



SC Members Present: Sarah Fisher, Jain Fletcher, James Larrabee, Deborah J. Leslie (chair), Gregory Pass, Elizabeth Robinson, Beth Russell, E.C. Schroeder, Jennifer O'Brien Roper, Joe Springer *Members Absent:* Eileen Smith

Visitors: Manon Th  roux, Ann Copeland, James Stephenson, Elizabeth Lilker, Larry Creider, Arevig Caprielian, Bob Maxwell, Ryan Hildebrand, Megan Lewis, Penny Welbourne, Jane Gillis, Kathy Wissner, Windy Lundy, Patrick Russell, Emily Epstein

1. Introduction of Members and Visitors

Members and visitors introduced themselves.

2. Settlement of the Agenda

The agenda was settled.

3. Approval of Midwinter 2002 Minutes

<http://www.folger.edu/bsc/2002.1.html>

Changes were noted, and the minutes from the 2002 Midwinter conference were approved.

4. Announcements

Committee membership. Robinson, P. Russell, and Schroeder are completing their two full terms of service at the end of the 2002 annual meeting. Robinson will continue as the committee liaison to the Library of Congress. New members as of the end of the 2002 annual conference are Ann Copeland, Beth Russell, Manon Th  roux, and Eileen Smith. Smith is excused from the annual 2002 meetings. Stephen Skuce will become intern to the committee. Bruce Tabb will continue on as Thesaurus Editor and Jane Gillis and Juliet McLaren are liaisons as the authors of DCRM(S). Robert Maxwell is ACRL liaison to the ALCTS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA). Leslie noted that there was some confusion about whether Robert Hall was actually a member. She will confirm whether or not he is appointed to the committee. [He was later confirmed not to be at this time.]

5. LCRI on Printers' Names

Robinson reported that the BSC-generated LCRIs for printer's names had been submitted to CPSO. They will be included in 2 regular LCRIs, LCRI 22.2 (widows) and LCRI 24.1

(partnerships), which are included on the most recent version of Cataloger's Desktop. While editorial stylistic changes were made, the content remains the same as what emerged from BSC discussions. Robinson suggested reconsidering the wording on LCRI 24.1, as it implies that all libraries will trace printers when it remains optional. Leslie suggested that this section might read "In the absence of clear evidence...do not establish a corporate body. Establish as a personal name."

Fletcher felt that this alluded to another issue, the idea of giving access point guidance in DCRM(B). Gillis mentioned that this kind of guidance has been provided somewhat in DCRM(S), for things like making added entries for publishers of serials. There was discussion as to whether such guidance should be provided in the form of an enhancement on the current DCRB Appendix A, or as an entirely new section. Everyone felt that the best course of action would be to build up the current appendix.

6. Family Names as Added Entries

Leslie reported that Smith would put together a report on the use of family names as main and added entries for the Midwinter 2003 meeting.

7. Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger

Creider updated the committee on resources that had been added and deleted from the Directory. Among the additions were new calendars and date converters. Following up on requests from Midwinter 2002, a link to the digitized version of the Gutenberg bible as well as a link to the ESTC catalog site. Leslie announced that the move of the site away from the University of Pennsylvania site has been postponed.

Pass asked if the committee had seen <http://www.rarebooks.com>, a commercial website that brings together articles, catalogs and other information pertaining to rare books. This site also provided access to digitized copies of standard rare book bibliographies, but requires a subscription for access. These reference works are out of print, and may be out of date but many are still excellent sources. Pass suggested that this is the sort of service that RBMS as section should be offering. The group agreed with this sentiment, and Schroeder suggested taking the idea to the publications committee. Pass will discuss this idea with Christian DuPont.

8. *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts (AMREMM)*

Pass reported that all amendments have been made and that AMREMM is on the agenda for the RBMS executive committee at Annual 2002. This committee was given documents in late February for review and approval is expected. The next step is to give to Hugh Thompson at ACRL, who hopes to have the document published by the end of the summer. It will not be available electronically initially, only in print format.

