

Catalogers Group

October 3, 2002

Minutes

Present: Aivazian, Benamou, Bross, Feinberg, LoPear, Matthiesen, McBride, Mendes, Miller, Morehead, Ratliff (Recorder), Riemer, Riggio, Stumps

I. Report on & discussion of October 2 CMC meeting.

Riemer reported on yesterday's CMC meeting at which new strategies were brainstormed for the collection development and technical services part of the Library's strategic plan.

Goal 5: "Acquire, organize, preserve, provide access to collections (including rare, unique and notable materials)."

These would be pursued in the next 1-3 years. Goal 5 Riemer distributed a document, containing very preliminary thoughts from the brainstorming session, for purposes of explaining, discussing, and possibly generating additional strategies for consideration during the subsequent write-up.

Existing strategies, from Aug. 2002 Strategic Plan Update, and how they could be revised:

1. Catalog/make available foreign language materials (backlog): Incorporate CJK.
2. Implement EDI in Classic: Rework to: Explore limited implementation of EDI in Classic (as an interim measure pending the selection/implementation of a new ILS)
3. Create an integrated gateway/portal to all materials: Not being carried forward.
4. Develop unified acquisitions database for electronic resources: Change to something like, "Increase ERDB functionality to support acquisitions and selections work and mainstream its use."
5. Provide comprehensive access to special collections (EAD): Possible revision:
Address Special Collections backlog by
 - a. converting finding aids to EAD
 - b. making materials available as digital objects/expanding efforts to digitize content
 - c. deal with cataloging backlog
6. In online form, provide at least inventory control for all materials upon receipt:
Revision could be: Examine use of control records to provide access to newly received materials and achieve inventory control.
7. Develop management/user reporting tools: Revision:
Continue to develop and implement Data Warehouse for the management of collections.
[Riemer clarified that this is a management report capability. The raw data contained within it would remain usable after software applications change. During September discussion, AdCon members indicated they would like to see an increase from 50% to 75% of LIS' efforts on report generation going to the Data Warehouse.]
8. Plan and implement archiving for digital material, esp. born digital. [Ongoing. Bross asked about the discussion of this item; Riemer indicated that CMC wants to wait and see what the CDL will do.]
9. Plan and implement a conservation lab with the support of the Mellon Foundation.
(Still unfolding; carried forward.)

Potential new strategies, generated from CMC:

1. Select, migrate to, and implement an ILS.
2. Develop strategies for enhanced communication and cooperation between selectors and the Digital Library Office.
3. Identify and implement projects to clean-up data prior to a migration to a new ILS.
4. Plan and carry out a cancellation program and identify and implement other cost-containment strategies in order to stay within flat budgets.
5. Build on success of Development Office in obtaining endowments for collection development.
6. Analyze existing budgets with a view toward possible re-allocation.
7. Implement SST (SRLF Selectors Tool) in all units.
8. Investigate becoming a CDL Shared Cataloging Program participant. [In answer to Feinberg's question, Riemer indicated that right now UC San Diego is the only library to catalog materials for CDL; maybe we could participate and thereby receive funding for staff. This will be investigated.]
9. Successfully demonstrate potential ability of an OAI Harvester for a selected category of library materials (e.g., sheet music).
10. Investigate changes to processes for incorporating Shared Cataloging Program (SCP) records into the OPAC to improve timely access to materials.
11. More systematically acquire analytic records for major sets (e.g., microforms, e-resources).
12. Advocate for and work with CDL and others to plan and implement programs for providing service copy and/or copy of records for the system when electronic is available.

Potential additions to the list from Catalogers Group discussion:

1. Matthiesen asked if there might be any consideration of looking into NEH grants for handling portions of the Special Collections cataloging backlog? (NEH used to do this, but current practice is unknown.) Perhaps the Library Development officer could investigate the availability of grants, and other knowledgeable persons could write proposals? Possible strategies: "Use outside fund sources to address cataloging needs." and/or "Restrict acceptance of gifts that are not accompanied by processing funds."
2. Matthiesen indicated that there are acquisitions records for Special Collections titles in Classic, which are better than the old Orion IP records since they are cloned from OCLC. Special Collections has historically used this method to provide a minimal form of access. There are many items which have records both in Orion and Classic, which will result in duplicate records when the two databases are merged. [This could fall under the first CMC strategy above.]
3. Riemer noted that the 2nd item in the CMC list could expand to include: "Find effective, meaningful ways to integrate UCLA Digital Library output with the rest of the Library's collections."
4. Riemer would like to add a strategy concerning reaching out to the profession: "Counter the 'graying' of the profession by reaching out to library school faculty and students, hosting internships, etc." [He explained that Jonathan Furner, a DIS professor teaching subject analysis, had asked him for some practical experience involving subject cataloging. Dr. Furner will visit with the sections in our department and learn about our practices. Riemer said that students are not typically aware of what we do in cataloging, since we are behind the scenes. He will consider speaking to Dr. Furner's class, being taught next Spring, and we will subsequently find out if students would consider cataloging internships in our Department.]

Riemer distributed a draft charge to the “Task Force on Guidelines for Selection and Cataloging of Free Internet Resources.” The membership will consist of him, Ellen Broidy (chair), Judith Herschman (Arts), and Cinthya Boeriu (Biomed). Please let Riemer know your reactions to the charge in the next two weeks.

