

**2011 CEAL Annual Meeting  
Committee on Technical Processing Program Minutes**

Wednesday, March 30, 2011, 2:00-3:50 PM  
Hilton Hawaiian Village, South Pacific Ballroom I & II

**2:00-2:05 -- Welcome and introduction (Sarah Elman, Chair)**

Sarah welcomed the audience and introduced the contents of the program.

**2:05-3:00 -- Creative technical services ideas (Presentations by CEAL members)**

The following three presentations were chosen among several proposals sent to CTP by CEAL members:

**1. Using Technological Devices to Improve Cataloging Productivity  
(Jee-Young Park, Columbia University) [\[Click for presentation slides\]](#)**

*Jee-young Park introduces two devices that will increase the productivity of the cataloging process: pen scanner and dual monitor. Pen scanner was introduced in the 2010 CEAL meeting and the presenter, as a full-time cataloger, found that it saved much time and effort. With a short video clip in the presentation slide, she showed how well the pen scanner can recognize CJK scripts. According to her experiment, using the pen scanner is 30 times faster than manual-typing cataloging. Pen scanning can work most efficiently, when coupled with the Korean transliteration macro in OCLC Connexion. Dual monitor is yet another tool that makes cataloging process smoother. With many affordable LCD monitors in the market these days, dual monitor can be easily set up on catalogers' desk. Catalogers can arrange cataloging tools on two screens according to their needs, eliminating much of the necessity of window-to-window navigation clicks. In conclusion, employing computer devices like pen scanner or dual monitor will make more convenient environment for in-house cataloging, when one knows the limitation and invests some time for adaptation to the devices. [No question was asked after the presentation.]*

**2. PDA (Patron Driven Acquisitions): An All-You-Can-Read Buffet : Impact, Challenges, and Opportunities for Technical Services in a Team-based Organization  
(Ping Situ, University of Arizona) [\[Click for presentation slides\]](#)**

*Ping Situ introduced a new Patron Driven Acquisitions system that had been tested at the University of Arizona Library which allows patrons to directly select books from the Library Catalog for their research and teaching. As these books get used by customers, the Libraries will purchase them and add them to the permanent collection. The printed books will be ready to pick up from the Libraries in 3-7 business days. PDA will be fully functional at University of Arizona by the beginning of the 2011 spring semester. Ping*

*also mentioned other changes occurred in her library as well as challenges and opportunities for technical services librarians.*

*The presentation generated several questions afterwards.*

***Q&A:***

*Q1: Would you comment on possible use of PDA model for CJK materials in book format?*

*A1: Our PDA model is being used only for English language books at this point. I talked with East View to see if APABI is interested in using the PDA model for their Chinese e-books. As of now APABI does not have such a plan. Thus, we do not have a PDA plan for Chinese books yet. We have a Japanese Studies Librarian. I am only responsible for selecting Chinese language materials. U of Arizona does not have a Korean Studies program, so we don't collect Korean language materials.*

*An East View representative made some follow-up comments on Ping's answer to question 1: East View has encouraged its partners to think about PDA. Meanwhile, East View is conducting research and establishing a platform for approval plan and possible PDA approach in the future.*

*Q2: There are cases that PDA exhausts deposit money very quickly. How does your library think about it?*

*A2: We have subject & non-subject parameters for the PDA books (both print and e-format). Our users have to be authenticated with Net ID and password. The threshold for e-book purchasing is 3 significant uses. We will be monitoring the process closely and will make adjustments if needed.*

*A CEAL member who uses the same vendor also made comments on defining the cases of significant uses with the vendor, as well as the strategies for preventing fund being spent quickly. For example, patron access the landing page, such as title page, doesn't count as significant use. Has to have access to real contents of the e-books.*

*Q3: With the approaches of outsourcing and shelf ready service at your library, will top catalogers play an important role of managing outsourcing, reviewing records of [shelf ready service]?*

*A3: In our library we started outsourcing cataloging services (Western language materials) after 1993. I joined the U of Arizona Library in 2001 when we were outsourcing original cataloging for Chinese language materials through TechPro. We also eliminated our large Chinese language backlog through OCLC. Arabic materials have been and will still be cataloged in house as we have an original cataloger. The Library administration does not believe that cataloging records have to be perfect. Ongoing examination will be conducted for needed adjustments.*

*Q4: What would the cataloger librarians (such as Librarian I or Librarian II) do if your library outsources almost everything?*

*A4. Most of the members in Technical Services Team are not librarians. All the people who do cataloging, ordering, receiving, claiming are staff. They will be transferred to other teams, such as Special Collections, Description, Delivery and Acquisition Team, Center for Creative Photography to do traditional technical services work as well as to learn new skills such as metadata, archival processing, etc.*

**3. Creative In-house Technical Services Ideas at University of Michigan**  
(Yuan Sung, University of Michigan) [\[Click for presentation slides\]](#)

*Yuan Sung introduced the cataloguing at the Asian Library at the University of Michigan which is an independent section and does not belong to the central system. They have 10 full-time staff plus part-time staff (including student workers). The lack of staff requires collaboration with the central system. The creative technical services ideas they have include the following:*

**Idea 1: Utilization of Macros**

- *Macros were designed for copy cataloguing and cataloguing statistics*
- *Create consistency in the copy cataloguing practices by making sure that all fields that should be include are present:*
  - *It checks for status, 300, 4XX, and deletes fields such as 263, and 852*
  - *Includes cataloguer's initials*
- **PROS:**
  - *minimizes typos*
  - *reduces mistakes*
  - *encourages consistency*
  - *useful for global updates*
  - *particularly efficient to ensure quality of less experienced cataloguers (i.e., student workers)*
- **CONS:**
  - *When trouble shooting is needed, programming staff is requires*
  - *Not as much of a time-saver but useful to ensure consistency and standardization of cataloguing practices*

