

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
OLAC CONFERENCE
DENTON, TEXAS**

**October 4, 1996
Minutes**

The meeting was called to order by Diane Boehr, CAPC Chair, at 3:00 p.m.

Members present: Diane Boehr (Chair), Ann Caldwell, Marcia Evans, Catherine Gerhart, Marlyn Hackett.

There were 14 guests.

1. Members and guests introduced themselves.
2. The [minutes](#) of the meeting of July 5, 1996 (ALA Annual Conference in New York City) were approved as published in the September 1996 *OLAC Newsletter*.
3. Old Business
 - a. OLAC NACO-AV Funnel Project Update (A. Caldwell)

A. Caldwell reviewed the names of the first trainees for the project: Richard Baumgarten (Johnson County (Kansas) Public Library), Virginia Berringer (University of Akron), Jo Davidson (University of Georgia), Heidi Hutchinson (UC Riverside), David Prochazka (Rush University), Martha Yee (UCLA Film and Television Archive). (Martha Yee was unable to attend.) The training to be held the following morning was to incorporate 5 days of LC NACO training into 5 hours. She is waiting for LC to assign NUC symbols for each person. These symbols will be published in the *OLAC Newsletter* so that we will be able to recognize the records when they appear. [See [here](#).] Once the records start appearing, she would appreciate comments from users. Because the contributors represent a diverse set of libraries: a public library, a very specialized archive, and academic libraries with quite different collections, she is hoping to get a wide variety of headings.

Plans are to expand the project in the future. Several interested people have expressed some concerns about the time it will take to contribute. If you are already doing any kind of authority work, then once you get through the initial learning period for NACO procedures, and work out your workflow, the time will be minimal. Also, there is no minimum number of records that you have to contribute. If you are already in a NACO library, you can still join. You will be assigned a separate NUC symbol for this project and the contributions will go through this Funnel instead of through your regular library channels. It's important to keep this project vital and growing because it shows the strength of the AV community. Also, the combination of this Funnel and the NACO Music

Funnel will give very good coverage to headings for nonprint materials. Catalogers of any type of collection are welcome.

OLAC has received tremendous support for this undertaking from LC's Cataloging Policy and Support Office and A. Caldwell was especially grateful to Ann Della Porta for her assistance.

b. Audience Characteristics Subcommittee Report--Further Discussion (Committee)

D. Boehr summarized the issue up to this point: This subcommittee, chaired by Mary Beth Fecko, was charged to prepare a discussion paper describing the various ways in which the MARC record could be modified to provide access to materials based on audience characteristics or on features designed to accommodate special needs of potential users. M.B. Fecko submitted a report at the last meeting (July 1996) which was very thorough and laid out all the options, several of which would require some sort of group to devise lists of approved terms to be used as headings or in notes, or categories to be coded in fixed fields, etc. This brings up the question of who that group would be. At that last meeting and since then, Boehr has gotten some indication that this issue isn't perceived to be as important as it was when the subcommittee was first charged in 1994, so before going any further it is necessary to determine whether the interest or need is still there.

The question was presented to the group for discussion.

C. Gerhart has heard of a reference librarian group working on a list of common terms for curriculum and grade levels. Everyone agreed that if there are other groups working on this we need to coordinate our efforts. MARBI recently approved new indicators for the 521 field (Audience) for age, grade, reading level, and interest level. There are also codes to indicate which list of terms is being used, similar to the codes for subject heading schemes. However, no authorized lists or terms have been developed yet, so it's just free text right now.

Some audience members have tried to include curriculum or grade level information in catalog records and have encountered many difficulties, including the fact that the information is not always given on the item, and when it is, it is often given in an abbreviated or coded form that is not clear. Some publishers do indicate reading level and interest level on their items but there is no standard terminology between publishers. Sometimes these designations are hard to find or are even coded to protect a child's self-esteem (such as 3 triangles for 3rd grade reading level). Also, many publishers use various terminology for marketing purposes and there is no way the cataloger can evaluate this information.

D. Boehr will get in touch with M.B. Fecko (currently Chair of the ALCTS AV Committee) and the other group that was mentioned to see if there is interest in pursuing this further.

