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1. Introduction of members and visitors

Members present: Marcia Barrett, University of Alabama; Jane Carpenter, University of California, Los Angeles (chair); Lori Dekydtspotter, Lilly Library, Indiana University; Eileen Heeran, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Ryan Hildebrand, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas, Austin (controlled vocabularies editor); Francis Lapka, Yale Center for British Art; Martha Lawler, Louisiana State University, Shreveport; Michelle Mascaro, University of Akron; Ann Myers, Stanford University (secretary); Jennifer Nelson, Robbins Collection, Law Library, University of California, Berkeley; Aislinn Sotelo, University of California, San Diego; Catherine Uecker, University of Chicago.

Members excused: Todd Fell, Yale University; Margaret Nichols, Cornell University.

Liaisons: Elizabeth German, University of Houston (ACRL to CC:DA liaison); William La Moy, Syracuse University (RBMS Exec liaison)
Visitors: John Attig, Pennsylvania State University; Erin Blake, Folger Shakespeare Library; Amy Brown, iSchool, University of Texas, Austin; Valerie Buck, Brigham Young University; Ivan E. Calimano, University of Southern California; Meghan Constantinou, Grolier Club; Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University; Ellen Cordes, Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, University of Minnesota; Diane Ducharme, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Emily Epstein, Health Sciences Library, University of Colorado, Denver; David Faulds, Emory University; Jain Fletcher, University of California, Los Angeles; Elaine Franco, University of California, Davis; Jane Gillis, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Linda Isaac, University of Miami; Nancy Kandoian, New York Public Library; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library; Christine Megowan, Loyola Marymount University; Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University; Stacey Penney, Memorial University, Newfoundland; Heather Pretty, Memorial University, Newfoundland; Nina Schneider, Clark Library, University of California, Los Angeles; Stephen Skuce, Massachusetts Institute of Technology;

2. Settlement of the agenda

Agenda item 14 was moved to follow item 6.

3. Approval of Annual 2011 minutes

The Annual 2011 meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Examples to Accompany DCRM(B) (Schneider)

Nina Schneider reported that the Examples team sent a copy of their latest draft to the Library of Congress, and got some suggestions for revisions, including reformatting the rules and putting the catalog records in MARC21 format instead of OCLC MARC. They also need proper permissions for a few more images. There are two major tasks remaining:

1. Delete the subject headings in the examples. The Library of Congress requested this because there were some problems with the subdivisions. The form and genre headings (655s) would be kept, but all other 6xx fields would be deleted. This is in line with previous editions of the Examples which did not include subject headings. It was suggested that a note could be made in the preface to explain their absence from the example records.

2. Two volunteers are needed to proofread the examples for punctuation, spacing, etc. by mid-March. Contact Schneider if interested.

Schneider said that they hope to have the Examples out by the next round of Cataloger’s Desktop updates in the fall, and that it will also be on the RBMS website for free. She thanked the volunteers for their help, and Jane Carpenter thanked Schneider for her work.
5. Controlled Vocabularies Subcommittee (Hildebrand)

Ryan Hildebrand presented nine terms from the scope notes project which the subcommittee had completed following a review of feedback on the digress.it blog. All scope notes passed unanimously.

**Convicts’ addresses**

SN Use for texts of speeches made, or purported to have been made, by those convicted of a crime.

**Eclogues**

SN Use for short poems on rural or pastoral themes, traditionally in the form of a dialogue between shepherds.

**Epics**

SN Use for long narrative poems on the adventures and deeds of one or more heroic characters.

**Erotica**

SN Use for literary or artistic works focused on sexual love or desire.

**Etiquette books**

SN Use for didactic works on the behavior, decorum, and manners of polite society.

**Fabliaux**

SN Use for bawdily humorous metrical tales of a type found chiefly in 12th and 13th century French poetry.

**Farces**

SN Use for comic plays featuring contrived and ludicrous situations, exaggerated characterizations, and physical humor.

**Formularies**

SN Use for reference works detailing prescribed forms, procedures, or models according to which something is to be done.
The term Fantasy literature was tabled. Hildebrand then presented two new terms, both of which were approved unanimously.

**book artist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesaurus</th>
<th>Relator Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Use for an entity who conceives and perhaps also executes an artist’s book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>book designer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interleaved books**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesaurus</th>
<th>Binding Evidence;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Text block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Use for books bound with blank leaves systematically inserted between the original leaves, whether by the publisher or owner, to facilitate user-added content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, there was a change request for the genre term Expurgated editions, which was approved with one minor amendment.

