TO: Kristin Lindlan, CC:DA Chair

FROM: John Attig, CC:DA Webmaster

SUBJECT: Revisions to "How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA"

Background

The document "How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA" was revised in June 2001 to add a section on the timetable for submitting proposals. At Midwinter 2002, CC:DA discussed a proposal to make other long-needed revisions to the instructions on the form of revision proposals, to bring them into line with the JSC procedures and with our actual practice.

The JSC *Statement of Policy & Procedures* was revised in April 2002 and subsequently posted on the JSC Web site at http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/policy.html. Section 2 covers the "format of revision proposals." The attached revision brings our document into conformity with these JSC specifications.

The attached revision also simplifies the instructions about marking up plain ASCII versions of revision proposals. It also dispenses with the requirement for a paper copy of the proposal, although it recommends a paper copy when the revision includes text with foreign language diacritics or special characters.

The revised document has also been checked against the proposed revision to the CC:DA Procedures; no conflicts were found.

The two examples have been revised to conform to the revised instructions. Each is given in two forms – a Word document and an ASCII document.

Proposed Revisions

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA

Introduction

The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) is the body within the American Library Association (ALA) that is charged with initiating and developing proposals for the revision of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2R)*. Within the United States, all additions and changes to the cataloging code must be channeled through this group composed of nine voting members, two interns, and thirty-three five non-voting members who represent ALA constituencies and a wide variety of other national library and related organizations with an interest in the rules.

Who Can Submit a Rule Revision Proposal?

Anyone can submit a rule revision proposal to CC:DA by following the instructions detailed below. CC:DA welcomes input and suggestions for code revision. At the same time, it should be noted that the process for rule revision is a formal one that requires careful preparation and patience upon the part of the petitioner. The latter is particularly important because, although approved and endorsed by CC:DA, a proposal must usually pass through a lengthy review, revision, and subsequent review process before it is approved by the **Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (JSC)**. It is not uncommon for this process to take a year or more given that the JSC is composed of representatives from the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the British Library, the Library Association, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, and the Australian Committee on Cataloguing. All these members review and discuss rule revision proposals with their own cataloging communities.

What Types of Proposals Are Acceptable?

CC:DA is open to considering rule revision proposals that range from small, isolated additions or changes to the text and/or examples (e.g., the Committee spent a great deal of time identifying and correcting typographical errors that had crept into the 1993 rule revision packet) to major changes of the code (e.g., addition of a new chapter or deletion of a rule).

How Will Proposals Be Evaluated?

Whether minor or major rule revisions result, each proposal is carefully evaluated by the Committee and considered from several different angles. Although each area below might not be equally important for every proposal, the following list provides a comprehensive overview of the factors and questions that the Committee routinely considers in its evaluation process.

- **The need for the revision is determined:** Is the current text confusing? Does the current text and/or examples lead to incorrect or inconsistent results, or does it cause access or identification problems for catalog users? Is there an inconsistency among similar or

analogous rules? Is a rule in the wrong place? Does the proposal address a situation not covered? Is it appropriate to a general code?

- **The context is considered:** What are the underlying principles or issues? Are there analogous situations?

- **The correctness of the proposal is assessed:** Does the proposal solve a problem without creating others? Is it in accordance with underlying principles? Is it clear and unambiguous? Is it consistent with other similar rules?

- **The possible impact on other rules is looked for:** Would the proposed change necessitate other changes? Would examples need to be corrected? Would captions, indexes, tables of contents, etc., need to be changed?

- **The potential impact of the proposal is examined:** Would old cataloging need to be altered? Would the change simplify decisions? How often does the matter arise? Is access affected?

Preliminary Steps To Take in Submitting a Proposal

Given the complexity and time-consuming nature of the rule revision process, as well as the careful evaluation and close examination that each proposal will receive, it is advisable to undertake several preliminary steps before undertaking the preparation of a formal proposal:

1. Discuss the concern with other catalogers in order to test the merits of your case and to establish the validity of the potential proposal in light of the evaluative criteria given above.

2. Contact one of the voting members of the Committee or one of the member liaisons representing a group (e.g., Music Library Association's CC:DA liaison) whose sphere of cataloging interest and activity might be closely allied with your concern. Discussion of the potential proposal with this expert might uncover other issues that need to be addressed, open up an avenue for discussion with other members of a particular cataloging community, or lead to taking an altogether different approach to the problem. Additionally, voting members and representatives can be particularly helpful in guiding the process outlined below and in navigating the waters of CC:DA procedure.

Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal

To submit a formal rule revision proposal to CC:DA, please provide the Committee with the following information:

Paper vs. Electronic Documents:

A paper copy of the rule revision proposal must be forwarded to CC:DA (see instructions on **Forwarding the Proposal** below)., but, iIf at all possible, the proposal should also be sent in electronic form as a simple ASCII text file to the Committee for distribution over its listserv. This Forwarding an electronic version will facilitate and speed up the process by allowing CC:DA to consider the proposal well in advance of receiving the print documents that go out by mail before each conference as soon as it is received. Proposals distributed to CC:DA are also posted on the CC:DA Web site <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/ccda.html>. (Note: if the proposal contains changes to a section or sections of the rules that feature foreign language

diacritics, ~~an effort should be made to expedite the paper copy~~ <u>a paper copy should also be provided</u>.)

<u>Electronic copies may be either in a recent version of a popular word processor, such as Microsoft Word or Word Perfect or may be in simple ASCII text. For ASCII text versions, formatting should be indicated by SGML-like tagging, as indicated below.</u>

<u>The CC:DA Webmaster prepares documents for distribution to CC:DA and for posting on the CC:DA Web site. The Webmaster may be contacted for assistance in the mechanical and editorial details of preparing a proposal.</u>

Address:

The proposal should take the form of a dated memorandum addressed as shown below. Once received by the Chair of CC:DA, the proposal will be assigned a document number.

```
To:        American Library Association,
           ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging:
           Description and Access
From:      [To be supplied]
Subject:   [To be supplied]
```

Note: On the `Subject:` line, please include the following types of information if applicable to the proposal: the rule number; captioned words associated with the rule; whether examples, footnotes or appendices are affected:

Examples:

- Corrections of two examples in rule 24.26A. DELEGATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL BODIES

- 1.4D1. Name of publisher, distributor, etc.

