Report of the SAC Working Group on External Review of Library of Congress Vocabularies

Submitted by Working Group Chairs Violet Fox and Jamie Carlstone, February 2023

Summary

After a comment from a Library of Congress (LC) employee mentioning that the potential for an editorial board had been discussed internally at LC, the members of the American Library Association's Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) voted to recommend to LC the creation of an editorial or advisory board that would have input on revisions to LC's controlled vocabularies (such as the Library of Congress Subject Headings) and the Library of Congress Classification. A working group was formed in April 2022 to explore potential avenues for the creation of an editorial board that includes members that are external to LC. This group brainstormed ideas about who was left out of the current LC editorial process and what LC should take into account when considering revising their editorial process. The group also surveyed 31 other controlled vocabularies and classifications used in libraries and archives, collecting information about editorial processes and identifying external review efforts. Three vocabularies and one classification were chosen as case studies with more detailed information about the process used to maintain each system. This report documents information about recent positive changes within LC and shares findings from the working group's survey of controlled vocabularies and classifications. The report also summarizes the working group members' ideas for who should be represented on an external review board and provides suggestions for improving the current editorial process.

Background of this working group

At the February 2021 Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Participants Meeting, Judith Cannan, Chief of Cooperative and Instructional Programs at LC, discussed a number of potential changes to LC Subject Headings (LCSH) that had been discussed at LC, one of which was asking whether LCSH should have an editorial board comprised of non-LC members that would work with LC to revise subjects.

In April 2022, the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) of the American Library Association (ALA)'s Core Division voted to form a working group to create a recommendation that LC should form an editorial board with non-LC representation. This working group "will have the latitude to

investigate a wide variety of possibilities and will determine the form that the recommendation takes."

Subject Analysis Committee member Violet Fox agreed to chair the working group and put out a call for volunteers. Thirty-six people responded with interest. Jamie Carlstone (Northwestern University) volunteered to co-chair the working group. The volunteers formed a working group and an advisory group to support writing this report.

Working group membership is primarily librarian specialists and experts in the areas of cataloging and metadata, though also includes library workers, managers, and specialists in technical services, systems, digital resources, media services, and special collections. Most working group members are from the library sector. Graduate students of library and information science, recent graduates, professors of library and information science, archivists, and museum professionals are also represented. Most information professionals in the working group are from colleges or universities, but public, school, and unaffiliated information professionals are also represented. Most members are from the United States. Participants were sorted into two subgroups: the working group, which did the bulk of the research and writing, and an informal advisory group, which was emailed periodically with updates from the working group and opportunities to provide feedback.

The working group and advisory group actively collaborated between May 2022 and February 2023. In May, members of the working group who were not familiar with the details of the LCSH approval process met with co-chair Violet Fox in Zoom meetings to get an informational overview. In June, a brainstorming document was shared among volunteers via Google Docs so that they could suggest ideas for how an editorial committee or advisory group could be structured. In July, the online Jamboard tool was used for brainstorming potential changes to the LC review process. By the end of October, volunteers used Google Sheets to complete a review of 31 non-LC vocabularies/classifications to investigate how these structures manage their editorial processes. The report was drafted and refined in November and December. A draft report was submitted to SAC for review and discussion in January and a final draft was submitted to SAC in February 2023.

Recent improvements in Library of Congress controlled vocabularies

In the past several years, multiple positive changes to the Subject Authority Cooperative Program (SACO) / Library of Congress (LC) controlled vocabulary editorial process have been implemented.

- *New webpages and documentation*. After the May 2017 Consolidated Appropriations Act was passed into law, requiring LC to "use a process to change or add subject headings that is clearly defined, transparent, and allows input from stakeholders including those in

the congressional community," a new webpage was published on the LC website in July 2017. This page, the "[Process for Adding and Revising Library of Congress Subject Headings](#)," describes the process for preparing and submitting proposals to revise headings or add new headings, along with the editorial process for review within the policy division. In June 2017, document [H 204 (Evaluating Subject Proposals)](#) was added to the LC Subject Heading Manual, which explains the workflow of proposals within the Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division (PTCP) and discusses, at a broad level, how decisions are made about proposals.

