

UCLA

Affiliated unit:

Seems extremely sensible to me. We have collection level records in the catalog which link to the finding aids.

Special Collections librarian #1:

Thank you for checking in on this! I am cc'ing __ & __ here just so they know about this conversation, but I am the only person at the [this location] who works with finding aids.

I agree with the decision to not ingest finding aid metadata from the OAC. The decision page is accurate for [this location], where my regular practice is to create a collection-level MARC record for the OPAC that links to the OAC, so it would not be particularly helpful to have a duplicate ingested record. Though it might not be regular practice to do this in all units where catalogers & archivists are separate teams (unlike the [this location]), the barrier to creating collection level records without in-house cataloging know-how is really low -- ArchivesSpace will export collection-level records in MARC, for example. I think that there are easier ways to ensure that all units with OAC finding aids have collection level recs in the OPAC than to harvest everyone's finding aids from OAC!

I hope this is helpful.

Special Collections librarian #2:

I concur with [Special Collections librarian #1] and the decision not to ingest finding aid metadata from the OAC. We also create collection-level records, which link to the OAC.

I know there have been other organizations (University of Denver, ArchivesSpace, Harvard) that have been working to develop integration specifications and plugins between ArchivesSpace and Alma. I would be much more interested in a mechanism like that, which will seamlessly allow for the creation/maintenance of collection-level bib records (and holding/location, item/container integrations) from our archival system of record, than harvesting metadata from a discovery platform. So, I'm glad to hear of this decision from the SILS DCFG to not move forward with ingesting metadata from the OAC.

UCSD

Special Collections Director (with support from the AUL for Scholarly Resources and Services)

It seems a most reasonable decision to me, with a good explanation of why your group came to that conclusion. It works for us. Special Collections has been creating full MARC records for finding aids for years now which is why I'm supportive, as is the SC&A staff. Other campuses haven't been, but that's on them.

Note: Both the AUL and the SC&A director mentioned hoping to see progress in the National Finding Aid Network (NAFAN) project.

CDL

I think the recommendation makes sense for campuses to have more fine-grained controls on the MARC data that they'd like to share. And it's consistent with these older recommendations:

- https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/hots/docs/UC_Bib_Standards_2012.pdf
- https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/hosc/docs/_Efficient_Archival_Processing_Guidelines_v3-1.pdf

UCSB

Special Collections Cataloger

I had a feeling this would be the case, at least for now. Personally, I'm happy to continue creating collection-level MARC records for our archival collections. It gives us a chance to enhance the records and share them with a wider audience through OCLC. And it's just fun for me to learn about our collections J

I am also the Chair of the UC Special Collections Cataloging and Metadata CKG this year and I'd love to share this with the group since finding aids in the catalog are an active topic of discussion in nearly every meeting. Please let me know if it's ok to share now or if you want to get campus input first before it goes out to other affected stakeholders.

(Note: I followed up with Martha and asked for the CKG's feedback. Their next meeting

is October 18th at 10 am. I have not yet heard back from the Director of Special Research Collections)

UCI

Special Collections and Archives Technical Services team

UCI's Cataloging and Metadata Services department has been creating Alma/Primo records for Special Collections & Archives finding aids using MARC XML downloaded from ArchivesSpace for several years. The departments have worked together to develop a workflow that is easy for both parties. We have also utilized the Alma/Primo features to make the finding aid Primo records easy to navigate, and we are pleased with these at this time. Special Collections & Archives sees no reason to change our procedure at this time and agrees with the decision made by the SILS-DCFG to not ingest finding aid metadata from OAC at this time.

UCSC

Special Collections and Archives Librarian 1

"This definitely makes sense to me and aligns with our current practice."

Special Collections and Archives Librarian 2

"This makes sense to me. I agree that this decision aligns with our practice at UCSC. Personally, I think the wide variety of EAD encoding practices across (and within) each campus would likely create a lot of display issues in Primo."

I recall that this option was floated in the past as a possible way to reduce duplication of effort when it comes to creating and maintaining both a collection-level catalog record and finding aid for the same collection (i.e. when a finding aid is updated, it often requires a catalog record update). I don't necessarily think that harvesting finding aids into Primo is the best way to address this, but I'm curious if that came up in your deliberations."

Special Collections and Archives Librarian 3

"[...] sounds like a fine approach to me too."

Special Collections and Archives Librarian 4

"I agree with this proposal, as long as a link remains [in the MARC collection record] that goes out to the finding aid itself. I don't think all of the EAD data should be imported into Primo in addition to the MARC records."

However, a couple UCSC folks did express some confusion about what was being proposed. I'm including their question and my reply in case they come up again:

Question:

"I'm not sure I understand the particulars of this proposal. Would this mean that finding aids would not show up in UC Library search at all? Or is this to do with data itself from a finding aid? It has been useful to have finding aids show up in a Search as it is an access point for finding our collections. In addition when we request a manuscript collection from NRLF, we find the barcode information from performing this search in Oskicat. We then find the requested box and obtain the NRLF barcode for the item. If we did not use this method for NRLF requests UCB & UCLA would need to provide some type of access to their Alma instance so that we could find a barcode."

Presently finding aids are available in two different forms in two different locations: There are [MARC-encoded finding aids or "collection records"](#) in Alma that are discoverable via Primo/UC Library Search and secondly, there are [EAD-encoded finding aids or "collection guides"](#) that we create and manage in ArchivesSpace and publish via OAC. The MARC collection records (the screenshot you attached is an example of such) are up in UC Library Search and will remain up in UC Library Search. The decision DCFG is presenting concerns **only** the EAD finding aids in OAC which are not up in UC Library Search. There has been discussion within our group and among other SILS 4 groups about whether or not to make the OAC finding aids discoverable in UC Library Search **in addition to** the MARC collection records. DCFG is proposing that we do not make the OAC finding aids discoverable for a number of reasons: Most broadly, 1) they are duplicative of the collection records that are already in UC Library Search, and 2) different campuses have used EAD differently and it would require a lot of work to ensure that the EAD finding aids created at different campus all look the same in UC Library Search. More narrowly within the scope of making digital collections discoverable (the primary concern of DCFG), we've found that 1) born-digital or digitized collections are not uniformly represented, available within, or linked to from OAC finding aids -- rather, in many cases digital collections are more likely to be linked to from MARC collection records, and 2) there are other, easier strategies for campuses wanting to provide collection-level versus item-level access to digital collections content (e.g. adding 856 links to digital collections in MARC records) and alternative sources from which to harvest collection-level metadata (e.g. harvesting collection-level metadata records directly from campus DAMS).

Archives and Special Collections, Archivist 1

“Thanks for sharing this with [Archives & Special Collections]. I just want to confirm that I agree with this decision and think the group’s reasoning to be sound -- thanks for working on it!”

UCR

Metadata Librarian

Yes, this decision makes sense. Our current workflow is to create the collection level MARC records as described in the reasoning on the decision page. Our campus would be interested in exploring integrations of ArchivesSpace MARC records in the future.

Special Collections Cataloging CKG

The SCCM CKG met this morning and we all agree with your decision to not harvest finding aid metadata from OAC. There are just too many different practices to account for at this point to have that harvested metadata effectively replace the catalog record. It may be something to reconsider as we harmonize more practices further down the road now that we're all in closer communication.