

To: Lori Robare, Chair, ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

From: Task Force to Update “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal”

Subject: Final Report of the Task Force

Introduction

Our task force was charged to update the Web document “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA” (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/how-to.html>), and was asked to address the following:

- Draft interim guidelines while the current document is under development
- Update the text in light of RDA (including changes in terminology, names, URLs, JSC processes and timetables, and new examples in the Appendix)
- Make additions to the text that would assist in the preparation of a change proposal
- Make changes to the proposal submission process that would reflect current methods for sharing electronic documents
- Simplify markup of the proposed changes

Members of the Task Force:

Patricia Dragon

Chamya Kincy, Chair

Dorothy McGarry

The Task Force made editorial changes where necessary, but mainly focused on the changes outlined in the charge. Our proposed changes are included at the end of this report, where we have provided the entire text of the guidelines in both marked-up and clean versions. We have also included the interim guidelines in Appendix A of this report.

The Task Force was asked to consult with various people, particularly the JSC representative, current and former CC:DA chairs, and others with experience in submitting revision proposals. We worked closely with the JSC representative, John Attig, who provided extensive feedback and advice during the course of our work, particularly with respect to the interim guidelines and information on the JSC’s processes and timetables. We are indebted to him for sharing his perspectives and for offering additions to the text that have greatly enhanced the document. We also consulted with CC:DA members who recently submitted proposals in order to get their impressions of the current guidelines and to gain insight into how the document could be improved. We especially thank Kathy Glennan, John Hostage, and Mark Scharff for assisting in this effort. We also thank Melanie Polutta for lending her insight on how to improve the guidelines. Finally, we received generous guidance and input from the CC:DA Chair, Lori Robare, whose direction and suggestions contributed immeasurably to our work.

General Comments

After devising the interim guidelines, the Task Force noted the document’s shorter length compared to the official guidelines—one and a half pages versus six. This inspired us to consider streamlining the larger document. The interim guidelines provide basic information for submitting a proposal while the larger document offers additional contextual information, such as “Who Can Submit a Proposal?” and “How Will Proposals Be Evaluated?” The Task Force considered moving the contextual information to another Web page so that the heart of the guidelines (i.e. “Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal”) could be displayed more prominently. We concluded, however, that the contextual information is too beneficial to relegate to another page, so we left the document with all the guidelines on the same Web page.

With extensive assistance from John Attig, we added, deleted, and rearranged text where necessary in order to provide the proper context for the guidelines, to create a more logical organization, or to minimize redundant and superfluous information. These changes are reflected most notably in the first three sections—the “Introduction,” “Who Can Submit a Rule Revision Proposal?,” and “What Types of Proposals Are Acceptable?”—where much of the text addresses information related to the JSC.

Interim Guidelines

The Task Force worked with John Attig, who drafted the interim guidelines. The Task Force accepted the guidelines with minor revisions and forwarded the document to the CC:DA Chair. The [interim guidelines](#) were posted to the CC:DA Web site in August 2011.

Changes in Terminology, Names, URLs, Etc.

Changes Unrelated to RDA. The Task Force made minor changes where necessary to improve the readability of the text. The focus of our work, however, involved changes in terminology, names, URLs, and other instances that warranted revision. One example involved the recent change in the Cataloging and Classification Section’s name to the Cataloging and Metadata Management Section. In addition, the German National Library was added to the list of JSC representatives to reflect this most recent addition to the group’s membership. Finally, we checked all the URLs and replaced them with updated links where necessary.

Changes Related to RDA. The Task Force identified and updated changes in terminology and names with respect to RDA. This included the name of the cataloging code itself, the JSC’s official name, and any other instance requiring the replacement of “AACR2” with “RDA.” The Task Force also updated examples for what to place in the subject line of proposals (in the “Address” subsection under “Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal”) in order to reflect

RDA instructions. Finally, we replaced any mention of experiences with the AACR2 rule revision process with more current RDA case scenarios.

