

## COMMITTEE ON CATALOGING: DESCRIPTION AND ACCESS

a committee of the  
 Cataloging and Classification Section  
 Resources and Technical Services Division  
 American Library Association

Minutes of the meetings held in Chicago, Ill.  
 Saturday, January 18, 1986, 2-5:30 p.m.  
 Sunday, January 19, 1986, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.  
 Sunday, January 19, 1986, 2-5:30 p.m.

## Members present

Dorothy McGarry, Chair  
 Nancy E. Douglas, Secretary  
 Elizabeth Herman  
 Monty L. Montee  
 Pat Oyler  
 Carlen Ruschoff  
 Richard Smiraglia  
 Christopher L. Sugnet

## Ex-officio representatives (those present are named)

Ben R. Tucker	LC
Glenn Patton	OCLC
Ed Glazier	RLG

## ALA representatives (those present are named)

Helen Schmierer	ALA, JSC
Ellen Waite	ACRL
Michael Fitzgerald	DDS:AAM
Patricia M. Thomas	CCS:CCM
Judy Myers/Marilyn Craig	GODORT
Beth Rile	IFRT
Gail Junion for Elizabeth Widenmann	IRRT
Peter M. Young	LITA
Mary Ann Waltz	MAGERT
John Attig	MARBI
Joan Kuklinski	RASD
Martha Yee/Bruce Johnson	RTSD-AV
G. David Anderson	RTSD-FLMS
Colleen Hyslop	RTSD-RLMS
Crystal Graham	RTSD-SS
Michael Shelley	RTSD-TSCC
Gary L. Strawn	SRRT

**Organizational representatives (those present are named)**

Lee Leighton	AALL
Joyce Farris	ATLA
Sherman Clarke	ARLIS/NA
Charles W. Simpson	ARSC
Ellen S. Kovacic	AJL
Tina-Karen Forman	CLA
Sue A. Dodd	IASSIST
Sally Sinn	MLA
Joan Swanekamp	MLA
Lauren Brown	SAA
Chris Grabenstatter	SLA

**Observers**

January 18, 1986: 36  
January 19, 1986: 31,16

**Notes**

I. This document does not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material has been rearranged as necessary to increase comprehensibility and to collocate items related to specific topics.

II. Due to inconsistent use of microphones, background noise, etc., tapes of the meetings are of variable quality. The Secretary regrets any loss of detail which results.

III. In CC:DA minutes the term "straw vote" indicates a poll of the ALA and other organization representatives to CC:DA. No account is kept of representatives absent. Such votes are advisory or informational and are not binding upon the Committee. A "Vote of the Committee" indicates a poll of those Committee members appointed in their own right rather than as representatives of a particular constituency. An indication of voting members absent is given following each such poll. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. Where no vote totals are recorded, but a CC:DA position is stated, the stand has been determined by consensus.

IV. In CC:DA minutes the term "members" is used to apply to both voting and non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where distinction is necessary, the terms "voting members" and "representatives" are used.

V. Abbreviations used in CC:DA minutes include: IFLA=International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions; ISBD= International Standard Bibliographic Description; JSC=Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR; MRDF=Machine Readable Data File(s); RI=Library of Congress rule interpretation(s); TF=Task Force.

## MINUTES

### 175. Opening Procedures

The Chair opened the meeting, introduced the Committee members and routed a copy of the roster for corrections of addresses and phone numbers. She asked members to retain the same seats throughout the meetings as much as possible, for ease of identification by the secretary for the minutes.

### 176. Correction and Approval of Minutes

Corrections to the minutes had been submitted by the Library of Congress and mailed to the members. Committee members were asked to submit any typographical or other corrections to Nancy Douglas. The following corrections were noted:

p. 5, 168.E., second sentence, change to: "With a great many videodiscs, playing time is not meaningful (cf. those with still images over which a user could pore a different length of time for each frame). For others (e.g., movies) playing time is meaningful and should be expressed in terms of revolutions per minute, or inches per second, as appropriate.

p. 7, 169.I., first sentence, change to: "Attig said that it is clear that initial articles cause a problem in automated systems and that there is little that can be done about this problem - apart from deleting initial articles from access points."

The minutes were approved as corrected.

### 177. Adoption of the Agenda

Smiraglia moved and Oyler seconded that the Agenda be adopted. The motion passed unanimously.

### 178. Report of the Chair (McGarry)

McGarry said that three NISO draft standards documents with very short deadlines for response had been sent to CC:DA members. She had received no comments from the members before the deadlines, so drafted responses to NISO indicating that these seemed to have been adequately discussed in the original development and CC:DA had no further comment.

