The meeting was called to order at 8:31 a.m.

1. Introduction of members and visitors

Members present: Annie Copeland, Penn State; Laurence Creider, New Mexico State Univ; Sarah Schmidt Fisher, University of Delaware; James Larrabee, UC Berkeley Law Library; Deborah J Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library (chair); Megan Lewis, Duke University (intern); Jennifer O'Brien Roper, Wake Forest University (secretary); Beth Russell, Ohio State (thesaurus editor); Stephen Skuce, MIT; Joe Springer, Goshen College; Manon Théroux, Yale University

Members excused: Gregory Pass and Eileen Smith

Liaisons present: Jain Fletcher, UCLA (rare music); Jane Gillis, Yale Univ Library (rare serials); Bob Maxwell, Brigham Young Univ. (CC:DA); Juliet McLaren, ESTC, UC Riverside (rare serials); Elizabeth Robinson, Library of Congress (LC)

Visitors: Dorothy Auyong, Huntington Library; Tatiana G. Barr, Univ of Florida; Randal Brandt, Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, Univ of Minnesota; Jackie Dooley, UC Irvine; Elaine Franco, UC Davis; Isaac Gewirtz, New York Public Library; Billie Hackney, Getty Research Institute; Christy Hicks, Calif State Univ, Fresno; Natalie Hutchins, UC San Diego; Elizabeth Johnson, Lilly Library, Indiana Univ; Nancy Kandoian, New York Public Library; Windy Lundy, Univ of Colorado, Boulder; Janice Matthiesen, UCLA; R. Arvid Nelsen, UC San Diego; Jessica O'Pray, Huntington Library; John Overholt, HRHRC, Univ of Texas; Patricia Ratkovich, Univ of Alabama; Louis Reith, Georgetown Univ Library; Joseph Ripp, Southern Illinois Univ; John Schalow, Univ of Maryland College Park; Elaine Shiner, Clark Library, UCLA; Laura Stalker, Huntington Library; James Stephenson, Getty Research Institute; Bruce Tabb, Univ of Oregon; David Woodruff, Getty Research Institute

2. Settlement of agenda

3. Approval of Annual 2003 minutes
http://www.folger.edu/bsc/2003.2minutes.html

Théroux requested changes in wording. Under item 5, the DCRM(B) discussion, she noted that in the third paragraph "current publication" should be changed to "current publications". Also under this item, in the discussion of area 5, paragraph three, she suggested that "differentiate" would be a more appropriate word than "determine". Finally, she requested "in the numbering sequence" be changed to "included in the pagination sequence", also in the third paragraph of the area 5 discussion. The committee approved these changes, and the amended minutes were approved.

4. Announcements

Positions available. A job opening for curator of the James Ford Bell Library at the University of Minnesota (announced by Leslie) and for a metadata librarian at Ohio State University (announced by Russell) have been advertised. Gillis announced that Yale would be recruiting for two rare book catalogers in the near future.

ISBD(A) revision. Leslie explained that this revision is part of a scheduled five-year review of documents, and the proposed revision was sent out to a number of different parties internationally. Robinson and Leslie looked at the document informally, and sent in comments updating the ISBD(A) revision group about the progress and direction of DCRM(B). A formal working group will be appointed to review ISBD(A), Leslie expressed the hope that someone from or close to the BSC will be appointed to the working group.

Exposing Hidden Collections. http://www.arl.org/collect/spcoll/ Leslie reported that the Library of Congress hosted a conference in September of the ACRL Special Collections Task Force, on "Exposing Hidden Collections." The conference addressed the notion that uncataloged and under-cataloged collections are a national problem, not just an institutional one, and that collaborative action was the best way to address it. Since the development of guidelines for remedial inventorying of materials is one of the proposed actions, Leslie emphasized that the BSC needs to make sure it is fully a part of this process. Elizabeth Johnson, Sarah Schmidt Fisher, and Arvid Nelsen are working on a document explaining different levels and options for cataloging rare and special collection materials. Barbara Jones is a member of the Task Force, and is hoping to sponsor an RBMS preconference on dealing with backlogs. Russell added that she gave a report on this conference to the meeting of the ALCTS Directors of Technical Services of Large Research Libraries, and was pleased that the questions included several about preservation and cultural issues.