- *New access to editorial meetings*. In August 2021, PTCP staff opened the editorial meetings to people outside of LC. This has allowed many members of the library community to listen in on meetings and give feedback about headings under discussion, providing more transparency into the process and more diverse perspectives to be represented in the discussion.
- *New expedited approval process*. In August 2022, a new expedited process was enacted which allows certain LCSH to be published on an approved list five weeks after being submitted.
- *New hires at LC*. The hiring of additional staff has provided fresh perspectives into the editorial process and afforded a new capacity for PTCP staff to attend SACO Funnel meetings.
- *New SACO funnels and reinvigoration of previously established funnels*. A renewed effort to do work within SACO funnels has resulted in the formation of new funnels and more collaboration between LC and funnel organizers. Meetings for the new Gender and Sexuality Funnel were started in summer 2022. The Latin American and Indigenous Peoples (LAIPA) Funnel, established in 2017, began regular meetings for the first time. The African American Funnel, established in 2000, was reorganized in 2017 and reinvigorated with an influx of new members. The African American Funnel members continued their regular meetings and adopted a new set of bylaws in February 2022. In late 2022, announcements were made about two additional new funnels: the SACO Medical Subject Funnel, and the NACO/SACO Comics and Fiction Funnel.
- *New advisory group for Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT)*. In January 2022, LC formed an advisory group for LCDGT. This group consists of an LC staff member and subject matter experts from nine institutions: the American Psychological Association, American Theological Library Association, Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. Census Bureau, Council of American Overseas Research Centers, Kinsey Institute, the U.S. National Library of Medicine, the Pew Research Center, and SIL International.

The members of the working group commend the LC PTCP Division for their receptivity and initiative. Providing transparency into the approval process has helped librarians better understand the process and what is necessary to make good proposals.

Over the past two years, many offensive and inaccurate headings have been changed for the better. Additionally, new headings have been introduced that allow more nuanced and appropriate description of resources about subjects about politics, race, and other complex

subjects. These include the addition of headings such as "Settler colonialism" (list 2104), "Rape in correctional institutions" (list 2106), "Palestinian Nakba, 1947-1948" (list 2111), "Police abolition movement" (list 2205), "White privilege (Social structure)" (list 2206), "Climate justice" (list 2206), "Mass incarceration" (list 2207), and "Historically Black colleges and universities (list 2208). Additionally, revisions to existing headings include: "Noble savage" to "Noble savage stereotype" (list 2104), "Problem youth" to "At-risk youth" (list 2204), "Brothers and sisters" to "Siblings" (list 2205), and "Manic-depressive illness" to "Bipolar disorder" (list 2208). Finally, large projects such as the removal of headings such as "Primitive societies" (list 2206) and "Art, Primitive" (list 2203); the revision of "Evacuation and relocation" to "Forced removal and internment" (list 2106); and the revision of "Slaves" to "Enslaved persons," and its many related headings (list 2212a) are examples of important positive changes made by LC in 2021 and 2022.

These changes and additions reduce harm to library users searching subjects in their library catalogs, particularly those who are personally described by or whose community heritage or history is described by the subjects. Additionally, these updates have contributed to a new sense in the profession that substantive change is possible within these structures.

Information about other controlled vocabularies or classifications leadership structures

The working group volunteers researched 31 international vocabularies and classifications, identifying whether an editorial board exists, as well as collecting information about their governance structure and their editorial review and approval process when possible.

Out of 31 vocabularies and classifications surveyed, the working group was able to confirm that ten have or had an editorial board. Collecting this information took the form of reviewing the website affiliated with the vocabulary and in some cases reaching out via email to the editorial staff. A chart with information about each of the vocabularies researched is available in this report's Appendix. The information in the chart was made from publicly available documentation, most of which was not time stamped, so it is possible that the information presented may not accurately reflect current practices.

The working group members were dismayed that in many cases, very little information about each vocabulary or classification was available online. This lack of transparency is not conducive to promoting trust that the vocabulary or classification is being maintained appropriately. We applaud LC for making much of its documentation available online, and encourage continued work towards ensuring information about the maintenance of LC vocabularies is up-to-date, well organized, and written with non-experts in mind.

