**November 14, 2022 – Academic Cataloging Group Notes**

**Attendees:** Katie Wenke, Amy Carson, Shelby Harken, Michael Lewis, Benjamin Ferguson, Katrina Lynn, Lisa Grover, Stan Johnson, Kelly Kornkven, Tuya Dutton, Jenny Grasto, Tina Gross, Liz Mason

**Comments/Questions?**

**New Topics:**

* Endorsement of ICOLC Statement on the Metadata Rights of Libraries (<https://icolc.net/statements/icolc-statement-metadata-rights-libraries>) <https://librarytechnology.org/pr/27934>

Decided to discuss this because the ICOLC is still advocating for entities to sign onto it despite the lawsuit being settled. Shelby pointed out that she was not in favor of supporting the statement because OCLC is a US owned entity and she didn’t think an international statement should have an effect on a US entity. Also, other sources of metadata, for example lower in the agenda OverDrive, which don’t have subject headings, are not as good. There are other international sources of metadata with their own standards, and more linked data rather than MARC. She is not happy with the records from the community zone/Ex Libris. Tina stated that the inability of libraries to use and repurpose OCLC records as they choose, even though we created them, is part of what creates the problem of low quality and inconsistent metadata. OCLC puts limits on our ability to do that. It is an open access question, and if you believe that information should be shared freely, then that is the gist of the statement. Katie stated that she is reading the statement the same way Tina is, and that she feels that the last paragraph applies to OCLC as much as it does to Clarivate. We are a capitalist society and we’re heading towards a more and more monopolistic lack of competition. So, she is for the statement. Kelly is considering bringing it to the ODIN advisory council and appreciates the discussion of this group. Shelby pointed out that OCLC isn’t the only game in town. Tina thinks OCLC will be more aggressive now about squelching other efforts to reuse their records, so we’ll have more occasions to think about this sort of thing. Lisa stated she is in favor of the statement, she recalls an organization called Skyriver that did the same as OCLC, just a lot smaller. The group took a poll, and the majority did not support the statement.

* Resource Types ([https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Primo/Product\_Documentation/020Primo\_VE/Primo\_VE\_(English)/050Display\_Configuration/050Configuring\_Local\_Resource\_Types\_for\_Primo\_VE](https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/Primo/Product_Documentation/020Primo_VE/Primo_VE_%28English%29/050Display_Configuration/050Configuring_Local_Resource_Types_for_Primo_VE))

When creating new resource types they must be set at the Network Zone level and therefore we need to agree to what they should be. Secondary resource types as well. The example they have in the release notes for secondary resource types is a book with a secondary resource type of microfilm. Once we decide then Liz can copy the configuration to the IZ levels so they are consistent. Tina stated that we should try to come up with examples where the two resource types are actually meaningful, and where a user would try to facet on it. For example, microforms wouldn’t be that because a user would not prefer microform over something else. We should try to think of cases where it might meet a need. Shelby stated the annoying thing of faceting is that you don’t really get to the nitty gritty until you have limited it down a lot. She would like to see some examples. If there’s an example of some library consortia, something with a good number of records where they have done this. Shelby’s biggest thing is book and ebook, reference would like to see the distinction.

* NDAC OverDrive MARC records – We are loading the free records from OverDrive Marketplace which do not have authorized name/subject headings. Tina says that NDSU has been acquiring OverDrive titles and she has found that the records provided by them are so bad that it was really going to be a detriment to users being able to find the content. The records that OverDrive provides have OverDrive subject headings that are very broad. There was discussion of the quality of OverDrive records. UND views these as popular reading and they aren’t building their collection around them. Kelly suggests that we take a look at how people are searching for these because she has a feeling that most people are not even going to our catalogs to search for them, they are going to be searching in the Libby app. Both Mayville and Valley City pointed out that they cataloged their existing OverDrive titles with OCLC records and then shared them with the consortium. We decided that in July we would request statistics from OverDrive on how many users reached their material through the app and compare with click-through data from Primo VE. Hopefully this will help us to determine if it is important to enhance the OverDrive MARC records.
* Date of the next meeting – Liz is on vacation December 12. Would you prefer December 5 or 19 for our next meeting? Decided the next meeting will be on the 5th.

**Open Discussion:**

* Taking suggestions for topics
* MarcEdit show and tell

**Next Meeting:**

Scheduled for 2nd Monday of each month or as needed.

**Monday, December ?, 2-3 pm CT -** Submit any agenda items to Liz.Mason@ndus.edu, Tina.Gross@ndus.edu, or to ODIN-ACAD-CAT@listserv.nodak.edu