



MINUTES (Final)
ALA Midwinter Conference 20-25 January 2006

San Antonio, Texas

Bibliographic Standards:

Saturday 21 January 2006, 8:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. (0800-1230)

Henry B. Gonzales Convention Center, room 002B

1. Introduction of members and visitors
 2. Settlement of the agenda
 3. Approval of Annual 2005 minute
 4. Thesauri
 8. Preconference seminars
 5. DCRM(S)
 6. DCRM(B) zeta version
 7. DCRM(M)
 9. CC:DA
 10. MARBI
 11. New business
 12. Announcements from the floor
- Appendix I. Report from ACRL Liaison to CC:DA
Appendix II. Proposed change to *Standard Citation Forms*

1. Introduction of members and visitors

Members Present: Randal Brandt, University of California, Berkeley; Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University (secretary); Laurence Creider, New Mexico State University; David Faulds, Emory University; Eileen Heeran, University of Michigan; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library (chair); Windy Lundy, University of Colorado, Boulder; R. Arvid Nelsen, University of California, San Diego; Beth M. Russell, Ohio State University (thesaurus editor); Nina Schneider, New York Public Library; Manon Th eroux, Yale University (ACRL liaison to CC:DA); Alex Thurman, Columbia University (intern).

Members Excused: Stephen Skuce, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Liaisons Present: Jain Fletcher, University of California, Los Angeles (rare music); Jane Gillis, Yale University (rare serials).

Visitors: Frances Ott Allen, University of Cincinnati; Bobbie Carr, Defense Language Institute; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, University of Minnesota; Carroll Davis, Library of

Congress; Vernica Downey, Harvard Law School; Emily Epstein, University of Colorado, Health Sciences Center; Sarah Schmidt Fisher, University of Delaware; Ryan Hildebrand, University of California, Irvine; Judy Kuhagen, Library of Congress; Robert Maxwell, Brigham Young University; Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University; Margaret Nichols, Cornell University; John Overholt, Harvard University; Mary Faith Pankin, George Washington University; Lucia Patrick, Florida State University; Phyllis Payne, Boston University; E.C. Schroeder, Yale University; Elaine Shiner, University of California, Los Angeles; Christopher Smith, Yale University; Jennifer Thorn, Newberry Library; Penny Welbourne, Yale University; David Whitesell, Harvard University.

2. Settlement of the agenda

The Preconference seminars discussion, agenda item 8, was moved up to item 5, to allow E.C. Schroeder to leave for another meeting.

3. Approval of Annual 2005 minutes

Several grammatical changes to the minutes were noted. A motion to approve the corrected minutes passed unanimously.

4. Thesauri (Russell)

Part 1: Terms:

A. Form terms:

Marbled sheepskin bindings

Creider questioned if this term is necessary and Russell explained that the term parallels the term Calf binding already established. Leslie further explained that the governing principle for the addition of terms to the thesauri is that if a cataloger needs a term to bring out a characteristic or genre in their cataloging, and the term is appropriate for our scope, we will create the heading. Maxwell asked if this is recorded anywhere or if a Thesaurus Committee Constitution exists. Russell explained that we will address this in writing very soon as the new online thesaurus goes live.

The term passed unanimously. Final version:

Thesaurus	<i>Binding Terms</i>
Term	Marbled sheepskin bindings
Hierarchy	[Materials and treatment]
SN	Use for sheepskin bindings whose surface has been treated with

acid to produce a marbled effect.
 BT Sheepskin bindings
 Warrant Sophia's Choice : An Annotated Bibliography of Books Owned and/or Read by Sophia Smith
 (<http://clio.fivecolleges.edu/smith/sophia/who/books/books.htm>):
 The binding is an unusual marbled sheepskin.

Commendatory poems

Russell noted that the Thesaurus Committee has made a change to UF Commendatory verse from Commendatory verses. She explained that in the Poems hierarchy the UF is Verse and that elsewhere warrant for Verse is strong.

The term was approved unanimously. Final version:

Thesaurus	<i>Genre Terms</i>
Term	Commendatory poems
Hierarchy	[Literary forms]
SN	Use for poems, generally appearing in the preliminaries of books, written in praise of the author and the work.
UF	Commendatory verse
BT	Poems
Warrant	Williams, F.B. Index of dedications and commendatory verses in English books before 1641. London: Bibliographical Society (1962), p. xi: "Scattered evidence exists of how writers and booksellers solicited commendatory poems from acquaintances and incorporated them in the manuscript before it went to the printer."