The Task Force noted that over the past several years, RDA guidelines have increasingly been referred to as “instructions” rather than “rules.” Thus, to be in accordance with current terminology, we deleted all instances of “rules” from the document and replaced them with “instruction,” where applicable. This included the title of the document itself, which we have changed from “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA” to “How to Submit a Revision Proposal to CC:DA.”

New Examples in the Appendix. The Appendix of the current guidelines includes examples of two revision proposals, both in Word and ASCII versions. The Task Force decided that instead of updating the examples to illustrate RDA revision proposals, the document should simply include a link to proposals that have been submitted in the past. Therefore, we deleted the appendix and, instead, introduced a new section entitled: “Where Can I Find Examples of Revision Proposals?” In this section, we provide a link to previously submitted ALA proposals on the JSC Web site (<http://www.rda-jsc.org/working2.html#ala>).

Changes in the JSC’s Processes and Timetables

For updating the JSC’s processes and timetables, the Task Force first consulted the JSC’s “Statement of Policy & Procedures,” which states that constituencies must submit their proposals two and a half months before the next scheduled JSC meeting. However, after speaking with the JSC representative, we learned that the JSC is in the process of revising its schedule and that the timeframe is now *three* months prior to the JSC meeting. Accordingly, we changed the requirement of CC:DA to transmit revision proposals in the second bullet under “What is the Timetable for Submitting a Rule Revision Proposal?” from “30 days” to “three months.” We also noted that the link for the “Statement of Policy & Procedures” was broken and should be replaced with the link to the most current version (<http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/5policy4rev2.pdf>). However, CC:DA should note that this link may soon change since the “Statement of Policy & Procedures” is currently under revision.

Language in the “What is the Timetable for Submitting a Rule Revision Proposal?” section states that the revision process “may take a year or more, depending on the complexity of the proposals and the number of revisions requested.” This generated inquiry into whether this still held true or if it should be updated in light of the JSC’s efforts to streamline its processes. After consulting with the JSC representative, we learned that the JSC’s scheduling would not be determined for another year, which would require revision of these guidelines in the future. This led to a more general discussion on whether the specifics of the JSC’s timetables should be mentioned at all in the guidelines, since the guidelines might need constant updating to accommodate future changes in scheduling. The Task Force ultimately decided to leave the language here unchanged and to bring this issue up for discussion during the CC:DA meeting.

Conversation on the timetables also led to a discussion about the JSC’s fast track process for proposals that require less extensive review (e.g., correction of typos, addition of RDA vocabulary terms, etc.). After clarification from the JSC representative, the Task Force learned that petitioners using the fast track process could bypass the formal submission process that involves CC:DA and submit proposals directly to the JSC representative. The JSC representative devised language to describe this process, which we have included in the “What Types of Proposals Are Accepted?” section. While not officially a part of the formal proposal submission process, the Task Force thought it would be useful to include language here as a way to steer petitioners in the appropriate direction—formal vs. fast track—depending on the nature of their proposal.

On a related note, if the text regarding the fast track process is approved by CC:DA, this may warrant review of the examples for what to place in the subject line of proposals in the “Address” subsection under “Formal Elements of the Proposal.” The examples here refer to text in the subject lines of formal proposals. Because “correction of errors” is one of the “minor issues” deemed eligible for the fast track process, it might be necessary to delete “Error in Appendix B, ABBREVIATIONS, [cite abbreviation]” from the list since it would not likely go into the subject line of a formal proposal.

Additions to the Text and other Changes that Would Assist in Preparing a Proposal

The Task Force was encouraged to consult with CC:DA members who have recently submitted proposals in order to get their suggestions for additions to the guidelines that would assist future petitioners. We received several suggestions, which we added in a new subsection under “Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal,” entitled: “Other considerations for inclusion in the proposal.” The JSC representative also added text under the “Proposed revisions” subsection of “Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal,” requesting that changes be outlined in a numbered list, which reflects a recent addition to the JSC’s procedures.

Along with these additions, The Task Force deleted text in order to improve the readability of the “Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal” section. We deleted redundant language regarding the impact of the proposal under “Rationale/Explanation for the proposed revisions,” since this is already addressed in the “Assessment of the impact and survey of related rules.” We also deleted language on the placement of the assessment of the impact and the placement of the rationale because we believed this did not need to be specified, and, in the case of the latter, could vary depending on the circumstance.

