

## Notes of the [UC Systemwide] Shared Cataloging Program Steering Committee (SCPSC)

Conference Call, December 21, 2000, 1:00 p.m.

1. Introductions: The first meeting of the Committee was convened by the chair, Patricia French (UCD). Members introduced themselves: Becky Culbertson (UCSD); Esther Fulsaa (UCB); Lynne Hayman (UCSB); Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA). Hayman agreed to serve as note taker.
2. Review and discussion of HOTS charge:
  - a. Steering Committee membership: French spoke with members before the meeting to explore their interest in joining or continuing on the Committee. New and continuing members joined this conference call and are interested in continuing. The Committee does not feel it necessary to expand the size of the Committee at this time.
  - b. Role of the SCPSC: Members see the Committee's role as addressing guidelines and issues, as the need arises and new types of materials are identified; also documenting standards and guidelines. This may include drafting guidelines, referencing existing national guidelines or those developed by ad hoc task forces or other groups familiar with specific material types. Communication with SOPAG is through the Committee's assigned HOTS liaison, Nancy Douglas. This is the route by which the Committee would make recommendations to the CDL, also the route by which topics are referred to the SCPSC as initiated by HOTS, CDL committees/task forces, the Shared Cataloging Program (SCP) and Shared Cataloging Program liaisons at each campus. The SCPSC Chair's role is to shepherd discussion. The Committee should continue to address the current version of MELVYL, but not focus on issues as display (similar to TFER2's charge).
  - c. HOTS has requested a progress report in late January. The Committee agreed the report should focus on how the Committee views its role.
  - d. Priorities: The Committee agreed guidelines for monographs and databases are priorities at this time.
  - e. Monographs & databases: Will the SCP be generating and distributing records for monographs and databases? Culbertson noted that such records have already been created by the SCP (60-70 MELVYL databases), but the records have not yet been distributed to the campuses. The Committee agreed the existing system-wide guidelines for Tier 1 and 2 serials created by TFER2 (French will clarify the scope of the existing guidelines) ought now to be expanded to address monographs and databases. The Committee's role could be to draft guidelines in some instances, incorporate (sanction) guidelines in others, also to recommend adoption of guidelines drafted and/or recommended by other groups, including ad hoc task groups.
3. Government Information and Shared Cataloging. Background: Prior to the Nov. 17<sup>th</sup> SOPAG meeting, the northern Government Information librarians forwarded a proposal to B. French for shared cataloging of State of California Internet documents (Andrea Severson's report to CDL on government information strategic options with minor revisions). SOPAG referred the proposal to the Government Information Steering Committee requesting recommended procedures be forwarded for consideration at its Dec. 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Additional information was supplied to SOPAG by Sherry DeDecker, Chair of the UC/Stanford Government Information Librarians Steering Committee, regarding their proposal for cataloging of State of California Internet documents using the CDL Shared Catalog Program (SCP). The UCSD Shared Cataloging Program is in conversation about a test to study workload and maintenance issues associated with responsibility for cataloging the documents.

4. Serials: Culbertson noted that each of the campuses is presently using the SCP-distributed files in a different way. She noted the SCP's addition of 710 fields to the records. Layne noted UCLA carries a 590 note in records: "Internet version licensed through CDL."
  5. Databases: Culbertson reported the SCP is cataloging databases as monographs. The Committee expressed support for this approach. The cataloging rules are clear and there is no controversy. UCSD as SCP is adding 856 links to print versions and would re-distribute the record for the print version. What print records are linked? Culbertson noted that if there are monthlies, quarterlies and annuals, all are set up. Several committee members asked if those associated records could be marked in the file in some way to distinguish them, such as carrying a code ADJ (adjunct). (Other codes we may want to recommend: UP for update; DE for delete; M for monograph). It was noted that the new (MARBI) bib lvl code: I would be applied and the fixed field would then change to the serial format for continuing resource, subsuming integrating entities. It was suggested we may want to advise waiting on implementation until our local systems "can cope". Culbertson clarified that the SCP catalogers catalog online databases using the appropriate format (usually textual) as monographs. There is a difference, though, between cataloging databases which are dynamic and monographs which are "static." Guidelines are at <http://tpot.ucsd.edu>.
  6. During the small remaining meeting time, the Committee entertained a preliminary discussion of standards for monographs. Layne noted that UCLA has recently loaded 60-70 NetLibrary records and will soon be loading 500 more; also that the cost of cataloging such monographs two different ways, both as separates and singles, would be prohibitive. Hayman noted that monographs are not subject to the same ready compromises as serials for taking a dual approach. Culbertson noted UCSD has taken the single record approach adding a 793 local title field in records, e.g.: 793 0 NetLibrary online books for economics, and employing macros for cataloging.
  7. Action Items:
    - a. French will affirm and clarify the scope of the existing guidelines for cataloging Tier 1 and 2 serials.
    - b. Culbertson will review the existing guidelines, referencing the SCP's experience, to identify where they are sufficient to encompass databases, where incomplete and where additional guidelines are needed as a separate document for databases.
    - c. Committee members will e-mail Culbertson their fax numbers.
    - d. The group will research and pursue thought on approaches to the cataloging of monographs and will develop issues further through e-mail in anticipation of the next conference call.
- 