The working group has selected three vocabularies and one classification to highlight as case studies: the American Folklore Society Ethnographic Thesaurus, the Homosaurus, the Getty

Research Institute vocabularies, and the Dewey Decimal Classification. These case studies were selected because, like LC, these structures cover a wide range of subjects, the organizations running them have dedicated staff or volunteers, and they have a clearly articulated process for proposing and reviewing revisions.

American Folklore Society: Ethnographic Thesaurus

The [American Folklore Society (AFS) Ethnographic Thesaurus](#) was developed in cooperation with the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress. The vocabulary is meant to facilitate access to material on folklore, ethnomusicology, cultural anthropology, and related fields.

The Editorial Board of the Ethnographic Thesaurus is made up of volunteers from the staff of the American Folklife Center. The staff includes archivists, librarians, and folklife specialists. Since their position on the editorial board is ex officio, there are no terms for length of service on the editorial board. Decisions are made by consensus after a discussion. The meetings are held as needed when new terminology is proposed. It is common for a group of terms to be proposed at the same time by a person or organization after the completion of fieldwork or writing an article.

There is also an AFS Ethnographic Thesaurus Advisory Board, established for carrying the initial grant forward. However, they are no longer actively involved in the Thesaurus.

The thesaurus is available for free online, and information about the history of the vocabulary and its editorial board is available on the website. A "submit a correction" form is available at the thesaurus webpage.

Homosaurus

The [Homosaurus](#) vocabulary began in the 1990s by [IHLIA LGBTI Heritage](#) as a Dutch and English gay and lesbian thesaurus. In 2013, Jack van der Wel and Ellen Greenblatt published version 1 of Homosaurus. Originally, it was distributed in Word/pdf and was a comprehensive vocabulary that included non-LGBTQ related terms. In 2016, the board decided to limit the scope to LGBTQ terms only. In 2019, version 2 of Homosaurus was published on the web as a linked data vocabulary, and in 2020, version 3 went live with dereferenced URIs to avoid the need for versioning in the future.

The editorial board is not designed to be representative of any groups or organizations. Board members are found through outreach and in response to the Contact Us form on the website, which invites board applicants. There is no term length for board member service.

The board meets every month. Complicated terms and questions are discussed at the board meeting, and decisions are made by consensus. There is a streamlined process for decision making so that decisions for most terms can be made asynchronously between board meetings.

Term creation and revision is suggested by community members, the board itself, and through partnerships. Examples of collaborations with other organizations to develop and revise terminology include (but are not limited to) working with the Leather Archives & Museum on kink-related terminology, InterACT on intersex-related terminology, and an upcoming collaboration with Sex Workers Project on sex work-related terminology.

As an international linked data vocabulary, Homosaurus is interested in expanding into other languages and has recently received an NEH grant to develop a Spanish-language version of Homosaurus. Opportunities and pathways to translate Homosaurus into other languages are currently being explored.

Updates to the vocabulary are released twice per year in June and December. The vocabulary is available free online, and information about the history of Homosaurus and its editorial staff is also available on the website.

Getty Vocabularies

The [controlled vocabularies of the Getty Research Institute](#) include the Art & Architecture Thesaurus (AAT), the Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names, the Cultural Objects Name Authority, the Getty Iconography Authority, and the Union List of Artists' Names. The AAT was first drafted in the late 1970s and is dedicated to providing a structured terminology for art, architecture, decorative arts, archival materials, visual surrogates, art conservation, and bibliographic materials. These vocabularies are maintained by a unit called the Getty Vocabulary Program. One managing editor and three editors work together with additional members of a technical team providing technical support.

Bulk additions to the vocabularies are made by institutions or consortia such as museums, archives, special collections, visual resource collections, large national or international translation or cataloging projects, or others who catalog art. Getty maintains a list of over 300 approved contributors to the vocabularies; the organizations on this list have been vetted in advance and are expected to understand the scope and hierarchical structures in the vocabularies they contribute to. Individual scholars and projects are also welcome to contribute terms, and Getty provides a Quick Reference Guide for Contributions which outlines the information needed. Contributions are made "constantly," with data being refreshed every month. There are no external reviewers for additions to the AAT. The Getty Vocabulary Program staff review new terms suggested by institutions and individual researchers, primarily to ensure they fit into the AAT scope, follow editorial guidelines, and are well placed within the current hierarchy. Editor Jonathan Ward described the acceptance of new terms: "Essentially, if terms a)

are from an approved contributor, and b) fit into the Vocabularies' scope and follow our editorial guidelines, then we consider the contributor the expert external reviewer."