**Expurgated editions**

| SN              | Use for editions of a work in which objectionable parts of the original text have been omitted or altered, usually on moral grounds. This term applies to all copies of an edition, not to individual copies that have been altered by an owner. |
| UF              | Bowdlerized editions                               |

There will be another set of terms appearing on digress.it for scope note comment soon: Harlequinades (Plays), Heroic dramas, Hornbooks, Indulgences, Jestbooks, Legal instruments, and Librettos. Legal formularies and Libri amicorum have been tabled.

6. **Revision of Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging (Barrett)**

Marcia Barrett’s general question for the committee was whether the draft distributed prior to the conference was sufficient for the working group to continue with their work. She presented some specific questions for committee input:

1. Whether to drop subordinate bodies in corporate names – there had previously been agreement to drop subordinate bodies, but some working group members opposed this idea because they felt that it might complicate catalog searches. An alternate proposal was not to include subordinate bodies when the name is included in the title but to keep them otherwise. Consensus was that ultimately it would be more user-friendly to drop the subordinate bodies altogether.
2. How to handle works with three or more authors: use the first name only, or all three? The consensus was that the catalog record for the source should serve as the basis for the citation, so regardless of the number of authors the citation would use the first creator name and the title, which should be sufficient to allow users to identify the work cited.

3. Is there any reason to deviate from the second edition of *Standard Citation Forms* in terms of the bibliographic information given in the examples? The only change the working group has made so far is giving fuller bibliographic information for supplements. There were no objections to this approach.

4. Is it acceptable to use AACR2 abbreviations, or should they be dropped? The consensus was that since these citations are notes rather than access points, the use of some abbreviations, such as ed. and suppl., would be reasonable.

5. Barrett asked for general feedback on the draft, particularly on the Construction of the Citation Form section. It was suggested that rather than enclosing multiple qualifiers in separate parentheses: (2nd ed.) (1994), they should be combined in one set of parentheses, separated by a comma: (2nd ed., 1994).

6. Should “George” appear in square brackets after the citation “Catalogue of prints and drawings in the British Museum” when volumes 1-4 were actually edited by Stephens? Consensus was that regardless of actual editorship, the work is commonly known as “George,” so “George” should appear in square brackets.

The committee agreed that the working group should continue revising the citation forms according to what is laid out here. Barrett said that by Annual 2012 the working group hopes to have a working draft completed which can then be fine-tuned. There is a wiki for anyone who would like to participate, and they will make the project available for more public comment at some point, but not before Annual.


Carpenter read out the charge for the task force (see Appendix A), which was approved unanimously. Deborah J. Leslie reported that the task force is using John Attig and Robert Maxwell’s discussion paper “Reconsidering DCRM in the light of RDA” as a starting point, and will be developing the questions posed in the paper into more specific recommendations regarding DCRM and its relationship to existing and incoming cataloging standards. Some changes will be trivial, while others will not be. For example: DCRM is currently structured according to ISBD; this will have to change if DCRM has the same relationship to RDA as it has had to AACR2.

Since Attig is the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), he will be acting as an advisor to the task force. Leslie recommended that BSC make a formal interim statement on what rare materials catalogers should do regarding the DCRM modules that have already been published (Books and Serials). The task force’s recommendation is that
catalogers continue to use the DCRM modules as published until they are revised – don’t try to mix DCRM and RDA for elements that are within the scope of DCRM.

Aislinn Sotelo pointed out that the BIBCO standard records are being revised to reflect RDA, and they are likely to want a revision of the record for rare books. Attig said that the BIBCO revision may have to wait until after DCRM(B) is revised. He also clarified that there are options for cataloging rare materials under RDA for those not already using DCRM.

Leslie acknowledged that for the DCRM modules currently under development this is a big issue. DCRM(G) has included some alternatives to accommodate RDA, but the task force will be looking at what kind of approach will be best for all the modules. Erin Blake and Kate Moriarty requested that the task force include representatives from the editorial teams of the unpublished DCRM modules in their discussions.

Text of a formal interim statement regarding DCRM and RDA will be drafted after Midwinter and voted on online.

7. Preconference seminars

a. San Diego 2012 (Sotelo, Lapka, and Dekydtspotter)

Sotelo gave the current details for a seminar tentatively entitled “That’s not how we do it...”: Metadata for Digital Projects. The speakers will be Joyce Bell, Princeton University, Arwen Hutt, University of California San Diego, and Laura Capell, University of Miami. They will address specific issues to consider before embarking on a digital project, expectations for MARC records in the digital environment, how the digital environment affects metadata decisions, how collections are prioritized for digitization, and how metadata plays a role in those decisions.