- Items without a collective title, 1.1G.

- 24.10B., First Baptist Church of Urbana ~~<italic>~~(Urbana, Ill.)~~</italic>~~ example

- Error in Appendix B, ABBREVIATIONS, [cite abbreviation]

- Change to GLOSSARY entry for [cite GLOSSARY entry term]

Background:

The proposal should include a background statement that provides the context in which the rule revision should be considered. A thorough explanation of the problem(s) in AACR*2R* that will be remedied by the revision, an historical overview of the steps, discussions, events, etc. that have led to its creation, and citations to any related documents are appropriate for inclusion in this section of the proposal. As the organizational needs of the proposal dictate, the **Rationale** and **Assessment of impact** discussed below may also be included here.

Proposed revisions:

According to JSC policy, "There will be one proposal per document." CC:DA interprets this to mean that all revisions in the proposal must be closely related, not that a separate proposal is required for each rule affected by the revision. It is therefore common for proposals to include revisions to more than one rule. Furthermore, these revisions often occur in different parts of AACR~~2R~~. To enhance the clarity and readability of the proposal, the following information is required for each instance of a proposed revision. If more than one revision is proposed, the order of presentation should mirror the text of the code.

~~**Presentation of the rule as it currently appears in AACR2R:**~~

~~Carefully observing spacing, indentation, capitalization and punctuation, the rule under consideration should be faithfully reproduced in the proposal. Given the limitations of ASCII text, the electronically submitted version of the proposal should also indicate bold and italic typeface by enclosing text between the following tags, leaving a space before and after each of the tags:~~

~~<bold> **indicates that enclosed text is bold** </bold>~~

~~<italic> *indicates that enclosed text is italic* </italic>~~

~~<bold> <italic> ***indicates that enclosed text is both bold and italic*** </italic> </bold>~~

~~In addition to the presenting the rules as they appear in AACR2R, the tags may also be used elsewhere in the electronically submitted version of the proposal if it is necessary to indicate <bold> **bold** </bold> or <italic> *italic* </italic> text.~~

Presentation of the rule with proposed changes included:

First, the proposed changes should be indicated in a copy of the current text. In presenting the current text, carefully observe spacing, indentation, capitalization and punctuation. Typography should be reproduced. If the electronic copy of the proposal is submitted in ASCII text, use the following SGML-like tags to indicate bold and italic typeface:

<bold> **indicates that enclosed text is bold** </bold>

<italic> *indicates that enclosed text is italic* </italic>

<bold> <italic> ***indicates that enclosed text is both bold and italic*** </italic> </bold>

Next, the ~~rule~~ proposed revisions should be ~~presented as instructed above along with the proposed revision(s)~~ indicated as deletions or additions to the current text. Deletions should be indicated by striking through the deleted text. Additions should be indicated by double-underlining the added text. ~~In the electronically submitted version of the proposal, the changes to the rule as it currently appears in AACR2R should be interpolated using the convention of enclosing the changes in sets of triple arrow brackets, leaving a space between the triple arrow brackets and the proposed text, as follows:~~ If the electronic copy

of the proposal is submitted in ASCII text, use the following SGML-like tags to indicate deletions and additions:

<<< enclosed change with spaces following and preceding the triple arrow brackets >>>

<<< enclosed change that includes <bold> bold </bold> and <italic> italic </italic> text >>>

<delete>deleted text</delete>

<add>added text</add>

<add>added text that contains <bold>bold</bold> and/or <italic>italic</italic> text</add>

If the result of the intended change is the deletion of text with no replacement wording or rewording, provide a brief explanation. within the triple arrow brackets as shown below:

<<< Third sentence deleted >>>

<<< Last paragraph deleted >>>

In summary, the arrows will serve to set off the proposed revision(s) in the context of the rule as currently formulated. Spacing, indentation, capitalization, and punctuation within the arrows should exactly represent the intent of the revision.

Presentation of the revised rule:

Finally, give a "clean" copy of the rule as it will appear after revision has been made. Use the conventions described above to indicate layout and typography.

Rationale/Explanation for the proposed revisions:

Each proposal should contain a rationale or justification for the suggested revision, including a statement of the problem presented by the current rule, and an estimate of the impact of the proposed solution when appropriate. The rationale behind the proposed revision(s) to each rule or an explanation of the proposed changes should be included in the proposal. It The rationale may follow the set of presentations for each rule, appear immediately after all the rules have been presented or be included in the **Background** statement discussed above.

Assessment of the impact and survey of related rules:

Finally, the proposal should include an assessment of the impact resulting from implementation of the revision(s), including the need to study and/or change other rules within AACR2R. This may be a separate section of the proposal or be included in the **Background** statement.

Forwarding the Proposal

The paper and electronic copies of the rule revision proposal can be forwarded to CC:DA in one of two ways:

- If the proposal has a particular focus or intent that coincides with the sphere of cataloging represented by one of many different groups represented on CC:DA, it can be forwarded to the Committee member representing that particular cataloging constituency.

- The proposal can be forwarded directly to the Chair of CC:DA.

The names of current CC:DA members are listed in the Committees section in the *ALA Handbook* (ALCTS/CCS/CC:DA) with full address information provided in the *Handbook*'s "Index of Persons." If you are an ALA member, one free copy of the *ALA Handbook* can be requested from ALA headquarters in Chicago. The roster of current CC:DA members is also available on the CC:DA Web site.

What is the Timetable for Submitting a Rule Revision Proposal?