**Idea 2: Duplicate checking**

- *Program developed to utilize spreadsheets with bibliographic information such as ISBN, author, title, series, etc and run duplicate checking*
- *It checks against the local system's holdings*
- *A report is created*
- *100-500 records searched in roughly 10 minutes*
- *Particularly useful program to check for donations, duplicate check for new acquisitions, etc*

### ***Idea 3: MARC Edit***

- *Use the spreadsheets provided by the vendors to create MARC records for the titles contained in the spreadsheet*
- *The MARC edit can be used for any language – not limited to CJK; however, the Korean vendors provide the Romanization that can be used in the parallel fields; it may not be the case with other vendors for different languages.*

### **O&A:**

*Q1: Does your library use these creative ideas for all CJK languages?*

*A1: No, right now only Korean language. Chinese vendors provide brief MARC records, so there is no need to use these tools.*

### ***3:00-3:40 -- Panel Discussion on RDA Testing: Process, Outcome, and Comments***

*Moderator: Shi Deng (UC San Diego)*  
*Panelists: Ermine Chao (Brigham Young University)*  
*Charlene Chou (Columbia University)*  
*Jai-Hsia Tao (University of Chicago)*

*The three national libraries—LC, NLM, and NAL—as well as 24 other libraries conducted a test on RDA (Resource Description and Access) between Oct. and Dec. 2010. Only a few East Asian catalogers participated in the process. The above three testers were invited to share their experiences with CEAL members. The following are the factual information related to RDA testing for the three universities:*

	<b>BYU</b>	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Columbia</b>
<b># of Testers</b>	Prof. -- 16 Paragraph. -- 18	Prof. – 12 Paragraph. -- 5	Prof. – 14
<b>Formats and Material Types Tested</b>	All <i>but</i> e-books, e-serials and Blue-ray videos	monograph, serial, map, microform, score, DVD, integrating resources (Internet websites), and Dublin Core	monographs, serials, microform, video-recording, loose-leaf, databases, websites, graphic (drawing), MODS, DC & EAD

<b>Lang. Tested</b>	CJK, Arabic, Slavic, and Western European languages	Chinese, Hindi, Slavic, and Western European languages	CJK, Slavic, and Western European languages
<b># of Bib.</b>	1,388	1,396	91
<b># of Auth.</b>	1,198	1,329	119

*Panelists were asked to answer the following three questions:*

***1. Briefly talk about the training and testing process at your institution.***

**Ermine Chao (Brigham Young University):**

- *In May 2010, we had Barbara Gillett from Library of Congress with us for 2 days to give us an overview of RDA, FRBR and the preparation of LC to RDA testing.*
- *In June, all employees in the Catalog Department had attended a webinar about RDA toolkit and further trainings by our Metadata & Special Collections Cataloging department chair, Robert Maxwell, followed.*
- *In July, we had 8 days of training sessions on bibliographic and authority records training in RDA from Robert and John Wright, my department Chair.*
- *After the training, we were all encouraged to get familiar with RDA before the official testing date. So many of us had started to create RDA master records, upgrade non-AACR2 master records to RDA master record and create RDA institution records from AACR2 master records since July. However, since we could not create RDA authority records before October 1st, so we saved all the RDA authority records in our online save file and processed them timely after October 1st.*
- *From October to December, 5 catalogers would cataloged 5 common original sets in AACR2 and 5 original sets in RDA with appropriate authority records in each format from the information that were provided. One copy cataloger would do the common copy set. The materials consisted of most formats, such as monograph, monograph with CD, loose leaf, map, video, poster, serials, e-serials, eBooks etc. So each set has a record in AACR2 and RDA. We would fill out a survey with questions like : how long it took to create each record, and the time to create the authorities in each record and what problem did we encounter, whether we needed to consult with others and for how long we had been cataloged that particular type of materials etc. for each record that we created.*

- *Besides these six people who took the test, everyone in the department was required to catalog at least 10 records with authority in RDA during the test period and reported the record and authority numbers to the department heads.*
- *Our department heads don't want us to forget all the training that we had and they really think RDA is the way to go, so they constantly encourage us, though not mandate, to continue the use of RDA in our daily work, so the majority of us still creating RDA records and authorities.*
- *The department has created a wiki page in the department webpage with much important information on RDA for future references.*

**Charlene Chou (Columbia University):**

**1. Tester group membership:**

*Columbia's tester group consists of eight core testers with six from Central Technical Services, one representative from Law Library, one from East Asian Library, and six other testers involving with non-MARC and extra-set records.*

**2. Training:**

- a. *Kate Harcourt and Charlene Chou were trained at the LC "Trainer-the-trainer" session on 1/15/2010 at the ALA Midwinter Conference by Barbara Tillett and Judy Kuhagen.*
- b. *From July 1 to September 30, 2010, test group met weekly to go through training documents and to listen to webinars as group discussion and training. With each tester's format and/or language knowledge, the discussion was very helpful for having a thorough understanding for RDA.*
- c. *Each core tester created test records and the main goal is to test new rules and element; therefore, we could have sufficient information to evaluate RDA. East record was reviewed and commented by other testers as a group learning method.*
- d. *For streamlining the training and testing process, a wiki was created for a better communication among the testers and all related documents were posted in our wiki page. For example, a tester organized all related RDA training documents and shared with all testers.*

**3. Testing Process:**

- a. *After three-month intensive training, tester group met less frequently from October 1 to December 31, 2010. Consequently, the testers could have sufficient time to create records for both common and extra sets. We had one meeting in the middle of testing prior to PCC Po-Co meeting for the chair to know our initial comments, and the other one approaching the end of testing concerning group comments for institutional questionnaire. Each tester can post individual comments on the wiki for the comments on each question of institutional questionnaire.*
- b. *Due to the complex procedures of testing, we decided to create records for common set first and to do extra set later and one tester created the a checklist for the testing procedures of common as well as extra sets.*