Francis Lapka and Lori Dekydtspotter reported on a discussion section they are organizing entitled “The Future of Rare Materials Cataloging Standards: Can DCRM and RDA Get Along?” They plan to build off the work of the RDA Task Force and use their recommendations as a basis to create specific topics for discussion. Leslie noted that something similar was done before BSC began the DCRB revision, and that a discussion section could be useful since this will be the first opportunity for the larger rare materials cataloging community to respond to the task force report. Lapka asked that at least key points of the task force’s report be shared prior to the preconference so they can plan the discussion section accordingly.

b. Minneapolis 2013 (Carpenter)

Carpenter encouraged more proposals for the 2013 preconference as none have been formally submitted yet. She also pointed out that seminar proposals do not necessarily have to follow the theme of the preconference. Anyone with ideas should contact Carpenter. Possible ideas from the Annual 2011 minutes include:
following up on the public services vs. technical services discussion group from the 2011 preconference, the NextGen catalog, and security marking.

8. Preconference workshops

a. San Diego 2012 (Sotelo)

Sotelo reported on a workshop about non-MARC metadata. Mary Elings of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, and Brad Westbrook of the University of California, San Diego will be the instructors. They plan to cover the digital information life cycle, different categories of metadata, descriptive data standards and challenges, and methods for moving metadata into different environments. There will be time for hands-on exercises and group discussion.

Jane Gillis announced that Jennifer MacDonald and Jennifer Nelson will be reworking their Latin for catalogers workshop into a workshop on Latin for special collections people in general – curators, reference librarians, etc.

b. Minneapolis 2013 (Carpenter)

A workshop on DCRM(G) was suggested, but Blake thought 2013 might still be too early. Gillis pointed out that a seminar on DCRM(G) might be helpful: it could introduce what visual materials are, and explain the scope of materials addressed by DCRM(G) as a prelude to a workshop. The other modules might want to do something similar as they get closer to publication.

Other workshop suggestions included something on DCRM and RDA, and computer programming for librarians in the context of digital libraries and metadata, perhaps with an eye towards fostering better communication between programmers and librarians.

9. DCRM(B): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books) (Leslie)

Leslie reported that DCRM(B) is currently being reprinted but she had not heard yet when it would be available. She then raised the issue of where DCRM editorial files are stored. Given the desirability of keeping and making accessible the final draft of the DCRM modules to aid in issuing reprints and new editions, she proposed that rather than depending on individuals’ record-keeping practices, a formal place should be designated to deposit all DCRM final drafts. These drafts would be the Word files from which the final camera-ready pdfs are made for publication.

This issue had already been discussed with Jason Kovari, who suggested a two-fold approach: the files could be put on ALA Connect, and also submitted to Chatham Ewing, RBMS Archivist, for storage. Kovari said that the rbms.info site would not be an appropriate place to store the files because of various issues with maintaining the site. There was some concern about whether the copies in the RBMS archives would be retrievable for future
revision, and it is unclear whether the archives are accepting digital files. Leslie pointed out
that access to the files would need to be restricted since the print copies are sold for
money, but indicated that this can be done relatively easy on ALA Connect. As long as the
issues of appropriate restrictions and access can be resolved, it was agreed that the RBMS
Archives and ALA Connect would be appropriate places to store the files, and having them
in two places would provide added security.

10. DCRM(M): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music) (Fletcher)

Jain Fletcher reported that DCRM(M) Version 5B is nearly finished and will be sent out for
comment within a month. Nancy Lorimer has written RDA alternatives where appropriate,
as the music community is further along in working with RDA than the rare materials
cataloging community. The editorial team will need to rework the standard citations
referenced in DCRM(M) so that they conform to the new principles, but Fletcher thought
that a complete draft within the year was definitely feasible.

The comments from MLA on the last draft indicated a need for clearer guidelines regarding
parallel statements, and Fletcher felt that the AACR2 instructions on parallel bibliographic
information were inadequate for cataloging rare music. She therefore drafted “Suggested
Additional Parallel Rules in DCRM Music” which was circulated prior to the meeting. Blake
shared feedback on this document from the DCRM(G) editorial team: on page 3, they
disagreed with the change made to 1F10.1 as the original wording had been in DCRM(B)
for a reason; they also identified three instances where information covered elsewhere in
the rules was repeated unnecessarily. Michelle Mascaro also asked that the suggested
change to 1F10.4 be amended to instruct catalogers to optionally omit statements of
responsibility if not practicable rather than to just omit them. Fletcher indicated that she
would look into these issues.

