

Systemwide cataloging

Do you have proscribed cataloging procedures that all libraries should follow?

Yes, we have systemwide policies and procedures on cataloging, the NZ, and local fields.

Because we are in a shared library system, we've had to standardize and get libraries to move away from local, non-standard practices.

Link to policies and procedures

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/9502745/Technical+Services+Policies+Best+Practices+Procedures>

Using OCLC as primary bibliographic utility

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/61113021/Bibliographic+Utility>

Original Cataloging at the Worldcat level

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/62029856/Cataloging+at+the+WorldCat+Level>
<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/61112881/Floor+Bibliographic+Standards>

What is the Network Zone?

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/61113019/Alma+Network+Zone>
<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/61112457/Working+in+Alma+and+the+Network+Zone>

Single vs separate records approach for print and electronic resources

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/61112686/Single+vs.+Separate+Records>

Systemwide policies and procedures for importing records to the NZ

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/57704508/Systems+Policies+Best+Practices+Procedures>

Has the "shared cataloging" environment changed cataloging practices across the CSU library system?

Yes. CSU libraries had to move away from local practices specific to their institution and towards shared, systemwide policies and procedures geared toward CSU-wide impact.

Central staff (NZ person) and committees (Resource Management, NZ group) must remind CSU libraries of our shared system and that how one campus can affect the others. Also, we have to discourage libraries from "This is how we've always done it." or "This how our library wants to do it."

Do you require all libraries use same local fields or other fields for metadata? What local fields are used?

Yes, we have a standardized chart of local fields (Marc 59x, 69x, and 9xx) across the CSU.

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMST/pages/78172584/Local+Fields+in+Alma+Primo>

For example, all CSU libraries must use the 973 field for local collection title.

This is because we have a centralized set of Primo normalization rules that take Alma Marc Data from all 24 CSU libraries for indexing and display in discovery. In order to have standardized set that applies to all CSU we needed standardized local fields so that we didn't have to create a set of norm rules for each of the 24 libraries.

For example, because the 973 is for local collection title. In Primo norm rules we can specify the 973 to display as Collection in Primo as well as index the 973 for title searches.

Primo example:

https://csun-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=01CALSA_ALMA71379441670002901&context=L&vid=01CALSA_UNO&search_scope=EVERYTHING&tab=everything&lang=en_US

Without standardization, each library could use any 9xx field for local collection title and then we'd have to create 24 norm rules just for the local collection title.

Despite this centralization and standardization, libraries do have flexibility with local, internal notes that do not display in Primo. (See 962-969 in Local Fields in Alma Primo).

Has the workload changed for the Cal State

libraries?

Cataloging workload: maybe at first, cataloging is slower because you're getting used to Alma and its laggy and clickiness but you get used to it and there are ways to be more efficient by using normalization rules/processes and templates

See "Normalization rules (basic and intermediate) & Configuring Normalization Processes"
<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/610238465/ULMS+Summer+Meeting+20>

¹⁸ Marc bibliographic and holdings record templates:
[https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Alma/Product_Documentation/010Alma_Online_Help_\(English\)/040Resource_Management/040Metadata_Management/050Working_with_Templates](https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Alma/Product_Documentation/010Alma_Online_Help_(English)/040Resource_Management/040Metadata_Management/050Working_with_Templates)

The NZ makes copy cataloging easier. If you have a book in hand and find a record in the NZ, you can just use the NZ record without having to go to OCLC.

Also, record loading is much easier in Alma. You can set up automated imports through ftp (Daily OCLC Load, Marcive Documents without Shelves (gov docs)). The imports run on a scheduled basis and don't require human intervention. I just review the import reports once in a while to make sure the imports are running smoothly.

Have the number of employees in cataloging been reduced based on how cataloging works with regards to the NZ?

I can't speak for all CSU's. I haven't heard of reduction of cataloging staff due to Alma.

Technical services workflows will definitely change though. Ex: you may have acquisitions staff doing more copy cataloging at the point of order. And cataloging staff doing more electronic resource activation and management.

For example: An acquisitions staff member orders a print book through the Gobi API. The Gobi API will add an order record and a brief bib record to the NZ. (You can configure Alma to [publish holdings to OCLC](#) to indicate your library know owns this book.) Then the daily OCLC load will import the full bib record from OCLC to the NZ, which is a task that a copy cataloger might have done in the past.

See also: "Presentation: Rethinking Technical Services Job Duties (Suzanna Conrad & Stacie Jensen)"
<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/URM/pages/144572459/Technical+Services+Open+Forum>

Do the catalogers communicate more as a group, sharing best practices?

