Bibliographic Control Committee Business Meetings
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Meeting #1 Thursday, Feb. 10, 2011, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Members present: Kathy Glennan (Chair), Bruce Evans, Damian Iseminger, Michael Colby, Mark Scharff, Hermine Vermeij, Susan Vita (LC representative), Jay Weitz (OCLC representative), Rya Martin (Recording Secretary)

I. Approval of 2010 minutes: minutes were approved.

II. Welcome new Recording Secretary: Kathy welcomed Jennifer Matthews, the new Recording Secretary, and thanked Rya for her four years of service.

III. Brief reports:
   a) BCC actions taken via e-mail, 2010-2011 (Glennan)
      1. Created a Guide to Cataloging Slot Music based on AACR2 Chapters 6 and 9
      2. Established the SACO Music Funnel with Michael Colby as Coordinator
      3. Authored a Response to Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)
      4. Filled empty subcommittee spots
      5. Responded to Functional Requirements for Authority Data
      7. Appointed various Task Forces and approved final reports
   b) BCC Website (Martin)
      1. URL for BCC website changed during the past year, but MLA Webmaster Jon Haupt globally replaced links and provided redirects to make the process transparent to users.
      2. BCC webmaster now has direct access to BCC portion of website.
   c) Music Cataloging Bulletin (Glennan for Koth)
      1. After 10 years as MCB editor, Mickey is stepping down. During her tenure, the MCB went from a print publication to a web version in 2004, with PDF version added in 2008.
      2. Position has been advertised and candidates were interviewed at the annual meeting. Mickey will work with the new editor during the transition. Send ideas and requests to the new editor.
   d) Library of Congress (Vita)
      1. Music Treasures Consortium site has been launched, with ca. 1000 manuscripts from the British Library, Pierpont Morgan, Harvard, New York Public, Juilliard, and LC.
      2. Ca. 2500 titles in Civil War sheet music collection are being enhanced with historical and music subject headings.
3. There’s a list of new finding aids in News from LC and a push to digitize more finding aids.
4. The website for It’s Showtime: Sheet Music from Stage and Screen just launched, representing ca. 1800 shows and films, most not in the online catalog.
5. Ca. 11,000 records for the Albert Schatz collection of opera librettos have been imported into the online catalog.
6. LC has been encouraged to be the home site for the International Standard Music Number. Sue has detailed a staff member to meet with individual publishers to explore this possibility.
7. MBRS’s National Jukebox website will hold 10,000 pre-1925 sound recordings, including Sony Music, Victor 78-rpm originals.

e) OCLC (Weitz)
1. Jay distributed copies of the News from OCLC.
2. A new membership report on the Geek the Library community awareness campaign is available on the OCLC website.
3. OCLC has released a new user interface for OCLC usage statistics.
4. A March or April release is planned for Connexion client 2.30, which will include: links to RDA Toolkit; change in the 029 field display; language of cataloging searching enhancements; MARCXML import/export capabilities; and an increase in number of batch searches to download. Workforms will be revised to implement the fill character for “no attempt to code”.
5. OCLC-MARC Format Update 2011 will implement elements of MARC21 Update no. 12, plus the 007 fields for kit, notated music, text, and unspecified.
6. Ca. 7 million records were merged in 2010 through Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) processes.
7. Linking ISSN were added to about 800,000 records.
8. About a million provider-neutral records were converted in a continuing process.

f) Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music) (Lorimer)
1. Nancy, Liaison to the DCRM(M), reported that MLA comments on the DCRM(M) and those from the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) overlapped only slightly.
2. Two 8-hour long meetings were held at MLA Annual to review comments, etc. Issues with the glossary were addressed during ALA Midwinter.
3. Any DCRMs still in process would include glosses to indicate points at which RDA would have an impact. Lacking an LC decision on RDA, the resources will need to bridge these two standards.

