

December 8, 2006

To: HOTS

From: CAMCIG and the SCP Advisory Committee

Subject: Reexamination of the single record policy for serials:
Preliminary Report

Charge:

In light of the discussions surrounding the BSTF report, HOTS believes that it is appropriate to reexamine the current cataloging policy of separate records for print and electronic monographs but single records for print and electronic serials. The question is whether it makes sense to change to a policy of separate records for print and electronic versions of serials.

HOTS would like CAMCIG to investigate and report on the technical services pros and cons of such a change in cataloging policy. According to SOPAG, neither CAMCIG nor HOTS needs to be concerned with the public services aspects of such a change in policy; SOPAG will arrange for public services input to any recommendation coming from HOTS.

Since any such change in policy would significantly affect SCP operations, CAMCIG may wish to confer with the SCP Advisory Committee.

General Principles

Reexamination of long-standing policy in light of changes in technology, services, or practices is wise. Even more helpful is clear understanding of existing problems to solve or new goals that might be possible to achieve. Some possibilities for technical services goals for moving from single to separate records might be:

- Maximize the use of existing or external sources for bibliographic records;
- Maximize the use of existing or external sources for holdings data;
- Minimize the need for manual maintenance of bibliographic data;
- Minimize the need for manual maintenance of holdings data.

These technical services goals must be implemented in such a way that they would support the following public services goals:

- Provide accurate (current and complete) information to users
- Provide consistent information to users
- Provide clear and concise information to users
- Provide timely information to users.

In addition, CAMCIG and SCP believe that the time and resources required to make a particular policy change, as well as the costs of continuing to support the policy after the change is made, are a significant factor in analyzing the cost/benefits of the change.

Bibliographic control options for serials:

- A. Single record, description based on print
- B. Separate record--CONSER Aggregator-neutral record
- C. Separate record--locally-cloned from any physical manifestation record to cover all e-versions (aka UCSB record)

In theory, there are two additional possibilities, but as these possibilities are not supported by any current standard, and would therefore automatically require significant additional work, CAMCIG has not taken the time to analyze them:

- D. Single record, description based on electronic
- E. Separate record, for every single provider

The cataloging pros and cons of each of the first three options are listed below.

Option A. Single record, description based on print

Definition: If a bibliographic record for the print is available in OCLC, information is added to that record so that it represents electronic as well as print holdings.

Pros:

1. Represents current practice for SCP catalogers as well as most (but not all) UC catalogers (and therefore requires no resources be devoted to changing the practice).
2. Maximizes use of existing bibliographic records
 - a. Just one bibliographic record is used for both electronic and print manifestations.
 - b. Follows existing standards and practices:
 - i. CONSER (the majority of CONSER libraries use the single record approach)
 - ii. GPO¹
3. Minimizes the need for manual maintenance of bibliographic data, since just one bibliographic record is used for both electronic and print manifestations.
4. Most UC campuses have developed (or are close to having developed) automated mechanisms for using the current SCP single records to update a significant portion of their local bibliographic and holdings data for electronic manifestations of serials.
5. Represents the possibility of automated receipt of updated records from OCLC, revised by *any* member.

Cons:

1. Deletion of data must generally be performed manually as it is usually impossible to delete the appropriate bibliographic and holdings data using automated means.
2. Depending on the system in use at a particular campus, manual maintenance (other than deletion) may be required for single records.

¹ Presently most GPO records use the single record technique. A reconsideration of this technique has been underway since early 2005. See http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/cip/SeparateRecord.pdf and http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/cip/gpo-catalog-prac.pdf.

Option B. Separate record--CONSER Aggregator-neutral record

Definition: A separate bibliographic record that represents all electronic versions of the serial is found or created in OCLC. Holdings data for all available electronic versions are associated with that bibliographic record.

Pros:

1. Increases the possibility of automated maintenance of holdings data for electronic manifestations of serials
2. Supported by national standards (a CONSER-sanctioned option for serials cataloging, even if it is the less popular option)
- 3A. Records would be in OCLC--with UC holdings attached--a significant benefit if we are considering using OCLC as our single data source for Melvyl+
- 3B. Introduces the possibility of automated receipt of updated records from OCLC, revised by *any* member.

Cons:

1. Requires that each campus that has been using the single record technique disentangle its print holdings and data from its electronic holdings and data for all serials now cataloged using the single record technique. This will be difficult to accomplish by purely automated means and will require significant resources of time and money to complete.
2. Requires that campuses revise their processes and procedures for loading SCP records.
3. Increases the amount of maintenance needed for bibliographic data: if a serial is owned or licensed in both print and electronic formats, changes to the bibliographic data that applies to both serials (e.g., title) must be made in two bibliographic records, not one.
4. Increases the amount of original cataloging needed for electronic manifestations: fewer separate records for electronic versions of serials exist in OCLC, especially for serials found in less-stable article-based aggregations (e.g., Expanded Academic).
5. Assuming no other changes in systems, increases the number of records being loaded into Melvyl each week as campuses will be modifying two serial records instead of one when updates are needed to bibliographic information.