Editorial guidelines are available in full on the Getty website, along with information about the history of each vocabulary, the editorial staff, and detailed information about what is required to contribute.

Dewey Decimal Classification

The [Dewey Decimal Classification](#) (DDC) was first published in 1876. OCLC has owned the DDC since 1988. Until 2011, the classification was published in a print edition which happened generally within a seven-year editorial cycle. In 2017, OCLC announced they would no longer print discrete editions, instead moving to a reliance on the frequently updated WebDewey.

The editorial staff numbers of the DDC have fluctuated throughout time; in the past few years, OCLC has decreased the staff to only one permanent editor to maintain the DDC. Proposals to revise the DDC are reviewed by the Dewey Editorial Policy Committee (EPC). This committee has ten members and makes recommendations to OCLC with respect to editorial policy for the DDC. The EPC meets several times a year to make decisions about proposals which are created by editorial staff. Representation on the EPC is selected by a variety of worldwide organizations, including OCLC, ALA, the United Kingdom DDC User Forum, the European DDC Users Group, and LC. Current membership includes representatives from the U.S., the U.K., Canada, South Africa, and Australia. EPC members serve multiple year terms.

A subscription to WebDewey is over $350 USD each year, per user. The subscription price is not accessible online without submitting a request for information. Information about the Editorial Policy Committee membership is available online, but information about editorial staff has been gradually removed from websites about the DDC over the past few years.

Ideas about who should be represented on a Library of Congress Subject Heading advisory board

To facilitate discussion about who should be involved in discussions about potential revisions to LC controlled vocabularies, the working group members participated in a brainstorming session conducted through Jamboard, a digital collaborative whiteboard available via Google Workspace. Members reflected on who was currently left out of the proposal process.

Several groups of people emerged in the discussion of who should be represented on an LC editorial board:

- *Groups described*. Our working group members were adamant that when groups of people or their history and heritage are being described by subject terminology, the groups being described by LC vocabularies should be consulted as much as possible.
  - LC should prioritize sources from the peoples and communities described, privileging those sources over traditionally "authoritative" sources, including literary warrant. In this way, LC can take into account changes or additions to terminology related to under-represented groups that reflect a more inclusive and culturally relevant understanding of the language associated with these groups and their heritage and history.
  - Challenges in doing so were acknowledged, including that some groups are fluid in how they describe themselves, and that there can be differing opinions within communities. Members felt that even when intra-community opinions are varied, those opinions should clearly be considered and incorporated into an authority record as appropriate.
- *Experts*. Subject experts should intentionally be consulted as part of the process, and these efforts should be transparent and clearly communicated. Before the working group began meeting, many members had not been aware that PCTP consults subject experts as part of its process. This demonstrates an opportunity for PTCP to highlight their current outreach practice by elaborating on consultations or other outreach activities that occur during the editorial process. This can be achieved by noting consultation details in the authority records themselves (in 670 fields), and through additional communication and promotion efforts such as write-ups in LC blog posts, newsletter articles, or journal articles.
- *International users*. Several working group members reflected that LC controlled vocabularies are used by many libraries outside of the United States. Differing cultural contexts and regional variations in the use of English language leave room for misinterpretation or misrepresentation of certain topics, people, and/or cultures. While the working group members understand that LC vocabularies were established as a US-based product, the time has come to acknowledge the fact that LCSH and other LC vocabularies are used throughout the world. We urge LC to seriously consider internationalizing its standards by creating an advisory group that includes membership from non-U.S. countries, providing perspectives that lead to more informed and inclusive development of terminology.

Other groups were noted as being impacted by LC vocabulary choices, yet disconnected from the process of evaluating terminology chosen. The working group did not reach a consensus about adding members of these groups to a potential advisory board, but the members felt it was important to note that these audiences are not aware of the rules and structures that LC vocabularies work within.
- *Authors*. Creators of works often have opinions about the headings that are assigned to their works, but have no input into the editorial process.
- *Publishers.* Publishers often collect and generate description metadata as part of marketing, especially for ebook formats. Publishers often have a closer relationship with

authors than libraries do, but our subject analysis does not always reflect a publisher's understanding of resources.
- *Non-catalogers and non-library catalog users*. The end users of LCSH are not usually catalogers, which means they encounter LC vocabularies devoid of the context of the hierarchy and rules catalogers work within.