### 179. Forum on Chapter 9

Arnold Wajenberg briefly reviewed the process which led to the development of the Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9, and rule revisions to Chapter 9. Michael Gorman then reviewed the major changes proposed in the new Chapter 9 draft. Gorman said that the plan is to produce a text for the publishers by mid 1987. The JSC is to meet in March primarily on Chapter 9, then again in the fall to cover all other questions.

The objective of the revision is to make the chapter better deal with all kinds of computer software. The first version dealt with a rather narrow definition of computer software, but since then there has been an upsurge in the production of microcomputer software. The Chapter will deal with commercially and non-commercially produced files and with software embedded in hardware. This revision includes an attempt to deal with the various sources of information available,

both within the software itself and on its carrier and documentation. Another problem discussed is term to be used for the general material designation; it will include "computer" and another word. The concept of "edition" will be broadened to parallel the usage for books; if in doubt, the cataloger can take such words as edition, revision, etc., as evidence of a new edition, which will broaden the interpretation. The introduction of an "area 3" for computer software is also included. In ISBD(G), area 3 is set up as an area in which data important to the description of certain types of materials would come early in the bibliographic record; the area was deliberately set up not to be completely uniform across formats, reflecting the varied needs of different types of materials. Having already said in the GMD that this is some type of computer file, area 3 might be used to say more specifically that this is a program, or data, or a game. The questions to be addressed are whether one should have that sort of early statement, and if so, how specific that statement should be.

Gorman thinks JSC will want area 5 to have just physical description, so if area 3 is rejected, the information will probably fall into area 7.

In the notes area, there is expansion in this draft for the specification of system requirements, such as make and model, memory required, and so on. There is a question as to whether this note should be given first.

In answer to questions, Gorman said that although he had put forth a supplementary document, the comments he had received really did not alter his proposals radically. He thinks it important to say fairly early on that this is a computer program, which can be used on a particular type of microcomputer. He did not envision another draft at this time; the basic draft and the supplementary document can be reviewed by JSC in March along with the documents submitted by the national libraries. After that, he would guess perhaps two more drafts would be prepared, one after the March meeting, and another after the summer national library associations' meetings.

From the audience, it was asked if this draft would make mandatory the physical description of the types of programs you may never actually have in hand. Tucker said it would not. There were comments that the format of computer diskettes may be on the decline, and concern that the new rules might still not be flexible enough. Gorman responded that even if diskettes become obsolete, there will be some new physical format to describe; for now we can only deal with what we know. He said in regard to 9.5B6, that the examples should be more generalized to bring out compatibility, e.g., Apple II or above, IBM or IBM compatible. Regarding the Glossary, Gorman said the prevailing point of view would probably be to only include terms used in a special sense in the book itself, so would define terms such as "computer software" in the specific sense used here.

John Byrum reported work on another front of mrdf control. This format should not be a part of the ISBD for non-book materials, but will have a separate ISBD. A IFLA working group with Byrum as chair, and including Sue Dodd, and representatives from other countries will be meeting on this in March.

## 180. Report of the Library of Congress Representative (Tucker)

Tucker said that he would go over only those documents labelled 2JSC/LC at this time; in the others LC was acting only as a respondent to other documents.

### A. 2JSC/LC/64/LC follow-up

CC:DA **supports** the LC recommendation.

### B. 2JSC/LC/69/Ed/MG rev.

LC response was based on CC:DA consensus from earlier meeting.

### C. 2JSC/LC/69

CC:DA **supports** correction of typo.

### D. 2JSC/LC/72/LC follow-up 2

Gorman asked about those videodiscs which need a statement of playing time. On some types, the viewer sets the playing time while viewing still images, so the time can not always be indicated. Gorman asked whether something should be added to the extent statement, beyond one videodisc. Tucker had not yet come to a decision on this, though he thought still images were better described as frames (7.5B1). Tucker asked if CC:DA wanted to suggest saying something quite specific about adding number of frames in the specific material designation. Hearing no comments, he said he would assume CC:DA would find acceptable whatever JSC decides.

### E. 2JSC/LC/73

Tucker raised a question about later editions of works which change the order of author statements. Rule 21.12 deals only with Mixed Responsibility, and the situation in question is one of simple shared authorship (21.6C1), which has no provision for changing order from that of the title page. CC:DA agreed with Ed Glazier's observation that the cataloging should be done from the book in hand, without attempting to learn about the first edition.

