CAMCIG, Sept. 12, 2006, UC Irvine, 10 am- 3 pm
Minutes

Present: Armanda Barone (UCB), Karleen Darr (UCD), Brad Eden (HOTS Liaison), Vicki Grahame (UCI), Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA, recorder), Jim Dooley (UCM), Sharon Scott (UCR), Linda Barnhart (UCSD, convener), Beatrice Mallek (UCSF), Amy Weiss (UCSB), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC)

Absent: Rebecca Doherty (CDL)

I. Review of Charge, website, and ground rules.

A. Nature of CAMCIG. Dooley (as Chair of HOTS) noted that SOPAG specifically requested that CAMCIG be an active group, developing and recommending policies, and collaborating on developing/implementing strategies for technical services.

B. Relationship with SCP AC. It was noted that there is a membership overlap between CAMCIG and SCP AC, and it was suggested that the chairs of CAMCIG and SCP AC "just talk" for now, rather than establish a more formal relationship between the two groups. It was noted that SCP AC made a proposal regarding the treatment of series following LC's decision, and that such a proposal would have been appropriate for CAMCIG to prepare, had CAMCIG existed at that time.

C. Chair of CAMCIG. Layne nominated Barnhart to be chair, and Hsiung seconded the nomination. Although no formal vote was taken, there were expressions of support for this nomination from the group, and Barnhart accepted.

D. Website. Barnhart indicated that CAMCIG members could communicate directly with Michael Stuart (mstuart@library.ucsd.edu), who is doing an excellent job of maintaining the CAMCIG website. Barnhart requested that we be very clear when making requests for additions and changes to the website. **ACTION:** Dooley to request a link from the HOTS website to the CAMCIG website.

E. Ground rules. Ground rules for meetings were discussed and established (see separate Ground rules document) Amy Weiss volunteered to take the minutes at the next CAMCIG meeting.

II. BSTF impact/fallout for this group.
Significant points made during the discussion:
- CAMCIG itself is a result of the HOTS discussion of the BSTF report.
- Many of the changes in the BSTF report hinge on "backend" stuff (i.e. technical services)
- We need to increase collaboration and reduce redundancy.
- We need to think about RDA and FRBR and their effect on our work.

- We need to continue to expand the range of tools and methods that we use, and to position ourselves to create non-MARC, non-AACR2 metadata.
- We need to deal with resource reallocation; vacant positions may not be filled "as is" but will need to be redesigned. Administration will expect us to do more with less. Library expectations for technical services have risen; users want materials processed more quickly.
- SOPAG is looking for changes that are relatively easy to make and that will mean a significant improvement in public services.
- We need to be willing to be futuristic.
- Our expertise is needed; we know our data. Improvement in bibliographic *services* means improvement in bibliographic *systems*. We need to work on making our systems use our data to the best advantage.
- We need to support the needs of scholars, even if scholars are less numerous than undergraduates.

III. Using OCLC as a single cataloging tool/data source

A. Discussed two scenarios for using OCLC as a single data source for a union or consortial catalog.

1. UC holdings in OCLC would be extracted to create a new and better Melvyl (possibly along the lines of the Endeca-NCSU collaboration). CAMCIG does not support this scenario. Two main reasons:
- Significant portions of our bibliographic data (e.g., SCP records, Casalini Libri records, etc.) are not reflected in OCLC.
- Specific holdings and location data are not included in OCLC.

2. Use Worldcat.org as a substitute for Melvyl. It is possible to set up a WorldCat-based library group. See for example the Indiana Library Catalog at http://worldcat.org/sitesandtips/default.htm
ACTION: Hsiung, Weiss, and Barone will look into the issue and gather further details with possible questions for discussion at the next CAMCIG meeting. Other CAMCIG members will also explore the worldcat.org site.

B. Discussed additional scenarios for changing our union/consortial catalog

1. If a relatively quick fix for Melvyl is desired, the data flow could remain as it is now, but instead of going to current Melvyl the data could be sent to "Son-of-Melvyl" (i.e., and Endeca-NCSU-type of OPAC)

2. Two relatively long-term scenarios were also discussed, each involving a single file data store (originally proposed by John Riemer in HOTS). Discussion of these scenarios identified some of the issues involved:
- Where is the system that can accommodate what we would need?

- What exactly is a single file data store in this context? What functionality would it have? What data would it include (i.e., MARC data? Non-MARC data?) How would we create this data store (merging or de-duping existing records?)
- How could we maintain the integrity of records for special materials such as rare books?
- How would individual UC holdings be reported to OCLC?

