Draft

Minutes (Draft)
Bibliographic Standards Committee
ALA Midwinter Meeting
Saturday, January 26, 2019, 8:30 AM - 11:30 AM
Hyatt Regency Seattle, 702 Clearwater (708)
Seattle, WA

RBMS Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
Association of College and Research Libraries
A Division of the American Library Association

1. Introduction of members and visitors
2. Settlement of the agenda
3. Approval of BSC meeting minutes
4. Consent agenda
5. Updates from the BSC Chair
5a. Library of Congress liaison report (James)
6. Experts Directory (Isaacs)
7. Report of the RBMS liaison to the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) (Moody)
8. BSC Program Planning Group (Bychowski)
9. *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* and *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts* (AMREMM)
10. *Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)* (Copeland)
11. Announcements from the floor
12. Acknowledgements
13. Adjournment
Appendix A: RBMS Policy Statements Summary of Activity Post ALA Annual
Appendix B: LC Rare Book Information for BSC Midwinter 2019
Appendix C: Program Planning Group Report
Appendix D: *Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)* Status report
Appendix E: Criteria for evaluating a revision or integration of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* and *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts* (AMREMM)
Appendix F: Minutes of the September 20, 2018 BSC virtual meeting
Appendix G: Minutes of the December 18, 2018 BSC virtual meeting
Draft agenda (all information from the draft agenda is incorporated into the notes below)

1. Introduction of members and visitors

Members present: Francis Lapka, Yale Center for British Art (chair); Amy Brown, Burns Library, Boston College (Controlled Vocabularies co-editor); Brenna Bychowski, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Kalan Knudson Davis, University of Minnesota; Elizabeth Hobart, Penn State University; Linda Isaac, Houghton Library, Harvard University; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library; Michelle Mascaro, University of California San Diego; Honor Moody, Harvard Library (CC:DA liaison); Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University (secretary); Iris O'Brien, British Library; Brian Stearns, University of Alberta; Amy Tims, American Antiquarian Society.

Members absent: Katelyn Borbely, ProQuest; Alison Greenlee, Wayne State University; Jason Kovari, Cornell University.

Liaisons present: Liz Call, University of Rochester (RBMS Executive Committee liaison); Kate James, Policy and Standards Division, Library of Congress.

Visitors present: Alison Bridger, Wisconsin Historical Society; Valerie Buck, Brigham Young University; Annie Copeland, Penn State University; Nancy Kandoian, New York Public Library; Martha Lawler, Louisiana State University-Shreveport; Ann Myers, Stanford University; Margaret Nichols, Cornell University; Audrey Pearson, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Sara Schliep, Folger Shakespeare Library; Beth Shoemaker, Rose Library, Emory University; Gina Solares, University of San Francisco; Brittney Washington, Harry Ransom Center.

2. Settlement of the agenda

The chair announced an experimental change in meeting format. After consulting with the chairs of BSC subgroups, he scheduled only the more pressing items for this meeting in order to engage with them more fully. Topics related to the Art & Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension, RBMS Policy Statements, and Web Resources for Rare Materials Cataloging may be treated in one or two virtual meetings in the spring. An update on the RBMS Policy Statements can be found in Appendix A. No concerns were expressed regarding the suggested format change.

A report by the Library of Congress liaison was added to the agenda, following agenda item 5. Agenda items 9 and 10 were switched.

3. Approval of BSC meeting minutes

After discussion, it was decided that, in the future, minutes will be voted on via email before the next BSC meeting (whether the next meeting is in-person or virtual) and ratified as part of the consent agenda of that next meeting. Minutes of meetings held outside ALA Annual or Midwinter will continue to be appended to the most recent prior ALA meeting minutes until the Web Team is able to give direct access to all meeting minutes. [N.B. After the meeting, it was decided to hold all virtual BSC votes on ALA Connect in order to continue the committee's practice of transparency.]

The minutes of the ALA June 22 and 23, 2018 meetings, the September 20, 2018 virtual meeting, and the December 18, 2018 virtual meeting were approved unanimously without changes.

4. Consent agenda

No items.

5. Updates from the BSC Chair

The chair reminded attendees that February 15, 2019 is the deadline to apply for BSC membership. He reported that, with this appointment cycle, BSC is gradually increasing its membership so that the proportion of BSC members to volunteers in BSC subgroups results in slightly more than half of subgroup membership being BSC members. If you are currently a contributor to a BSC activity and are interested in full BSC membership, it is likely that your application will be approved. Full BSC membership involves engaging with activities beyond those in one's subgroup and, per ACRL, attending the BSC meetings you can. Maintaining volunteer status allows one to focus solely on the tasks of one's subgroup and is also acceptable and very much appreciated. The chair will be asking the heads of BSC subgroups soon to evaluate their group's openings and any anticipated transitions of volunteers to full BSC membership.

The chair also reminded attendees of the new approach to discussing the activities of the Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group (CVEG), which is that issues identified by that group will be discussed in their meeting, rather than at BSC. CVEG co-editor Amy Brown informed attendees that, at this afternoon's CVEG meeting, they will be seeking feedback on their recent Subdivision Policy recommendation and RBMS Controlled Vocabulary Reorganization update. The BSC chair reiterated that he hopes BSC members will comment on the two blog posts and attend today's CVEG meeting.

5a. Library of Congress liaison report (James)

The Library of Congress liaison reported that a products manager, Ivey Glendon, has been hired for Cataloger's Desktop and that the process of transitioning duties to her has begun.

The liaison also reported on an LC Rare Books and Special Collections Division multi-year project underway to retrospectively convert information on the Division's 536,000 catalog cards to electronic catalog records. Establishing new authority records is not part of the scope of the project. See Appendix B for the written report.

6. Experts Directory (Isaac)

The Experts Directory is moving forward. The Web Team recently posted the test form to which 13 BSC members submitted test information. Feedback on the form included possibly expanding the scope of the directory beyond the US by including country in the geographic information, and a suggestion that the moderator send regular invitations to a wide range of e-lists to join the directory and/or update one's information (edits cannot be made directly but can be submitted to the moderator via an email address on the form). The BSC chair thanked Linda Isaac and Ann Myers for their work and called for a volunteer to serve as moderator, effective immediately. Chocolate gold coins were offered as incentive. [N.B. The vacancy has since been filled.]

7. Report of the RBMS liaison to the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) (Moody)

Much of CC:DA's work is on hold until the stabilization of the English-language RDA text in April. CC:DA has a liaison to the North American RDA Committee (NARDAC) and it is recommended that any proposals go through that individual via CC:DA. The CC:DA Virtual Participation Task Force report,

which included a recommendation to conduct a test CC:DA hybrid meeting at Midwinter 2019, was approved. The RBMS liaison, Honor Moody, will report back on its effectiveness in order to inform discussions on hybrid BSC meetings. The Monday Midwinter CC:DA meeting is cancelled in favor of a special session, "A Deeper Dive into RDA," sponsored by members of the RDA Steering Committee. [N.B. It is not clear that the Midwinter 2019 CC:DA meeting tested the hybrid approach. The RBMS liaison will report back on its effectiveness whenever the test does occur.]

8. BSC Program Planning Group (Bychowski)

Introduction of new subgroup

Formed in September 2018, the Program Planning Group (PPG) is charged with coordinating efforts to provide programming on topics related to technical services and cataloging by soliciting proposals and facilitating proposal submissions. The group consists of Brenna Bychowski (lead), Katelyn Borbely, and Francis Lapka. They have met twice, researched related content at recent professional conferences, put out a call for proposals, and compiled a list for discussion of potential programming for the RBMS 2020 conference. The group thanked everyone for their great ideas and stated that they are happy to take more. The PPG has also begun undertaking the task of archiving past programming content that was sponsored or supported by the BSC. See Appendix C for the full report of the Program Planning Group.

