

CAMCIG In-Person Meeting at CDL
Thursday, Nov. 29, 2007
Morning Session
WorldCat Local and Its Implications

Present: Linda Barnhart (UCSD, chair), Armanda Barone (UCB), Karleen Darr (UCD), Rebecca Doherty (CDL), Jim Dooley (UCM), Brad Eden (UCSB), Vicki Graham (UCI), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC, recorder, p.m.), Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA, recorder, a.m.), Bea Mallek (UCSF), Manuel Urrizola (UCR)

Guests from the UC/OCLC WorldCat Local Pilot Implementation Team: Patti Martin (CDL), John Riemer (UCLA)

1. Overview and Latest News
John Riemer

Pilot is expected to run from April 2008 to end of that year. The Implementation Team will be working at least till 12/08.

To get the necessary programming done for the Pilot, the UC-OCLC teams undertook a planning blitz in Sept and met face-to-face in Oakland Oct 24-26, to pin down some critical decisions and to make sure we had the same understanding and assumptions of how things would work.

Some features won't be there on day 1 (use of LHRs by WCL, presence of CDL Request system) but those are expected to be ready later in the pilot.

Missing Records: For the Pilot a small set of categories of missing records have been identified. (Sara sent CAMCIG the latest list.) The purpose of choosing those 11 was to learn the most we can during the pilot, both about how the records display but also about what it is like to get records loaded. The categories include usage of the SCP single- and separate-record techniques, brief records, rare books records, on-order/in-process records. For some categories we are only loading the records that successfully matched an existing WorldCat record. For others, the non-matched records will also be loaded as new.

This is far from all the records that would need to be loaded if we move from Pilot to production. A good thing to do at this time would be to identify any records for which we need OCLC to negotiate vendor permission to load. The lead time OCLC needs can easily be 6 months.

Comments: Merced has many such sets—Jim spent time at the Charleston conference explaining to vendors the importance of having permission to load these records into OCLC—the vendors are willing. Do we have permission to set holdings for Marcive records? To load ICPSR records from Michigan?

ACTION: Sara to distribute vendor permissions chart to CAMCIG after verifying data with OCLC.

A key feature of the next generation Melvyl Pilot is support for searching across the entire information space. The UW pilot contains both traditional ILS records and article metadata. We want to go beyond that by including digital object metadata (e.g. non-MARC metadata from digital library projects at UCLA & UCSD, the contents of the e-Scholarship repository, and those OAC finding aids pointing to digitized content). If that data resides in WorldCat, there is a good chance that name & subject headings will be kept current, something beneficial for federated searching.

Reclamation Projects: There is a document posted on the UC/OCLC Pilot Implementation site. Some important points: Getting symbols attached is only part of the work. Very important to get the OCLC#s back into the ILS. Do not swamp current Melvyl with the results of that effort. If your past records show RLIN numbers, OCLC numbers will be needed. Have a plan in place to keep current with your symbols in WorldCat upon completion of your project. This includes removing symbols when withdrawals occur. Do not include SCP records in what you send to OCLC. In the case of SCP serials, if you have locally-licensed e-access or print holdings go ahead and send those.

There are benefits to waiting to do reclamation projects. You can get the benefits of lessons learned during the pilot and the policy decisions subsequently made. This will save you from having to redo some of the work.

Part of what the Missing Records team will be doing during the pilot is assessing how well the various campus holdings cluster together in WCL. A coordinated approach to reclamation projects suggests itself here!

Comments: Patti: Downside to waiting: Google mass dig projects—advantage to having the records in OCLC, if they are not already there. Sara: it is possible that a batchload project could solve this particular problem, may not need an entire reclamation project. Linda: are we the group that is supposed to coordinate reclamation projects? Systems and cataloging folks are the key participants in reclamation projects.

OCLC Symbols: Roles symbols play: who owns it; where it is located (not always the same); routing of ILL traffic; whether WCL should query an ILS & if so which one. It is becoming clear to OCLC that an institution's identity will be comprised of a small group of different symbols. During the Pilot, the OCLC symbols supporting a single "campus view" of Melvyl cannot point to more than one ILS.