While CC:DA will accept a rule revision proposal at any time, rule revision is a complicated and lengthy procedure, and the more complicated and longer the proposal, the more time will be required to consider it. For a proposal to be guaranteed to receive consideration at the next CC:DA meeting, the following minimal time should be allowed:

- Rule change proposals should be made available to the chair of CC:DA six weeks prior to the next CC:DA meeting, which is scheduled during the ALA Annual or Midwinter Meetings. The proposals will be made available to the CC:DA membership and posted on the CC:DA Web site one month prior to the next CC:DA meeting.

- If the rule revision proposal is accepted by CC:DA, it is forwarded to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC). JSC requires that rule revision proposals be transmitted to JSC at least 30 days prior to the next scheduled JSC meeting in order to be considered. This is to allow sufficient time for the other JSC members to consult their respective advisory bodies, for those advisory bodies to review the proposal and formulate their responses, and for the JSC member to transmit those responses to the other JSC members in a time frame that allows them to read the responses and be prepared to discuss both the original proposal and the responses at the next JSC meeting. [The schedule of JSC meetings is available on the JSC Web site, usually as the final item on the latest report of Outcomes of the … JSC Meeting. The JSC procedures for receiving and considering revision proposals is documented in JSC's "Statement of Policy & Procedures."]

- Unless the rule revision proposal is either accepted or rejected by all the JSC constituents, there will likely be further revision by CC:DA and subsequent review by JSC. This process may take a year or more, depending on the complexity of the proposal and the number of revisions requested.

APPENDIX

This appendix provides two examples of rule revision proposals that were submitted from different groups to CC:DA — proposals that made their way through the CC:DA process to the JSC and were eventually adopted, one with minor changes, as part of AACR~~2R~~. Although the examples differ somewhat in their organization and content, each provides the information needed by the Committee to review and evaluate the merits of the proposal. Each example is presented twice to illustrate both options for submittal: (1) ~~paper~~ <u>a Microsoft Word document</u> and (2) appropriately coded, electronic ASCII text.

> *Example 1:* 3JSC/Chair/ALCTS AV rep response
> - ~~Paper~~ <u>Word processing</u> version
> - ~~Electronic~~ <u>ASCII</u> version
>
> *Example 2:* CC:DA/MuLA/25.30D2/1
> - ~~Paper~~ <u>Word processing</u> version
> - ~~Electronic~~ <u>ASCII</u> version

Clean Copy of Revised Document

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA

Introduction

The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) is the body within the American Library Association (ALA) that is charged with initiating and developing proposals for the revision of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR)*. Within the United States, all additions and changes to the cataloging code must be channeled through this group composed of nine voting members, two interns, and thirty-three non-voting members who represent ALA constituencies and a wide variety of other national library and related organizations with an interest in the rules.

Who Can Submit a Rule Revision Proposal?

Anyone can submit a rule revision proposal to CC:DA by following the instructions detailed below. CC:DA welcomes input and suggestions for code revision. At the same time, it should be noted that the process for rule revision is a formal one that requires careful preparation and patience upon the part of the petitioner. The latter is particularly important because, although approved and endorsed by CC:DA, a proposal must usually pass through a lengthy review, revision, and subsequent review process before it is approved by the **Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (JSC)**. It is not uncommon for this process to take a year or more given that the JSC is composed of representatives from the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the British Library, the Library Association, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, and the Australian Committee on Cataloguing. All these members review and discuss rule revision proposals with their own cataloging communities.

What Types of Proposals Are Acceptable?

CC:DA is open to considering rule revision proposals that range from small, isolated additions or changes to the text and/or examples (e.g., the Committee spent a great deal of time identifying and correcting typographical errors that had crept into the 1993 rule revision packet) to major changes of the code (e.g., addition of a new chapter or deletion of a rule).

How Will Proposals Be Evaluated?

Whether minor or major rule revisions result, each proposal is carefully evaluated by the Committee and considered from several different angles. Although each area below might not be equally important for every proposal, the following list provides a comprehensive overview of the factors and questions that the Committee routinely considers in its evaluation process.

- **The need for the revision is determined:** Is the current text confusing? Does the current text and/or examples lead to incorrect or inconsistent results, or does it cause access or identification problems for catalog users? Is there an inconsistency among similar or

analogous rules? Is a rule in the wrong place? Does the proposal address a situation not covered? Is it appropriate to a general code?

- **The context is considered:** What are the underlying principles or issues? Are there analogous situations?

- **The correctness of the proposal is assessed:** Does the proposal solve a problem without creating others? Is it in accordance with underlying principles? Is it clear and unambiguous? Is it consistent with other similar rules?

- **The possible impact on other rules is looked for:** Would the proposed change necessitate other changes? Would examples need to be corrected? Would captions, indexes, tables of contents, etc., need to be changed?

- **The potential impact of the proposal is examined:** Would old cataloging need to be altered? Would the change simplify decisions? How often does the matter arise? Is access affected?

Preliminary Steps To Take in Submitting a Proposal

Given the complexity and time-consuming nature of the rule revision process, as well as the careful evaluation and close examination that each proposal will receive, it is advisable to undertake several preliminary steps before undertaking the preparation of a formal proposal:

1. Discuss the concern with other catalogers in order to test the merits of your case and to establish the validity of the potential proposal in light of the evaluative criteria given above.

2. Contact one of the voting members of the Committee or one of the member liaisons representing a group (e.g., Music Library Association's CC:DA liaison) whose sphere of cataloging interest and activity might be closely allied with your concern. Discussion of the potential proposal with this expert might uncover other issues that need to be addressed, open up an avenue for discussion with other members of a particular cataloging community, or lead to taking an altogether different approach to the problem. Additionally, voting members and representatives can be particularly helpful in guiding the process outlined below and in navigating the waters of CC:DA procedure.

Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal

A copy of the rule revision proposal must be forwarded to CC:DA (see instructions on **Forwarding the Proposal** below). If at all possible, the proposal should also be sent in electronic form to the Committee for distribution over its listserv. This will facilitate and speed up the process by allowing CC:DA to consider the proposal as soon as it is received. Proposals distributed to CC:DA are also posted on the CC:DA Web site <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/ccda.html>. (Note: if the proposal contains changes to a section or sections of the rules that feature foreign language diacritics, a paper copy should also be provided.)

Electronic copies may be either in a recent version of a popular word processor, such as Microsoft Word or Word Perfect or may be in simple ASCII text. For ASCII text versions, formatting should be indicated by SGML-like tagging, as indicated below.

The CC:DA Webmaster prepares documents for distribution to CC:DA and for posting on the CC:DA Web site. The Webmaster may be contacted for assistance in the mechanical and editorial details of preparing a proposal.

Address:

The proposal should take the form of a dated memorandum addressed as shown below. Once received by the Chair of CC:DA, the proposal will be assigned a document number.

```
To:        American Library Association,
           ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging:
           Description and Access
From:      [To be supplied]
Subject:   [To be supplied]
```

Note: On the `Subject:` line, please include the following types of information if applicable to the proposal: the rule number; captioned words associated with the rule; whether examples, footnotes or appendices are affected:

Examples:

- Corrections of two examples in rule 24.26A. DELEGATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL BODIES

- 1.4D1. Name of publisher, distributor, etc.

- Items without a collective title, 1.1G.

- 24.10B., First Baptist Church of Urbana (Urbana, Ill.) example

- Error in Appendix B, ABBREVIATIONS, [cite abbreviation]

- Change to GLOSSARY entry for [cite GLOSSARY entry term]

Background:

The proposal should include a background statement that provides the context in which the rule revision should be considered. A thorough explanation of the problem(s) in AACR that will be remedied by the revision, an historical overview of the steps, discussions, events, etc. that have led to its creation, and citations to any related documents are appropriate for inclusion in this section of the proposal. As the organizational needs of the proposal dictate, the **Rationale** and **Assessment of impact** discussed below may also be included here.

Proposed revisions:

According to JSC policy, "There will be one proposal per document." CC:DA interprets this to mean that all revisions in the proposal must be closely related, not that a separate proposal is required for each rule affected by the revision. It is therefore common for proposals to include revisions to more than one rule. Furthermore, these revisions often occur in different parts of AACR. To enhance the clarity and readability of the proposal, the following information is required for each instance of a proposed revision. If more than one revision is proposed, the order of presentation should mirror the text of the code.

Presentation of the rule with proposed changes included:

First, the proposed changes should be indicated in a copy of the current text. In presenting the current text, carefully observe spacing, indentation, capitalization and punctuation. Typography should be reproduced. If the electronic copy of the proposal is submitted in ASCII text, use the following SGML-like tags to indicate bold and italic typeface:

> <bold> **indicates that enclosed text is bold** </bold>

> <italic> *indicates that enclosed text is italic* </italic>

> <bold> <italic> ***indicates that enclosed text is both bold and italic*** </italic> </bold>

Next, the proposed revisions should be indicated as deletions or additions to the current text. Deletions should be indicated by striking through the deleted text. Additions should be indicated by double-underlining the added text. If the electronic copy of the proposal is submitted in ASCII text, use the following SGML-like tags to indicate deletions and additions:

> <delete>deleted text</delete>

> <add>added text</add>

> <add>added text that contains <bold>bold</bold> and/or <italic>italic</italic> text</add>

If the result of the intended change is the deletion of text with no replacement wording or rewording, provide a brief explanation.

> Third sentence deleted

> Last paragraph deleted

Presentation of the revised rule:

> Finally, give a "clean" copy of the rule as it will appear after revision has been made. Use the conventions described above to indicate layout and typography.

Rationale/Explanation for the proposed revisions:

Each proposal should contain a rationale or justification for the suggested revision, including a statement of the problem presented by the current rule, and an estimate of the impact of the proposed solution when appropriate. The rationale may follow the set of presentations for each rule, appear immediately after all the rules have been presented or be included in the **Background** statement discussed above.

Assessment of the impact and survey of related rules:

Finally, the proposal should include an assessment of the impact resulting from implementation of the revision(s), including the need to study and/or change other rules within AACR. This may be a separate section of the proposal or be included in the **Background** statement.

Forwarding the Proposal

The rule revision proposal can be forwarded to CC:DA in one of two ways:

- If the proposal has a particular focus or intent that coincides with the sphere of cataloging represented by one of many different groups represented on CC:DA, it can be forwarded to the Committee member representing that particular cataloging constituency.

- The proposal can be forwarded directly to the Chair of CC:DA.

The names of current CC:DA members are listed in the Committees section in the *ALA Handbook* (ALCTS/CCS/CC:DA) with full address information provided in the *Handbook*'s "Index of Persons." If you are an ALA member, one free copy of the *ALA Handbook* can be requested from ALA headquarters in Chicago. The roster of current CC:DA members is also available on the CC:DA Web site.

What is the Timetable for Submitting a Rule Revision Proposal?

While CC:DA will accept a rule revision proposal at any time, rule revision is a complicated and lengthy procedure, and the more complicated and longer the proposal, the more time will be required to consider it. For a proposal to be guaranteed to receive consideration at the next CC:DA meeting, the following minimal time should be allowed:

- Rule change proposals should be made available to the chair of CC:DA six weeks prior to the next CC:DA meeting, which is scheduled during the ALA Annual or Midwinter Meetings. The proposals will be made available to the CC:DA membership and posted on the CC:DA Web site one month prior to the next CC:DA meeting.

