

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)**

**ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
MARRIOTT MARDI GRAS ABC
JUNE 25, 1993**

Submitted by Heidi Hutchinson, OLAC Secretary

Minutes

The meeting was called to order by CAPC Chair Richard Harwood at 8:09 p.m. Members present: R. Harwood, V. Berringer, M. Konkel, J. LaGrange, S. Neumeister, N. Rodich-Hodges. Members absent: D. Boehr. 30 guests present.

1. The [minutes](#) of the January 22, 1993 meeting were approved as printed in the *OLAC Newsletter* 13 (1), with one change: Under point 2.d., second paragraph, drop the phrase "to enter operas under composer and."
2. (a) Chair Harwood led the discussion on the draft document "A Guide to the Bibliographic Control of Music Video Material" prepared by the Working Group on Bibliographic Control of Music Video Material, Music Library Association. Jennifer Bowen, Chair of the Bibliographic Control Committee (BCC) of MLA had asked for OLAC CAPC's input on the document in the form of a written response within a month of this meeting.

In the section on "Application of Standards" (p. 4), the following question was discussed. Is a choreographer or a conductor ever significant enough to transcribe in the statement of responsibility? Acknowledging that there is a difference between responsibility for the work and responsibility for the performance of the work, CAPC agreed to suggest to BCC that the document include guidelines to help determine when a choreographer is significant enough to transcribe in the statement of responsibility.

There was discussion on whether a performance should be considered a "physical manifestation" of a work, as cited from the Introduction to Part II of AACR2R, "The rules in part II apply to works and not to physical manifestations of those works ..." This issue had been brought up in a letter submitted to CC:DA from the Music Library Association's liaison to CC:DA, Phil Schreur from UC, Berkeley.

Glenn Patton gave some historical perspective on the development of these rules: in AACR1, whereas moving image materials were always considered works of shared or mixed responsibility, sound recordings should be cataloged just like the "works" of which they are a physical manifestation. While the special rules for choice of access points for sound recordings were carried over into Part II of AACR2, those for moving image

materials were not. Nonetheless, for other reasons, the rules are generally interpreted to consider videorecordings works of mixed responsibility.

CAPC agreed with the view in Schreur's letter that "videorecordings of musical performances cannot be said to be purely musical works according to the AACR2R definition, as a musical work is a 'Musical composition ... intended for performance,' a concept which does not seem to include the performances themselves; therefore, the AACR2R Chapter 21 rules for 'Musical Works' cannot be applied directly to videorecordings of musical performances."

CAPC suggested that in its interpretation of the wording in the Introduction to AACR2R, Part II, CAPC understands the term "manifestation" to mean physical carrier or format, not the performance as a manifestation of the work.

CAPC spoke out in support of the wording under "Operas, Musicals, Ballets" on p. 6 of the Working Group's document that recommends such videorecordings be entered under title according to AACR2R 21.1C1a.

In the section "Concert and Recital Performances" (p. 7), CAPC voted in favor of the recommendation to apply sound recording rules (AACR2R 21.23) to such videorecordings, but with a request to amend the wording "principal purpose ... of a concert or recital performance, which is to create an aural experience." It was the consensus of the group that a videorecording can never be a strictly aural experience. The visual impact cannot be negated. Chair Harwood will include a remark to this effect in his letter to BCC.

The "Collections" section cites and supports an LC Rule Interpretation concerning music videos, which recommends considering collections of videotaped musical performances moving image works and entering them under title. CAPC endorsed this wording.

CAPC had no further comments on the rest of the document.

Chair Harwood asked for a show of hands, and the majority of CAPC members present (5 out of 7) agreed that they could fundamentally support the document in its present form.

Chair Harwood expressed his appreciation to MLA for soliciting CAPC's input on the document.

(b) Guidelines for Interactive Media

Laurel Jizba described the methodology of the CC:DA Interactive Media Guidelines Task Force (appointed at ALA Midwinter 1993) and summarized Friday afternoon's review forum. She distributed two handouts: a reproduction of the six-page Guidelines draft from July 1992 and a copy of the June 1993 revisions. L. Jizba introduced the four members of the Task Force present, Eric Childress, Nancy Davey, and Jo Davidson and

thanked everyone at the CAPC meeting for all of the comments on the draft that had come from the cataloging community.

Important changes were made to the definition of Interactive Media, including changing its name to Interactive Multimedia. This name change will also be recommended by the Task Force as a change to the GMD. There have been many calls in the cataloging community for a new AACR2 chapter to cover these materials.

L. Jizba read the timeline for the development, which includes a chance for catalogers to "try out" the guidelines in practice and solicited volunteers among catalogers present for cataloging a set of samples between August 1 and September 15, 1993. The final report and draft Guidelines will be submitted to CC:DA in December 1993 for distribution at ALA Midwinter (February 1994). The committee hopes that CC:DA will then forward the Guidelines to CCS and the ALCTS Publication Committee for editorial work, to be published in summer of 1994.

(c) OLAC draft statement, "Why Catalog AV Material?"

CAPC member Mary Konkel, Chair of the CAPC subcommittee charged with drafting this statement, introduced the members of the subcommittee: Virginia Berringer, Nancy Rodich-Hodges, and Johanne LaGrange. V. Urbanski had sent M. Konkel comments on the interim draft as it stands now. The purpose, direction and audience of the statement is still not clear.

Chair Harwood suggested that the draft be forwarded to the Executive Board for further clarification of the charge to the subcommittee.

3. (a) MARBI documents of interest to OLAC

John Attig gave the report for N. Olson, briefly describing each of the documents that had been distributed in the CAPC packet:

Proposal no. 93-12: *Additions to Accommodate Curriculum Information in USMARC Bibliographic Records* (source: Northwest Ohio Education Technology Foundation)

--expansion of scope of 520 note to include curriculum information

--additional sophistication in the 521 field (new subfield for motivation/interest level)

--658 field for curriculum objective index term

Discussion paper no. 67: *Multiple Versions in the USMARC Formats* (source: Library of Congress)

Reviews the recent work undertaken on finding a suitable technique for constructing records for items that are the same in content but different in physical representation. Suggests that the technique recommended by the Multiple Versions Forum for communicating hierarchically organized records (with version information in the holdings area) may be too difficult; the suggested alternative is a separate record for each

version (full- or minimal-level). J. Attig predicted there would be lengthy discussion on this at Saturday morning's MARBI meeting.

Discussion paper no. 68: *007 Physical Description Fixed Field for Computer Files*
(source: *National Serials Data Program*)

New field. Some characteristics to consider are: physical carriers, color, sound, density, dimensions, and direct or remote access (007 or 008)

Discussion paper no. 69: *Accommodating Online Systems and Services in USMARC*
(source: *Library of Congress/OCLC Internet Resources Project*)

Discusses the need for USMARC records to describe and provide access to online systems and services, and whether the appropriate format is the Community Information Format with bibliographic fields added or a Bibliographic Format with community information fields added. New field 856 would show location of and access to an Internet resource.

Another MARBI issue of interest to OLAC CAPC was how to record numbers found on physical carriers in an expanded 024 field; MARBI is working on the definition of which numbers belong in this field (bar codes, etc.).

(b) Other new business:

Eric Childress had information to distribute on how to subscribe to the listserv EMEDIA.

Chair Harwood thanked outgoing CAPC members Mary Konkel, Sue Neumeister, and Johanne LaGrange for their service on CAPC.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 p.m.