

**CAMCIG Conference Call Minutes**  
**Monday, April 5, 2010**  
**2:30 - 4:00 p.m.**

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

**1. Announcements (all)**

Riverside has hired a 0.4 FTE Thai cataloger, a former volunteer, to do original cataloging; this step will allow Riverside to continue its arrangement to catalog materials for Berkeley; materials are chiefly on religion and Festschrifts. **Action:** Manuel will send this information on to update HOTS cataloging language expertise document.

UCLA has reorganized their AUL portfolios, and the print acquisitions and cataloging departments are again both reporting to the AUL for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication, Sharon Farb.

**2. Next Generation Technical Services (NGTS) Updates (Jim and Linda)**

Task Force members met on March 12 to determine next steps, based on the ULs' endorsement. The Phase 1 teams have been discharged, and the executive and steering committee teams are working on charges, new task groups, and deadlines for Phase 2. They are awaiting the return of Bruce Miller, Executive Team Chair, to finalize the next steps.

**3. NGTS Link Types Subgroup Updates (Linda)**

The Link Types Subgroup (Linda Barnhart, Claudia Horning, Karl Kocher, Lisa Sibert, and Perry Willett) was charged with looking at the types of links used in records across the campuses. The group sent a survey to each campus. An underlying purpose of the survey is to determine the future of the PID server and the future of URLs in UC library records. Subgroup members are analyzing survey data and hope to share the results with CAMCIG and/or campus respondents in the next month.

**Heads up:** All campuses would like to see standards for choosing URLs; CAMCIG might be the group to develop these standards, perhaps with ACIG.

**4. Joint Next Generation Melvyl (NGM) and NGTS Task Group on Local Holdings Records (LHRs) for Serials Updates (Sara)**

The first report and comments on it are out. There are minor revisions and three additional appendices: 1) Shared Cataloging Program (SCP) LHRs; 2) UCSD LHR process; 3) LHRs for campus deposits in the Regional Library Facilities (RLFs).

The task force discussed one of its charges earlier in the day: to revisit the single record/separate record issue for serials. The SCP Advisory Committee will be asked to consult. There is no deadline for this charge but Sara wants to move quickly and hopes to have a draft statement on the short- and long-term benefits of separate records by the next conference call. **Action:** Sara will resend the charge to the CAMCIG list.

## **5. Electronic Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)**

A summary of campus ETD cataloging practices, including a grid of MARC fields used and sample records, was attached to the agenda. Correction on first page: UCB should read: UCSB, since Berkeley doesn't have ETDs yet (nor do UCLA or UCSC). Question from Sara: should the grid have two columns, one for born-digital and one for born-print? Answer: at this point, the grid is for born-digital TDs only. All TDs at Merced are digital, but none have made their way to the library yet.

Campuses have varying workflows, some using XML data from the candidates (Davis, Riverside, San Diego), some using ProQuest MARC records (Irvine, San Francisco, and Santa Barbara). Question for UCSB: are we sending our records to OCLC? [Answer supplied by Anna later: No, because ProQuest does not allow us to send their MARC records to other entities.] Question: Is UCI sending records for its ETDs to OCLC? Answer: Records have not been added yet, but they will be in future.

Question: Are 856s placed in the OCLC master records, or in local ILSs only? It would be helpful for other UCs to have the 856s in OCLC for sharing, and to use the unique URL linking to full text.

Question: Are embargoed titles a problem? Riverside: records have a link to text; when text is embargoed, the link doesn't work; when not embargoed, the link works. Campus policies on embargoes vary widely, ranging from Davis actively discouraging them to San Diego allowing them easily.

Question: Should UCSB records have "a" not "t" for "Type," since ETDs are considered published? Answer: Yes.

ETD preservation question: use print as an archival copy? Riverside purchases print versions of ETDs from ProQuest for deposit in SRLF. Davis has no print version. ProQuest makes and keeps microfilm versions (their preservation format). The UC system is relying on ProQuest and CDL DPR as its archive.

Question: Include pagination? Not required for Level K records; does indicate the extent of the resource. ProQuest MARC records do include this data, but not in XML files, so libraries using XML data must add it manually.

Comment: Source of title note required for electronic resources, but only Riverside and San Diego supply it.

Dissertation adviser name: San Francisco and Santa Barbara give them. Is this data useful? At UCSB, students, especially in the School of Education, look for dissertations supervised by their advisers, though there is a problem with searching, since it is supplied in a note, not a 7xx field.

Question: Should records include ISBNs and ProQuest numbers? All but Riverside and San Diego supply ISBNs. The ISBN is required data, if available. ISBNs are not assigned to print dissertations, but ProQuest provides them for TDs, either born-digital or scanned by ProQuest.

Paging for bibliographical references (504) note: Only UCR and UCSD provide. Is there a point to having the note without the paging, since TDs generally have bibliographies? Extent of dissertations and their bibliographies may not be available free to non-UC users, so information may be useful.

Question: Do we want to develop further system-wide standards for ETDs in view of the fact that they are the work products of the system? Manuel: we could provide options for various levels of cataloging, but standardize them according to the rules.

The consensus of the group was that the Xiaoli's compilation and the ensuing discussion have provided useful ideas to pursue locally. Comments from various participants: It might be early to ask all campuses to adhere to guidelines. Campuses can document their reasons for changing practices. We are working in the World Cat Local environment: do we need to look at best practices?

**Action:** Berkeley will send their procedure on later.

**Action:** Look again at the idea of writing guidelines for ETDs in six months.

## **6. Issues related to/impact of the National Library of Medicine's Changes in Cuttering Practice**

NLM will cease supplying cutter letters for most print monographs, beginning June 21, 2010, since they are shelving by accession number. This change will affect shelf-ready programs and what level of staff process these materials. **Action:** Xiaoli will send a survey regarding a response to the change.

## **7. Other Items**

CalDocs: still waiting for response from the GILS group on their selection process. **Action:** Xiaoli Li will email Yvonne Wilson, co-chair of GILS. Santa Cruz has completed the procedure document on the project of fixing broken or dead links in SCP CalDocs records. They will archive a resource if it has no permanent URL.

LHRs (Wanda): talked to Michael Thwaites from CDL about parsing UCI's LHRs for Request (initial conversation).

The minutes of last month's call are posted on the CAMCIG website.