

CAMCIG Conference Call Minutes

May 5, 2008

2:30-4:00 PM

Present:

CDL - Rebecca Doherty; UCB -- Armanda Barone; UCD -- Karleen Darr (recorder); UCI -- Vicki Grahame; UCLA -- Sara Layne; UCM -- Jim Dooley; UCR -- Manuel Urrizola; UCSD -- Linda Barnhart (chair); UCSF -- Bea Mallek; UCSC -- Lai-Ying Hsiung

Absent: HOTS -- Brad Eden

1. California documents collaborative project-- See the email from Linda sent April 16, which includes an attachment about SCP practices. Can we talk about the idea of committing 10% of a position for a one-year pilot? What would it take to get this off the ground? (Those who were at the April 21 HOTS meeting can report on the discussion of Cal Docs that took place there.)

K. Darr commented that it is difficult to commit additional staff resources towards California documents cataloging because of campus budget uncertainties. Other members agreed. L. Barnhart clarified that the collaborative pilot she proposed would initially involve cataloging from copy for electronic California documents. S. Layne commented that there is a mixture of understanding of the meaning for original cataloging and copy cataloging. If five campuses could each volunteer 10% of one FTE, then investment would be relatively small. We might want to consider appointing a person to take leadership and coordinate the 5 campus record contribution pilot.

Action: A. Barone will check with her cataloging staff to determine whether they could commit and volunteer to take leadership of the project.

Action: Continue to think about a collaborative Cal docs project and consider it in the Fall when there is a clearer picture of the budget impact on technical services.

2. Institution records in OCLC (IRs)--HOTS has asked that CAMCIG discuss this to see if we agree with HOTS view; Linda will forward the HOTS draft minutes separately so CAMCIG can get a sense of what this agenda item is about.

Berkeley has announced that they plan to use institutional records (IRs) to keep OCLC and their local GLADIS records in sync. Changes to GLADIS records will be batch sent to update their associated OCLC IRs. Berkeley is experimenting with IRs and plans to develop strategies to enrich OCLC master records.

OCLC hasn't taken a position on institution records beyond providing the ability to link IRs to the master record. S. Layne commented that this is a difficult topic to discuss until OCLC sets future direction for IRs (i.e., more information about search indexes for retrieval and their display in WorldCat Local.)

Several campuses agreed with the 3 potential uses that John Riemer shared with HOTS. M. Urrizola commented that IRs would be very useful for Riverside to express different printings in their science fiction collection. Catalogers find that reviewing IRs are very helpful and contain additional cataloging information not found in OCLC master records. Several members thought it would be helpful to enrich the OCLC master record rather than continue duplication and local variation. L. Barnhart also cautioned that OCLC charges for institutional records unless you are an RLG migrating institution.

Action: L. Barnhart will draft an email which reflects the key points made in the discussion. After vetting with members, she will forward response to HOTS. [LB: That vetted response follows here.]

At HOTS request, CAMCIG discussed the topic of Institutional Records at its May 5 conference call, and raised the following points:

- We agree with the three potential good uses for Institutional Records that John Riemer outlined;
- We affirm the value to all of rich OCLC master records;
- We appreciate that several UC campuses are still exploring Institutional Records and trying to understand how best to make use of them;
- With OCLC's own position on IRs unclear, and without fully understanding the functionality intended for these records, it is difficult for UC to take a systemwide stance on their desirability or effectiveness.

3. Reprint deposits--See email sent on April 11 by Linda. Question originated with SRLF and went to CDC; there are cataloging implications. See also UCLA's thoughts, sent by Sara and forwarded by Linda on April 29.

This topic came out of a CDC discussion. As a result of the JSTOR project, RLFs reported receiving reprints in lieu of the original publication. It raised the question whether to consider originals and reprints as equal in terms of the non-duplication policy. CDC consensus was that original and reprint publications are not the same thing and recommended that campuses develop a joint policy to add information to the holdings or item records to identify reprints.

Action: The group will consult on our campuses to identify 3 or 4 staff who would draft a common coding practice for identifying reprint materials sent to the RLFs.

4. WorldCat Local pilot (Next Generation Melvyl pilot)

- Any updates? On anything?
- Any information to share from staff use, or in preparation for the public release?

Members discussed reclamation projects. There are categories of records in your ILS which should not be included in a reclamation project. One category is SCP records unless you have local print holdings attached. Jim mentioned campuses must have permission from vendors to load that category of records into OCLC. Several campuses reported that their Marcive record holdings are not available in WorldCat Local. M. Urrizola added that campuses may choose to exclude local record categories (e.g. Reserves material, low level records, etc.). Campuses can request to have full MARC records returned, or, OCLC supplied table of OCLC record numbers and ILS numbers to match.

UCSD and UCD have planned staff introduction sessions to the Next Generation Melvyl pilot.

5. "New Directions for Cataloging" from UCLA and UCB Web site on its New Directions Initiative

See two email messages, from Sara and Armanda, both sent on April 7.

A. Barone summarized the work that Berkeley has been involved in since last Fall. There are 16 different frameworks on the changing library environment, including identification of needs and future services. The administrative group has met and selected the top actions from these reports. They plan to hold a meeting to announce their recommendations and implementation plans. Technical Services identified 2 priority actions- upgrade all low level records and archive the library web site.

M. Urrizola reported that Riverside developed a 5 year plan for the library. Technical Services identified 3 areas for future direction- cataloging and classification; quality control and database management; cooperative projects. He will send out the mission and goals developed for technical services.

Action: Continue to look at Brad's documents.

6. Announcements/updates

- 655 heading for theses/dissertations: consider use of controlled vocabulary in the future and consult with RBMS (thought from R. Brandt, UCB)
- SCP budget cut next steps: HOTS subgroup formed; will report to HOTS for June meeting

Action: Review the Cataloging Expertise & Needs document on the HOTS web site and send updates to Lee Leighton.

Next phone call: Monday, June 2, 2008

Recorder: Armanda