



Bibliographic Standards Committee
Annual Conference, June 2003
Toronto, Ontario
Minutes

SC I: Saturday, 21 June 2003, 0830-1100

BSC II: Sunday, 22 June 2003, 0900-1100

Members Present: Ann Copeland, Sarah Schmidt Fisher, Jain Fletcher, James Larrabee, Deborah J. Leslie (chair), Gregory Pass, Beth Russell, Jennifer O'Brien Roper, Steven Skuce, Joe Springer, Bruce Tabb (thesaurus editor), Manon Th  roux

Eileen Smith was excused.

Liaisons present: Jane Gillis, Juliet McLaren (Rare Serials), Robert Maxwell (CC:DA)

Visitors: Randal Brandt, Carolyn Coates, Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, Emily Epstein, Laura Guelle, Ryan Hildebrand, Megan Lewis, Windy Lundy, Arvid Nelson, John Overholt, Mary Faith Pankin, Nina Schneider, E.C. Schroeder, Jim Stephenson, Alison Warner, Penny Welbourne, David Woodruff.

1. Introduction of members and visitors

2. Settlement of the agenda

Fletcher asked to set aside time to discuss the new options for minimal cataloging. Leslie noted that it would be added to agenda item #14 and discussed if time remained. [It was later decided that this discussion was more suited to a meeting of the MARC for Special Collections Discussion Group.]

3. Approval of Midwinter 2003 minutes

Copeland moved to approve the minutes, and Russell seconded the motion. The minutes were approved without changes.

4. Announcements (Leslie)

Leslie announced changes in committee membership. Larry Creider will rejoin the committee. Stephen Skuce, currently an intern on the committee, has been appointed a full member, and Megan Lewis will become the committee intern. Russell will take over as thesaurus editor. All new appointments will begin at the close of the Toronto meeting.

5. Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books) (DCRM(B)) (Leslie)

Leslie announced that this Saturday meeting was devoted to a structured discussion of the DCRM revision. She gave a brief overview of the status of the revision, noting that it started several years ago while Bob Maxwell was chair of the committee. Thanks to the generosity of the Beinecke Library at Yale University, the committee was able to participate in a week-long conference devoted to the revision this past March. There were alternating plenary sessions and meetings of six working groups. A great deal of work was done, mostly additions to the existing text of DCRB.

Working Group 1

Springer authored the position paper that the group worked from, and Jackie Dooley led the group discussion of Working Group 1, on the general principles for DCRM. The charge was to articulate the general principles for both the cataloging of rare materials (as an apology for the separate rules) as well as guidance for those who were revising the rules. The Working Group decided to also provide objectives as a more primary form of guidance. Leslie asked if the distinction between objectives and principles as outlined in the draft document was clear and helpful or confusing and redundant. Springer noted that this distinction was a result of the on-site work, and was based on Elaine Svenonius' Intellectual Foundations of Information Organization and the "Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records" (FRBR). McLaren added that these ideas were axiomatic from the beginning, and that the working group was only trying to create a clear division between the overarching idea of how to get where you want to go and actually defining that destination. Gillis said that after reading the draft she feels it is much easier to find what you are looking for, and applauded the fact that user needs are primary in the document. The group agreed that the distinction between objectives and principles was clear and useful.

Leslie noted that the term "users" is never defined. At one point in the draft, collection managers and patrons are mentioned in opposition to each other, and it should be made explicit that some of the most important users of a catalog are library staff. While McLaren and others argued that cataloging rules have tended to focus too much on internal needs and not on the general body of users, it was agreed that library staff are an important user group, and that the text could be revised in two places so that "users" and "staff" are not placed in opposition.

