

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE
San Francisco, California
June 15, 2001**

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM. by Meredith Horan, CAPC Chair. Members present included: Meredith Horan, Greta de Groat, Iris Wolley, Steven Miller, David Reynolds, John DeSantis, Robert Freeborn, Rebecca Lubas (intern) and Lisa Bodenheimer (intern). Ex officio members present included: Vicki Toy-Smith (CC:DA Audience Observer), John Attig (MARBI Liaison), and Ann Caldwell (NACO-AV Funnel Coordinator). Ex officio member David Procházka (NACO-AV Assistant Coordinator) was unable to attend.

1. Chair Meredith Horan welcomed new CAPC members Steven Miller and Robert Freeborn and interns Rebecca Lubas and Lisa Bodenheimer. There were 41 guests. Members and guests introduced themselves.
2. Minutes of the CAPC meeting from January 2001 could not be approved as the March newsletter had not yet reached all of the OLAC membership.
3. Subcommittee reports
 - a. Authority Tools (I. Wolley)

Iris Wolley described the [*Bibliography of Authority Tools for AV Catalogers*](#) and reported that it is on the OLAC Web site in its final form, but will be updated periodically. David Procházka, its current editor, will be calling for new titles to be added between August 2001 and February 2002, along with people to review them and create annotations for them. He plans to do his final updates next February.
 - b. Source of Title for Internet Resources (I. Wolley)

Iris is taking over the final development of this document. She reported that it is essentially complete as to content but needs some tweaking, a bit of rewriting, and a new format. The Task Force on Source of Title Note for Internet Resources, who coordinated this project, included Marcia Barrett (Chair), Becky Culbertson, and Louise Reis. The project began as an investigation into what parts of a Web site are used for source of title notes, how to define them, and which ones might be prescribed sources. Two documents were produced: [*Source of Title Note for Internet Resources*](#), submitted by Marcia Barrett, and a second document comprising the text of the first one and graphics of the examples. Iris requested that CAPC members review both documents and report to Iris by the end of July, especially as to format. URLs for these documents can be obtained from Iris.

4. NACO-AV Funnel (A. Caldwell)

Ann Caldwell reported the statistics mounted on the PCC Web site for the LC fiscal year running from Oct. 1, 2000 through Mar. 31, 2001. The NACO-AV Funnel added 954 new names, 5 new series, and changed 159 names, an excellent contribution. LC has expressed concern about low producers and people who have not contributed anything. In some cases, people have retired or left an institution, their positions have not been filled, and the institution has not continued to participate in the project. LC has asked who should be put on inactive status, and Ann has put several institutions on inactive status, even though she is not exactly sure what this means. From now on, when Ann calls for volunteers to be trained for the Funnel, she will be asking for a more firm commitment that people will be contributing records. Collectively, though, the AV Funnel has been one of the most productive NACO funnels.

5. MARBI (J. Attig)

John Attig reported on current proposals and discussions before MARBI, as follows:

Repeatability of the 508 field (200 1-07). The basic proposal is supported by CAPC, but there was no interest in merging the 508 and 511 fields into one. Additional items of a subfield 3 and subfield u within the 508 will probably become separate proposals. Jane Johnson expressed AMIAs concern that in the case of a single work with multiple titles, making the 508 repeatable might encourage putting multiple titles on a single bibliographic record inappropriately.

DVDs in 007 for videorecordings (2001-08). Coding for DVDs is not clear. There is no code for DVD, and in some cases the term “optical disc” may not apply. This will probably end up with two values, for analog and digital DVD.

Additions to 007/10 for sound recordings (2001-10). The proposal is to add and redefine some elements, dealing mostly with archival types of sound recordings. Since these are technical, CAPC decided not to discuss them.

Expanding Field 046 for Other Dates (Discussion paper 2001-DPO4), especially for electronic resources. As part of mapping qualified Dublin Core to MARC, it was discovered that there are several dates that can be recorded in qualified DC that don't have a good place in MARC records. The suggestion is to use field 046 (expanded version of the date codes in fixed fields) for date modified, date valid, or date created. There are issues here that have more implications than format. John urged CAPC members to look at the paper and think about its implications.

For details on the progress of these MARBI discussions, see the [MARBI report](#) elsewhere in this issue.

6. CC:DA (J. Attig)

John first reported on the revisions to chapter 9 of AA CR2. The text of the revision was

sent to the publisher in April, and JSC has received back the typeset version. It is in the final stages of proofreading and may be published by the end of July. There is no word on its final form, or how it will be announced or distributed. Updates to the index for the last few revisions to AACR2 may be published along with the revisions to chapter 9. John has received the publisher's permission to distribute the revisions in advance of publication to a small group of OLAC members who volunteered to work on informing the cataloging community of these changes and providing some orientation/training information on a Web site. He recommends having the site up by the time the revisions are published, and publicizing it widely.

