

CAMCIG Conference Call Minutes

August 6, 2007

2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

Present: Karleen Darr (UCD), Vicki Grahame (UCI), Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA), Jim Dooley (UCM), Manuel Urrizola (UCR), Linda Barnhart (UCSD, convener), Beatrice Mallek (UCSF), Amy Weiss (UCSB, recorder), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC), Rebecca Doherty (CDL)

Absent: Brad Eden (HOTS representative), Armanda Barone (UCB)

1. UC/OCLC Implementation Team topics and updates

a. Joint Working Group on Collections and Cataloging (Sara)

This is the parent group of the specific implementation teams, chaired by John Riemer. They hold weekly conference calls with OCLC and questions can be directed to them for OCLC.

Currently they are working on the issue of local holdings records, and are making mockups to test for WorldCat Local. Local holdings are of increasing importance since local 856s may need to be in locals holdings.

OCLC Western has a workshop on local holdings in OCLC. OCLC can now do batch loading of local holdings.

Discussion followed of which schools have MARC holdings. Ex Libris and Endeavor use the MARC holdings format, III uses 866 fields containing free text.

There will be further discussion in September and October. See also (d) below.

b. Missing Records Team (update) (Sara)

OCLC has loaded sample files of some categories of missing records. UCSD is checking the SCP records matching and finding the results variable. They are checking not only the files that matched but the unmatched records, which in some respects are more interesting. UCB is checking the files of brief serials. UC is working on a deal to get the MARC record set for the Congressional Serials Set, and the UC is working to try to get Readex to agree to allow the records to appear in OCLC so this does not become another case of missing records.

c. OCLC Holdings Symbols Team (Linda)

The team has made a report with two suggestions, one for adding SCP records to OCLC and one for how to display RLF records. For SCP, they recommend setting up separate parallel symbols for each school specifically for SCP. This would allow for ease of data manipulation and campus security. SCP would set holdings for all 10 schools. OCLC should be able to merge holdings so that schools with a one record approach could continue to do so.

For the RLFs, there are already symbols for OCLC, ZAS and ZAP. ILL would like these symbols used in OCLC. There may be some workflow issues with this since most schools don't change holdings in OCLC when materials are sent to an RLF. There is a question of whether the school's holding symbol should stay in addition to the RLF holdings symbol, in which case the school would have to be listed as a non-supplier. Batch processes could take care of this adjustment and add the RLF symbol as well.

d. Local Bibliographic Holdings Team (Linda and Sara)

The campus reports submitted to this team show that there is a lot of local data added and that sometimes similar data is added to different MARC fields. There is discussion over whether or not this data should be made uniform across the campuses, whether or not we all need to become enhance libraries, how much record enhancement there should be.

It is suggested that a CAMCIG sponsored subcommittee, perhaps consisting of the Local Bibliographic Holdings Team members, should be formed to discuss standardization of some types of local input. Linda will draft a charge for this subcommittee.

e. Duplicate OCLC record numbers question from John Riemer

UCSB has run a report of their duplicate OCLC records in their local catalog and has corrected the list.

Davis has numerous duplicate numbers but has not attempted to correct.

Sara notes that duplicate numbers may prevent the WorldCat Local catalog from linking to any record in the local ILS so this problem may be more pressing than it initially appears. UCLA corrects its duplicate records.

Riverside has instances of cloned records that may have the same record number.

UCI – III won't identify them for cleanup.

2. CAMCIG reports to HOTS/Annual Report

CAMCIG needs to justify its existence to HOTS. Participants seemed to find CAMCIG useful and it is noted that CAMCIG has done a great deal of work over the past year.

CAMCIG was the origin point of the discussion over missing records in OCLC, and did extensive work on creating a report on Single vs. Separate Records.

3. UC Conser Funnel

SCP at one point recommended making exceptions to the Conser standard record, but at this point it seems they will be adhering to the minimum standards of requirement of the Conser Standard Record. It would appear that the schools participating in the funnel have agreed to follow the guidelines for both original records and for record maintenance.

Those with questions can follow up with their local serials experts.

4. Question from Lee Leighton on cataloging directly in OCLC

Linda will ask John Riemer to form questions for a report that each school will make on this topic.

5. Future Meetings

Next Call: September 10th

Recorder: Armanda

We will try to meet face-to-face in November.