Slurs

Leslie noted that because they are interested in mis-imposition and other printing errors at the Folger, she needed this term. Russell noted a change to the scope note. The term was approved unanimously. Final version:

Thesaurus	<i>Printing Evidence</i>
Term	Slurs
Hierarchy	[Make-ready]
SN	Use for blurred or doubled ink impressions caused by the sliding of the paper on the printing surface
UF	Blurs Double printing
BT	[Make-ready]
Warrant	Glaister, G.A. Encyclopedia of the book, 1996 (slur: a letterpress-machine

printing fault in which irregular movement between paper and forme causes half-tone dots to be distorted, or letters to show a double impression); Webster's 3rd: Slur: a blurred or doubled spot or area in printed matter caused by the sliding of the paper on the printing surface at the moment of impression.

B. Relator terms

Conservator

The Thesaurus Team changed the wording of the scope note to read: Use for a person who documents, preserves, or treats printed or manuscript material, works of art, artifacts or specimens. Creider asked in what way this definition differs from that of a cataloger who documents? Schroeder also questioned if this would pertain to binders' stamps that have been used in rebinding (e.g., Sangorski) and asked how it would signify what has been documented in the cataloging record. Russell commented that we are not trying to create "best practices" in the thesauri. As we have allowed the relator term Binder, this seems similar. Conceivably one could put initials in the cataloging record in a local note and use this relator term for copy specific information.

The term was approved with one vote in opposition. Final version:

Term	Conservator
SN	Use for a person who documents, preserves, or treats printed or manuscript material, works of art, artifacts, or specimens.
Warrant	Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. <i>Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2004-05 Edition</i> , Archivists, Curators, and Museum Technicians, on the Internet at http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos065.htm defines the term as follows: <i>Conservators</i> manage, care for, preserve, treat, and document works of art, artifacts, and specimens, work that may require substantial historical, scientific, and archaeological research.

Part 2: Report

Russell noted that after much hard work we are ready to announce the online version of the thesauri. We will be sending out the URL to the community shortly. We will be working further to expand functionality and to improve display elements. In preparing the online product, we found structural problems in some of the thesauri. The committee will initiate an evaluation of each thesaurus in turn. We will begin with *Genre*

Terms, removing qualifiers and cleaning up ambiguities. We also need to explicitly document how the thesauri have developed.

The committee is proposing to work on merging the six thesauri, with the combined hierarchies in one alphabetical list. This would allow the elimination of automatic parenthetical qualifiers for all terms in any given thesaurus, and it would be clear in which thesaurus a term had originally resided from the hierarchy. A new code would need to be obtained.

Maxwell noted that he uses the rare book thesauri terms all the time, for everything. Nelsen concurred, citing a study that he did at UCSD when making a case for separate indexing for their genre terms. He discovered that 4% of the genre terms in their catalog are found in special collections cataloging records. Of the 16 different thesauri used in the UCSD catalog, the RBMS thesauri were used more than any others (with the exception of a locally defined term *On-line*.) Russell has heard from colleagues that they don't understand the use of 655's and are confused about whether to strip them from records or not. She hopes that we can get the message out to Please Use!

Leslie asked that if anyone knows of a web design person with experience, to please let her know. We will be posting a job description and soliciting bids to get a sense of the cost of designing a new website for the Thesauri.

Th roux asked if we would be voting on the decision to combine the thesauri, especially given some hesitation over maintenance in our local catalogs caused by the upcoming changes. Russell replied that such a committee evaluation would be part of the process of analysis and revision. Creider moved that the BSC ask the Thesaurus Committee to look into the feasibility of moving the 6 thesauri into one during the upcoming evaluation. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Preconference seminars

2006 Preconference Seminar, Austin (ALA in New Orleans)
Cataloging Artists' Books: Challenges and Solutions

Sarah Schmidt Fisher (University of Delaware), Megan Lewis (Duke University) and R. Arvid Nelsen (University of California, San Diego) have been working for some years on this seminar. The emphasis changed when ARLIS held a regional conference on the theme of Artists' Books last spring and it became clear that many communities are struggling with this issue in isolation. The organizers of this seminar decided it would be best to have various representatives come together to discuss the current state of cataloging artists' books. Speakers include:

- Johanna Drucker, Robertson Professor of Media Studies, University of Virginia, Book Artist [just published a metadata schema in *The Bonefolder*]
- Nina Schneider, Librarian, Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection of English and American Literature, New York Public Library
- Daniel Starr, Manager of Bibliographic Operations at Thomas J. Watson Library, The Metropolitan Museum of Art (unconfirmed)

Leslie asked if we will publish something as an outgrowth of this seminar, something like a rare book approach to cataloging artists' books? Nelsen replied that ARLIS UK is publishing something and we should try to endorse that statement. Leslie asked how many of our institutions collect artists' books (most members and visitors raised their hands), and tried to gauge the interest in having this as an RBMS Preconference theme in the future, one that would deal with collecting, storing, as well as cataloging artists' books. Nelsen spoke of the synchronicity of bringing various communities together to discuss a problem and the conference theme: "Libraries, Archives, and Museums in the Twenty-First Century: Intersecting Missions, Converging Futures?"

