CAMCIG Conference Call
Monday, Sept. 10, 2007
2:30-4pm

AGENDA

Present: Armanda Barone (UCB – recorder), Linda Barnhart (UCSD, convener), Amy Weiss (UCSB), Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA), Karleen Darr (UCD), Rebecca Doherty (CDL), Beatrice Mallek (UCSF), Brad Eden (UCSB, HOTS Rep), Manuel Urrizola (UCR), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC), Jim Dooley (UCM)

Absent: Vicki Grahame (UCI)

1. Cataloging directly in OCLC

HOTS asked CAMCIG to address specifically the following points:

- Implications for possibly increasing the number of Enhance authorizations across the UC to accomplish this;
    - Each campus would need to invest in Enhance training. Catalogers would need to know (better than they do now) the difference between local practices and national practices.
    - Enhance status is given by format; some campuses have Enhance for some (but not all) formats. Getting additional authorizations is a time-consuming process and could take a lot of work. Must every campus have enhance for all formats? (It may not be worth the work for small numbers of more esoteric materials (maps, software))
    - Each Enhance format is a separate OCLC authorization number. We believe that OCLC is disinclined to combine them (can't have Books and Scores on the same authorization number?) This could mean that staff would be needing to manage multiple authorizations, and be moving between them all day long
    - Catalogers may also have to have different authorizations for different activities (i.e. NACO, CONSER)
    - Several campuses do not have enhance authorizations at all
    - We need a fuller understanding of the multiple levels (Enhance, enrich, upgrade, lock and replace) and what is possible under each authorization level
    If we need to increase our enhance authorizations, will OCLC be able to do so, considering it will probably mean a large number of authorization requests?

- The level and number of staff that may be required;
    - What level of staff would handle what activities?
    - If we have to increase the numbers of staff with enhance, there will be training issues.

- Not all staff are authorized to be able to lock and replace records in OCLC
- This could be an increase in cost if we have to hire higher level staff (LA III or higher) and/or provide more training.
- May involve increasing dramatically the numbers of staff with enhance capabilities.
- On some campuses, there is only one cataloger
- On some campuses, students are utilized for certain basic cataloging functions; would they be permitted to enhance?

- Workflow implications;
  - UCI, UCSB and UCR – catalog via their OPAC
  - UCLA, UCB, UCD – catalog via OCLC
  - Catalogers don't look at PromptCat records critically (if at all); is this a double standard?
  - There are categories of records that are not done in OCLC at all; each campus would need to identify these and develop workflows to put them in OCLC. This would mean training.
  - What fields would we enhance and what would we not enhance? When would we change data in OCLC and when in the ILS? We need to analyze the kinds of non-local changes that we make to records so we could apply them at the network level.
  - Are changes made in OCLC in real time or batch? On some campuses real time, on others batch.
  - Might campuses need to switch to OCLC for printing spine labels?
  - Deciding the directions we should see cataloging going will take a long time to work through.

- Transmitting the information back into our local ILS;
  - Is the goal to make OCLC our local catalog? Yes, local OPAC, but not our local ILS.
  - Will changes to the OPAC necessarily always go to the ILS?
  - Do we need multiple OPACs or funnels to WorldCat? We still need databases in our ILS for circulation and acquisitions.
  - Do we need bibliographic records in ILS? What about local holdings and institutional records in the long term? In terms of local data, what is in OCLC and what is not in OCLC is a major issue. If data is coded as local data will this display to others? Depend on campus practices? Will be need to change our practices?

- Use of the OCLC Bibliographic Notification service to bring updated information back to the local catalogs;
  - If the master record is upgraded, Bib Notification would upgrade. How would this work?

- UCB has been working with Bib Notification for some time. Bib Notification compares all upgraded OCLC MARC records to the records your library has holdings attached to, and then sends you upgraded records based on a detailed profile that tells OCLC what updates are important to the library. More information on this service can be found at : http://www.oclc.org/bibnote/

- The possibility of sending maintenance information in institutional records rather than updating the master records.
  - Use of the institutional records would mean a huge number of records in addition to the master record. Is this sustainable?
  - Or use the institutional records only for certain categories of information? Limited use, but used when deemed appropriate.
  - OCLC's indexing needs to include local data
  - OCLC needs to include ILS functionality, such as cross references from authority records and call number search and browse.
  - Can OCLC liberalize its policy on local URLs?

2. Standardizing local bibliographic data update

CAMCIG hoped that Randal Brandt (UCB), chair of the Local Bibliographic Data Task Group, might be willing to wear a "second hat" and so that this group could undertake this worthy and appropriate task. He was unable to take this on due to all his current responsibilities, and having the group take this on without him would be difficult, so we need a "Plan B." The group discussed the possibility of our own subgroup, but decided there were still too many uncertainties about how OCLC will want to handle this. Because OCLC is unclear about how it wants to handle local bibliographic data (IRs, LHRs or something else?), it is hard to propose concrete actions. We could defer any action since it is still too soon, but maybe there might be something we could do to prepare. S. Shatford-Layne agreed to pull together some information for the group.

3. OCLC Digital Registry

The group decided that updating all entries for UC was not an appropriate undertaking for CAMCIG. John Riemer (UCLA) will take it to Terry Ryan (UCLA, Chair and member of the Executive Team)

4. Poll on OCLC record numbers

This information was requested by HOTS. Five of the ten campuses have responded. The results of the poll will provide us with useful information to have discussions about similarities and differences. Once we have all ten responses the group might want to recommend some standardization of practices. Will add this to the next conference call agenda.

5. UC Standard Practice for Cataloging Dissertations

Are we all following the 1989 document:

http://tpot.ucsd.edu/SPC/Collection/dissert.pdf>http://tpot.ucsd.edu/SPC/Collection/dissert.pdf

Some campuses are following this document and others are following it with changes. Each member will take it back to their individual campus for further comment and feedback. We will revisit this issue in October.

6. Any WorldCat Local pilot news

L. Barnhart sent a note to Joy Wanden at OCLC Western in reference to ten new symbols for the Shared Cataloging Records for each campus. L. Barnhart will be in touch with CAMCIG as Joy works through this.

7. Reclamation projects news

UCR is close to doing their reclamation project. UCB is working on a variety of clean up projects in anticipation of their reclamation project. L. Barnhart will forward email from Patti Martin and Rebecca Doherty pertaining to the coordination of campus reclamation projects.

8. Planning for Nov. 29 in-person meeting at CDL