

RBMS Seminars Committee Meeting
ALA Annual 2016 – Orlando, FL
Sunday, June 26, 2016, 1:00pm-2:30pm
Location: Hyatt Celebration 05

Attendees

Sarah Horowitz (Committee Chair), Elizabeth Call, Ellen Cordes, Jason Dean, Moira Fitzgerald, Lara Friedman-Shedlov, Melanie Griffin, Haven Hawley, Samuel Huang, Melissa Hubbard, Christina Kasman, Cindy Krolkowski, Margaret Nichols, Melissa Nykanen, Allison O'Dell, Greg Prickman, Veronica Reyes-Escudero, Kimberly Tully

1. Call to order

Horowitz called the meeting to order and Nykanen volunteered to record minutes.

2. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves.

3. Approval of minutes of January Midwinter meeting

Midwinter minutes were approved.

4. Changes in committee membership

Horowitz thanked the outgoing members.

5. Review of seminars presented at the 2016 Conference

Attendees discussed the 2016 seminars. Reaction overall was very positive. The scheduling went well and seminar sessions included plenty of time for Q&A. There is interest in a management series based on the soft skills seminar.

It was noted that some seminar speakers had not registered and therefore did not have badges prepared for them. There was also some confusion about whether seminar speakers could attend conference sessions without registering. The manual language has been updated to indicate that seminar speakers need to register to attend sessions other than their own. If seminar speakers do not wish to register, ACRL needs to be notified so that a badge can be provided. Going forward, Seminars Committee liaisons should check in with speakers regarding their intention to register.

Discussion followed on the seminars proposal process. It was mentioned that it can be confusing that the call for seminars proposals goes out earlier than calls for other types

of sessions such as poster and paper sessions, and potential speakers may mistakenly believe that they have missed the deadline for contributing to the conference. Horowitz confirmed that the seminars proposal process cannot take place later in the year due to ACRL deadlines. It was suggested that the call for seminar proposals indicate that calls for other types of sessions would be forthcoming. A glossary could also be included on the conference website that explains the difference between seminars, papers, posters, participant-driven sessions, and any other types of sessions. There may be some language related to this in the conference manual that could be adapted for the website. The website could also include a page on “how to attend the conference.”

A question was raised over whether seminar proposers need to attend the Seminars Committee meeting at ALA Annual to respond to questions regarding their proposal. Horowitz clarified that she sends an email to all proposers to let them know that they are welcome to attend the meeting to present their proposal. If they are unable to attend, she lets them know that she will send them feedback from the meeting and they will have the opportunity to respond to feedback by revising the proposal if needed.

A suggestion was made that the RBMS conference orientation could include information about how to submit proposals for conference sessions. Call will suggest this to the Membership and Professional Development Committee.

6. Review proposed Seminars for 2017 Conference

Horowitz explained that we would discuss each seminar proposal and that proposers would be offered an opportunity to speak about the proposal if they are present.

Proposal 1: Put a Hashtag On It: #LibrariesofInstagram

Dean indicated that this seminar would teach people how to reach a wide audience through Instagram. It would be a hands-on seminar, and would include sections on how to photograph materials and best practices for creating hashtags. Attendees liked the session and the title. Several suggested broadening to other types of social media, or using Instagram as a segue to talk about other types of social media. Photography skills and applying hashtags can be useful in other contexts as well, and the popularity of social media platforms changes over time. Several other suggestions included possibly addressing the following: differences between types of platforms (typical content, audiences), creating a social media plan (such as how often to post), the intersection between social media platforms and other types of platforms (including working with IT departments), collecting or documenting the institution’s Instagram posts, and assessing the impact of social media involvement.

Proposal 2: Solid Foundations in Heavy Metal

Attendees liked that this addressed a music niche that represents a socio cultural movement, and they liked the emphasis on collaboration and the relationship between booksellers and librarians. However, it felt like a case study, and might be better suited

to a short paper. The audience takeaway should be more clear. This could also be a part of the lightning round seminar (proposal 10), if accepted.

Proposal 3: DCRM (MSS)

Nichols elaborated on the proposal and emphasized that this seminar would look at larger issues behind the development of DCRM(MSS), including how to build a bridge between different perspectives regarding materials. She mentioned that a lot of philosophical questions were discussed during the drafting of this standard. One of the speakers is an archivist, and another comes from more of a rare books background. Attendees felt that this conversation has the potential for long-term impact on the field, and would even influence how we count materials, relevant to the current ACRL/RBMS-SAA Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries. Attendees felt that the seminar would need a descriptive title, and that the description should make it clear that this isn't a seminar to teach how to catalog manuscripts. The proposal should also distinguish between this seminar and a future workshop on the topic. This proposal has some overlap with proposals four and ten.

Proposal 4: Cataloging and Description

It was noted that this seminar has some overlap with proposals three and ten, as well as with a seminar given at the 2010 Preconference, "Bridging the gap: Communication between catalogers and archivists."

Proposal 5: The RBMS List

Attendees felt that this would be better suited to a participant-driven session, which could include discussion around all RBMS communication channels in addition to the listserv. A tech-friendly room would be required.

Proposal 6: Every Space is Special: The Art and Science of Pop-Up Special Collections Exhibits

Krolikowski provided additional information. Not everyone has a dedicated space to display special collections materials. Pop-up displays seem simple, but can require a lot of preparation and collaboration with other library departments. This seminar would address principles of good preservation and security as well. Attendees were very interested in this seminar and liked that it has broad appeal. There was some interest in having the seminar address pop-up exhibits outside of the library building as well. A couple of different directions were suggested. The seminar could maintain the focus on pop-up exhibits, but expand to include several other institutions that are also doing pop-up exhibits. Or, the seminar could broaden its focus to include institutions that do have a dedicated exhibit space.

