CAMCIG Conference Call

Date: Monday, Oct. 3, 2011
Time: 2:30 - 4:00 p.m.
Phone number to call: 866-740-1260
Password: 8244981

Recorder: Armanda Barone (UCB)
Present: Armanda Barone, Anna DeVore, Heidi Hutchinson, Wanda Jazayeri (chair), Tasha Keagan, Xiaoli Li, Bea Mallek, Sara Shatford Layne, Adolfo Tarango,
Absent: Jim Dooley, Linda Barnhart, Sherry Willhite

1. Announcements

W. Jazayeri has contacted CDL for the authorization to update the website. She also requested a list of CAMCIG alias to update.

A. Tarango confirmed there were no objections raised from anyone regarding implementation of the BSRs and of the Provider-Neutral guidelines, so SCP will move forward with implementation of these guidelines as of 10/3/11.

2. Next Gen Melvyl (information sharing)

a. LHR displays and SCP 856 fields (see Margery Tibbets email I forwarded to CAMCIG on sent 9/19)

On Sept. 12, the CDL turned on serial LHRs for the 8 campuses who have contributed their LHRs to OCLC. SCP reported a problem with the display of the 856 information for SCP cataloged titles. The outcome of their investigations was there should only be one campus LHR record, the xxxER record, with an SCP 856 link. The LHR Requirements for UC campuses documents report:
http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/oclc_docs/LHRsSerial

clearly states that the campuses are not to include 856 fields for SCP items in their local LHRs.

CAMCIG was asked to discuss the problem and determine what the best path forward is for both fixing the existing display problem and preventing it from happening in the future.

ACTION: A. Tarango has and will continue to follow up with campuses affected by this issue to review their processes.

A. Tarango brought up an issue with display when invoking a Z39.50 request to the local OPAC from Melvyl. For San Diego, we are finding that only some of the links from the OPAC are displaying. The behavior is not consistent, that is, sometimes only one of

several links displays, sometimes most display, and sometimes the display is fine. We have not found any pattern to the behavior either, for example, it's not always the same package, it's not only the first or last link, or it's not always open access links. We have not seen this behavior when invoking the Z39.50 request for the other campuses but folks should check this on their own in case the behavior differs when the holding campus makes the request.,

S. Layne asked whether we wanted to consider standard wording that we would all use for online resource LHRs in WCL. The WCL display of LHR locations is based on a table that CDL maintains. Each campus that has implemented LHRs has submitted a list of the location codes that appear in the 852 $b of its LHRs together with the corresponding translation or display text that should appear in WCL for each of these location codes. The question relates to the LHRs that are purely for Internet resources—for example, if your campus subscribes to an e-title that doesn't exist in print, or to which you do not have any print holdings. Or, if like UCLA and UCSD, you place your 856 fields in an LHR that is purely for your 'online' holdings, and that is separate from your print LHR(s) for a title.

The SCP LHRs (for the xxxER) symbols, use the translation or display text "See online holdings at the top of this record" for their LHRs. UCLA currently uses "Online Resources" because that is what UCLA has used in its local catalog as display text for that particular location. S. Layne had been thinking of asking the UCLA public service folks if the UCLA translation/display should be changed so that it is the same as the SCP display—and then wondered if CAMCIG might want to recommend that all the UCs use the same translation/display text for online resource LHRs.

ACTION: S. Layne will send a snapshot of an example to the group to review.

3. Survey on dissertation practices (compiled by Armanda). Do we want to mount on CAMCIG website?

The group all agreed that mounting these campus surveys on our website would be useful.

ACTION: W. Jazayeri will forward both the "E-scholarship survey" (email sent 9/29/2011 9:32 AM) and the "Dissertations survey" (email sent 8/31/2011 6:13 PM) out to the group to review their responses knowing that we will now mount them on the CAMCIG website.

4. Placing RDA links on CAMCIG website (discussion continued from August)

Now that LC has a new website tracking RDA, the group no longer felt the need to mount RDA information on the CAMCIG website.

5. Other

POT 5 Activities:

A. Barone and A. Tarango shared with the group progress on POT 5 (Maximize effectiveness of Shared Cataloging) All the POT teams have been working on their task lists and timelines. POT 5 will, most likely, be asking CAMCIG to serve as a Lightning Team (one of multiple) on the deliverable: Recommendation on whether to continue or stop record distribution to campuses. In particular, CAMCIG will be asked to ascertain monetary and staffing costs of record distribution to SCP and campuses, both current state and if campuses choose to add the records themselves. Possible task may include:

- Use a sample based on either campus size or ILS
- Ascertain monetary costs of purchasing records if campuses choose to add records themselves.
- Identify staff costs of current state
- Ascertain staffing costs if campuses choose to add the records themselves.
- Summarize staff costs of current state and scenario if campuses acquire records themselves

A final charge will need to be vetted with the NGTS Management Team before moving to CAMCIG for action. In the meantime, CAMCIG was asked for an estimate of how long the group will need to address the above tasks. The group consensus was 2-3 months will be needed. A. Barone and A. Tarango will pass this information onto POT 5.

OCLC Authorizations

X. Li canvassed the campuses as to whether they have generic unit authorizations or individual authorizations for their catalogers. Individual authorizations would allow the ability to see who cataloged an item and allow statistics collection. Varied from campus-to-campus.

Firm order of e-books and PromptCat

X. Li asked "Does your campus do firm orders for e-books? If you do, do you use prompcat records (from OCLC) or vendor records (YBP, ebrary, NetLibrary, ect.)?"

ACTION: X. Li will emailed the group this question and compile the responses.