- c. *For extra-set records, each tester posted OCLC record number on the wiki, so NACO coordinator could report the number to LC.*
- d. *Columbia has not created any RDA record after December 31, 2010 and this would be revisited after the announcement of three national libraries' decision.*

**Jai-Hsia Tao (University of Chicago):**

*At the University of Chicago we have 3 main testing principles that guided our approach to testing.*

- 1) ***Involving all original catalogers.***
- 2) ***Testing RDA as RDA, not a local version of RDA.*** *We tried minimizing local exceptions. We did not re-interpret any RDA instructions for local use. Our only change was to make a few RDA elements that are not Core in the standard, and to make them "UChicago Core". Those were elements that catalogers felt were important for descriptive purposes, or for the purpose of the test process itself. Those six elements were:*
  - *Other Title Information (RDA 2.3.4): Core for monos; cataloger's judgment for serials and integrating resources*
  - *Copyright Date (RDA 2.11): Core for monos; cataloger's judgment for serials and integrating resources*
  - *ISSN of Series (RDA 2.12.8)*
  - *ISSN of Subseries (RDA 2.12.16)*
  - *Media Type (RDA 3.2)(337field)*
  - *Source Consulted (RDA 29.6.). This for the authority records*
- 3) ***When RDA proposes multiple options for a scenario let catalogers use their judgment in applying options***

**Training**

- ***Exercises: converted number of existing AACR2 records into RDA records in local system***

*In spring 2010 we did these exercises. With the cheat sheet created by a senior serial cataloger we converted 46 (including 4 Chinese) records in various formats. The cheat sheet indicates fields and elements that need to be changed or added. Then we met to discuss any confusion, issues and problems. See <http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/staffweb/depts/cat/rda/rdaexamples.pdf> for all these records.*

- ***Two formal training sessions on RDA for all original and copy catalogers***

*The training sessions were held in August. It began with an overview of FRBR. We watched Barbara Tillett's recorded presentation "FRBR for Non-Catalogers: Things You Should Know but Were Afraid to Ask"*

*([http://www.loc.gov/today/cyberlc/feature\\_wdesc.php?rec=4554](http://www.loc.gov/today/cyberlc/feature_wdesc.php?rec=4554)).*

*Then, the training was followed by watching LC's "Train the Trainer"*

*(<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/RDAtest/rdatraining.html>) modules and the ALA Toolkit Webinars (<http://www.rdatoolkit.org/training>).*

- ***"Refresher" session for RDA authority records***

*In February, 2011, we had another session focusing on authority records only. This session was mainly based on feedbacks we had received from LC. LC has reviewed all of our authority records contributed during the test period and then we corrected our records accordingly.*

***Other RDA related activities:***

- *Added new RDA MARC fields to local system and Aquabrowser's tables and indexes.*
- *Website created for RDA-related documentation.*
- *Cross-divisional working group with staff from cataloging, public services, and systems to make decisions on configuring display of RDA records.*
- *All the testers met for reviewing LC Policy Statements and making decision on local policy before testing, weekly meeting during testing period, and couple follow-up meetings after testing period.*

*All Chicago cataloging units except E.A. have continued creating original records following the RDA rules. E.A. will start RDA later this year. No plans to change existing AACR2 copy records into RDA for Copy Cataloging. We expect to be using a combination of AACR2 and RDA records for many years to come.*

***2. Important comments from testers in your institution as well as your personal opinions regarding RDA and its implications for CJK materials.***

***Ermine Chao (Brigham Young University):***

- ***Positive comments:***
  - *Great potential for improving the ways we identify and access information*
  - *Moving away from a card cataloging environment. It is time to the library world gives Google some competition*
  - *Options for searching – serves public better to see relationships*
  - *Removing of Latin abbreviations and spelling out of words are good. It gives the patron an easier understanding of what they stand for*



- *Integration of additional information on authority records (such as birth place, profession, association) to make a person more unique*
- *RDA has the ability to be compatible with FRBR principles*
- *One of its greatest strengths deal with being able to distinguish between works, expressions and manifestations*
- **Negative comments:**
  - *It doesn't seem RDA has brought about any significant enhancements to our catalogs, but take a lot more time to create one*
  - *More libraries are cutting personnel and costs for quick and dirty records. How are RDA records going to be created with less qualified personnel? It is hard enough for the catalogers who have been around for years!*
  - *Spelling out of wards in the 300 fields gets to be so much that it is very much NOT user friendly*
  - *Difficulty in using the RDA rules. Applying the rules (both for cataloging and authority work) does take longer and require more work than AACR2, but if it ends up being for the common good for providing better access, then so be it.*
  - *No system yet to support this!*
  - *Leaving too much to individual cataloger's judgment – we need best practices for music*
  - *I really miss the GMD*
  - *The 3xx information in authority records do not help the patrons at all because it cannot be accessed*
  - *RDA Toolkit is too hard to use! Often the description is very general and not enough examples*
  - *3xx in bib record do not make sense to patrons (AND catalogers). This part should be redesigned.*
  - *It is very confusing at the beginning, though it becomes better as times go on*
  - *VERY time consuming!!*
  - *Need more examples, especially the unusual types*
  - *I felt I had a handle on the main rules; using RDA was basically quick as AACR2. I'm still learning the rules for less ordinary situations, and that type of cataloging can take a while*
  - *What are we going to do with vendor records? Do we have to force them in providing RDA records?*
- **My personally opinion on RDA:**

*Looking at RDA by itself it doesn't accomplish a great deal. Viewed in the context of MARC cataloging alone—as we've seen in practice so far—it doesn't seem that RDA has brought about any significant enhancements to our catalogs. That's probably why it doesn't seem to have caught the interest of our community of users to any extent. To be of any great value, RDA must be envisioned in the larger context of advancing to a new level of bibliographical control, one in which we are more concerned with identifying entities and their relationships to one another and more concerned with*