Proposal 7: Data-Driven Practice

Fitzgerald elaborated on the proposal. She mentioned that speakers may include an administrator as well as someone who can speak to the impact of data on public

services. The seminar would address what kind of data to gather and how that data can be used to make decisions. Attendees thought this was a good opportunity to tie into the work of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries, of which Fitzgerald and Hardman are both members. Attendees suggested possible representation from institutions of varying sizes, from institutions testing the new guidelines, and from institutions using systems other than Aeon (in addition to those using Aeon). Other suggestions included addressing how researcher needs are used to inform cataloging and how to conduct usability studies, but it was also thought that those could be separate seminars. Both University of Florida and Case Western were suggested as possible sources for speakers.

Proposal 8: 3D Printing Book History: Extending Bibliographical Pedagogy through Additive Manufacturing

Attendees felt this was a strong, well-thought-out proposal, and many said they would attend this seminar. They liked the potential for collaboration with engineering and science departments. Some thought that the seminar could benefit from another institution's perspective, but they also thought this might be a case where the entire time was needed to address this project and the educational components.

Proposal 9: Advocacy for Financial Resources

Attendees felt that this is an important skill for special collections professionals, that the aspect of addressing ethics was a nice element, and that this builds on the donor seminar from 2016. It was mentioned that this seminar could address the commodification of manuscript collections. Several suggested including a development officer.

Proposal 10: Today's Rare Materials: A 90-Minute Bootcamp on Description and Access

O'Dell provided more information on this seminar. We have robust rules and best practices for older materials, but do we know how to provide access to today's materials? The seminar would involve approximately nine speakers who would each discuss a genre, its access needs, and how that access has been built. Attendees were interested in having another lightning round-style seminar, but suggested that this format and the number of speakers be more clear in the proposal. It was also mentioned that a non-academic library perspective could be included. Attendees also liked that this seminar addressed projects that our departments are creating.

Proposal 11: The Digitization and Accessibility of Latin and Greek Rare Books

Huang and Hawley explained that the program outlined in this seminar proposal touches on themes of alignment with institutional mission, distance education, and deep connections to an academic department. It has involved working with PhD students in classics to translate Greek and Latin descriptions, digitization, and library instruction. The project has been very useful to an annual institute, as well as to faculty and many others. Several attendees indicated an interest in the aligning with

institutional mission and the distance education component, and wondered whether this could be one part within a broader seminar on distance education. On its own, the seminar proposal feels more like a case study and would ideally be broadened to include other institutions. Other possible institutions active in distance education were mentioned, including Penn and the Digital Public Library of America. It was also suggested that a call could be put out on listservs for other institutions that may want to be involved in the seminar.

Proposal 12: Study Abroad

Friedman-Shedlov (who is a colleague of the proposer) mentioned that the proposer teaches a class to library and information science students who go abroad to learn about archival practice in other countries. Another international exchange program that was mentioned is the Mortenson Center for International Library Programs at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, which brings international librarians to the U.S. to study American libraries. Other similar programs include job swap-type opportunities, the Fulbright for librarians program, and curators going with study abroad students to help them use resources in their host countries. Attendees felt that a seminar on this topic could be very interesting. The proposal needs clarity and additional speakers.

Proposal 13: The Future of Bibliographic Data - New Discoveries from the Study of the Oldest Printed Books

Prickman provided additional information about this proposal. The seminar would bring in those working with the databases to talk about how the work is being done and how that applies to other collaborative projects. Funding for travel for the participants has been identified. Attendees found this proposal very exciting and really liked the opportunity to hear from new voices.

Proposal 14: Telling the Special Collections Story: Outreach on the Ground

Call further explained this proposal. It will address the practical ways we are breaking down walls within institutions and how we are bridging differences. A suggestion was made to include the administrative perspective on how to encourage collaboration.

Proposal 15: Collecting in the Heartland: Regional Book Arts

Several attendees liked the regional focus. Attendees felt that the educational takeaway needs to be emphasized, which might be done through the collection development element. It was also suggested to include a component on how to use artists' books in instruction.

Horowitz summarized three additional proposals, which all came in after the deadline, on the following topics:

- Management, building on the 2016 seminar on soft skills
- The newly revised "Core Competencies in Special Collections Librarianship"

- The Digital Atlas of Native American Intellectual Traditions, involving Amherst, Mukurtu, and the Digital Public Library of America

Discussion on the management topic followed. It seems that there is a hunger for information on management for those in different seasons of management. A suggestion was made to bring in someone from outside our professional community to talk about management, but to make sure they are familiar with the work that we do. The ARL Leadership Fellows Program and the Harvard Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians were two suggested sources. DeEtta Jones was also mentioned as a potential speaker.

Horowitz noted that there were no proposals for seminars on teaching/instruction, and few on public services. She asked the attendees to consider putting forward a proposal on these topics.

7. Next steps: timelines and deadlines

Horowitz will send feedback to the presenters, and revisions will be requested by July 15th. The committee will vote on the proposals in mid-August, and titles, speaker names, and seminar descriptions will be needed for ACRL by Thanksgiving.

8. Other business

There was no other business to discuss.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.