

## 2008-2009 CCS Committee Charge Review

**Committee: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access**

**Respondent: John Myers, Chair, CC:DA, 2008/09**

**PPC Liaison: Jimmie Lundgren**

---

Please complete the questionnaire below and return to your PPC liaison by March 1, 2008.  
Thank you.

### **Charge/Function statement:**

[Reproduced from the ALA handbook and available online at:

<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/digital/ccda/charge.html>]

- To make a continuing assessment of the state of the art and suggest the direction of change in the field of descriptive cataloging;
- To recommend solutions to problems relating not only to bibliographic description but also to choice and form of access points, other than subject access;
- To initiate proposals for additions to and revisions of the cataloging code currently adopted by ALA and to review proposals initiated by other groups or individuals;
- To develop official ALA positions on such proposals in consultation with other appropriate ALA units and organizations in the U.S.A.;
- To instruct the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (or successor organization) regarding the official ALA position and to suggest acceptable bases for negotiations;
- To develop official ALA positions on proposed international cataloging policies and standards pertaining to the committee's area of responsibility and to advise the official ALA representative; or, if there is *no official ALA representative*, to act as the clearinghouse within ALA for review of these policies and standards and to serve as the formal liaison between ALA and the originating organizations;
- To encourage the U.S. library and information services community to express opinions on issues under consideration through timely publication of agenda items in the community's press;
- To keep the profession informed by reporting committee actions promptly through appropriate communication channels.

### **1. How adequately does the statement given above describe the purpose and scope of the committee?**

The above statement well describes the purpose and scope of the committee. We note the following edit is appropriate to update the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet: "ALA Representative to the Joint Steering

Committee for Revision of AACR” is now “ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA.”

## 2. How could the size and composition of the committee be improved?

Several issues were raised in the last renewal:

- a) Composition of the committee: Successfully resolved. More broadly opening committee representation to constituencies with a stakehold in cataloging issues was advocated, along with the possibility for the chair to grant provisional representation. The revised criteria are available at:  
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/digital/ccda/docs/CCDAIaisionPolicy.pdf>
- b) Size of the committee: Successfully resolved. Size was less problematic than lack of understanding regarding responsibilities. Ah an orientation document was proposed and developed to address this, available at:  
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/digital/ccda/orientation.html>
- c) The press of work: Unresolved. If anything, the ongoing development of RDA as a successor cataloging code to AACR2 has increased the workload of the committee. This is coupled with other significant changes to or emergence of critical standards in descriptive cataloging that have also taken place. The following is a list of the Task Forces empanelled to address these (and remember this is on top of the work of the committee-as-a-whole to review the successive drafts of RDA):
  - Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs (ALCTS/ACRL) [2004-2005]
  - Consistency across Part I of AACR2 [2002-2007]
  - FRBR Terminology [2003-2007]
  - Maintain “Differences Between, Changes Within” [2004-2007]
  - Review of Draft Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books) [2005]
  - Review of the Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials) [2008]
  - Review of Draft Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR) [2005-2006]
  - Review of ISBD Consolidated (July 2006 Draft) [2006]
  - Review of ISBD(A), 2006 revision [2006]
  - Review of ISBD(CM) [2005]
  - Review of ISBD(ER), 2004 Revision [2004]
  - Review of ISBD(G), 2003 Revision [2004]
  - Review of proposed ISBD Area 0 [2008-2009]
  - Review the Draft Functional Requirements for Authority Data [2007]
  - Review of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles [2006-2008]
  - Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media [2005-2007]
  - Specialist Cataloguing Manuals [2007-2008]
  - Specific Material Designations (SMDs) [2003-2007]

As large as CC:DA is, and drawing on ALA members outside the committee, this is still a prodigious amount of work. With the current economic situation and the corresponding

press from employers “to do more with less”, it is uncertain how this workload can be maintained.

- d) Open-meeting policy: Successfully resolved. The closed nature of the committee’s former primary electronic discussion list represented a possible conflict with ALA’s open meeting policy. The opening of the JSC’s document distribution policy has allowed discussions to be migrated to a new discussion list which is more widely shared in a read-only version of the list postings. Further changes are anticipated which will allow archival access by non-committee members as well.
- e) CC:DA website: In progress. Changes to the ALA website and its software along with changes in the membership of CC:DA have strongly indicated the need to migrate CC:DA’s primary website from the employer of the former CC:DA webmaster’s servers to an ALA hosted version under the ALCTS pages. This is in progress, although slowly due both to the extensive volume of CC:DA’s web documentation and the complexities of migrating ALA’s website to its new interface.