Mostly yes. Especially during migration and because we were migrating to the same system, campus libraries were able to share info and rely on each other. The systemwide migration to Alma/Primo has brought libraries closer together.

We share best practices through Zoom (especially [Technical Services open forums](#)), Slack, in-person meetings and library email lists.

What do you do, if anything, if it is found that a library is contributing records that don't meet the cataloging standards CSU group has established? Does it matter?

As our former chair of resource management likes to say, "We're not the cataloging police."

No one is checking the quality of NZ bib records and which campus contributed them.

If you have bib records that do not meet the minimum standards you may keep them in the IZ.

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/62029856/Cataloging+at+the+WorldCat+Level>

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMS/pages/61112881/Floor+Bibliographic+Standards>

We also allow for brief bib records (created at the point of order) in the NZ

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=59900042>

NZ record quality does matter because the records are shared and display in Primo for all CSU libraries. The NZ and the OCLC Worldcat database are so closely aligned in the CSU. We want the NZ to be a miniature version of Worldcat (aka World-kitten (someone else coined this term)) So we aligned NZ cataloging standards to OCLC.

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en.html>

Network
Zone

How was the NZ originally populated for the Cal States? Was it largest library first?

The NZ was populated with Worldcat master records from OCLC. Exlibris gathered the collective OCLC holdings of all CSU libraries and imported these Worldcat records into the NZ. Then as each library's data migrated the bib records matched on OCLC number (035 field) to NZ records. So be sure, your existing bib records have accurate OCLC numbers in the 035 field, make sure you have one 035 field. If you store the OCLC number in another field (like 001) you can copy the OCLC number to the 035 field with the OCLC prefix. (Exlibris probably already told you this.)

Using Worldcat records enabled us to start the NZ with the most complete, neutral (not local records from a library's previous ILS that may have been customized based on previous local practices) records.

(I talked to SUNY about this too. And I think they will also employ the Worldcat-first approach.)

Once the records from the various CSU libraries were all migrated, what are some issues that arose that people did not foresee?

There were some extraneous NZ records that were not held by any CSU libraries. This may be because CSU libraries had inaccurate holdings in OCLC.

There were some records that were not in the P2E list so electronic inventory was not created. It wasn't too difficult to re-import these bib records into Alma to create electronic portfolios. See https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_YGFL4AA6XdV1L8MY0-M8ao0rAmp--PErtTO9hOYPT0/edit?usp=sharing

I think there will always be data cleanup, before and after migration. You'll want your data as clean as possible before migration but you'll have a chance to cleanup after migration too.

We will be conducting a system-wide reclamation project. Are there any issues we should be aware of or any suggestions for us?

You should closely examine the data returned by OCLC reclamation.

A CSU library who was previously using SkyRiver performed an OCLC reclamation before we migrated to Alma/Primo. During reclamation, instead of matching the library's existing records

with Worldcat records, OCLC created duplicates and triplicates in Worldcat. These records then populated the NZ during cutover and cluttered our NZ and Worldcat with duplicate records.

After migration, we found that the daily OCLC load was creating many multi-matches (when an incoming record matches 2 or more existing NZ records). We discovered that OCLC was merging these duplicate records in Worldcat and then the merged records would import during the daily OCLC load and cause multi-matches. Cleanup of these records is ongoing (almost 2 years after we migrated) and done through the resolving of multi-matches during the Daily OCLC load.

CSU Northridge also performed a reclamation. We were using OCLC record previously. But for serials, OCLC matched our perfectly good Conser records with serial records of lower quality cataloged by British libraries. As the serials cataloger, I had to clean up the 035 fields in our previous library system, Millennium and re-add our holdings to the Conser record in Worldcat. There were thousands of serial records.

After migration: Assuming you're doing reclamation after migrating to Alma, you'll probably want to use the 001 field (Alma's MMS ID (aka bib record ID number) as the match point when loading the records. Also, because you may have IZ records linked to the NZ and because you can't overlay in NZ record with an IZ import profile, you may have to unlink your IZ records from the NZ.

You can create a set in Alma by MMS ID and run the job, "Unlink a set of records from the Network" on this set. Then you can import the reclaimed OCLC records, match by 001 MMS ID, and merge on your existing IZ records. Then re-link the IZ records to the NZ by matching on OCLC number.

I'm not exactly sure about the above procedure because I've never done a reclamation in Alma.

Does the NZ manager or someone else take it upon themselves to clean up any records?

Yes. Members of the NZ management group are allowed to delete duplicative or extraneous NZ records. However, we discourage others from deleting NZ records because of boundwiths. Boundwiths are when an item record is linked to 2 or more bib records. For example, a single volume of a serial that went through a title change so one barcode is linked to the previous serial title as well as the subsequent serial title. Or monographs that were locally bound into a single volume so one item record is linked to 2 or more bib records.