9. Early Music Cataloging Rules

Fletcher announced that these rules are up on the web, and she will announce the address by the end of June. Karen Spicher of Yale agreed to review the rules with an eye towards manuscript music, which is a considerable issue for music cataloging. She inserted her manuscript-minded changes into the latest version of the rules and the committee is inclined to approve them. The modifications include the use of "item" instead "publication". Fletcher also mentioned that the reviewers are currently looking for examples to supplement the rules.

Creider asked how Fletcher was planning to notify interested parties that the document was ready for review, and she responded that she would send the URL to Leslie for distribution. Leslie suggested sending this URL out to an extended BSC list that includes those who have expressed interest in the committee. Leslie asked if Fletcher meant for the rare music cataloging rules to be published by the BSC, and Fletcher responded that this was her hope. The group discussed how an open hearing for the rules would operate since the BSC and MLA have sponsored this project jointly. Maxwell suggested holding hearings at both the MLA conference as well as ALA. Since the DCRM(S) rules may be reading for an open hearing at Midwinter 2003, Fletcher agreed to aim for Annual 2003 for an open hearing for these rules. In the meantime, she will have an open hearing at the MLA February meeting.

10. DCRB Revision

The group that agreed to develop the general principles for DCRM(B) was not ready to present anything to the committee for this meeting. This group consists of Springer, Fletcher, Creider and Leslie. Leslie reported that during interim e-mail discussions, the committee agreed in principle to approve the transcription of dates in roman as roman numerals.

Leslie presented her proposed textual changes to DCRB rules 4D1, 4D2 and 4D7, and asked the committee for comment. The group agreed that the wording of the 4D rules could be problematic. The changes proposed by Leslie is to add the clause "as it appears" after "Transcribe this date from the publication" in the second sentence, as well as adding an example in Roman date form. No one had an objection to these changes. There was discussion of where to note this change of transcribing roman dates in roman numerals. Suggestions included an article in RBM, the preface of the new DCRM(B), and the appendix of the new publication. No decision was made.

Leslie's proposed changes to 4D2 were discussed. These changes were more substantial and the discussion centered on transcription of dates. This issue involves not only the transcription of roman dates in roman numerals, but also the transcription of Gregorian, Julian, and other variants of dating. The group discussed whether or not the cataloger should be instructed to provide any variant dates with a "translation" or transcription in Arabic numerals in square brackets. Leslie said that this is mandatory, so far as the equivalent date can be determined. The principle is that the cataloger should transcribe the date as seen and provide in Arabic the equivalent Gregorian year, if it can be determined. Leslie said that she would like to take the suggestions mentioned here and rework the wording of 4D2 before too long. Fletcher and Gillis mentioned that any new wording to this rule would affect wording in both DCRM(M) and DCRM(S).

Fletcher mentioned that the group working on DCRM(M) had considered adding a dates and dating appendix, suggesting that this approach might be useful for DCRM(B) as well. Leslie agreed that this was a possibility, as it would allow the rules to be streamlined and give greater latitude to educate catalogers about the issues of non-Gregorian and old-style/new-style dating issues. Russell agreed that this information would be helpful to catalogers unaware of the historical situation with dates.

Maxwell asked another question regarding the proposed rewording of 4D2, which was a question of why the cataloger would be instructed to transcribe roman dates as they appear but to ignore spacing. Leslie admitted to picking one method for the purposes of discussion. Her reasoning for choosing this side of the argument was that there are a number of ways of rendering roman numerals with dots, dots and spaces, spaces without dots all being used. Sometimes it can be difficult to discern what was used, space or half space, etc. By ignoring all punctuation and spaces, the cataloger is removed from the problem of figuring out what is represented. She added that cataloging involves normalizing punctuation in other transcription, including spacing to some extent. Furthermore this approach allows more systems with keyword searching ability to search roman dates as a consistent form in the catalog, because while periods may not affect searching in some systems spaces probably would. Schroeder suggested adding an optional provision for catalogers to transcribe Roman dates as seen, with spaces and punctuation. Leslie concurred, pointing out that elsewhere in the rules such faithful transcription has been allowed. A discussion of the principles of transcribing or omitting punctuation occurred. Fletcher pointed out that when the rules changed from BDRB to DCRB, a decision was made to follow ISBD punctuation. Periods and spaces have meaning in ISBD punctuation, and she felt this should be reason enough to omit periods from transcription. Leslie suggested resubmitting this proposed change to 4D2 to DCRB-L and giving it a stated period for discussion. A conclusion to this issue needs to be reached between meetings, though, unless the committee wants to put off the completion of DCRM(S) indefinitely.