Next the committee discussed objective 4 from this draft statement of principles, which some questioned as a necessity. This objective answers the question of why DCRM is necessary above and beyond the rules provided in AACR2. Many thought that the term "modern conventions" was problematic and in particular might seem to bar the use of DCRM for current publications. Springer pointed out that the statement under discussion is one of several objectives, and that the cataloger does not have to aim to meet all of the objectives with each piece being cataloged. "Conventional practice" was suggested as a more neutral phrase. Springer emphasized that the objectives focus on what we need to allow users to do; with this objective it is to access materials whose presentation characteristics differ. If this is not a particular cataloger's objective that does not mean that their concerns are not addressed by a different objective. Leslie stated that the wording issues would be left to the editorial board.

Working Group 6

Working Group 6 discussion worked from a position paper by John Attig and Ann Copeland and was moderated by Bob Maxwell. This group was looking at the concepts of editions, issues, and states, or when to create a new record. The product was that the issue is defined as the default level of description, as well as considerations for what defines an issue. It has been suggested that this work should be put at the beginning of O.B, and Leslie asked the group if this was the best place for these considerations. She added that it is possible to put this work in a separate section entirely, since there are a number of different ways to apply DCRM from full, minimal, and core, to collection-level cataloging. Springer asked if there is a clear sense of where AACR is headed with its definition of "when to create a new record", as this decision could provide guidance. Maxwell replied that the JSC considers its "when to create a new record" document to be complete and it will be separate from AACR2. Some on this committee felt that DCRM should have such considerations as part of the whole document. Thérout pointed out that the consideration of when to create a new record should be at the beginning of DCRM, because the options will be discussed throughout the rules, and the cataloger should have a basis to work from. Larrabee noted that there is a distinction to be made between policy and pre-cataloging decisions. In general the committee agreed that the cataloging the issue was the appropriate default level.

Leslie announced that after the conclusion of the Toronto meeting an editorial team would begin work on updating the alpha versions of the areas into a beta draft version. This group will be headed by Thérout, and includes Springer, Attig, Maxwell, and Leslie. She reminded the committee that for the purpose of this discussion is to agree to concepts while the editorial team will work on specific wording.

Working groups [2](#), [3](#), [5](#)

Area 0

Leslie noted that the rest of the day's discussion would involve the work of Working Groups 2, 3, and 5. All of these groups dealt with additions, deletions, or changes to the existing rules, and some of their work overlapped.

Working Group 2 concerned itself with early letterforms and characters. Leslie and Benjamin Griffin of the Folger Library wrote the position paper, and Brian Hillyard of the National Library of Scotland was the moderator. The working group had not come to an agreement on how to transcribe the Tironian et and the contraction symbol for "rum". They did agree to continue transcribing an ampersand as such. The argument for transcribing the Tironian et as an & is based on an understanding of its functioning as an ampersand in Gothic fonts, and therefore should be transcribed as an ampersand. One addition to DCRM will be an appendix that gives more symbols of contraction, reducing the need to use another publication for consultation. The -rum is a single character formed from the 2-shaped form of the "r" with crossed strokes that make it similar to a "4." Transcription of this varies between [rum] and r[um]. Pass claims that the best practice in the manuscript world is r[um] because the shaped "r" is a recognizable part of the symbol. It was pointed out that best practice for manuscript tradition would not necessarily apply to printed material. For printed material the cataloger is bracketing the fact that a single symbol was used. Leslie advised that consistency is more valuable, and stated that the -rum is exactly the same issue as the ampersand, the latter formed over time from the separate letters

"et." Leslie called for a straw poll, showing a strong consensus on continuing to transcribe the Tironian et as "[et]", and the -rum as "[rum]."

Leslie then brought up the main issue considered by Working Group 2, the transcription of I/J U/V. With surprisingly little discussion, the working group had agreed with the position paper to continue the present system of transcription, despite its problems, because it is the least painful of the various options. Leslie asked if the group had anything they wished to discuss regarding I/J U/V transcription. When McLaren asked why this transcription method is easier than the cataloger transcribing what is seen, Leslie responded that 1) the only way a cataloger is actually transcribing what she sees is by doing quasi-facsimile transcription; and 2) while transcribing what is seen is easiest for the cataloger, it is not necessarily easier for the user, who approaches the catalog with citations from other catalogs or publications, the majority of which adjust the upper- and lower-case graphs according to usage. There were no further objections raised to continuing the current method, confirmed by a straw poll.