- If the rule revision proposal is accepted by CC:DA, it is forwarded to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC). JSC requires that rule revision proposals be transmitted to JSC at least 30 days prior to the next scheduled JSC meeting in order to be considered. This is to allow sufficient time for the other JSC members to consult their respective advisory bodies, for those advisory bodies to review the proposal and formulate their responses, and for the JSC member to transmit those responses to the other JSC members in a time frame that allows them to read the responses and be prepared to discuss both the original proposal and the responses at the next JSC meeting. [The schedule of JSC meetings is available on the JSC Web site, usually as the final item on the latest report of Outcomes of the … JSC Meeting. The JSC procedures for receiving and considering revision proposals is documented in JSC's "Statement of Policy & Procedures."]

- Unless the rule revision proposal is either accepted or rejected by all the JSC constituents, there will likely be further revision by CC:DA and subsequent review by JSC. This process may take a year or more, depending on the complexity of the proposal and the number of revisions requested.

APPENDIX

This appendix provides two examples of rule revision proposals that were submitted from different groups to CC:DA — proposals that made their way through the CC:DA process to the JSC and were eventually adopted, one with minor changes, as part of AACR~~2R~~. Although the examples differ somewhat in their organization and content, each provides the information needed by the Committee to review and evaluate the merits of the proposal. Each example is presented twice to illustrate both options for submittal: (1) a Microsoft Word document and (2) appropriately coded, electronic ASCII text.

Example 1: 3JSC/Chair/ALCTS AV rep response
- Word processing version
- ASCII version

Example 2: CC:DA/MuLA/25.30D2/1
- Word processing version
- ASCII version

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA

**Example 1: 3JSC/Chair/14/ALCTS AV rep response
Microsoft Word Version**

29 March 1990

Memorandum

To: Verna Urbanski,
            Chair, CC:DA

From: Bruce Chr. Johnson,
            ALCTS AV Representative to CC:DA

Subject: Rule Revision Proposal for Kits and Activity Cards

Source of Proposal

The following proposal is presented jointly by the ALCTS Audiovisual Committee and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC). Contributors include Bobby Ferguson of the State Library of Louisiana, Sharon Almquist of the University of North Texas, and Lois McCune of Indiana University.

Background

A number of subtle changes to rule 1.1C1 and the glossary definition of kit appear to introduce confusion rather than lend clarity. The wording in question relates to an understanding of what is meant by kit and lab kit. The following set of proposals is intended to eliminate this confusion and introduce more precise terminology which should make it easier for the AV cataloger to appropriately describe kits, single medium kits, and activity cards.

Rule Revision Proposals

Proposed Revision:

[1.1C1. Footnote 2:]

2. The following rules apply to list 2:
   1) Use *map* for cartographic charts, not *chart*.
   2) For material treated in chapter 8, use *picture* for any item not subsumed under one of the other terms in list 2.
   3) Use *technical drawing* for any item fitting the definition of this term in the Glossary, appendix D; for architectural renderings, however, use *art original*, *art reproduction*, or *picture*, not *technical drawing*.
   4) ~~Use *kit* for any item containing more than one type of material if the relative predominance of components is not easily determinable, and for a single-medium package of textual material (e.g., a "lab kit," a set of activity cards).~~

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

2. The following rules apply to list 2:
   1) Use *map* for cartographic charts, not *chart*.
   2) For material treated in chapter 8, use *picture* for any item not subsumed under one of the other terms in list 2.
   3) Use *technical drawing* for any item fitting the definition of this term in the Glossary, appendix D; for architectural renderings, however, use *art original*, *art reproduction*, or *picture*, not *technical drawing*.

Rationale: The definition should be in the glossary, not in a 1.1C1 footnote.

Proposed Revision:

[1.1C1. List 2:]

<u>activity card</u>
art original
[rest of list unchanged]

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

activity card
art original
[rest of list unchanged]

Rationale: In pre-AACR2 days, activity cards with text were more commonly called *lab kits,* and the term *kit* was applied to them. The current practice among manufacturers and librarians is to call this type of material (both graphic and textual) *activity cards*. Since there is no GMD which describes this type of material, and since inclusion of this type of material under the GMD kit introduces confusion, and since the term *activity card* is clearly understood by the user community, and since there is no way currently to bring together all activity cards in a catalog, it is recommended that the term *activity card* be added to List 2 of rule 1.1C1.

Proposed Revision:

8.5B1. Record the number of physical units of a graphic item by giving the number of parts in arabic numerals and one of the following terms as appropriate:

<u>activity card</u>
art original
[rest of rule unchanged]

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

8.5B1. Record the number of physical units of a graphic item by giving the number of parts in arabic numerals and one of the following terms as appropriate:

activity card
art original
[rest of rule unchanged]

Proposed Addition to Glossary:

Activity card. A card printed with words, numerals, and/or pictures to be used by an individual or a group as a basis for performing a specific activity. Usually issued in sets. *See also* Game, Kit.

Rationale: Definition derived from *Audiovisual materials glossary*, Nancy B. Olson. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC, 1988.

Proposed Revision to Glossary:

Game. A set of materials designed for play according to prescribed rules. <u>*See also* Activity card, Kit.</u>

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

> **Game.** A set of materials designed for play according to prescribed rules. *See also*
> Activity card, Kit.

Proposed Revision to Glossary:

> **Kit.** 1. An item containing two or more categories of material, no one of which is
> identifiable as the predominant constituent of the item; also designated
> "multimedia item," (*q.v.*). 2. A single-medium package of textual material (e.g., ~~a~~
> ~~"lab kit," a set of activity cards~~ a "press kit," <u>a set of printed test materials, an</u>
> <u>assemblage of printed materials published under the trade name "jackdaws"</u>). <u>*See*</u>
> <u>*also* Activity card, Game.</u>

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

> **Kit.** 1. An item containing two or more categories of material, no one of which is
> identifiable as the predominant constituent of the item; also designated
> "multimedia item," (*q.v.*). 2. A single-medium package of textual material (e.g., a
> set of printed test materials, an assemblage of printed materials published under
> the trade name "jackdaws"). *See also* Activity card, Game.

