

CAMCIG Conference Call -- Minutes

Monday, Feb. 1, 2010

2:30 - 4:00 p.m.

Phone number to call: [866-740-1260](tel:866-740-1260)

Password: 7526735

Present: Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz (UCB), Xiaoli Li (UCD, chair), Wanda Jazayeri (UCI), Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA), Jim Dooley (UCM), Manuel Urrizola (UCR), Linda Barnhart (UCSD, recorder), Nina Meechoonuk (UCSF), Anna DeVore (UCSB), Brad Eden (HOTS liaison), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC).

1. Announcements and news from ALA midwinter (all)

Welcome to Anna DeVore from UCSB.

Xiaoli mentioned that the CLA Technical Services Interest Group will be holding two workshops in April-May, mostly likely in northern California: Basic Serials Cataloging, and the MARC Holdings Record. UCSD [updated info: National University in San Diego] is slated to host a one day program to talk about recent developments in cataloging, including the provider-neutral record, the CONSER Standard Record, and the Bibco Standard Record.

Rebecca Doherty at CDL will be retiring at end of February.

Several CAMCIG members attended ALA Midwinter and reported the following items of interest:

- (1) The takeover of Blackwell NA by Baker & Taylor, and its merger into YBP (for those customers who want to be merged)
- (2) The interesting presentation at the Metadata Mashups session by the Google person responsible for metadata. One of the reasons for bad metadata can be traced back to libraries and MARC. The MARC data that they get is not granular enough in ways that can be normalized. MARC is hard to break apart. Strange local practices cause problems. Please use MARC the way it was intended.
- (3) There was brief discussion about RDA. The costs/price model for the forthcoming tool has raised some concerns. Regarding dates of RDA testing--at the ALA RDA Forum, Beacher Wiggins outlined the process this way: June to October 1: train; October 1-Dec 31: use; Jan to March: assess and analyze (that's the report writing part). LC will coordinate the set of examples and make them available to all; LC will share all their training materials. I am inferring that anyone who wants to participate informally in testing could do so. Also at the RDA Forum, from Glenn Patton: OCLC is will be installing RDA-related MARC 21 changes in May. RDA records will be marked as: 040 |e rda. We will see RDA records in OCLC as they are created. The RDA testing schedule was outlined: three months to learn the new tool; three months of actual testing, and three months of report writing. The testing group expects to finish by March 2011. No UC libraries are members of the test group, but individuals at UCLA and UCSB will participate with the music group.
- (4) One member learned after the WorldCat Local User Group meeting that OCLC expects to have a Work Record in WorldCat in six months. The idea is that this would be one record from

a cluster that would represent the cluster, and would have data element common to all the records in the cluster. Creation of Word Records would have to be automated, but we don't know whether Work Records would be fixed or generated on the fly.

Xiaoli reported that as followup from the CONSER Operations meeting, OCLC is going to add the ISSN-L linking number into OCLC record. There may be a future Webinar that will provide more information about the ISSN-L. This number may be particularly useful for services like Open URL, library catalogues, search engines, or knowledge bases (for more information, visit ISSN International Center website: <http://www.issn.org/2-22637-What-is-an-ISSN-L.php>). OCLC intends to start adding this information soon, and is hoping to finish this year. Do any UC libraries plan to add the ISSN-L into their local database records? What will SCP do? There were no answers; it is too early to know.

2. Updates on Next Gen Technical Services (Brad, Jim, Linda)

Jim announced that the reports from the four resource teams should be made public any day now. [These were posted on February 2 at http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/uls/ngts/docs/current_activities.html.] Bruce Miller, chair of the Executive Team, will provide explanation and context in a cover email message that will be widely distributed, and will direct staff to the reports. These reports are not for comment; they are for information. They describe the issues that surfaced through the teams' information gathering. Next steps: The Executive and Steering Teams are writing a joint report for the ULs for their Feb 25 meeting which will describe where UC is and where they think we should go. The ULs will need to "buy in" and provide feedback and direction. After the UL response is received, NGTS can move forward.

In addition, the Steering Team has issued 2 charges to HOTS, which has formed subgroups: (1) NonRoman cataloging backlogs, and (2) Systemwide shelfready group. Brad is chairing the Systemwide Shelfready Group, which had its first phone call last week. They received a revised charge earlier today with more realistic dates. Adnan Malik is chairing the NonRoman subgroup. They have conducted a survey of the campuses that is close to finished, and will include priorities.

3. Outcomes of the CalDocs brainstorming conference call (Lisa, Wanda)

Lisa facilitated this phone call and Wanda took notes. Wanda's highlights document is appended to these minutes. Many different perspectives were represented at this brainstorming call, with the selectors being the most vocal. The group did not have time to discuss cataloging issues.

GILS is taking responsibility for two issues: (1) re-evaluating and confirming selection (Are the right agencies on the list? Should list be changed or expanded? Should selection be done more systematically across campuses?) and (2) archiving (Which archiving service should be used, and how? Does it need to be approved by CDC?) No deadlines were set. There was unanimous agreement on the call that if something was worth cataloging it should be archived. This would take care of the "dead URL" problem. The hope was that CAMCIG and GILS could work

together to carry this project forward. This group does not plan another call, although they can be “on call” for CAMCIG if we need them again.

Two comments came in from Tracy Seneca after the summary document was sent.

