

REPORT OF THE CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS

The meeting was held in the Chicago Hyatt Regency July 5, 1985, 8-10 pm. [Minutes of the last meeting](#) were approved.

The proposal for revision of AACR2 rules 6.5D1, 8.5D1 and 10.5D1 was discussed. It was agreed that **10.5D1** is appropriately ambiguous as is, and should be left unrevised. There were objections to adding **or smaller**. Giving the range of sizes will not be helpful as it will be for 8.5D1.

8.5D1.

It was determined that 8.5D1 should be submitted for consideration by CC:DA in the form proposed on the 7/5/85 rule revision proposal, i.e., asking for **or smaller** to be added. When addressing this topic Ben Tucker (LC) indicated that this had purposely been left ambiguous because the Joint Steering Committee felt that the important thing was to give an indication of size of shelving needed for the collection rather than actual dimensions of the item.

6.5D1.

Rather than using **or smaller**, some felt it would be better to give a span of smallest to largest for sound discs. It is more specific and precedent exists for it in **2.5D3**. LC representatives present felt more comfortable with this approach. It was determined that 6.5D1 should be revised to call for recording a span of sizes for sound disc. The proposal will be withdrawn from current consideration by CC:DA and will be redrafted and resubmitted.

Dorian Martyn reported on the survey regarding captioning information in cataloging records. Several proposals were discussed for adding information about captioning to cataloging records for chapter 7 and chapter 8 materials. One proposal suggested addition of this information to the physical description and another suggested the information should go in a note. After discussion it was agreed that the note area was preferable and that an LCRI would be adequate. Ben Tucker agreed to write an appropriate LCRI. It was recommended that the note take the following form: "Closed captioned for the hearing impaired."

The LC proposal for revision of **7.5C6** (re: playing speed of videodiscs) was approved by CAPC with no changes and little discussion.

10.4G2.

Continuing the discussion from Midwinter, Ben Tucker thought an interpretative statement might be appropriate here to emphasize that the decision should hang on whether or not the entity's name is present, not on whether or not the place is present. Ben agreed to write a rule interpretation which would add positive and negative examples to help clarify application of this rule.

GMD for MRDF.

Sheila Intner's survey indicates dissatisfaction with "machine-readable data file" but shows a lack of consensus on a better term. Two proposals for GMDs for microcomputer software were discussed: 'computer material' and 'computer software.' Ben Tucker offered two arguments against sending either of these forward:

1. Chapter 9 must cover more than microcomputer software, so a GMD for the other Chapter 9 material ought to be proposed at the same time;
2. LC did a literature search (of cataloging literature) and determined that 'machine-readable' is more widely used than 'computer' in this context. The possibility was raised of splitting Chapter 9 in two: Could computer software be distinguished from machine readable files clearly enough that rules for GMDs and physical description could be written for each? (The question was not resolved and no specific proposal was put forward) A subcommittee was appointed to examine popular and scholarly computing literature to see if the terminology has stabilized enough to support proposals for better GMDs for Chapter 9. Members of this subcommittee are: Sheila Intner, Susie Koch, and Bob Mead-Donaldson.

257 field.

The Committee voted to support the including of a 257 field in the MARC format for visual materials, to hold area 3 (country of production) for Chapter 7 materials, as long as it is defined as an archival field. A precedence exists because there is an area 3 in place for maps, serials and music. Martha Yee felt it was a very useful device for bringing together foreign films in archival collections.

The Committee expressed no interest in investigating the implications of revising or interpreting the rules to allow inclusion of performers in statements of responsibility for films. The issue was not resolved, but Martha Yee was invited to prepare a draft of a proposal to make this change if she so desired. OLAC/CAPC would then consider it more fully.

John Lashbrook and Dorian Martyn gave a report on their investigation into the possibility of developing a microcomputer based template for the development of audiovisual cataloging policy manuals. They passed out draft copies and asked those present to review and send comments to Verna, John or Dorian. There will be follow up reports at the next meeting.

The MARBI and CC:DA reports were deferred until the membership meeting Saturday night.

Verna Urbanski was re-elected to chair the Committee for the upcoming year.

Verna asked Committee members to review the projects list by August 31 and let her know what they want to work on next.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.

Attending were: Richard Thaxter, Glenn Patton, Lidia Heretz, Robert Mead-Donaldson, John Attig, Judith Wing, Carmela DiDomenico, Dorian Martyn, Martha M. Yee, Susie Koch, John E. Lashbrook, Verna Urbanski, Edward Swanson, Ben R. Tucker, Katha Massey, Mary Goss, Chong Yoon, Christina McCawley.