On the question of transposition, Blake mentioned that in DCRM(G) there is a general rule
instructing that if considered important the cataloger should make a note to indicate the
original position of the elements unless the piece has a standard title page, and wondered if
this might be helpful for DCRM(M) as well. Fletcher said they would consider it, and
mentioned that she thinks it would be best to keep languages together, which will mean
transposing elements in the transcription. There was no objection to this idea, so long as
catalogers are instructed to make a note about the transposition if considered important.

Fletcher asked what they should do regarding the AACR2 rule to drop parallel title
information after three languages and it was agreed that for rare materials all title page
information should be transcribed, regardless of the number of languages. As for order of
languages, it was suggested that they should be transcribed as indicated on the title page –
top to bottom, left to right – rather than language by language as in AACR2.

Fletcher asked for further thoughts and comments after Midwinter on the overall intent of
DCRM parallel guidelines as the DCRM(M) editorial team would like to give more guidance
without deviating from the overall DCRM intent. She also welcomed further comment on
the proposed changes for DCRM(M).
11. DCRM(G): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Graphics) (Blake)

Blake presented some issues that had come up in response to the draft of Appendix L: Illustrations in Books and Serials. The first is with the Citation note (rule L3.5.3) and whether both a 5xx note and a 773 linking entry field are required as seems to be suggested by AACR2. The ensuing discussion concluded that either a 5xx or 773 field or both could be used to create the desired citation and note, and that this choice is system-dependent. The editorial team was advised to take out the system-dependent language in the instructions and to provide examples showing the different possible MARC field combinations.

The second issue Blake presented was how to handle a situation where an institution might have two copies of the same print, one having been removed from a book or issued loose and the other still in the book. Should there be two separate records, or one record with very careful notes? The consensus was that a single record would be preferred, with a list of related items and corresponding holdings records as appropriate. Blake pointed out that this approach would cause problems with using a 773 field. Given that this issue is caused by the quirks of MARC it will need to be revisited.

Blake asked for approval of Appendix L with the wording changes as discussed for citation notes and clarifying the use of one bibliographic record for both loose and bound illustrations. She will redraft the Appendix and submit it for vote online after Midwinter.

12. DCRM(MSS): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts) (Nelson for Nichols)

Nelson reported that since ALA Annual the DCRM(MSS) editorial team has worked on Area 5 and continued to work on Area 7. They are now numbering their drafts on the wiki by date, and have combined all the Areas into one document. They hope to have a complete draft ready for a hearing by Annual 2013.

The digress.it site is still open for comment on Area 5, and the comments they have received so far have been very helpful. The current major debate is over how to record size: original size vs. current size, text block vs. binding, the manuscript itself vs. the container, folded vs. original size, whether paging information or researcher information is most important, and how much should be optional vs. mandatory – book catalogers want more mandatory instructions, while archivists want more optional. Leslie wondered if there was a manuscripts reason to depart from measuring the height of the binding. AMREMM instructs catalogers to record both the height of the binding and the height of the text block as well as the actual writing space. Moriarty explained that the size element is actually completely optional in DCRM(MSS), but it does instruct catalogers to measure the binding for security reasons. Based on the comments they received in Area 5, the editorial team is revisiting whether to make the size element completely optional or not.
13. **DCRM(C): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic) (Kandoian for Fell)**

Nancy Kandoian reported that the DCRM(C) editorial team has finished working on Areas 1-7 and has moved on to the Appendices. The latest draft is available on the wiki and everyone is encouraged to read it. They plan to have a complete draft ready for a hearing at Annual 2013. Kandoian also expressed the team's gratitude to the DCRM(G) editorial team for their work on Appendix L, which they will be adapting to cartographic materials.

15. **Reports (appended to the minutes)**

   a. Appendix B: Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger (Creider)
   b. Appendix C: CC:DA Report (German)

Carpenter introduced Elizabeth German, the new ACRL liaison to CC:DA. She has been working with Lapka and Dekydtspotter, who are acting as point people for BSC to coordinate on issues with CC:DA.

German reported that between June and December CC:DA had 19 motions, of which 17 passed unanimously. All documentation is available on the CC:DA website. One motion was withdrawn and submitted to a task force which will report at Midwinter, and the motion on using containers as a source of description was rejected and submitted to a task force for further investigation. Ann Copeland clarified that this task force is investigating sources of information as relates to RDA 2.1 and 2.2 because OLAC and MLA objected to the lack of options for collective titles. The task force will contact BSC when there is anything for us to comment on.

