

Report to CAMCIG From the CAMCIG Subgroup on Reprint Coding

Introduction

This report responds to the October 14, 2008 charge# 1 developed by CAMCIG in response to the RLF's need to have reprints identified as such when they arrive for deposit (appendix A). The charge was to:

“Prepare guidelines that will define a common coding practice for identifying reprint materials (both monograph and serial) sent to the RLFs. Please define ‘reprint’ so that campuses will share a common understanding. For materials already in the RLFs, will any actions be required of the campuses or of the RLFs?”

In order to fully understand how campus' current and legacy practices with respect to reprints contribute to the reprint problem at the RLFs, the Subgroup put together a six-question survey (appendix B) which was distributed to CAMCIG members in November, 2008. The responses from all the campuses were compiled into one Excel spreadsheet (appendix C).

After reviewing and discussing the survey results, the Subgroup has determined that:

- All campuses use all or part of the AACR2 definition of reprint to identify reprints. Accordingly there is no need to “define” reprint, instead AACR2 definitions relevant to reprint were attached to the report for convenience of reference (appendix D). However, we have observed that the definition is not always interpreted and applied the same way. In particular, there seems to be some confusion as to what constitutes a reprint edition vs. printings of the same edition;
- Additionally, the survey results have confirmed that even when a campus recognizes that a piece is a reprint, there are a variety of ways in which the reprint condition is indicated in the campus catalog record. In some cases, it is not indicated at all, even when the campus knows the material is a reprint;
- It seems there is a strong need from local campuses to receive more and standardized training on cataloging reprints. Since this is out of the scope of the Subgroup's charge, we recommend CAMCIG further evaluate campuses' training needs in that we believe it is an important issue as we proceed towards “cataloging at the network” level.

The Subgroup identified five guiding principles that formed the foundation for the report and its recommendations. They are:

- Acknowledge that retrospectively updating legacy records for already deposited materials is not currently feasible—in the campus, RLF, or UC union catalog (MELVYL or Worldcat/UC-WCL);
- The two RLFs should operate in the same way under the same general policies. Whatever is decided should be the same for both;
- Staff at the RLFs should have the final authority to decide whether a volume is a reprint and will record that information in the RLF's catalog record;
- Reprint information entered into the RLF's catalog for new RLF deposits should be viewable in the Worldcat environment (i.e. Next-Gen Melvyl);

- Campuses should provide reprint information to the RLFs for new deposits.

Finally, the Subgroup determined that it would prepare campus deposit guidelines for reprints and RLF processing without recommending major changes to cataloging practices at the campuses. We suggest those guidelines be re-evaluated six months after being implemented by the RLFs and local campuses.

Recommendations for New Deposits:

Single volume monographs:

The campus bibliographic record should either describe the reprint or have the reprint information noted in the bibliographic record. If the contributing campus overlooks the reprint situation, the RLFs will reject the title and ask the campus to re-catalog it.

Multi-volume monographic sets:

1. All volumes are reprints:

The campus bibliographic record should either describe the reprint or have the reprint information noted in the bibliographic record. If the contributing campus overlooks the reprint situation, the RLFs will reject the title and ask the campus to re-catalog it.

2. Volumes are a mix of originals and reprints:

- a. The contributing campus can catalog the originals and reprints on separate records, with each bibliographic record indicating whether the volumes are reprints or not.

or

- b. The contributing campus can catalog all volumes on the bibliographic record for the original and add a note for the reprint volumes, either in the bibliographic record or in a publicly viewable note in the holdings record. Ideally the note should specifically indicate which volumes are reprints, who the reprint publisher is, and the year of reprinting. Example: "Vols. 2, 5, 7-10 are reprints published by Kraus Reprint in 1965."

If the contributing campus overlooks the reprint situation by not doing either (a) or (b) above, then the RLFs will reject the title and ask the campus to re-catalog it.

Serials:

1. All volumes are reprints:

- a. The contributing campus can use a bibliographic record that describes the reprint.

or

- b. The contributing campus can use the bibliographic record for the original and add a note, either in the bibliographic record or in a publicly viewable note in the holdings record that indicates the volumes are

reprints. Ideally the note should specifically indicate that all volumes are reprints, who the reprint publisher is, and the year of reprinting. A reprint flag (appendix E) should be inserted into the first volume that indicates that all volumes of the title being contributed are reprints.

or

c. The contributing campus can insert a reprint flag into the first volume that indicates that all volumes of the title being contributed are reprints.