Riggio asked whether there is a written general Collection Development policy statement here. Riemer hasn’t seen one, so he’ll ask, since the free e-resources policy should be based on a larger one. Regarding the question, “Do some e-resources belong in ERDb but not the catalog?”, Morehead stated, “No.” Bross indicated that there are some without content, and we don’t need these in the OPAC. The meaning of “free” was discussed; it indicates resources for which no licensing fee is required. Also, those URLs which require user names and passwords should not be selectable, since access is based on an individual user. Riemer said that record removal policies need to be added to the charge.

II. Report on **UCLA Digital Library Council** meeting of Sept. 24 (Riemer)

At the meeting, Riemer spoke about “How Much Metadata is Enough?” (He had previously distributed his speaking points.) DLC members include: Terry Ryan, Gabriella Gray, Howard Batchelor, Stephen Davison, Kathy Donahue, Curtis Fornadley, Genie Guerard, David Hirsch, John Riemer, Stephen Schwartz, and Cindy Shelton.

The objectives of the main discussion topic, “How much metadata is enough?” were to raise consciousness, to share ideas, to inform decisions for specific projects, and to inform a strategic approach to the allocation of staff.

There was a general consensus that there is no one answer for all the projects.

Metadata costs estimates ranged from a low of \$3 per photograph in the Hoover Collection up to \$100 for each full MARC record for the Index of Medieval Medical Images (IMMI) collection.

Terry presented the CDL Metadata Standards (for description), which is a minimum standard for description. Basically, you have to have some metadata. “The bar has been set fairly low.” The Online Archive of California (OAC) best practice guidelines for finding aids suggest only a handful of Dublin Core elements:

- Title
- Name of creator(s)
- Date(s) of creation
- Subject (3: geographic, name/topical, genre)
- Repository name

There was support for at least using the 15 DC elements as a checklist of metadata to consider including.

The Powerpoint slides Stephen Schwartz brought back from a conference program he attended “Do We Need Metadata?” didn’t make clear which of the ideas he was supporting. A statement in one of the slides, “Manual is 0.26 better than Automatic out of a scale of 5—which is not statistically significant” provoked a lot of discussion.

It refers to the difference between carefully-assigned controlled vocabulary and keyword retrieval supported by descriptive summaries. If staff resources in a particular metadata project only

permit summaries or controlled access points, but not both, which should we spend energy on? Stephen touted the results of successful Google searches, and noted even catalogers use that tool. Terry recounted her personal experiences as a Medline searcher. To excel, one had to study hard at courses NLM offered. Then one day abstracts and summaries were added to most entries in the system, and suddenly novice searchers right out of library school could achieve results quite comparable to what trained experts managed. It was humbling to learn that keyword access could be as good as controlled heading access.

Given the either/or context of the digital library projects, where there might be money only for the summaries *or* the other fields, it seems like the fair comparison in Medline would be use of a copy of the database that didn't include *both* abstracts and the controlled headings. A study should be done involving a separate copy of the entire Medline database, stripped of all the controlled headings, leaving behind just the abstracts, so we could see how keyword searchers would fare.

One action item Stephen Schwartz and John were left with: by the next meeting in a couple of months, review the literature to see what other studies say about the degree of difference in retrieval between controlled headings and keywords. Is it only an incremental improvement to use controlled vocabulary? It probably makes a significant difference if the retrieval system includes all the see references for the authorized terms; then people see the full results of the investment in controlled vocabularies.

Morehead suggested that sometimes assigning controlled-vocabulary headings is not too important, as long as there is good data in the descriptive cataloging. More discussion followed.

III. **Gia Aivazian** just returned from an extended working visit to Armenia, and was warmly greeted by everyone. Riemer asked her to give a brief report.

In Armenia, her research was based at the National Library where she received the warm cooperation of the President of the Library as well as that of the librarians she had to work with in their Special Collections Dept. She worked on some 20 rare periodicals published 1908-1915 in Constantinople, and earmarked some 250 images to be developed into slides, and approximately 5000 pages of text to be microfilmed. The slides segment of the project was completed before her departure, while the microfilming portion is still in the works.

Over the 5 weeks she was in Armenia (Aug. 29-Oct. 1), Gia made many contacts. She was invited to speak at the National Library on Sept. 13 regarding her work at UCLA and her two major research interests. Many media representatives were present. This appearance at the National Library triggered three newspaper interviews, a 25-minute interview on Armenia's national radio (repeated at least once during that week), and a 5-minute TV interview. Finally, on the day before her departure, she spoke for over an hour at the History Institute of the Armenian Academy of Sciences in the presence of well-known historians, who posed many questions at the end of her presentation.

On the 26th of Sept, she attended the opening conference of three library associations of the Southern Caucasus, namely, Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan. Several notable figures from ALA were also present.

During the last week, she went book buying. The President of the National Library facilitated her efforts by setting up appointments for her at various institutes. He also had his people go to publishers to obtain books at good prices. She also received many gift books from institutions like the National Library and the Genocide Museum, as well as from the authors themselves.

Next meeting: Probably Oct 17, in ACR.