Lapka mentioned that John Attig’s report on “Descriptions of relationships in RDA” might be of interest to BSC members; the report is available on the CC:DA website as part of the Midwinter agenda. He also reported that ALCTS is be sponsoring some webinars on RDA, including one on May 23 on rare materials and RDA which will be presented by John Attig and Robert Maxwell, and one on May 30 on archival materials and using RDA with DACS.

16. **New business: Discussion of possible options for formalizing BSC relationship to CC:DA (Carpenter)**

Currently there is a division (ACRL) representative to CC:DA but a section (RBMS) representative might be more helpful for BSC’s purposes. There are two possibilities: either petition CC:DA for a formal section liaison, or formalize the nomination process of the ACRL liaison. The section liaison would technically represent RBMS as a whole, but would focus on BSC issues. The current nomination process informally involves BSC in choosing the ACRL representative, but there is no documentation of this fact. Carpenter asked whether BSC wants to pursue either of these options, and if so, which one.

The group agreed that having a separate RBMS liaison to CC:DA would be best since BSC is heavily invested in the work of CC:DA. There was some concern that the other groups
traditionally represented by the ACRL liaison might now feel underrepresented, but if that is the case they can also petition for their own liaison. German will continue to report to them in the meantime. Carpenter mentioned that Lori Robare, chair of CC:DA, is supportive of RBMS having its own liaison, and has offered to follow up BSC’s petition with a letter of support. Carpenter will draft a petition and circulate it for comment, then submit it to the RBMS Executive Committee for approval before sending it to CC:DA.

17. Acknowledgments/Announcements

Carpenter thanked Deborah J. Leslie, Stephen Skuce, and Randal Brandt for helping her in her new role as chair; Manon Théroux for her input on CC:DA issues; John Attig, Robert Maxwell, and Larry Creider for supplying information and history on various BSC issues; Francis Lapka and Lori Dekydtspotter for taking on more CC:DA responsibilities; and Catherine Uecker for helping get image permissions for Examples to Accompany DCRM(B). She also stated that BSC owes a debt of gratitude to everyone who is in charge of a task force or working group, including all the DCRM modules.

There were two job announcements: Jane Gillis announced that a job description would be coming out in mid-February for the Head of Digital Projects and Metadata at the Beinecke Library, Yale University, and Marcia Barrett announced that the University of Alabama is now accepting applications for Associate Dean for Special Collections.

Finally, Skuce congratulated Carpenter for running a fabulous first meeting.

18. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ann Myers
Appendix A: Task force on DCRM and RDA

Background

In response to the discussion paper prepared by John Attig and Bob Maxwell, “Reconsidering DCRM in the Light of RDA: A Discussion Paper,” which appeared in late 2010, (http://www.rbms.info/committees/bibliographic_standards/committee-docs/DCRM_RDA-DP-20101214.pdf) and subsequent discussion of the paper and the issues it raised at the BSC 2011 Midwinter Meeting in San Diego, BSC chair, Stephen Skuce, called for the formation of a Bibliographic Standards Committee Task Force on DCRM and RDA at the BSC 2011 Annual Meeting in New Orleans. Deborah J. Leslie agreed to head the task force, which also includes members Catherine Uecker and John Attig.

The Attig/Maxwell discussion paper analyzes the relationship of DCRM—as exemplified in the published modules for Books, DCRM (B) and Serials, DCRM (S)—with AACR2 as the current accepted cataloging standard for general materials. Once RDA is fully implemented, that relationship will need to be redefined. Attig and Maxwell present four possible options for revising DCRM in response to the implementation of a new cataloging standard, and suggest that BSC choose one of these options as soon as possible, in order to establish a general direction which would guide and inform a more thorough analysis of changes which would have to be made.

In addition to the issue of the overall relationship of DCRM and RDA, Attig and Maxwell also identify other areas in DCRM that will be affected by RDA, such as DCRM terminology; structure and arrangement of DCRM standards; selection of a standard for those parts of the record not covered by DCRM; ISBD; and LC policy on application of DCRM (B).

Lively discussion by BSC at the 2011 Midwinter Meeting reflected varying opinions on these issues, including which of the four options might best serve the special materials cataloging community, highlighting the need for additional in-depth analysis of the issues, assessment of options, and recommendations for action. (See Item 7 of BSC 2011 Midwinter Minutes http://www.rbms.info/committees/minutes/2011/bibstandminutes11m.pdf)

Task Force Charge

In light of the recommendations of the Attig/Maxwell discussion paper, and the need for further analysis of issues involved in modifying DCRM in response to implementation of RDA, the Task Force is charged, in general, to develop recommendations on the relationship between DCRM and RDA for consideration by Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC). Specifically, the Task Force is asked to:

1. Submit a report containing an expanded, more in-depth analysis of the issues and options presented in the Attig/Maxwell discussion paper, along with recommendations for next steps by BSC.
2. Assist BSC in coordinating decisions on particular DCRM/RDA issues which would affect DCRM modules currently being developed; and, using those decisions as a guide, create a single set of implementation decisions for all DCRM modules, including those already published.

