Cataloging & Access Guidelines
for Electronic Resources Subcommittee
(CAGER)
Minutes of conference call
January 10, 2006

Present: Emmett Denny (FAMU), Dan Jergovic (USF), Helen Laurence (FAU), Jim Michael (USF), Kimberly Montgomery (UCF), Mary Ann O'Daniel (FCLA), Angela Randtke (UNF), Naomi Young (UF), Sue Wartzok (FIU).

Jim introduced Dan Jergovic who is dealing with USF's locally digitized resources.

Naomi reviewed the conversations from the last conference call. At the annual meeting held at FCLA, the Digital Development & Access Committee was established as the successor to the Digital Projects Planning Committee. There were questions about overlap between committees and subcommittees.

CAGER's charge was approved by the TSPC. The text was in an October email sent out by Naomi. Naomi read the charge and noted that she had sent it to Tenille for loading on the CAGER section of the Council of State University Libraries website.

> [Editor's note: text as posted on the CSUL (http://www.fcla.edu/csul/tspc/cager/cager_charge.shtml):
>
> *2005- The Cataloging and Access Guidelines for Electronic Resources (CAGER) is a Subcommittee of the Technical Services Planning Committee (TSPC) and serves two primary functions for Florida's State University Libraries (SUL). First, CAGER is a forum for the sharing of information about the technical aspects of bibliographic control of and access to electronic resources, particularly within the context of the statewide shared library management system as implemented by the Florida Center for Library Automation (FCLA). Second, CAGER promotes coordination of metadata creation, traditional cataloging, and quality control standards among the SUL for purchased and locally created records, without discouraging appropriate adaptations for local needs. CAGER advises the TSPC and related bodies on planning in the area of providing effective access to electronic resources. CAGER sends any formal recommendations concerning its areas of responsibility to the SUL Directors via the main Technical Services Planning Committee.*]

There was discussion of the CAGER pages that are linked to the old USF site instead of the current FCLA pages. Mary Ann is sending a note to Tenille about this.

Current and future committee projects were discussed.

Naomi continues work on the electronic journal guidelines.

Sue and Jim are still working on the database guidelines. There were questions about whether we were in danger of re-inventing the wheel. The Bibco/Conser Integrating resources manual was mentioned (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/irman.pdf). Also mentioned was the August 5, 2005 email sent by Jim which discusses provider-neutral records for integrating resources. Naomi will send out a link for UF's guidelines for databases. [Editor's note: the link is http://web.uflib.ufl.edu/alephpro/catmet/database.htm]

Naomi said that she and Martha had discussed what we were accomplishing at the state level. National guidelines are beginning to supersede local guidelines.

The emphasis for CAGER will change to the evaluations of external records. Serial solutions records have been bought by UF, UNF and GC. MarcIt! is an alternative from ExLibris, but they were using print records in pre-AACR2 form as the basis for electronic records. Now they are using the CONSER record first.

There were questions relating to records for aggregators – how do we get them in, maintain them, and remove them when needed. In one library, the public services people were opposed to separate records at first, but now accept them. Sue said that she discussed the single record approach with MarcIt! and that they said that one of their customers was looking into doing that.

There was discussion of issues relating to evaluation of vendor records, whether for fee or free. Do records from Serial Solutions or MarcIt! get corrected when the OCLC record changes? It is not certain how often or if this is done. SS records do not have the OCLC number. SS records can be bought at eight different quality levels.

There were questions about moving records around for local digitization projects done on NOTIS. It is possible to export from Connexion to a file, then use Catalyst to import them into LTQF. In earlier conference calls, there was discussion about where the LTQF database would end up. It appears that it will migrate to Aleph as a separate database.

The conference calls should be back on schedule for the first Tuesday of the month.

Action item: Anyone who has evaluated vendor records, please send to the list comments on things they liked, things they disliked and other observations. Please send these comments before the next conference call so that we can discuss the issue then.

Recorder: Kimberly Montgomery