

Report to RBMS-BSC Annual Meeting

Re: 245 \$i Discussion Paper (DP) for submission to the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC)

Date: June 20, 2023

Background

Last year, Helena Zinkham, Chief of the Prints and Photographs Division at LC, approached the RBMS-BSC committee to consider participating in a proposal to MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) for the creation of a \$i in the *Title Statement* field, 245 (245). The need for this new subfield was to indicate where a cataloger located a title with harmful language. The 245 \$i would parallel the *Varying Form of Title* field, 246 (246) using \$i—the *Display Text* subfield.

Based on concerns heard from researchers, the goal was to alert public catalog users to the presence of racist and other harmful language. Another goal was to provide context for the language, which archival and library communities increasingly recommend. While \$i would have application to multiple bibliographic formats, the creation of this subfield would be most helpful for items where the title source is not immediately apparent on the items.

A group dedicated to planning a course of action was formed: Andrea Belair, Brenna Bychowski, Maren Cornett, Jamie Cumby, kalan Knudson Davis, Noah Sheola, Jackie Parascandola, Kellee Warren, Helena Zinkham. Soon afterwards, a small writing committee was convened to draft a discussion paper with an aim for submission at this year's MAC Annual Meetings to be held in June, 2023.

Discussion Paper

The writing committee: Jamie Cumby, Jackie Parascandola, Noah Sheola, and Helena Zinkham, crafted a paper describing the need for this subfield, proposed a solution, presented pertinent examples, and outlined how \$i can help in these instances.

The Discussion Paper was submitted by the announced due date to the MAC Steering Committee for review.

Per their request, we submitted two papers to MAC. One with links to the example records and the second with examples placed in the document. Additionally, MAC asked us to include a harmful language statement but that was already a part of the paper.

Submission of both papers as sent to MAC have been forwarded for consideration.

Preliminary reactions

MAC/LC recognized the role for this kind of information. They disagreed with the proposed solution.

Their concerns [**in bold**] were as follows:

Placement of \$i within the 245

There were concerns this would lead to “cluttering” this field with superfluous notes. Since \$i would be defined as “Display Text” this could lead to many notes be moved into the 245 field.

Proposed solution: After some discussion and consultation with the Co-chairs of BSC, we decided to make the \$i Non-Repeatable (NR) and to refine the definition of the subfield to indicate this only be used for the purpose proposed in the discussion paper.

Don’t position the \$i at the start of the 245 field

Placement at the head of the field would interfere with the second (non-filing) indicator in the 245 field which needs to be \$a.

Proposed solution: Move the \$i to a later position in the 245 field.

Another proposed solution was to *devise* a title for the 245 and use the *actual* title in a 246 with \$i.

This solution ignores DCRM and other content standards requiring the title to be transcribed *as is*. While the title would still be searchable, creating a title when one is readily available, albeit objectionable, is not the desired approach.

One other proposed solution was to use \$7 (Data Provenance) field with a variety of codes.

This new subfield is intended for machine-to-machine communication, even though it has a free-text option. Rather, we’re trying to communicate with public catalog users.

This was rejected by Jackie Parascandola already knowing this solution would not be welcomed or supported by RBMC BSC.

Proposed solution: After consulting with BSC Co-chairs this solution will not be considered moving forward.

Where we now stand/Next steps

After much discussion Helena Zinkham and Jackie Parascandola decided to withdraw the draft discussion paper and consulted with BSC Co-chairs. The Co-chairs expressed continued support for this paper and the writing committee will refine and rework this paper for submission at the next MAC cycle in January 2024.

Helena and Jackie met with Manon Theroux to learn more about the variety of objections and find an acceptable solution palatable to everyone. The outcomes of this meeting included:

Would a different subfield designation be a better approach? E.g. \$t for “Type of Title” with stock language as suggested in *Cataloging Cultural Objects*:

“The recommended controlled vocabulary for this element suggests the following terms, among others: owner’s title, repository title, inscribed title, creator’s title, descriptive title, constructed title, published title and collective title.”

Would refining the new subfield to limit the use to strictly indicate the source of the harmful language help to assuage fears this subfield would be populated with information better suited for a 5XX field?

The writing committee will reconvene and rework the paper to address these concerns.

We are looking to late summer and early fall to ask for commentary from the wider cataloging communities:

Reaching out to other interested groups such as ARLIS and VRA for input and commentary. Thank you to Maren Cornett for helping us with contact leads in ARLIS.

Send the paper to the DCRM(L) and RBMS listservs for commentary.

Also, we thought it would be helpful to have a joint meeting with the Technical Services Discussion Group (TSDG) to discuss the paper sometime in the fall.

What is needed

It would be helpful if everyone would review the documentation and send comments, questions, and concerns about any of the issues raised above to

Jackie Parascandola- jpara@upenn.edu

Thank you.

Jackie Parascandola (on behalf of the 245 \$i working group)