2007 Preconference Seminar, Baltimore (ALA in Washington)

a) Cataloging of Special Collections Materials in an Organizational Context

Beth Russell is proposing a seminar to look at the way in which several recent trends have affected the cataloging of special collections material: technological changes in cataloging workflows, increased emphasis on mainstreaming special collections in larger libraries, and organizational cultures which continually seek efficiencies. This seminar will focus on the question of whether special collections cataloging functions better as part of a cataloging department or a special collections department, and will explore the issues that arise from this decision in a larger organizational context.

Russell plans to give the introduction, explaining why the placement of this function merits consideration. She will be using data from a recent study of ARL libraries in her discussion. A case study will highlight specific questions or problems that have been encountered by colleagues. The need for creativity in dealing with personnel and assignments will also be addressed. A senior library administrator will address how individuals can influence organizational structure (formally or informally) for the betterment of the whole. The emphasis will be on encouraging people to communicate for what makes sense in your institution.

Two comments from the floor: Related ideas - what happens at institutions as collections get bigger and bigger? What happens as institutions close their Rare Book shelflist? Leslie asked about the goals for this seminar, might it result in a written endorsement of one model over the other? Maxwell suggested that we might be able to compose a document detailing the things that catalogers must be able to do – e.g.,

have ready access to the rare materials being cataloged, have access to reference materials relating to the collections being cataloged. Schroeder added: have access to expertise with non-European languages represented in the collections, either in-house or by outsourcing. Russell referred committee members to the article she wrote for the *Journal of Academic Librarianship* (v. 30, no. 4 (July 2004), p. 294-303) dealing with these problems. Shiner asked if Russell could generalize about where catalogers would like to sit and she responded that it can be problematic for catalogers who are not full time in Special Collections.

b) Bibliographic Databases Update

Schroeder is proposing to have a traditional panel of 3 presenting three databases: ESTC – will be moving to its own site away from RLIN; CCILA – new *Latin American Imprints to 1850*, a union catalog, coming out within the next year from Henry Snyder's shop (the UC Riverside Center for Bibliographical Studies and Research); Handpress Book Database, an RLG product to which Yale contributes. Schroeder will organize and moderate this session.

c) Workshop on cataloging ephemera

The Preconference Program Planning Committee is wondering if Bib Standards would be interested in sponsoring a half day or all day workshop on the topic of cataloging ephemera. This workshop would require registration and it would be held on the Tuesday preceding the Preconference.

The workshop would cover the various issues that have to be considered in deciding how to catalog ephemera (collection vs. item; AACR2 vs. DCRB), along with the consequences of each choice. We could have working segments on each of these options (collection-level record, AACR2 or DCRB, finding aid) with discussions on the kind of access each provides.

Finally, something on digitizing ephemera and creating metadata might be appropriate given the recent digital ephemera collections mounted by American Memory and Readex (from the American Antiquarian Society).

This would be a substantial workshop from which someone could walk away with an understanding of the pre-cataloging decisions to be made, factors to consider in cataloging, and the value of these cataloging options for access. The format would be a combination of presentations and hands-on training sessions.

Copeland presented the idea to the group and there was considerable interest in pursuing the idea. Fisher, Schneider and Fletcher will follow up with Copeland who

will work on a formal proposal with presenters' names for further discussion at annual.

5. DCRM(S) (Gillis)

Leslie announced that the editorial board for the rare serials rules is composed of Jane Gillis, Juliet McLaren, Annie Copeland, Randy Brandt and Stephen Skuce.

Gillis and McLaren have been working for several years on a draft that was put on hold pending some decisions in DCRM(B). Last November, Gillis used an earlier version of the DCRM(B) rules as the basis for a new draft of the serials rules distributed prior to this meeting to the Committee. Examples are still needed for many areas as noted in the text. Discussion questions on this new draft were circulated by email and Gillis asked the committee for guidance on the following:

- Appendix E:

Currently there is no appendix E in the draft (Bibliographic Variants in DCRM(B)) – does this matter and do the Appendices in DCRM(S) need to match DCRM(B) in form and order? Leslie stated that if it doesn't make sense to keep something, then we shouldn't try to include it. Thérroux suggested waiting until we are further along as something might arise that would warrant an additional appendix. Maxwell suggested that we should keep some order between the Appendices in the modules because as we get more used to these rules we will want consistency across them and Creider suggested that App. G and App. H may go across all the modules. Thérroux suggested that in the same way that area 3 is blank in DCRM(B), it would be all right to have a blank App. E, and that as we get closer we might reorder the appendices so that those in common to all modules would likely be grouped at together at the start.