The BSC chair noted that very few BSC members volunteered for the PPG and reminded attendees that the group does not give or moderate sessions. Its role is as an incubator: soliciting, providing, and assisting in developing ideas. Ideally, the group would be a balance of four early- and mid-career professionals with some experience in organizing programming. The chair encouraged members to volunteer for the group when spots open in the next cycle.

A discussion on what it means for a conference program to be sponsored by BSC concluded that, if a proposal goes through a process of BSC discussion and voting, it can be considered a BSC-sponsored program. The details of that process are still to be worked out but, for this year's cycle (for the 2020 RBMS conference), the PPG will take feedback on the list of proposals from today's meeting, work with the proposers, and bring more finalized proposals for BSC discussion at Annual. The hope is for the BSC to regularly sponsor a fuller slate of programming than in the past.

2019 Baltimore

Workshop: Introduction to Rare Materials Cataloging for the Non-Cataloger (Tims and Bychowski)

Amy Tims and Brenna Bychowski will be delivering this workshop geared to non-cataloging, special collections practitioners. Since it will be very hands-on, attendance is capped at 20. If there is interest, the presenters are open to running the workshop again and designing it for a different audience and/or material (this workshop focuses primarily on printed books). The presenters will send the workshop description, pasted below, and their draft outline to the BSC e-list and anyone else interested in more information on the content and format. They will also make their slide deck freely available. [N.B. The workshop description and draft outline were emailed following the meeting.]

Workshop description (also available on the conference website at http://conference.rbms.info/2019/program/):

> The library catalog is a ubiquitous and essential tool in any special collections library, but how catalog records are created, what information does (and doesn't) go into them, and the language used to discuss them can be opaque. This can cause confusion, create questions, hinder finding materials, and exacerbate gaps in communication as we all work towards our shared goals of helping patrons (and each other) find and access materials.
>
> The goal of this workshop is to provide an introduction to rare materials cataloging for special collections practitioners who never, or rarely, find themselves creating catalog records. It will provide an overview of the types of information that are included in catalog records and where that information comes from. Participants will learn about common standards used to describe printed materials and about MARC (MAchine Readable Cataloging), the underpinning of many library catalogs. A concluding section will explore the history of cataloging practice and how that affects both contemporary practice and the array of records that practitioners are likely to find in their local catalogs and union catalogs, such as OCLC WorldCat. During hands-on exercises, participants will create bibliographic descriptions for modern and antiquarian materials and learn about the challenges of both original bibliographic description and copy cataloging. Throughout the session participants will be introduced to, in varying depth, AACR2, RDA, DCRM, NAF, LCSH, RBMS Controlled Vocabularies, AAT, MARC, and BIBFRAME, both what they mean and how they are used.

<u>2020 Bloomington</u>

The Program Planning Group led a discussion on a slate of ideas for workshops, seminars, papers/panels, and participatory sessions for the RBMS 2020 conference, the theme of which will be Power, Resistance, and Leadership. See Appendix C for the list of proposals as well as a description of the conference theme. Workshops and seminars are not required to engage with the conference theme, all other formats are.

General comments included 1) determining expertise availability when considering topics; 2) planning long term when possible, for example, rotating through a series of programming on cataloging by format/material; and 3) organizing lightning talks on what people do and how they do it.

Workshop Proposals

1. **Introduction to cataloging non-Roman languages**. Suggestions included 1) broadening the scope beyond non-Roman languages to cataloging languages one does not know and 2) developing professional judgment: the harm of incorrect information, knowing when to stop, determining when to outsource versus copy catalog, determining when to code a record as minimal, and factors to consider before using transliteration tables.

Draft

2. **Cataloging artists' books or unconventional materials**. Suggestions included narrowing the scope to either artists' books or unconventional materials or changing the topic to cataloging realia.

3. **How to put together a cataloging class or cataloging instruction session**. It was clarified that the intent of the proposal ran more toward developing a formal class than training employees.

Discussion on workshops will continue over email.

Seminar Proposals

There was endorsement of all three proposals.

1. **Lessons from the second phase of LD4P and the viability of an RDF-based future for rare materials cataloging**. It was generally agreed that this would be timely in occuring at the end of phase two of LD4P and would be a good follow-up to the 2018 RBMS conference workshop, [Cataloging Rare Materials Using RDF: The Rare Materials Ontology Extension](#).

2. **Culturally Competent Redescription**. The focus of this session will be on controlled language. Suggestions included partnering with the RBMS Diversity Committee; looking at the work of the Society of American Archivists, the Library Company, Amherst College, and the Cataloging and Metadata Management Section (CaMMS) Subject Analysis Committee; examining the choice of names used for peoples; incorporating an action component; and seeking representation and diversity among the presenters. As this topic fits with the conference theme, it could become a papers/panel session instead of a seminar.

3. **Managing in technical services**. All three components of this proposal - managing staff, communicating technical services needs up the hierarchy, and managing projects - received a favorable response. An additional suggestion included incorporating the difference between administration and middle management.

Papers / Panels Proposals

The six proposals were discussed as a group.

1. **Handling biases in cataloging**. This session may be combined with the Culturally Competent Redescription seminar proposal, though having two sessions on ethics in cataloging could also have value.

2. **Backlogs**

3. **Retrospective conversion**

4. **Outsourcing cataloging work**

   5. **Differences between special collections cataloging and general cataloging**

   6. **Special collections catalogers on cataloging as a career path**

There was a suggestion to combine related proposals 2-4 (backlogs, retrospective conversion, and outsourcing). An additional topic was also proposed: cataloging controversial material: how to do so without value judgments and how to support staff cataloging disturbing content.

Participatory Sessions Proposals

   1. **My favorite mistake (and lessons learned)**. There was significant support for this proposal. Observations included that it recognizes the importance of talking about what does not work and that it could be a good introduction to new catalogers. There was a suggestion to broaden the scope 1) from a focus on the individual to include departmental/institutional mistakes and 2) to examine the reality of having to make the best decisions under current circumstances, whether or not these prove beneficial in the future. There was also a suggestion to modify the focus and engage with the conference themes of resistance and continual questioning by highlighting instances in which an institution made the decision to go against standards and the degree to which those actions were successful.

   2. **My favorite (little-known) web resource**. No discussion.

   3. **Topics of conversation between catalogers and non-catalogers**. There was some support for this proposal.

The Program Planning Group was thanked for developing such a robust slate of events for RBMS 2020.

10. Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials) (Copeland)

Copeland gave an update on the project (see Appendix D for the full report), thanked the BSC and others for the close review of examples in the spring of 2018, and requested a BSC review of the introduction and index. The BSC chair thanked the editorial group and stated that he will coordinate the review in February. No improvements on the last review process were suggested. It is anticipated that the resource will go live with one of the later 2019 issues of Cataloger's Desktop.

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

At the September 20, 2018 BSC virtual meeting, there was support for merging *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* (DCRM(MSS)) and AMREMM and investigating the applicability of alignment with RDA. Since this would be a significant undertaking, the BSC chair formed an exploratory group to first evaluate the need for and feasibility of such a resource and submit its recommendations in the form of a white paper to BSC by ALA Annual. Guidance to the group is given in

the BSC chair's document, "Criteria for evaluating a revision or integration of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* and *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts* (AMREMM)" (see Appendix E), which includes instructions to evaluate three issues: patron needs, cataloger needs, and alignments. The focus will be on description, not ontology. Regarding alignments, the BSC chair sees three possibilities: 1) the resource is incorporated into the RBMS Policy Statements, 2) the resource has its own RDA policy statements, or 3) the resource is expressed in another way. Discussion included a suggestion to consider the different traditions of describing pre-modern, early modern, and modern manuscripts in evaluating patron needs. In concluding the discussion, the chair stated that the exploratory group will have full discretion in their recommendations and emphasized the importance of this work, as many repositories are looking to provide better access to their manuscripts.