Working Group 2 also proposed adding a clause to 0J2 allowing the cataloger to use judgment in expanding contractions and abbreviations. This was a contentious issue amongst WG2 members, and Leslie wanted a general opinion on whether that clause would be an improvement, and whether it would be safe. She explained that unless it were left out, some catalogers would surely start expanding common contractions such as "Mr." which is most definitely not the intention of the clause. Pass pointed out that AMREMM does not try to create a comprehensive list of abbreviations. Thérour suggested that if very obscure examples can be found to add into the rules, fine, but if they cannot be found perhaps leaving this clause out would be better. There was general agreement to this solution.

Thérour asked about the proposal to not convert lower- to upper-case in transcription. Leslie replied that ISBD(A) differs from AACR2 in instructing the cataloger to transcribe from upper- to lower-case, but not the other way around. The ESTC follows ISBD(A) practice. Leslie admitted that if DCRM(B) were to follow ISBD(A) on this concept, it would be a serious deviation from AACR and would require a compelling rare book reason for the rule. Leslie is not willing to push this, and since general opinion was against it, she will drop it from the draft.

Area 4

Thérour asked about mandatory notes indicating transposition. Such notes are not now mandatory for the edition or publication areas, but WG5 made a proposal that any transposition of elements in title page transcription must be noted. There was discussion regarding how this would affect the cataloging of machine press materials, which could end up with some complicated notes when the cataloger is mixing elements from different sources. Leslie responded that use of DCRM(B) for machine-press materials would have the same underlying reasons for exact transcription as would that for hand-press materials. She asked Thérour for examples of complex transpositions so that the editorial group could study the problem.

Currently, catalogers routinely omit address that are present in the imprint, and a proposed revision would make the text more neutral, with encouragement through examples of transcription of addresses but ultimately leaving it to the cataloger's discretion. Additionally,

there is a proposal to increase the minimum number of names transcribed in lengthy imprints from one to three. There were no objections to either proposal.

Several of the working groups dealt with issues relating to the publication area. Working Groups 3 & 5 in particular discussed the concept of privileging the publisher over other functions, such as printer, bookseller, stereotyper, etc. Leslie explained that the foundation behind the DCRB refusal to privilege the publisher comes from the relationships of the period itself; since these functions are not well defined in the hand-press era, this situation is reflected in the wording, layout, and typography of the materials themselves. Machine press and other later materials do show the primacy of publisher over other functions, and the cataloger can follow how the item represents this information in determining in which subfields to transcribe information. Gillis noted that a problem arises with some items where there are clues that indicate the publication is being issued by body not mentioned in the imprint, (such as railroad route which includes the name of a printer only, and the assumption is that the railroad company is the publisher), but Leslie said that any interpolation of assumed data would violate the purpose of the publication, etc. area as a transcription field. Leslie said that any imprint information taken from another area of the piece, if at all, as well as information represented in the record in a different order than is on the piece should result in a note.

Leslie noted that DCRB is based upon the firm principle of transcribing information, and then considered copyright dates in that light. The new proposal is to transcribe copyright data when included in 260c, rather than present them formulaically. Another issue is that of the 1870 start date for modern copyright legislation, which needs more research and discussion if it is to be changed.

Area 5

Rule 5B6 currently directs the cataloger to provide both roman and Arabic numerals in the pagination when the item has a mix. In cases where the first page of a subsequent numerical sequence is unnumbered, should the cataloger be instructed to provide that first number in brackets (i.e. xii, [13]-176 p.)? Most agreed that this method is less precise, leaving the user of the record without a clear idea of how many unnumbered pages there are in the item. After a vote, the majority preferred to provide the number of blank pages in brackets and change the example to: xii, [1], 14-176 p.