3. Coordinate with moderators of BSC-sponsored discussion session on DCRM and RDA at 2012 Preconference in San Diego to insure consistent presentation of issues and recommendations.

4. As necessary and appropriate, suggest rewording to JSC of problematic areas of RDA related to rare materials cataloging.

**Timeline**

The Task Force will present its report, including analysis, recommendations, and discussion of possible outcomes at the BSC 2012 Annual Meeting in Anaheim.
Appendix B: BSC Directory of Internet Resources

Additions & Changes—January 2012

Additions:

Cataloger’s Reference Shelf
http://www.itsmarc.com/crs/crs.htm

LC’s Information and Resources to prepare for RDA
http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/

ILAB Book Search Form
http://www.ilab.org/search_form.php Occasionally useful for descriptions and/or images

Frequently Asked Questions about Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials (LCGFT)
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/genre_form_faq.pdf

The Ideal Book: Private Presses in the Netherlands, 1910-2010

Form/Genre Terms for Legal Materials

http://dlib-diss.mpier.mpg.de/ catalog of over 73,000 works held by the Max-Planck-Institut fuer europaeische Rechtsgeschichte In addition to catalog records, there are facsimiles of title pages.

An Analytic Bibliography of Online Neo-Latin Texts
http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/bibliography/ by Dana Sutton. Includes some facsimiles.

Blockbuecher aus Bayerischen Sammlungen
http://www.bayerische-landesbibliothek-online.de/xylographa with indexes by work, provenance, and present location

Medical Heritage Library http://www.archive.org/details/medicalheritagelibrary
http://www.medicalheritage.org/

Land Case Maps http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/collections/landcases.html From the Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley

Mapsof.Net http://mapsof.net/ --Images of maps, including historical maps
Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum Schaller & Koensgen
http://digi20.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb00050039_00001.html

Updates to Swiss e-codices: http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/all/LastUpdate/50/0

Penn in Hand—Selected Manuscripts http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/medren/index.html
also includes early modern, Schoenberg, and Indic manuscripts

Vivarium: the online collections of St. John's University and the College of St. Benedict
http://www.hmml.org/vivarium/

CHANGES: No changes were made to the site.

Submitted by
Laurence S. Creider
Appendix C: CC:DA Report

ACRL Liaison Report on CC:DA Activities: Midwinter 2012
Elizabeth German, ACRL Liaison (emgerman@uh.edu)

Announcements

- Reminder: Use the RDA Tool kit for typos
- Updated guidelines on how to submit an instruction change to CC:DA were accepted. See the CC:DA website.
- RDA is undergoing a rewording project, the purpose of which is to clarify the language of the RDA instructions without altering their meaning or introducing ambiguity.

Upcoming Events

- June 23, 25 – CC:DA Meeting at ALA Annual

Also see the RDA Toolkit Training Calendar: http://www.rdatoolkit.org/calendar

Useful Links

- CC:DA Website: http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/
- JSC Website: http://www.rda-jsc.org/
- RDA and PCC Website: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/RDA-PCC.html
- RDA Toolkit: http://www.rdatoolkit.org/

CC:DA Pre-Midwinter Motions and Votes

- Chair Summary: http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair58.pdf
  - CC:DA plans to work on revising some documents in light of RDA (“How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA” as well as the brochure, “Building International Descriptive Cataloging Standards: the role of the ALA’s CCDA”). Task forces will be formed on revisions.
- 19 votes, 17 passed unanimously
  - Motions not carried: CC:DA/MLA/2011/1, Container as a source: The motion was to approve the proposal as modified by discussions on the CC:DA wiki. Discussion indicated a need to take a more comprehensive look at the instructions for sources of information. There were 2 votes in favor and six opposed; the
motion was rejected. The Committee subsequently approved the formation of a task force to continue work on this topic.

**CC:DA/AALL/2010/1/Rev.**: The motion was to approve the revised AALL proposal on Places in certain federations as modified by discussions on the CC:DA wiki and the discussion list. During discussion, it became clear that issues could not be resolved in time to complete action before the deadline for proposals, and the motion was withdrawn.