11. Announcements from the floor

Work has begun by Deborah Leslie and Kim Taylor on a fourth printing, to be published online, of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)* (DCRM(B)). Revision will be based on the list of errata developed as each of the DCRM modules were published, including converting Appendix C from "Core-Level Records" to "Capitalization." A draft will be ready for BSC review by May.

There are two more DCRM(MSS) workshops scheduled. The first will take place April 11, 2019 at the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives conference in Morgantown, WV; the second will be June 7, 2019 in Berkeley, CA for the Society of California Archivists.

Attendees were reminded of the RBMS Technical Services Discussion Group (TSDG) meeting Sunday, taking place at a new time: 2:30-3:30 p.m. One of the agenda items regards a review of the TSDG charge, as all RBMS committees have been asked by the RBMS Executive Committee to review their charge and develop an action plan. Those unable to attend the meeting can email feedback to the TSDG co-conveners, Amy Tims and Whitney Buccicone.

The Houghton Library is looking for a curator of graphic and printing arts. The job announcement is posted online.

The Cataloging and Metadata Management Section (CaMMS) is kicking off an effort to create ethical guidelines for catalogers and metadata creators. A call for volunteers for working groups will be issued shortly. RBMS members are encouraged to apply to provide input from the rare materials community.

The BSC chair gave an update on the BSC charge and action plan. After contributions from BSC subgroup leaders and BSC members, the BSC action plan and revised charge were submitted to the RBMS Executive Committee (RBMS Exec) January 15, 2019. The chair will send the final versions to BSC members. Any flaws in the 2018-2019 action plan can be corrected when work begins in about six months on end-of-year reporting and development of the 2019-2020 plan. Revisions to the charge or its Comment or Coordination sections can also be considered at that time. [N.B. In the RBMS Exec meeting at Midwinter, approval of the proposed BSC charge revision was tabled. BSC must first hold a formal vote on the proposal. Such a vote, preceded by discussion, will take place in a BSC meeting before Annual 2019.]

12. Acknowledgements

The chair thanked Katelyn Borbely, Amy Brown (previously an ex-officio member), Alison Greenlee, and Honor Moody for joining the committee and Jason Kovari and Kate Moriarty for renewing their membership. Linda Isaac and Ann Myers were also thanked for their work on the Experts Directory.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted February 18, 2019 by Kate Moriarty, RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee secretary.

Appendix A

RBMS Policy Statements Summary of Activity Post ALA Annual

In August 2018, a subgroup of the Bibliographic Standards Committee was formed to carry out the task of finalizing the draft RBMS PS for publication in the RDA Toolkit. Subgroup membership is as follows: Amy Brown, Kalan Davis, Elizabeth Hobart, Francis Lapka (BSC chair), Deborah J. Leslie, Michelle Mascaro (editor), Iris O'Brien, Audrey Pearson (keeper of the text), and Amy Tims.

The subgroup had a Zoom call in early October where we discussed the RDA Beta Toolkit and possible strategies for moving forward with revising the existing draft policy statements to be in line with the revised RDA text and redesigned Toolkit.

Since that call, the timeline for the release of the revised stabilized English RDA text has been pushed back once again until April 2019. (This is nearly a year after the RDA Steering Committee's initial target of June 2018.) At the advice of the RSC, the subgroup is holding off commencing revisions of the draft Policy Statements until they have stable RDA text to work with. In the meantime, subgroup members are continuing to familiarize themselves with the RDA Beta Toolkit.

The Policy Statement Examples Group of Ellen Cordes, Linda Isaac, Iris O'Brien, and Catherine Uecker continue to forge ahead with identifying real world examples to accompany the draft RBMS PS. They hope to complete their first pass (skipping non-book sections) in the first quarter of 2019.

Submitted by Michelle Mascaro, RBMS PS Editor

Appendix B

LC rare book info for BSC Midwinter 2019

The LC Rare Book and Special Collections Division holdings are undergoing a retrospective conversion project that will be a multi-year effort. The Division's holdings have only partially been represented online in the OPAC and in OCLC. This project's effort is to convert card information from the divisional shelflist (and other divisional card and book files) to online records. The vendor performing the conversion is LAC Federal. The current staffing of the project is 1 project manager, 1 alternate project manager, and 7 processing technicians.

As in recon of the 1980s, this recon projects involves converting the information on the cards to online data. It does not involve recataloging nor consultation of actual books. In most cases, the staff is updating existing online records. However, they are also creating new records where none are found locally. At a later date, when we have the pre-processing software developed for this particular project, they will also use copy cataloging from OCLC. The standards of the cataloging varies per workflow and has been developed in consultation with the Policy and Standards Division.

The total number of cards to be processed is roughly 536,000.

The Rare Materials Section hired Jessica Zieman in early 2017 to work on this project. Her primary recon work pre-vendor included sampling cards, demonstrating the project to potential vendors, and assisting with developing the workflow document for the vendor. With two other RMS staff members, she reviews the vendor's work, and she now has begun the post-recon rework generated by flags input by LAC Federal staff for known problems (several). This cleanup work also involves other RMS staff and will be another multi-year effort.

Appendix C

Bibliographic Standards Committee
Program Planning Subgroup
Report, Midwinter 2019

In response to comments about the lack of cataloging/technical services-focused sessions at RBMS 2018 and the much-belated conversation about sponsoring proposals for RBMS 2019 (which resulted in one workshop proposal), one of BSC's goals for 2018/2019 is to increase the presence of technical services programming at RBMS 2020. To that end, a subgroup has been created to proactively work toward this increased programming presence. This subgroup consists of three BSC members: Brenna Bychowski (lead), Katelyn Borbely, and Francis Lapka.

The following is a tentative list of topics generated and solicited by the subgroup. We plan to discuss these topics at the Midwinter meeting, so please be prepared to offer feedback and comments on the topic that we and the proposers can use to craft strong proposals. Topics not listed below may also be proposed during the Midwinter meeting. We will then discuss the finished proposals at Annual.

Workshops

- Introduction to cataloging non-Roman languages. Try to get a few language specialists to talk about handling these materials.

- Cataloging artist's books or unconventional materials? (Forgive me if there has been a session like this offered in the past and I missed it. We recently had a few Artist's books at the museum. The unconventional materials stems from this as well. We were sent a tree branch as an artist's book in a plastic bag.)—Suggested by Katelyn Borbely, Katelyn.Borbely@proquest.com

- How to put together a cataloging class or cataloging instruction session. Suggested by Duncan Stewart, duncan-stewart@uiowa.edu

Seminars

- "The second phase of LD4P will conclude at the end of June 2020, so this would be an apt time for a seminar to hear reports from those institutions that cataloged rare materials and special collections as part of their LD4P projects. We would describe the scope of our projects, the workflows we developed, successes and failures, and would take a look ahead to what we see as the viability of and needed developments for an RDF-based future for cataloging to work for our community. The seminar may also include a portion on the developments of the ARLIS-RBMS-SAA Art & Rare Materials Ontology Extension Task Force, and how the ontology was developed as a result of the feedback from LD4P testing." Suggested by Audrey Pearson, audrey.pearson@yale.edu

- Culturally competent re-description: A variation of a session given at SAA, perhaps treating non-archival materials too (see https://sched.co/ESld). This topic might be merged with the

biases in cataloging session described under paper/panels below. Suggested by Francis Lapka, francis.lapka@yale.edu

- Managing in technical services; could focus either on managing staff and communicating technical services needs up the hierarchy or on managing projects. Suggested by Brenna Bychowski, brenna.bychowski@yale.edu

Papers / Panels

- "At ALA Annual in 2017, there was a great session on handling biases in cataloging, especially with regard to subject headings. There was a panel of 4 or 5 people talking about how they have handled things, including one from a tribal library who helped create a local vocabulary."