Finally, the working group members had thoughts about who should *not* be reflected as part of an editorial board.
- Representatives from groups or organizations that purport to speak for marginalized communities, but who exclude the voices of members of the marginalized community.
- Researchers or representatives from groups or organizations where the experts cause harm to members of marginalized communities. For example, organizations like SIL International are known to be controversial in the linguistic community ([see page 618-619 of "SIL International and the disciplinary culture of linguistics" by Lisa Dobrin](#)), and researchers on transgender people have historically harmed members of the transgender community ([see "The Disturbing History of Research into Transgender Identity" by Jack Turban](#)).

Ideas for improving the Library of Congress controlled vocabulary approval process beyond external review

In addition to the idea of external review of the LC controlled vocabularies, the Working Group discussed the approval process in general, coming up with several themes that might be addressed by the PTCP Division.

Improving access to the proposal system was a major theme of these discussions. Group members discussed the limitations of hosting the proposal system within ClassWeb, which requires a yearly subscription fee. Because ClassWeb is primarily used by well-resourced academic libraries, it excludes a significant proportion of the library community. Additionally, investing in development of automated processes and workflows could serve to make the process more efficient and transparent long term.

Ideas to improve the process of submitting proposals included:
- Automate the submission process with a single public facing, easy to use form:
  - Create a web form not hosted within Classification Web that both SACO and non-SACO members can use to submit proposals.
  - Instructions on the form should be clear and complete, identifying what to expect next and how to get status updates, after submission of the form. The PDF form that is currently available for non-SACO members is cumbersome and has incomplete instructions (for example, it does not provide information about the

additional email address users must submit their proposal to in order to be scheduled onto the monthly tentative list).

- ○ Form submissions should make use of workflow email notifications. Form submitters receive a confirmation or success message, and a copy of their submission emailed to them for their records. New submissions via the form should be automatically sent to an additional email address for scheduling on the monthly tentative list, and any other LC stakeholders as needed, preventing the need for submitters to send a separate email.
- Make the existing proposal web form more widely available: Let non-SACO participants use the ClassWeb proposal web form. This still requires access to ClassWeb, but at least more librarians would be able to use the web form, which reduces errors and omissions in proposals.
- Improve transparency by making the status of proposals visible to the public:
  - ○ Publicly display status of proposals. Automate this process so the proposal's status updates dynamically as it changes internally. For example, a table displaying in-process proposals could initially display a status of "Proposed" and date of proposal. As the internal status changes and it moves through the internal review process, it could get updated to "In review," and "Review Completed." When planned for discussion, the status could be changed to "Planned for discussion on [date of meeting]" and "Discussed at [date of meeting]." Additional statuses could be used such as "Delayed" or "On hold" to indicate when the proposal is not moving through the process as expected. Include publicly displayed notes as needed to provide additional information or explanations.
  - ○ Provide view-only access to ClassWeb. This still requires access to ClassWeb, but at least more libraries would be able to view the status of proposals.
- Add a "Submit for Review" button to ClassWeb. At present, proposals that are saved are not submitted for review until there is an email sent to SACO. This step can be easily missed, and lead to confusion when nothing happens to a finished proposal. Automate this process so that proposals that are saved or submitted automatically trigger an email sent to SACO so the submitter is not required to take an additional step.
- Ensure that old forms and outdated information on the LC site are taken down, or are redirected to up-to-date information.
- PTCP employees should not rely on people emailing them repeatedly to ensure proposals are considered. The fact that even highly motivated catalogers have been discouraged from making proposals because of the obstacle-ridden proposal system is a significant problem that must be addressed by LC in order to rebuild confidence in this process.
  - ○ Embed automated notifications to the submitter into the process to improve transparency about the status of their proposal as it changes.
  - ○ Create an easy to use form or other method for submitters to request updates or provide additional information to PTCP when needed.
  - ○ Assign PTCP staff to monitor and respond to update requests, to update the status of requests internally and publicly, and to liaise with the submitter when more information is needed.