### F. 2JSC/LC/74 and 2JSC/LC/75

The two LC suggestions would provide for a uniform treatment of omitting all initial articles in the headings covered by AACR2 Chapter 24 and 25 (Corporate Bodies and Uniform Titles). In discussion with experts in non-European languages, Tucker has been informed that the initial article does not function much differently from its usage in German; i.e., it can be deleted, generally with some change of nuance but not a major change in meaning. Tucker said that Chapter 23 is a bit more complicated; though the article is dropped for some foreign cities such as The Hague, those American cities with foreign names including articles such as El Paso and Los Angeles have retained the article as part of the name. Tucker further discussed the use of non-filing character indicators for initial articles, and how there was really no way to deal with initial articles when they appear in, say, the title part of an author/title added entry, except for the cataloger to drop them from the access point. CC:DA voted to **support** these two LC proposals.

G. 2JSC/LC/76. CC:DA **supported** LC's proposal.

H. 2JSC/LC/77. CC:DA **supported** LC's proposed deletion.

I. 2JSC/LC/78

The proposal as shown is to replace only the first paragraph of 22.16A. Tucker indicated that this only deals with variants of the same name, not pseudonyms, and that the addition of dates would still be preferable to this proposed addition of the more complete form of name. Helen Schmierer suggested a more appropriate location would then be with other "additions to names" rather than as an expansion of initials, so perhaps in 22.18 or 22.19. Tucker said he would study the question of placement further. CC:DA **supported** LC's proposal, with the suggestion that the statement might be placed between 22.18 and 22.19, rather than replacing the first paragraph of 22.16A.

J. 2JSC/LC/79.

The suggestion was for making a strong effort to delete some of the options in corporate and geographic name chapters, since these were resulting in very divergent cataloging practices. LC has used RI's to explain its use of the options, and is now proposing that the substance of the options in the following cases become the main substance of the rule itself (2JSC/LC/80 and 2JSC/LC/81).

K. 2JSC/LC/80. CC:DA **supported** LC's proposal.

L. 2JSC/LC/81.

Tucker explained that the proposal replaces only the first sentence of the rule. There was discussion of the use of the word "distinctive," but no better alternative was found. CC:DA **supported** LC's proposal.

M. 2JSC/LC/82

There was discussion as to whether the proposal might be similar to Type 3, in that though the names are distinctive, it proposes another exception to entering something under its own name. Others proposed that the addition of a parenthetical qualifier might be as appropriate. Tucker said the use of such corporate names is a relatively new and unusual situation, but typically the name of the larger corporate body is on the title page. Tucker's final argument was that this is what LC has been doing since 1981, and LC has not received complaints about the government or non-government headings established this way. CC:DA voted 6 in favor of the proposal, 1 against.

N. 2JSC/LC/83. CC:DA gave **general support** to the proposal.

O. 2JSC/LC/84. CC:DA **supported** the added example.

P. 2JSC/LC/85.

Tucker explained that the Canadian libraries would also be supportive of this change, and would prefer to see it as a rule change rather than an LC rule interpretation. Though it would make note

order more permissive, Tucker would prepare a rule interpretation clearly stating that the promotion of some other note to first position typically will be done only for Chapter 6 materials at LC. In other chapters, the note that is listed first tends to be the most important one already. Helen Schmierer pointed out that JSC will be carefully reviewing the effect of this on all other chapters as well. CC:DA supported LC's proposal.

Q. 2JSC/LC/86.

Tucker explained that this new wording does not bring any change in LC practice. Schmierer pointed out that the first sentence is very complicated, and the term "heading" should be changed to "uniform title," and Tucker agreed. CC:DA supported LC's proposal.

R. 2JSC/LC/87.

Discussion points included the similarity with 2JSC/LC/73. Tucker said that in both situations, he proposed to enter the work under the heading appropriate to the work in hand. CC:DA supported LC's proposal.

S. 2JSC/LC/88.

Sue Dodd suggested a wording change from "printed monographs" to "printed monographic series," which Tucker accepted. Tucker agreed that 1.6B2 also needed revision. CC:DA supported LC's proposal.

T. 2JSC/LC/89.

Schmierer suggested that the three sentences in this rule be changed to three separate paragraphs. CC:DA supported LC's proposal.

U. 2JSC/LC/91.

Schmierer suggested a wording change from "one of two" to "difference is two or more," to which Tucker agreed. CC:DA supported LC's proposal.