Chapter 9 changes may not be as extensive as the upcoming changes to chapter 12. In conjunction with chapter 12 revisions, input to CONSER via Jean Hiron was urged, since CONSER has been looking at only print and networked resources as examples of integrating resources. Anyone having examples of integrating resources in formats that are non-print and non-networked, such as slides or CD-ROMs, should send them to Jean.

Other CC:DA matters John mentioned included the implications of chapter 12 revisions for certain types of materials, one of which is the definition of integrating resources, particularly as it applies to cartographic materials. Another matter is the recommendation that area 3 be eliminated from chapter 9 and that the information currently in area 3 be placed in notes.

Subsequent to these recommendations, the cartographic materials community responded that certain critical pieces of information on the nature of the content of the resource being described need to be given in area 5 along with the nature and extent of the carrier, because they are related, and that this needs to happen whether the resources are direct or remote. They are asking for a different sort of revision of the rules for specific characteristics. Suspecting that cartographic materials are special in this regard, John had put out a brief e-mail discussion paper asking if the situation might apply to other types of formats. Is this situation more broadly based than cartographic materials? Greta de Groat responded that she sees implications for several types of non-book materials, for example photo CDs (photograph on CD-ROM, or on a slide, or on a piece of paper, all with the same intellectual content) and motion pictures (on videotape, on videodisc, or on 16-mm. film, again with the same intellectual content) so that other chapters of AACR2 could be affected. John said that taking this seriously would mean rewriting the rules in the light of a statement in the revised 0.24 that says to treat all aspects of the item essentially equally; this is the first time we're being asked whether we really meant it.

John said that there are some inherently tangled concepts here, and the SMDs in chapter 3 do mix aspects of content and carrier and they can't be separated. Many of our SMDs contain hidden implications. It's already a mess; how compelled are we to try to clean it up? Iris Wolley responded that she is not sure that what the maps people want to do will clear up the issues of content and carrier for other formats. But why not look at it?

7. Reports/Discussions

- a. Abstract Writing Primer (S. Holmes)

Sheryl Holmes reported on the Task Force on 520 Summary Notes that she chairs. In some formats 520s are mandated; in others they are optional, and there are very few detailed guidelines as to how they should be created as to style and content. In light of the increased use of keyword searching, this is a timely topic. The group is well into the information gathering stage. They have compiled a draft bibliography, most of which is annotated. It is in the process of being posted to a Web site. They are also collecting examples; most of the examples they have to date are for computer files and videos. The group members at ALA plan to meet and discuss how to distil this information into something useful soon.
- b. DVD Primer (R. Freeborn)

Robert Freeborn reported on the DVD Cataloging Task Force working on a primer for cataloging of all sorts of DVDs. Other members are Nancy Olson, Sueyoung Park, Scott Diefenberg, and Verna Urbanski. The group's charge is to develop guidelines that will provide an introduction to DVDs, explanations of the types of DVDs, discussion of problems associated with identifying relevant information, suggestions for successful cataloging of DVDs, MARC-encoded examples, and a bibliography. They have not decided whether to publish the guidelines online, in print, or both. They plan to have everything except chapter-by-chapter recommendations done, including the bibliography, by next spring. Robert's complete report will be available on the OLAC Web site.
- c. Core for Maps (A. Caldwell)

Ann Caldwell reported, as Chair of the PCC Standing Committee on Standards, on the group she had appointed to draft a core standard for maps, the only format not yet having a core standard. The group consisted of Paige Andrew, Chair (Penn State), Nancy Holcomb (Cornell), Nancy Kandoian (New York Public Library), Mary Larsgaard (UCSB), Rebecca Lubas (MIT), and Barbara Story (LC's Geography and Map Division). The group's charge was left open, not specifying what type(s) of cartographic materials to cover, or whether to do one core or several cores for the different types of cartographic materials. They chose the one-stop-shopping approach, covering all of the cartographic formats. They also discovered that they needed to use elements from some of the other core standards, such as computer files; this is the first core standard to do that on a regular basis. The Standards Committee has not yet discussed this core but will be reviewing it at ALA. After review it may be returned to the task group for revisions or clarifications; the final version will then go to the PCC Policy Committee and then it will be available for use.
- d. GMD Survey Results (J. Weihs)

Jean Weihs from the Canadian Library Association reported on her survey on the General Material Designation (GMD) that was funded by the OLAC Research Grant. She wanted to do this study because she was one of two people responsible for the original then-called General Medium Designations, Ben Tucker being the other, back in the 1970s. The list was designed to cost libraries the least money. Jean wanted to know if the GMD still had use in the 21st century, so she drafted a

survey and had it mounted on a Web site. She contacted 54 professional journals and organizations worldwide to publicize it. Of these, 34 said they would put the survey in their journals and/or on their Web sites; 10 declined; 11 did not reply but may have advertised it. Of all of these, only 158 [157 in final report] responses were received. Jean summarized these responses, in terms of geographic area and type of library.