*expressing and encoding our data in languages that are understood and compatible across many more communities than just libraries. RDA has the ability to be compatible with FRBR principles.*

*There will always be opposite opinions on the same subjects in RDA as we have seen from the comments earlier. It is very intimidating and confusing at the beginning, but I don't think it's that hard to learn RDA and apply it, especially if you already have a strong foundation in AACR2 and if you don't obsess with trying to be perfect or worry too much about what you might have missed or done wrong. RDA is flexible and forgiving enough that we don't all have to come up with the same answers all the time. Plus it's alright to learn as you go, even if that means that you occasionally have to go back and fix your mistakes. RDA cataloging does seem to take more time than AACR2, particularly when you think about all the searching and additions that could be added to the authority records. I have to admit, the RDA Toolkit is very difficult to navigate and we do need to have more examples, especially the uncommon ones. I do believe the new additions to name authority records will have a bigger impact to CJK materials. With so many CJK names that have the same characters and Romanization, information such as occupation, field of activities, associated places will help to make a name more unique. However, these changes are very time-consuming, but if we do adopt RDA, it will take less time eventually when more people are contributing.*

**Charlene Chou (Columbia University):**

- *Strengths*
  - a. *Relator codes (useful for some, not all resources)*
  - b. *Vocabularies*
  - c. *More granularity in authority records*
  - d. *The new 3xx fields*
- *Concerns:*
  - a. *Dissatisfaction with nearly every aspect of the **RDA Toolkit** created a barrier to learning and implementing the new code, e.g. no index, the back arrows not working, the TOC not specific enough for use, etc. In general, catalogers found the Toolkit difficult to navigate, examples were not helpful and the lack of an index is a major issue.*
  - b. *The underlying design decision to make the code **format neutral** was seen as problematic because real life work is not format neutral. Workflows and the large number of LCPS seem compensatory rather than helpful. Their eventual proliferation and the difficulty in keeping them in sync with RDA may create major problems down the road.*
  - c. *The focus of RDA is on the rearrangement of existing cataloging rules in a new theoretical framework, with relatively few substantive changes.*

- d. *The rules rather than simplified as promised seem more complicated and catalogers and managers alike fear that gains in productivity with the BSR and CSR will be lost.*
  - e. *Some of the changes such as the new rule for numbered conferences seem to be a step backward.*
  - f. *The multitude of options and inevitable compromises to accommodate legacy records as well as the complexity of working with hybrid records does not bode well for cataloging efficiency, data sharing or an improved user experience in future library catalogs.*
- *My personal opinions concerning the RDA impact on the CJK records*
    - a. *The authority record got strengthened by new elements even though they are optional. RDA has fixed the problem of certain AACR2 rules, especially the restriction of qualifiers for personal names. For CJK materials, the maintenance of undifferentiated name authority record has been quite difficult for a long time, so new RDA rules or options could reduce the amount of undifferentiated name authority records. With new RDA elements, it also enriches the information of authority record, especially helpful for some academic staff, which would be important for academic libraries. Sometimes, you cannot find this kind of information through Google, Wikipedia, Baidu or any web resource. This kind of information in authority record could be a unique source for researchers or academia.*
    - b. *On the other hand, my major concern is a longer bibliographic record for CJK materials with more elements as well as parallel fields, especially for audio-visual materials. For example, a record for Chinese DVD may be two/three-page long. It takes much more time to create the records. However, users may not need certain kind of detailed information from library catalog, but are more inclined to use other web resources as routine.*

**Jai-Hsia Tao (University of Chicago):**

- ***What did we like?***
  - *Expression of relationships*
  - *Getting rid of abbreviations*
  - *Treatment of reproductions*
  - *No 'rule of three'*
  - *Cataloger's judgment*
  - *37X fields in authority records*
- ***What we disliked?***
  - *Cataloger's judgment*
  - *Changing established AACR2 headings for personal names and corporate bodies (strong and wide preference for keeping those headings)*
  - *Copyright date in 260\$c*

- 33X fields in bibs – utility of this data is unrealized in MARC and in our systems
- Navigating search results and lack of an index in the Toolkit
- **Relationship:** Being able to express relationships is good. However we found there aren't enough relation designators (Appendix I) corresponding to every situation that we encountered, e.g. reproduction agency for microform.
- **Abbreviation:** We felt that eliminating most abbreviations, while slightly more time consuming for them, was probably better for end users. And in our limited user testing of RDA records with acquisitions, public services, and collection development staff, they have felt the same thing.
- **Reproduction:** We felt that, in theory, cataloging reproductions as distinct manifestations was a good thing for FRBR and for the Semantic Web. In practice, there are aspects of the ILS configuration that will need to be adjusted to accommodate this approach. Other concern is that reproduction covers not only printed materials in paper but also microform, provider neutral and registry digital master records. Can we treat them all the same or applying different standards?
- **Rule of 3:** Catalogers appreciated not being hindered by the 'rule of three,' which was nothing more than an arbitrary throw-back to card catalogs anyway.
- **Catalogers' judgment:** This is a love-hate situation. In theory, catalogers liked the "idea" of employing their experience and judgment. But in practice it is a different story. In practice, exercising cataloger's judgment is surprisingly difficult. Catalogers want the ability to apply their judgment, not just a definitive answer about what to do. However, catalogers love consistency. Exercising judgment means departing from the beloved consistency. In the end catalogers want someone, or some policy, to tell us what to do. And this may be one of RDA challenges. In an electronic/web-based environment, do we really need LCRI and LCPSs to tell us which option to choose, or will it be okay to make decisions based solely on the piece in hand at the time of cataloging?
- **Copyright date:** This one doesn't apply to E.A. materials too much. Catalogers in our institution found that recording copyright dates is troublesome, not because of the data itself, but because of the MARC format. Right now there is no other place to put the copyright date than the same 260\$c subfield alongside the publication date. It looks weird. We also had some confusion on which date to enter in the date field in fixed field area.
- **33X fields in bib:** The use of the new 33X fields was questioned. Two concerns: (1) was the terminology/vocabulary meaningful enough to users (e.g., "unmediated"), and (2) could the data be more effectively employed by our systems if it weren't solely human-readable free-text.  
 37X fields in authority: Through 37X Catalogers could visualize how library data could contribute to the Semantic Web and express relationships between entities. However, the functionality is limited until those relationships could be expressed less with text and more with unique identifiers in the form of URIs. I also found that sometimes it is not easy to translate activity, affiliation, and occupation correctly into English in an authority record.
- **Keeping existing AACR2 authority records:** We felt that existing AACR2 authorities should be kept rather than flip them to RDA forms. Except the changes to headings and access points for the Bible and other religious texts, we suggested RDA forms of