**CC:DA Midwinter Motions and Votes:**
- Approval to form 3 Task Forces:
  - Descriptions of Relations
  - Relationship design in Appendix K designators
  - Building International Cataloging Standards
- Motions to approve
  - CC:DA/JSC Rep/JCA/2011/4
  - Report and recommendations of the Task Force to Update “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA”:

**Meeting Notes**

*Report from the Library of Congress Representative*
- LC Midwinter Update: [http://www.loc.gov/ala/mw-2012-update.html](http://www.loc.gov/ala/mw-2012-update.html)
- LC has undergone many staff changes. Roberta Shaffer was appointed Associate Librarian for Library Services.
- The weekly Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) Approved Lists are now issued on a monthly basis.
- The Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRI) will remain available online, but will no longer be updated or changed.
- In May 2011, the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative was formed to review the bibliographic framework to better accommodate future needs. A website has been established for this initiative: [http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition/](http://www.loc.gov/marc/transition/)
- LC Information and Resources in Preparation for RDA: [http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/](http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/)

*Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee*
- Reports:
  - Revision of RDA 6.21 and 6.29.1.33: [http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/jsc1112a.pdf](http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/jsc1112a.pdf)
  - Descriptions of relationships: [http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/jsc1112b.pdf](http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/jsc1112b.pdf)
• ALA Proposals Discussed at the JSC meeting
  o 6JSC/ALA/3: Affiliation
    The proposal was not accepted. The issue of recording additional information about affiliation will be discussed with the FRBR Review Group. In the meantime, the nature of the affiliation may be recorded as a relationship to the affiliated body (with appropriate relationship designators) or as a note in the Biographical information element.

Appendix K now opened for additions
The JSC affirmed that proposals may be submitted for additions to the list of relationship designators in Appendix K.

The JSC decided that “data about data” should be considered out of scope for RDA at this time.

o 6JSC/ALA/2: Heads of state and Heads of government
  The JSC had near consensus that preferred names for heads of state and heads of government should be based on the language preferred by the agency recording the data. ALA was asked to prepare a revised proposal on this basis, and to address any other comments that remain relevant.

o 6JSC/ALA/1: Reports of one court
  The JSC approved the proposal, using the revised wording proposed by LC.

o 6JSC/ALA/4: Artistic and/or Technical Credit
  The JSC agreed to expand the scope of this element to include sound recordings. The scope will read: “An artistic and/or technical credit is a listing of persons, families, or corporate bodies making contributions to the artistic and/or technical production of a moving image resource, sound recording, or multimedia resource not recorded in another element.”

The JSC agreed that there were difficulties distinguishing in a principled way between information about persons, families, and corporate responsible for a resource that is transcribed in a Statement of Responsibility (2.4) and that recorded in Notes (7.23, Performer, Narrator, and/or Presenter; 7.24, Artistic and/or Technical Credit). The JSC invited ALA to prepare a discussion and recommendations on these issues.

• Motions, Notes, and Announcements:
  o Reminder that all outcomes are posted on the JSC website: http://www.rda-jsc.org/
  o Attig noted that the JSC is reviewing the scope of RDA and what to do with the place-holder chapters on subject attributes and relationships. A discussion paper is planned, which may outline options for following FRBR, FRAD, or FRSAD.
- Work is also underway on how to harmonize RDA with other standards, such as ISBD and ISSN.
- RDA is undergoing a rewording project. Managed through ALA Publishing, a copy editor, Chris Oliver, has been hired; he is carefully working through the chapters of RDA to clarify and simplify the language of the instructions.
- Appendix D of RDA may be expanded to include annotations.
- JSC can only act on proposals. There is now a system of fast tracking proposals. Also, anyone can submit typo and error changes through the RDA Toolkit.
- CC:DA approved a motion to accept CC:DA/JSC Rep/JCA/2011/4
- The report on “Descriptions of relationships” (RDA section 8) was discussed and a task force will be formed to address this issue. (see: http://ccdatest.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/jsc1112b.pdf)

**Revision Proposal from AALL: Places in Certain Federations**
- Conversation revolved around the idea of modern former jurisdictions. This is considered an open issue.

**Report of Task Force on RDA Instructions for Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies**
- A straw poll was conducted and CC:DA supports the TF recommendation for eliminating type 6; A name that includes the entire name of the higher or related body.
- The task force will continue looking at this issue.

**Revision proposal from ATLA: Sacred Scriptures**
- The proposals in the report were discussed with a focus on the Apocrypha and Apocryphal Books. The group continues to struggle with this issue and further discussions will take place online.