Note that campuses are expected to insert reprint flags as described in (b) & (c) above only when the volumes are easily identifiable as reprints (e.g. reprint publisher on the spine, non-library bindings, etc.). Campuses are not expected to open every volume and inspect the publisher information for each issue to determine if it is a reprint or not.

The staff at the RLFs will enter the reprint information in a publicly-viewable note (appendix F) in the summary holdings record. Examples:

“v.1-42 yr.1859-1894 Kraus Reprint.”

“v.1-18 yr. 1980-1997 Locally Produced Reprint.”

If staff at the RLFs notice a title is a reprint and none of the above steps has been taken by a campus, they will enter the reprint information in the summary holdings and not reject the volume.

2. Volumes are a mix of originals and reprints:

a. The contributing campus can catalog the originals and reprints on separate records, with each bibliographic record indicating whether the volumes are reprints or not.

or

b. The contributing campus can use the bibliographic record for the original and add a note, either in the bibliographic record or in a publicly viewable note in the holdings record, that indicates some volumes are reprints. Ideally the note should specifically indicate which volumes are reprints, who the reprint publisher is, and the year of reprinting. A reprint flag should be inserted into each volume that is a reprint.

or

c. The contributing campus can insert a reprint flag into each volume that is a reprint.

Note that campuses are expected to insert reprint flags as described in (b) & (c) above only when the volumes are easily identifiable as reprints (e.g. reprint publisher on the spine, non-library bindings, etc.). Campuses are not expected to open every volume and inspect the publisher information for each issue to determine if it is a reprint or not.

The staff at the RLFs will enter the reprint information in a publicly-viewable note in the summary holdings record. Examples:

“v.37-42 yr.1889-1894 Kraus Reprint.”

“v.1,7-18 yr. 1980,1986-1997 Locally Produced Reprint.”

If staff at the RLFs notice a volume is a reprint and none of the above steps has been taken by a campus, they will enter the reprint information as part of the item description and not reject the volume.

Recommendations for Legacy Materials Already Deposited in the RLFs:

For legacy collections already in the RLFs, there will be no attempt to identify reprint volumes except as they occur through problem resolutions. As the survey responses revealed, single volume monographs and most multi-volume monographic sets have generally been adequately cataloged to identify the existence of reprint volumes. The survey revealed that mixed serial sets have inconsistent treatment, with some but not all campuses identifying the reprint volumes. Even those campuses who currently identify the reprints within mixed sets would acknowledge that older cataloging practices and the retrospective conversion programs undoubtedly lacked this level of detail.

Without the volumes in hand to compare against the bibliographic records, campuses are not able to identify reprints within their mixed serials sets at the RLF. At the RLFs, staff would need to examine bibliographic records and pull the physical volumes in order to make an accurate identification of reprint volumes. The effort involved would overwhelm the RLF processing staff, negatively impacting the receipt of new deposits, or the RLFs would need many more FTE to manage a review of the legacy serial deposits. To put this in some perspective, serial holdings make up approximately 25% of all RLF deposits. At the NRLF that represents 1.5 million volumes, and at the SRLF that represents 1.3 million volumes (using 2007/08 numbers for total volume equivalents at the RLFs). Existing shared print holdings have been excluded from this calculation, since reprints among those holdings have been identified.

Submitted by Subgroup members:

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

February 12, 2009

Appendix A: Background from CAMCIG

CDC discussed the RLF question at their March 19 conference call. The overwhelming response from CDC members was that reprints should not be considered duplicates to the original, and that there are valid arguments for collecting and retaining both the original and the reprint edition. CDC endorsed the idea that bibliographic records should include a statement that the holdings include some reprints, if in fact a cataloging center has chosen to use reprints to fill in missing volumes, and that the RLF item records should identify reprints. Unfortunately, the UC cataloging centers do not follow a standard practice and that makes it difficult for the RLFs to identify reprints when they arrive for deposit.