Once proposals have been submitted, there is often a sense from those outside LC that the proposals have entered an "abyss" until they show up on a tentative list, which can be multiple months later. Sometimes those proposals don't ever show up on tentative lists, with proposers left confused about what happened. Development of transparent practices and staff workflows suggested in the section above such as public display of proposal status, and embedding of automated and staff initiated email notifications to the proposer will help to avoid frustration and confusion by those submitting proposals.

Ideas to improve the process of reviewing proposals included:
- Notify catalogers if their proposal has been delayed for any specific reason. One work group member had a few proposals that sat for months and were scheduled to later lists but never knew why they were delayed (this is with Classification Web). Email follow up for one of these proposals eventually got a response.
- If LC changes a heading before accepting it, communicate this to the proposer, and request additional information or feedback when needed. One working group member had a heading changed by LC in a way that made it inaccurate in the view of the proposer. When the proposer emailed to ask why, the response was that they spent a lot of time thinking about the heading. However, LC never contacted the proposer to get input or feedback.
- Consider letting proposers know if their heading is going to be discussed. Typically the preview list goes out 1-2 days before the meeting and oftentimes, the proposer is unaware. The proposer may be able to provide clarification and useful feedback during the meeting.

The working group members reiterated their gratitude and excitement that editorial meetings are now open to the public. Many ideas were floated about continuing this positive step and ensuring barriers to attending the meetings are reduced, including:

- Creating a registration form as opposed to requiring users to email LC.
- Providing a static webpage with information about attending editorial meetings as opposed to a yearly pdf.
- Providing information about attendance at editorial meetings for new attendees on a webpage, including brief explanations of the tentative list process and information about which topics attendees are welcome to comment on. This would also provide clarity about what types of questions are not welcome; for example, basic questions about how LCSH works might not be good uses of editorial meeting time, so there should be an email address or other place for people to get information about basic questions.
- Providing a short welcome at each editorial meeting inviting comments and setting expectations.
- Providing a staggered meeting schedule that would allow people in various time zones to attend meetings, including those living on different continents.

Other ideas to promote better understanding of the editorial process included:

- Providing resources to email for help regarding proposing revisions or additions to LCSH. A member of the working group noted, "It would be nice if there was a resource you could email for help that isn't LC or one of the listservs. There's so much bad

behavior on listservs, I wouldn't feel comfortable messaging the list if I have a question about a heading. It's also intimidating to email so many people."

- Providing an email address for FAQs about the subject proposal process that isn't staffed by LC. This might be a project PCC could undertake, to provide an "ask an expert" service for non-SACO catalogers and other interested library workers.
- Providing webinars and other training opportunities for people new to the SACO process, or just curious about how the LC editorial process works. There is a good deal of interest in this process within the library community and the desire for more basic information about how LCSH are created and maintained extends beyond just those librarians currently participating in SACO work. This may be another area where PCC members could supplement LC's limited capacity for training.

Conclusion

The process of creating this report reinforced the importance of transparency and clear, up-to-date information about the maintenance of the structures we use in libraries and archives. The members of the working group are excited about the forward momentum that LC has demonstrated over the past several years and hope that LC will thoughtfully consider the possibility of including a more diverse set of stakeholders in its editorial process by implementing some form of external review. We look forward to a collaborative future that ensures the vocabularies and classification used by LC remains responsive to the needs of users around the world.

Working group members

Co-chairs:
Violet Fox, SAC member, Northwestern University
Jamie Carlstone, Northwestern University

Working group members:
Allison Badger, Idaho State University
Allison Bailund, San Diego State University
Alyssa Key
Aparna Ghosh, University of South Florida
Carrie Evans, Five Colleges, Incorporated
Crystal Casparis, UNC Chapel Hill
Emory LaPrade, Johnson City Public Library (Johnson City, TN)
Jeanette Claire, Sewell Rice University
Jennifer Parsons, Central Methodist University
John Keogh, Johnson County Library (Johnson County, KS)
Julia Bullard, University of British Columbia
Leanne Finnigan, Temple University Libraries
Melissa De Fino, Rutgers University Libraries

