

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
February 14, 1997
Minutes**

The meeting was called to order by Diane Boehr, CAPC Chair, at 8:03 PM.

Members present: Diane Boehr (Chair), Ann Caldwell, Marcia Evans, Catherine Gerhart, Marlyn Hackett, Mary Beth Fecko, Mike Essman.

There were 24 guests.

1. Members and guests introduced themselves.
2. The [minutes](#) of the meeting of Oct. 4, 1996 (OLAC Conference in Denton) were approved as published in the Dec. 1996 *OLAC Newsletter*.
3. Old Business
 - a. OLAC NACO AV Funnel Project Update (Ann Caldwell)

Please see separately submitted [report](#) in this issue.

One area of concern for the project is that we still don't have a backup person for Ann as coordinator. This needs to be someone who has had NACO training. If anyone is interested, please contact either Ann or Diane. Ann would also like to have another person with NACO training to just consult with now and then about specific headings.

- b. Audience Characteristics Subcommittee Report (Mary Beth Fecko)

The Subcommittee plans to finalize their report so that it will be completed for the 1997 ALA Annual Conference. In the report, they plan to make specific suggestions to CAPC for actions to be taken, and can later possibly present some in this information in a position paper to MARBI. In finalizing the report they will contact other relevant groups, such as Cataloging of Children's Materials and reference groups who can help them locate lists of appropriate terms and provide them with input on how these terms are used by patrons.

- c. MLA Discussion Paper on the Use of the 028/037 Fields (Karen Little)

The Subcommittee on MARC Formats of the Music Library Association (MLA) has written a discussion paper that explores the current uses of fields 028 (Publisher Number) and 037 (Source of Acquisition) in the bibliographic format and evaluates the need to modify the field definitions to match those uses. Karen Little of MLA initially brought this topic before CAPC a year ago, at which time OLAC indicated that they were interested in supporting further work on the issue,

and now would like some feedback on the options outlined in the paper. Briefly explained, the problem has arisen because some music publishers are assigning publisher numbers to books that are analogous to the numbers they assign to music, and catalogers would like to be able to include these numbers in the 028, but that field is not valid for books. Also, in the case of videorecordings, it is often not clear whether a number on the item is a publisher's number (028) or a stock number (037). Attempts to clarify the difference between a publisher's number and a stock number have not been successful. Generally, catalogers want to use the 028 for any numbers that they think are bibliographically significant.

The discussion paper puts forth three options: a. Leave things the way they are; b. Keep both fields, but make the 028 valid in all formats; and c. Combine the 028 and 037 into a single field. A concern with option b is that retaining both fields without a good definition between the two would result in catalogers agonizing over where to put the number. A concern with option c is that lumping all numbers together with no regard for their significance might create a cluttered, unusable index. After some discussion, CAPC members came out generally in favor of option b. An informal show of hands among all of those present indicated a close split between options b and c, with a slight edge for option b. One person was in favor of option a. CAPC is willing to co-sponsor a discussion paper with MLA on this topic to be submitted to MARBI.

- d. *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia*--an Update on the Practice of LC and NLM (D. Boehr)

D. Boehr discovered recently that the Library of Congress (LC) had made an internal decision not to follow the *Guidelines* for cataloging interactive multimedia. D. Boehr had distributed copies of a letter sent to Laurel Jizba, Chair of the CC:DA subcommittee looking at revising the *Guidelines*, from the LC's Cataloging Policy and Support Office. The most problematic area the LC catalogers had identified was not being able to decide whether the work being cataloged fit the *Guidelines* definition of interactive multimedia. This problem was magnified by the fact that the LC catalogers did not have the option of mounting the files and trying them out to determine the "degree of user control." They had found the *Guidelines* most helpful in providing guidance for handling multiple physical carriers, but changes in technology have resulted in most works being issued on a single physical carrier (an optical disc.) For these reasons they had recommended that all computer files be cataloged using Chapter 9 of AACR2. They did outline several areas where recommendations from the *Guidelines* should be incorporated into Chapter 9 or into LCRIs.

D. Boehr explained further that when NLM (National Library of Medicine) heard about LC's decision, they thought it was a good idea and decided to follow the same policy as of January 1997. None of this was publicized or made known to the general cataloging community. LC never really cataloged much of this type of material anyway, but NLM has cataloged a lot of it and still does. There isn't very

much difference in the records, except for the general material designation (gmd) [interactive multimedia] vs. [computer file].

There was some discussion about whether NLM records cataloged as computer files in OCLC would overlay records already present that were cataloged as interactive multimedia, or whether duplicate records would result. Eric Childress, of OCLC, was not sure about this, but he brought up the additional fact that the new ISBD for computer files, which is working its way through the international bodies that have to approve it, has changed its name to ISBD for Electronic Resources. As a result, Laurel Jizba is bringing a proposal to CC:DA (tomorrow) to abandon the gmd [interactive multimedia] in favor of [electronic resource]. (See CC:DA report in a future OLAC Newsletter issue for more information on this topic.)

- e. Draft Rewrite of OLAC's Statement of *Rationale for Cataloging Nonprint Collections* (D. Boehr)

D. Boehr explained that she was not completely sure what R. Harwood wanted in terms of a rewrite. R. Harwood explained that he wanted CAPC to determine whether the statement was worded broadly enough to incorporate electronic resources and, possibly, information sources that might not be physically housed in the library, but that if CAPC felt it was premature to change the statement then that was their decision.

