Ready talk number: 866-740-1260 / Code: 8220091

Topics:

- 1. Where are we now?
 - a. UCSD: Completed NACO training; contributing at least 1 RDA NACO per week. Began contributing RDA bib records for IRs. On track to move to RDA cataloging January 2, 2013
 - b. UCLA: Both Cat & Met Center & Law have approval to contribute RDA bib records for continuing resources. To receive LC NACO training in October.
- 2. What questions are we working on w/r/t RDA?
 - a. Provider neutral: BC sent questions to Les Hawkins. Waiting for his response; then the document will be ready for CONSRLST review.
 - to clarify the wording used to specify relationships (Appendix J): Can we use "Print version:" rather than "Reproduction of (manifestation)"
 - to clarify use of the 588 field for integrating resources. Can the p-n guidelines be made more parallel across modes of issuance, by always including a 588 note regarding the basis for identification?
 - Relationships: MMB has been grappling with the way that relationships are expressed under RDA for IRs.
 Melissa has been cataloging the IRs that are now issued as serials Example1: Supersedes (work).
 ACTION: MMB will send a copy of her AALL ppt + pdfs
 - c. Reproductions: VB is awaiting responses from LChelp4rda to questions regarding print reproductions, given the decision to describe serial reproductions on their own terms (rather than based on the serial being reproduced). ACTION: VB will send a copy of the questions submitted, along with Les Hawkin's responses + pdfs
- 3. What do we need to do for the UC CONSER Funnel?
 - a. Summary of conversations with Sarah Gardner, Carole McEwan, and Elaine McCracken
 - b. Next steps will depend on what training CONSER is planning and who will participate.
 - If the live training is limited (either to CONSER reps or reps plus SCCTP trainers), then those who are trained will need to develop training for their groups. In addition to the bridge training, we need to know what follow-up discussions and how peer review will be provided.
 - If the live training is open to all CONSER participants, then we could serve as guides rather than trainers.

 ACTION: If CONSRLST has not announced training by mid-September, VB to send question to Les & Hien. At NASIG, the message was that bridge training would be given in October; but that plan may have changed.
 - c. In any case, Sarah Gardner's suggestion of developing guide sheets (as was done for the Funnel) and 15 or 30-minute "shorts" on specific topics is worthwhile. We could brainstorm topics, divvy them up, and share them within the UC CONSER Funnel to augment the general bridge training.

Format:

- Cheat sheets: Renee Chin has already developed one for IRs. Other topics would also be suited to these. We could develop a clearinghouse of guides, with pointers to those created by others
- Short presentations: Could take 1-3 examples and show how they are handled under RDA. Or, could develop a brief review of a topic. MMB developed a presentation for AALL that incorporates aspects we would want to include: terminology, comparison of past & RDA practice

Topics (examples)

- Basic Terminology Review
- Provider-neutral records & RDA
- Changes in mode of issuance: IR to serial changes requiring a new description (e.g., MMB example of Determining child & spousal support)

ACTION: Between now & the next call, write down questions/topics that could work as cheat sheets or brief interactions.

Next call: Brainstorming session.

- 4. Critique of the CONSER Bridge Training
 - a. In general, the CONSER Bridge Training was a good overall summary.
 - b. However, the topics jump back & forth; some topics lack context. Some of the slides are VERY basic; others complex/advanced. Should begin with general concepts, then identifying records and so forth
 - c. Should consider the increased emphasis on online continuing resources when identifying examples. (Should e-serials be the default for serials examples?)
- 5. MMB training: for a future time. We should read the sections & come prepared with our questions.