Next the group discussed the problem of Roman dates expressed through an apostrophus, a series of curved lines and forward and backward C that are a distinct way of representing roman numerals. The convention has been to transcribe these symbols into the appropriate letter - M, D, C, etc. Russell mentioned that this issue would be a good one for discussion in a dating supplement as discussed earlier. Larrabee suggested that it is time to ask that the inverted capital C be added to the character set, and add the transcription "where possible" of the apostrophus into the rules. The group debated the merits of a faithful transcription of an apostrophus with some arguing that DCRB is committed to transcription and other maintaining that this type of transcription enters into the realm of facsimile transcription, which is not called for in DCRB. Leslie suggested giving catalogers the option to create a note stating that the date is in the form of an apostrophus rather than reconstructing the apostrophus in the 260 field. Robinson revealed that this has been her practice. Others agreed that this idea would successfully moderate the idea of transcription with system retrieval.

Looking at the suggested changes to 4D7, Springer questioned the provision of volume numbers in roman numerals. The rewording suggests providing Roman numeral information in a note. Springer argued that a note is to inform, and catalogers do a better job of informing if they use Arabic numerals. Leslie queried how to handle a multi-volume set published over a span of years

where the date in the earlier volumes is represented in roman numerals and in the later volumes in Arabic numerals. She suggested transcribing the earliest and latest date as they appear and providing both in Arabic in brackets. Schroeder suggested providing all of the 260 date information in Arabic and providing a note describing the representation. Leslie suggested further contemplation on this issue, as faithful transcription is important to some users but not most users.

Leslie pointed out other suggested changes to the 4D rules. One was a change in the rules for dealing with chronograms. While it would be optional for the cataloger to transcribe the chronogram, a note describing the source of the date would be required. Th roux suggested splitting the last sentence into two separate statements. After some revision, this wording was suggested "...source of the date. If desired, transcribe the original chronogram in the note area."

Leslie asked the committee's opinion on the use of "i.e." in square brackets. Current practice is to use "i.e." if the date is being corrected or amended. Larrabee argued that this is not a correct usage as some changes represent an equivalent, not a correction. Th roux suggested using "i.e." in both instances and creating an explanatory note. Russell agreed that this is a helpful suggestion because it explains to users how/why the cataloger knows that the date is wrong. He added that the use of "i.e." is not unique to DCRB. Fletcher pointed out that the use of brackets delineates cataloger-inserted information, suggesting that perhaps brackets could be used for equivalents and "i.e." be used only for fictitious or incorrect dates. Creider suggested that this does not clarify the situation for less skilled users who do not have access to a dating appendix. Her argued that the use of "i.e." for both changes and corrections allows less sophisticated users to discern that the given date was not correct. He added that this argument did not include using "i.e." when representing a roman date in Arabic numbers. Leslie agreed with this last tenet.

Schroeder asked what the long-term goal of this discussion of proposed changes to 4D was and did it involve an in depth discussion either in person or on DCRB-L. He added that the group could clearly spend a morning on each issue. Leslie expressed interest in working via e-mail, noting that this required responses from committee members. She asked for suggestions about facilitating such a discussion as Gillis received little response via e-mail on DCRM(S) issues. Wisser suggested creating a summarizing function, either through e-mail or a static web page, so that those who had not contributed thus far could catch up with the conversation.