The survey asked libraries what they had in their collections, and whether they used GMDs. The most used GMDs were videorecording and sound recording; the least used GMD was manuscript. The use of music, art original, globe and chart is not widespread.

One part of the survey that was very interesting was the understanding of the GMD. The survey asked whether the GMD was understood by library users and catalogers. Everyone understood globe. Catalogers understood Braille, slide, and filmstrip 100%. Least understood by users were realia, diorama, and interactive multimedia (not sanctioned by AACR2 but Jean was asked to include it). Least understood by catalogers were interactive multimedia, activity card, and picture. Six GMDs were better understood by users than by catalogers: art reproduction, chart, game, map, picture, and toy. The differences were not huge in this last category.

Some libraries use the GMD as a location device, assigning a different GMD to an item based on the department ordering it.

One thing that came through quite strongly is that people do want to retain General Material Designations. People said that they are even more important in this era of Web catalogs.

Issues for consideration: preservation of standards for derived cataloging; costs involved in changing GMDs to suit individual libraries; misunderstanding of the role of the GMD; general vs. specific GMDs (it takes a long time to get international agreement on these); the difficulty in determining how to slot an item into a particular GMD; unhappiness with the GMD electronic resource because the public thinks of electronics in a much broader way than the GMD, but people don't want to go back to computer file either; formats that are no longer used, such as motion picture, filmstrip, etc. that are now in a different format. Several people said they would like separate electronic resource GMDs for those that are physical format and those that are remote access.

There was unexpected added value to the survey. Several respondents said that the exercise was very helpful in opening up a dialog between their reference and cataloging departments. Others said that it really made them think about the GMDs and that they had changed their minds about the GMD and its usefulness when they did the survey.

In answer to a question, Jean reported that the GMD text was used; 12 people reported that they used it. Some of these said that they used it for textbooks.

Someone in the audience reported that many online catalogs are indexing the GMD term, whether as part of the title, or in a separate index, or combining it with other pieces of information from the MARC record to help specify the format of the material.

Someone else asked whether librarians are talking about the usefulness of the GMD as a way to narrow search results in the catalog. Yes, that was mentioned in the survey results.

The [final version of Jean's report](#) will be sent to the OLAC-List, and mounted on the OLAC Web site.

- e. Proposed RIs concerning uniform titles for video cataloging (G. de Groat)
Greta had come to the last CAPC meeting with a list of problems she had encountered with uniform titles for video cataloging and some suggested solutions. At this meeting, she presented her proposed rule interpretations. Most are either an adaptation or extension of a rule interpretation that already exists, or a clarification of practice as it seems to exist already. On 1.6 concerning television series, since there seems to be no consensus on this, the proposal consists of a general rule and an option. On 25.SB on when to qualify two options are proposed, and one or the other needs to be chosen. Option 1 adapts LC practice for monographs to radio and television programs, adding a qualifier to the title. Option 2 seems to be what people are actually doing currently basically a more broad application of qualifiers than in any other LC rules, except perhaps for serials. Two people spoke in favor of having the two options available for doing television series. The 25.SB option has to be decided upon before these proposals go any further. It was decided to post Greta's report to the OLAC-List for comments from a wider venue than CAPC. [This has been done, with comments to be sent to Greta by the end of July]
8. New business. There was none.
9. Announcements.

Jane Johnson announced that the Society of American Archivists and the Association of Moving Image Archivists are publishing the [AMIA Compendium of Moving Image Cataloging Practice](#). Based on a survey of almost 100 questions, it presents a snapshot in time of the cataloging practices of 27 diverse institutions, thus offering a choice of various solutions to cataloging problems for moving images. It is on the SAA Web site now and is expected to be out in print by the end of June. At that time, the actual procedure manuals from these institutions will be available as PDF files, linked to the AMIA Web site.
10. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy H. Holcomb
OLAC Secretary

Recorded attendees: Greta de Groat, Steve Miller, Jean Weihs, Mary Konkell, Kay Johnson, John Attig, Cathy Gerhart, Catherine Leondardi, Matthew Wise, Francie Mrkich, Sherman Clarke, John Maier, Stephen H. Peters, Norma Hendrickson, Mary Wu, Maxine Sherman, Susan Leister, Bobby Bothmann, Mike Esman, Helen Schmierer, John Hostage, Marijo Wilson, Shelby Harken, Sandy Roe, Jane Johnson, Jeannette Ho, Diane Boehr, Walt Walker, Gene Kinnaly, Jam Fletcher, Meredith Horan, Iris Wolley, Ann Caldwell, Sheryl Holmes, Lisa Bodenheimer, Robert Freeborn, David Reynolds, Rebecca Lubas, Lowell Ashley, John DeSantis, Vicki Toy-Smith, John Felbinger, Gayle Porter, Kevin Furniss, Becky Culbertson, Sueyoung Park, Marilyn Hackett, Sue Ann Gardner, Laurel Jizba, Nancy Holcomb.