d Date of reproduction

‡e Physical description of reproduction

‡f Series statement for reproduction

‡m Dates and/or sequential designation of issues reproduced

‡n Note about reproduction (required when a title is filmed with different titles)

***The RLFs don't have a way to link multiple bibliographic records to a single holdings record. If the bibliographic record for the main title doesn't include the "filmed with" information, the information is not displayed anywhere. ***

- Note about the location of the various generations and their access

Though none of the national standards require such a note, we believe the information would direct interlibrary loan traffic and/or requests of reproduction of films to the owning campuses, thereby saving time/effort on both the RLFs' and the requester's part.

Proposed note: *[Master]/[print] negative microfilm at [SRLF]/[NRLF]. Not available for loan. Request copies from [XXX]* (for depositing campus-specific contact information, see Appendix D).

The campuses may choose to use either a 5xx MARC filed in bibliographic record (i.e. 500, 530, 590), or a public note filed in holdings record.

For the campuses which have utilized a mechanism to display the location for each generation of film to the public, such as using separate holdings records, check-in records, etc., this note field is optional.

- b. Maintain accurate holdings records in their local systems.

C. Responsibility of the RLFs:

RLF's will maintain accurate holdings record for each generation of film. The depositing campus contact information (Appendix D) will be included in the RLF's holdings records. The note will be displayed on UCLA's or UCB's OPAC, but will not appear in the Next-Generation Melvyl since the RLF's holdings symbols will not be attached to OCLC records.

2. Backlogs at the SRLFs

The SRLF has approximately 26,500 reels of preservation films waiting to be processed. Several depositing campuses have been using the single record approach. As a result, some films were cataloged on print records. We recommend SRLF staff contact those campuses as they process the backlogs. The campuses can choose to take one of the following two actions:

- a. Re-catalog the titles following the recommendations listed in II.1.B. (see above);
- Or
- b. Add note about the location of the various generations and their access to the exiting bibliographic or holdings record (see II.1.B. above).

For either situation, SRLF staff will include the depositing campus contact information into SRLF holdings records (cf. II.1.C.).

3. Titles that have been processed by the RLFs

A couple thousand preservation microfilm titles have already been processed by the RLFs. Since the owning campus is responsible for maintaining and upgrading the bibliographic records, we feel it is the individual campus's decision on whether or not they will update their legacy single records. However, we recommend the RLFs update the RLF holdings records to include the depositing campus contact information (see Appendix D).

Appendix A: Charge

Prepare guidelines that will define a common cataloging practice for master negatives (both monograph and serial, including newspaper) sent to the RLFs. Additional information follows below, and at the end of this document.

After considerable debate, CAMCIG agreed that the ten campuses could support separate records rather than the single records, following the approach detailed in the CONSER Cataloging Manual, Chapter 33, Newspapers. Our decision was guided by the interest in clarity (understanding what is being described), in maintaining standards (although both approaches are permissible), and in the future potential for bringing together the various records for different formats in a FRBR display. More immediately, though, these guidelines need to be acceptable to both NRLF and SRLF. As they currently process materials, both facilities can accommodate the separate record approach, whereas only the SRLF can accommodate the single record approach.

CAMCIG thus requests that the subgroup prepare guidelines, including addressing the following elements:

1. Please prepare a policy recommendation with examples that support separate records for the various microform generations.
2. Please define/describe the types of materials to which the guidelines apply. Clarify and differentiate the terminology: microform master, preservation master, service copy, master copy, printing negative. Do the guidelines apply to monographs as well as serials?
3. Please specify the required data elements that must be included in records submitted to the RLFs, so that the RLFs will be able to design internal processes and checklists to determine campus compliance.
4. Please recommend the wording for standard notes so that records across the UC system will be consistent.
5. Please recommend a course of action for legacy single records.

Appendix B: Definitions

Preservation microfilming: ideally, when a title is filmed as a preservation microfilm three generations of film are produced: master negative, printing master, and service copy.

Preservation microform master or Master negative: the first-generation microreproduction of library materials that meet archival standards for film stock, processing, enclosures, and storage (ARL Guidelines for Bibliographic Records for Preservation Microform Masters, 1990). It is generally used to produce printing masters. Also referred to as the first generation master (OCLC Bibliographic Formats and Standards, 4th ed.), microform master, and master copy.

Printing master: microforms of any generation employed mainly for the production of other microforms. Used for all masters not manufactured, produced, and stored in accordance with archival standards. Also referred to as the printing negative, duplicate negative or second generation.

Service copy: microforms that are for public use, rather than for production of other microforms. When produced during the preservation microfilm process, the service copy is always positive microfilm. Also referred to as the third generation, use copy, or distribution copy.

