Cataloging Advisory Committee Business Meeting
Saturday, May 6, 2006 6:10-7 p.m.

Chair: Kay Teel

Present:

Kay Teel, Chair
Penny Baker
Lynda Bunting
Sherman Clarke
Linda Cuccurullo
Elizabeth Likier
Elizabeth O'Keefe
Maria Oldal
Daniel Starr

Outgoing Board Liaison: Jonathan Franklin
Incoming Board Liaison: Susan Koskinen

and about 15 observers

Minutes:

The CAC’s outgoing and incoming Board Liaisons were introduced.

The Committee discussed the current state of the exhibition publications cataloging guidelines. After many years of work on this topic, Kay Teel asked about the future of the document: how far the revision process had gone, what the final product should be, and who the intended audience was. Elizabeth O’Keefe wanted to see the guidelines finished in the near future, but raised the impact of RDA on the final text. The document was originally conceived as a print product, later a web product. Now it was time to consider different types of web publications. Kay Teel also pointed out that in its current form, the document is a mixture of guidelines and best practices. O’Keefe described the comparable UK guidelines as an extremely detailed step-by-step instruction manual. The CAC guidelines were designed in a way that they do not reiterate AACR. Lynda Bunting suggested that perhaps a portion of the document, which does not appear to be affected by the impending RDA changes, could be distributed on the web. Sherman Clarke supported that by saying that some provisions in the guidelines are equally true to AACR, RDA, or ISBD. O’Keefe suggested an FAQ or a top 10 issues format. The Committee decided to pursue this further via e-mail.

CAC moved on to discuss the attribution qualifiers list that is available in PDF format and was submitted to various listserves for comment. Responses pointed out that
the list needed a better introduction. Sherman Clarke suggested using some of the explanatory text from CCO. Maria Oldal expressed the need to include actual examples of use of these terms in catalog records. Examples from VRA sources might also be useful. Elizabeth O’Keefe agreed to update the introduction.

Kay Teel continued with the topic of moving artists groups names from LCSAF to LCNAF. A message to CPSO in July 2005 remained unanswered. Elizabeth O’Keefe said that RDA would not impact this decision, so there was no reason to wait with pursuing this change. Sherman Clarke questioned whether there was anything in FRBR that could have supported the change. Citing FRBR was an argument in the building names response CAC received from CPSO. Kay Teel raised the possibility of submitting a white paper that would explain why CAC considers this a conceptual misunderstanding. The Committee agreed that a well crafted letter would be the most useful next step.

CAC will consider pursuing the issue of Chinese art subject headings with combined dynasties, after getting more input from affected constituencies.

The Committee sent a response to CPSO about their proposed changes to LCRI 25.13, Uniform titles for manuscripts and manuscript collections. The Bibliographic Standards Committee of RBMS sent a note of agreement with the CAC response. Both committees are now waiting for the updated document to submit another round of comments.

A few members of the Committee (including Daniel Starr, Penny Baker, and Elizabeth Lilker) reviewed the UK artist books cataloging guidelines that is to come out late spring, early summer. They thought that it was a well crafted, thoroughly done manual that they would order for their own use. However, the manual encourages catalogers to provide analysis and interpretation that fall more under curatorial responsibilities, therefore going well beyond what is appropriate for catalogers in the US.

CAC’s CC:DA representative, Daniel Starr gave an update about RDA. Because information is now more widely available about the process, his e-mail messages to the Committee had focused only on those issues that directly affect the art cataloging community. He encouraged CAC members to read the Joint Steering Committee and the CC:DA websites. Although the minutes of their meetings take months to come out, they are extremely thorough. The next step is to wait for and comment on the June product. Starr also raised the issue of succession. A planned succession might be the best with a year overlap with the new person. Upcoming RDA work involves access points followed by authorities. It will also be important to make sure that art cataloging examples will be sufficiently represented in RDA. Elizabeth O’Keefe asked if we still had an opportunity to submit more examples. Starr commented that CAC will have a chance to comment on examples. Since the rules are getting more general, specific examples will be even more important.

In her MARBI report, Elizabeth O’Keefe talked about the addition of subfields for relator terms/codes for subject access to images (2005-06). In order to facilitate the use of $e depicted, new subfields needed to be defined for the X11 fields. Proposal 2005-04 expanded on the desirability of additional subfields in 752, e.g., city subsections, extraterrestrial areas, etc. Once RDA goes into effect, there will be a lot of MARBI follow up. O’Keefe also talked about another interesting discussion paper (2006-dp03) that was coming up at annual, that calls for the incorporation of former
headings into MARC 21 authority records. Sherman Clarke remarked that it might be very important for file maintenance.

Linda Cuccurullo passed around her report from the CCS Subject Analysis Committee in whose meeting CAC was commended for its work on building names.

Kay Teel reported that the new edition of the Saco Participants Manual, which has been revised by a committee under the leadership of Adam Schiff, is very close to completion. The new edition will have some additional art and named building examples provided by Sherman Clarke and by former CAC member Claudia Hill.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Oldal
The Morgan Library & Museum