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*Italic denotes agenda items added in the course of the meeting*

1. **Introduction of members and visitors**

   **Members present:** Nina Schneider, Clark Library, UCLA (chair); Marcia Barrett, University of California Santa Cruz; Valerie Buck, Brigham Young University; Jane Carpenter, UCLA (ex-officio: Controlled Vocabularies editor); Ellen Cordes, Yale Lewis Walpole Library; Lori Dekydtspotter, Lilly Library, Indiana University; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, University of
2. Settlement of the agenda

There was some readjustment to the agenda.

- Agenda item 5 (DCRM(M) report) was moved to after agenda item 7 (DCRM(MSS) report).
- Alison O’Dell and Amber Billey’s seminar proposal on linked data was added to agenda item 11.b.2.
- Randal Brandt requested to be added to the agenda to discuss updating the listing of BSC sponsored programs on the website. Brandt was added as agenda item 11.c.

3. Approval of Midwinter 2015 minutes

The minutes were approved pending minor corrections.

4. Updates from BSC Chair

1. The Program for Cooperative Cataloging updated the BIBCO Standard Records (BSR) on April 14, 2015. This supersedes earlier versions. The link to the BSR has been updated on the BSC website (http://rbms.info/dcrm/rda)

2. BSC co-sponsored a virtual Preconference with the ALCTS Metadata Interest Group. The Preconference, titled, “Planning for the Evolving Role of Metadata Services” was held over three days, June 2-4, and was one of the most popular
Preconferences they hosted. There were 81 individuals and 56 group registrations with international participation. A recording is available for a fee, per ACRL’s policy.

3. Jackie Dooley and John Chapman of OCLC organized a meeting during ALA in June, to discuss changes and updates of the way OCLC accepts and displays bibliographic data. During the meeting Jackie suggested that the RBMS community create a forum of some sort to document specific problems with the master record concept and automatic de-duping of records. Specifically, OCLC needs documentation and a record of issues and concerns in order to better meet the needs of the rare materials community. They asked us to document what both catalogers and library users want in their records. Asheleigh Perry (Georgetown University) and Allison Rich (Brown University) have kindly volunteered to explore these ideas on behalf of the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee.

6. DCRM(C): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic) (Brandt)

Brandt reported that everything that the editorial team stated at Midwinter they were planning on doing has been accomplished. LC, CC:DA, and MAGRIT have reviewed the text, and the editorial team is working through the comments. They hope to have the revised text to BSC for review in early August. DCRM(C) already has a 040 code. The team has not yet decided on a cover color.

7. DCRM(MSS): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts) (Nichols)

Margaret Nichols reported that the editorial teams received comments back from LC a couple weeks ago. Reviewing these comments will be the focus of their meeting on Monday. They will also have SAA review the text. Nichols will talk to Schneider about how to possibly do simultaneous reviews with remaining groups.

5. DCRM(M): Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music) (Lorimer)

Nancy Lorimer announced that LC Policy and Standards Division (LC PSD) has passed the DCRM(M) text. CC:DA and MLA simultaneously reviewed the text and gave very thorough comments. These comments have been reviewed and several questions were posed to BSC for comment on the DCRM(M) wiki last month. During BSC review, it was discovered that the DCRM errata text needs to be added to the DCRM(M) text. Deborah J. Leslie of the DCRM Steering Committee has agreed to help. Lorimer hopes to review all the BSC comments by August.

In sum, DCRM(M) is moving closer to publication. They had originally thought to be published last year, which is why DCRM(M) instructions have already been incorporate in the PCC BSR. The cover will be teal.
To conclude the DCRM module reports, Nina Schneider commented that late August/early fall will be busy time for the BSC, and volunteers will be needed to review the text of the DCRM modules nearing publication.

8. Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group (Carpenter/Brown for Hildebrand)

Jane Carpenter reminded the BSC that Controlled Vocabularies is now a separate committee. Ryan Hildebrand is working on thesaurus integration and linked data projects, and Amy Brown is leading the fast tracked project to add scope notes to all genre terms that lack them.