Currently, leaves and pages of text are transcribed first in the statement of extent, followed by the leaves and pages of plates. There are two major exceptions to this, engraved title pages and folded letterpress tables. Despite satisfying the technical definition of plate, DCRB considers an engraved title page to be a leaf of text, presumably because of the customary privileging of the title page, and considers an inserted letterpress table (presumably folded, or otherwise of a different size than the other leaves) to be leaves of plates despite lack of illustration. The new proposal is to formulate the statement of extent based wholly on the book's format and structure without exceptional reference to content, as in the case of engraved title pages and letterpress tables. In this proposal, a leaf that is part of a sheet that has gone through a letterpress would be counted as a leaf of text, and any non-integral inserted plates would be counted as plates. Thérout noted that this would require a change to the glossary definition of plates. She also said that while this proposal makes sense from a bibliographic standpoint, it is important to remember

that the standard user will think of plates as illustrative material, and many engraved title pages have fancy lettering but no illustration. Springer thought it would be appropriate to make a distinction between engraved t.p. plates that accompany letterpress t.p.'s and those that are the only t.p. Leslie concluded that this issue needs further discussion before a decision can be made. In a show of hands, the majority of the group present would like to see more examples and discussion before deciding.

The Machine Press Working Group (WG3) noted that with machine press materials it can be difficult to differentiate between inserted and integral leaves as outlined in 5B9. There may also be multiple signature series as well as inserted plates that are included in the pagination sequence. The committee agreed that when it is impossible to ascertain the nature of engraved leaves in machine-press books, the default is to include engraved leaves that are part of the pagination sequence as leaves of text, and count as plates those that fall outside the pagination sequence.

Leslie introduced the problem of the "folder." A folder is a single folded sheet that is meant to be read consecutively when unfolded. It can be difficult to determine pagination, particularly when the "pages" are not of uniform size or shape. The proposal is to drop the use of the word "folder", as it is not used or defined as such in any other community. The rule would instruct the cataloger to count panels, not pages of content. The group agreed that the treatment of single sheet items-particularly in the physical description area-is problematic and that possible solutions need to be further considered.

6. MARBI report (Maxwell)

MARBI rejected discussion paper 2003-DP04 <<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2003/2003-dp04.html>> submitted by the BSC to authorize subfield \$2 in X55 fields in authority records. Their main reasoning was there was an already existing method of identifying the thesaurus the term came from. The discussion paper's argument that the already existing, rather complex, method does not work in any current system to authorize the entire string in a 655 bibliographic field, nor are systems likely to pay attention to this problem, did not prevail.

7. Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) report (Maxwell)

A report of the DCRM conference has been given to CC:DA. No comments from CC:DA members, to Maxwell's knowledge, have come back. The report has been posted on the CC:DA home page at <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/iasweb/personal/jca/ccda/acrl1.doc> [Microsoft Word] or <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/iasweb/personal/jca/ccda/acrl1.pdf> [Acrobat Reader]

A task force on the use of relator terms has been set up to examine 21.0D to see if it needs to be revised to encourage use of these terms (or codes). Part of the impetus for this is the ongoing drive to introduce FRBR concepts into the code, which include a heavy emphasis on identification of relationships between entities in the record. Maxwell is a member of the task

force, representing the rare cataloging community. Anyone interested in the work of the task force can contact him.

Maxwell reported that John Attig had presented a proposal, originating with the work of the DCRM post-hand press working group, to revise the way AACR2 defines colored illustrations. Attig's written report on the action given after the conference follows:

At the CC:DA meeting at ALA Annual in Toronto, CC:DA approved the proposal that I had drafted to delete the term "Coloured illustrations" from the AACR Glossary. The proposal has been forwarded to the Joint Steering Committee for their consideration.

I understand that the Bibliographic Standards Committee discussed the proposal and decided that specific instructions were needed for describing rare materials.