access points could be added as references to already established AACR2 authorities. There is no reason to retrospectively flip existing headings for personal, family, and corporate names.

- **How to transliterate when numbers expressed in scripts:** a problem I encountered during testing.
- **Edition Statement (RDA 2.5.1.4):** Transcribe an edition statement as it appears on the source of information.

No question on

Source: 第1版.

Record: Di 1 ban.

How about

Source: 第一版.

How shall I transliterate the following it?

Record: 250 第一版.

250 Di 1 ban.

or

250 第一版.

250 Di yi ban.

- **Numbers Expressed as Numerals or as Words (RDA1.8.1)**  
When recording numbers expressed as numerals or as words in date of publication, numeric and/or alphabetic designation, chronological designation in serial, and numbering within series area, etc., transcribe them in the form in which they appear on the source of information.
- **Form of Numerals (RDA1.8.2)**  
Record numerals in the form preferred by the agency creating the data, unless the substitution would make the numbering less clear.  
Alternatives:  
Record numerals in the form in which they appear on the source of information.  
LCPS:  
LC practice for Alternative (1st): Apply the alternative.
- **Numbers Expressed as Words (RDA 1.8.3):** Substitute numerals for numbers expressed as words.

Since the script numbers can be words or numerals I am not certain how to transliterate the following:

**Date of publication:**

Source: 民國三十五年

Record: 260 #c 民國三十五年 [1946]

260 #c Minguo 35 nian [1946]

or

260 #c 民國三十五年 [1946]

260 #c Minguo san shi wu nian [1946]

**or**

260    ㄉc 民國 35 [1946]

260    ㄉc Minguo 35 [1946]

**Numeric and/or alphabetic designation:**

Source:        復刊第貳五四號

Record:       362    復刊第貳五四號

362    Fu kan di 254 hao

**or**

362    復刊第貳五四號

362    Fu kan di er wu si hao

**or**

362    復刊第 254 號

362    Fu kan di 254 hao

*For my records, I exercised my cataloger's judgment and treated those script numbers as numerals. So for the script filed I entered as what source looks like. Since there is no clear mention on how to transliterate numerals in RDA I spelled them out one by one. For the sake of consistency I think CEAL members should discuss this and decide what the better way to handle this.*

**3. What was your institution's recommendation regarding the implementation and training of RDA.**

**BYU:** *One of our department heads, Robert Maxwell, is very involved with FRBR and RDA, so we will have no problem with ongoing training from him on these areas. But with other libraries, especially small libraries that don't have a lot of funding, webinar is the way to go as far as training goes. I also believe that the experiences that we have with RDA can be a great access to small libraries that don't have many resources to training as we had. Robert believes that AACR2 is basically dead since it has not been updated at least for the last 5 years. He recognizes that RDA is not perfect, but it is a beginning. With ongoing updates and training, RDA will be well accepted as AACR2 before in the future. He believes the decision of whether RDA will be implemented is all depends on PCC's decision which will be influenced largely by LC decision.*

**Columbia:** *Columbia's recommendation is "ambivalent" and Columbia would like to see certain problems fixed prior to implementation if RDA is adopted.*

*It has been predicted that by 2015 as much as 70% of new monographic acquisitions will be electronic and metadata will be provided by aggregators. It seems unlikely that vendors will follow RDA with any more success than they follow AACR2. Local cataloging will be increasingly for rare, unique and global material using metadata from diverse sources and using diverse standards based on content type and audience. Metadata may not always be created by MLS catalogers. The testers found that RDA worked least well for rare and non-traditional material and was problematic for non-*

*MARC schemas. Diverting scarce resources to catalog a shrinking body of traditional material using a code that has serious limitations is difficult to justify. It seems more productive to identify and decouple the good features of RDA and move forward in developing new cataloging models, work to facilitate data exchange with other data sources and communities, create official format based application profiles that focus on necessary elements for description and access, and seek a replacement for MARC. Whether the US community does or does not implement RDA, we will view RDA as one among many other content standards that we use in cataloging and see in our catalogs.*

**Chicago:** *The U of Chicago recommended that the U.S. national libraries adopt RDA. While there are areas needing improvement and future development in RDA, none of us believed that there was a hindrance to adoption. As mentioned earlier, we also recommended that LC and the JSC look at keeping valid AACR2 access points in existing authority records, rather than flipping them.*

### **Comments on RDA from Beijing, Hong Kong and Taipei**

*Charlene Chou went visited libraries in Beijing, Hong Kong, and Taipei in the winter to share her RDA testing experience with librarians there. She brought back the following comments from librarians there:*