IV. Brief reports from Subcommittees and Task Force chairs (highlights of issues to be covered in the business meetings)
   a) Authorities (D. Iseminger)
1. Meeting will detail activities of subcommittee members, chiefly reviewing the 38X best practices document.
2. The expression record example document will be discussed in detail.
3. Experiences with the national library’s RDA test will be discussed, with particular focus on works and expressions.

b) Descriptive Cataloging (Scharff)
1. Music issues on the list of deferred issues from RDA will be taken up. They’ll also solicit previously unknown issues.
2. Another discussion topic is how to monitor and recommend changes in a multi-code world, especially if LC doesn’t adopt RDA.
3. Proposed changes to Descriptive’s charge are under discussion.

c) MARC Formats (Evans)
1. Bruce will share reports from MARBI, focusing on an 041 field proposal and a documentation matter regarding the 028 field.
2. They’ll discuss MARC-related issues from News from OCLC and News from LC.
3. Music-related MARC concerns that came out of the RDA test will be discussed.

d) Metadata (Riley)
1. An online metadata clearinghouse is being planned to guide people with understanding and making decisions on non-MARC metadata for music. A survey will be distributed on MLA-L to elicit priorities and comments. The target date for the resource is the next annual meeting.
2. They’re hoping to partner with other groups in MLA on related projects.

e) Subject Access (Vermeij)
1. The group is working in conjunction with the Genre/Form Task Force, especially on the medium of performance aspect.
2. Issues include: where the medium of performance authority records will reside; how they will be dealt with when topical headings; where they will live in the MARC record.

f) MLA-BCC Genre/Form Task Force (B. Iseminger)
1. The Task Force will discuss how to develop the syndetic structure and methods for possibly automating that process.
2. They’ll work on ways to pare down a huge list of new terms and discuss how they should be proposed to LC.
3. Implementation of genre/form and medium terms will be addressed.

g) New MARC formats issue (Glennan)
1. Kathy introduced a topic for Business Meeting #2, a discussion topic from the NACO Music Project open meeting that concerns controlling a list of thematic indexes for use in MARC field 383, numeric designation of a musical work, a new RDA field.
2. Kathy will attend the MARC Formats Subcommittee meeting, where this will be discussed.
3. Mark reported that this proposal grew out of a discussion about whether to put out a new edition of *The Best of MOUG*.
V. Review/update of BCC administrative documents
   a) Administrative Handbook
      1. BCC membership paragraph: Kathy proposed adding the SACO Music Funnel Coordinator and Metadata Subcommittee Chair, as well as the Liaison to CAPC and the Liaison to the ALCTS Metadata Interest Group. All approved.
      2. Removal of first MARC Formats paragraph: All approved.
      3. All approved updating the name of the Metadata Interest Group, which ALA changed from Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group.
   b) Revision of charges
      1. Descriptive Cataloging: consider expanding charge to include LCPS, RDA. Kathy drafted proposed language, which the subcommittee will review.
      2. BCC: Damian and Mark volunteered to examine the BCC charge and draft language to reflect its function within the organization, to adequately reflect the various subcommittee charges, and to explicate those both to members and those outside the organization.
   c) MLA Administrative Structure (on MLA website)
      1. Michael needs to be added as SACO Funnel Coordinator.
      2. Subcommittee chairs were asked to verify members’ term limits.
   d) BCC Procedures Manual (latest update 2/2/11)
      1. Kathy sent BCC members a draft of changes to the manual, creating protocol to cover a member’s inability to attend a national meeting and establishing rules for replacing any member whose service may need to be prematurely terminated.
      2. Kathy’s also documenting changes made throughout her term, which ends in 2012.

VI. PCC training documents – update to Provider-Neutral Guidelines coming (Glennan)
   a) The Program for Cooperative Cataloging’s Standing Committee on Standards is working to reconcile the provider-neutral guidelines with the Electronic Resources BSR.
   b) MLA will be asked to submit notated music and sound recording examples for the provider-neutral guidelines for inclusion in a PCC training document.
   c) Anyone with experience or interest with provider-neutral for music materials is encouraged to contact Kathy.

