CAMCIG Conference Call
Monday, February 7, 2011
2:30 - 4:00 p.m.

Present: Linda (recorder), Xiaoli (Chair), Lisa, Sara, Manuel, Lai-Ying, Anna, Jim, Bea, Adolfo, Wanda

Absent: Brad

1. Announcements

Deferred until the end.

2. RDA Toolkit - UC consortial license?

Xiaoli introduced the topic with an email message from ALA Publishing. We now have acceptable license terms UC-wide. Xiaoli asked whether HOTS (from an earlier discussion) had an opinion about UC licensing of the RDA Toolkit; they do not.

Is it premature for UC to get a consortial license for RDA? If the negotiations will take some months, then we should start now. We want access to the RDA Toolkit even if we are not creating RDA records yet. At minimum, starting July 1, we want one license for each campus, and the possibility of adding more later. There was some concern about those campuses that already have negotiated a local license, like UCLA and UCSD; how will the overlap between licenses be managed?

Adolfo volunteered to be the go-between between CDL and CAMCIG and will tell CDL to go ahead with the consortial license.

3. NGTS reports: thoughts/reactions? Possible impact on CAMCIG?
 (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/uls/ngts/docs/ngts_phase2.html)

Some background information was presented:
- HOTS will discuss the high priority items identified by the University Librarians on their wiki. These high priority items are unlikely to change much.
- SOPAG has been charged with implementation and will present a draft plan to the University Librarians at their meeting later this month. After that, there may be a clearer direction for CAMCIG.
- The Executive Team and the Steering Team have been disbanded.
- Some campuses have had local discussions and many questions have been raised

CAMCIG suspects that the "good enough" record standard will likely come to us eventually. Another topic that we set aside while awaiting the NGTS report was cataloging for California documents; CAMCIG wondered if this will also come back to us because of the NGTS priority to expand SCP activities. We didn't follow up after the joint meeting with GILS because we had anticipated that the Next Generation Technical Services Phase Two teams would make recommendations on how to manage government documents system-wide in a collaborative and cooperative manner. GILS wanted to re-evaluate the California state agencies list and develop a web archiving plan.

We will add this as a standing agenda item. A specific charge may come forward, or we may generate more thoughts ourselves after more local consultation.

4. Next Generation Technical Services Link Type Subgroup Final Report
(http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hots/camcig/campusPractices.html)
 Has your campus adopted the recommendations? Any issues/questions? A related question: does your campus validate URLs regularly? If so, how?

Something went wrong when this report was loaded on to the CAMCIG web site, and it is difficult to read. Xiaoli will work with Holly on this. Some campuses noted that they were complying with this report (including SCP); others are still looking into it.

Regarding URL validation, Davis is not doing URL checking at all because websites don't like automatic checkers. Other campuses said they had noticed similar problems and offered workarounds, such as hand-checking individual links that are representation of the entire package. SCP checks PIDs and BIBPURLs and regularly runs validation processes; however, they note that they cannot validate SFX OpenURLs.

5. Electronic serial analytics (see Linda's earlier email)

Thanks to the campuses who responded. Many campuses are not cataloging these at all due to reduced staffing from the budget cuts. There doesn't seem to be a good solution at the moment for tracking new individual monographs for cataloging within electronic sets/series and serials. Maybe best practices will emerge when we all get more experience in this area.

6. UC standard for dissertations

Linda raised a concern from San Diego about a message from eScholarship that appeared to mandate data elements for Thesis Advisor and Thesis Committee for metadata submitted to eScholarship for dissertations. No other campus had heard about this. San Diego wondered whether they needed to add these elements to their MARC catalog records, and if so, if it should be done consistently systemwide. Santa Cruz thinks that the Advisor's name is of great interest to some users, and described their possible workflow. If it is important, they will add the Advisor's name.   More data is better than less data.   San Francisco raised a concern about name headings needing to be controlled, and the workload that that entails. Berkeley felt there was no reason not to do this if the information is available and useful. Irvine thought this topic might come up in the "good enough" record standard discussion.

7. Local holdings records (LHRs)

Deferred until the March phone call.

8. Announcements

- Question about the wrapup of the systemwide LHR group and their reports on single/separate and vendor records: what happens now? We believe decisions will be made by the NGM Implementation Team.
- Some discussion of the impact of budget cuts at each campus