In discussing the membership preparatory to this charge renewal, it was observed that the ACRL representative has traditionally been drawn from the rare book & special collections cataloging community (RBMS). Given this community’s very different descriptive standards (and very active standards committee), continued representation of this community within CC:DA is desirable. However, other sections in ACRL do have cataloging communities: AFAS and WESS each have a discussion group and SEES has a standing committee. Although the current ACRL liaison sends regular reports on CC:DA activities to these groups and solicits and conveys feedback, she has some concern that these other ACRL communities might feel disenfranchised. This seems largely a matter for ACRL to work out, and it may be that ACRL will decide to keep the current arrangement. However, should one or more of the individual cataloging communities within ACRL decide to petition for individual representation, the CCS Executive Committee and CC:DA would need to address the following issues:

- 1) Although any organization can submit a request for representation, according to the liaison policy guidelines on the CC:DA website, it isn’t clear whether a subgroup of a currently represented organization can do so [currently, only CCS has multiple liaisons];
- 2) the cataloging “groups” in ACRL include both discussion groups and standing committees. Generally, a discussion group does not have members in the same way that a committee does. Would a discussion group be eligible for representation on CC:DA?;
- 3) Would it be acceptable to have one section-level representative (e.g. RBMS) and one representative for the remainder of ACRL?

**3. Please describe any overlap, of which you are aware, between the scope of this committee and that of any other division level or section level committee within ALCTS.**

Following changes to CC:DA membership, many of the committees, sections, and divisions with a stakehold in cataloging have found representation on CC:DA. There are still numerous Interest Groups in CCS that address various functions of cataloging, but there is no direct overlap with respect to the issue of standards, which seems central to CC:DA’s charge.

The relationship between CC:DA and the Subject Access Committee (SAC) has been raised previously, but with no subject component to AACR2, the two committees have been left in a state of independence from each other. This may need to change as RDA, the successor cataloging code to AACR, is planned eventually to incorporate rules concerning subject entities. This change in scope from AACR to RDA presents the potential for conflict with the charge of the SAC. It is possible that the RDA rules will deal only with the recording of the attributes for subject terminology. This could minimize intrusion into matters under SAC's purview. In any case, there are solutions to this potential overlap, including joint groups or a liaison. SAC has independently and simultaneously come to an awareness of the potential overlap and has approached CC:DA about this concern. For the present, with no set schedule for development of the relevant chapters, we feel it is adequate that both committees are aware of the potential overlap and that both are willing to negotiate and/or present solutions when the time comes.

**4. Please describe programs the committee has sponsored or co-sponsored, and publications the committee has written, in the past 4 years.**

Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) Preconference at Annual 2004 in Orlando, co-sponsored with ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI). This day-and-a-half preconference drew 162 attendees and featured 10 speakers: Barbara Tillett (Library of Congress); Allyson Carlyle (University of Washington); Glenn Patton (OCLC, Inc.); Consultant Tom Delsey; Sally McCallum (LC); Vinod Chachra (VTLS, Inc.); Jennifer Bowen (University of Rochester); Merrilee Proffitt (RLG); Diane Vizine-Goetz (OCLC, Inc); Olivia Madison (Iowa State University). Topics covered FRBR as a conceptual, entity-relationship model and as an evolution of existing cataloging theory, along with various practical aspects and applications of FRBR.

Resource Description and Access (RDA) Program at Annual 2005 in Chicago, co-sponsored with ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI). This was extremely well attended (a 1000 person auditorium was comfortably full). Speakers included Barbara Tillett (Library of Congress & LC representative to the JSC), Jennifer Bowen (University of Rochester & ALA representative to the JSC), and John Attig (Penn State University & CC:DA member). Presentations covered: the background and context of RDA, including international activities with IFLA's IME ICC and ISBD Review Group; the drafting and review process for RDA, including the change from AACR3 to RDA; and the anticipated features of the new rules as well as some current issues with the development of the rules.

Cataloging Cultural Objects (CCO) Program at Annual 2005 in Chicago, co-sponsored by the Visual Resources Association (VRA), American Library Association/Society of American Archivists/American Association of Museums Joint Committee (ALA/SAA/AAM Joint Committee), ALCTS Network Resources and Metadata Interest Group (NRM IG), and Collaborative Digitization Program. This was well attended with an estimated 400 in attendance. Speakers included Elisa Lanzi (Smith College & Past President VRA), Ann Whiteside

(University of Virginia & Vice President ARLIS/NA), Maria Oldal (Pierpont Morgan Library), and Jonathan Furner (OCLC). Presentations covered the background and organization of CCO, as well as how to use it as a content standard and in conjunction with the MARC communication standard.