5. MARBI

John Attig's written report is provided as an [Appendix](#). Maxwell will give a report on CC:DA at Sunday's MARC for Special Collections discussion group meeting.

MARBI proposal 2004-01. http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2004/2004-01.html BSC approval to submit the MARBI proposal "Making Subfields $e, $f, and $g Repeatable in Field 260 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format," issued as proposal no. 2004-01, was achieved via email. Springer moved to ratify the email approval, Russell seconded; the submission was approved unanimously. The proposal generated comments on the PCC list, most of which surrounded an unease with the provision for a repeatable $g. Robinson echoed these concerns. She mentioned that this leads to the question of cataloging at the edition level and wanting to cover various iterations of a work, and suggests that providing multiple 260s in a record would be a better solution. Others agreed with Robinson, but Leslie pointed out that this is now up to MARBI, as the proposal has been submitted.

MARBI proposal no. 2004-03. http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2004/2004-03.html "Designating the Privacy of Fields 541, 561 and 583 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats" seeks to introduce an indicator value to fields 541, 561, and 583 that would prevent them from displaying to the public. Robinson warned that in many local online public catalogs, including LC's Voyager OPAC, the public can select a MARC view that displays everything in the record, even information supposedly suppressed from public view. Leslie said that she would pass this concern along to Attig. [*Note: Attig addresses this concern as part of his written MARBI report*]

MARBI Discussion paper 2004-02. http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2004/2004-dp02.html "Applying Field 752 (Added Entry - Hierarchical Place Name) for Different Purposes in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format" was proposed by the ALA MAGERT Cataloging and Classification Committee and brought to the BSC's attention by Kandoian. Map catalogers would like to apply field 752 to the coverage of the map, but without indicators or some other method of differentiation, separate 752s created for disparate pieces of information will end up in the same index file. There was discussion on whether or not a 652 field should be provided for the subject access desired. No consensus was reached; Kandoian will relay the substance of the discussion to the MAGERT cataloging committee.

6. Thesauri

a. Relator terms

Medium
The term "psychic" had been discussed in Toronto and sent back for further work. After

much research the committee is presenting the relator term "medium" with a scope note "Use for a person who purports to communicate with spirits." The original term, "psychic", did not have the necessary relation to the text. Creider expressed concern due to the definition of the term "medium" in cataloging. Leslie countered that there is only one definition for medium as a person. There was discussion about providing UF references for "psychic", "clairvoyant" and other terms that may be used to indicate a person involved with spirit communication. Russell will add wording to the term record to indicate that at certain time periods this concept was expressed with other terms. Many agreed that if the scope note is changed to reflect this idea, then UFs should be provided, as the note is indicating that in the past these other terms were used to convey the idea currently captured by "medium". The committee agreed to accept the term with the creation of additional UF references. Final version of the relator term record:

Term: Medium
SN: Use for a person who purports to communicate with spirits
UF Channel
Clairvoyant
Psychic
HN: Candidate term 12/03
Comments Proposed by Laura O'Keefe, 8/03. Although modern specialist usage recognizes distinctions among the functions of "medium," "psychic," "channel," and "clairvoyant," these terms appear to be less distinct in earlier works. This accounts for the inclusion of UFs that are not strictly equivalent according to specialists in psychic phenomena.

b. Form and genre terms

Invitations

The thesaurus subcommittee discussed whether or not invitations of a commercial nature should be excluded in the scope note, but decided to leave this issue up to institutional judgment and needs. LCSH expresses a similar concept in their term "invitation cards," but the group felt that 'Invitations' was more accurate. Maxwell suggested submitting this term to SACO for a change, so that the thesauri would be reconciled with LCSH. Maxwell and Tabb volunteered to help turn this term into a SACO proposal. Adding the term to the Genre thesaurus passed unanimously. Final version of the approved invitations term record:

Term: Invitations
SN: Use for printed or handwritten requests for one's presence at an event
UF: Invitation cards
Thesaurus: Genre
Hierarchy: [Conditions of publication]
BT: Ephemera
Warrant: OED online, 12/23/03 (Invitation: the spoken or written form in which a person is invited)
HN: Proposed by Jeffrey Makala, Wesleyan University, 9/2003

Volvelles
This term has been considered at various times over the years. The group acknowledged its problematic nature--is it a genre or a physical characteristic?--but agreed that this ambiguity is true of a number of other terms already in Genre Terms, such as "Yellowbacks." The inclusion of Volvelles in Genre Terms is a short-term solution until such as time as Genre Terms can be thoroughly evaluated. The term was approved by vote, with one abstention.

Term: Volvelles
SN: Use for devices, whether individual or in books, consisting of one or more movable circles surrounded by other graduated or figured circles and intended for the calculation of astronomical or other data
Thesaurus: Genre Terms
Hierarchy: [Conditions of publication]
BT: [Conditions of publication]
UF: Voluelles
Volvells
Warrant: Warrant: OED (2nd ed.) (Volvelle, also voluelle, volvell. An old device consisting of one or more movable circles surrounded by other graduated or figured circles, serving to ascertain the rising and setting of the sun and moon, the state of the tides, etc.)
HN: Submitted by Sara Piasecki, July 2, 1998; resubmitted by Eileen Smith, May 2003.

c. Electronic thesauri. The Thesaurus subcommittee continues to explore the possibility of acquiring software to create manageable and usable digitized thesauri.

7. Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger
http://lib.nmsu.edu/rarecat/

The transfer of the site from Penn to NMSU has gone smoothly. Creider will send out an email detailing the additions and deletions to the site.

8. Early music cataloging rules
http://www.bol.ucla.edu/%7Ejfletchr/DCRM/DCRM_opener.htm

In previous reports, Fletcher had indicated that the group working on these rules had maintained a focus of aligning their wording with that of the new DCRM(B). After comparing the DCRM(M) draft to the alpha version of DCRM(B), they decided it would be difficult to track a moving target. Thus, they will instead use their own wording, based on DCRB, music cataloging, and chapter 5 of AACR2. This decision has helped them move forward. Work still needs to be done on transcription, examples and glossary additions. Group members have a deadline of Jan. 30th, after then the web site will be updated. A draft for public comment will be ready in March, after the group has had an opportunity to meet at MLA. There was no objection to the music rules to have their own wording, and Théroux offered to send Fletcher the editorial checklist that the DCRM(B) editorial committee has created to aid them in wording consistency. Fletcher expressed interest in receiving this list. Gillis asked for a copy of the editorial checklist as well, so that it can be used with the rare serials rules.

9. DCRM(B) discussion
http://www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/dcrbrev.html

The editorial group met for three days in November, taking under consideration the alpha version and the comments and questions relating to it, and formed a beta version. Théroux, chair of the editorial group, noted that they had developed an editorial checklist to remain consistent in language which they will share with editors of other DCRM modules. The work progressed slowly through the fall as a strike at Yale diverted Théroux, but this issue has been resolved and the work should progress much more easily this spring. The editorial group decided to track all changes made in successive version to DCRB, as opposed to tracking changes from the previous version. Hence, the beta version tracks changes from DCRB, although the alpha version will remain available on the DCRB revision web site. Out of their disagreements or lack of strong opinion, the group developed questions for discussion at this meeting.

a. Do the rules in 4A6 make sense?

Robinson asked for an example of "separate statements, printer privileged". An example would be two statements that appear on the title page, with the printer appearing first, larger, or somehow more prominent. Creider suggested that "prominence" might be a less confusing term than "privilege". In a straw vote those present agreed that, if

separable, and when prominence is given to the publisher, the printer should be separated out into the 260 $e and f.