\*From the 13 November 2000 report from HOTS by K. Cargille to the LAUC Fall Assembly 2000:

"There was a discussion of the CDL Shared Cataloging Program and its governance by the CDL SCP Steering Committee charged by SOPAG to report to HOTS with Pat French (Davis) as the new chair. This Committee is empowered to add and delete members as needed; they are also empowered to form task forces as needed. The committee originally was formed to deal with issues surrounding the cataloging of electronic journals, but as the CDL Collections mature other types of material are being acquired and are in need of cataloging. Nancy Douglas, HOTS Chair, will follow-up with the Steering Committee to clarify their role."

---

Email from Nancy Douglas forwarded to SCP by P. French on Dec. 4:

Shared Cataloging Program task group and SCP Steering Committee - C. Johns/N. Douglas

The question is how the Shared Cataloging Project (SCP) and the SCP Steering Committee should interact with one another and with HOTS and on how the Steering Committee could be moved back into action. After wide-ranging discussion, HOTS agreed to several main points:

- a. The existing membership of the SCP Steering Committee brings a wealth of experience into their work, and the size seems right. However, the Committee has been in existence for some time and we recognize that some members might be interested in being relieved of their responsibilities. The recently-appointed Chair, Pat French, should contact the members to see if they wish to continue. If there is a need, the Steering Committee can select additional members or ask HOTS for additional recommendations. The Committee should feel free to expand as necessary or to appoint ad hoc task forces to deal with non-serial material in electronic form, such as monographs, government documents, or rare materials. The core Steering Committee can insure that recommendations of such task forces are appropriately aligned with the existing UC standards as laid out in the TFER reports.
- b. The priorities for the SCP and the Steering Committee should be driven by the packages purchased by CDL. This is, in fact, what seems to be happening, as the SCP has started cataloging monographs and databases, since they completed the serials packages. Presumably, they have been following the TFER guidelines, but there are aspects of monographs and databases which should be specifically addressed and incorporated into guidelines.
- c. HOTS would like to see a progress report from the SCP Steering Committee sometime after Mid-Winter ALA 2001. In mid-November, there will be an invitational LC conference on multiple versions, which Leighton is attending; information gained there might help inform the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee report should indicate the membership roster, plans for expansion or additional task forces, and a plan of action to address at least the monographs and databases packages which are already being cataloged by the SCP. HOTS discussed in round-robin form the use the campuses were making of the distributed SCP files; most were treating as a resource file, either after some in-house consolidation project or after receiving a current snapshot of the latest use of the records. SCP might also want to review this more formally through the campus cataloging liaisons to the SCP.
- d. As a general plan of information flow, as the front-line catalogers, the SCP will indicate to the Steering Committee when new formats are appearing for which no guidelines exist. The Steering Committee will be responsible for drafting the guidelines, integrating them into the overall guidelines for electronic cataloging, and resolving ad hoc requests for guidance from the SCP. HOTS will serve as the body for final review of guidelines and for addressing policy issues that the Steering Committee considers beyond their scope, as well as keeping SOPAG informed.

---

Sources:

SOPAG Electronic Resources Cataloging Task Force Report, included CDL Cataloging Guidelines (for serials)

<http://tpot.ucsd.edu/Cataloging/HotsElectronic/SOPAG/>

LC Draft Interim Guidelines for Cataloging Electronic Resources

[http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/elec\\_res.html](http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/elec_res.html)

CONSER Working Group: Single vs. Separate Records

<http://wwwtest.Library.ucla.edu/libraries/cataloging/sercat/conserwg/>

(includes a page of bookmarks for policy documents from major libraries)

Document owner: [HOTS webmaster](#)

Last reviewed: November 6, 2003