Rationale: Under part 2 of the current definition of kit, activity cards which
contain only pictures would be cataloged under the rules for graphic
materials. Activity cards which contain textual materials would be cataloged
under the rules for kits. This is to say that activity cards are sometimes kits
and sometimes not. This does not square with the American understanding of
the term *Kit,* the current wording leading to confusion. This proposed change
allows *Kit* to apply to single medium materials while eliminating this
confusion.

**Example 1: 3JSC/Chair/14/ALCTS AV rep response
ASCII Version**

29 March 1990

Memorandum

To: Verna Urbanski,
          Chair, CC:DA

From: Bruce Chr. Johnson,
          ALCTS AV Representative to CC:DA

Subject: Rule Revision Proposal for Kits and Activity Cards

Source of Proposal

The following proposal is presented jointly by the ALCTS Audiovisual
Committee and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC). Contributors
include Bobby Ferguson of the State Library of Louisiana, Sharon
Almquist of the University of North Texas, and Lois McCune of Indiana
University.

Background

A number of subtle changes to rule 1.1C1 and the glossary definition of
kit appear to introduce confusion rather than lend clarity. The wording
in question relates to an understanding of what is meant by kit and lab
kit. The following set of proposals is intended to eliminate this
confusion and introduce more precise terminology which should make it
easier for the AV cataloger to appropriately describe kits, single
medium kits, and activity cards.

Rule Revision Proposals

Proposed Revision:

[1.1C1. Footnote 2:]

    2. The following rules apply to list 2:
       1) Use <italic>map</italic> for cartographic charts, not
          <italic>chart</italic>.
       2) For material treated in chapter 8, use
          <italic>picture</italic> for any item not subsumed under one
          of the other terms in list 2.

        3) Use <italic>technical drawing</italic> for any item fitting
           the definition of this term in the Glossary, appendix D; for
           architectural renderings, however, use <italic>art
           original</italic>, <italic>art reproduction</italic>, or
           <italic>picture</italic>, not <italic>technical
           drawing</italic>.
        <delete>
        4) Use <italic>kit</italic> for any item containing more than one
           type of material if the relative predominance of components is
           not easily determinable, and for a single-medium package of
           textual material (e.g., a "lab kit," a set of activity cards).
        </delete>

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

    2. The following rules apply to list 2:
        1) Use <italic>map</italic> for cartographic charts, not
           <italic>chart</italic>.
        2) For material treated in chapter 8, use
           <italic>picture</italic> for any item not subsumed under one
           of the other terms in list 2.
        3) Use <italic>technical drawing</italic> for any item fitting
           the definition of this term in the Glossary, appendix D; for
           architectural renderings, however, use <italic>art
           original</italic>, <italic>art reproduction</italic>, or
           <italic>picture</italic>, not <italic>technical
           drawing</italic>.

Rationale: The definition should be in the glossary, not in a 1.1C1
footnote.

Proposed Revision:

[1.1C1. List 2:]

        <add>activity card</add>
        art original
        [rest of list unchanged]

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

        activity card
        art original
        [rest of list unchanged]

Rationale: In pre-AACR2 days, activity cards with text were more commonly called <italic>lab kits</italic>, and the term <italic>kit</italic> was applied to them. The current practice among manufacturers and librarians is to call this type of material (both graphic and textual) <italic>activity cards</italic>. Since there is no GMD which describes this type of material, and since inclusion of this type of material under the GMD kit introduces confusion, and since the term <italic>activity card</italic> is clearly understood by the user community, and since there is no way currently to bring together all activity cards in a catalog, it is recommended that the term <italic>activity card</italic> be added to List 2 of rule 1.1C1.

Proposed Revision:

   <bold>8.5B1.</bold> Record the number of physical units of a graphic
   item by giving the number of parts in arabic numerals and one of the
   following terms as appropriate:

                     <add>activity card</add>
                     art original
                     [rest of rule unchanged]

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

   <bold>8.5B1.</bold> Record the number of physical units of a graphic
   item by giving the number of parts in arabic numerals and one of the
   following terms as appropriate:

                     activity card
                     art original
                     [rest of rule unchanged]

Proposed Addition to Glossary:

   <add><bold>Activity card.</bold> A card printed with words,
      numerals, and/or pictures to be used by an individual or a group
      as a basis for performing a specific activity. Usually issued in
      sets. <italic>See also</italic> Game, Kit.</add>

Rationale: Definition derived from <italic>Audiovisual materials glossary</italic>, Nancy B. Olson. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC, 1988.

Proposed Revision to Glossary:

   <bold>Game.</bold> A set of materials designed for play according to
      prescribed rules. <add><italic>See also</italic> Activity card,
      Kit.</add>

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

    <bold>Game.</bold> A set of materials designed for play according to
      prescribed rules. <italic>See also</italic> Activity card, Kit.

Proposed Revision to Glossary:

    <bold>Kit.</bold> 1. An item containing two or more categories of
      material, no one of which is identifiable as the predominant
      constituent of the item; also designated "multimedia item,"
      (<italic>q.v.</italic>). 2. A single-medium package of textual
      material (e.g., <delete>a "lab kit," a set of activity
      cards</delete> a "press kit," <add>a set of printed test
      materials, an assemblage of printed materials published under the
      trade name "jackdaws"</add>). <add><italic>See also</italic>
      Activity card, Game.</add>

Clean Copy of Revised Rule:

    <bold>Kit.</bold> 1. An item containing two or more categories of
      material, no one of which is identifiable as the predominant
      constituent of the item; also designated "multimedia item,"
      (<italic>q.v.</italic>). 2. A single-medium package of textual
      material (e.g., a "press kit," a set of printed test materials,
      an assemblage of printed materials published under the trade name
      "jackdaws"). <italic>See also</italic> Activity card, Game.

