Joint SCP Advisory Committee/CAMCIG
Conference Call
October 24, 2006
8:30-10:00 a.m.


Present: L. Barnhart (CAMCIG chair), B. Culbertson, J. Dooley, S. Gardner, V. Grahame, L. Hsiung, S. Layne, E. McCracken, C. McEwan, J. Riemer (SCP AC chair), S. Scott, A. Tarango (recorder), A. Weiss


1. The Single/Separate Serial Record question HOTS referred to CAMCIG and the SCP AC (All)

Discussion was wide-ranging, with the following comments made:

John suggested two more options to consider:
- Changing the single record to look like the electronic version (same as the UCSB option described in Adolfo's written response). Some advantages include:
    - Leverages the use of "separate" records with the control of detailed coverage statements
    - Ability to deal with buried title changes
    - Add as needed non-vendor "packages" like government publications
    - Avoids use of brief records
    - Provide a record as good as the print record, but have it be a separate record
    - Ability to use a control number in the 776 field to link to print from online version and which later could be used to set holdings in OCLC for either
- Using a single version record that had the electronic version as its base

The group was interested in hearing more from HOTS about the problems that would be solved by moving to a separate record.

Benefits of separate records:

- Potentially easier "in and out" record loading (as we do with electronic monographs); campuses would not need to manually process many of the records, but would simply delete and replace with new file of records. Staff wouldn't have to worry about merging or unmerging records over time.
- UC might get an automatic data flow of updated records from OCLC.
- Each campus's holdings can be more accurately reflected in OCLC thereby helping ILL.
- Record use would more accurately reflect UC's collections (less mistaking electronic holdings for print).
- Statistics might be easier to manage and could potentially be more accurate and consistent.
- SCP, if it continued to catalog serials, would then focus its resources on more "upstream" work, i.e., creating more CONSER records.


1

- The creation of OCLC records for the electronic versions would benefit the "greater good."
- Separate records might make using records from outside vendors easier.

Limitations of some implementations of the separate-record technique:

- Wouldn't cover buried title changes (in SFX, sometimes previous titles don't get separate targets)
- Coverage statement information would be at the publisher's whim, lacking detail and consistency of presentation (SFX Global KnowledgeBase does not carry applicable volume coverage data as often as it provides chronological data.)
- May not match current GPO policy for Government publications
- Brief records are used for non-CONSER serials
- In setting up for separate record processing, would we end up creating more complicated workflow mechanism to manage/identify brief records, NSDP records that contain description only, titles not in a vendor's knowledge base
- There could possibly be more work in creating bib records for the electronic versions. (Is this a one-time burden that would pass?) We think the hit rate for copy is better now than in the past, but is skewed toward established publishers. Separate records require effort to keep descriptions in synch with that for print versions.
- Citation titles (the abbreviations in MARC 210 fields) are not always included.

Some in the group indicated that having all vendors on a single record (the aggregator-neutral approach) was UC's preferred option. Is it possible for vendors to give us that? Some thought this was a service that vendors did provide. This led to some speculation about asking vendors to supply OpenURLs that pointed to UCeLinks, wondering if that would be useful to UC. Becky reminded the group that it is important that each campus be able to see the others' electronic holdings (Tier 2 and 3). This should be possible through Verde.

Discussion ensued about dealing with materials not in vendor knowledge bases. Is it possible for a vendor to work only on the "standard" titles, and let SCP worry about the others?
UC has approximately 2,000 serial titles without SFX IDs. If UC chose to use a service/vendor for serial maintenance instead of SCP, how would we handle this stream of materials? We would not want to substitute brief vendor records for the potentially fuller OCLC records that we already have (at least not without thorough examination of the brief vendor records). We would need to create a mechanism for dealing with this workstream.

The group also had concern about maintaining synchronization between the print and electronic records. This is difficult, and has not been done well by the vendors. It will be increasingly important for accurate and clear FRBR-ized displays.

Is it necessary to synchronize our print and online records with the OCLC database? Some talked about the recent assignment to CAMCIG about analyzing what data content UC has that is not in OCLC. If the ULs/SOPAG truly are interested in moving toward OCLC as our shared OPAC, then this synchronization might be critical. Carole suggested that maintaining the

connection with the OCLC database (through the OCLC number) might give UC more flexibility, and in fact it is currently our most critical match point.

What value does SCP provide in its serial records? Four elements were mentioned: 793 information (which will be subsumed into Verde in 2007), package hooks, local subject headings (690s), and call numbers. Will vendors be able to provide these? Are there others?

Some in the group thought that it was important to include a cataloger's view of the public services impact for each option. Jim said that SOPAG was very clear that it wanted to be the one to involve public services in this discussion.

John suggested an alternative structure for our report. We would list the five options, and then various parameters by which we could evaluate each of the options. John will share these with the group.

Action item: Linda will reformat "Serial Single Record Policy" document, incorporating the parameters outlined by John for evaluating each of the options. Today's phone call participants will fill in with relevant comments made today and others they may have, by Tuesday, Oct. 31st. SCP AC members are welcome to join the CAMCIG conference call scheduled for Monday, Nov. 6, 2:30 pm.

2. When to hold our next meeting
     Tuesday, November 14, 2006
     8:30 am-10:00 am
     Recorder: B. Culbertson