Michael L. Stewart, University of Delaware
Michele Lamorte
Nicola Cook, Wellcome Collection
Paul Richmond, Emerson College
Rebecca Saunders, Western Carolina University
Robin Lowell, Freeport Community Library (Freeport, ME)
Sara Herrman, Wichita State University
Shana McDanold, DC Public Library
Stephanie Leary, University of Washington iSchool
Stephanie Luke, University of Illinois
Stephanie M. Roach, San Mateo County Community College District
Sue Luftschein, University of Southern California
Tina Gross, North Dakota State University
Victoria Lowe, SUNY Albany

Advisory group members:
Alissa McCulloch, Deakin University, Australia
Bri Watson, University of British Columbia iSchool / Homosaurus
Israel Yáñez, University of California - Davis
Kalani Adolpho, Virginia Commonwealth University
Kat Louro, University of Northern British Columbia
Teresa Helena Moreno, University of Illinois at Chicago
Tim Thompson, Yale University
Whitney Buccicone, University of Virginia

Dedication

This report is dedicated to the memory of David Philip Norris (1983-2023), Cataloging and Metadata Librarian at St. Catherine University Library, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Appendix

Name of vocabulary or classification	Owner of vocab/classification	Editorial Responsibility	Editorial Process	Public Input
Agricultural Thesaurus	National Agriculture Library	USDA staff	"Editorial Staff" (2) appears to be USDA staff.	Webform
AIATSIS Subject Thesaurus	Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies	AIATSIS staff	Responsibility is with the staff of AIATSIS.	Email
American Folklore Society Ethnographic Thesaurus	Not explicitly stated, but most likely the American Folklore Society	AFS Ethnographic Thesaurus Editorial Board	The AFS Ethnographic Thesaurus Editorial Board. All members are from the American Folklife Center, Library of Congress, as well as a cataloger. There is also an AFS Ethnographic Thesaurus Advisory Board. The Board consists of 13 members who possess archival, museum and library experience. They represent the fields of folklore, cultural anthropology, ethnomusicology, and library science.	Webform
CABI Thesaurus	Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International	Thesaurus manager	Quarterly reports published by Thesaurus Manager. CABI has an editorial board for its publishing division. Unclear if the editorial board contributes to the thesaurus.	Unknown
Chicano Thesaurus	Maybe University of California?	Editors	Most recent work by Lillian Castillo-Speed & Yolanda Retter Vargas. Committee for the Development of Subject Access to Chicano Literatures is listed as author on first print edition. See link to grant proposal final report.	Unknown

[Dewey Decimal Classification](#)	OCLC	Dewey Editorial Policy Committee	10 international members (librarians & LIS educators) appointed by OCLC and international library organizations like ALA. The Editorial Policy Committee votes on revision proposals drafted by the Dewey editor, who collaborates with librarians around the world.	Email
[Digital Europa Thesaurus](#)	Office of the European Union	Managed by DG COMM	Managed by DG COMM (Directorate-General: the department of communication)	Unknown
[ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) Thesaurus](#)	U.S. Department of Education	ERIC Indexers at the US Department of Education	Department of Education reviews and approves changes recommended in proposals by ERIC indexers and quality assurance staff	Webform
[Ethnographic Thesaurus](#)	American Folklore Society	Staff with advisory board	Staff listed, as well as Advisory Board (advisory board is no longer active	Webform
[EuroVoc](#)	Office of the European Union	Publications Office of the European Union	Publication team handles technical details and coordinates with the maintenance committee.	Webform
[First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Indigenous Ontology (FNMIIO)](#)	National Indigenous Knowledge and Language Alliance (NIKLA) and the Canadian Federation of Library Associations (CFLA)	The Joint Working Group on Classification and Subject Headings	The Joint Working Group on Classification and Subject Headings	Email
[Getty Vocabularies](#) (including the Art and Architecture Thesaurus)	Getty Research Institute	Getty editorial staff	The Getty Vocabulary Program includes 4 members, one managing editor and three editors. Bulk addition of terms to the vocabularies are made by approved organizations.	Webform