- What overlapping material do we need? What should be deleted? What should be edited? Do these work? What about other modules?:

Should we retain the general, not format specific, statement of objectives and principles? If we have them only in DCRM(B) we could have format specific principles in the Preface. Creider feels that the DCRM principles should be in each module but that AMREMM's status is tricky - it doesn't have the DCRM principles. Leslie explained that AMREMM was very far along in draft stage before we conceived of the rare materials modules and that while BSC can commission some modules, others, while closely related (the rare map rules and AMREMM), are not our publications and will not be part of our constellation. AMREMM does not say that it is part of DCRM and it isn't called DCRM(MS). Creider reminded us that we had agreed that AMREMM would be brought under the DCRM mantle when a second edition was needed.

Gillis has revised the Objectives section and the Pre-Cataloging Decisions section to reflect serials. Questions arose pertaining to paragraph 3 on p. 11 of the draft which discusses cataloging an annual as a monograph. As an example, Gillis explained that when the publishers of an almanac have a feud and each publishes a separate publication with the same title and year, the situation is made clearer when they are cataloged as monographs. Creider suggested this be reworded to explain what is really going on.

Maxwell suggested that another factor in deciding Serial vs. Monograph is indexing. Because of the way the MARC format indexes materials, the user could miss a serial title and others like it because it is indexed with monographs when one would expect it to be indexed with serials. Creider suggested that we don't want to force catalogers to fit something into a mold and that we should make a point clearly in the rules, "If cataloging something as a serial results in a loss of information or causes confusion, catalog as a monograph." Gillis added that "If cataloging something as a monograph will cause needless repetition from record to record, catalog as a serial."

Théroux suggested that we reorganize the content currently in Pre-Cataloging Decisions, Serial vs. Monograph, for more clarity. Several members of the Committee voiced a need for very basic information that would help rare book catalogers and non-rare serial catalogers to understand the issues influencing decisions. They suggested describing what constitutes a serial and what constitutes an issue in the Pre-Cataloging Decisions section, and moving the questions about frequency and title changes etc. (currently indented under Serial vs. Monograph) into the section: Factors to consider 2) Intellectual and Physical Characteristics of the Item or the Collection.

- No "Perfect Copy" and no "Bibliographic Variants" in the sense of DCRM(B):

Creider and Maxwell noted that this has implications for shared cataloging. If cataloging exists that was based on older rules, you could use it and make sure you provide access to what you have; however, you can't always tell if it is the same thing. If you catalog just what you have, you may be replicating serial copy based on pre-AACR2 cataloging. You can't just convert pre AACR2 records to look like what you have.

- Numbering – are these rules clear? For people who have cataloged serials, do these make sense?:

Russell picked up on the second question and asked that the rules be written with the rare monograph cataloger in mind as well. Gillis said that she and McLaren had agreed to write a CONSER module for rare serials that would be clearly written for serials catalogers who don't know much about rare serials. It would have links to other rules and be very straightforward. Maxwell noted that DCRM(S) needs to be self contained

and Leslie said that DCRM(S) should make a strong reference to CONSER such as: consult CONSER rules if you don't have enough guidance to go on.

Théroux noted that in DCRM(B), levels of cataloging (collection level, core level, minimal level) are discussed in Pre-Cataloging Decisions and in App. A. (DCRM(B) Code for MARC 21 records), and are then further spelled out in individual appendices. She noted that cataloging at the minimal, core, and collection levels are all options for serials and could be included in DCRM(S)". Gillis had removed discussion of collection level cataloging, assuming that if one was cataloging a group of serials as a collection, that they would look at DCRM(B).

A general discussion about the Collection Level Cataloging Appendix ensued. Some felt that a collection record, no matter what material it represents, is by its nature monographic. Thus, there should be one Appendix with mixed material examples that would be used in each module. Others on the Committee believe that this would be an opportunity to customize the examples and entries according to the format of the module in question (maps, serials, music). Théroux noted that DCRM(B) examples could be made more monograph-centric to allow the other modules to tailor their examples to their format. Fletcher and Brandt were in favor of a common appendix that would be tailored to bring out the singular format of the module. Russell suggested that having a collection level appendix specific to serials would provide the opportunity to add subject headings like: Texas – Periodicals. Théroux concluded by saying that the editorial team of DCRM(B) would have to decide whether the Appendix would be a mixed material collection level record with other modules repeating it or referring to it, or not.

- Reprints:

Gillis said that there are quite a few differences between cataloging reprints according to AACR2 and DCRM(S). The biggest difference is what to use as the basis of description. Maxwell suggested that we make it very clear that this is DIFFERENT than CONSER and catalogers will need to pay attention to this rule. Gillis said that after the rules are done there would be a table of differences between CONSER and DCRM(S). Maxwell suggested that on the second chart under 0B2 that we say: "First issue; lacking that, earliest in hand" for maximum clarity.