**181. Report of the Task Force for Revision of Chapter 9 (Herman)**

Item 1. CC:DA unanimously accepted the Task Force proposal that 9.0A (Scope) be rewritten in terms of "computer files" rather than "software" and that software be changed to computer files throughout the text; that the references to "commercial" and "non-commercial" be changed to "published" and "unpublished" files; that a statement explain that computer files for local, direct use and remote use are to be described by these rules; and that 9.0A also identify the items not eligible for cataloging under these rules.

Item 2. The Task Force report proposes a single chief source, rejecting the proposal for two chief sources, presented in the document 2JSC/Ed/MG/29. The Task Force preferred adherence to the usual practice in the rules of a single chief source, with alternate sources available if information is incomplete on the chief source, and a note indicating alternate source used. Objections to the single source proposal were that the cataloger would always have to mount the file or take the information from other than the chief source. Tucker said

that LC would not plan to mount the files, so they would always have to use the label for information; if the CC:DA proposal meant that LC would have to make a note about source on every one of their records, he would probably prepare a rule interpretation saying that LC would not make the note. It was argued that this would be confusing to the library community; Tucker countered that if the community were aware of LC's interpretation, and also had the label information in hand, the source would not be ambiguous.

Schmierer made the parallel that computer files are treated more like sound recordings, relying on the label, than like microforms, which seldom rely on the header. She questioned how often the label information differs from the internal information. Dodd said the internal information is so easy to update and modify that it is often changed without any external evidence or labelling, particularly in edition information but also sometimes in titles. Smiraglia pointed out that Chapter 7 might be still more parallel, where the chief source of information is a film itself, with the container when the container is a cassette. He said that although bibliographic sense would argue for use of internal information, common sense would say the label is easier to use, and if we choose to dictate internal information as primary and an RI says never to use it, we are set in contradiction. Tucker pointed out that for CIP, label information may be all that is available. The final proposal to be voted on was that there be a single chief source, and if not used, a note should be made, or if that is found to be impractical, the alternative proposal would be that there should be two alternative chief sources allowed and the one chosen would always be noted. The motion passed.

	<u>for opposed abstention</u>		
Straw vote	25	0	1
Vote of members	7	0	0

Item 3. The Task Force proposed an example be added to the 9.1B2 proposal on recording a file name if it is the only name given in the sources. The motion passed.

	<u>for opposed abstention</u>		
Straw vote	25	0	1
Vote of members	7	0	0

Item 4. After discussion, the voted on the LC proposal for the use of "computer file" as the GMD for these materials (2JSC/LC/90). If the JSC prefers "computer software" instead of computer file, Tucker will suggest that the question be tabled for further study and Schmierer will support that position. The motion passed.

	<u>for opposed abstention</u>		
Straw vote	20	4	3
Vote of members	6	1	0

Item 5. The task force supports the section in 2JSC/Ed/MG/29/LC response, which limits the statement of responsibility to those persons or bodies responsible for the content of the file, with the text for 9.1F1 to read: "Record statements of responsibility relating to those persons or bodies responsible for the content of the file as instructed in 1.1F. Give other statements of responsibility in a note (see 9.7B6)."

	<u>for opposed abstention</u>		
Straw vote	25	0	1
Vote of members	7	0	0



Item 6. The Task Force supported the LC suggestions for further development of Area 2, the edition area, in 2JSC/Ed/MG/29/LC response, as amended by 2JSC/Ed/MG/29/LC response 2.

	<u>for</u>	<u>opposed</u>	<u>abstention</u>
Straw vote	25	0	0
Vote of members	7	0	0

Item 7. The task force did not recommend inclusion of an area 3 in Chapter 9. The task force objected that, although the ISBD(G) allows any use of area 3, it is in the middle of data which is transcribed from the source of information. This Chapter 9 area 3 would be formulated by the cataloger rather than transcribed, so the task force thought it out of place here. Another objection is its effect on existing cataloging, in that the application would be not to the new microcomputer technology but to precisely those kinds of computer files already cataloged as machine-readable data files.

Arguments in support of area 3 were that it provides information early in the record as to what kind of material is being encountered, which will be helpful to library users, and that there are not large numbers of catalog records done yet on these materials anyway. Others commented that it will be possible to have more than one area 3, such as one for the computer file aspect, and another if it is a serial. Tucker pointed out that area 3 information typically could not be supplied on many software-type programs, though there might be microcomputer files for which the cataloger thought area 3 important to include. Intner stated that there was no doubt that the information needed to be included, the question was whether it should go in area 3, 5, or 7. Dodd said the information is easy to find for large data files, and very useful to the users, but not available on most microcomputer programs. Tucker thought the information was far too important to push into area 7, which would happen if 7 were an alternative possibility for area 5; it would be desirable to be able to say that area 3 is where you will always find file characteristics. He stated further that, with future growth unpredictable, we should try to set up as many precise areas for information as possible, such as area 3.