In late October, UC & OCLC ratified decisions to create a parallel set of 10 symbols for the SCP titles accessible to a given campus; to create a single UC-wide symbol for mass-digitized content. The rationales: Not all CDL-licensed resources are available to all campuses (need individual symbols for each campus). Using separate symbols will permit SCP staff to add and remove campus symbols independently as resources come

and go. For mass dig content, the access will be the same for all 10 campuses, so one symbol should be sufficient. Use of a single symbol for all the content in an RLF can help point WCL to the ILS that contains the most current location & availability info, as well as route the ILL traffic.

Comments: Linda: the grouping of symbols—how is that done? By each campus? John: Max number for most campuses would be three: the regular symbol, the new campus SCP symbol, and the Mass-dig symbol, since right now a campus grouping can point to just one ILS. Manuel: Are SCP symbols on Tier 1 and Tier 2? Linda: Yes, if SCP cataloged them. Sara: ZAS symbol has been added to 1.8 million monograph records with OCLC numbers. The ZAS symbol will point to the UCLA OPAC for the pilot.

Local Data (and Linking to Local Systems): The most critical local data at this point is local URLs. The solution of choice for WCL is LHRs containing the URLs, but WCL won't be ready to use those on Day 1 of the Pilot. The interim solution will be Z39.50 queries to the ILS to retrieve the bib record containing the 856 fields. Local call numbers will be obtained via Z39.50 queries that retrieve call numbers from holdings records in the ILS.

When it comes to any other local data, we quickly run up against inconsistent treatment/placement of the data and MARC tagging that would not be retained in OCLC's master records.

Note that Institutional Records will not display and will have no functionality in the pilot.

WorldCat Registry entries. The registry is a compilation of directory-like information from a wide variety of places in OCLC products. We are still in the process of learning from OCLC which of the many UC-related entries are relevant to the Pilot and which data elements are mission-critical for WCL. The key data has to be edited by OCLC staff at present. There will only be one Registry entry per campus that will have to be edited.

Comments: Lai-Ying noted that it is possible to ask OCLC to delete duplicate entries from the registry.

WCL has been summarized as elevating discovery to the network level. Bill Jordan (UW) has given a lot of thought towards the benefits and requirements for elevating *maintenance* to the network level. Think of the savings if things like authority work and recataloging to keep up with serial title changes only had to be done in one file that we all share! He advocates that OCLC show leadership on this; he anticipates movement on this front when a critical mass of large libraries is using WCL.

Karen Calhoun has noted that she feels it is important to strengthen OCLC's Quality Control Unit.

A number of campus update sessions are scheduled this fall: UCSB 10/4; LAUC Assembly @ UCM 11/16; UCSD 11/30; UCI 12/3; UCR 12/14; UCLA 12/17.

Comments: Armanda: UCB is trying to schedule a session also.

There is a survey on the communication methods staff prefer for keeping current on this project. Only 5 questions. Look for it on the SOPAG site
http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/uc_oclc.html

2. Working at the “network level”: what does this mean?

- **What does it mean to work more in OCLC?**
- **What did Davis learn about their local practices?**
- **What kind of collaboration would we need to make this work amongst ourselves (e.g., enhance)?**
- **What kind of tools would we need from OCLC for database maintenance?**
- **Can we talk through some hypothetical workflows?**
- **How will we maintain our “database of record”?**

Karleen/UCD counted how much local tweaking they were doing. 14.5 % of records had local changes. Hadn't expected so much local addition of information based on data in other local catalogs-- while not enriching the master record in OCLC. Karleen sees that more enrichment could be done. It would not be too much extra work for UCD since they are already doing their cataloging in OCLC. Also UCD wants to adjust the tweaking to focus on what matters. Avoid doing things like changing main entries from 1xx to 7xx. Did find quality differences among formats. Videorecordings require more work—UCD would like to request Enhance for videorecordings. PCC records are controversial—UCD is seeing variations in quality among PCC records. Maybe based on format?
Armanda/UCB: copy-catalogers add call numbers to master record.