Controlled Vocabularies is now using a discussion blog to post and solicit public comment on proposed scope notes and new terms. The committee met via Blackboard three times this spring to discuss public feedback. Controlled Vocabularies will continue to send reports to the BSC, with the full discussions being viewable on the blog. As a free standing committee, BSC no longer has to formally vote/approve controlled vocabulary terms. Controlled Vocabularies is still experimenting with this new workflow and may continue to make adjustments. There are currently 10-12 people working on Controlled Vocabularies assignments, and the committee is actively looking for new members.

Brown then reported for Hildebrand on the Controlled Vocabularies linked data initiatives. The first step is to integrating all the RBMS vocabularies. This project, including specifically how to handle terms that appear in multiple thesauri, will be discussed during Controlled Vocabularies’ second scheduled session today from 4-5:30 pm. Jason Kovari from Cornell will be at that session to talk about options for releasing the RBMS vocabularies as linked data.

Leslie then asked whether the committee has considered if instead of maintaining separate RBMS vocabularies, energies should be used to integrate the vocabularies with the LCGFT. Brown stated the committee is thinking about this, but has not reached a conclusion. Leslie also suggested that due to the new Ligatus’s Language of Bindings Thesaurus, Controlled Vocabularies consider suspending work on binding terms. Brown responded that releasing the RBMS vocabularies as linked data can help with relating to other vocabularies.

9. Revision of Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging (Barrett)

Marcia Barrett reported that the Standard Citations Forms (SCF) website is up and running and available for use. They have received thirty proposals for new citations, which have been created. The SCF team has tried to respond to all comments and is working with the Web Team on getting usage statistics for the site. Barrett also announced that the SCF meeting for tomorrow has been canceled. The team has worked successfully via conference calls and felt meeting in person at the conference was unnecessary. Schneider formally commended SCF for an outstanding job.

10. CC:DA Report (Haugen)
Matthew Haugen reported that CC:DA has completed their review of DCRM(C) and DCRM(M), and will do same with DCRM(MSS) when it is ready. Prior to the conference he posted to DCRM-L information about two CC:DA RDA revision proposals of interest to the BSC: (1) Sources of statements of responsibility and (2) references to descriptions. The latter is sponsored by the BSC.

Haugen then discussed in more detail the proposal on references to descriptions. The proposal suggests revisions to RDA to accommodate descriptions of referential works, such as Standard Citation Forms. Last year a RDA revision proposal limited referential relationships to “as subjects”, which are at the work level. However, Standard Citations Forms refer to entries within a bibliography, which are at the expression or manifestation levels. The proposal also supports the need to represent inter-WEMI relationships (e.g., Work to Expression, and not just Work to Work or Expression to Expression.) Additionally, the proposal accommodates negative relationships, such as “not in ESTC.”

So far the proposal has received good comments at CC:DA, but will need some revisions before going forward. These changes will need to be made by the end of July. Haugen will post the revision to DCRM-L for comment. Carpenter asked if this proposal will change how the 510 is recording. Haugen stated that if the RDA proposal is accepted that he plans to pursue a MARC proposal to add $2 (source of citation) to the 510 and add a new 510 indicator for not relationships. Brown asked about how these relationships would appear in the BIBFRAME. Haugen answered they would be treated like any other relationship.

Francis Lapka commented that this proposal defines references to descriptions as relationships, not notes. He would like our community to consider whether we should still maintain separate the SCF database or follow one of the RDA approaches for relationships. The SCF entries are very close to authorized access points. Discussion ensued. Barret stated that this change would mean revising 900 citations to match RDA authorized access points. Haugen stated he thinks of the SCF as authorized access points to a slightly different content standard, which could be signified in 510 $2. It was agreed that more time was needed to ingest this idea.