Changes in the Proposal Submission Process

Paper vs. Electronic Copy. The Task Force was charged to “incorporate changes to the ‘Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal’ section to reflect current methods of sharing documents electronically.” The current guidelines show a preference for electronic copies, but still allow for the option of paper copies. The guidelines also require submission of paper copies for any proposals involving foreign language diacritics. In the latter case, we decided that there are ways

to deal with diacritics that do not involve paper copies. Therefore, to reflect current methods of sharing documents electronically as well as “facilitate distribution over the Committee’s electronic discussion list”—as rationalized in the guidelines—the Task Force proposes that the format of the proposals be restricted to electronic versions, even for cases involving foreign language diacritics.

Choice of Electronic Versions. The current guidelines require proposals to be submitted in the most recent version of Microsoft Word or in ASCII text. In our discussions with the JSC representative, we learned that the JSC no longer wants submissions in ASCII text. One of our consultants offered an alternative format: Open Document Format, produced by OpenOffice.org software. However, the Task Force decided to restrict electronic submission to Microsoft Word (version 1997 or higher) until advised otherwise.

Protocol for the “Address” Portion of the Proposal. One of our consultants noticed different addressing protocols in the two Appendix examples and suggested that petitioners include their name in the “From” line, conceding that this may, in fact, be less relevant in the current wiki age. Nevertheless, the Task Force proposes adding language in the guidelines that encourages inclusion of the name of the petitioner followed by the constituent group he or she represents, if applicable. It was also noted that many recent proposals have been addressed to the Chair of CC:DA. We have adjusted the text to reflect this.

Forwarding the Proposal. The Task Force noticed inconsistent language regarding the person to whom proposals should be submitted. The first sentence in “Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal” reads: “A copy of the rule revision proposal must be forwarded to the Chair of CC:DA,” while in “Forwarding the Proposal,” the petitioner is instructed to forward the proposal to either the CC:DA Chair or a CC:DA member. After consulting with the CC:DA Chair, we learned that petitioners can submit proposals either directly to the Chair or via CC:DA members. Therefore, we deleted the first sentence under the “Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal” section and left the two options under the “Forwarding the Proposal” section unchanged.

When forwarding via CC:DA members, one Task Force member thought that petitioners should not be restricted to representatives whose “sphere of cataloging” coincides with “the particular focus or intent” of the proposal—as instructed by the guidelines—but should be able to send it to any CC:DA member. Thus, we have proposed alternative language to reflect this. When it comes to finding a CC:DA member, the Task Force felt that directing petitioners to the *ALA Handbook* would be an outdated method. One of our consultants also questioned if it was still feasible to obtain a free copy of the *Handbook*, as stated in the current guidelines. Therefore, the Task Force has stricken from the document language regarding the *Handbook* and proposes that petitioners use the roster for locating members. It was also suggested that any wording that refers to non-voting CC:DA members as “representatives” should be changed to “liaisons.” All of these changes are reflected in the revised guidelines.

Simplifying the Rules for Markup of the Proposed Changes.

The Task Force attempted to simplify the markup language under the “Proposed Revisions” subsection of “Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal.” Particularly challenging was the simplification of the language for proposals submitted in ASCII format. However, since ASCII text is now discouraged by the JSC, we omitted every reference to ASCII and SGML in the document and focused on the rest of the text.

A general observation from one of our consultants was the difficulty in reproducing RDA’s format, given that it is an online product. This consultant felt that there should be less emphasis on reproducing spacing, indentation, and typography, and more on submitting a logically organized document that reasonably distinguished heading, text, and examples. Given this observation, along with a general attempt to streamline the markup, we have deleted much of the details in this section and included only the most critical instructions.