There was also discussion of the material which gives only a printer's name, but the cataloger knows that the author or some other party is the publisher, that is, paid to have the item printed. A railroad annual report is a good example. The beta version rules would have the cataloger record the printer in the 260ab field. Leslie suggested that more discussion of this issue, an obvious yet unnamed publisher, is needed.

b. Is the requirement in 7C19 to indicate the holding institution within each local note burdensome? How many already do this?

Leslie noted that there are different ways to comply with this rule, either through use of the 590, or a 500 with a $5 naming the institution to which the note applies. There was some confusion regarding the usage of the 590, whether or not it is to be applied to local notes or copy specific notes. Leslie clarified that the 590 is merely set aside as a local note, the information in this field can be universally true, but perhaps of no interest outside a particular institution. Maxwell noted that most catalogers tend to think of their records as appearing in the context of their catalog, where it is assumed that all notes apply to the copy help by that library. Leslie argued that in a copy-cataloging environment, such clarification of copy specific information is important so that catalogers using copy can tell which notes are not relevant. Otherwise, notes may appear in records that are correct only for the original copy cataloged, and thereby misleading for the copied cataloging record. For catalogers in the OCLC environment there will be an additional choice to make, as all 590s will be stripped out of the record. The OCLC catalog is used for purposes other than copy cataloging, and such copy specific information may be useful to these other audiences. A suggestion was made to simplify the wording to make it clear that the note should clearly refer to copy specific features as such, without prescribing the manner in which this should be done. The group liked this idea, as it upholds the principle and is applicable across systems. The group began to debate the definition as use of the 590 field, and the differences between local and copy specific note. Leslie suggested this to be a good topic for discussion at MASC.

c. Rule 7C14 provides instructions for a "not in" note and features an example - Standard Citation Forms does not address how to make such notes. Should the note get coded as 510 or a 500? If 510, should we start it with "Not in:" or with the resource's name so that the citations will index properly (in systems that have the field indexed)? The date is recommended because electronic resource are so dynamic, but it also affects indexing.

Leslie stated that a "not in" note would provide guidance when dealing with material that fits into the scope of a purportedly comprehensive bibliography yet is not listed there. Fletcher suggested that perhaps a new element, such as a $i, acting as it does in the 246, would be a useful addition to the 510 field. The majority of those present seemed to prefer using general notes rather than bibliographical citation notes for a "Not in…" note, although a strong minority held the opposite view, while others did not believe a "Not in…" note was ever appropriate. Leslie rephrased the question to ask if the text of "not in" makes sense for records in a dynamic database. It was pointed out that "not" is an operator in many systems and could cause problems. Copeland brought the discussion back with a reminder this group is concerned with rules, not MARC coding, and that this topic would be better for MASC.

Creider questioned the deletion of several bibliographies on the list of those considered important to note when an item is included. Théroux responded that the editorial committee did not want to privilege certain sources, notably Anglo-centric sources, but rather preferred to leave it up to cataloger judgment. In response to several suggestions of bibliographies to include, Maxwell stated that no matter what bibliographies are listed, the question of "why this list" remains. The group agreed, though, that a statement such as "normally, citing national bibliographies…" would be helpful to catalogers using the rules without training or knowledge in rare books. Examples of a few major sources will be listed.

d. The rules have always relied quite a bit on the notion of "grammatically separable" or inseparable. Are these words ambiguous or clear? Is more guidance needed?

Leslie proposed the term "grammatically independent" as a clearer term, commenting that currently the text lacks definition of separable and inseparable. The group agreed that the term "independent" is less ambiguous. The reciprocal use of "grammatically dependent" will be considered by the editors.

e. The rules currently use the noun "record" (implying a MARC record). AACR3 authors are proposing that the word "description" be used instead of "record" in such cases. Should we follow suit in order to anticipate that change? Examples: 1B1, 1F7, 1F8, 2B3, 2B4, 2D.