- Backlogs: "I think dealing with backlogs in special collections without being able to add staff is very much an elephant in the room for cataloging managers and catalogers (I'm both). There are issues of access, ethical considerations for materials, preservation, and what counts as "good enough" cataloging. This also touches on questions of what we are willing to give up / what services we may want or need to let go." Suggested by Beth Shoemaker, elizabeth.shoemaker@emory.edu

- Retrospective conversion: both current, ongoing projects and the results we still deal with from previous projects. Suggested by Katharine Chandler, kchandler74@gmail.com

- Outsourcing cataloging work. "Some questions that could be addressed: Does the number of staff hours put into planning such projects outweigh the benefits of outsourcing? What does a successful outsourcing project look like? How viable are outsourcing projects for special collections with small TS departments?" Suggested by Liz Adams, elizabeth.adams@duke.edu, and Lauren Reno, lauren.reno@duke.edu

- The differences between special collections cataloging and general collections cataloging. What are the different skills, focuses, expectations? How do you make the argument to your administrators that separate experts should be hired for both? OR A panel of special collections catalogers talking about cataloging as a career path: how they got into it, what they love about it, what the challenges are, etc. Perhaps aimed at students/new professionals. Suggested by Erin A Leach, eleach@uga.edu

Participatory Sessions

- My favorite mistake (and lessons learned), a remake of a session given at SAA: "With radical transparency, the bravest [catalogers] ... share their 5-minute stories of error and explain how dumb luck, desperate exertion, or helpful colleagues played a role in fixing their mistake or enduring its consequences." https://sched.co/ESmE. Suggested by Francis Lapka, francis.lapka@yale.edu

- My favorite (little-known) web resource: This session would allow each participant to describe an online resource (preferably of the lesser known variety) that proves particularly useful in the cataloging or interpretation of special collections material. As a secondary benefit, the session could draw attention to BSC's (by then) recently redesigned Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger. Suggested by Francis Lapka, francis.lapka@yale.edu

- Follow-up session to this summer's workshop, with "various topics in each corner of the room such as: recording local data in the catalog, creating rare book cataloging policy, inclusive subject access, adoption of IFLA-LRM into RDA." Or any other topics of conversation between catalogers and non-catalogers that might come out of this summer's workshop. Suggested by Kalan Knudson Davis, kkdavis@umn.edu

General comments

- "Always practitioner focused sessions. Theory and "future" discussions are great, but practical "this is what worked" and "this is what failed" are infinitely useful. Stuff that can be taken back to work and applied immediately to daily work, to workflows, and to policies and procedures."

--

2020 Conference Theme
(see RBMS-L http://lists.ala.org/sympa/arc/rbms/2018-09/msg00013.html)

> Power, Resistance, and Leadership
>
> Building on what RBMS has accomplished in areas of inclusivity, commitment to diversity and building good leaders, the conference will provide opportunities to highlight the good and give participants tools for improvement. "As a profession, we must examine how we can intentionally build leadership that will foster continual questioning and effect transformative change." We hope to explore sessions that practice what we preach, are both inspirational and practical in all areas of our work.
>
> Taking advantage of what our host, Lilly Library and Indiana University Bloomington Libraries, and nearby institutions have to offer, there will be plenty of opportunities for practical, experiential sessions as well.

Preference will be given to papers/panels and participatory session proposals that engage with the theme. Workshops and seminars are not required to engage with the theme.

Appendix D

Examples to Accompany Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)
Status report, January 9, 2019

The editors of DCRM(S) began creating cataloging and compiling examples for an Examples volume in 2008. Over the past year we have made quite a bit of progress and are happy to report that we are close to finishing.

An update:

1. The Bibliographic Standards Committee and some generous volunteers reviewed all of the examples via Google Docs in April 2018. (THANK YOU!)

2. The editors met in July to address the questions resulting from the review; many decisions were made that created a good deal more work. Many comments were recorded in the Google Docs space while others were simply fixed in the actual examples. The introduction and index have been compiled but have not yet been proofed by the BSC.

3. Bruce Johnson, who runs the Library of Congress' Cataloger's Desktop, has retired. He is training a replacement, Ivey Glendon. She will help create shortcut links to DCRM(S), to MARC 21, and to CONSER and will advise us going forward.

4. We are working on the images which need to be saved separately with links within the Desktop.

5. Links between examples (previous, next) also need to be created. This work will be very time consuming.

6. In February, we are hoping that the BSC will have one last look at the examples for any glaring irregularities (not for content).

7. The Index and the Introduction will need to be reviewed by the BSC and corrections and revisions will need to be made.

8. Finally, it will be sent to Les Hawkins, CONSER Coordinator at the Library of Congress, for approval.

9. The DCRM(S) examples will be made available in Cataloger's Desktop in the same form as DCRM(B) examples. A subscription/login will be required to follow the links from the examples to DCRM(S), but the examples themselves (and images) will be viewable in Cataloger's Desktop without a subscription.

Appendix E

Criteria for evaluating a revision or integration of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* and *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts (AMREMM)*

Prepared by Francis Lapka, Jan. 14, 2019

Before charging a BSC group to work on a successor to DCRM(Mss), AMREMM, or both, the Chair would like BSC to further articulate the real needs and imperatives that would drive such development. The DCRM(Mss) editorial team started this review in recommendations shared in the fall of 2018. Additional evaluation should build upon (and refine) those recommendations, and begin to answer some of the questions posed in the same document.

The evaluation may be framed by the following questions (among others):

1. Patron needs: In what ways (if any) do the data produced by application of DCRM(Mss) or AMREMM fail to fulfill patron needs?
   a. Are there data elements in which there's an imperative to record information differently?
   b. Are there data elements (or entities) omitted from the current standards that are needed to fulfill patron needs?

2. Cataloger needs: In what ways (if any) should the scope, content, form, or delivery mechanism of DCRM(Mss) or AMREMM be altered to better fulfill cataloger needs?

3. Alignments: What alignments best lead to fulfillment of patron and cataloger needs?
   a. Would needs be better fulfilled by alignment with the IFLA Library Reference Model? Is there another model (e.g. the CIDOC CRM) that would be more appropriate for manuscript material?
   b. Should a successor standard be aligned with RDA? Aligned and incorporated with RBMS Policy Statements?
   c. Do the existing standards need modification in order to be optimally expressed in BIBFRAME or other linked data applications?

Fulfillment of patron needs should of course be the greatest concern.

In the fall, the following individuals volunteered to further consider the issues of AMREMM/DCRM(Mss) revision/integration: Debra Cashion, Matthew Haugen, Jennifer MacDonald, Michelle Mascaro, Margaret Nichols, Jessie Sherwood, and Brittney Washington. The Chair charges this current group to evaluate the questions above, drafting recommendations for BSC by Annual 2019. If the group concludes that there is warrant to begin a revision / integration of DCRM(Mss) and AMREMM, the group should make recommendations on the fundamental changes needed in the standard(s).