Option C. Separate record--locally-cloned from print to cover all e-versions (aka UCSB record)

Definition: Another type of "separate" record is a new record for the electronic version that is created algorithmically ("cloned") from the print version of the record in OCLC. This cloned record is **not** contributed to OCLC as it may in fact be a duplicate of a record already existing in WorldCat. Holdings data for all available electronic versions are associated with the cloned bibliographic record.

Pros:

1. Increases the possibility of automated maintenance of holdings data for electronic manifestations of serials
2. Uses automated techniques to create separate records for electronic manifestations of serials

Cons:

1. Requires that each campus that has been using the single record technique disentangle its print holdings and data from its electronic holdings and data for all serials now cataloged using the single record technique. This will be difficult to accomplish by purely automated means and will require significant resources of time and money to complete.
2. Requires that campuses revise their processes and procedures for loading SCP records.
3. Increases the amount of maintenance needed for bibliographic data: if a serial is owned or licensed in both print and electronic formats, changes to the bibliographic data that applies to both serials (e.g., title) must be made in two bibliographic records, not one.
4. Records would not be in OCLC, a significant drawback if we are considering using OCLC as our single data source for Melvyl+
5. Assuming no other changes in systems, increases the number of records being loaded into Melvyl each week as campuses will be modifying two serial records instead of one when updates are needed to bibliographic information.
6. It would be a significant burden not only to get our records synchronized, but to keep them synchronized.

Conclusion and recommendation(s):

The pros and cons listed above for the three viable options for bibliographic control of serials are *cataloging* pros and cons. Although CAMCIG was instructed that it did not need to be concerned with public service questions, CAMCIG recommends that if HOTS *does* decide to recommend a change in policy to SOPAG, CAMCIG should be asked to prepare examples, based on Melvyl displays, to accompany the recommendation. CAMCIG considers that catalogers have the expertise to prepare examples of record displays, even if they are not being asked to evaluate the examples from a public service perspective.

Although CAMCIG is happy to analyze the options listed above in much greater detail, we conclude that, *at this time*, the costs of making a change to our policies and practices for bibliographic control of serials far outweigh any benefits that such a change would bring.

CAMCIG recommends that we continue to explore the various options, but wait to suggest a policy change until:

- (1) a determination has been made regarding whether OCLC can and should serve as the single UC data source for Melvyl+;
- (2) a determination has been made regarding implementation of a single UC data store, including, if such a data store is to be implemented, what system we would be working with and the possibilities for indexing and display of bibliographic and holdings data;
- (3) Resource Description and Access (RDA), or, The-Code-Formerly-Known-as-AACR3, has been completed and decisions made regarding its implementation.
- (4) FRBR implementation is at hand.

Appendix 1: Current Policy

From CDL Cataloging Guidelines (undated, but ca. 1999)

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/tfer/tfercdlguid2.html>

“The majority of the records for CDL-licensed materials will be created using the "single record approach," as recommended in the initial [HOTS Task Force on Electronic Resources report](#) and following the precedent set by the full text project. However, when no print record exists or when the nature or content of the print and electronic versions differ substantially, separate records will be used.”

What was UC’s rationale for using single records for serials?

From the 1998 TFER Report:

- Brings together access information for both print and electronic holdings in a format which is easy for users to understand;
- Provides a streamlined method of adding electronic access to existing titles at substantially reduced costs when compared with making separate records;
- Enables libraries to accept cataloging copy from GPO with minimal revision;
- Enhances bibliographic access to Internet resources by applying existing search structures, controlled access points and headings under authority control to electronic versions.

Appendix 2: CONSER policy

From CONSER Cataloging Manual, 31.2.3:

CONSER members may choose not to catalog online versions separately, but instead note the existence and electronic location of the online version(s) in the record for the printed serial (or, lacking that, in the record for another format, e.g., a CD-ROM serial). The following rules of thumb give advice on when the single-record approach is a viable choice, but do not prohibit application of the single-record approach in any case. The decision must be made by individual libraries, since it is not possible to require a library to catalog a particular online version and it is independently valid to note facts about an online version in the record for different versions.

The principles behind the rules of thumb are: If the bibliographic record for the original version (print, CD-ROM, etc.) provides sufficient access for the online version, no matter what the differences are between the two, the single-record approach is a good alternative. If the desired access points for the online and the original version differ, separate records may be more useful. Separate records are always a permissible option.

- The single-record approach is considered most valid when the online version contains sufficient full-text to be a satisfactory substitute and has no significant additional content. That is, the single-record approach works best when the original and online versions can be considered equivalent manifestations.
- The single-record approach is also commonly applied when the online version lacks full-text or has only selected full-text from the original, and is therefore not considered to be an adequate substitute. The online site may not be considered worth cataloging separately in many such cases, so its existence and electronic

location are noted on the record for the original, with appropriate indication of its relationship to the original version.

- Separate records are preferred when the online version has significant additional content not present in the original. The choice of a separate-record approach in such cases means that the versions are not considered equivalent and the difference of the online version from the original is significant to users.

The aggregator-neutral record was developed after surveying CONSER and non-CONSER librarians on the need for an OPAC record representing the online version of a print title. Librarians told of problems with selecting and editing records from the national database to customize for local OPACs. They needed a simpler record, adaptable to local access methods through use of record sets, serials management systems, and databases that provide full text or citations to serial content.