I anticipated that the rough-and-ready first-impression approach that seems to be appropriate in general cataloging might be inadequate for the description of rare materials. I would direct the group's attention to the MARC 21 "color" element in field 007 for projected graphics, nonprojected graphics, motion pictures and videorecordings. Although not strictly relevant to the description of illustrations in printed texts, some of the concepts may be useful.

John Attig
MARBI liaison

The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) is revising Z39.19, the Guidelines for the Construction, Format, and Management of Monolingual Thesauri. This is the document on which BSC bases its RBMS thesauri. The BSC, therefore, has an interest in following developments here and participating if possible. Stephen Hearn is the ALA representative to the revision group.

The JSC is now talking in terms of AACR3. This could include: new introductions and a conceptual overview; the introduction of FRBR concepts and terminology; a revision of chapter 21 (including a probable change in the "Rule of 3"); a part III on authority control; incorporation of the work of the CC:DA Task Force on Consistency Across Part I; a possible reorganization of Part I, including a reconsideration of the concept of class of materials; a reconceptualization of chapter 9; an examination of the role of and problems associated with the GMD; incorporation of the work of the Format Variation Working Group (how to deal with different manifestations of the same work). The timeline for this is rather vague: the earliest we could see something would be four years from now, and most think it will be longer, possibly as long as ten years. John Attig is the chair of the above-mentioned CC:DA Task Force on Consistency Across Part I, and Maxwell is a member.

The JSC has decided that the full stop will be removed following metric symbols (unless the full stop is otherwise required, such as at the end of a field). They decided not to publish this change immediately; it will be included in the new edition of AACR (date yet to be determined).

8. Research survey on special collections libraries (Russell)

Russell announced that as part of her research agenda she has developed a survey that has been distributed to ARL institutions regarding the structure supporting special collections cataloging. She asked that anyone who is at an ARL institution that has not received the survey to please contact her. She is also interested in getting responses from non-ARL institutions as a comparison group. Anyone interested in filling out the survey should contact Russell. She is particularly interested in changes in organizational structure related to special collections cataloging.

9. Directory of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger (Leslie for Creider)

Leslie noted that Larry Creider was unable to attend this meeting, but he did forward a report. The page has moved from the University of Pennsylvania to the University of New Mexico, with URL <http://lib.nmsu.edu/rarecat/>. He has some questions about the organization of the web page, and would like feedback from those who use it frequently. Leslie polled the group about two particular web sites that Creider is thinking of adding to the list. Not many in the group had had a chance to evaluate the Thesaurus Exemplorum Medii Aevi <<http://www.ehess.fr/gahom/ThesEx.htm>>. Copeland and Leslie had looked at the page from the Glasgow Center for Emblem Studies <<http://www.ces.arts.gla.ac.uk/html/links.htm>> and both found it useful. Leslie will send out Creider's report to the DCRB-L listserv.

10. Early music cataloging rules (Fletcher)

Fletcher announced that at the Austin meeting of the Music Library Association, the committee lost one member, and Maxwell has agreed to join the committee working on early music cataloging rules. The committee talked about the impact of the Yale conference on their work, as they are trying to stay aligned with the DCRM(B) wording. As a result, their draft is not quite ready for review. They have made all the content changes they wanted to, and now they must compare the language to the drafts of DCRM(B). For anyone who is interested, there will be full day workshop on manuscript music cataloging at the 2004 RBMS Preconference.

11. Preconference seminars - Toronto 2003 (Th  roux)- New Haven 2004 (Fletcher, Leslie)- St Louis 2005 (Leslie)

A full-day workshop sponsored by the BSC and organized by Karen Spicher of Yale University, et al., will be offered at the 2004 preconference. It will provide an introduction with hands-on exercises to "Cataloging Manuscript Music."

