

CAMCIG Conference Call Minutes

April 2, 2007

2:30-3:40 PM

DRAFT

Present: Linda Barnhart (chair), Armanda Barone, Karleen Darr, Rebecca Doherty, Jim Dooley (recorder), Vicki Grahame, Lai-Ying Hsiung, Sara Layne, Bea Mallek, Sharon Scott, Amy Weiss

1. Update from UC CONSER Funnel

Linda distributed a report on funnel activities before the call. No one had any questions. Linda will convey CAMCIG's appreciation for progress to Valerie Bross.

2. Update on Master Microforms policy (Sharon)

A group composed of Sharon Scott, Elaine McCracken, Andrea Vanek and Karen May has been formed to investigate the question. Sharon has spoken with NRLF and will speak with PAG regarding the use and description of the items. There will be a further update at the next conference call.

3. Update on March 21 HOTS conference call

Linda circulated the draft minutes from the call to CAMCIG before the call with the understanding that the minutes should not be distributed beyond CAMCIG. There was a general discussion of the OCLC implementation issues listed in the minutes focusing on the very large number of brief serial records in UC catalogs and the difficulties of matching these to the correct OCLC record. CAMCIG determined that it was premature to discuss these issues in detail until the OCLC Implementation Committee developed its charge to HOTS. Linda suggested that CAMCIG members could think about selecting sample serial records for testing and identifying campus experts who could work on specific questions. She also suggested that CAMCIG review its report to HOTS for problems that didn't appear in the list in the HOTS minutes.

4. Procedures for updating holdings in OCLC (Linda)

Each campus could have one or several reclamation projects to make campus holdings current in OCLC. After these projects we will need to develop procedures and best practices for ongoing OCLC holdings maintenance. A poll of current campus practices was conducted with the following results:

Santa Barbara-All updates for both adds and withdrawals are done manually; no batch processes are utilized.

Berkeley-Most maintenance is done in Gladis; haven't been deleting in OCLC.

Davis-All cataloging done on OCLC; original records are cataloged directly on OCLC, exported to local catalog with OCLC holdings set; we directly edit OCLC

bibliographic records for major changes using Lock/Replace or Enhance; we also delete holdings directly on OCLC; we have no batch processes set up with OCLC.

Riverside-Batch update file produced weekly but sent to OCLC monthly.

Los Angeles-Almost all cataloging done on OCLC except for Casilini records; holdings for withdrawn items are deleted from OCLC in a semi-batch process.

San Francisco-No serial holdings in OCLC; many brief serial records.

Irvine-Most cataloging is done in local catalog. Monographic holdings are updated when record is downloaded in acquisitions. Withdrawals are sent to OCLC in a monthly batch process.

Santa Cruz-Goal of current years is to have all records in OCLC for both original and copy cataloging. Withdrawals are reflected in OCLC as much as possible. However, holdings are mainly at institutional level and local editing is not made in OCLC. No SCP and vendor e-resource records are in OCLC.

Merced-Monographic holdings are updated monthly by a batch process. Does not have print serials. SCP and vendor e-book records are not in OCLC.

San Diego-Original cataloging is done in OCLC. Copy cataloging is done in the local system with a monthly batch update file sent to OCLC. Withdrawals are also a composite of batch and manual processes.

This survey highlights the different procedures used among the campuses and the consequent difficulty in developing system-wide best practices.

5. Posting of the training survey document

Linda asked if it would be all right to post the training survey document prepared by Brad on the CAMCIG web site. Members agreed to review the document to be sure that there was nothing in it that shouldn't be posted. Linda also suggested that it might be useful to extract from CAMCIG minutes the "polling" evidence when we describe individual campus practices. We have polled ourselves several times (series authority control, music relator codes, as well as the OCLC holdings topic above) and having a chart of campus responses might be easier to find when needed. She will draft and send cataloging policy documents to CAMCIG for review before posting.

6. ETD update

The proposal by Catherine Candee to use the eScholarship Repository for all UC dissertations and theses will be reviewed and possibly accepted by the graduate deans at each campus in May. Linda pointed out that the proposal as it currently exists appears to bypass cataloging, thus leading to the possibility of split files for theses and dissertations. The MARC records currently received from ProQuest lack subject headings. Sara

mentioned a study at UCLA that demonstrated that the presence of subject headings had a significant positive effect on retrieval of theses and dissertations. CAMCIG concluded that we should monitor developments closely and pay particular attention to possible changes in workflow required by ETDs.

Next conference call: May 7, 2:30-4:00 PM