Meeting #2 Saturday, February 12, 2011, 2:00-4:00 pm

Members present: Kathy Glennan (Chair), Bruce Evans, Damian Iseminger, Michael Colby, Mark Scharff, Hermine Vermeij, Susan Vita (LC representative), Jay Weitz (OCLC representative), Rya Martin (Recording Secretary)

Addition to agenda: Indexing and display recommendations for online catalogs of the new elements in relation to RDA for music
VII. RDA issues (Scharff/Glennan)

a) Living in a multi-code environment (Mark)
   1. Questions focused on BCC’s role in the multi-code environment and whether a proactive or reactive stance for BCC would be more appropriate at this point.
   2. Guidance could come in part from what CC:DA considers to be within its purview. Mark will bring things back to BCC from CC:DA.
   3. If no groundswell for further revisions to AACR2 materializes from those not moving to RDA (should it be adopted), MLA should be forward-looking and not advocate for time invested in the older standard.
   4. The forum for such discussions is the Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee.

b) RDA Music guidelines – MLA’s role? BCC’s role? Access? Content?
   1. BCC discussed at some length the need for a practical resource for people cataloging music in RDA and how BCC could meet that need without conflicting with any policy statements from LC or other groups.
   2. Any guidelines should follow LC’s principle of getting away from case law in policy statements in order to retain the flexibility and room for cataloger’s judgment that are inherent in RDA.
   3. While LC will issue needed policy statements, we shouldn’t assume that they will issue best practices guidelines. We also can’t assume that LC and MLA will always agree on policy and needed revisions.
   4. Kathy will develop a charge for a Task Force that BCC will vet before it goes to the MLA President. The charge will include a list of priorities, which might include workflows for scores and sound recordings and guidelines for problematic areas (e.g., order in access points). The Task Force should recruit members who have real-life experience with RDA.
   5. The MLA Board needs to be involved in this effort. It was noted that this dovetails well with the current MLA strategic planning initiative.

VIII. Indexing and display recommendations for online catalogs of the new elements in relation to RDA data for music (Glennan)

a) We have some best practices guidelines, for example for indexing of the 38x fields, but more work on this is needed. Should BCC charge an internal task force to deal with this issue?

b) The Emerging Technologies Committee is discussing a document that would give recommendations on how OPACs should handle these elements.

c) We have the ability to capture rich data but the systems have not been designed that allow us to fully exploit it. Because of variations among systems, couching our needs in terms of generalizable outcomes and getting public services involvement will lead to better results.

d) Genre/form and medium of performance work is also generating a lot of index changes; this issue is not confined to RDA elements.

e) Jen Matthews will take this issue to Emerging Technologies and express BCC’s openness to cooperating on an outcomes-based document.
IX. Music genre/form discussion (B. Iseminger)
   a) The goal is to create a thesaurus, with all entries having broader and narrower terms.
   b) Next steps for the Task Force include plotting the relationships between existing LCSH genre/form terms by extracting the structure present in authority records, adding relationships as needed, and developing a visualization tool.
   c) The Task Force will take their list of new terms not in LCSH, search them in OCLC for literary warrant, and create SACO proposals or compile a list of recommended additions.
   d) At this MLA meeting, the Subject Access Subcommittee has taken on the work for medium of performance terms, which will be a collaborative enterprise and probably proceed on the same timeline.
   e) In light of questions about where medium of performance will reside in the bib record, Mark and Hermine will discuss how Descriptive can help with this effort.

X. Topics for next year
   a) Program planning
      1. Metadata discussed two potential collaborative projects.
         a. There’s interest in RDA as element set, which could be part of a linked data session. They’ll discuss with Emerging Technologies.
         b. The Preservation Committee is interested in digital preservation efforts, especially at LC.
      2. Genre/Form might present a session on upcoming changes and how various discovery platforms would handle them. Maybe that could be co-sponsored with a public services group.
      3. BCC Town Hall will be an information-sharing session.
      4. There was discussion on how to address the need for RDA training, given that the deadline for conference proposals predates the decision on adoption. A webinar separate from the conference was proposed as a solution.

XI. New business
   a) Revisiting the thematic index issue
      1. Authorities has agreed to start compiling a list of available thematic indexes by mining 667s in old authority records, then using the old LC list and the 1997 bibliography of thematic catalogs to fill in the gaps. That would be the source in the subfield 2.
      2. Descriptive will come up with the concepts in the form of an outcome document and send it to MARC Formats.
      3. Maintenance of the list would have to be determined, perhaps folded into a subcommittee member’s responsibility.

XII. Discussion of appointment recommendations (non-voting members are excused)
Submitted March 25, 2011
Rya Martin, Recording Secretary