Rationale: Under part 2 of the current definition of kit, activity
cards which contain only pictures would be cataloged under the rules
for graphic materials. Activity cards which contain textual materials
would be cataloged under the rules for kits. This is to say that
activity cards are sometimes kits and sometimes not. This does not
square with the American understanding of the term
<italic>Kit</italic>, the current wording leading to confusion. This
proposed change allows <italic>Kit</italic> to apply to single medium
materials while eliminating this confusion.

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA

Example 2: CC:DA/MuLA/25.30D2/1 —Microsoft Word Version

November 29, 1993

To: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Music Library Association
           Bibliographic Control Committee
           Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging

Subject: Revision of Rule 25.30D2

Background

The music library community has long been concerned with two problem areas in rule 25.30D2. The first one concerns the discrepancy between the basic rule about what to base a music uniform title on (25.27A) and 25.30D2, and the second, how the mode is added to the key in this rule. This proposal suggests ways to solve both of these problem areas and helps clarify and fix some less important, but related, parts of the rule.

In rule 25.27A it states: "Use as a basis for the uniform title for a musical work the composer's original title in the language in which it was presented." This rule helps ensure that various catalogers at various times will formulate the same uniform title for a musical work. In rule 25.30D2, key for post-nineteenth-century works, the idea of basing a uniform title on the composer's original title is cast aside and instead, the prominence of information on the item in hand is used to determine the addition of key to the uniform title. The instruction in rule 25.30D2 builds into the rules a case in which catalogers cataloging different editions of the same work will construct different uniform titles based upon varying information on the items they are cataloging. For example, if a publisher decides to add or delete the key of a work on the title page, it will change the uniform title if the cataloger literally follows rule 25.30D2.

In May 1989, right after the current 1988 revision of AACR was issued, the Library of Congress, at the request of MLA music catalogers, issued a *Music Cataloging Decision* (MCD) instructing catalogers to base this addition of

key in uniform titles on the original title as described in 25.27A rather than prominence on the item. The **MCD** reads:

> **2.530D2.** For post-nineteenth-century works, include the key in the uniform title if it is part of the composer's original title (25.27A) or the first-edition title used as a substitute for the composer's original title (MCD 25.27A) (before the deletion of elements such as key under 25.28).

While this **MCD** kept discrepancies in the uniform titles for the same work to a minimum, MLA members feel that this is not a satisfactory solution. The rule itself should be revised so that it does not contain directions that result in discrepancies. The kind of direction found in Rule 25.30.D2 confuses and misleads the many people using the rules without the aid of the MCDs.

The second problem area is the addition of the mode to the key. The rule indicates that you add it if it is "clearly major or minor." In post-nineteenth-century music it can be very difficult to tell if a piece is in a key. Often it may start in a particular key but immediately move to a different one and not return again until the end. Because the determination of this information is based on cataloger judgment as well as the cataloger's knowledge of music it is very problematic. We would like to propose a solution that would build on the arguments made above and not mislead the user, namely, to add the mode if it appears in the composer's original title.

Rule Revision Proposal

> **25.30D2. Post-nineteenth-century works.** For post-nineteenth-century works, give the key if it is ~~stated prominently in the item being catalogued~~ <u>part of the composer's original title (see 25.27A)</u>. If the mode is ~~clearly major or minor~~ <u>also specified there,</u> add the ~~appropriate~~ word *major* or *minor*.
>
> > ~~**Reizenstein, Franz**~~
> > > ~~[Scherzo, piano, op. 20, A major]~~
> > > ~~Scherzo in A for piano forte~~
> >
> > **Reizenstein, Franz**
> > > [Trios, flute, clarinet, bassoon]
> > > Trio for flute, clarinet, and bassoon
> > > > ~~(*Key not stated prominently*)~~
> > > > (*Composer's original title unknown, title taken from first edition*)
> >
> > **Hindemith, Paul**
> > > [Symphonies, band, Bb]
> > > Symphony in B flat for concert band
> > > > (*Original title:* Symphony in B flat for concert band)

Hanson, Howard
[Concertos, piano, orchestra, op. 36, G major]
Concerto for piano and orchestra, opus 36
(*Original title:* Concerto in G major for pianoforte and
orchestra, op. 36)

Clean Copy of Revised Rule

25.30D2. Post-nineteenth-century works. For post-nineteenth-century works, give
the key if it is part of the composer's original title (see 25.27A). If the mode is also
specified there, add the word *major* or *minor*.

Reizenstein, Franz
[Trios, flute, clarinet, bassoon]
Trio for flute, clarinet, and bassoon
(*Composer's original title unknown, title taken from first
edition*)

Hindemith, Paul
[Symphonies, band, Bb]
Symphony in B flat for concert band
(*Original title:* Symphony in B flat for concert band)

Hanson, Howard
[Concertos, piano, orchestra, op. 36, G major]
Concerto for piano and orchestra, opus 36
(*Original title:* Concerto in G major for pianoforte and
orchestra, op. 36)

Explanation of Changes in Examples

We'd like to recommend deletion of the first Reizenstein example for two
reasons. First, there are two errors in the uniform title given. a) The original
title for this work includes the key but does not indicate a mode and since
the piece starts in A minor, it is not clearly in the mode of A major as given.
b) There is a typo in the opus number for this example. The correct opus
number is 21. (Opus 20 is his Sonata for violin and piano in G sharp.)
Second, we think that once the errors are fixed it contains no useful
information as an example that is not contained in the Hindemith example.

Since we are recommending a change to the way mode is determined, we'd
also like to add an example in which the piece is clearly in a mode (hence the
addition of the Hanson example).

Implementation impact statement

We anticipate very little "clean-up" of records since the MCD maintained the consistency of the headings. From our discussions with music catalogers, we also think that the impact of the change to the rule for adding the mode will be slight since many are already leaving out the mode if not indicated somewhere on the item. The main impact will be greater consistency in the rules, leading to easier application to items being cataloged.

