

2003-2004 CCS Committee Charge Review

Committee: Committee on Cataloging:Description and Access (CC:DA)

Respondent: Mary Lynette Larsgaard, Chair, CC:DA, 2003-2005

PPC Liaison: David Banush

Please complete the questionnaire below and return to your PPC liaison by March 1, 2004. Thank you.

Charge/Function statement:

Committee Charge [available online at

<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/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.

[Source: *ALA Handbook of Organization*]

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

Quite well.

2. How could the size and composition of the committee be improved? I am using the response to this question not only to discuss size and composition but also to forward to areas of concern to the CC:DA: the press of work; online meetings and their possible conflict with ALA's Open Meeting Policy; and organizational support for the Webpage.
 - a. *Composition of the committee:* This is the primary concern; because CC:DA is the ALA voice on changes to the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* – and with the Library of Congress constitutes the U.S. voice – it is important that every cataloging community be adequately represented on CC:DA, and that the representative of a given community be active in CC:DA work. It is thus somewhat unfortunate that the current CCS policy on CC:DA membership treats representation as an entitlement of certain levels of the ALA hierarchy, rather than as a means of communicating with relevant cataloging communities and other stakeholders; for example, there are limitations on representation from ALA organizations outside of CCS [section only] and ALCTS [division only], and on representation from non-ALA organizations. In order to be sure that all cataloging communities are well represented on CC:DA, the CCS policy could profitably be rewritten in terms of the stakeholders and cataloging communities CC:DA needs to work with in order to do its work. In addition, it would be helpful if the chair were be given the authority to grant provisional representation to organizations that are relevant to current CC:DA work. There is currently a discussion paper by CCS Chair, Jennifer Bowen, that deals with this topic in a way that I as CC:DA Chair perceive will improve this matter.
 - b. *Size of the committee:* Since CC:DA does its work primarily via email and the committee Web page (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/>) instead of using snail-mail, size in terms of photocopying and mailing expenses is not a concern. There is some question as to whether the present size – 44 – is too large to conduct business in an effective fashion. The current system of 9 voting members and 35 non-voting representatives/liaisons is indeed working, albeit perhaps not perfectly. It is in my opinion as chair that it is the considerable press of work and the lack of an orientation document for new members (to explain as exactly as is possible what work is involved) rather than the large size of the committee that causes problems. To deal with this second problem, CC:DA plans to have an orientation document (for review by CC:DA) out by mid-2004,

so that members will understand what work is involved in being on CC:DA. One point for discussion within the committee is whether spreading the work around is better done with more voting members or with more representatives from cataloging communities.

- c. The *press of work* is much more difficult to deal with successfully, in that there does not seem to be a way to divide up the AACR work, and the work of reviewing documents dealing with cataloging (e.g., IFLA documents; NISO documents when they apply to cataloging), with another committee or committees. What has happened is that for various reasons – most noticeably the tremendous increase in resources available over the Web, and the necessity for the cataloging community to have rules by which to catalog these resources – the Joint Steering Committee to Review AACR (JSC) has been moving very quickly to change and to develop AACR. This has been a double-edged sword for CC:DA members, for it requires – since the late 1990s or early 2000s – large amounts of work on task forces and via email as well as at CC:DA's four in-person meetings per year (two at Annual and two at Midwinter). It is not unusual for the most active members – such as the ALA representative to JSC, the CC:DA Webmaster, the CC:DA Chair, and indeed any member who may well be on a couple of task forces plus keeping up with reading, understanding, and commenting on the extensive documentation – to spend one week a month working on CC:DA task forces and documents. We may be unwittingly transgressing the ALA limitation on the number of ALA groups in which one person may participate at one time. As chair of CC:DA, I do intend to encourage increased participation on the task forces both by non-voting members of CC:DA and by catalogers who are not members of CC:DA but are knowledgeable on a topic being addressed by a task force. For example, a task force on cataloging early printed monographs (formed at Midwinter 2004) is heavily populated by early-materials catalogers who are not members of CC:DA but do frequently catalog these early materials.
- d. *Online meetings and ALA's open-meetings policy:* As was previously mentioned, the timetable and the press of work mean that CC:DA conducts much of its work online via email; as an example of the type of work that is done online, I have included in Appendix A the schedule for a few months immediately after Midwinter 2004. The membership of this listserv (ALA-CCDA@ala.org) is limited to members of CC:DA. If this voluminous email to conduct committee business is construed to be the online equivalent of a meeting, then this appears to be in conflict with ALA's Open Meetings policy (Policy 7.4.3), which states: "All meetings of the American Library Association and its units are open to all members and to members of the press." This is certainly not a problem that is unique to CC:DA; vide the following attachment

to an OCC document (EBD #12.30, 2002-2003):

<http://www.ala.org/ala/yalsa/boardandcommittees/coordpt.pdf>. More likely to be unique to CC:DA is the stricture of the JSC that JSC documents be available only to members of JSC, which is extended to CC:DA via the ALA representative to JSC. This stricture is not likely to change any time soon, because of the problems JSC has experienced in the past with proposal documents being used by catalogers as current cataloging rules. On the other hand, CC:DA documents are available to all via the CC:DA Webpage, and the chair would like to make a practice of informing catalogers of these documents and requesting comments, probably by means of the chair sending emails to AUTOCAT-L and other relevant groups. Another possibility is that after each issue, discussion, and vote, a summary would quickly be posted to the CC:DA Website. Very often, the short timetable (3-5 days as a maximum) may preclude making an issue available for public comment – although the chair is certainly willing to try to summarize short-time-frame issues prior to discussion and vote, and sent the discussion to appropriate listservs – but for the longer lead-times and in certain carefully defined situations, it might be possible to follow this route. As an aside, these summaries – prior to discussion and vote – tend to be written anyway, and sent to the CC:DA listserv, by the ALA representative to JSC, the chair, or anyone kind enough to take on the work (e.g., John Attig has written several of these summaries).