- *RDA has not simplified rules but added more granularity or details to rules. How can RDA make cataloging more efficient if taking longer to catalog? (All)*
- *Our key priority is to get books processed and shelved faster. Can RDA make this happen? (Beijing)*
- *More options for flexibility may cause difficulties in a shared-catalog system. (HK & Beijing)*
- *Doubts in the functions of 336/337/338; if removing \$h [GMD], cannot tell its format from the first look. How about legacy data? (HK & Taipei)*
- *It's harder to manage copy cataloging if RDA and AACR2 coexist. Anxious to know LC decision. (Beijing)*
- *Did RDA testing collect feedback from users? (All)*
- *Why still keeping main entry in RDA? (Beijing)*
- *Can RDA handle vendor records or data easily? (Beijing)*
- *Concerns with little impact on serials—CSR (HK)*
- *RDA documentation is too much and complicated, and RDA toolkit is not easy to navigate/use at all. (Beijing)*
- *Latin abbreviations may be more international since it's not US-centric and fairer to other European countries. This change does not prove RDA really international. (Beijing)*
- *Doubts in the change in bilingual uniform titles (HK)*
- *Why kept Romanized form in record? Certain problems can be solved if heading in Chinese script. (HK)*
- *CMARC in Taiwan requires no punctuations. Did RDA consult other standards/rules outside MARC21? (Taipei)*

- *If using profession as qualifier, it may change or be harder for multiple roles, e.g. Zhang Xiguo (Taipei). Does RDA require controlled vocabularies for professions? (Beijing)*
- *Can RDA data be used for the development of ontology or Semantic Web? (Beijing)*

### **Questions and Answers:**

*Q1. Xiaoli Li, University of California, Davis: What are the differences in results from the U.S. RDA Test with Western-language resources and East Asian-language resources?*

*A1. Charlene Chou, Columbia University: There was no particular difference in results from the U.S. RDA Test with Western-language resources and East Asian-language resources. One such difference, however, was RDA provisions which enable creation of differentiated personal name authority records, in cases where, under AACR2, undifferentiated personal name authority records would be unavoidable, in that such cases noticeably more frequently arise with East Asian personal names appearing in East Asian-language resources than East Asian or other personal names appearing in Western-language resources.*

*Q2. Xiaoli Li, University of California, Davis: Isn't RDA's description principle transcription of elements as found in resources? Wouldn't it result, in the case of description of East Asian-language resources, in recording of non-Latin script elements as primary description data? Why does cataloguer-supplied romanization appear in description elements of RDA records?*

*A2. Charlene Chou, Columbia University: The language of cataloguing in the U.S. is English.*

### **3:30-3:50 -- Reports from CTP (Sarah Elman, Chair)**

1. *Revision of the Descriptive Cataloging of East Asian Material: CJK Examples of AACR2 and Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*

*Since the release of the Descriptive Cataloging of East Asian Material: CJK Examples of AACR2 and LCRIs a few years ago, it has been frequently used by many new and seasoned catalogers. However, some cataloging rules and practices had been changed during the past few years. My committee thought that it would be useful to update the document to reflect the changes. With the endorsement of the LC, the committee started the project in May 2010. The work was divided by language and Erica Chang, Shi Deng, and Hideyuki Morimoto were designated as coordinator for their respective languages. They determined how to proceed with the review and whether colleagues outside of the committee would be invited to join or not. The following people spent hours to review and revise the chapters they were responsible for.*

- *Erica Soonyoung Chang (University of Hawaii)*



- Shi Deng (UC San Diego)
- Sarah S. Elman (Columbia University)
- Shuyong Jiang (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)
- Hyounghae Lee (Princeton University)
- Hideyuki Morimoto (Columbia University)
- Jee-Young Park (Columbia University)
- Yue Shu (Smithsonian Institution Libraries)
- Jia Xu (University of Iowa)

*The work was completed in Dec. 2010 and the files were sent back to LC for further review and approval. Major changes include:*

- Korean Romanization, word division & spacing
- Added CONSER Standard Record rules for serials (chapter 12) and reference to BIBCO Standard Records
- Practice for recording series, i.e., from 440 to 490/830
- Notes describing East Asian traditional materials
- Corrected errors

*After the final review, the chapters will be posted on the Cataloger's Desktop to replace the old version. After RDA is implemented, the document will need to be revised again.*

## 2. LC Genre/Form Terms for Religious Material Project—East Asian religions

*In July 2008, the Library of Congress Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access (ABA) management team approved five new genre/form projects to be undertaken by CPSO (now called Policy and Standards Division): cartography, law, literature, music, and religion in order to improve access to materials. The timeline for the religion project is from late 2010 to late 2011. In May 2010, Cameron J. Campbell of the American Theological Library Association contacted Sarah Elman to see if CTP would be interested in joining the project and work on East Asian religions. Thinking that a wider participation from the CEAL community was desirable, Sarah sent out a call for volunteers to Eastlib. Seven CEAL members volunteered. Additional people were invited to join in order to cover all countries in East Asia. As of late March 2011, the following people participated in the project:*

- Ermine Chao (Brigham Young University)
- Charlene Chou (Columbia University)
- Sarah S. Elman (Columbia University)
- Lauran Hartley (Columbia University)
- Tang Li (Yale University)
- Toshie Marra (UCLA)
- Hideyuki Morimoto (Columbia University)
- Jee-Young Park (Columbia University)
- Chiaki Sakai (University of Iowa)
- Hee-sook Shin (Columbia University)
- Keiko Suzuki (Yale University)

*Terms related to Buddhism, Taoism, Shinto, Shamanism, Bon (Tibetan religion), etc., were proposed and the list will be sent to Eastlib for public review. Other colleagues who are interested in the project are welcome to join as well.*

3. *Status of guidelines on non-Latin script references in authority records*

*After RDA testing was completed, LC PSD finally was able to move this project ahead. Because of the complexity of this issue, LC decided to do a survey within the library community. In January 2011 PSD sent a draft survey to a few organizations for review, including the NACO Nodes and the PCC Task Force on Non-Latin Script Cataloging Documentation, etc. Comments will be incorporated and then a formal survey will be posted to a wider audience, hopefully not too long from now.*