The Task Force proposal not to use area 3 was put to a vote and failed.

	<u>for</u>	<u>opposed</u>	<u>abstention</u>
Straw vote	6	13	4
Vote of members	1	6	0

A motion was made by Richard Smiraglia and seconded by Ruschoff that CC:DA support the use of area 3 as expressed in 2JSC/Ed/MG/LC response 2. Discussion centered around whether the information in that area had to be "transcribed" or created uniformly. Tucker suggested that we would want to minimize variation between terms like "program" and "software," and when you get into terms like spread sheet, word processing, program, etc., the list could be endless. There was some preference expressed for using more general terms, and Tucker noted that a RI would be important in implementing the use of the area.

Sue Dodd suggested friendly amendments to 2JSC/Ed/MG/LC response 2, the first of which involved changing the term "files" to "record and/or bytes", when appropriate. Another was to insert after the 9.3B2 example this sentence "For source code statements, give the pro-

gramming language in the system requirements note." She also suggested deletion of (d) and moving its example to 9.3B2 (a)1. The suggestions were agreed to by the makers of this motion.

The CC:DA vote was then unanimously in favor of the motion.

Items 8, 9, 10, and 11 in the task force report were unanimously accepted, both in the straw votes and the CC:DA vote, to be forwarded to JSC.

There was further discussion on 9.5B1; CC:DA voted unanimously to support this area of 2JSC/Ed/MG/29.

Herman proposed that the Task Force discussion documents go to Helen Schmierer for the JSC meetings, so she could see how the discussions progressed, and CC:DA agreed. Herman also moved to extend the life of the Task Force through the summer, and to incorporate Helen into its membership as the JSC representative. CC:DA agreed unanimously.

Dorothy McGarry thanked the members of the task force for their excellent work and documentation.

#### 182. Report of the ALA Representative to JSC (Schmierer)

Schmierer directed attention to the JSC minutes she had prepared and distributed, which indicated the areas for CC:DA action.

#### 183. Report of the Task Force on 22.2C (Yee for Baughman)

There were three positions presented in the task force: 1) supporting the Australian proposal, 2) thinking the Australian proposal goes beyond the rule for pseudonyms, 3) a compromise based on the RI. The RI is being applied to 20th century American and British authors; 20th century contemporary authors from other cultures need further consideration. Schmierer suggested that in principle the Australian request could be supportable, but suggested that CC:DA request that the rules be redrafted by the editor to see if that would clarify more of the issues involved. Montee moved that CC:DA support the Australian proposal, requesting consideration for future modifications, a redraft of 22.2 to see the effect of the proposed change, and consideration of LC response. CC:DA unanimously supported the motion, and continued the existence of the task force.

#### 184. Report of the Task Force on Rules on Works Realized Through Performance (Smiraglia)

Regarding transcription for pop music folios, the task force thought any confusion could be resolved by an addition to the RI for 1.1F1 adding an example of a pop folio and a videotape. CC:DA gave unanimous approval to forward this suggestion to LC.

In reviewing choice of entry for pop recordings, folios, and videos, the task force found rule 21.18 adequate, though perhaps more explanations and examples could be provided through a manual. The task force expressed concern about the way in which rule 21.23C would separate a performing ensemble into two entries, and suggested that this be removed from the LC rule interpretations. CC:DA unanimously supported the recommendation that this be forwarded to LC.

Smiraglia moved that another task force be formed to study choice of entry for films and videorecordings that are transcriptions of performances, to report back at the annual conference. CC:DA unanimously approved, and McGarry appointed Smiraglia Chair of the Task Force.

#### 185. Old Business

Thomas (CCS:CCM) said that the group she represents (Cataloging of Children's Materials) uses predominantly the concise AACR2. She suggested that this work be edited to reflect the extensive revisions of Chapter 9. McGarry said she would forward that concern to the authors.

#### 186. New Business

Tucker referred questions about the use of Marc field 752 to the LC Serial Record Division. LC expects to develop more complete instructions for use of the field.

Several people asked about attending the JSC meeting in March. Schmierer suggested they contact the host, Jean Weihs, at the Toronto Public Library for further information.

#### 187. Adjournment

There being no further business, McGarry adjourned the meeting.