

ALA CONSER At-Large Meeting
June 27, 2010
Summary

1. Open Access Journal Project Update: Linda Geisler & Robert Rendall co-chaired the planning group. The planning group report is available from <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/Open-Access-Report.pdf> [PDF: 50 KB; 6 p.]. Over 20 libraries have volunteered and many volunteered to do more than the 3-5% of annual production recommended in the planning group report.

Next steps: Update since the meeting: Linda Geisler, Robert Rendall, and Steve Shadle have agreed to co-coordinate implementation of the plan.

Questions:

- a. Will assigning of Bib PURLS be part of the project?

Answer: participants are welcome to assign Bib PURLS but it is not a requirement for participation

- b. How will cataloged serials be tracked?

Answer: Journals that require cataloging will be distributed by spreadsheet, libraries will submit lists of cataloged titles each month to the coordinators.

2. CONSER database scan (Robert Bremer)

Robert described an OCLC project to change CONSER records to reflect new MARC 21 coding including the 588 and the new codes "o" and "q" in the 008/23, 008/22.

Robert raised the idea of removing the qualifier "Online" from 1XX and 7XX fields:

Comments:

- While CONSER standard record (CSR) seems to indicate that the qualifier "online" is optional, perhaps we should just make it policy not to use.
- Need to be aware of needs for NACO and monograph series qualifiers/distinguishing element- could the process involve a check of the authority file before changing bib records?

Outcome: a summary of the changes and description of the work to be done with the qualifier "online" was sent to the CONSER email list for comments after the meeting.

3. Documentation and training (Hien Nguyen)

- a. CEG draft update of the 588 field has been posted to the CONSER web site
- b. CSR cheat sheet, PowerPoint, and metadata application profile have been updated. Thanks to Melissa Beck for this work.
- c. Advanced and integrating resources workshops have been updated thanks to Meg Mering, Adolfo Tarango, Jian Wang and Shana McDanold

4. NISO Journal title presentation group (Cindy Hepfer) Cindy is chairing a group to draft best practices for journal title presentation on publisher and provider web

ALA CONSER At-Large Meeting

June 27, 2010

Summary

pages. There are opportunities for joining "observer" and "reactor" groups as the best practices are drafted. More information on these opportunities will be made available later.

5. RDA testing. Judy Kuhagen of LC's Policy and Standards Division (PSD) welcomed comments on how/if PCC policy practices for bibliographic records should be added to Library of Congress Policy Statements.

PCC Steering Committee released a statement about PCC work with bibliographic and authority records during the RDA test period:

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/RDA-Testing-PCC.pdf> [PDF; 39 KB; 2 p.]

Attendees asked about updating PCC authenticated records created during the test. If we are not part of the test how can we update RDA records? Attendees were asked to send questions to the email set up to receive RDA test related questions: LChelp4rda@loc.gov Judy Kuhagen is monitoring this mailbox and will consult with the test committee to resolve this issue others.

6. ISSN Update (Regina Reynolds)

Two pilots are being undertaken by the ISSN Network:

- 1) Expansion of assigning ISSN to integrating resources. The focus will be on databases, directories, A&I services and tools. Excluded for now are organizational web sites.
- 2) The ISSN Network will attempt some RDA testing during the period of free access to the RDA toolkit.

Regina revisited two ISSN related issues raised at the CONSER Operations Meeting in May involving cases where the number of ISSN assigned and the number of CONSER records are out of synch:

- 1) Fewer ISSN assigned than CONSER records. One category of these are when corporate main entry changes in a CONSER record and new record is created. ISSN rules do not make use of the concept of corporate main entry, so only one ISSN is appropriate if the title has not changed. In these cases assigning a corporate body qualifier as part of the key title may make these situations clearer.
- 2) Multiple ISSN and fewer CONSER records. This happens when an ISSN center decides a title change is major while a CONSER institution decides the change is minor. Contacting ISSN centers to request a change in decision has not been successful in most cases. One possibility is to pursue the repeatability of the 022. An indicator would be needed to identify which ISSN goes with which title. Regina will pursue the idea with the ISSN Network

7. Renette Davis, University of Chicago was presented a certificate of thanks for her services to CONSER and the PCC as well as best wishes for her retirement.