

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC) MINUTES
ALA MIDWINTER MEETING, JANUARY 5, 1990**

Reported by Ellen Hines, Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 8:08 PM in the Gold Coast Room of the Hyatt Regency Hotel by Sharon Almquist, CAPC Chair.

1. The minutes of the June 23, 1989 CAPC meeting were approved, pending any corrections or additions received by the Chair in the next month.
2. There were four additions to the agenda:
 - o Verna Urbanski--subject heading issues
 - o John Attig--CC:DA task force discussion
 - o Glenn Patton--MARBI
 - o Sheila Smyth--processing manual update
3. Verna Urbanski provided an update on the progress of the manual for locally produced materials. Examples are in the final stages of being collected and analyzed, and the April 1990 goal for completion of the text (and submission to Nancy Olson for editing) should be able to be met.
4. Sheila Smyth reported on the plans for the upcoming OLAC Conference ("Technology: Friend or Foe?") to be held in Rochester, New York on October 17-19, 1990. She passed out an outline of the scheduled speakers and workshops, discussed the Conference registration fee (which will include lunches), and said that more detailed information will be appearing in upcoming issues of the newsletter. Sheila will also be meeting at Midwinter with Anne Moore (of the Conference Planning Committee) to finalize the publicity campaign for the Rochester Conference.
5. Sharon Ahmquist led a discussion of the ALCTS/OLAC proposal for revision of AACR2R concerning activity cards and kits. The issue concerns some subtle changes in rule 1.1C1 and the glossary which appear to obscure the definitions of "kit" and "activity card". The current AACR2R wording states:

1.1C1. Footnote (2.4) Use kit for any item containing more than one type of material if the relative predominance of components is not easily determinable, and for a single-medium package of textual material (e.g., a "lab kit," a set of activity cards).

Glossary

Kit. 1. An item containing two or more categories of material, no one of which is identifiable as the predominant constituent of the item; also designated "multimedia item," (q.v.). 2. A single medium package of textual material (e.g., a "lab kit," a set of activity cards).

The basis for our discussion was the memo from Bruce Johnson (ALCTS AV representative to CC:DA) which outlined the joint ALCTS/OLAC rule revision proposal. Concern was expressed over the possibility of broadening the interpretation of "a single-

medium package of textual materials" to include things far beyond the intention of the "kit" definition. Bobby Ferguson spoke for many at the meeting when she said she had never encountered the term "lab kit" in her cataloging, thus using that term in the footnote did nothing to clarify the definition.

In order to explain the use of "lab kit", Ben Tucker walked us through the history of the term. While he and Jean Weihs were working on the first revision to AACR (mid 1970's), "lab kit" was the term used in Canada and part of the U.S. for those activity cards that have nothing but text. Since that time, "lab kit" has become increasingly obsolete and the term "activity cards" has taken its place. Ben will talk with Jean about whether "lab kit" is still a term used in Canada.

Verna noted that since activity cards are used like flash cards (which are cataloged using Chapter 8), why shouldn't they be thought of in the same way. A new GMD, "activity card", is needed to prevent these items from being split between textual and non-textual activity cards. As it now stands, textual activity cards should be cataloged under Chapter 2 (AACR2R) with the GMD "kit"; visual cards, on the other hand, are pushed into Chapter 8 with a GMD "picture." Since this is not an acceptable situation, the following is being proposed:

1. Add the GMD activity card to List 2 of rule 1.1C1.
2. Change the definitions in the Glossary to:

Activity card. A card or other opaque material printed with words, numerals, and/or pictures to be used by an individual or a group as a basis for performing a specific activity. Usually issued in sets.

Kit. 1. An item containing two or more categories of material, no one of which is identifiable as the predominant constituent of the item; also designated "multimedia item" (q.v.). 2. A single-medium package of textual material (e.g., a "press kit"). c) Change footnote to:

1.1C1. Footnote (2.4) Use kit for any item containing more than one type of material if the relative predominance of components is not easily determinable, and for a single-medium package of textual material (e.g., a "press kit").

(The term "press kit" was offered as an alternative to "lab kit" and could well be omitted from this definition.)

6. In response to a question, Pen Tucker reviewed the LC proposal to discontinue the data sheet program. A task force is still exploring the issue and comment is welcome (write to Jeffrey Heynen, Chief, Special Materials Cataloging Section, Library of Congress, Washington DC., 20540). Ben said that LC's reasoning behind this idea is based on a desire to primarily serve the patrons who actually use the Library of Congress (not other libraries) and because budget cuts have taken their toll on the division responsible for the

data sheet program. Verna reminded everyone that OLAC/CAPC members must contact LC immediately in an attempt to prevent this loss of standardization.

7. Verna reported that the Subject Analysis Committee (SAG) is going to reexamine the "Guidelines for subject analysis of audiovisual material." Among other issues under review is the use of GMD's as form add-ons to subject headings. Katha Massey is on SAC and will represent OLAC during the updating of this document. Verna will try to attend the SAC meeting and will report back to us on any pertinent developments.
8. John Attig gave us an overview of the activities of the CC:DA Task Force studying the concept of producer. Producer is used in three different contexts in the cataloging rules, a) in Area 1 as a possible statement of responsibility, b) in Area 4 as a type of publishing entity, or as qualifier to name of publisher, and c) in Chapter 7 as a possible note. The Task Force tends to be moving toward removing "producer" from the publisher concept and emphasizing that producers may serve as creators and/of authors (Area 1). They are also working toward modifying the Glossary definition of producer to distinguish between producer as technician and producer as author. John said he hoped the specifics of the Task Force's activities could be shared with OLAC before this summer.
9. Glenn Patton reported on three items on the MARBI agenda of particular interest to OLAC. The first is a proposal to define a new 5xx field as an "awards" note (e.g., Caldecott, Academy Awards, etc.). Second proposal is to expand the use of the 521 field so that it can be used for age and reading level information. The final issue is a discussion paper about the use of the 753 field in the Computer Files format (Are multiple fields needed? Are additional subfields necessary? Should display requirements (CGA, VGA, etc.) be noted in a subfield? How is the 753 used by the library community?) (See Nancy Olson's [report on MARBI](#) elsewhere in this newsletter.)
10. Sheila Smyth said that she will be meeting this week with Karen Driessen and Katha Massey to discuss the "Physical processing of non-print material" manual. They will begin with compact discs, but would appreciate any examples OLAC members might have of local processing manuals. Examples can be sent to: Sheila Smyth, Nazareth College of Rochester Library, P.O. Box 10996, Rochester, NY 14610-0996. (See ["Physical Processing Manual Alert"](#) elsewhere in this newsletter for more information.)
11. There was no new business and the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 PM.