The statement of *Rationale* is dated 6/95 and was originally distributed to administrators and managers to be a philosophical and practical explanation of why it's just as important to catalog non-print materials as it is to catalog materials in traditional book form.

D. Boehr will appoint a subcommittee to work on this and have a draft version to discuss at the next meeting.

- f. Core Categories for Visual Resources (D. Boehr)

The Data Standards Committee of the Visual Resources Association asked OLAC for comments on their draft document *Core Categories for Visual Resources*, which defines needed descriptive elements in records for art objects. This was submitted to CAPC after the October meeting but the comments were needed before this meeting, so CAPC was unable to discuss it. CAPC members commented on it via Email and D. Boehr composed a letter which was sent to that association.

4. New Business

- a. MARBI Proposals and Discussion Papers (J. Attig)

John Attig reported on selected proposals and discussion papers that MARBI would be deciding on at this conference. (His [complete report](#) with an explanation of the documents and MARBI results can be found in this issue.) CAPC supported Proposal 97-1 which makes some changes to the 856 field to facilitate the practice of using this field to describe the electronic location of related resources. CAPC did not come to any consensus on Proposal 97-3, a redefinition of code "m" in Leader/06 (Type of material.) This controversial proposal has at its heart the larger concept of whether we should be cataloging a work based on its content vs. its carrier.

b. Using the MARC 310 Field in Non-serial Material (Meredith Horan)

Meredith Horan from the National Library of Medicine, described a problem with cataloging entities such as databases, electronic lists and web sites, which are not considered to be serials according to current rules. The closest thing like these in the print world are loose-leaf publications. M. Horan cited the recent publications of Crystal Graham of UC San Diego and Jean Hirons of CONSER that point out the problems in describing these types of works because they don't really fit as either serials or monographs.

In cataloging their own databases, the catalogers at NLM would like to be able to use the 310 field to record information about update frequency. They think that with format integration, it is appropriate to use this field in a record not coded as a serial. However, OCLC has not validated this field for such use. When they contacted OCLC, they were told by Robert Bremer that there is some debate as to what fields belong in a monograph record, and they would like more direction from LC.

The broader question here is that we may need to either change the definition of a serial, or provide for a different bibliographic level for something in between a monograph and a serial. John Attig pointed out that Graham and Hirons will be presenting a paper on this at the Toronto conference next fall. (This is the International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR, being convened by the Joint Steering Committee of AACR.)

Meanwhile, catalogers are making do by using a 500 note for update frequency information, and one institution is adding an 006 to the record to reflect seriality even though that may not be a strict interpretation of how that field is supposed to be used.

CAPC will look at this issue more closely and discuss it again at the next meeting.

c. Necessity of 538 and Source of Title Notes When Cataloging Internet Resources (Krista Hoffman)

Krista Hoffman, Cataloging Director of NLM, expressed her concerns about having the 538 and the source of title being required for cataloging Internet resources. She thinks that this is a waste of time, and cannot justify the extra time it takes to do this in a production environment. She thinks we need to trust the cataloger more.

Concerning the source of title note: There was a heated discussion about why this note is important. D. Boehr explained that copy catalogers need to know whether they have the same thing as what is described in a record, and titles can vary depending on where you take them from. John Attig pointed out that Chapter 9 is the only chapter that allows the cataloger to choose the chief source, and this makes it important to note where the title was taken from. The general consensus of the group was that the minuscule amount of time that it would save to leave off this note may cause the users of these records to waste a great deal of time determining if they have a match.

Concerning the 538, the group agreed with K. Hoffman that a very generic note such as "Available through the Internet" was sufficient because system requirements for viewing Internet resources change frequently. Nancy Olson noted that the forthcoming new version of the OCLC Internet Cataloging Manual has a very general statement such as this in the 538, with more specific URL information in the 856.

d. Proper Use of the 546 Field (Nancy Olson)

Nancy Olson had planned to discuss this problem at the meeting, but it was solved the day before she left to come to the conference. Many people had been asking her for help with tagging of notes for videos with captions (both open and closed), described videos, intertitles, videos that are signed, etc. She appealed to Glenn Patton of OCLC about this, and after some discussion with others at OCLC and at LC, he formulated a rationale that explains that all of these enhancements are a part of Ra continuum of the language aspects of moving image materials that moves from title cards and intertitles... in silent films, to dubbing in another language, to subtitles in another language, to subtitles in the same language (which is really what traditional closed captioning is), to signing in the same or another language, to audio description, etc. This reasoning persuaded LC to change their policy to include all these types of notes in MARC field 546 as language notes. An internal LC statement has been prepared, and we can expect this to appear in future MARC documentation.

Nancy's paper pointed out that CAPC could still help clarify this area by drawing up a list of notes as examples that could be used by catalogers of videos, as well as proposals for subject headings and fixed field codes. There may also be uses for such notes, headings and codes when cataloging materials other than video. (See [Language Code for Sign Language](#) and ["Language" of Videos](#) this issue.)

5. Adjournment

D. Boehr adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Thompson
OLAC Secretary