Gillis asked about Area 3 and numbering. She wondered about the fact that in AACR2 this is a recording[?] area (with instructions to abbreviate), whereas in DCRM it is a transcription area. Transcribing an abbreviation might look like we are abbreviating. Leslie suggested that we add examples using (*Editorial Comment*: appears this way on the title page) to avoid confusion.

Numbering conventions for serials may be awkward with rules for transcription,

especially bracketing conventions. According to the RDA draft, “[sic]” will no longer be used to indicate a mistake. Leslie asked the editorial team to be clear about instructions to “Transcribe”, “Record”, or “Supply” according to what is required in each field in the rules, replacing “Give” where possible.

- Date of publication:

CONSER calls for only years to be in the date of publication area. There are good reasons for this—sometimes the only date we have is actually the coverage date (20-24 November 1784; summer 1955). What should be done with phrases like “Printed in the year.” The draft has them in the Publisher part of the statement (260 \$b):

Leslie stated that the 260 is a transcription field and to transcribe the phrase, “Printed in the year” in the publisher area is a distortion of the data. Maxwell agreed that as it is not part of the publisher’s statement and if it can not be put in the \$c, then we omit with a mark of omission and add a note. A further problem is recording a statement like “Printed in the year” if it is not on all issues since the 260 \$c relates to the entire run of the publication.

Several questions (Extent; Glossary) were held due to the need to move on. Leslie informed us that the request for the dcrms code for MARC 21 will be sent to Randy Barry at the Library of Congress. Further discussion on all these issues should be conducted on the DCRM-L list, with DCRM(S) in the subject line.

6. DCRM(B) zeta version (Théroux, Leslie)

Maxwell has deleted many messages a day sent to DCRM-L from SPAMmers. He is trying to set up a system whereby non-member messages would be rejected at the outset.

The zeta draft posted prior to the meeting incorporates most of the comments received from the UK Bibliographic Standards Committee, from LC’s CPSO, and from CC:DA. In the next few months the editorial team will be finalizing the draft and hopes to submit to LC by April 1. Remaining issues are the Preface, indexing options, formatting issues (running heads, etc.)

Following the BSC meeting and the Hearing at ALA Annual in Chicago, the editors met, reviewed the results of the straw polls taken, and made some decisions. Maxwell asked Théroux to summarize them.

- 0F, 1B5, 4C6, Appendix B 245. The instructions on supplied data were revised to give preference to the language of the cataloging agency rather than English.

- 0F2. The instruction to preserve the ligatures æ in Anglo-Saxon, œ in French, and æ and œ in Scandinavian languages was restored to conform to DCRB/LCRI
- 4C4. If the publisher statement contains only an address, sign, or initials, the full publisher name can now be given in a note, rather than supplied in square brackets, if desired
- 4D2. The "Transcription involving adjustments or additions" section has been subnumbered and substantially revised. It now includes a new rule on "Multiple adjustments or additions." The footnote has been revised to refer to the new Appendix H rather than AACR2 22.17A.
- 4D4. Copyright dates are no longer to be recorded in the date of publication element. They may be given in notes and they may form the basis for supplied dates of publication. The instructions now deviate from both AACR2 and DCRB but they resolve the problems associated with transcribing copyright statements.
- 5C1. Illustrations on title pages may now be treated as illustrations in the 300 \$b. Illustrations on bindings and dust jackets are not be treated as illustrations in the 300 \$b; they may be mentioned in a note.
- 5C3. We will rely on the revised glossary definition for "coloured illustration" that appeared in the 2005 amendments to AACR2.
- 7B9. The instructions on recording nonroman signatures have been revised and expanded.
- Appendix A. The "dcrmb" code is not to be used for collection-level descriptions. CPSO thought the DCRM(B) instructions were too similar to those in Cataloging Service Bulletin no. 78 (Fall 1997) to warrant special coding.
- Appendix F/G/H. Appendices F (Title Access Points) and G (Early Letter Forms and Symbols) have been expanded; Appendix H (Gregorian Calendar conversion) is new and has been taken verbatim from AACR2 22.17A.
- Glossary. The FRBR terms have been deleted; new terms: chronogram, gathering, signature; revised terms: plate, title proper.

Théroux indicated that the editors have not yet discussed what to do with the rv as w issue in Appendix G. When she sends a draft of changes on Monday nights to the editors night she could also send them to DCRM-L. The editors will have to decide whether to begin tracking changes from zeta or to continue tracking them from DCRB, which has become such a tangled mess that it is unusable. It was suggested that perhaps an intern could compile the changes between DCRB and the final text of DCRM(B).