Publication of a new edition of “Differences Between, Changes Within.” This resource provides guidance on when changes are sufficiently major as to warrant a new record, or minor as to warrant edits to an existing one. The responsible task force brought the text of the previous edition up to date with respect to changes in AACR2 and the LCRI, as well as resolved troubling differences between the print and pdf formats. Further details are available at the publication website: <http://www.ftrf.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/org/cat/differences.cfm>, and the task force’s webpage: <http://www.ftrf.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/org/cat/differences.cfm>.

Issuance of a revision to “Guidelines for Cataloging of Record Sets.” This online publication was originally issued to address the creation of the sets of records that support commercially issued microform sets. It was reviewed and revised to bring it up to date with respect to the prevalent format change of the resources from microform to digital. The revision is available at: <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/org/cat/catrecordsets.cfm>

**5. Please describe other activities, such as surveys or other research, conducted by the committee in the past 4 years.**

CC:DA has provided an extensive body of responses as part of the RDA development process since the issuance of the first draft under the title AACR3 in autumn 2004. These can be found at the Working documents page of the JSC website at: <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/working1.html>, with contributions variously under the links to the individual drafts of RDA, as well as under the various constituency document series. This effort has been the primary focus of CC:DA’s activities since the last renewal. CC:DA also has to its credit the activities of various task forces providing input and feedback on other standards developments like the IME ICC, DCRM (monographs and serials), ISBD(A), and proposed ISBD Area 0, among others.

**6. What plans in the near future does the committee have for sponsoring or co-sponsoring programs and issuing publications?**

No solid plans at the moment. Much of the anticipated RDA programming is being handled by CCS and/or ALCTS, specifically by the CCS Task Force on the Implementation of RDA. It is reasonable to assume that continued standards development will elicit the need for further CC:DA task forces and their subsequent reports.

It is expected that current CC:DA publications will require re-assessment and probable revision to bring them in line with RDA’s requirements.

**7. What other activities do you foresee in the near future that will help the committee meet its charge?**

It can be anticipated that CC:DA will have a role and considerable task in the immediate post-release revisions to the RDA content. Further, CC:DA will continue to monitor the progress of cataloging standards development. The next several years portend a period of “settling in” between RDA, the existing/revised ISBD, the new IME ICC, and the MARC 21 format. This settling in period will all be affected by the growing influence of the conceptual models found in FRBR and FRAD reports, as well as the implementation of relational database practices that seem to represent the next evolutionary step in catalogs and catalog records. There will doubtless be numerous opportunities for task forces and/or responses by the committee as a whole.

**8. Please describe scheduling conflicts/problems this committee has had with other committees, both within CCS and ALCTS, and external.**

There are a number of cataloging-centered Interest Groups that routinely conflict with CC:DA’s Saturday meeting slot, but this seems unavoidable given the constraints on conference schedules. It is unfortunate though because it would seem logical that such Interest Groups would be excellent proving grounds for prospective CC:DA committee members. Under the current schedule set up, the IGs and CC:DA are completely divorced from each other.

For several conference cycles, there was a standing conflict with the RDA Update Forum, which was problematic because a) CC:DA participants (members and audience) had a vested interest in both RDA development and communication of those developments, and b) several CC:DA members were presenters for the Update Forums. This forum has since been moved to Sundays to avoid this conflict. Regrettably, the conflict has re-emerged though as RDA implementation moves forward. For instance, at Annual 2009, the RDA program conflicts with CC:DA standing Saturday afternoon slot and the RDA pre-conference conflicts with CC:DA’s “back up” slot on Friday afternoon. (CC:DA meeting time had expanded into Friday afternoons in recent years, although it is to be hoped that this Friday afternoon time slot will no longer be required as the scale of RDA development ramps down. We now are faced with “Sophie’s choice” as to which RDA programming – program or preconference – we wish to miss.)

One potential area of scheduling conflict that has been avoided is with the MARBI meetings. At all costs, the current lack of conflict must be maintained due to the heavy overlap in interests by both committee and audience members. At the recent 2009 Midwinter meeting, it was particularly felicitous that the MARBI and CC:DA meetings were scheduled in the same space (at different times of course). This seemed to work out well, as the space needs for both are very similar – open U-table configuration facing a large audience.

**9. What changes do you recommend for this committee?**

None at this time. As noted above, changes to the liaison structure with respect to ACRL may be forthcoming. Also, the inclusion in RDA of rules regarding subjects will be monitored and mutually agreeable solutions to resolve the overlap with SAC will be proposed when appropriate.

**10. Would you recommend changing the status of your committee to a discussion group?  
If yes, why?**

No.

**11. Would you recommend dissolving this committee? If yes, why?**

No.