Example 2: CC:DA/MuLA/25.30D2/1 —ASCII Version

November 29, 1993

To: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Music Library Association
           Bibliographic Control Committee
           Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging

Subject: Revision of Rule 25.30D2

Background

The music library community has long been concerned with two problem
areas in rule 25.30D2. The first one concerns the discrepancy between
the basic rule about what to base a music uniform title on (25.27A) and
25.30D2, and the second, how the mode is added to the key in this rule.
This proposal suggests ways to solve both of these problem areas and
helps clarify and fix some less important, but related, parts of the
rule.

In rule 25.27A it states: "Use as a basis for the uniform title for a
musical work the composer's original title in the language in which it
was presented." This rule helps ensure that various catalogers at
various times will formulate the same uniform title for a musical work.
In rule 25.30D2, key for post-nineteenth-century works, the idea of
basing a uniform title on the composer's original title is cast aside
and instead, the prominence of information on the item in hand is used
to determine the addition of key to the uniform title. The instruction
in rule 25.30D2 builds into the rules a case in which catalogers
cataloging different editions of the same work will construct different
uniform titles based upon varying information on the items they are
cataloging. For example, if a publisher decides to add or delete the
key of a work on the title page, it will change the uniform title if
the cataloger literally follows rule 25.30D2.

In May 1989, right after the current 1988 revision of AACR was issued,
the Library of Congress, at the request of MLA music catalogers, issued
a <italic>Music Cataloging Decision</italic> (MCD) instructing
catalogers to base this addition of key in uniform titles on the
original title as described in 25.27A rather than prominence on the
item. The MCD reads:

> <bold>2.530D2.</bold> For post-nineteenth-century works,
> include the key in the uniform title if it is part of the
> composer's original title (25.27A) or the first-edition
> title used as a substitute for the composer's original
> title (MCD 25.27A) (before the deletion of elements such as
> key under 25.28).

While this MCD kept discrepancies in the uniform titles for the same
work to a minimum, MLA members feel that this is not a satisfactory
solution. The rule itself should be revised so that it does not contain
directions that result in discrepancies. The kind of direction found in
Rule 25.30.D2 confuses and misleads the many people using the rules
without the aid of the MCDs.

The second problem area is the addition of the mode to the key. The
rule indicates that you add it if it is "clearly major or minor." In
post-nineteenth-century music it can be very difficult to tell if a
piece is in a key. Often it may start in a particular key but
immediately move to a different one and not return again until the end.
Because the determination of this information is based on cataloger
judgment as well as the cataloger's knowledge of music it is very
problematic. We would like to propose a solution that would build on
the arguments made above and not mislead the user, namely, to add the
mode if it appears in the composer's original title.

Rule Revision Proposal

    <bold>25.30D2. Post-nineteenth-century works.</bold> For post-
nineteenth-century works, give the key if it is <delete>stated
prominently in the item being catalogued</delete> <add>part of the
composer's original title (see 25.27A)</add>. If the mode is
<delete>clearly major or minor</delete> <add>also specified
there</add>, add the <delete>appropriate</delete> word
<add><italic>major</italic> or <italic>minor</italic></add>.

        <delete>
        <bold>Reizenstein, Franz</bold>
           [Scherzo, piano, op. 20, A major]
           Scherzo in A for piano forte
        </delete>

        <bold>Reizenstein, Franz</bold>
           [Trios, flute, clarinet, bassoon]
           Trio for flute, clarinet, and bassoon
               ~~<delete>(<italic>*Key not stated*~~
               ~~*prominently*)</italic></delete>~~
               <add>(<italic>Composer's original title
               unknown, title taken from first
               edition</italic>)</add>

        <bold>Hindemith, Paul</bold>
           [Symphonies, band, Bb]
           Symphony in B flat for concert band
               <add>(<italic>Original title:</italic> Symphony
               in B flat for concert band)</add>

```
            <add>
            Hanson, Howard
                [Concertos, piano, orchestra, op. 36, G major]
                Concerto for piano and orchestra, opus 36
                    (<italic>Original title:</italic> Concerto in G
                    major for pianoforte and orchestra, op. 36)
            </add>
```

Clean Copy of Revised Rule

<bold>25.30D2. Post-nineteenth-century works.</bold> For post-
nineteenth-century works, give the key if it is part of the
composer's original title (see 25.27A). If the mode is also
specified there, add the word <italic>major</italic> or
<italic>minor</italic>.

```
            <bold>Reizenstein, Franz</bold>
                [Trios, flute, clarinet, bassoon]
                Trio for flute, clarinet, and bassoon
                    (<italic>Composer's original title unknown,
                    title taken from first edition</italic>)

            <bold>Hindemith, Paul</bold>
                [Symphonies, band, Bb]
                Symphony in B flat for concert band
                    (<italic>Original title:</italic> Symphony in B
                    flat for concert band)

            Hanson, Howard
                [Concertos, piano, orchestra, op. 36, G major]
                Concerto for piano and orchestra, opus 36
                    (<italic>Original title:</italic> Concerto in G
                    major for pianoforte and orchestra, op. 36)
```

Explanation of Changes in Examples

We'd like to recommend deletion of the first Reizenstein example for
two reasons. First, there are two errors in the uniform title given. a)
The original title for this work includes the key but does not indicate
a mode and since the piece starts in A minor, it is not clearly in the
mode of A major as given. b) There is a typo in the opus number for
this example. The correct opus number is 21. (Opus 20 is his Sonata for
violin and piano in G sharp.) Second, we think that once the errors are
fixed it contains no useful information as an example that is not
contained in the Hindemith example.

Since we are recommending a change to the way mode is determined, we'd
also like to add an example in which the piece is clearly in a mode
(hence the addition of the Hanson example).

Implementation impact statement

We anticipate very little "clean-up" of records since the MCD maintained the consistency of the headings. From our discussions with music catalogers, we also think that the impact of the change to the rule for adding the mode will be slight since many are already leaving out the mode if not indicated somewhere on the item. The main impact will be greater consistency in the rules, leading to easier application to items being cataloged.