The group may wish to conduct a survey to evaluate current needs, as suggested by the DCRM(Mss) editorial team. To conduct its evaluation, the group may also find it useful to review the draft [BSR for MSS material](#) provided by Alison Bridger and the DCRM(Mss) team.

Draft

Appendix F

Minutes
Bibliographic Standards Committee
Virtual Meeting
Zoom, Thursday, September 20, 2018
2:00 - 3:00 pm EDT

1. Introductions and quick housekeeping (Francis Lapka)
2. Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts) (Margaret Nichols)
3. Standard Citation Forms (Ann Myers)
4. Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger (Matthew Ducmanas)
Appendix F1: "DCRM(MSS) and AMREMM: A Merger Proposal"

Members present: Francis Lapka, Yale Center for British Art (chair); Katelyn Borbely, ProQuest; Amy Brown, John Burns Library, Boston College; Brenna Bychowski, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Kalan Knudson Davis, University of Minnesota; Alison Greenlee, Wayne State University; Elizabeth Hobart, Penn State University; Linda Isaac, Harvard University, Houghton Library; Jason Kovari, Cornell University; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library; Michelle Mascaro, University of California San Diego; Honor Moody, Harvard Library (CC:DA liaison); Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University (secretary); Iris O'Brien, British Library; Brian Stearns, University of Alberta; Amy Tims, American Antiquarian Society.

Visitors: Jeff Barton, Princeton University; Erin Blake, Folger Shakespeare Library; Alison Bridger, Wisconsin Historical Society; Valerie Buck, Brigham Young University; Katharine Chandler, Library of Congress; Abigail Connick, Smith College; Ellen Cordes, Yale University, Lewis Walpole Library; Diane Ducharme, Yale University; Matthew Ducmanas, Temple University; Emily Epstein, University of Colorado Health Sciences Library; Meredith Hale, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Sarah Hamerman, Princeton University RBSC; Matthew Haugen, Columbia University; Sarah Hoover, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; Jennifer MacDonald, University of Delaware; Martha McTear, UC Santa Barbara; Ann Myers, Stanford University; Jennifer Nelson, Robbins Collection, Berkeley Law; Margaret Nichols, Cornell University; Liz O'Keefe, retired; Maria Oldal, Morgan Library & Museum; Audrey Pearson, Yale University, Beinecke Library; Felicia Piscitelli, Texas A&M University; Jessie Sherwood, Robbins Collection, Berkeley Law; Brittney Washington, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas-Austin.

1. Introductions and quick housekeeping

The Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) chair opened the meeting with a few points of online meeting etiquette and a request for attendees to sign in on the online attendance form. Because of technical difficulties, agenda item 2 was moved to the end.

3. Standard Citation Forms

The Standard Citation Forms editorial group (SCF) sought feedback on a new submission form (https://rbms.info/scf/submit/), which would streamline the group's work by automatically populating fields in the WordPress program that feeds the Standard Citation Forms for Rare Materials Cataloging resource.

Changes from the current form include the addition of a second Author field, multiple Notes, Subjects, Reprint, and Supplement fields, and a new Online Version field. The form no longer has the "OCLC # for records in which the bibliography has been cited" field.

There was general approval for SCF to move forward with the form. Suggestions included
- Add introductory text at the top of the form that welcomes the submitter and provides instructions, including:
  - In general, copy and paste information from the OCLC record.
  - If there is no author, type "none" in the required Author field.
- Make the "Notes" and "Subjects" labels singular to match the other labels and avert the inclusion of multiple notes or subjects in the same text box.
- Since editor names are entered in the Author field so that they are indexed, change the field to read: Author/Editor.
- Instead of duplicate fields, present one field with a button allowing the submitter to add text boxes. For example, there would be one Note field, with a down arrow to add more.
- Add more Author fields.
- Explore a sustainable way for SCF to follow up with the proposer following a submission. One possibility is a checkbox on the form requesting a status update. (Formerly, SCF emailed each proposer when their citation was published but the increase in submissions has made that burdensome.)

SCF will make revisions and submit the updated form for BSC approval.

4. Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger

The Working Group for the Review of Web Resources for the Rare Materials Cataloger has transitioned to an ongoing editorial group of two or three members.

The editors submitted two design options for feedback, one in which the resource is embedded in the RBMS website http://rbms.info/testweb-resources-for-the-rare-materials-cataloger/, another in which it is a stand-alone WordPress resource, similar to SCF: https://goo.gl/cmCn7p. It is likely that a dedicated search function would only be possible with option 2, the stand-alone version. Opinion leaned heavily in favor of the stand-alone version for its search capability, esthetics, branding, and ease of updating. The editorial group will move forward with that version.

There was general agreement to tighten the scope of the resource by omitting links to resources pertaining to general cataloging. Further and continued evaluation of the resource's content will resume once the new site is live. As part of its initial review, the Working Group checked the resource for and eliminated bad links, a task that the new editorial group will continue periodically.

2. Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)

In addressing their charge to make recommendations regarding "a future set of rules for describing and cataloging manuscripts," the editors of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* (DCRM(MSS)) sought feedback on their proposal, "DCRM(MSS) and AMREMM: A Merger Proposal" (see Appendix F1). The editorial group recommended that a group of experts integrate DCRM(MSS) and *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts* (AMREMM), and suggested DCRM(MSS) serve as the basis of the standard, adding rules where there is an AMREMM reason to deviate from DCRM(MSS) instruction. There was general agreement on merging the two standards.

As the integration would likely involve making the standard compatible with RDA and incorporating DCRM(MSS)/AMREMM into the RBMS Policy Statements, the BSC chair will charge a group to evaluate the applicability of RDA to describing individual manuscripts. BSC members and non-members interested in serving on the group should contact the chair. The DCRM(MSS) editors suggested that users of DCRM(MSS) and AMREMM be surveyed to determine how many of them have access to the RDA Toolkit.

Before closing, the chair announced that there will probably be one more meeting before ALA Midwinter 2019. The meeting closed at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted September 24, 2018 by Kate Moriarty, RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee secretary.

Appendix F1

DCRM(MSS) and AMREMM: A Merger Proposal

Introduction

The final part of the original charge of the DCRM(MSS) Editorial Team was to make recommendations concerning "a future set of rules for describing and cataloging manuscripts." The charge continues:

Possibilities include: 1) a full revision of AMREMM that incorporates rules for modern manuscripts; 2) a two-component DCRM module for manuscripts (one component that has the same scope as the current AMREMM and a second component that picks up where AMREMM leaves off and covers modern manuscripts).

The DCRM(MSS) editorial team would like to suggest that DCRM(MSS) be combined with AMREMM to produce a single RDA-compliant standard for cataloging all manuscripts, from ancient to modern. The combined document could consist of either an interweaving of the two texts or the presentation of two separate components, one for modern manuscripts and the other for pre-modern ones. We think it would be clearer to have two separate components. Since most repositories contain more modern (post-1600) than pre-modern manuscripts, DCRM(MSS) could be used as the basis of the combined text. A small editorial team could be convened to assess the standards side by side and determine where AMREMM needs to diverge from DCRM(MSS). It should then become clear if the legitimate reasons to diverge, taken together, argue for keeping AMREMM as a separate standard, or whether they can be addressed by a supplement.

Four reasons for this proposed project are: a) AMREMM is now 15 years old; b) both AMREMM and DCRM(MSS) are pre-RDA; c) manuscripts are attracting increasing attention from both researchers and repositories as unique resources that support new directions in research and make an institution's holdings distinctive; and d) combining DCRM(MSS) and AMREMM would give catalogers more flexibility in handling ambiguous cases such as documents and early modern manuscripts.