- e. **CC:DA Website:** The work of CC:DA is an important component of the mission of CCS, and of ALCTS as a whole. The support required by CC:DA in order to do its work has: a) changed in nature (from distribution and control of paper documentation to preparation and control of electronic documents managed through the CC:DA Website); and b) expanded (exponentially is the impression of persons doing the work) in size and in complexity. This means that increasingly over the years the CC:DA Website has become essential to the performance of the committee's work. Very often, documents need to be available over the Website for members to read. As matters are currently, there are in effect two webpages: one that is an ALCTS-maintained Website (<http://www.ala.org/ala/alctscontent/catalogingsection/catcommittees/ccda/ccda.htm>); and one, composed in the main of Committee documents, at the university by which the CC:DA Webmaster is employed (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/index.html>). The work needed to keep the latter Website current – document design and editing; document control; Website maintenance – is more than any one person should be asked to do on a volunteer basis. In part because of this problem, CC:DA has a task force on its Web presence, to try to determine other ways to get the Web work done; our two favorite options at the moment are: a) get organizational

assistance from ALCTS headquarters; and b) have CC:DA interns take on some of the Web work.

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.

CC:DA has the unique authority to speak on behalf of ALA on matters involving AACR and other descriptive cataloging standards; no other organization has that ability. For this reason, the many groups within ALA who have cataloging interests have to work through CC:DA. CC:DA's goal is to work with these other committees as experts in their own fields; a primary example is MARBI, with which CC:DA has an excellent working relationship. Here is just a sampling of the groups within ALA that focus on cataloging: ALCTS Catalog Form and Function Committee; ALCTS CCS Copy Cataloging Discussion Group; ALCTS CCS Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials; ALCTS CCS Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee; ALCTS Serials Section Committee to Study Serials Cataloging; LITA/ALCTS CCS Interest Group on Authority Control in the Online Environment; etc.

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

CC:DA has been very active over the years; I refer you to the CC:DA Website for specifics. Below are a few high points.

2000: Preconference at Annual, "Metadata: Libraries and the Web - Retooling AACR and MARC21 for Cataloging in the Twenty-First Century," July 6-7. This preconference was extremely successful - in excess of 400 persons attended - and was the inspiration for a series of ALCTS regional institutes on metadata and AACR.

2002: co-sponsor in name only for program, "Introduction to the Revised AACR Chapter 12," of the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging

2003: program on FRBR at Annual

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

CC:DA does much of its work via task forces and these perform research as required by the charge of the individual task force.

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

CC:DA has the following planned:

Programs:

- Annual 2004: Pre-Conference on FRBR
- Annual 2005: program on the International Cataloguing Code

Publications:

- "Differences Between, Changes Within"

This publication was completed last year, and will be free over the Web to ALCTS members, and for sale to other persons and agencies.

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

As mentioned above, CC:DA does much of its work via task forces.

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

Scheduling of programs is always a problem, since there are so many cataloging meetings already in place that are of interest to catalogers. Scheduling meetings of task forces can also be a little difficult, since many members attend both CC:DA and MARBI.

9. What changes do you recommend for this committee?

Please see 2. above.

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.

APPENDIX A

NB: Comments were sent in late for some of these, mainly due to email problems caused by a virus during the first half of February, which were substantial and slowed down work considerably.

February 11, 4pm PST: comments in to listserv re report of TF on OPAC Displays; comments due in to IFLA on February 13.

February 11-12 Sec9 – “optionally” as compared with “optional addition”
<http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/internal/sec/sec9.pdf>

February 13, 4pm PST: comments in to listserv re 2 TF reports – metadata and ISBD(G); comments due in to IFLA on February 16.

February 13-19 LC/54 – authorities: Begin discussion (1 week): Response to LC document – <http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/internal/lc/lc54-lcfolup2rev.pdf>. Due date for CC:DA response to JSC: March 22.

February 18 – next version of Chair’s response to ALCTS questionnaire reviewing CC:DA; it will incorporate comments received from CC:DA via email. Due in to ALCTS on March 1.

February 20 – begin discussion (1.3 weeks): Response to CILIP/BL paper on seriality of multipart – Awaiting document. Due date to JSC: March 22.

March 2 – begin discussion (1.2 weeks): Response to Format Variations WG proposals on Chapter 25 – Awaiting document. Due date to JSC: March 22.

March 10-18 – discussion (1.2 weeks): Response to Format Variations WG proposals on mode of expression – Awaiting document. Due date to JSC: March 22.