4. *Acknowledgement of CTP members (2008-2011)*

*Sarah Elman thanked the following CTP committee members for their dedication and hard work during the past three years:*

- *Erica Soonyoung Chang (University of Hawaii at Manoa)*
- *Shi Deng (UC San Diego)*
- *Shuyong Jiang (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)*
- *Hyoungbae Lee (2010-2011; Princeton University)*
- *Hideyuki Morimoto (Senior Consultant ; Columbia University)*
- *Eunseung Oh (2008-2009; Sanford University)*
- *Chiaki Sakai (University of Iowa)*
- *Yue Shu (Smithsonian Institution Libraries)*
- *Fabiano Takashi Rocha (University of Toronto Libraries)*
- *Jia Xu (University of Iowa Libraries)*

## **Workshop on Films and Videorecordings Cataloging**

*Thursday, March 31, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM  
Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Room 306*

*Trainer: **Peter H. Lisius**  
Music and Media Catalog Librarian  
Assistant Professor  
Kent State University Libraries*

### **I. Training Materials:**

- *[Click for Basic contents]*
- *[Click for Advanced contents]*
- *[Click for RDA-related contents]*

### **II. Questions and Answers**

#### **Basic Section:**

***Q1. Should subfield(s) in 041 follow the alphabetical order, such as example in slide 38, should subfield “\$j eng” be after subfield “\$h spa”***

*A1. Subfields in MARC records are not generally intended to be input in alphabetical order. See details in OLAC Newsletters: Cataloger’s Judgment: Q&A, compiled by Jay Weitz (<http://olacinc.org/drupal/newsletters/enews/2010June/judgement.html>)*

*Follow-up response from Shi Deng: Jay Weitz’s Cataloger’s Judgment: Q&A can be keyword searchable at: <http://olacinc.org/drupal/?q=node/59>*

***Q2. If an English parallel title is seen on disc, can it be added to 245 [\$b]? (Question asked at the time with slide 46)***

*A2. You would start with chief source. AACR2 says item itself and its container (and container label) if the container is an integral part of the piece (7.0B1). So yes, if an English title appears on chief source of information, e.g., the title frames, a disc, [with the title proper]; no, if an English title appears only on disc [as not taken from title frame with title proper], use 246 to trace the English title.*

***Q3. Which field do we choose to record participants/performers and creation/ production credits? 511 or 508 field?***

A3. Creation is different from performance. 511 records credits for these who PARTICIPATE in a film, while 508 records credits for these who CREATE and/or PRODUCE a film and not recorded in 245c.

**Q4. Question on 245 #c punctuation as practice convention, usually not put comma between credit and name when it is not on the piece, i.e. “dao yan Lu Xuechang”(CJK practice convention) vs. “dao yan, Lu Xuechang” (slide 51, 63, etc.) (Originally asked by Sarah Elman, brought it up by Peter Lisius)**

A4. For English DVDs and other Western languages that I catalog, I've always added commas when it made sense grammatically to do so. Then asked audience what they think. Shi responded that at UCSD, for original cataloging, we follow CJK practice convention most of time unless a person with multiple credits/different responsibilities, three or more, we would use comma to break them to make sense grammatically, i.e. “zhi pian, she ying, bian ju, dao yan, Lu Xuechang (制片, 摄影, 编剧, 导演, 路学长),” not “zhi pian she ying bian ju dao yan Lu Xuechang.”

**Q5. Morimoto pointed out a couple errors in 246 of the 4<sup>th</sup> example of slide 61: missing space after Hotel M; missing “#b”; “Gangster” should be lower case.**

A5. Before correction: #i Title known as in English: #a Hotel M: Gangster's Last Draw

After correction: #i Title known as in English: #a Hotel M : #b gangster's Last Draw

**Q6. I have seen a lot catalog records record original release date for DVD in 260c, what's your practice?**

A6. It is OK if date is the same as original release date. However, if not, prefer to add original release date in 500 field to avoid confusion.

**Q7. If a copy found matching, credits on screen in CJK, but recorded as English probably taken from container, what you would do?**

A7. If you are pretty sure about it, enhance the record by adding CJK scripts, if not, create new record.

**Q8. Publication date with DVD that has special feature: What about single DVD that has special feature?**

A8. Treat it the same as DVD with special feature on bonus DVD.

**Q9. As to the second example of slide 97: why coding single date in DtSt of fixed field in this case?**

*A9. In this case, special features are included. (Referring to OCLC master record: 150881728. This record indicates that multiple special features are included in the DVD version.)*

***Q10. If a motion picture is based on an original drama/novel by an author, where do we record the original author? In 245 \$c? ?***

*A10. Yes, if the original author appears on the chief source of information.*

***Q11. Do we still emphasize “title from ...” note?***

*A11. Yes, we should, if not from chief source.*

***Q12. Is it a standard practice to provide summary in CJK language in quotation marks in 520 field? (See also example and question in slide 102)***

*A12. Hideyuki Morimoto’s answer is yes, according to Descriptive Cataloging of East Asian Material: CJK Examples of AACR2 and LCRIs, 7.7B17 Summary.*

***Q13. If [language] subtitles are added to a DVD, do we create a new record?***

*A13. Yes, adding [language] subtitles is considered a significant difference from other versions.*

### **Advanced Section**

***Q1. What is a reasonable cataloguing quota of videorecordings?***

*A1. It is difficult to come up with such a number, especially at academic libraries, where cataloguers are expected to perform other additional duties than hands-on cataloguing. Maybe, it is within the range of 10-20 original cataloguing bibliographic records per day, accompanied by processing of necessary supporting authority records, for videorecordings.*