Other comments

- The CC:DA Chair suggested that we add the ALA representative to the JSC and the CC:DA Chair to the list of consultants in the “Preliminary Steps To Take in Submitting a Proposal” section, so we revised the text accordingly.
- In the “How Will Proposals Be Evaluated” section, the first sentence of the first bullet point (“The need for the revision is determined”) reads: “Is the current text [of RDA] confusing?” One of our consultants wondered if this might invite wordsmithing, given the unpopularity of the current RDA editorial style. However, we decided to leave this in, not only in light of the recent appointment of the new RDA copy editor, but also to allow for instances where clarification of the text truly is needed.
- Another one of our consultants felt it helpful to mention that the same process sometimes comes into play for constituent responses to major proposals (e.g., MLA’s response to LC/12 during the RDA drafting process, which ran to 23 pages).

Changes with Markup

Association for Library Collections ~~and~~ & Technical Services
(A division of the American Library Association)
~~Cataloging and Classification Section~~ Cataloging and Metadata Management Section

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

How to Submit a ~~Rule Change~~ Revision Proposal to CC:DA

Table of Contents

Introduction

Who Can Submit a ~~Rule~~ Revision Proposal?

What Types of Proposals Are Acceptable?

How Will Proposals Be Evaluated?

Preliminary Steps To Take in Submitting a Proposal

Formal Elements of a ~~Rule~~ Revision Proposal

Forwarding the Proposal

What is the Timetable for Submitting a ~~Rule~~ Revision Proposal?

~~Appendix: Examples~~ Where Can I Find Examples of Revision Proposals?

Introduction

RDA: Resource Description and Access is a set of guidelines and instructions on formulating data to support resource discovery. RDA provides a comprehensive set of guidelines and instructions covering all types of content and media.

RDA was developed and is maintained by the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (JSC), which is responsible for making decisions regarding the content of RDA. This international group is made up of representatives from the American Library Association, the Australian Committee on Cataloguing, the British Library, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, the German National Library, and the Library of Congress.

The JSC receives, discusses, and makes decisions on proposals received from one of the JSC constituencies or from non-JSC groups. Each JSC constituency is expected to respond to every proposal, and reaches decisions by consensus.

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)~~ RDA. Within the United States, all additions and changes to the ~~cataloging code~~ RDA (except those originating from the Library of Congress) must be channeled through this group.

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 revision 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)~~ **Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (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 Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, 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?

The JSC accepts two types of proposals:

1. Certain minor issues may be subject to a Fast Track procedure. This is designed to deal with issues that do not require extensive discussion or consultation by the JSC members. Examples include the addition of terms to the RDA vocabularies (including the relationship designators), the addition, deletion, or modification of examples, the correction of errors in the text (including typographical errors). Suggestions for Fast Track proposals should be directed to the ALA representative to the JSC, who will carry them forward to the JSC.
2. Other proposals follow the more formal process described in this document.

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~~) (e.g., the Committee submitted a proposal to change an RDA instruction and a related glossary definition to expand the scope of Artistic and/or Technical Credit to include sound recordings) to major changes of the code (e.g., addition of a new chapter or deletion of ~~a rule~~ an instruction).

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~~ an 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~~ instructions? Is ~~a rule~~ an instruction 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~~ instructions?
- **The possible impact on other instructions ~~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 the Chair of CC:DA, one of the voting members of the Committee or one of the ~~representatives~~ liaisons from a group (e.g., Music Library Association’s CC:DA representative) 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, the Chair, the voting members, and representatives the liaisons can be particularly helpful in guiding the process outlined below and in navigating the waters of CC:DA procedures.

3. Consider consulting with the ALA representative to the JSC. It can be helpful to discuss preliminary ideas with someone familiar with the overall editorial and revision process.

Formal Elements of a Rule Revision Proposal

~~A copy of the rule revision proposal must be forwarded to the Chair of CC:DA (see instructions on [Forwarding the Proposal](#) below). If at all possible, the The proposal should be sent in electronic form to facilitate distribution over the Committee's electronic discussion list. This will 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.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/ccda.html>. <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/otherdocs.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 must be either in a recent version of a popular word processor, such as Microsoft Word (1997 version or higher), 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. The Webmaster may contact the proposer for corrections or clarifications; the proposer will have the opportunity to review the final version of the 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: [Name], Chair, ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
~~American Library Association,
 ALCTS/CCS Committee of Cataloging:
 Description and Access~~