11. BSC-sponsored Preconference programs

Before starting discussion on potential programming for future conferences, Schneider gave a reminder that conference program proposals need to be reviewed and approved by BSC before being formally submitted.

a. (2015) – Oakland, CA

1. Seminar: Successful Technical Services and Public Services Collaboration (Dekydspotter)

Lori Dekydspotter reported that the BSC sponsored seminar that she and Morag Boyd organized was very well received.
Agenda reordering: At this point, the meeting was running ahead of schedule. As one of the presenters of agenda item 11.b was not scheduled to arrive until 10:30 am, Schneider opted to and move on to agenda item 11.c and return to agenda item 11.b after the break.

c. Conference Programming on BSC Website (Brandt)

Brandt reported that BSC has a tradition of documenting the conference programs they have sponsored on their website. However, what is currently on the BSC website has several gaps. If the committee is interested in maintaining this listing, a couple volunteers are needed to gather BSC sponsored programs from the missing years to be added to Website. The other option is for the BSC to take down this page and rely on the archived schedules on the RBMS conference websites. The general consensus of the committee is to maintain and update the BSC conference programs page.

The committee took a 15 minute break

b. (2016) – Coral Gables, FL

1. Workshop ideas (Lorimer and Brandt)

Both DCRM(M) and DCRM(C) have submitted proposals for full day workshops. Lorimer and Brandt gave synopses of their proposed workshops, focusing on specialized elements to their format.

2. Seminar ideas (DeZelar-Tiedmann and O’Dell)

Two potential seminars have been submitted to the Seminars Committee:

“Succession Planning for Rare Materials Cataloging: Challenges and Strategies” submitted by Christine DeZelar-Tiedmann. If anyone is interested in helping with the seminar please contact DeZelar-Tiedmann. She is specifically looking for a potential panelist from a small institution.

“Using RBMS Publications as Linked Data: An Introduction and How-To” submitted by Alison O’Dell and Amber Billey. This seminar will be an opportunity to announce BSC linked data initiatives for Controlled Vocabularies and Standard Forms Citations.

The two proposals are appended to the minutes as Appendix A.

3. Discussion/Interactive session (Leslie)

As a prelude to talking about discussion sessions, Jane Gillis, member of the RBMS Conference Committee, announced that discussion sessions are now being more broadly defined as interactive sessions. Leslie stated that she
and Haugen are working on formulating a proposal for a conference forum on authority work in RDA, focusing on special needs and problems that arise for rare materials catalogers. While the proposal is still in the abstract stage, the structure being considered is for specific problems to be presented to the floor for discussion, working towards community consensus on best practices. One area that they specifically wish to explore is best practices in regards to the 3xx. Forum is a deliberate word choice since the session will be structured a little differently than discussion sessions at past conferences. Haugen added one of their hopes is to develop more formalized practices that will to lead to a seminar on the topic the following year.

12. DCRM Task Force (Lapka)

Lapka began his report with a reminder that the DCRM Task Force will be having its second conference meeting tomorrow 8:30-2:30. In the morning they will be joined by Gordon Dunsire and Kathy Glennan of the RDA Joint Steering Committee.

Lapka then gave a synopsis of the task force’s activities post Midwinter. At Midwinter, the task force envisioned creating both a set of policy statements and workflow for rare materials cataloging that would reside in the RDA Toolkit. In early spring, Lapka started a series of emails, followed by a Skype call, with the JSC to clarify this approach. JSC endorsed the policy statements approach, but not the workflow model. As a result, the proposed workflow has been abandoned, and the task force will focus on creating policy statements.

The task force is continuing to plug along with their review of RDA. Chapter 1 is complete and the task force is well into chapter 2. In addition to the two ALA conferences, the task force is having fall and spring meetings at the Lewis Walpole Library. Lapka formally thanked Ellen Cordes and her colleagues at the Walpole for their support, and the Beinecke for funding food at the Walpole meetings.

Dialogue is also beginning with rare materials catalogers that use RDA but not necessarily DCRM. A symposium on rare materials cataloging will take place in conjunction with the 2015 JSC meeting in Edinburg, Scotland (November 2-6). Schneider and Lapka are co-organizing the seminar with European colleagues, including Iris O’Brien. Details are still being worked out. Lapka clarified that the session will not be a BSC or DCRM event.