11. MARBI Report

At Midwinter, Attig introduced the proposals from the British Library for addition to MARC21 of note fields for fingerprint and binding information. Originally the fingerprint proposal had been for a note field, but the proposal has been amended to a 026 field.

The proposed 563 for binding information is a non-mandatory and repeatable field, and Attig admits that the description is very vague. This field is primarily intended for use with rare books. When questioned on the usage of the 563, Attig pointed out that when a specific note field is defined in the formats, it should be used instead of a general note. He added that this does not need to have any affect of current US practice, but it will let the British continue to follow their practices. P. Russell pointed out that there needs to be a provision for copy identification

somewhere in the field. Attig mentioned that MARBI intended to reach a decision by the end of Annual 2002 on these proposals.

Attig next discussed the discussion paper on the functional requirements for bibliographic records (FRBR). This discussion paper comes from a working group set up by the JSC to look at the problem of format variations and the concept of cataloging at the expression level rather than the manifestation level. In looking at this problem, the group looked at chapter 24 from AACR at uniform titles as a way of collocating expressions. In the discussion paper three categories of potential solutions were identified. The first of these are single record solutions, the latest way around the multiple versions problem. This solution is supported by a CONSER policy that allows for serials to be cataloged. The second suggestion was linking entry fields. The third solution is using authority records to treat identifiers at the expression level and add in a uniform title. This last solution looks like the most likely avenue that will be explored. When MARBI and CC:DA have a joint meeting to discuss issues of mutual interest revolving around FRBR this issue may come up.

Leslie asked Attig how the BSC could go about proposing that superscript pi and chi be added to the character set. Attig said that AMRBI would want to see how other symbols work out. He also suspected that the character set would remain static until Unicode is fully functional. Leslie asked about the timeline prospects for Unicode, and Attig did not have an answer. He pointed out that Unicode is not so much a MARC issue as a computer industry issue. He did say that everything seems to be moving towards Unicode, in small steps.

12. X55 i2 Proposal

Maxwell reminded the group that this proposal is to add subfield 2 to the authorities format for X55 fields. Attig made several suggestions, and predicted that it would likely be issued as a discussion paper first. If there is interest in pursuing the matter after distribution of a discussion paper, it will become a proposal at the following meeting. Leslie advised Maxwell to make the changes indicated by Attig and submit.

13. Committee On Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) Report

The AACR Joint Steering Committee is focusing on rules for online catalogs. Attig added that they recognize that most people are creating MARC records rather than cards, and that AACR2 is based on a card environment. Maxwell said that they are looking at a shift in terminology, from "entries" to "headings," etc. There is also an effort to incorporate functional concepts into the code, which will involve drafting language to change terms to match FRBR. For instance, discussion about "items" is not on the same topic in each standard. Fletcher asked if the definition of item from FRBR will prevail, and Maxwell thought this would be the case. The current thinking is that the term "resource" will be used when the intent differs from FRBR definitions. The intent is also to keep the Anglo-American focus of the code, but at the same time to become more interconnected with international codes.

There have been many proposals to eliminate the GMD, and it is being discussed. If anyone has strong feelings about the GMD, speak to Maxwell and he will pass those thoughts along.

Tomorrow there will be a program on the new chapter 12 rules. The Library of Congress will be implementing amendments on Dec. 1, 2002, complete with LCRIs. The LCRIs have been written and will be available in edition 3 of Cataloger's Desktop. ALA Editions expects to be far enough along with the amendments to send proofs to the JSC in July. Attig added that if everything goes well, printing will begin in September. Maxwell noted that the new AACR will be sold as loose-leaf text, with an extra charge for the attendant binders and tabs. The Library of Congress will have their authority file available via the web on July 1, 2002 at <http://authorities.loc.gov>. There are still some issues, such as no diacritics, and more information can be found at <http://loc.gov/ils/ilsfaq.html>.

Creider asked if definitions for terms such as "work" and "expression" would be provided in the next AACR revision. Attig conjectured that the definitions would be close to the FRBR definitions. Creider expresses concern for adopting a theoretical model without understanding or clarifying definitions, but Attig felt that it was premature to say that a conceptual level is being dealt with at this point. Creider also asked the status of the attempt to redo AACR by area instead of chapter, and Attig responded that the JSC is skeptical about whether such a change would provide significant improvement.