From: [To be supplied]

Subject: [To be supplied]

Note: On the *From:* line, please include the name of the person submitting the proposal, followed by the constituent group he or she represents, if applicable. On the *Subject:* line, please include the following types of information if applicable to the proposal: the ~~rule~~ RDA instruction number; captioned words associated with the ~~rule~~ instruction; 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]~~
- RDA 6.29.1.21, Reports of One Court
- RDA 7.24, Artistic and/or Technical Credit
- RDA 9.13, Affiliation
- RDA 11.2.2.21.1 & 11.2.2.21.2, Heads of State and Government
- RDA 16.2.2.9, Places in Certain Federations
- 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 RDA~~ 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~~ instruction affected by the revision. It is therefore common for proposals to include revisions to more than one ~~rule~~ instruction. Furthermore, these revisions ~~often~~ may occur in different parts of ~~AACR RDA~~.

To assist CC:DA and the JSC in discussing the proposal, the specific changes being requested should be given as a numbered list, if possible. This not only draws attention to the specifics, but allows reference to each change by number.

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. the text of the proposed changes should be given in two versions: one using markup to show the changes from the current text, and one showing a clean version of the proposed text. The current text of RDA should be copied from the RDA Toolkit and should retain the original typography.

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. The markup should use strike-through to indicate deletions and double underlining to indicate additions. 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 instruction, 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 instructions:

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~~ instructions within AACR RDA. This may be a separate section of the proposal or be included in the [Background](#) statement.

Other considerations for inclusion in the proposal:

It may be useful to include surrogates or other ways of depicting resources to be cataloged that illustrate the instruction being addressed (e.g., a recent proposal from the Music Library Association that included surrogates of two CDs to show circumstances where the inability to use a source that presents a collective title as the preferred source leads to complications). It may also be advisable to include evidence of having considered the scope of the proposed change and to offer suggestions for broadening or narrowing that scope, if applicable. Finally, it may be helpful to mention other constituencies that have been consulted or made a part of the proposal-drafting process (e.g., consultation or coordination with OLAC, the Canadian Association of Music Libraries, etc.).

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 representative from that particular cataloging constituency.~~
- ~~The proposal can be forwarded directly to the Chair of CC:DA.~~

The revision proposal should be forwarded to the Chair of CC:DA, either directly or through any voting or non-voting member 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~~ Revision proposals should be made available to the eChair of CC:DA one month prior to the next CC:DA meeting, which is scheduled during the ALA Annual Conference or Midwinter Meeting. 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~~ Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (JSC). JSC requires that ~~rule~~ revision proposals be transmitted to JSC at least ~~30 days~~ three months 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~~ date of the next JSC meeting 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 are 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. 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: ~~JSC/Chair/ALCTS AV rep response~~

- ~~Word processing version~~ [Word processing version](#)
- ~~ASCII version~~ [ASCII version](#)

Example 2: ~~CC:DA/MuLA/25.30D2/1~~

- ~~Word processing version~~ [Word processing version](#)
- ~~ASCII version~~ [ASCII version](#)

Where Can I Find Examples of Revision Proposals?

All RDA revision proposals are posted on the JSC website. Check here for examples of recent proposals, paying particular attention to the [ALA proposals](#).

Revised by CC:DA: ~~2002 Jun 17~~ [Current date of revision]

Revised per ~~CCS CaMMS~~ Executive Committee: ~~2003 June 2~~ [Current date of revision]

Clean Version

Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
(A division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Metadata Management Section

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

How to Submit a Revision Proposal to CC:DA

Table of Contents

- Introduction
- Who Can Submit a Revision Proposal?
- What Types of Proposals Are Acceptable?
- How Will Proposals Be Evaluated?
- Preliminary Steps To Take in Submitting a Proposal
- Formal Elements of a Revision Proposal
- Forwarding the Proposal
- What is the Timetable for Submitting a Revision Proposal?
- Where Can I Find Examples of Revision Proposals?

Introduction

RDA: Resource Description and Access is a set of guidelines and instructions on formulating data to support resource discovery. RDA provides a comprehensive set of guidelines and instructions covering all types of content and media.