Xiaoli noted that we are not doing anything cooperative right now in terms of distributing the original cataloging that is being done to all UC campuses. Is there anything that CAMCIG can do in the meantime while waiting for GILS? The group agreed that sharing records was a good idea, including copy if the copy is good in WorldCat. Each of the five campuses doing original cataloging could compile a list (text file; one OCLC record number per line) and send it at the end of each month to Adolfo Tarango. (This list could include copy cataloging, as long as the WorldCat record was satisfactory.) SCP staff could then concatenate those lists and turn them into a batch search in OCLC Connexion. This file could be added into the next SCP weekly distribution so all campuses could benefit. (Note that there would be little or no manual intervention by SCP staff with these records.)

One member wondered why CalDocs was a CAMCIG issue, and whether it was more appropriately a HOTS or CDC issue. The group agreed that it belonged with CAMCIG.

UCI thought we needed more discussion of standards to use in cataloging, as well as specifics about serials and integrating resources.

UCSC wondered what had happened to the 100-200 CalDocs records where they fixed broken links in OCLC. These were sent to Donal in SCP—but what happened? Are they being archived? Linda will investigate.

Berkeley said that they would write WAS instructions if other campuses want to do this. The group agreed that archiving instructions would be useful, but it is a campus decision whether or not they are able to do this.

4. Local Holdings Records (all)

- a. LHR documents (see attached) - comments/questions
- b. Issues associated with the implementation of the LHRs project at campuses

The group reviewed two documents prepared by the Joint Next-Generation Melvyl and Next-Generation Technical Services Task Group on LHRs for Serials, chaired by Sara.

It was suggested that some text be added to clarify that campuses do not need all this data in their local system. Some of the data can be generated upon output, and some can be created by OCLC at their end. It is the end result of all the processing that is needed by OCLC. Sara will add this concept to the document.

CAMCIG members need to reply to Sara about the 852 \$t (see email from Xiaoli on January 26). So far, no one is using this subfield.

Linda described where we are with SCP LHRs: waiting for some programming from CDL in order to create multiple campus-specific LHRs from SCP's one generic checkin record.

There were questions about timeline that was distributed in the Fall, and for which several deadlines have passed. Campuses are working as best and as fast as they can. John is working with HOTS, OCLC, and the NGM Implementation Team. If campuses work with OCLC on LHRs, please cc John so he can track activity and contact.

5. Future agenda topics for CAMCIG discussion? (all)

This is a good time to think about what we want to do for the rest of the year. CAMCIG has been heavily involved with MARC records; should we start to look at other metadata formats? Some suggestions for future topics:

- Electronic theses and dissertations. The goal of standardizing practice might be easier for new formats, and we can share best practices.
- RDA implementation discussion will be needed later (perhaps a year from now).
- Local notes. What should we discourage campuses from doing?
- Other metadata formats. UCSD is starting to go down this path, but it is too soon to discuss fully.

OCLC has a document about their intentions for handling local data that Sara can share, but it must not be distributed beyond UC.

6. Others

Next call: March 1

Highlights from the Caldocs Brainstorming Conference Call
January 27, 2010 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Present: Tracy Seneca (CDL), Tom Raftery (UCB), Lisa Rowilson de Ortiz (UCB), Jared Campbell (UCD), Patsy Inouye (UCD), Holly Tomren (UCI), Carole McEwan (UCI), Yvonne Wilson (UCI), Wanda Jazayeri (UCI), Kris Kasianovits (UCLA), Valerie Bross (UCLA), Claudia Horning (UCLA), Hanley Cocks (UCSD), Deanne Trebbe (UCSD), Annelise Sklar (UCSD), Adolfo Tarango (UCSD), Donal O'Sullivan (UCSD)

The brainstorming group ideas & suggestions:

- Collaborative cataloging of CalDocs should continue. Either by reinstating the responsibility with SCP, or an SCP-like structure, or via the 5-campus collaborative model. CAMCIG and GILS could recommend to SCP JSC to give high priority to cataloging of CalDocs. CalDocs seems right up the ally of "Next Gen TS."
- Harvesting is dead; SCP says there is no way to make the algorithm any better, and in the end, there continued to be problems. Another sharing method needs to be developed to share campus cataloging. Possibilities: A shared workspace or even a listserv.
- GILS is going to re-examine the selection process. (The two co-chairs of GILS were members of the brainstorming group.) They will determine if the current 33 agencies are the correct agencies. They will also discuss the frequency of submitting their selections to cataloging. What should that frequency be and should participating selectors all use the same cycle? Should selectors use the same strategies and methodologies? Can WAS produce a list that aids selection? Is it feasible for selection and cataloging be done from within the WAS captures of CA websites?
- Can e-serials and websites be included in selection and cataloging (along with e-monographs)? Can copy cataloging be included (in addition to original)? Can the 5 campus collaborative cataloging model be expanded to include additional or all campuses?
- If something is cataloged it should be archived; especially since print via CA depository has been significantly reduced and will continue to shrink. Also, archiving rids us of the problem of broken URLs within catalog records. GILS should be responsible for evaluating and selecting an archiving service (e.g. WAS, Hathi, etc.).

WAS information highlights:

- WAS has long-term funding for state agency archiving. The California archive in WAS is currently its own distinct entry and is not being charged back to any campus – at this time.
- CDL had previously outsourced the gathering of state agency information to Stanford beginning in 2003. This information can be brought into WAS in the future.
- WAS can be used to produce statistics on how volatile selected agency websites are.
- Nearly half of the state agencies have website restrictions that prevent them from being captured or fully captured by WAS.