TO: Chamya Kincy and Paul Frank, PCC SCT Co-chairs

FROM: George A. Prager, Chair of the PCC SCT RDA Records Task Group

SCT RDA Records Task Group Final Report

March 1, 2012 (with revisions to April 2, 2012)

Background

The PCC SCT RDA Records Task Group was created in late October 2011, in accordance with the August 25, 2011 mandate of the PCC Policy Statement on RDA Training. Its members included: George Prager, New York University Law School (Chair); Nancy Lorimer, Stanford University; Christee Pascale, North Carolina State University; Robert Rendall, Columbia University. The group's charge was to collect examples of complete MARC RDA bibliographic records in all formats and modes of issuance; collect examples of RDA records in non-MARC 21 encoding schema (as time and resources allowed); collect examples of complete RDA name authority records; review the records for completeness and accuracy, and submit the record in a file organized by type of record, on or before March 1, 2012.

An interim report, dated January 16, 2012, described the group's first three months of work. The task group ended up submitting a total of 138 records (130 bibliographic records, including 3 non-MARC records, and 8 authority records). The records reflect a variety of practices since RDA often allows more than one option for recording bibliographic data. In most cases, the records were left as is to show the variety of allowable practices that catalogers will encounter in a national bibliographic utility.

Here is a breakdown of the records. Please note that there is some overlap between the categories, and that final arrangement of the records may change when they are posted on the PCC Website.

Organization of Record Examples

Batch 1: Records in Arabic & Urdu: 4 records

Batch 2: Records for cartographic resources: 11 records

Batch 3: Records for print textual monographs: 13 records

Batch 4: Records for dissertations: 7 records

Batch 5: Records for microform monographs and additional print textual monographs in non-Western languages: 8 records

Batch 6: Records for archival resources and non-archival serial record entered under family as creator: 7 records

Batch 7: Records for law resources: 10 records

Batch 8: Records for serials and Websites: 9 records

Batch 9: Records for rare books and incunabula: 9 records

Batch 10: Records for art objects, graphic images, artists' books, etc.: 15 records

Batch 11: Records for nonmusical sound recordings: 3 records

Batch 12: Records for scores: 10 records

Batch 13: Records for musical sound recordings: 8 records

Batch 14: Records in non-MARC formats: 3 records (Including Dublin core, EAD, and MODS)

Batch 15: Records for projected medium: 11 records

Batch 16: Records for video games: 2 records

Batch 17: Records for name authorities: 8 records.

Policy Decisions

The group was faced with several thorny policy decisions. I will highlight the most significant, and our reasons for the policies we decided to follow.

Use unauthorized RDA form of headings or authorized AACR2 forms? PCC interim policy between the end of the RDA test period and the implementation of RDA is to use the authorized AACR2 form of headings, rather than unauthorized RDA forms (for example, use the AACR2 form: "Bible. Old Testament. Genesis", rather than the RDA form: "Bible. Genesis"). After much discussion, our group, in consultation with the SCT chairs, decided that using RDA forms of heading, when readily available, rather than AACR2 forms, would make the records most helpful in understanding RDA/LCPS practice. We did not try to establish the RDA form for every heading already established in AACR2. If however, the RDA form was readily apparent, we would use that instead of the AACR2 form, if they differed.

Use newly approved but not yet implemented MARC 21 fields? MARC 21 Update 13 (September 2011) added field 264 (Production, Publication, Distribution, Manufacture, and Copyright Notice), new fields 344-347 (Sound characteristics, Projection characteristics of moving image, Video characteristics, and Digital file characteristics) to the MARC 21 bibliographic format, as well as new subfields to field 340 (Physical Medium). None of these new fields and subfields has yet been implemented by LC, PCC, or OCLC. While it is likely that at least field 264 will be implemented in the next few months, no definite

date has been announced for any of these fields, and it is always possible that their implementation may be delayed. In some cases, it would be relatively straightforward to decide how field 264 should be coded; in other cases, it would involve examining the resource itself, and/or possibly doing further research, especially in the province of scores, sound, and video recordings. Properly coding the new 34x field would be even more complex. For all these reasons, the task group concluded that it was best not to use any unimplemented fields in the sample records. However, when these fields are implemented, it may be worthwhile for this task group or another group to update the records with the new fields, or simply to add additional examples using them.

Provision of surrogates? At the PCC SCT Meeting during ALA Annual in January 2012, it was suggested that the task group provide surrogates with the record examples whenever possible. (This was not in the original charge). Unfortunately, by then, the task group had already collected a large proportion of its records, which it was busy reviewing. For these records, no surrogates had been collected. Many records were being provided by catalogers outside the task group, and we felt we couldn't ask them to go to this extra step. It was agreed that going forward, we would do our best to provide surrogates, if we could do so without substantially slowing down our review process. We were able to provide surrogates for many of the law examples.

Provision of authority records? Two files of sample RDA authority records, dated September 2010 and August 2011, are available as links from the Webpage "Training examples for RDA at the Library of Congress": http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/training_examples.html

It was decided by the task group, in consultation with the SCT co-chairs, that we should submit a smaller, complementary batch of NARs. Our NARs include records primarily for music name-titles, and for non-Roman script names.

Areas where more records are needed

While our task group did our best to submit as representative a group of records as possible, there are certainly areas where more samples would be useful. Some areas may be overrepresented (if that is possible), due to record availability and task group expertise and/or interests. At the present time, there appear to be few non-MARC 21 RDA records available, so that is definitely an area for expansion.

Recommendations

After reviewing the records, the PCC Standing Committee on Training came up with suggested enhancements that would further leverage the records' usefulness as training materials. These enhancements go beyond the original charge for the task group, and the SCT recommends that such changes be made to the records at some point in the near future, preferably through the formation of a follow-up task group that would make the changes. The recommended enhancements are as follows:

- Use bold and/or italics font to emphasize core elements.
- Use additional coding conventions in non-required fields to emphasize core and non-core elements (e.g. indicating that $e is non-core in an access points that isn't required in the first place).
- Make annotations to show the instruction numbers governing how data is transcribed or recorded.
- Add footnotes when necessary (e.g. to explain if something is a devised "relationship designator").
- Designate a subset of records where multiple copies could be made to show a variety practices.
- Provide additional surrogates beyond the ones for law records.

Source of Records and Acknowledgments

Task group members selected many of the records, either from resources they had cataloged, or from OCLC. In our record selection, the task group received invaluable assistance from many other individuals, without whom we would not have been able to fulfill our charge. Needless to say, we are responsible for any and all errors in the records. We would like to extend special thanks to the following (with apologies to anyone we have missed): Melanie Wacker and Charlene Chou (Columbia University), Charles Riley (Yale University), Greta DeGroat (Stanford University), Kathy Winzer (Stanford University Robert Crown Law Library), Kevin Kishimoto and Christopher Winters (University of Chicago), Robert Maxwell and Dale Swensen (Brigham Young University), Iman Dagher (UCLA), the Middle East Librarians Association, Elizabeth O'Keefe and Maria Oldal (Morgan Library), Penny Baker (Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute), and Sherman Clarke (freelance). Needless to say, we also received invaluable advice and guidance throughout our work from the PCC SCT co-chairs, Chamya Kincy, UCLA, and Paul Frank, LC, for which we'd like to offer our heartfelt thanks and gratitude!

Lastly, I would like to express my appreciation for the expertise, dedication, and unfailing good humor of my fellow task group members, Christee Pascale, Nancy Lorimer, and Robert Rendall.