Leslie gave John Attig's explanation of the difference, noting that "record" would still be used as a noun when referring to a description plus subject and form headings, whereas "description" is only used for the parts of the record covered by AACR. Leslie pointed out that adopting this change would not only change the wording within the rules, but also the section on "when to create a new record". Théroux suggested that further clarification with the AACR3 proposal is necessary.

f. When doing exact transcription of punctuation per 0F3 footnote 3, we are currently instructed to preserve periods and commas (though not spaces) within a date expressed in roman numerals. Should we preserve spaces?

Leslie summarized Richard Noble's argument in favor of keeping spacing as well as punctuation. There are many problems with doing this: the inconsistency and the difficulty of telling whether it is one space or two or three, of instructing catalogers on what constitutes a single space for purposes of this type of exact transcription. One of Noble's arguments was that spacing is a compositorial practice tracked by Sayce. Leslie pointed out that bibliographic records cannot be used as raw material for such projects, and that a cataloger with an item in hand can use the original to consult Sayce for additional information. A large majority of those present favored omitting spaces when doing exact transcription of roman dates, with no passionate support for defining spacing as punctuation for purposes of transcription.

g. Certain notes in the rules are mandatory. We are compiling a list of these. Should there be an area 7 rule corresponding to each mandatory note? Or is it enough for 7B to simply list the rules numbers that contain instructions for mandatory notes?

The editorial board would like to know if there is interest in area 7 containing a list of mandatory notes. It was pointed out that the problem with relisting mandatory notes mentioned earlier in the text is that these notes will be listed without their original context. This problem can be avoided by copying the text from the previous area's rule in full, but this would create other issues. Gillis noted that the serials rules do mention mandatory notes in both other areas of the text and in area 7. Some felt it might be confusing to call for notes elsewhere in the text and make no mention of them in the area devoted to notes. The group agreed that there should be an example in area 7 for every mandatory note. That will require the addition of one or more note types to area 7. The group also agreed that all instructions to provide mandatory notes should cite the rule number.

h. Should the instructions for publisher's devices in 4C4 also apply to modern books?

Skuce noted that there is nothing in the text of this rule that states that it does not apply to modern books. Théroux mentioned that her concern is for 20th century publishers who provide the imprint in a stylized way, but still in text, so it does not need to be put in brackets. Although those present understood that such stylized textual representations are not to be considered printer's devices, the concern remained that there might be confusion on the part of catalogers trying to decide same. Leslie suggested defining devices in the glossary as graphical rather than textual. There was no objection to this solution.

i. If cataloging an impression other than the first, LCRI 1.4F6 says to transcribe the date of impression in 260g and revise the record later on if receive the first impression (the record for the first impression is the one that should stand for all unchanged impressions). Do we need a similar rule or is it implied?

The editorial group is interested in knowing how explicit the rules should be about this point. When dealing with rare books, the impression cataloged may be the only impression of this edition that the cataloger ever comes across. Leslie stated that since the issue is the default level of cataloging in DCRM(B) level, the decision to either revise the record later on or supply less information about manufacture ought to be made at the local level. She suggested that perhaps this can be included the discussion of precataloging decisions.

k. Rule 7C19 says to use the word "imperfect" only for imperfections resulting in loss of text or other printed matter. Does this definition fit your understanding of the term. Are we correct in implying that loss of blank leaves or damage to the cover do not constitute imperfections?

It became apparent that there is no shared understanding of this word. At best there were several pluralities. Since the rules do make reference to perfect and imperfect copies, it must nevertheless be defined. Leslie suggested that the glossary committee should look at this issue. However it is defined eventually will be at odds with how many agencies now use the term, but will have the benefit of standardizing the usage for the future.

l. Should we simplify "With:" notes in 7C18/19 and make the rules match AACR2 more? Or are the constructions fine as is?

