CAMCIG Conference Call Minutes
Monday, July 7, 2008
2:30-4pm

Present: Adolfo Tarango (SCP, convener), Manuel Urrizola (UCR—recorder), Rebecca
Doherty (CDL), Armanda Barone (UCB), Xiaoli Li (UCD), Vicki Grahame (UCI), Sara
Shatford Layne (UCLA), Jim Dooley (UCM), Brad Eden (UCSB, HOTS Rep), Lai-Ying
Hsiung (UCSC)

Absent: Linda Barnhart (UCSD—chair), Beatrice Mallek (UCSF)

1. California documents: the "SCP proposal"
CAMCIG requested a written procedure from SCP that outlined the "harvesting"
process in more detail. This was sent as an attachment to an email by Linda on
June 20, with a followup nuance on June 23. [Reminder: both this proposal, and
the one below, are for electronic resources only. Each campus is still on its own for
handling whatever print CalDocs come your way.] Some questions to answer:

·   Are there any specific questions for Adolfo about this procedure, or how it
would work?
Questions and discussion brought out the following:
- ✓ SCP proposes that SCP do harvesting.
- ✓ According to Adolfo, harvesting should retrieve only CalDocs since State
  Library catalogs only state documents.
- ✓ Proposal would harvest updates as well as new records.
- ✓ Preserving BibPURLs should not be a problem.
- ✓ UCB proposal, original cataloging by 5 UC campuses, complements SCP
  proposal.
CAMCIG members jointly answered questions from Adolfo's June 19th draft document
Batch Searching and Distribution of CalDocs:
1. **We could, if the campuses wanted, use 936 field with no indicators (or**
   some other agreed upon field) for keeping track of the dates that the
   records were mined. (Note: SCP currently uses the 936 field with a
   second indicator of 9; this does not go to the campuses).
   936 field not needed.
2. **Are there some kinds of errors that Kate could easily search for during**
   the cloning process?
   No.
3. **Differing format records—should the priority order be Online, Print,**
   CD-ROM?
   Yes: Online, Print, CD-ROM.
4. **Possible use of batch PIDs/batch translation table although this would be**
   definitely value added for very little input—plus once the Web Archives
   Service is ready, they could be transferred. IMHO PIDS would be better
   than BibPurls because using the existing review file, they can be batch
   created and entered into the records.

Whatever is in the record is acceptable to CAMCIG.
5. **An additional search (at less frequent intervals) could be done in the non-CSL category for CalDocs results for cities other than Sacramento. Easy to do (just switching the pl: to another city in the search). May not be fruitful to do this as often as monthly.**
Searches for other cities are not desirable.

· **The success of this approach depends on automated processing. Would all ten campuses be willing to accept CalDocs records for electronic resources from WorldCat that had not been manually reviewed at the individual record level?**
Yes.
Would there be an issue with selectors about getting all the electronic resources that have records, rather than "selected" electronic resources?
No, there should not be an issue since there will probably be more CalDocs than now.

· **This approach will catch many, but not all, CalDocs electronic resources. Is it a problem that this is not perfect or comprehensive?**
No, the current situation is not perfect.
Suggestions for improvement?
SCP should when necessary modify procedures with time.

· **If the records are not manually reviewed, there would be a variety of the kinds of URLs in these records. Would this be a problem? It might increase the verification workload in local ILSs.**
- ✓ Each campus should make updates to master record in OCLC.
- ✓ Updates in master OCLC record would be distributed to other campuses.
- ✓ SCP needs to be notified if record needs to be deleted because online access no longer exists.
- ✓ SCP will need to work out a way to not include updates of records with notes about no online access.

· **Do campuses still want records in their local ILSs for electronic CalDocs?**
Yes.
Could we investigate an alternative to the "traditional" record distribution model by having OCLC create the files for EDX delivery if SCP added xxxER holding symbols?
Best to continue to have SCP distribute records.
This would save SCP a good deal of time and could be the prototype for a future distribution model. Would this be a problem to implement for the campuses?
Yes, would be problematic for campuses now.
Are we willing to go in this direction?
We can re-evaluate in the future.

· **Are campuses generally comfortable with this approach?**
Yes.

What are the next steps needed in order to move ahead? (Linda would like to see a small test, from which we can both look at the results and get a sense of how much time doing this would take. Ideally, it would require such a small amount of time that SCP might be able to take on this as a standing workload.)
CAMCIG agrees with Linda's suggestion about testing the procedures.

2. California documents: the "UCB proposal"
Based on Armanda's email (sent on June 2 with attached document) and our last CAMCIG phone call, five brave libraries have taken the challenge for the original cataloging of CalDocs, dividing up the GILS list: UCB, UCD, UCI, UCSD, and, provisionally, UCLA. Armanda has agreed to put together a more detailed project plan/proposal, but we don't expect that to be ready for Monday's call. To help shape the detail, perhaps CAMCIG could talk about Sara's very good questions:

(1) There must be a mechanism in place for archiving the documents that we are cataloging. A presentation by Janet Coles in 2005 stated that, for California government digital info: "The average lifespan of a web site is 44 days; the half-life of government web pages is 4 months." We at UCLA feel that it is not a good use of scarce cataloging resources to catalog documents that may move or disappear within months or even weeks, and that archiving is an essential component of the proposed approach.
- ✓ According to Adolfo, based on anecdotal evidence, most CalDocs do not disappear but move or change agency websites.
- ✓ CAMCIG members will talk to campus Gov Docs librarian(s) about the issue of archiving/preserving online Cal Docs.

(2) The identification and prioritization of specific documents/entities to be cataloged, even if an agreement has been reached regarding the agencies whose documents a campus will catalog, is a relatively complex selection activity, not a cataloging activity. This identification and prioritization of documents/entities to be cataloged would need to be done by selectors pre-cataloging.
- ✓ Gov Docs librarians have identified which agencies should be a priority. Which documents by the agency should be cataloged is not clear and would involve some selection by the cataloger. SCP cataloged "published" documents.
- ✓ UCLA cataloging has the time to catalog CalDocs but not the time to select which docs to catalog.
- ✓ CAMCIG members will talk to campus Gov Docs librarian(s) about the issue of selection.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT APPROXIMATELY 4:00 PM.

Additionally, some other questions:
ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS POSTPONED.
(3) Do we need an overall project manager/coordinator, or is following standard original cataloging practice independently good enough? Do all the participants need to follow basically the same workflow for identifying materials to catalog?

(4) Are we expecting as part of this project for these original catalogers to enhance substandard copy?
(5) Are we making commitments to do original serial cataloging as well as monographs?
(6) Will all campuses use BibPURLs? Does it matter?
Final thought: Do we need some followup communication with GILS to let them know the directions/decisions from the CAMCIG conversation on both projects?

3. Announcements/updates
- **Any interesting news or developments to report from ALA?**
REPORTS POSTPONED.

Next phone call: August 4, 2008
Recorder: Bea

Tentative agenda items:

- **Next chair for CAMCIG**
- **Cataloging at the network level/New approaches for systemwide cataloging initiatives (Brad's document)**
- **Campus poll on local bibliographic practices**
- **Campus poll on Enhance**