Fletcher has written a proposal for a preconference seminar to be sponsored by this committee for next year, on "The Role of Biblio-Analysis and Description for Rare and Special Materials." The seminar will look at the reporting structures for special collections cataloging in a variety of

institutions. She is currently looking for 3 to 4 people to speak on different aspects of this topic. The proposed seminar format is a topic focused information exchange, which allows the audience to participate more than in a lecture format. This is similar in style to the seminar sponsored by the BSC at the 2002 Preconference. When asked what presenters would be asked to talk about, Leslie clarified that the topic is the administrative structure as well as the human relationships between those who catalog special materials. Anyone interested in participating, as a presenter should contact Fletcher. Leslie will send out an email to ExLibris prior to the Preconference alerting attendees to the nature of this seminar, so that more audience members will be prepared to participate. Other topics for discussion could be the perspective of managers, the practicalities of workflow, and interaction with readers. [This proposal was not accepted by the Seminars Committee.]

Leslie reported on this year's Preconference seminars. Th  roux led a seminar on authority control problems in special collections cataloging. The reviews of the seminar were very good and it was well attended, both by line catalogers and supervisors and administrators. The BSC also sponsored a forum on the DCRM Conference. The forum was loosely organized, and consisted of working group moderators or position paper writers reporting on the work of each group and the major accomplishments. Although well-attended, the acoustics of the room were poor, and many attendees had apparently not had read the draft proposals, so it is unclear how successful this seminar was.

Leslie announced that she would like to start working on proposals for the 2005 Preconference, as proposals need to be submitted before ALA Annual 2004. By mid-winter the committee should be moving forward with concrete ideas. One idea that has been mentioned in the past includes digital reproductions, their cataloging, authenticity, and the impact of digital initiatives on cataloging departments. The group liked this idea. Th  roux asked if this topic includes metadata for the images, and Schroeder responded that when it first came up as a topic it was focused less on the metadata standards and more on the issues involved with the entire cataloging process. Other aspects of the topic that could be explored include loading of records, cleanup, the relationship of the project to the cataloging department, as well as the relationship of the digital image to the original. Copeland, Brandt, Russell, Th  roux, McLaren, and Roper all expressed interest in working on this seminar.

Leslie noted in the past that there had been a suggestion for a seminar on artist's books, and she urged the committee to consider this for a future preconference. Sarah Fisher, Megan Lewis, and Jim Stephenson volunteered to work on a seminar proposal on this topic for 2006. Another topic mentioned was a seminar on promotional materials/ephemera. A repeat of the Latin cataloging seminar is still on a back burner.

12. Thesauri (Tabb)

Leslie contacted Hugh Thompson, publication director of ACRL, and has confirmed that there are currently plenty of thesauri in stock. When the stock runs low, the committee will want to make some revisions before reprinting.

Tabb began by stating that the subcommittee is still looking into getting the thesauri online. They have written a funding proposal and had thought they would outsource the project, but no vendors are interested in a project of such small size. This issue is not forgotten, but the subcommittee will need to work on a different plan.

The committee looked at four proposals for new terms, and two relator terms.

Subscription publications

Thesaurus: Genre Terms

Hierarchy: [Conditions of publication]

SN: Use for (non-serial?) works published by subscription

BT [Conditions of publication]

Warrant: Clapp, Sarah L.C. Subscription: a chapter in the History of Book Publishing, 1617-1688.

Subscription publication.

The subcommittee did not like the word "non-serial" but would like a way to prevent usage of this term for publications such as Time magazine. Gillis and McLaren suggested the term "monograph". The scope would then read "Use for monographic works published by subscription." The UF will include subscription books and subscription editions. The committee approved the term as amended.

Point holes

Thesaurus: Printing & publishing Evidence

Hierarchy: [Pressman's work]

SN: Use for holes found in or near the edges of untrimmed printed leaves made by the points of the hand press (serving to ensure correct register?)

UF: Pin holes, Pin-holes, Pinholes, Press points, Points (Printing)

BT: [Make-ready]

RT: Register

Warrant: Glaister, Point holes

Larrabee asked if the point holes might be left behind after trimming, and the group agreed this could happen. "Untrimmed" was removed from the scope note. The amended term passed.