**Report from the ALCTS CaMMS RDA Programming Task Force**
- Look for a one-day preconference at ALA Annual

**Revisions to CC:DA Procedures**
- The procedures document was updated to reflect the name change of the Cataloging and Classification Section to Cataloging and Metadata Management Section and the Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office became the Policy and Standards Division.
- Modified the description of the SAC role to include: Decisions and recommendations on subject entities and relationships in RDA are informed by SAC and communicated to CC:DA and the JSC representative by the SAC liaison.
Report from the MARBI Representative

- Report: [http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/marbi1201prel.pdf](http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/marbi1201prel.pdf)
- Proposal 2012-01: New Data Elements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats for Medium of Performance
  - [http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-01.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-01.html)
  - Discussed at MARBI during Midwinter. After considering the creation of a new 6xx field, MARBI has opted instead to use (and expand) the existing 382 field to record this data.
- Discussion Paper 2012-DP01: Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format
  - [http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-dp01.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2012/2012-dp01.html)
  - Will return at annual in the form of a proposal
- Discussion: The Future Role of MARBI in the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative
  - Issue concerns the informal function and structure of MARBI as both the ALA committee and the LC MARC advisory committee.
  - There was no formal conclusion but general consensus from all groups that the work of MARBI should move forward.

Report from the Task Force to Update “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA”

- Purpose of Task Force:
  - Draft interim guidelines while the current document is under development
  - Update the text in light of RDA (including changes in terminology, names, URLs, JSC processes and timetables, and new examples in the Appendix)
  - Make additions to the text that would assist in the preparation of a change proposal
  - Make changes to the proposal submission process that would reflect current methods for sharing electronic documents
  - Simplify markup of the proposed changes
- Accepted by CC:DA

Report from the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3

- Informal report
- Group plans to have a discussion paper ready by annual

Report from the PCC Liaison

- Reminder to use the PCC RDA website for information on the transition and training: [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/RDA-PCC.html](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/RDA-PCC.html)
- PCC completed work (in September) on the BIBCO standard record for archival collections: [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/BSR_Archives_20110916.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/BSR_Archives_20110916.pdf)
- PCC is aiming for a date during the 1st quarter of 2013 as “Day One” for authority headings in RDA. This means that valid pcc records (BIBCO and CONSER) would have to use headings formulated according to RDA no later than the date of Day One.
The rest of the bibliographic record could of course still be cataloged according to AACR2; PCC intends to let institutions transition to RDA at their own pace. Needless to say, catalogers will have to be comfortable formulating RDA authority records before Day One. PCC will issue online NACO-RDA training (for catalogers already trained in NACO-AACR2). These training modules will require a total of two days to complete, although the modules will be broken up in a manner so that two full consecutive days will not be required.

- The PCC Task Group on RDA Acceptable Heading Categories issued a report (on Sept. 1) noting that about 95% of existing headings within the authority file (LC NAF) are valid under RDA, and therefore usable as-is. Of the remaining 5%, about half can be made valid via computer automation, while the remainder will require human intervention. Full text of the report: [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/Report%20of%20the%20Task%20Group%20on%20AACR2%20&%20RDA%20Acceptable%20Headings-1.docx](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/Report%20of%20the%20Task%20Group%20on%20AACR2%20&%20RDA%20Acceptable%20Headings-1.docx)

**Report of the CC:DA webmaster**
- Report: [http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/redesign.ppt](http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/redesign.ppt)
- CC:DA will be moving to a Content Management System

**Report from the Task Force on Sources of Information**
- Presented discussion questions and received comments from the group
- Potential to fast track a proposal
- Group plans on having a proposal ready for annual

**Report from ALA Publishing Services:**
- Will be moving towards more predictable releases (2nd Tuesday of the Month) with only substantial changes twice a year.
- The recent January released addressed loading times and introduced icons in preparation for translated versions
- Virtual user group Feb 15: [http://www.rdatoolkit.org/virtualusergroup](http://www.rdatoolkit.org/virtualusergroup)
- Discussed the issue surrounding numbering. ALA Publishing anticipated that numbers would be retired not reused which is causing conflict with the proposals that have been adopted that reuse numbers.

**Report from the RDA Training Task Force**
- Upcoming webinars:
  - March 14: RDA and Moving Images. Presenter: Kelley McGrath
  - March 28: Cataloging Three-Dimensional Objects and Kits with RDA. Presenter: Kelley McGrath
  - May 23: Rare Materials and RDA: Exploring the Issues. Presenters: John Attig, Robert Maxwell (OCLC) pattong@oclc.org (CC:DA) lrobare@uoregon.edu (ALCTS Staff) jreese@ala.org