The introduction to the combined text should acknowledge our considerable debt to Gregory Pass and his collaborators for their trailblazing work in creating the first RBMS standard for describing manuscripts.

The combined text should be produced with full awareness of the ways in which medieval and earlier manuscripts differ from modern ones, both in how they are produced and in how scholars do research on them. Notable differences:

1. As Gregory points out in a recent email, before the printing press, all books in the Western world were manuscripts, "produced in more-or-less standard ways and intended for circulation and use (even if on a limited scale)." The surviving pre-early-modern codex manuscripts are more formal, self-conscious productions than most modern ones.

2. "Scriptorium era" manuscripts have physical characteristics that are important to researchers, but which are not covered in DCRM(MSS), such as prickings, rulings, signatures, hand decoration, and the like.

3. Scholars frequently do detailed textual analysis of medieval manuscripts to determine the order in which different versions of a given text appeared, or to establish an authoritative version of the text. On the other hand, early modern and modern documentary forms such as letters, diaries, etc. are often analyzed more for their sociological or historical content. Then again, detailed textual analysis is also done on modern literary manuscripts, with some of the same aims that scholars apply in studying pre-modern ones.

AMREMM and DCRM(MSS): Differences and Similarities

Some differences:

- AMREMM has a more detailed list of sources of information for the description (AMREMM 0B1)

- Title and Statement of Responsibility: AMREMM requires a note on the source of title and SOR in all cases; DCRM(MSS) requires it only if the title is transcribed.

- AMREMM uses square brackets for devised titles as well as for interpolations in transcribed titles; DCRM(MSS) uses brackets only in the latter case

- DCRM(MSS) gives more detailed instructions on devising titles (AMREMM 1B1.6 vs. DCRM(MSS) 1B), including for specific types of works (AMREMM 1B2 vs. DCRM(MSS) 1B2-5)

- AMREMM includes more instructions for dealing with composite works

- AMREMM uses the GMD (General Material Designation); DCRM(MSS) uses the Material Type element for the manuscript's method of production, etc.

- Edition/version Statement: AMREMM prescribes the use of Area 2 (edition/version statement), though only for cases where there is an explicit version statement on the item

- Place and Date of Production: AMREMM uses the Place and Date of Production area (Area 4) only for literary manuscripts; DCRM(MSS) uses it in all cases. AMREMM uses square brackets for place and/or date if the form they are given in differs from the form used in the manuscript itself.

- Extent: AMREMM includes description of the type of support, e.g. parchment, in the "other physical details" element (300 $b); dimensions are given in mm; in addition to extent, both "other physical details" and dimensions are required elements

- Notes: AMREMM's list of required notes differs from DCRM(MSS)'s. AMREMM also provides for including a note on the item's shelfmark and former shelfmarks in the bibliographic record.

- Appendices: AMREMM includes an appendix on doing analytics, e.g. when it's called for to catalog individually the parts of a composite manuscript.

Some similarities (AMREMM was, after all, one of the sources that DCRM(MSS) drew on):

1. AMREMM and DCRM(MSS) are both structured essentially like AACR2, covering the different areas of description in the order in which the cataloger applies them.

2. Both standards acknowledge that transcription is less straightforward for manuscripts than for books. For instance, both acknowledge that the title may be absent, unreliable, etc. AMREMM notes that spelling was much more variable in the pre-modern period than later, there were copying errors, etc., so exact title transcription can be of limited usefulness. Both standards provide for devising a title or taking the title from reference sources.

3. Both standards have different rules for the title and statement of responsibility of literary manuscripts, of letters, and of legal documents.

4. AMREMM and DCRM(MSS) both instruct the cataloger to normalize place and date of production.

5. Both standards provide for describing the item in detail as a physical artifact as well as an intellectual creation.

Some Remaining Issues

1. We believe that DCRM(MSS) is usable for describing pre-modern manuscripts, provided that it is augmented with provisions specific to those early manuscripts. But will the content of DCRM(MSS) remain the same, or will it have to undergo major changes in order to be RDA'ized like the other DCRM manuals? Will these changes affect its utility for pre-modern manuscripts?

2. How will AMREMM fit in with RDA? Are medieval manuscripts too far removed from bibliographic description to fit in? Actually, this is a concern not just for AMREMM but for DCRM(MSS) too.

3. Who will do the work of revising AMREMM? Are there enough people with the subject/domain knowledge, but also a knowledge of bibliographic descriptive practices? (Note: Jennifer Nelson (Berkeley) is willing to be on the editorial team, and she knows a medieval manuscripts cataloger at Berkeley whom she recommends for this work, too; Jennifer McDonald knows a cataloger at the Schomberg whom she recommends.)

4. How will a revised AMREMM be made accessible to users? Through policy statements only (in which case, the cataloger has to have access to RDA)? As a stand-alone product? Our impression is that In the DCRM(MSS) workshops we've taught, about half the attendees have been archivists, who don't typically use RDA except for access points. (Also, although we can't prove it, we do think that there are people currently using AMREMM who will not have access to RDA, like some of the modern archival catalogers now using DCRM(MSS).) We suggest doing a survey of current users of AMREMM and DCRM(MSS) to determine how many of them have access to the RDA Toolkit.

5. What happens if RDA continues to undergo substantive changes while the combined, RDA-compliant manuscript standard is being put together?

6. RDA is based on FRBR, which doesn't apply well to manuscripts at all. Should we be even trying to shoehorn DCRM(MSS)/AMREMM into RDA?

Draft

Appendix G

Minutes
Bibliographic Standards Committee
Virtual Meeting
Zoom, Tuesday, December 18, 2018
1:00 - 2:00 pm EDT

1. BSC Activity Assignments
2. BSC Membership and Participation on BSC Activities
3. BSC Virtual Meetings for ALA Annual or Midwinter
4. Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group: Charge
5. Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group: Discussions
6. RBMS-ARLIS/NA-SAA Joint TF on Development of the Art and Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension
7. BSC Action Plans

Appendix G1: RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee, Chair's Report - Drafted by Francis Lapka, December 5, 2018

Members present: Francis Lapka, Yale Center for British Art (chair); Katelyn Borbely, ProQuest; Amy Brown, Burns Library, Boston College (Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group co-editor); Brenna Bychowski, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Kalan Knudson Davis, University of Minnesota; Alison Greenlee, Wayne State University; Ryan Hildebrand (ex-officio: Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group co-editor); Elizabeth Hobart, Pennsylvania State University; Linda Isaac, Houghton Library; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library; Honor Moody, Harvard Library (CC:DA liaison); Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University (secretary); Iris O'Brien, British Library; Brian Stearns, University of Alberta; Amy Tims, American Antiquarian Society.

Visitors: Linde M. Brocato, University of Miami (Coral Gables, FL); Courtney Brombosz, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Whitney Buccicone, University of Washington; Valerie Buck, Brigham Young University; Matthew Ducmanas, Temple University; Todd Fell, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Jane Gillis, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Matthew Haugen, Columbia University; Martha McTear, UC Santa Barbara; Ann Myers, Stanford University; Liz O'Keefe; Maria Oldal, Morgan Library & Museum; Audrey Pearson, Beinecke Library, Yale University; Jessie Sherwood, Robbins Collection, Berkeley Law; Brittney Washington, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas-Austin.

Members excused: Jason Kovari, Cornell University; Michelle Mascaro, University of California San Diego.

The chair introduced the meeting by stating that a chair's report was distributed prior to the meeting in two forms: a clean version and a version to which BSC members and volunteers to BSC activities made comments. This meeting's structure directly follows the chair's report, and discussion refers both to the report and the comments. See the clean version of the report, in Appendix G1, for background on each agenda item.