Patterned cloth bindings

After subcommittee discussion it was determined that the thesaurus editor needs to consult further with the person who suggested the term.

Volvelles

Hierarchy: [Condition of publication]

SN: Use for devices, whether independent 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.

UF: Vouelles, Volvelles

BT: [Mechanical works], [Condition of publication], or [Illustrated works]

Warrant: Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd Ed., 1989 vol. 19, p. 759

This term has been proposed twice before, but the majority of the editorial group argues that "volvelles" doesn't fit in the current hierarchy of genre terms or within that thesaurus' scope. There is no problem with the term itself. Leslie presented her objection to the majority stance.

The thesauri were constructed to be used by special collections catalogers, with the Genre terms first for the 655 and then the other five for the 755. When Leslie was thesaurus editor, she established, with Eric Holzenberg's (then chair) approval, the basic principle that if a cataloger needed a term when cataloging a rare book or special collections printed item, that was sufficient cause for the editorial group to proceed with the term. Volvelles, while they may be found outside of books, are almost entirely found within books, and are themselves a printed item. This term, as with a number of others in Genre terms (such as "Yellowbacks"), signifies an inseparable marriage between physical form and intellectual genre. There is also no requirement that a form term used must be co-terminous with the item cataloged. That is, one may use the genre term "Sermons" when cataloging an item that contains one or more sermons, without the work itself considered a sermon. Springer replied that no one is wholly opposed to the term "volvelles," but that there remains a problem that should be addressed before accepting the term. Perhaps the scope of the Genre terms volume needs to be reworked. Tabb agreed that this particular edition is over 10 years old and needs to be looked at critically. Russell said that she would need to actively seek input from those who use this thesaurus and create a document to which people can respond. Leslie asked if Russell could provide a draft scope by midwinter 2004, and Russell agreed. Leslie explained that while Tabb's term as thesaurus editor is up, he will work closely with Russell during the transition.

Relator terms

Originator

The subcommittee felt that originator referred to a different concept than that which it was being suggested for, and encouraged McLaren to resubmit the proposal using the term "Founder."

Psychic

Tabb likes the term, but after a reportedly exhilarating discussion the editorial group realized that the relationship of this person to the publication is not that of "psychic." It may be that of "medium;" the group will work more on the proposal and re-submit it for consideration.

13. Thesaurus der Provenienzbegriffe (multilingual provenance thesaurus) (Leslie)

This is a German project to create a multilingual provenance thesaurus, using Provenance terms as its base. The editors of this volume wrote to Hugh Thompson, who referred it to Leslie. She and Thompson agreed to encourage this use provided that the BSC could comment on the product before publication. Description in IFLA report <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s18/pubs/winter03.pdf> (p. 10-13)

14. Overflow discussion; new business if any

Leslie proposed that instead of the current two shorter meetings, the BSC could try meeting for a longer time on Saturday, from 8:30am-12:30pm. The proposal was met with general approval. It was admitted that this change would have an impact on MARBI and CC:DA reports. The former meets on Saturday, and the latter on Saturday and Monday, which is why reports on their meetings to the BSC have occurred at the Sunday meeting. Leslie suggested making the MARC

for Special Collections (MASC) Discussion Group a longer meeting (1.5 or 2 hours) and including these liaison reports at that meeting. Russell responded that this was a positive idea, and allow the discussion group to explore more topics. Leslie also noted that it might make travel arrangements easier for those who only attend ALA for the BSC meetings. When Roper noted that moving the MARBI and CC:DA minutes to MASC would exclude the content of these reports from the BSC minutes, Leslie said that Maxwell and Attig could provide written reports for the minutes. The committee agreed to try this new schedule for the Midwinter 2004 meeting.

Leslie adjourned the meeting, thanking outgoing members Fletcher and Thesaurus Editor Tabb for their dedicated and outstanding work on the committee.