Brandt raised an issue with the definition of the term *wrapper* in the Glossary. He would like to see the phrase, "Not to be confused with modern paperbacks" removed. Théroux said that the editorial team still needs to review the literature on "wrapper" before making a decision.

7. DCRM(M) (Fletcher)

Leslie noted that ideally there would be a hearing at ALA Annual (New Orleans) for DCRM(S) and at Midwinter (Seattle) for DCRM(M) (music).

Fletcher is working on updating the rare music rules according to changes made to DCRM(B) Epsilon version. Five areas have been completed. Her committee is a Joint RBMS/MLA Task Group consisting of: Stanley Boorman, NYU; Jain Fletcher, UCLA (*Chair*); Nancy Lorimer, Stanford; Robert Maxwell, BYU; Karen Spicher, Yale; Bruce Tabb, U. of Oregon; Charlotte Wolfe, U. of Michigan. Four people are taking 2 areas apiece and using the editorial style sheet, tracking changes and distributing clean copies. They hope to have a new version out and posted on the web in a few months. Fletcher noted that the section on collective titles has been moved to appear before the statement of responsibility area for reasons related to music cataloging. Transcription is still an issue. She would like to have a hearing at Midwinter so that she can work with MLA in Feb. based on guidance and feedback.

9. CC:DA (Th eroux)

CC:DA will be meeting three times in San Antonio. Friday's meeting was for review of the Draft of Pt. 1 of RDA. There is a very short comment period and all comments must go through the ACRL representative to CC:DA (Th eroux), by the of Feb. 7 deadline. Leslie wondered whether the Joint Task Force on Early Printed Monographs should or could formulate the response, since they had not been formally discharged. Maxwell, the chair of that Task Force, doubted the ability of its members to formulate a response within the short time period. Leslie asked whether any BSC members would be interested and had the time to formulate a response on behalf of the committee. Schneider and Creider volunteered; Leslie said she would work with them. Th eroux announced the RDA Forum from 4-6 p.m. on Saturday at the Convention Center Theatre and encouraged people to sign up for the RDA-L listserv. [The full report on CC:DA activities over the past 6 months is given in Appendix I.]

10. MARBI (Leslie)

Leslie announced that Proposal No. 2006-02: *Adding subfields for relator terms to X11 fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats* has been approved. *Depicted* is now on the relator term list for describing images.

Proposal No. 2006-03: *Standardized terminology for access restrictions in field 506 of the MARC21 Bibliographic Format* will be important for digitization projects. A controlled vocabulary will be used for access restrictions and we may want to have input into the list of terms being developed.

11. New business

a) Bibliographic Standards Committee Core Competencies Task Force

Three members from BSC will be serving on the newly created task force to devise a response from the perspective of special collections catalogers to the survey of the *RBMS Task Force on Core Competencies for Special Collections Professionals*. They are Windy Lundy (Chair), Larry Creider and David Faulds. The charge of the BSC task force is at: <http://www.folger.edu/bsc/CoreCompetenciesTF.html>. The final report of the task force is due by February 28, 2006.

b) LC CPSO change proposal for *Standard Citation Forms*

The BSC, represented by Leslie, and CPSO, represented by Barbara Tillett and Elizabeth Robinson, have prepared a joint proposal to move away from the instruction to use the shortest form understandable; rather, it recommends using an entry that is as close as possible to the catalog entry. Current citation forms, with the exception of most of the surname-only citation forms, will remain as they are. The proposal is Appendix II.

The eventual dream is to enable a link from the bibliographic record with the 510 field to the catalog record for the title cited. Additionally, authority records for citation forms would greatly assist catalogers in interpreting abbreviations in old records. There is a question about the double spacing in citations and local systems that needs to be resolved. Leslie will report back that BSC is in favor of the proposal.

12. Announcements from the floor

MARC for Special Collections Discussion Group will be meeting on Sunday morning from 10:30-11:30.

A new website at Yale, still under development, is called "Resources available at Yale for establishing authoritative forms for the names of pre-1800 European book trade personnel" (<http://www.library.yale.edu/cataloging/authorities/eurobooktrade.htm>). Théroux said that Eileen Smith is creating the resource and welcomes input.

Creider mentioned Princeton's cataloging documentation linked from the Resources for Rare Book Catalogers page and noted that UCSD has a section as well. He welcomes references to documentation at other institutions for the next update to the Resources page.

Judith Kuhagen, reporting for Elizabeth Robinson, announced that ISBD(A) will be available for public comment this spring.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30

Respectfully submitted,
Annie Copeland

Appendix I. Report from ACRL Liaison to CC:DA

To: ACRL/RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee
From: Manon Th roux, ACRL Liaison to CC:DA
Subject: CC:DA Report for ALA Midwinter 2006 (June 2005-January 2006)

1. RDA: Resource Description and Access

Much of the work of CC:DA has revolved around the rather tight schedule for the production of "RDA: Resource Description and Access" (the successor to AACR2) by the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (JSC). The standard has an anticipated publication date of 2008.