1. BSC Activity Assignments

There was general agreement to continue the use of an annual survey, started in August 2018, to solicit BSC member interest in and assign members to one or two recognized BSC activities. The chair will implement it this upcoming appointment cycle and incorporate a brief description, the approximate number of openings, and contact information for each activity.

2. BSC Membership and Participation on BSC Activities

In order to reduce the BSC's dependence on volunteers (as opposed to committee members), there was general support for a move, starting with this appointment cycle, to gradually grow the size of the BSC and encourage current volunteers to apply for BSC membership, with a long-term goal of reaching approximately a balance of three-quarters BSC members/one-quarter volunteers in BSC activities. The chair acknowledged the vital role volunteers play in BSC work and suggested we recognize them by listing their names on BSC websites.

3. BSC Virtual Meetings for ALA Annual or Midwinter

Roughly two-thirds of those who commented on the chair's report expressed an interest in meeting virtually, probably for the Midwinter meeting; one-third of respondents had mixed feelings. The chair proposed that we schedule a virtual meeting for the ALA Midwinter 2020 meeting and in the meantime strive for continued improvements in virtual meeting procedures and experiences. After Midwinter 2020, we would evaluate the effectiveness of the meeting and consider whether to meet virtually again for Midwinter 2021. Following a discussion on the merits of in-person (effectiveness, collegiality) and virtual meetings (financial accessibility) there was agreement to proceed with this proposal. We have until early 2019, when facilities requests are due to ALA, to change our minds.

It was noted that with an increase in RBMS committees meeting virtually at Midwinter, more and more BSC members attend Midwinter solely for the BSC meeting. However, an observation was made that in-person Midwinter meetings may provide better equity of financial accessibility than in-person Annual meetings since they are held in a wider selection of cities.

There was also discussion of hybrid meetings (an in-person ALA meeting at which some of the attendees participate virtually). The Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) Virtual Participation Task Force recently issued a report that includes exploration of hybrid meetings. One concern raised is the potential creation of two tiers of members: those from better-resourced institutions and those who are not. The CC:DA will conduct a hybrid meeting at Midwinter 2019, after which the RBMS CC:DA liaison will report back on the experience.

4. Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group: Charge

The BSC chair and Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group (CVEG) co-chairs had two recommendations.

Following up on a discussion initiated at Annual 2018, the first recommendation was a revised charge for CVEG (see the chair's report, Appendix G1). The BSC chair explained that the new charge acknowledges the changing landscape for hosting controlled vocabularies and the degree to which the BSC and CVEG collaborate and work together toward common ends. During the discussion, minor changes were made, such as the suggestion to move the final clause, "which serve as an important complement to the descriptive standards developed by BSC," to the "Comments" section of the charge. The amended charge was unanimously approved in a vote of 15 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained:

> Under the aegis of and working in concert with the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee, the Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group maintains the content of and facilitates access to the RBMS Controlled Vocabularies.

If approved by CVEG members, the charge will be submitted to the RBMS Executive Committee. The BSC chair thanked all of those who helped draft the charge.

There was also agreement with the second recommendation, to amend the RBMS manual to specify that the BSC chair serves in an ex-officio capacity on the CVEG and that the CVEG co-chairs continue as ex-officio members of the BSC. It was noted that the ex-officio memberships will contribute to strengthening the relationship and collaboration between the two committees.

5. Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group: Discussions

There was general agreement with the recommendation of the BSC and CVEG chairs to move discussion of CVEG issues from BSC meetings to CVEG meetings. This will provide visitors to CVEG meetings a better forum at which to engage in some of the high-level work of the committee. The change will take effect at Midwinter 2019.

6. RBMS-ARLIS/NA-SAA Joint TF on Development of the Art and Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension

The chair reported that the Joint Task Force's charge has been approved by all three organizations and that a call for volunteers will be issued soon.

N.B. The call for volunteers was issued January 3, 2019 to several electronic lists.

7. BSC Action Plans

We will work on the BSC Action Plan, which will include a revision of the BSC charge, in early January to submit it by the January 15 due date.

Before closing, the chair thanked BSC members and volunteers for engaging actively in the chair's report before the meeting. For others, if this meeting went too quickly, you are encouraged to reach out to the chair with questions.

The chair also reminded attendees that the BSC will be meeting in person at Midwinter 2019 in Seattle.

Draft

The meeting closed at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted January 4, 2019 by Kate Moriarty, RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee secretary.

Appendix G1

RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee, Chair's Report
Drafted by Francis Lapka, December 5, 2018

1. BSC Activity Assignments

In August, the Chair asked all current BSC members to complete a form/survey to indicate the BSC activities to which they were most keen to make contributions. The general plan is that all BSC members serve the committee by making contributions to one (or less frequently two) of the recognized activities of BSC. This idea is merely a formalization of a practice that has been loosely in place already. As intended benefits, this system gives activity leaders a clear sense of who can be called upon to work on a given project; and it gives all members of BSC -- especially new members -- a clear sense of where they can make contributions.

If BSC thinks that this approach is useful, the Chair envisions conducting the survey on a yearly basis, in late spring (after new members have accepted appointment), with assignment cycles to begin following each ALA Annual.

> *Question: Does BSC think that this system for activity assignments is useful? How might it be improved?*

2. BSC Membership and Participation on BSC Activities

From year to year, the roster of BSC members usually numbers about 10 to 16 people. Every year, BSC receives a healthy number of volunteer applicants. During the tenure of the current Chair, BSC has accepted less than half of applicants, in order to keep the committee at its conventional size.

BSC has encouraged those interested in becoming members of the committee to make unofficial contributions to BSC activities, as a stepping stone to membership. It's also true that some members of our community gladly make contributions to BSC activities in an unofficial capacity, independent of any interest in serving as an official member of BSC.

By the Chair's estimate, affiliation of contributors to current BSC activities is as follows* (there are likely to be small errors).

	BSC members	Not BSC members
CC:DA Liaison	1	0
Conference Programming	3	0
DCRM(Mss)	1	5
DCRM(S) Examples	0	4
Experts Directory	1	0
RBMS Policy Statements (including Examples)	9	8
Standard Citation Forms	2	7
Web Resources	1	2

* Numbers for DCRM(Mss) are for the group that is just completing its work. Numbers and distribution for the soon-to-be-formed group tackling AMREMM integration are likely to be similar.

Clearly BSC gets essential help from individuals who contribute without being recognized members of BSC. Do we wish to maintain this dynamic?

The Chair poses the question in part because he perceives that RBMS leadership would prefer contributions to be made in an officially recognized capacity. Are there other RBMS committees that lean as heavily on volunteers?

The Chair notices that at least one or two other RBMS committees are quite large in size (and also make use of sub-groups?). See, for example, the Membership and Professional Development Committee, with about 30 members.

The Chair recognizes that committee size would grow significantly if all or most contributors served as official BSC members. It's also likely that some volunteer contributors are content to participate in a given BSC activity without taking on the more burdensome requirements of full BSC membership.

Potential benefits of a more inclusive approach to BSC membership (with a larger committee) include:
- Full recognition of contributions made, which sometimes is needed to garner institutional support (for time and travel)
- Greater inclusivity may encourage wider interest in BSC activities
- In some cases, participation as a recognized BSC member may lead to greater engagement in activities (compared to unofficial participation)

Question: Should BSC gradually introduce a change of practice whereby most contributors to BSC activities do so as full members of the committee?

3. BSC Virtual Meetings for ALA Annual or Midwinter

The Chair is keen to hear community thoughts on whether BSC should sometimes conduct virtual meetings in lieu of meetings at ALA Annual or Midwinter. Midwinter 2020 is the earliest we might consider such an option.