Appendix C: Examples

1. Monograph:

007 h #b d #d a #e f #f a--- #g b #h a #i a #j p
007 h #b d #d a #e f #f a--- #g b #h a #i b #j p
007 h #b d #d a #e f #f a--- #g b #h a #i c #j p
090 R133#b. A4 1910
100 1 Adams, Jane K
245 10 Occult methods of healing #h [microform] /#c by Jane K. Adams
260 Krotona, Hollywood : #b Theosophical Pub. House, #c [191-]
300 29, [2] p., [1] folded leaf of plates : #b ill. ; #c18 cm
490 1 Krotona lectures ; #v no. 1
500 "Presented at the regular session of Krotona Institute of Theosophy"--Cover
500 Master microform held by: CUS
504 Includes bibliographical references (p. [31])
533 Microfilm. #b La Jolla, CA : #c Filmed for the University of California, San Diego by the University of California Reprographic Service, #d1991. #e 1 microfilm reel ; 35 mm
650 o Medicine, Magic, mystic, and spagiric
710 2 Krotona Institute of Theosophy (Ojai, Calif.)
793 o UCSD master microfilm collection
830 o Krotona lectures ; #v no. 1

2. Serial:

007 h #b d #d a #e f #f b--- #g b #h a #i c #j p

007 h #b d #d b #e f #f b--- #g b #h a #i a #j p

043 n-us-ca

090 SF521 #b .W32 mf

245 04 The Western apiarian, and Queen breeder's journal #h [microform].

246 13 Western apiarian and ranch and range

260 Placerville, CA : #b Watkins & McCallum, #c 1889-

300 v. : #b ill. ; #c 23 cm.

362 0 Vol. 1, no. 4 (Sept. 1889)-

362 1 Ceased with vol. 2, no. 4 Mar. 1890?

500 Title guide on microfilm incorrectly reads: Western apiarian and ranch and range.

515 Vol. 1, no. 6 never published?

530 Available on paper.

533 Microfilm. #m v. 1-2 (Sept. 1889-Mar. 1890): [Lacks v. 1: no. 6, v. 2: no. 2-3] #b Berkeley : #c University of California, Library Photographic Service, #d 1988. #e 1 microfilm reel ; 35mm. #n Filmed with "Western apiarian."

590 Non-circulating master negative microfilm at NRLF. Request copies from UCD Library Preservation Services. *[may optionally be placed in the holdings record]*

650 0 Bees #z California.

650 0 Bees #v Periodicals.

776 1 Western apiarian, and Queen breeder's journal

780 05 #t Queen breeder's journal

785 00 #t Western apiarian and ranch and range

3. Newspaper:

007 h #b d #d a #e f #f b--- #g b #h a #i a #j p
007 h #b d #d a #e f #f b--- #g b #h a #i b #j p
007 h #b d #d a #e f #f b--- #g b #h a #i c #j p
043 n-us-ca
130 o Người Việt (Westminster, Calif.)
245 00 Người Việt #h [microform].
246 13 Nguoi Viet daily news
260 Santa Ana, Calif. : #b Người Việt
300 v. : #b ill. ; #c 57 cm.
310 Daily, #b June 22, 1985-<Dec. 31, 2000>
321 Frequency varies, #b <Mar. 30, 1980>-June 21, 1985
500 Publication moved to Westminster, Calif., Aug. 22, 1981.
500 Issues for <June 21, 1984-> have a weekly English section with separate numbering called: Người Việt Diễn Đàn Viet Forum
500 Issues for <-Feb. 21, 2004> have weekly English section, published Thursdays, called: Người Việt daily news. English section.
500 Issues for Feb. 12, 2004- have weekly English section, published Thursdays, called: Người Việt 2.
530 Issued also in print.
530 Issued also online with title: Người Việt online.
546 In Vietnamese.
533 Microfilm. #b Washington, D.C. : #c Library of Congress Photoduplication Service, #e microfilm reels ; 35 mm.
650 o Vietnamese Americans #z California #v Newspapers.
651 o Westminster (Calif.) #v Newspapers.
651 o Santa Ana (Calif.) #v Newspapers.
730 o Người Việt Diễn Đàn Viet forum.
730 02 Người Việt daily news. #p English section.
730 02 Người Việt 2.
752 United States #b California #c Orange #d Westminster.
752 United States #b California #c Orange #d Santa Ana.
740 o Người Việt online.
776 08 #i Original: #t Người Việt #x 1056-5124 #w (DLC)sn 91000745 #w (OCoLC)21385250
856 41 #u <http://bibpurl.oclc.org/web/10945> #u <http://www.nguoi-viet.com>

Appendix D: Depositing Campus-specific Contact Information

Campus	Note
UCB	Not available for loan. Request copies via OCLC or UCB ILL webform at http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/ILS/photo_form.html
UCD	Not available for loan. Request copies from UCD Library Preservation Services.
UCI	Not available for loan. Request copies from UCI Library Document and Access Delivery.
UCLA	Not available for loan. Request copies from UCLA Library Preservation Office.
UCR	Not available for loan. For information consult UCR California Newspaper Microfilm Archive at http://cbsr.ucr.edu
UCSB	Not available for loan. Request copies from UCSB Library Special Collections.
UCSC	Not available for loan. Request copies from UCSC Library Preservation Office.
UCSD	Not available for loan. Request copies from UCSD Social Science & Humanities Library ILL.

* UCM and UCSF do not have preservation microfilms, so they are not listed.