RDA was developed and is maintained by the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (JSC), which is responsible for making decisions regarding the content of RDA. This

international group is made up of representatives from the American Library Association, the Australian Committee on Cataloguing, the British Library, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, the German National Library, and the Library of Congress.

The JSC receives, discusses, and makes decisions on proposals received from one of the JSC constituencies or from non-JSC groups. Each JSC constituency is expected to respond to every proposal, and reaches decisions by consensus.

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 RDA. Within the United States, all additions and changes to RDA (except those originating from the Library of Congress) must be channeled through this group.

Who Can Submit a Revision Proposal?

Anyone can submit a revision proposal to CC:DA by following the instructions detailed below. CC:DA welcomes input and suggestions for revision. At the same time, it should be noted that the revision process 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 Development of RDA (JSC)**.

What Types of Proposals Are Acceptable?

The JSC accepts two types of proposals:

1. Certain minor issues may be subject to a Fast Track procedure. This is designed to deal with issues that do not require extensive discussion or consultation by the JSC members. Examples include the addition of terms to the RDA vocabularies (including the relationship designators), the addition, deletion, or modification of examples, the correction of errors in the text (including typographical errors). Suggestions for Fast Track proposals should be directed to the ALA representative to the JSC, who will carry them forward to the JSC.
2. Other proposals follow the more formal process described in this document.

CC:DA is open to considering revision proposals that range from small, isolated additions or changes to the text (e.g., the Committee submitted a proposal to change an RDA instruction and a related glossary definition to expand the scope of Artistic and/or Technical Credit to include sound recordings) to major changes of the code (e.g., addition of a new chapter or deletion of an instruction).

How Will Proposals Be Evaluated?

Whether minor or major 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 an overview of the factors and questions that the Committee routinely considers in its evaluation process.

- **The need for the revision:** 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 instructions? Is an instruction in the wrong place? Does the proposal address a situation not covered? Is it appropriate to a general code?
- **The context:** What are the underlying principles or issues? Are there analogous situations?
- **The correctness of the proposal:** 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 instructions?
- **The possible impact on other instructions:** 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:** 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 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 the Chair of CC:DA, one of the voting members of the Committee or one of the liaisons from a group (e.g., Music Library Association’s CC:DA representative) 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, the Chair, the voting members, and the liaisons can be particularly helpful in guiding the process outlined below and in navigating the waters of CC:DA procedures.

3. Consider consulting with the ALA representative to the JSC. It can be helpful to discuss preliminary ideas with someone familiar with the overall editorial and revision process.

Formal Elements of a Revision Proposal

The proposal should be sent in electronic form to facilitate distribution over the Committee’s electronic discussion list. This will 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.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/otherdocs.html>>.

Electronic copies must be in Microsoft Word (1997 version or higher).

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. The Webmaster may contact the proposer for corrections or clarifications; the proposer will have the opportunity to review the final version of the 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: [Name], Chair, ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
 From: [To be supplied]
 Subject: [To be supplied]

Note: On the *From:* line, please include the name of the person submitting the proposal, followed by the constituent group he or she represents, if applicable. On the *Subject:* line, please include the following types of information if applicable to the proposal: the RDA instruction number; captioned words associated with the instruction; whether examples, footnotes or appendices are affected:

Examples:

- RDA 6.29.1.21, Reports of One Court
- RDA 7.24, Artistic and/or Technical Credit
- RDA 9.13, Affiliation
- RDA 11.2.2.21.1 & 11.2.2.21.2, Heads of State and Government
- RDA 16.2.2.9, Places in Certain Federations
- 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 revision should be considered. A thorough explanation of the problem(s) in RDA 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 instruction affected by the revision. It is therefore common for proposals to include revisions to more than one instruction. Furthermore, these revisions may occur in different parts of RDA.

To assist CC:DA and the JSC in discussing the proposal, the specific changes being requested should be given as a numbered list, if possible. This not only draws attention to the specifics, but allows reference to each change by number.