O’Brien then announced that she has been approached by UK publishing house Facet Publishing to write a book about RDA and rare materials cataloging. Boyd has also volunteered to help. The plan is to wait to publish until after the RBMS PS come out. There is an assumption the book will be co-published in the US by ALA. Previous RDA handbooks for specialized formats published by Facet and ALA have been MARC focused, which may not be the best approach for this book. O’Brien asked anyone who has specific ideas to email her directly. Leslie recommended that she put a call out on the DCRM-L discussion list.
Lapka also announced that a follow up discussion paper to the British Libraries’ original 2014 discussion paper on reworking PPDM area will come out in either July or August. The task force will discuss it at that time.

Also, since Midwinter the task force has officially decided that their final product will be called RBMS Policy Statements (or RBMS PS).

Matthew Beacon asked what drove to the scheduling of the Edinburgh symposium. Lapka responded that it was community driven. The JSC hopes that the seminar will serve as a mechanism for outreach.

13. Proposal to Explore a Schema for Rare Materials Description (formerly Linked Data proposal) (O’Dell)

O’Dell submitted a proposal to form a BSC task force to identify data elements the rare materials cataloging community needs. Rare materials metadata is very nuanced, and not necessarily supported with current schema (e.g., MARC). The task force would go through DCRM to identify data elements that are needed and look at possible solutions, such as creating an extension to BIBFRAME, or developing our own schema. The task force would last one year. The end deliverables would be documentation of needed elements and a list of potential solutions for the BSC to vote on. There was general support for the task force. O’Dell will work on a task force name and charge for the BSC to vote on after the conference, via ALA Connect. A copy of the proposal is appended to the minutes as Appendix B.

[N.B. The BSC voted to approve the charge of the Task Force to Explore Data Elements for Rare Materials Description via ALA Connect on July 15, 2015. A copy of the charge is appended to the minutes as Appendix C.]

13.5 Consent Agenda

At this point, it was noted that formal ratification of the committee’s vote on ALA Connect to co-sponsor the ALCTS Metadata Interest Groups Virtual Conference did not make it on the agenda. Before moving into the announcements, Schneider called for this vote. The consent agenda was ratified unanimously.

14. Announcements from the floor

Brian Geiger, director of the ESTC, asked to briefly discuss their plans to update the database, including making the ESTC available as linked data and developing a new front end. The goal is to have a beta version of the new front end by Bib Week. The ESTC is very interested in input from the BSC. Leslie recommended that this could be a good DCRM-L discussion.

Jackie Dooley of OCLC Research spoke briefly about the OCLC forum with rare materials catalogers that took place on Friday. The session covered a lot of ground. Dooley reiterated that OCLC is very interesting in having a group to work to open dialogue to
RBMS and BSC. A summary of the OCLC meeting will be posted to DCRM-L for further discussion.

Several open positions were announced.

15. Acknowledgements

Schneider acknowledged members who are rolling off the committee and those who are joining.

New members: Emily Epstein, Amy Tims, and Leslie C. Waggener

Members returning for a second term: Nina M. Schneider, Marcia Barrett, Valerie Buck, Lori Dekydtspotter (one year), Matthew C. Haugen, and Margaret F. Nichols

Members rolling off: Deborah J. Leslie, Michelle Mascaro, and Catherine C. Uecker.

Schneider announced that Buck will be succeeding Mascaro as secretary. Schneider and the rest of the BSC formally commended Mascaro for her service as secretary.

16. Adjournment

Schneider adjourned the meeting at 11:36.

--Respectfully submitted by Michelle Mascaro, RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee Secretary.
Appendix A: Seminar Proposals

“Succession Planning for Rare Materials Cataloging: Challenges and Strategies”
Submitted by Christine DeZelar-Tiedman.