In the NZ, Alma doesn't accurately indicate that a title is held by a campus for boundwiths. So

you may see an NZ record that is held by no one but it could actually be a boundwith.

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMST/pages/63045712/Deleting+Network+Zone+Records+Without+Inventory+from+an+IZ>

Sometimes the NZ person gets reports from campuses about an unused NZ record or Exlibris tells us that an extraneous NZ record is causing display issues in Primo. Then the NZ person follows the procedures below to confirm that the NZ record is not in use and deletes it.

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/URM/pages/678920193/Deleting+an+NZ+record+that+is+not+being+used>

The NZ group also performs database maintenance during the Daily OCLC load. The procedure below consolidates duplicate NZ records and aligns the NZ database with Worldcat.

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/URM/pages/643170422/Resolving+multi-matches+from+daily+OCLC+load>

Eluna presentation on NZ management

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1wZMIURpccIOOWaENMKfLyPCBmS4PtN7Cung2DoF E8fM/edit?usp=sharing>

What kinds of issues (regular and infrequent) regarding maintenance of the Network Zone have come up that might be relevant for a large group of college libraries like the CCC?

Infrequent: Be careful when deleting NZ records that you think are not in use. You may delete boundwiths. See:

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1wZMIURpccIOOWaENMKfLyPCBmS4PtN7Cung2DoF E8fM/edit#slide=id.g271260cb06_0_1025

Regular: Database maintenance of the NZ during the Daily OCLC load allows for piecemeal tasks to be performed in a bibliographic database of millions of records. We keep the NZ up-to-date with updated Worldcat records and consolidate duplicate records at the same time.

Infrequent: Bad data from OCLC Worldcat. There was some data corruption in Worldcat records where invalid diacritics were added to bib records and these records entered our NZ. I discovered these records by spotchecking the Daily OCLC load. I reported the issue to OCLC. They are aware of it and are cleaning them up. In the meantime I used an [indication rule](#) in the Daily OCLC load to filter these records from the NZ.

It's difficult to anticipate issues with the NZ because we're new to Alma especially in a consortial environment. The best I could do is check Alma reports (especially reports after I ran a job or after a record import) and spot-check records to look for anomalies. Also we set up an NZ problem reporting form for libraries to report problems with NZ records.

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMST/pages/80683328/NZ+Problem+Reporting>

Are there still differences of opinion among the CSU libraries about how the Network Zone is maintained, and how are any disputes settled?

I don't think there are difference of opinion regarding the NZ. (I think most libraries are glad that they don't have to maintain it or have to manage shared electronic collections because these tasks are centralized.)

Also, when we migrated we modelled our policies and procedures on the Orbis Cascade Alliance. Especially at the beginning, maybe libraries didn't have objections because they didn't know how the new system would work? Also, our perspective was, "If it's good enough for Orbis,..."

If there are any disputes or requests for reconsideration, we discuss during the TS open forum. For example, we had a policy against suppressing NZ records from Primo. We were afraid that if one campus suppressed the NZ record then it would be hidden for all libraries. But we learned that if one campus suppresses an NZ record in their instance of Alma, it is just suppressed for that campus. So we revised the policy to allow campuses to suppress NZ records from their instance of Alma.

<https://calstate.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ULMST/pages/63045723/Suppression+of+Records+for+Physical+Inventory>

Is a NZ Manager necessary to maintain the integrity of the NZ? What problems do you think might have come up if you weren't taking on that role?

Maybe NZ manager is not necessary. But the community colleges will need central person(s) to manage shared electronic collections.

(The CSU Chancellor's Office has a person who handles the activation, licensing and management of shared electronic collections. She troubleshoots access to these collections and fields questions about opt-ins, authentication, and ordering. She does the work of several people and depending on how much shared e-collection development the CC's want to do, you'll need a similar person or at least 2. The Chancellor's Office also has a department, Systemwide Digital Library Content that

negotiates e-collections and licenses for the CSU. SDLC works closely with her.)

Much of what I did was troubleshooting and problem-solving. Libraries would ask, "How do I deal with this situation?" Or "We'd like to do this? Is this okay? Or does this go against NZ policy?"

Or there would be something amiss in Primo and I'd have to figure out if it was Alma configuration or Primo configuration. What is the source of the data (IZ, NZ, or CZ or maybe Primo Central Index). Is it inventory (physical or electronic)? Is the problem specific to a campus or does it affect all libraries?

NZ management is a full-time job. Maybe a community college person could take on the role part-time but it's probably better to have a dedicated, point-person to manage the NZ. This is the approach of Orbis, CSU, SUNY (in the near future) and WRLC.