To enhance the clarity and readability of the proposal, the text of the proposed changes should be given in two versions: one using markup to show the changes from the current text, and one showing a clean version of the proposed text. The current text of RDA should be copied from the RDA Toolkit and should retain the original typography.

The proposed revisions should be indicated as deletions or additions to the current text. The markup should use strike-through to indicate deletions and double-underlining to indicate additions.

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 instruction.

Assessment of the impact and survey of related instructions:

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 instructions within RDA.

Other considerations for inclusion in the proposal:

It may be useful to include surrogates or other ways of depicting resources to be cataloged that illustrate the instruction being addressed (e.g., a recent proposal from the Music Library Association that included surrogates of two CDs to show circumstances where the inability to use a source that presents a collective title as the preferred source leads to complications). It may

also be advisable to include evidence of having considered the scope of the proposed change and to offer suggestions for broadening or narrowing that scope, if applicable. Finally, it may be helpful to mention other constituencies that have been consulted or made a part of the proposal-drafting process (e.g., consultation or coordination with OLAC, the Canadian Association of Music Libraries, etc.).

Forwarding the Proposal

The revision proposal should be forwarded to the Chair of CC:DA, either directly or through any voting or non-voting member of CC:DA. The [roster of current CC:DA members](#) is available on the CC:DA Web site.

What is the Timetable for Submitting a Revision Proposal?

While CC:DA will accept a revision proposal at any time, 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:

- Revision proposals should be made available to the Chair of CC:DA one month prior to the next CC:DA meeting, which is scheduled during the ALA Annual Conference or Midwinter Meeting. 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 revision proposal is accepted by CC:DA, it is forwarded to the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (JSC). JSC requires that revision proposals be transmitted to JSC at least three months 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 date of the next JSC meeting 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 are documented in JSC’s [“Statement of Policy & Procedures.”](#)]
- Unless the revision proposal is either accepted or rejected by all the JSC constituents, there will likely be further revision 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.

Where Can I Find Examples of Revision Proposals?

All RDA revision proposals are posted on the JSC website. Check here for examples of recent proposals, paying particular attention to the [ALA proposals](#).

Revised by CC:DA: [Current date of revision]

Revised per CaMMS Executive Committee: [Current date of revision]

Appendix A: Interim Guidelines

Submitting a Proposal to Revise RDA

Interim Guidelines

The document “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA” is being revised to reflect the change from AACR2 to RDA as the focus of revision, and to update the procedures. The revision should be completed around the end of 2011. In the meantime, please follow the interim guidelines below.

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 *Resource Description and Access (RDA)*.

Within the United States, all additions and changes to the cataloging code (except those originating from the Library of Congress) must be channeled through CC:DA.

Anyone can submit a revision proposal to CC:DA. CC:DA welcomes input and suggestions for revision, ranging from small, isolated changes to the text and/or examples to major changes such as deletions of instructions or additions of new chapters.

Forwarding the Proposal

Proposals may be forwarded to CC:DA through any voting member or through any of the many different groups represented on CC:DA. A [list of members and representatives](#) is available on the CC:DA website. If in doubt, submit the revision proposal to the Chair of CC:DA [currently [Lori Robare](#)].

Contents of the Proposal

Each proposal should contain:

1. A background statement that provides the context in which the revision proposal should be considered: an explanation of the problem being addressed by the proposal, any historical background to the current instructions, events that have led to the proposal, etc.
2. The proposed revisions, shown as additions and deletions to the current text, along with a clean copy of the revised text (see also “Technical Details” below). The proposal should attempt to identify instructions in other parts of RDA (including Glossary definitions or examples) that might be affected by the revision.
3. A rationale for the proposed revisions. (This may be included in the introductory background statement.)

All RDA revision proposals are posted on the [JSC website](#). Check here for examples of past proposals.

Technical Details Relating to the Proposal

1. Documents should be submitted in Microsoft Word 1997/2003 format.
2. The text of proposed changes should be given in two versions: one using markup to show the changes from the current text, and one showing a clean version of the proposed text.
3. The current text of RDA should be copied from the RDA Toolkit.

4. The markup should use strike-through to indicate deletions and double-underlining to indicate additions.