4. New Business

- a. Recommendation concerning the *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia* (Committee discussion)

Laurel Jizba, Chair of the CC:DA subcommittee looking at revising the *Guidelines*, had requested a formal written response from CAPC giving suggestions and concerns about the *Guidelines*. CAPC members had already started the discussion over e-mail. Some of the suggestions were: To include more MARC tagging examples and complete MARC records, including the 0XX fields and to incorporate format integration changes; to include more examples of the type of titles that would be found in public libraries, such as travel planners, Walt Disney productions, and decorating guides; and to combine the notes for source of title and source of edition statement. Many people like the repeatable 538 fields. The term "computer optical disc" in the 300 field was pointed out as being not very helpful to users, and perhaps some other term could be found. Someone wanted a clarification of when the statements of responsibility area belong in the 245 and when in a note, because the example on p. 25 is not consistent with the explanation given. Another area needing clarification has to do with the source of title note. Since the chief source of information is the entire item, then if the same information appears in several places on the item, which place should be cited in the note? We may need a note something like: "Consistent title on all sources."

Some discussion ensued concerning the definition of interactive multimedia itself and using the general material designation (GMD) "interactive multimedia." The distinction between what is and what is not interactive multimedia is getting very blurry-- more and more software is going in the direction of interactive and multimedia. There is a concern that we may be creating a separate class of materials that doesn't exist. It may be that much of the innovative concepts in the *Guidelines* needs to just be incorporated into Chapter 9, and have interactive multimedia not be a separate type of material, but be designated as one type of computer file. On the other hand, some people like the GMD. They are still getting a lot of non-interactive computer files, such as reference databases, and like to be able to distinguish between the two types. One problem mentioned in applying the definition is that if you can't load the item and run it, you have to rely on the information on the package or container, and publishers like to use the word "interactive." Sometimes you can use the system requirements as an indicator, but not always, because there are a lot of works with sound and video that are not interactive. It takes a lot of judgment. The question was asked: Should the GMD be so judgment-oriented? GMDs are meant to be broad umbrella-type terms, and then you can use other parts of the record to designate the format more specifically and describe it fully. Another point was raised concerning the new version of the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Computer files (ISBD(CF)) that is circulating now for international approval. This document replaces the GMD "computer file" with "electronic resource" and also treats interactive multimedia as one type of electronic resource. If and when the ISBD changes, AACR2R will have to be revised to comply with it.

L. Jizba asked CAPC to address the question: Are the *Guidelines* a useful enough document to go through the process of revising it? She pointed out that it is written in a way so that parts of it can never be incorporated into AACR2R as those rules are currently arranged. The Committee agreed unanimously that it was useful.

D. Boehr will draft a formal response for the Committee and submit it to L. Jizba by November 1.

- b. ALCTS AV Committee's rule-change proposal to change the definition of the term "label." (Committee discussion)

This proposal was presented by the ALCTS AV Committee to CC:DA in July. It concerns changing the definition of the term "label" in AACR2R for chapters 6, 7, 8, and 9 to include information permanently embossed or imprinted on the item as well as a separate label that is affixed to the item. CC:DA sent this proposal back to ALCTS AV to rework in conjunction with a representative from the Music Library Association.

CAPC did not get a copy of this proposal to comment on before it was submitted. D. Boehr will contact OLAC's liaison with ALCTS AV to request to be included in the revision of the proposal.

- c. Possible revision of OLAC's statement of Rationale for Cataloging Nonprint Material (Richard Harwood)

R. Harwood, OLAC President, asked CAPC to review the statement to determine whether it is inclusive enough to incorporate the cataloging of remote resources. D. Boehr read the statement as it is currently printed. R. Harwood asked the group to look at the question "What does audiovisual or nonprint mean?" and to look toward whether the wording of the statement is adequate in helping to define OLAC's identity and role in the current world of cataloging.

After a brief discussion about words like "material" vs. "resource" and "resources" vs. "collections," it was agreed that CAPC would draft a new version of the *Rationale*.

5. Adjournment

D. Boehr adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Pat Thompson
OLAC Secretary