

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)  
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)  
ALA ANNUAL MEETING  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA**

**FEBRUARY 3, 1995  
Minutes**

The meeting was called to order by Mary Konkel, OLAC President, for absent CAPC Chair Richard Harwood at 8:00 p.m.

Members present: Diane Boehr, Pat Thompson, Susan Bailey, Lowell Ashley, Brian McCafferty, Virginia Berringer, Nancy Rodich-Hodges

Guests: John Attig (MARBI liaison), Harriet Harrison (Library of Congress contact), Eric Childress (ALCTS AV contact) and 20 other guests

1. Members and guests introduced themselves. M. Konkel asked that everyone sign the attendance sheet being passed around.
2. The [minutes](#) of the October 7, 1994 meeting were approved as printed in *OLAC Newsletter* 14 (4).
3. Old Business
  - a. OLAC/CAPC PCC Update

M. Konkel reported for Richard Harwood on a letter sent to Sarah Thomas at Library of Congress formally volunteering our services to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) for the formation of a core record for nonbook materials. Thomas replied that our letter has been forwarded to the PCC. She has also asked John Byrum of the Regional Cooperative Cataloging Council to have a staff member talk with CAPC about a possible NACO funnel project in which OLAC members could participate in contributing authority records to the national authority file. Currently authority records for media materials are lacking in the national database.

- b. 7.7B2 Rule Proposal and LC Interpretation Request

E. Childress reported that this proposal, which would further refine the note dealing with language enhancements, will be discussed at CC:DA Monday. The Joint Steering Committee (JSC) had agreed on some minor changes last year. The proposal needed additional changes. D. Boehr

worked extensively on this and explained the reasoning behind the recommendations and asked for comments from the attendees.

J. Attig commented on the general tendency JSC has to not want to revisit proposals and since this was on the table last year they may not want to deal with it again. Also, they will not want to have examples of every language enhancement possible in the rules and an LCRI giving guidance might be a better direction. H. Harrison commented that LC has agreed not to pursue LCRIs when a rule revision is in the works.

E. Childress pointed out that the focus is to refine these changes before they are printed as a change to AACR2R. Childress wondered if we needed definitions of any of the terms being used. J. Attig thought that, in the past, definition of terms used in examples were not allowed.

#### 4. New Business

M. Konkel had two announcements. First, Konkel attended the OCLC Users Council meeting and wanted to announce a call made at that meeting for participation in an Internet cataloging project. Konkel has forms available for this project. CAPC will be forwarding their name as resource for this project. Second, CAPC has a Task Force looking at Audience Characteristics but the report is not ready so it will be submitted at the June meeting. The members of this Task Force are V. Berringer, N. Rodich-Hodges, and J. Attig as a consultant.

##### a. MARBI Proposals/Discussion Papers

CAPC members had received copies of these documents before the meeting. MARBI liaison J. Attig summarized them and pointed out aspects of interest to CAPC.

- **Discussion Paper no. 81:** *Form of Music Codes*

This paper discusses the future of the 047, Form of Music Codes in the MARC Format. LC has issued a rule interpretation indicating that they will not be adding this field. Since this information is nearly always present in the record in an eye-readable form, it is under debate whether it is also useful in coded form.

CAPC members and audience were not in agreement on whether this was needed or not. The coded form is more consistent than the free text form.

The lack of needed codes is very frustrating. In terms of interest in pursuing, no CAPC members were interested and only two audience members were.

- **Discussion Paper no. 82:** *Merging Field 755 with Field 655*

This paper was brought up by the Rare Books and the Subject Access communities. There is a basic problem with the way these two fields work. The writers of this paper are the main users of the fields and they would like to make sure that there are not others that need to make this distinction. The differences between the two fields are not easily identified and are probably not useful to the catalog user. D. Boehr moved to support the paper, V. Berringer, seconded. It passed unanimously.

- **Proposal 95-2:** *Definition of Subfield \$v for Form Subdivisions*

This proposal, if approved, would allow \$v defined for form subdivisions. LC is seriously considering using a technique like this. NLM is already identifying these terms and would like to use them as soon as possible. The AAT also would very much like to differentiate between form and topic in their subject strings. J. Attig emphasized that this subfield would definitely be optional and used when people wanted.

The question arose whether the computer can be used to convert these headings. Arlene Taylor has done a study that has shown that only two-tenths of 1% would be converted incorrectly.

CAPC supports the proposal while recognizing the obstacles yet to overcome.

- **Proposal 95-6:** *Linking Code for Reproduction Information*

This proposal deals with one solution to the multiple versions problem discussed in the last few years. The technique of linking all the fields that have to do with the reproduction would allow systems to pull that data together and display it in a subordinate

record without having to implement subordinate records at the network level. At ALA in Miami, the examples looked differently because they used real fields rather than the 533 field. Anything not in the 533 could be added and linked to the 533. The 00X fields cannot be linked since they cannot have subfields. One question is whether the 533 is a better way to go than the separate fields.

Another problem that will need to be looked into is how to use this in a local system. It is assumed that if this additional coding is added, the coding will be optional, like the 505 implementation.

CAPC supports the proposal recognizing that there are still problems to be worked out and that it should be optional.

#### 5. Source of Title Note for Films and Videos (From ALCTS AV)

E. Childress began the discussion of a proposal ALCTS AV is considering writing that would make the source of title note required for media. They are interested in OLAC's reaction on whether this would be a worthwhile proposal or not. One reason this is being considered is that in Chapter 9, this information is required and it is very convenient having it there. Most of the same problems occur in media as in computer files, like variations in title in different places.

There was some feeling from the group that it would be too time-consuming to always type in "Title from title frame." Others definitely would like to have this information included so that they would not have to figure it out. A long discussion and some straw votes were taken to give E. Childress some idea what people thought about this issue. There was agreement that if the title is not from the title frame it should be noted and that it would be good if the rules were changed to reflect this. There was disagreement about whether the note should be there no matter what the source is.

#### 6. CC:DA Proposals

E. Childress reported that the Australians have withdrawn their proposal about changing technical specification notes in Chapter 7.

L. Ashley reported on the Working Group on Music Videos. The manual will be issued with title main entry being recommended if following current rules. Two papers have been written for presentation at the next MLA meeting that address the issue of main entry for music videos. One paper presents the pro

and one the con. E. Childress continued that CC:DA will probably be looking at setting up a Task Force to look at this.

There are four Chapter 9 changes being brought to CC:DA. The abbreviations for computer memory terms are being reconsidered. The spelling of "disc" in the rules is finally being finished. The chief source of information for computer files when sources vary is being refined. An indication in the rules that compressed files be decompressed before cataloging is also being considered.

Finally, further refine the mode of access note to Internet resources. They will be discussing whether the phrase should go in the text or in the examples. Also, how full should the examples be and should it be in the 856 as well as the note.

- The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m. Respectfully submitted,  
Cathy Gerhart  
OLAC Secretary