***Q2. What is the difference between genre/form headings 155 and form subdivisions 185?***

*A2. The trainer reviewed Advanced Section, Slide #4.*

***Q3. Genre/form headings may not geographically be subdivided. Isn't it the case? How may such a geographical aspect of a videorecording be indicated?***

*A3.1. Genre/form headings may not geographically be subdivided.*

*A3.2. It is LC's policy for the time being. In the meanwhile, some libraries code bibliographic field 655 entries as local and geographically subdivide genre/form headings, when deemed appropriate.*

***Q4. When a name of a corporate body is "... Films", is such a name alone considered to convey the idea of a corporate body or is it necessary to add a qualifier " (Firm)" in the heading, as per AACR2, 24.4B1?***

*A4. The trainer tends to think "... Films" alone conveys the idea of a corporate body and usually proceeds as such. However, when various cases of this type are checked in the LC/NACO Authority File, mixed practice is apparent.*

***Q5.1. Advance Section, Slide #57 (excerpt from a bibliographic record): The uniform title under field 130 and the title proper under field 245 are identical. In this case, is uniform title necessary under bibliographic field 130?***

***Q5.2. Should the uniform title under field 130 rather receive a qualifier in subfield "a"?***

***Q5.3. However, exact match authority record, LCCN no2010061721, does not carry any qualifier for this uniform title.***

*A5: The trainer will investigate this case and will let workshop participants know his findings. [Below is the trainer's follow-up answer via e-mail:*

*\*\*No, it isn't necessary to add to the bibliographic record. They are identical, as you note above. I had originally added this example because there was an authority record for the series in the NAF. In Question 5.3, the question was why the same basic title for "Ethical markets" did not have the qualifier "Television program." This heading was established by me. When I set this heading up, there were no "conflicting resources" making it necessary to qualify the heading by "television program." But, there was another title by which this series is known, "Ethical markets TV series," and it is included as 430 reference on this particular NAR. If the program had not been known by a different title, I wouldn't have established the heading.]*

***Additional question about whether it's necessary to add the uniform title (with qualifier) to the record for the original work.***

*Trainer: When cataloging motion pictures, I always search the NAF for a uniform title. If I find one, I always add it to the bibliographic record. I usually assume that a previously-existing conflict prompted the heading's creation, making it a good idea to add the uniform title each time a heading is found.*

***Q6: When a uniform title is established in the LC/NACO Authority File for use under bibliographic field 630 as a subject of a resource on a motion picture, should a pre-existing bibliographic record for the motion picture itself be revised for addition of the uniform title under field 130?***

A6: *It is PCC practice to do so.*

**Q7: *Is it a requirement to enter relater codes?***

A7: *No, it is not mandatory.*

**Q8: *Should uniform titles separately be established for different videorecording systems, such as VHS, DVD, and Blu-ray?***

A8: *No, VHS, DVD, and Blue-ray are still of the same format, videorecording. Separate uniform titles are established for different resources.*

**Q9: *For establishment of separate uniform titles, when it is said they are established for different resources, do different resources mean different contents?***

A9: *Yes.*

**Q10: *In the following pre-existing name authority record:***

010 no2010182385  
040 ILMchBWI |b eng |c ILMchBWI  
130 0 Melancholy of Haruhi Suzumiya (Television program)  
430 0 Suzumiya Haruhi no yu(macron)utsu (Television program)  
670 The melancholy of Haruhi Suzumiya. Complete collection [VR], 2006.  
670 IMDb, Nov. 8, 2010 |b (Melancholy of Haruhi Suzumiya; Japanese animated television series; original air date April 2, 2006; original title: Suzumiya Haruhi no yu(macron)utsu)

**Why is the established heading an English translation title and the cross-reference a Japanese original title?** *As more or less explained under 670-2 above, Japanese original Suzumiya Haruhi no yu(macron)utsu was first televised, Apr.-July 2006, then translated into English and localized for the North American market for release, May-Nov. 2007. So, the Japanese and English versions were **\*not\*** simultaneously made. Also, the cataloger who established this name authority record did have both the English translation and Japanese original titles. Is LCRI, 25.3A for the named individual works of art applied to television programs?*

A10: *This name authority record is in error. The Japanese original title should be the main part of the established heading.*

**Q11: *Then, may fields 130 and 430 be switched in this name authority record for update registration in the LC/NACO Authority File?***

A11: *Yes, if one is authorized to make changes to name authority records in the LC/NACO Authority File.*

***Q12: A DVD was originally published with no series title. Then, the same DVD was re-packaged, together with other DVDs, with a series title on a box. Is a new bibliographic record permitted for the re-packaged DVD?***

*A12: When there is no major difference, and when there is no accompanying material added, and when there is no special feature added, no new bibliographic record is created. Series title appearing on a re-packaged box alone does not constitute a major difference. (If considered important, catalogers may add additional information of the re-packaging in local note.) An alternative approach is to create a set record for the new set so the data elements of this re-packaged manifestation can be brought out.*

***Q13: As long as the same bibliographic record is used for the original DVD and repackaged DVD, may the series statement appearing on the box (but not in or on DVD itself) of the later repackaged publication be added to the pre-existing bibliographic record originally prepared for the original DVD?***

*A13: No.*

### **RDA Section**

***Q1. Question about DVD doesn't indicate the year it was released, can we use conjecture date?***

*A1. Yes. If you know the date late than ... use [20--], if sure, [date], if not sure, [date?].*

***Q2. How do you see the implementation of RDA?***

*A2. RDA concept will truly help patron identify videos. It all started with good intention. ... Latin abbreviations are acceptable internationally, but now we go down to the level without them. ... MARC is old format, we need new thing that definitely work well with RDA. I don't want RDA to die, it's a new standard in progress.*

***Q3. How much of your workshop slides can be shared?***

*A3. Don't mind to share, but will do some tweak before put on CEAL web site, maybe by the end of April.*