14. CC:DA Subject Access Committee (SAC) Subcommittee On Fiction Guidelines

Tabb reported on the SAC fiction guidelines subcommittee meeting that he attended. They are working on genre terms for works of fiction, and had hoped to create single suite of guidelines for improved genre and subject access to individual works of fiction. After determining that a single suite of guidelines was not feasible, they made a decision to work on subject access and genre access separately, and plan to complete areport by Annual 2003. Tabb noted that it is important to realize that there are other lists of subject and genre terms available.

15. Thesauri

Three new relator term proposals and one binding term proposal were considered.

a. Cover designer. Discussion ensued about the relationship of binding designer and book cover designer, and regarding the purpose of the relator terms and how comprehensive the list should be. An argument made for a NT for "book cover designer" so that a cataloger might differentiate from other types of covers - album, slipcase, etc. was not approved by the committee. The term was approved as follows:

Cover designer

Scope note: Use for the person responsible for the graphic design of a cover: for example, book cover, album cover, slipcase, box, or container, etc. For the person responsible for the graphic design of an entire book, use Book designer. For the person responsible for the design of a bookjacket, use Bookjacket designer

UF: Designer of cover

RT: Artist

b. Draftsman. Tabb explained that the MARC code list already had a code for draftsman, but restricted it to the maker of technical drawings. We need the term to stand for the maker of both technical and artistic drawings. [Note: LC has since agreed to amend their scope note to encompass artistic draftsmen]. There was discussion regarding the possibility of using gender-neutral terminology, but the committee ultimately determined that there is no warrant for a term such as "draftsperson." The term "draftsman" was approved as follows:

Draftsman

Scope note: Use for the person who executes artistic or technical drawings.

RT: Artist

c. Printmaker. Tabb explained that the list needed a broader term to gather the terms already existing for the makers of specific printing surfaces. The committee approved the term as follows:

Printmaker

Scope note: Use for the person who makes a relief, intaglio, or planographic printing surface.

NT: Engraver

NT: Etcher

NT: Woodcutter

RT: Artist

d. Sealskin binding. Tabb noted that this term did not appear to require a scope note. There was discussion about whether or not the two UF terms "seal skin binding" and "seal-skin binding" were necessary. It was determined that both would be left in as user search habits and system requirements vary. The committee approved the term as follows:

Term: **Sealskin bindings**

Thesaurus: Binding Terms

Hierarchy: [Material and treatment]

UF: Seal skin bindings

UF: Sealskin bindings

BT: Leather bindings

Schroeder suggested sending out regular announcements about added terms to the RBMS listserv and perhaps Exlibris. Leslie will do so after the web site has been amended to reflect the most recent terms. Noble suggested sending out the URL to Autocat as well.

Gillis asked about the progress of putting the thesauri online. Tabb responded that he has a few leads on funding and that he and Russell will be working on this over the next few months.

16. DCRM(S)

Gillis thanked everyone who gave comment on the latest draft. The remaining outstanding issues are the 260 field, series, and redundancy. Many of these are related to the direction that DCRM in general will take. Gillis asserted that DCRM has to be finished before DCRM(S) can be

finished. Leslie and Gillis have discussed methods to facilitating this process, but have no concrete suggestions to make at this point. Gillis would like to ensure that what comes out is a DCRM that will be easy to look at and map to other areas. When asked how close to completion the rules are, Gillis responded that there is some cleaning up to do, but no major work. Leslie invited people to begin cataloging using these rules, despite their draft status, and Gillis mentioned that the proper 040 code remains "dcrb" at this time.