[Glossary of Disability Terminology](#)	Disabled People's Association of Singapore	Staff of the parent organization	No editorial board is listed. Governance of the parent organization is posted publicly but management and updates to the glossary are not specified.	Email
[GSSO](#) (the Gender, Sex, and Sexual Orientation ontology)	Clair Kronk	Editor	Unknown	GitHub
[Homosaurus: An International LGBTQ Linked Data Vocabulary.](#)	Digital Transgender Archive	Editorial board	Editorial board currently has 11 members including librarians, professors, and PhD students. Accept self-nominations to board positions. Editorial board oversees edits on a quarterly basis.	Webform
[Inclusive Terminology Glossary](#)	Cultural Heritage Terminology Network (maintained by Carissa Chew)	Editor	Maintained primarily by the Editor with suggestions from others in the UK cultural heritage sector. Development into a "funded, open-access database" is being explored as of February 2023.	Suggestions to collaborative Google document
[International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11)](#)	World Health Organization	World Health Organization	Consensus model with revisions made on as-needed basis.	Website registered account
[Maori Subject Headings](#)	Not explicitly stated	Te Whakakaokao (Ngā Upoko Tukutuku Reo Māori Working Group)	Te Whakakaokao (Ngā Upoko Tukutuku Reo Māori Working Group) is the Working Group that maintains and updates the thesaurus; is guided by a Governance Group with members from Te Rōpū Whakahau, LIANZA and the National Library of New Zealand.	Email
[Medical Subject Heading (MeSH)](#)	U.S. National Library of Medicine	NLM staff	Managed by NLM employees. The vocabulary is updated once per year.	Webform
[NASA Thesaurus](#)	NASA STI (Scientific and Technical Information Program)	Unknown	Unknown	Webform

[PBCore Controlled Vocabularies](#)	PBCore, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH)	PBCore Advisory Subcommittee of the Association of Moving Image Archivists	In 2013, CPB transferred responsibility for the PBCore metadata standard to the WGBH Media Library and Archives as part of the American Archive of Public Broadcasting (AAPB) initiative. The AAPB team established a PBCore Advisory Subcommittee of the Association of Moving Image Archivists to reassess the schema, lead outreach efforts, and gather feedback from the user community.	Google group, open Zoom meetings, Basecamp
[Racial Equity Tools Glossary](#)	Site is managed by 3 groups: MP Associates, Center for Assessment and Policy Development, and World Trust Educational Services.	MP Associates; CAPD; World Trust Educational Services	The website is "voluntarily managed" by the three organizations running it.	Webform
[RBMS Controlled Vocabularies](#)	Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of ALA	Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group	The Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group (24 members, largely rare book catalogers with two people acting as editors) works in concert with the Bibliographic Standards Committee.	Webform
[RxNorm](#)	U.S. National Library of Medicine	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
[Sears List of Subject Headings](#)	Grey House Publishing	Editor	Editor makes decisions individually after consultation with an ad-hoc advisory board consisting of librarians & vendors.	Email
[STW Thesaurus for Economics](#)	Leibniz Information Centre for Economics	Editorial team	In 2007, the ZBW exclusively assumed responsibility for the maintenance and development of the STW.	Webform
[UNESCO Thesaurus](#)	UNESCO	UNESCO	No details available	Email

[Unified Astronomy Thesaurus](#)	American Astronomical Society	Unified Astronomy Thesaurus Steering Committee	Thirteen professionals working in the astronomical community serve on the Steering Committee. Members serve a one or two year term, with an option to renew, and they meet monthly by conference call.	GitHub
[Universal Decimal Classification](#)	UDC Consortium	Editorial team and advisory board	Managed by an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Editor-in-Chief. Editorial board does the maintenance work cooperating with the Advisory Board, who are specialists.	Unknown
[Virtual International Authority File](#)	OCLC	VIAF Council	VIAF Council. Members come from VIAF Contributors, with one liaison from OCLC.	Unknown
[Women's Thesaurus](#)	Atria, Institute on Gender Equality and Women's History	Atria staff	Appears to be managed by Atria staff	Email
[Zine Subject Thesaurus](#)	Anchor Archive Zine Library (Halifax, Nova Scotia)	Anchor Archive Zine Library volunteers	Volunteers edit the thesaurus on an irregular, as-needed basis. Decisions are made on a consensus basis. As of February 2023, the zine library is working to formalize editorial rules and implement a webform for term suggestions.	Email