As the “baby boomer” generation of catalogers begins to retire, a wealth of deep knowledge and experience in rare materials cataloging is at risk of being lost. What are institutions doing now to make sure the needed expertise is being passed on to the next generations? What metrics are needed to make the case to administrators to fill vacated positions? How will smaller institutions that may not even have a full-time rare materials cataloger cope? What skill set is needed for a 21st century cataloger?

The session will feature three (?) speakers, offering a variety of perspectives: an instructor of rare materials cataloging, an administrator in a special collections or cataloging department, and a working rare materials cataloger.

“Using RBMS Publications as Linked Data: An Introduction and How-To”
Submitted by Allison Jai O’Dell and Amber Billey

The Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) is working to produce several publications in Linked Data formats, namely: the Controlled Vocabularies for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloging, the Standard Citation Forms for Rare Materials Cataloging, and the relationship designators contributed to RDA (and by extension, the RDA Registry).

These new formats will empower the RBMS community to improve workflows, bolster discovery, and enhance research.

To provide a review of BSC work with Linked Data, and encourage use of RBMS publications as Linked Data, we propose an educational seminar with a three-fold purpose:

1) To introduce these publications and their Linked Data formats
2) To educate the RBMS audience on the benefits of these formats
3) To instruct the RBMS audience on how to engage with the publications

The session content will provide an overview of each publication and the benefits of its new data format, followed by practical (and accessible!) instruction for working with RBMS publications as Linked Data. Examples will include cataloger tasks (e.g., linking to an external authority resource, ingesting contextual information), curatorial tasks (e.g., uncovering related material and collections, building connections and stories via raw data), and user tasks (e.g., discovering special collections material in search engines). We would like to stress that the instructional component will be basic enough for the average RBMS attendee.

The format will be a lecture-style, mini workshop. We prefer Internet access.
Appendix B:

Proposal to Explore a Schema for Rare Materials Description

Submitted 15 June 2015 to the Bibliographic Standards Committee, Rare Books & Manuscripts Section, Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association

Summary
This paper explains the need for a schema to encode description of rare materials. The schema solution is envisioned as a companion to the content standards produced by the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), in order to make this content machine-actionable and meet the discovery needs of rare materials users. A Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) task force is proposed to explore needed data elements and recommend a schema solution.

Background
The BSC is charged with enabling intellectual access to rare materials. The BSC has produced two content standards for rare materials description that reflect the specialized research needs of rare book and manuscript users:

1. Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM): a suite of guidelines for resource description
2. Controlled Vocabularies: a taxonomy of rare materials features and genres, and a vocabulary for indexing these features and genres

The DCRM suite and the Controlled Vocabularies are sophisticated content standards, the use of which produces granular metadata regarding works, editions, and individual objects in many formats. Recent discussions have elicited strong community interest in aggregated, cross-collection access to this metadata.

Several BSC initiatives are underway to ensure that rare materials description is compatible with contemporary data models and technologies. For examples: The Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials Task Force is aligning DCRM with Resource Description and Access (RDA). The Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Group is working to produce the Controlled Vocabularies in Linked Data formats, in support of the Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BIBFRAME). A proposal to the American Library Association (ALA) Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) requests that references to descriptions are appropriately modeled as relationships between resources.

In sum, the BSC supports rare materials cataloging and discovery, and is committed to enabling this activity using Web and Linked Data technologies.

Problem
There is a gap between the granular content within rare materials catalogs and our ability to encode this metadata for machine-action. Among the encoding schemas which RBMS members employ, none fully reflect our content standards, nor the research needs of our users. The MARC Standards and BIBFRAME are designed for general-purpose libraries. Encoded Archival Description (EAD) is designed for archival collections. The Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) is designed for manuscripts. Schema.org’s “Creative Work,” is designed for the commercial sector. Each of these schema options include elements relevant to rare materials description, but none are designed to encode the full content resulting from the DCRM suite and the Controlled Vocabularies.
Without a schema designed specifically for rare materials description, two major problems arise:

1. inconsistent encoding, which diminishes data interoperability
2. high-level encoding, which diminishes discovery of granular content

Examples of inconsistent encoding in the MARC formats include:

- Location & local call numbers
  - 852 ## |a Institutional location |b Collection |c Shelving location VS
  - 099 ## |a Call number
- Subdivision of genre terms
  - Leather bindings (Binding) |z France |y 19th century VS
  - Leather bindings (Binding) |x France |x 19th century VS
  - Leather bindings (Binding) -- France -- 19th century
- Acquisition and provenance notes
  - 541 Immediate Source of Acquisition Note VS
  - 561 Ownership and Custodial History VS o 796/797 Donor notes
- Binding notes
  - 563 ## |a Note |5 Institution VS
  - 59x ## |a Note (for local copy)

The last example above illustrates the problem of high-level encoding:

- Notes
  - 500 (General note) OR 59x (Local notes) VS
  - 5xx More specific note fields

Inconsistent and high-level encoding make it difficult to index rare materials for discovery platforms. The end result is that most discovery platforms fall short of providing access to the granular content of rare materials description, and the desired cross-collection access is severely hindered.

Solution

To encode (and by extension, to build access to) the granular content of rare materials catalogs, the RBMS community needs a specialized encoding schema. A schema designed for rare materials will diminish the problems of inconsistent and high-level encoding. A schema designed for rare materials will enable development of discovery platforms and cross-collection access.

Given the work of the Bibliographic Framework Initiative to transition libraries away from the MARC formats, this is an opportune time to develop a schema solution.

This solution could be executed in several ways:

1. As a standalone schema, produced by RBMS
2. As an extension of an existing schema (e.g., BIBFRAME and/or the RDA Registry), recommended by RBMS
3. As an amalgamation of elements from existing schema, with mappings maintained by RBMS

Communities beyond RBMS will also have an interest in this solution. Likely partners include the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) Rare Books and Special Collections Group, the Library of Congress Bibliographic Framework Initiative, and the RDA Registry.
Proposal
A Bibliographic Standards Committee task force is proposed to explore needed data elements and recommend a schema solution. The task force will be charged with the following:
1. To determine a list of data elements complementary to the DCRM suite, the Controlled Vocabularies, and rare materials user needs
2. To compare this list with existing schema, and to determine areas of overlap and/or need
3. To recommend a schema solution (see the categories above)
4. To seek community partners for this solution

Conclusion
A consistent and granular schema for rare materials description will enable improved discovery of our collections. It will enable the full potential of content built with the DCRM suite and the Controlled Vocabularies. It is the logical outgrowth of these existing BSC standards.

The proposed task force will complement the work to align the DCRM suite with RDA, and to produce the Controlled Vocabularies as Linked Data. Together, these three initiatives will enable machine-actionable data in catalogs for rare materials, and will enable Web-based discovery applications that are appropriate for rare materials users.

BSC Contact
Allison Jai O’Dell
Appendix C

Task Force to Explore Data Elements for Rare Materials Description

Proposal
A Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) task force is proposed to explore and document data elements needed for rare materials description. The task force will convene for one year, concluding its work prior to, and reporting at, the BSC meeting held at the 2016 ALA Annual Conference & Exhibition.

Charge
1. To determine a list of data elements complementary to the Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM) suite, the RBMS Policy Statements for RDA, the Controlled Vocabularies for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloging, and rare materials user needs
2. To recommend solution(s) for incorporating these data elements into library and archives data models, schemata, and tools
3. To seek community partners for these solution(s)

Volunteers
- Allison Jai O'Dell, Metadata Librarian, University of Florida, (task force chair, BSC member)
- Amy Tims, Project Cataloger, American Antiquarian Society (BSC member)
- Arielle Middleman, Cataloger, Library Company of Philadelphia, (volunteer)
- Dot Porter, Curator of Digital Research Services, Kislak Center for Special Collections, Rare Books and Manuscripts, Penn Libraries, (volunteer)
- Linde M. Brocato, Catalog Librarian, University of Memphis, (volunteer)
- Amber D’Ambrosio, Special Collections Librarian and Archivist, Dixie State University Library, (volunteer)