IV. LC decision on series:
Will different campus policies make moving to a single data store/ILS more difficult?
Census of current campus policies on series:
- Berkeley: Is following LC direction, except in the cases where catalogers are creating/contributing a PCC record. In the PCC cases, catalogers follow the PCC direction of creating a SAR.
- Davis: Accepting OCLC copy as it comes through, relying on authority vendor LTI to control series if possible. Creating local authority records for original cataloging.
- Irvine: Continuing full authority control for series. Copy-cataloging is done in acquisitions. Monitoring 490s on copy through reports and reporting. Creating local authority records for original cataloging.
- Los Angeles: Is continuing to control series according to previous practice for now, with the assistance of the authority control vendor BSLW; considering changing to controlling just some series (e.g., numbered series; series on standing orders).
- Merced: Gets all physical books shelf-ready from YBP. Will fix discrepancies between classed together and classed separately treatment for the same series as the problems are noticed. Is continuing to control series using authority control vendor Marcive.
- Riverside: Wait and see; want to gauge size and impact of problem
- San Diego: Wait and see; continuing to control series for the moment; uses authority control vendor BSLW
- San Francisco: Indexes all 490 fields. Has seen just one LC record with the series not traced.
- Santa Barbara: Will continue to control series. Uses LTI as authority control vendor and has asked them to control series headings in 490 fields as well as other series headings.
- Santa Cruz: Indexing all 490 fields. More standing order titles will be moved to vendor approval plans from our serials unit. More items with distinctive titles will be cataloged separately. Original catalogers will continue their current practice of controlling series on records created or edited, and copy catalogers will continue to accept copies as is. Does not have an authority control vendor, but this issue of authority control will be an item for future review. Will monitor the series situation closely during the coming year.

It was remarked that our actual procedures may be closer than it at first appears based on our policy statements. For example, Berkeley is still controlling some series although the

stated policy is that they are following LC, while UCLA is considering controlling just some series.

Differences in series treatment will be just one more difference to take into account if/when we merge our records into a single file.

V. Digitization .

    A. Projects and supporting structure on each campus.

- Berkeley: Projects largely handled by Bancroft (special collections).
- Davis: The UCD General Library Digital Initiatives Program is comprised of staff from throughout the library with digital expertise. The program creates, preserves, and provides online access to non-commercial collections of finding aids, manuscripts, rare books and photographs. The program includes a staff member from the Catalog Department. That staff member participates in the development of strategies to define and use metadata for digital library collections. The staff member also provides leadership for coordinating current cataloging practices with developing national standards and addresses local needs for new access mechanisms.
- Irvine: No separate digital projects department. Thought better to integrate digital materials into existing departments. Most projects are done in special collections. Have just recruited an e-resources and metadata cataloger.
- Los Angeles: Digital Library Program is in Library Information Technology (LIT); Digital Resources Metadata Section is in the Cataloging & Metadata Center. Digital rights management is handled by Digital Collections Services. Working towards increasing involvement of the Cataloging & Metadata Center (CMC) in digital projects. Recent AIDS poster project involved 15+ members of the Cataloging & Metadata Center creating descriptive metadata using VRA Core (also TGM, MeSH). Currently interviewing for Librarian for Digital Collection Development (in LIT) and for Head, Digital Resources Metadata Section (in CMC). Many digital projects involve Special Collections.
- Merced: Digital Assets librarian does the digitizing and creates her own metadata. Generally local special collections materials. Major project is IMLS-funded digitization of Japanese art in the Clark Center for Japanese Art and Culture in Hanford. Have decided to accept dissertations only in digital form.
- Riverside: No formal program. Some digitization has been done but without any participation by the cataloging department.
- San Diego: Many digitization projects, beginning with the digitizing of 250,000 slide images. No separate digital projects office. UL (Brian Schottlaender) did not want two parallel structures to develop. Metadata Analysis and Specification Unit (MASU) established within the Metadata Services Dept. IT and MASU work together on digital projects. An important role in digital projects is the analysis of the metadata needs.
- San Francisco: Tobacco archives are being digitized; also another special collection. Digital projects are separate from the traditional technical services area.

- Santa Barbara: Working with Proquest with electronic dissertations currently, and this is being done with the cataloging department doing the processing/cataloging using records supplied by Proquest and then patched up to meet UC and local standards. Other than that, other digitization programs such as the wax cylinder project and the Alexandria project are being done outside of Technical Services.
- Santa Cruz: Most projects are performed in Special Collections. Cataloging Unit has recently been renamed as "Metadata/Cataloging Unit." Recruitment of Metadata/Cataloging Librarian is in progress.

   B. Problems/issues raised:
- Coordination: we [cataloging experts] need to be involved at the beginning of digitization projects to advise on organization and access.
- Standard CMS (Content Management System) is needed—maybe Content DM?
- Project management is needed to prioritize individual digitization projects

VI. Goals for CAMCIG

   A. Develop training opportunities
   Survey campuses to see if there are commonalities in training needs
   Need workshops with hands-on components, not just overviews
   Possible workshop topics:
- Non-MARC, non-AACR2 metadata standards such as METS, XML
- Metadata for digital theses and dissertations
- Metadata for digitized image materials

   B. Think about the future of the catalog

   C. Act on any directives that emerge from the ULs meeting on Sept. 21

Next meeting: Conference call, Monday, Oct. 2, 2:30-4:00 pm.
Barnhart will make the arrangements.