Notes from the March 19 CDC meeting (provided by Barbara Schader) include these comments:

1. Reprints as duplicates - question from RLFs (see email sent 3/4 by Julia) (Guest: Colleen Carlton; 2pm)
 - Colleen – this question surfaced at the RLFs last year. Her staff asked for guidance on print and reprint deposits. There are currently items sitting on hold at the RLFs.
 - SRLF is comparing their holdings with JSTOR. To Colleen's surprise, JSTOR has used reprints for their digitizing but requires UC use the originals. She estimates UC has had to use a reprint because the original was not available to provide to JSTOR about 5% of the time.
 - Concern was expressed and there was much discussion regarding originals and reprints not being the same and that a policy should be drafted and given to HOTS.
 - Colleen suggested we would expect to see something in the bib record indicating that an item was a reprint. Originals and reprints could both be accepted. SRLF and NRLF are both willing to add an item note to indicate that a reprint is included. SRLF and NRLF agree that the campus must flag the item as a reprint and indicate that the reprint should be added. For example, if a serial run is sent which includes originals and reprints, the campuses would need to indicate which items were reprints and which are originals. Colleen says this is a new process but there is a document to which this information can be added.
 - Reprints do have value and we should not necessary exclude. But we must also be careful to not exclude an original if we do not know that the item already deposited is a reprint and not an original.

From: Carlton, Colleen [mailto:ccarlton@library.ucla.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 2:17 PM
To: julia.kochi@library.ucsf.edu
Cc: Bernie Hurley; Scott Miller
Subject: RLF Question to CDC: Reprints as Duplicates?
Dear Julia,

I am writing on behalf of the NRLF and the SRLF, with a request for guidance from CDC on the question of reprints as duplicate deposits. This question has significant importance now that the persistence policy applies to the RLFs, and as the RLFs reject duplicate deposits. While this question could apply to any journals or monographic sets, I am framing the question around our most recent experience with the JSTOR Project.

Since the beginning of the JSTOR Project in 2005, we have frequently encountered the problem of mixed holdings (originals and reprints) contained on a single bibliographic record. For the JSTOR Archive, we are striving to collect entire runs with the original publications. Reprints are accepted only when we cannot find

suitable original copies within the UC library holdings. The JSTOR volumes are added to a single bibliographic record, with a single SRLF-JSTOR holdings record. All the volumes, originals and reprints alike, are linked to the bib and holdings record for the JSTOR title. As original copies are located and added to the JSTOR Archive, the SRLF is discarding the duplicates and reprints, or we are returning them to the owning campus. When we can't find an original that is complete and in good condition, the original volume is rejected and we accept reprints instead.

As a result of the JSTOR experience, the SRLF and the NRLF are now facing a dilemma: should all reprints be defined as duplicate copies? Cataloging treatment of reprints varies among the UC campuses. Some campuses have made the decision to use the original cataloging record for reprints of both serials and monographic sets. In doing so, the reprints are not identified in the record. When holdings are transferred to the NRLF or SRLF, the campus bibliographic records are used as the cataloging source, and that record might not indicate the presence of reprint volumes. The RLF staffs are not adding this information to the holdings or item records.

Our questions for CDC: Does CDC consider originals and reprints to be equal, in terms of the RLF non-duplication rule? Should a definition of originals and reprints as duplicates be added to the Persistence Policy?

There is no easy or efficient way for the NRLF or the SRLF to go back and identify reprints that had previously been deposited, but we think it's important for campuses to realize that deposits are being rejected as duplicates, even though some items may not EXACTLY duplicate the first copies that were deposited.

We would appreciate it if you could bring our questions to an upcoming CDC meeting. Please let me know if you need additional information or examples to further this discussion.

Many thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Carlton
UC Southern Regional Library Facility
Box 951388
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1388
V: 310 206-2700
F: 310 206-5074

Appendix B: Survey Questions

Campus:

Library:

1. How does your library define “reprint”? See AACR2 glossary
2. Does your campus consider reprints to be the same edition as the original?

Monographs:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

Serials:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

3. Does your campus consider reprints to be different edition from the original?

Monographs:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

Serials:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

4. If all the volumes of a title are reprints:

a. Do you create a bib record for the original edition and ignore the condition?

b.1. Do you create a bib record for the original edition and add a note about the reprint?