Several people have found this rule complicated in the past. McLaren asked if AACR2 would provide guidance to a cataloger dealing with a volume of bound pamphlets. Gillis explained how Yale has simplified its local policy on bound-with items by no longer including the bibliographic information for the other items bound with. Fletcher stated that this concept isn't universal across systems. Gillis suggested that the rules could describe several alternatives to dealing with this type of material. Leslie emphasized that she would still like to see a clear distinction in the rules, and in the record, between items issued together and items bound together. There was a consensus that "Bound with:" is a more appropriate preface for items bound together later than is simply "With:" which can be reserved for items issued together.

m. Do we need any special rules or examples for artists' books?

Leslie suggested that the best way to address this issue would be to ask for volunteers to apply these rules to artists' books and give feedback based on that practical

experience. Théroux suggested that the group working on the artists' books Preconference seminar may want to address this issue as well, who readily agreed.

n. General comments

Gillis asked for examples to illustrate the alternate rules allowing for cataloging by impression. Leslie mentioned that while there was no time for discussion of the appendices, the editors would be looking at them in the spring, so comments on these documents would be welcome.

10. Preconference seminars
http://www.folger.edu/bsc/preconference.html

Copeland reported on the progress of the proposal for 2005. It will be a 1.5 hour seminar dealing with rare books digital projects, and will attempt to capture interest of administrators and curators in addition to catalogers. It was suggested that the best approach would be to set up the issues and then deal with some case studies. Nicole Bouché of Yale has agreed to speak, and the group is currently recruiting two other speakers. Fletcher suggested Genie Guerard from UCLA as a possible speaker. Leslie commended Copeland and the group for moving forward well in advance of the deadline.

Fletcher reported that everything is on track for the 2004 Preconference workshop on cataloging manuscript music. Théroux added that there will be no charge for the workshop in addition to the preconference registration, but since capacity will be limited, anyone interested in participating should alacritously preregister for the preconference and sign up for the workshop.

Fisher spoke about the proposal for the 2006 Preconference, which will be a seminar discussing issues with cataloging artists' books. The group hopes to have a more detailed proposal available in Orlando.

11. New business

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer O'Brien Roper

Appendix. MARBI report

MARBI Report from ALA Midwinter Meeting, San Diego, CA, January 2004

The following MARBI documents appeared on the BSC agenda (http://www.folger.edu/bsc/2004.1agenda.html). For further information, see the MARBI agenda at http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2004_age.html

Proposal No. 2004-01, Making 260 $e, f and g repeatable, was submitted by me on behalf of BSC. It was approved without much discussion.

Proposal No. 2004-03, Designating the privacy of fields 541, 561 and 583, was approved with mechanical changes. Indicator value "0" will indicate a public note, and value "1" a private note. It was decided that it was unwise to assume anything about records with a blank in the indicator position; therefore, blank will mean "no information provided" and anybody who cares about the privacy of their data outside their own system will use other values.

Discussion Paper No. 2004-DP02 dealt with the use of 752 for geographic coverage information for maps. It was agreed that this use would need to be distinguished from the current uses of the field for place of publication. There was considerable discussion about whether the new type of hierarchical place name belonged in a subject field (the 655/755 discussion all over again!). In the end, a straw poll was equally divided between using 752 with an indicator position and adding a new 6XX field. A proposal will be developed with these two options; also to be considered are the adequacy and definition of the subfields and the need for a corresponding field in the Authorities format.

As to the question about Proposal 2004-03, no MARC coding is magic -- it requires proper implementation. The indicator values approved in Proposal 2004-03 would allow a system to suppress display or export of a field in any context -- but it doesn't happen automatically; it has to be programmed. I think that MARBI's reaction to Elizabeth's point would be (a) suppressing on the MARC display is something you need to talk to your vendor about; and (b) if you are that concerned, you should not include "private" information in your bibliographic records at all. I would also note that 541 and 561 are valid in MARC holdings records, and I don't think any system displays a MARC view of holdings records.

John Attig
MARBI liaison