Brad: UC could change the whole structure of tech services—the way we are doing cataloging is not cost-effective. UCSB is a no-growth campus and effectively getting budget cuts. Moving cataloging to the network level would be one way to spend less on cataloging. John: we would all need to get Enhance? Brad—we could group the common things centrally—that would take care of 60-80% in common. Vicki—encourage catalogers to enrich records even if they don't have to Enhance status. John: could we have funnel projects for odd formats? Are there too many different levels of Enhance/Enrichment? Should OCLC be a wiki? Vicki: at UCI: DLC and pcc copy 'cataloged' in acquisitions. UCB and UCR have students doing first pass at copy-cataloging. UCSD is accepting more categories of copy for PromptCat as of three weeks ago—getting more that is shelf-ready. UCB has been doing PromptCat for 20,000-30,000 titles/year—the operation is student-run—UCB has gone back and forth about what categories of copy to accept. Brad suggests cataloging state documents centrally. Suggests setting up specialized centers. We can't continue to spend a lot of the library's resources on print cataloging. Problems of taking on cataloging of electronic materials while still doing print. Why can't we talk to the State Library about doing the cataloging for state docs? Vicki: New titles are being cataloged in OCLC; the old stuff is the

problem. Brad: Need to talk about new models and cost allocations. Sara: R2 consultants are evaluating workflow at UCLA.

Linda: Looking at WorldCat as our discovery platform changes things. Will we eventually move away from local OPACs, which require a lot of energy? Patti—OCLC is not thinking primarily of scholarly academic users-- we need to present OCLC with evidence for what we need—their decisions regarding functionality are evidence-based.

Lai-Ying: we are spending many resources on local ILS—we are thinking about what WorldCat Local can do vs. what ILS can do. ILS is management tool we cannot get rid of. Linda: Need ERMS and print management—SCP would like to get out of the business of distributing SCP records to all campuses. What about the database of record. We have to have one place where we know what we've got. Which database do we believe? Our local database. Want to make sure we don't screw that up.

3. Reclamation projects: what are our plans?

- **Does each campus intend to do one (or more)? What are our goals? What are our timetables?**
- **Updates from Berkeley, Davis, Riverside, and Santa Barbara about their status and experience?**
- **Learning to manage separate SCP and RLF symbols. Any questions about the profile?**

UCB: monthly meetings; Charis Takaro is the project manager for new ILS as well as for Reclamation. UCB has been working through lists of problems in preparation for reclamation.

UCSC: Looking at reclamation because of Google project. Need OCLC number in record for the linking to work. Also, when SCP redistributes records because a 'real' OCLC number has replaced the 'eo' OCLC number, it will be important to maintain the old 'eo' number in the record in order to match for overlay purposes. Innovative stores OCLC number in 001 field.

UCD: Exception list for serials was just huge. Found lots of things that were reported as match and weren't and vice-versa. Had multiple hits—40% of serials needed manual intervention. Sent different files and requested different kinds of processing for different files. Want full records for some and not others.

UCR is going to mark the records that are sent. Will send all records except SCP, suppressed, not-yet-catalog records—also not sending the records created for individual printings for the SciFi collection. Sending the records in batches.

UCSB: Just 15% of their records are linked to OCLC; RLIN records didn't have UCSB holdings on them. Reclamation or batchloading? Which would be better?

ACTION: Sara to distribute OCLC description of reclamation vs batch-loads

John: OCLC needs to know whether we want a matching table or MARC records in return.

Linda: SCP symbol Profiles received at OCLC from everyone except SF and LA.
ACTION: LA and SF to fax profiles to OCLC Western ASAP.

4. Local bib and holdings data in WorldCat: how will we manage?

- **What strategies are possible, and do we have one that we prefer?**
- **How do we avoid double work?**

Sara: Core data report covers options for local data.

Lai-Ying: some local field tags aren't valid in OCLC; some data needs to be private.

Linda: How do we avoid double work (i.e., editing OCLC and the local record)?

Batchloading? How can you be sure what is coming down from OCLC into our systems?

Will we get other people's local data that we do not want? How much are we going to need to go to the LHRs?