Monographs:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

Serials:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

b.2. If you add a note, does it display in:

I. Local OPAC:

II. Melvyl:

III. WorldCat Local:

c. Do you create a separate bib record that is for the reprint?

Monographs:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

Serials:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

5. Mixed sets or runs- originals and reprints for one title to make up one complete run:

a. If you only have one bib record for the original, do you ignore the condition and do not add a note?

b.1. If you only have one bib record for the original, do you add a note that vols. X-X are reprints?

Monographs:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

Serials:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

b.2. If you add a note, does it display in:

- I. Local OPAC: Yes
- II. Melvyl: Don't know
- III. WorldCat Local: Don't know

c. Do you create one bib record for the original edition and a separate one for the reprints?

Monographs:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

Serials:

- Current practice:
- Legacy practice:

6. Are there any additional comments you'd like to offer?

Appendix C: Survey Results (see email attachment)

Appendix D: Definitions

The AACR2 definitions of reprint are reproduced below for convenience of reference

1. Facsimile reproduction
A reproduction simulating the physical appearance of the original in addition to reproducing its content exactly. *See also* [Reprint](#).
2. Reprint
 - a. A new printing of an item made from the original type image, commonly by photographic methods. The reprint may reproduce the original exactly (an [impression](#) (q.v.)) or it may contain minor but well-defined variations (an [issue](#) (q.v.)).
 - b. A new edition with substantially unchanged text. *See also* [Facsimile reproduction](#).
3. Impression
All copies of an edition of a book, pamphlet, etc., printed at one time. *See also* [Issue](#), [Reprint](#).
4. Issue
Copies of an edition forming a distinct group that are distinguished from other copies of that edition by minor but well-defined variations (e.g., a new impression of a book for which minor revisions have been incorporated into the original type image). *See also* [Impression](#), [Reprint](#).

Appendix E: Flag

RLF reprint flag

Check appropriate box:

Whole serial run is reprint material

☐

Mixed serial run of reprint material

☐

~~~~~  
insert flag so portion above line is sticking up  
out of the book.

*Shipping library's instructions:*

If whole serial run is a reprint, check box and  
insert in first volume of set.

If there is a mixed serial run, check box and  
insert a flag in each volume with reprint  
material.

RLF reprint flag

*Check appropriate box:*

Whole serial run is reprint material

☐

Mixed serial run of reprint material

☐

~~~~~  
insert flag so portion above line is sticking up
out of the book.

Shipping library's instructions:

If whole serial run is a reprint, check box and
insert in first volume of set.

If there is a mixed serial run, check box and
insert a flag in each volume with reprint
material.

Appendix F: Example Record

Author Public_Affairs_Information_Service.

Title Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service; annual cumulation.

Publisher New York [etc.] : Public Affairs Information Service.

Description 53 v. 27 cm.

Publishing History 1st-53rd; 1915-67.

SRLF Z7163 .P96 [Circ status](#) v.1-53(1915-1967)
v.1-13 are Kraus reprints.

Their note is displaying on OCLC WCL. See the screen shot below:

Item records do not show reproduction, but that should be okay since the note lists all reprint vols.

Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service; annual cumulation.
by Public Affairs Information Service.; H.W. Wilson Company.

☆☆☆☆☆
(not yet rated)

Type: Journal, magazine, English
Publisher: New York [etc.] Public Affairs Information Service.
Editions: [View all editions and formats](#)
ISSN: 0731-0110
OCLC: 1587563
Related Subjects: [Social sciences -- Bibliography -- Periodicals.](#) | [Political science -- Bibliography -- Periodicals.](#) | [Legislation -- Bibliography -- Periodicals.](#)

Citations: [Cite this item](#) | [Export to EndNote](#) | [Export to RefWorks](#)

Search for articles in this publication:

Get this Item

UCeLinks
University of California Libraries

Location	Call #	Status	Notes
UC Berkeley Libraries [check availability for this item]			
UC Irvine Libraries [check availability for this item]			
UC San Diego Libraries [check availability for this item]			
UC Santa Cruz Library [check availability for this item]			
UCLA Library			
SRLF		v.1-53(1915-1967)	v.1-13 are Kraus reprints.

[View item details](#)