In July 2005, the JSC issued a prospectus for RDA; this prospectus was revised in December (see below). From July through September, CC:DA discussed JSC proposals relating to: levels of description, access, and authority control; the simplification of AACR2 chapter 21; the simplification of AACR2 area 4 rules; rules and glossary definitions relating to music resources; and rules for describing archival and manuscript resources. In October 2005, Marjorie Bloss was appointed RDA Project Manager and Deirdre Kiorgaard, the Australian Committee on Cataloguing representative, was selected as the new JSC Chair. That same month, the JSC met in London; the following documents came out of that meeting:

JSC London meeting: Executive Summary
<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0510exec.html>

JSC London meeting: Outcomes
<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0510out.html>

JSC London meeting: Report of the ALA representative
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/index.html>

In December 2005, the JSC issued a public draft of Part I of RDA (minus chapter 3) together with various other documents providing background and context for the draft, including a revised version of the prospectus. All documents are available here: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdadraftpt1.html>. They are also listed separately below:

Draft of part I of RDA (minus chapter 3):

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-part1.pdf>

Strategic Plan for RDA 2005-2008 (describes the goals for the development of RDA and the strategies for achieving those goals):

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5strategic1.pdf>

Prospectus for RDA (describes the approach being taken in RDA as a whole; includes a draft outline of the chapters and sample text illustrating style and layout):

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-prospectusrev.pdf>

Objectives and Principles (states the objectives and principles for the design of RDA, as well as the functionality of records produced using RDA):

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-objectives.pdf>

Frequently Asked Questions (provides answers to many questions relating to the content of RDA, its relationship to other standards, and the process for its development):

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdafaq.html>

In January 2006, a public draft of RDA chapter 3 was issued:

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-part1-ch3.pdf>

2. Commenting on "RDA: Resource Description and Access"

Catalogers in the U.S. who wish to make formal comments on the draft of Part I of RDA must submit them to CC:DA, either via an official CC:DA liaison or using a web form set up for that purpose: https://cs.ala.org/alcts/rda_form/rda_form.cfm

The deadline for submitting comments is: February 7, 2006. Comments should address the rules in the RDA draft but not the examples. The JSC has appointed a separate group to review the RDA examples.

If the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee wishes to formulate a committee response to the draft of Part I of RDA, that response should be sent to the ACRL liaison to CC:DA. The liaison will be responsible for entering the group's comments into the CC:DA Confluence database. The ALA representative to the JSC will formulate the ALA response to the RDA draft based on the comments that have been submitted to CC:DA.

Catalogers may also make informal comments on RDA-L, an electronic forum for discussion of RDA. To subscribe: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdadiscuss.html>

3. CC:DA Task Force Reports

Three CC:DA task forces submitted final reports. They have been posted on the CC:DA website at the URLs given below.

Task Force to Review the Draft "Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)":
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/tf-dcrb1.html>

Task Force to Review the Draft "Functional Requirements for Authority Records":
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/tf-frar1.html>

Task Force for the Revision of the ALCTS Online Publication "Guidelines for Cataloging Microform Sets":
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/tf-cms1.html>

One CC:DA task force submitted a status report:

Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media:
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/tf-tddm3.pdf>

4. CC:DA Meetings at ALA Midwinter 2006 (San Antonio)

CC:DA met three times at ALA Midwinter. The major business was review of the draft of Part I of RDA; other business included reports from LC, MARBI, NISO, the ALA representative to the JSC, ALA Publishing Services, and various CC:DA task forces. The full agenda is available at: <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/agen0601.html>. A two-hour "Open Forum" on RDA, sponsored by the ALCTS Cataloging and Classification Section, was also held at Midwinter.

Some areas of tension identified during the RDA discussions included:

- representation vs. accuracy (JSC tends to come down on representation side - recording what you see and adding notes or access points to clarify)
- redundancy (but some is intentional because it is designed to facilitate non-linear use of the web product)
- transcription wars (some communities want more transcription, some want less)
- sources of information (a straw poll revealed that the majority of CC:DA members wanted to be able to use the entire resource as a source of information for everything rather than have special rules laying out preferred sources, though afterwards there was disagreement on whether that meant you must always note the source used and it isn't always clear what is to be considered part of the resource)

- insufficient instruction for when you have multiple instances of the same data element
- difficulty of indicating relationships between data elements, especially when elements are repeatable
- non-text media not given enough attention
- some uncertainty as to what is to be treated as a separate data element
- no punctuation rules
- the concept of notes does not exist in some metadata standards (e.g. Dublin Core)
- no option for single-record approach for print vs. e-resource
- disagreement over the option to omit the statement of responsibility if providing an access point (although it was revealed that it isn't just metadata communities that want the option - JSC feels strongly about including it, as does LC)