RBMS leadership welcomes the use of virtual meetings in lieu of in-person meetings at ALA. In an email to arrange scheduling for Annual 2019, the current RBMS Chair said: "I recommend virtual meetings, if they would be sufficient for the work of your committee."

The Chair thinks that these are the primary advantages of in-person meetings:
- Discussions are significantly more effective than in virtual meetings, to the benefit of BSC productivity.
- In-person meetings provide an environment for greater collegiality and community building.
- A 3-hour in-person meeting is tolerable, sometimes fun. A 3-hour virtual meeting would likely be a slog (though obviously we could change the format).

The Chair thinks that these would be the primary advantages of substituting a virtual meeting for an in-person meeting:
- If participants no longer need to attend an ALA conference, there could be multiple benefits, including:
    - savings on the cost of travel and conference registration;
    - reduced environmental impact (conference travel comes with a significant carbon footprint).
- In some cases, virtual meetings present a lower barrier to participation, especially for those with limited support for travel.

At this time, the Chair is skeptical about the logistical desirability of hybrid meetings (in-person meetings with a virtual component).

Question: Should BSC consider virtual meetings in lieu of some in-person meetings at ALA Annual or Midwinter?

4. Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group: Charge

The Co-Chairs of the Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group (CVEG) and the Chair of BSC recently resumed discussion of revisions to the CVEG charge, following initial discussions at Annual. Working together, the Chairs recommend the new CVEG charge below. The revised charge recognizes the changing landscape for hosting and accessing the Controlled Vocabularies and emphasizes the collaborative and complementary nature of BSC and CVEG efforts.

Recommendation: Edit the CVEG charge as follows.

Existing charge, with proposed revisions
Under the aegis of and working in concert with the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC), the Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group is responsible for "Controlled Vocabularies for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloging." The group will develop and maintains the content of and facilitates access to the RBMS Controlled Vocabularies, which serve as an important complement to the descriptive standards developed by BSC.

Clean version
Under the aegis of and working in concert with the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC), the Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group maintains the content of and facilitates access to the RBMS Controlled Vocabularies, which serve as an important complement to the descriptive standards developed by BSC.

Recommendation: Edit the RBMS manual (http://rbms.info/rbms_manual) to specify that the BSC Chair serves ex officio on CVEG, while maintaining ex officio membership of CVEG Chairs on BSC.

5. Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group: Discussions

The CVEG Co-Chairs and BSC Chair propose a modified approach by which BSC (and the larger community) receive updates and provide input on CVEG activities. Such discussions have generally taken place as items on the BSC agenda -- as with the three issues CVEG presented for discussion in BSC's meeting at 2018 Annual. Going forward, the Chairs propose

that these discussions are instead conducted in the CVEG meetings at Annual and Midwinter, whether in-person or virtual. This approach would:

- Provide more time to hear and discuss information about CVEG activity, compared to the time allotted during BSC meetings
- Free up time during (always tight) BSC meetings
- Provide a more rewarding experience for visitors to Annual and Midwinter CVEG meetings, including increased transparency and community engagement

In the approach described above, it would remain necessary for CVEG and BSC to reach agreement on issues that CVEG identifies for discussion. BSC cannot of course vote during a CVEG meeting. BSC would instead explore timely alternative procedures for expressing agreement or requesting further discussion.

Recommendation: CVEG discussions

CVEG will re-frame its Annual and Midwinter meetings to:
- provide updates on current activity
- present recommendations or questions concerning major changes to the Controlled Vocabularies, and solicit input on the same
- provide a general forum for BSC and community input

Discussions of the type described above will generally be removed from BSC meetings, unless needs are identified.

6. RBMS-ARLIS/NA-SAA Joint TF on Development of the Art and Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension: an update (we're getting close)

In late November, the ACRL Board approved the following:

- **Name:** ACRL/RBMS-ARLIS/NA-SAA Joint Task Force on Development of the Art and Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension
- **Charge:** The task force will publish and refine a BIBFRAME ontology extension for the description of special collections materials. The work will build upon the Art and Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension established as part of the first phase of the Linked Data for Production (LD4P) project, 2016-2018.
- **Tasks**:
  - Review initial modeling of the Art and Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension (ARM), and build upon areas for future work identified by the LD4P project. Identify use cases not yet covered by ARM, especially those that may be required for discovery of archival material. Extend and refine the ontology as appropriate.

- - ○ Publish an initial version of the ARM ontology extension, potentially in coordination with the Library of Congress Linked Data Service.
    - ○ Identify long-term strategies and structures for the administration of ARM.
    - ○ Work with the Library of Congress to further define the relationship between the core ontology (BIBFRAME) and the ARM extension.
    - ○ Work with the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) to incorporate ARM into PCC application profiles for the description of special collections materials.
- **Membership:** Appointments will be at the discretion of the ACRL President, in consultation with RBMS, with the task force appointed by Midwinter 2019.
- **Timeline:** The task force will be charged with a term of two years to complete initial project goals.
    - ○ Date interim report is due: ALA Midwinter Meeting 2020
    - ○ Date final report is due: ALA Midwinter Meeting 2021

The Chair prepared the charge and tasks in collaboration with Bronwen Bitteti (Chair, ARLIS/NA Cataloging Advisory Committee) and John Bence (Chair, SAA Standards Committee), with significant help also from our own Jason Kovari (Lead, LD4P Art & Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension, 2016-2018).

The Chair gives warm thanks to Liz Call (RBMS Member at Large) and Shannon Supple (RBMS Chair) for their tremendous help in guiding the proposal through the required RBMS and ACRL procedures.

We expect to make a call for volunteers soon, probably before the BSC virtual meeting on December 18. The call will include instructions on how to volunteer. Appointments should be made by January 2019. The TF will include an equal number of members from each of the three partner organizations.

7. BSC Action Plans

In late June, Shannon Supple (RBMS Chair) included the following in an email to committee chairs:

> To this end [ongoing strategic thinking], I'm asking that all committees (including Exec.) craft an action plan for the work of our committees. See attached for my action plan template -- this is meant to be a guide, so please adjust it as needed. (It is my first-go at trying to give us structure around which we can have more substantive conversations.)

> Deadline: Please be prepared to share your committee's action plan with the Executive Committee by JANUARY 15, 2019. This will give us about 10 days to review them all before the ALA Midwinter meeting begins. (Those of us with long flights will have some reading.) We will include time to discuss the action plans as a collective leadership group during our Exec. meeting at Midwinter.

I'm asking us to look at four areas:
1. Create a current checklist of the tasks your committee does, noting alignment (or not) to your committee's charge
2. Report on activities for the previous year (1 July 2017 - 30 June 2018): What were your objectives and projects? What process did you make and what issues did you face? Please also list the committee chair(s)' and members' names.
3. Action plan! What does your committee plan to accomplish in this coming year, 1 July 2018 - 30 June 2019? Please include committee chair(s)'and members' names.
4. Please assess your committee's current charge. Does it encompass what you do? Are there areas that require revision?

The process in which you do this work is up to you and according to the needs of your committee. You may seek to ask a small group of committee members to draft it and have the whole committee review it. You may write it yourself and then ask for committee feedback. You may write it as a committee online, after a lively conference call with committee members. Etc. I leave it to you to decide how to proceed.

The BSC Chair will develop the action plan in collaboration with the leaders of BSC activities. The Chair will also suggest changes to the BSC charge. All will be shared with BSC (for discussion and revision) as soon as time permits. For now, here is Shannon's template. With help from Brenna Bychowski, this template now includes examples of how sections II and III may be completed (Report on Activities 2017-2018, and Action Plan 2018-2019).