5. Missing records: how do we move toward completeness in WCL?

- **What groups of records are in your local ILS but not in WorldCat (setting SCP aside)?**
- **How do campuses identify these and make decisions about inclusion in WorldCat?**
- **Timetable?**

UCD: Working with a sample of On-order and in-process records; for the pilot we will probably ask OCLC to set holdings on existing records that match (for on-order and in-process records) but will not load as new records that do not match. Jim: ACIG agrees that the non-matches should not be loaded)

Patti: Who is to check re e-scholarship records and UC Press e-editions rights?

ACTION: Linda will check on these.

John: Has UCI had problems with ILL requests for on-order records? Vicki/UCI: No, ILL hasn't had a problem with requests for on-order records.

**CAMCIG In-Person Meeting at CDL
Thursday, Nov. 29, 2007
Afternoon Session**

1. Newspaper Policy:

The subgroup's draft "Guidelines for bibliographic records for preservation microform masters" were discussed. CAMCIG recommended that separate records be used,

following the approach as detailed in CONSER Cataloging Manual, Chapter 33, Newspapers. Sharon and her committee will be asked to redraft the Guidelines for CAMCIG's Feb. 4 Conference Call, including recommendations on how to handle legacy records.

2. Theses and Dissertations Cataloging:

“Campus Practices for Thesis and Dissertation Cataloging As of November 2007” was discussed. CAMCIG recommended that all campuses will stop using 690 for the UC-wide heading “Dissertation, Academic—[campus]—[discipline], but to use 655 7 with a [2] local instead.

3. Integrating Resources:

Because each resource needs to be individually examine, campuses felt that a one-by-one flip of Bib level from “m” to “i” is more desirable.

4. Round Robin (issues currently requiring time or attention):

UCI: Trying not to create any backlogs despite many vacancies. One strategy is to set priorities on what really should receive full cataloging.

CDL: May move straight from Melvyl upgrade to UC/OCLC pilot.

UCD: Re-structuring and re-aligning the organization based more on functional lines, and moving towards greater centralization; cleaning up database to prepare for batch projects.

UCR: Conducting training on subject analysis and copy cataloging; has intern; working on the big science fiction backlog; updating guidelines for assigning materials to AV Library and to Music Library.

UCB: Recruited a new ILS manager for acquiring an ILS; reclamation project; implementing recommendations from the latest technical services review by R2 and finding strategies to get materials out to users much faster; will resume staff hiring, create Materials Control Unit to move materials around, use briefer records, depend on OCLC Bibliographic Notification, outsourcing, look for inspiration from outside experts.

UCSF: Taken on systems and many other responsibilities and projects; ship many items to NRLF; move East Asian collection out to create dedicated space for students; clean up Web OPAC.

UCM: 70% collection development responsibilities; 30% Technical Services. YBP bibliographic records and vendor records all need OCLC numbers; UC/OCLC pilot; will not continue order for Millennium OPAC, but use WorldCat Local as OPAC; cataloging of gift collection outsourced to OCLC Techpro; all print are shelf-ready.

UCSB: Reclamation project imminent; outsourcing; need TS technologist to move in the direction of digitalization, using ContentDM, TEI, etc.; need strategies to cope with limited funding.

UCLA (Sara): Re-structuring, and will be getting report from R2 soon; Acquisitions and Cataloging moved off campus and still are dealing with the resulting logistics; non-MARC metadata; Head of Digital Resources still vacant.

UCSC: Collection Development/Technical Services review next March by R2; cross training staff across unit lines, several staff trained to perform each task on routine basis and to perform task from start to finish to mitigate impact of staff absences and to ensure prompt turnaround and smooth workflow; reclamation project; Google project; new computer games collection.

UCLA (John): UC/OCLC pilot; secure funding; grants for Arabic and Persian collections; batch improvements of records for the digital library.

UCSD: Updating TPOT Web site infrastructure; electronic theses will start in December in addition to electronic dissertations; expanded use of Promptcat to all types of copy; subgroup will investigate managing cataloging tools using social tagging and LibraryThing.

5. Wrap Up:

- Next conference call in January 2008 (December call cancelled)
- Eden will submit ideas/document to CAMCIG systemwide initiatives for collaboration
- WorldCat Local development (continuing agenda topic)