Some details of the plans for publishing RDA, as presented by the ALA Publishing Services representative:

RDA is scheduled to be published both in web form and in print form. The RDA editor is working closely with ALA Publishing Services to develop the web product. It will have options for viewing full, concise, or customized versions (e.g., based on type of resource being cataloged, etc.) and various interface options (e.g., search/browse; worksheets; step-by-step). They intend to license RDA to vendors for incorporation into their systems and are looking at including training modules for use in educational settings. CC:DA members expressed concern about cost and implementation issues and suggested that an e-book option, based on the print product, might be a third option to consider.

Finally, not related to RDA but of possible interest to RBMS members:

CC:DA will be sponsoring a Preconference at the 2006 ALA Annual Conference on Cataloging Cultural Objects (CCO), the descriptive metadata standard developed by the Visual Resources Association: <http://www.vraweb.org/ccoweb/>. The Preconference will take place on Thursday afternoon and all day on Friday (June 22-23, 2006); half-day registration options will be available.

Appendix II. Proposed change to *Standard Citation Forms*

Barbara Tillett (LC CPSO), Deborah J. Leslie (BSC chair), and Elizabeth Robinson (BSC LC liaison/SCF maintenance editor) met on January 9, 2006 to discuss a possible change to the citation form of entries in *Standard citations forms for rare book cataloging*. As noted in the 1982 introduction to the reference work, citations are used in bibliographic records to help verify, identify, and describe items held in rare book and special collections.

The current forms are created based on the working principles of *Standard citation forms* (see part IV, "Construction of the citation form"). The principles allow for forms that are entered under personal and corporate names with short titles, surname-only entries for well-known sources, short titles only, acronyms, etc.

Since RDA will very likely move away from abbreviations to reduce the cryptic nature of information in catalog records--abbreviations that are often not understood by library patrons or even staff--we would like to anticipate that move and make *Standard citation forms* plainly understandable. Underlying the most problematic and cryptic of these citations is the concept of "a work [having] become widely known" in a certain form; what is widely known to one community may not be to another. This is true even within the larger rare materials cataloging community, not to mention our various constituencies.

Tillett, Leslie, and Robinson originally considered the idea to adopt *Chicago manual of style* citation forms, but options in it also prove problematic. The following draft approach is being offered for consideration and comments:

- New entries to SCF should all follow this general form (other SCF additions for editions and dates could still apply):

Corporate name or surname with initial(s). Title proper unabbreviated.

Or

Title proper unabbreviated.

The notion is to follow the AACR2 main entry form as much as possible. Lengthy titles proper may be shortened to significant words that might aid in identification and finding the source in an online catalog.

For example:

Actual data (SCF entry no. 2): Abbey, J. R. Scenery of Great Britain and Ireland in aquatint and lithography, 1770-1860, from the library of J. R. Abbey: a bibliographical catalogue.

Say this is the 1991 reprint. There is also a 1952 edition preceding the 1972 reprint, both of which precede the 1991 reprint.

Would be cited as:

Abbey, J. R. Scenery of Great Britain and Ireland (1991 reprint)

- The current list has some citation forms with surname only. We propose to scrutinize each of these surname-only entries with the intention of changing them to match the new form above. The objective is to make them more understandable (and findable) internationally by other than those with access to *Standard citation forms*. An example is “Greg,” which is highly ambiguous and cannot be searched by itself in an online catalog to find the source referred to.
- Other entries in the current list will remain as-is with any changes reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The objective in any change would be to make the citation understandable on its own or unambiguously findable in an online catalog. Decisions to change existing citation entries will take into account the current use of these citation forms on cataloging records, and any potential difficulties or conflicts that might be created. We suggest that the old and new forms can co-exist in the catalog. Libraries wishing to make the older forms more intelligible to users would be free to update them and submit the updated forms to SCF.
- Parenthetical qualifiers for editions, supplements, reprints, and multiple versions would remain the same.
- Forms for articles in journals and other larger works would also follow the new form noted in the first bullet, for both the article and the larger work.

Postscript: Regardless of any change to the citation forms in SCF, it would be desirable to construct integrated library systems’ displays that can generate the full citation from the current shortened forms as input in MARC field 510. We would encourage the rare books community to petition their vendors for such capability, if they agree with this proposal.

Barbara B. Tillett, Chief, Cataloging Policy and Support Office, Library of Congress

Deborah J. Leslie, Head of Cataloging, Folger Shakespeare Library and Chair, RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee

Elizabeth A. Robinson, Team Leader, Rare Book Team, Special Materials Cataloging Division, Library of Congress and LC Liaison to the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee

18 January 2006