17. Preconference Seminar Report - Atlanta 2002

Gillis reported that the seminar was very successful, with between 45-50 attending. There was a lot of discussion and positive feedback. It was suggested that the facilitators and recorders work to summarize each discussion. Leslie mentioned that there was a desire for continued discussion along these lines. She suggested that perhaps this could be a recurring Marc for Special Collections (MASC) topic. Another idea would be to use the 11-12:30 time at the end of the BSC I meeting for this kind of discussion. Noble felt that the users had more frustration than affect, and suggested that the BSC think about working cooperatively with LITA to create a discussion group. This way systems librarians and system vendors would be more likely to attend.

18. Preconference Seminars - Toronto 2003

Th  roux submitted the BSC's seminar proposal for the 2003 preconference. It will be a workshop format discussing NACO issues relating to special collections cataloging, issues where the NACO guidelines do not adequately address what needs to be done. The proposal was unanimously accepted. Currently Leslie is listed as moderator and Th  roux as presenter. She is amenable to working with a co-presenter, but they would like to limit it to 2 presenters.

19. Future Preconference Seminars: New Haven 2004, Boston 2005

Fletcher is interested in arranging a seminar about the role of cataloging and the location of special collections cataloging functions within organizations. She does not feel that she is quite ready to submit this proposal, but would like to see this issue discussed sooner rather than later. Leslie agreed that she would like to have BSC sponsored seminars well planned, and suggested that Fletcher submit it for the 2004 Preconference.

20. Introduction and Discussion of Katherine Wisser's Research

Katherine Wisser is a doctoral student in the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She introduced her current research project, which is to assess adherence to DCRB standards. Her sample includes 80 titles, which have over 10 holdings through OCLC. She will be contacting the individual libraries to ask them to send her their local MARC records, recognizing that local records may contain significant changes from the OCLC records. She wanted to the committee's input to help her shape the analysis portion of the project, specifically what they saw as important in description and access. She described the methodology of her project as a content analysis with binary questions and latent content analysis. Several committee members pointed out that her sample might miss out on libraries more likely to use DCRB if she does not broaden her sample to include RLIN. Th  roux pointed

out that Wisser should consider going directly to library OPACs to collect initial local records, as catalogers might be tempted to clean up records before sending them out.

In terms of DCRB adherence, transcription and description issues were deemed most important. The 245, 260, and 300 fields were identified as the key fields to analyze. The issue of material that was retrospectively converted and cataloged to a lower standard was raised. It was suggested that the 80-title sample might not be a large enough base for statistical reliability once the recon records are accounted for. Wisser is hoping to publish the results of this research. Anyone interested in speaking with her further about this should contact her at Kathy_wiser@ncsu.edu.

21. WA Kelly's German Bibliography

Dr. Kelly has asked if the BSC will act as co-publisher of his large bibliography, and Leslie has agreed to take a copy for review. This bibliography has previously been self-published by Dr. Kelly on the web.

22. Maintenance of Guide to Rare Book Records in Online Systems

Leslie noted that this guide is outdated and would like a volunteer to look through and suggest changes. Anyone interested should contact Leslie.

23. Web Access to IRLA Report (1979)

This IRLA report is the basis for the creation of this committee. Leslie has recently received a copy of the report and would like to make it available via the web. She would like to have it OCR scanned, but at the very least would like an image scan of the pages. She suggested that this would be a good project for anyone who has expressed interest in becoming involved with the BSC. Anyone interested in working on this should contact Leslie.

24. Report on the ARL Task Force On Special Collections

Leslie wanted to inform members not aware of this task force about their presentation at the RBMS Preconference. Barbara Jones of the University of Illinois talked about the Task Force's grave concern for inaccessible and hidden collections, and they will address and identify minimum standards for cataloging. With the support of Suzy Taraba, Leslie has asked for the Task Force to work with the BSC on this issue.

25. DCRB Core Study

Windy Lundy discussed her survey on core standard usage. From 43 participants she received 37 responses. Six of the responding libraries use the DCRB core, and 1 library uses the core for all pre-1801 rare book cataloging. The other libraries used the core standard in smaller percentages. There were a variety of reasons for using and not using the standard. She is hoping to publish the results of the survey and is open for comments and questions.

Respectfully submitted, Jennifer O'Brien Roper