Meeting #1 Thursday, Feb. 16, 2012, 11:00 am-12:30 pm

Present: Kathy Glennan (Chair), Damian Iseminger, Mark Scharff, Michael Colby, Bruce Evans, Jenn Riley, Hermine Vermeij, Susan Vita, Jay Weitz, Alan Ringwood, Jennifer Matthews. Incoming members: Nancy Lorimer, Tracey Snyder, Beth Iseminger. 29 guests

1. Adjustments to agenda
2. Kathy Glennan thanked the outgoing members: Mark Scharff for his four years of service as chair of the Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee and Michael Colby for serving as the initial SACO Music Funnel Coordinator. BCC and guests thanked Kathy Glennan for her outstanding service as BCC chair. Kathy also welcomed the new members: Beth Iseminger, incoming BCC chair; Tracey Snyder, incoming Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee chair; Nancy Lorimer, incoming SACO Music Funnel Coordinator.

3. Routine administrative business
   a. Kathy distributed the updated BCC roster, the BCC 2012 calendar, and a list of BCC actions taken via e-mail since MLA 2011.
   b. BCC approved the 2011 minutes as they currently appear on the BCC website.
   c. Minor changes to the various charges and liaison relationships in the MLA Administrative Structure, the MLA Administrative Handbook and the BCC website are needed to reflect name change of CCS to CaMMS (SDC charge; liaison sections for CC:DA, SAC, ACIG) and the similar change in liaison section from “NRMIG” to “MIG”. Kathy will prepare a marked up version of these changes for Beth to forward.
   d. Kathy made an announcement about applications for BCC subcommittees. Applications must be in writing and must be delivered to a BCC member by noon on Saturday. Subcommittee chairs will be available at the Get Involved session Sat. morning.

4. Old business
   a. Kathy reported that the changes BCC approved last year to the Administrative Structure (Corrections to BCC membership paragraph; removing 1st paragraph in MARC Formats charge; updating the ALA acronym for the Metadata Interest Group) had been forwarded to members of the MLA Board in March; however, the actual document had not been updated with these corrections yet. She alerted the MLA Parliamentarian and resent the changes in late January.
   b. Status of possible changes to charges (Descriptive, BCC): Descriptive will take up proposed changes to their charge in their business meeting; BCC will address potential changes to its charge later in this agenda.

5. Brief Reports
   a. BCC actions taken via e-mail, 2011-2012 (Glennan) – Kathy distributed a document listing approvals and actions taken by BCC during the last year.
b. BCC website (Matthews) – Jennifer provided an update on the move of the public BCC to MLA wiki. Kathy and Damian have been assisting with reviewing new site. Jennifer will ask Michelle Oswell if both sites can run in tandem before we make the final switch. The various subcommittee sites will also be able to migrate to the new platform; Jennifer can help facilitate the discussion about how to do this.

c. Music Cataloging Bulletin (Ringwood) – Alan announced that 8 issues have been published over the past year. An index for the 2011 issues and two 2012 issues are online. Alan worked with Michael Colby to identify changes in subject authority records that should be included in the MCB, and he worked with LC to create a more streamlined process for compiling the issues. Alan generated print copies of back issues for MLA archives. Jim Zychowicz showed him how to create PDF docs from HTML docs on the web.

d. SACO Music Funnel (Colby) – The funnel is up and running, with four institutions participating (Bowling Green State, Stanford, UCLA, University of Chicago). Several headings have been approved and three are in process. The SACO-Music Funnel webpage is up on the PCC site (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/saco/Music_Funnel.html). The funnel is using LC’s new submission process. Michael promoted the funnel at ALA. Nancy will succeed Michael as the SACO-Music Funnel Coordinator.

e. Library of Congress (Vita)—For the official report, see http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/MLA2012.doc. LC is strongly focusing on creating more access to collections this month. They have started a retrospective conversion project that should be completed in August. The project involves placing the virtual catalog online—46% of titles scanned are not in database and are unique to LC. There is also a push for more finding aids online. The RIPM project is continuing. Additional projects include: adding subject headings to the Civil War sheet music project; scanning 76,000 sheet music records for the “It’s Showtime” collection; and moving the “American Memory” materials to make them easier to find. “Song of America” is now up and running. LC has acquired more Bernstein letters and more Danny Kaye materials, and they have tripled the size of their Gershwin collection. Everyone was invited to take a look at the National Jukebox collection.

f. OCLC (Weitz)
   ii. As of 2/15, OCLC made a discussion paper available for which they invite comments. The paper, Incorporating RDA practices into WorldCat, is available at: www.oclc.org/us/en/rda/discussion.htm.
   iii. During the month of March they hope to have links from Bibliographic Formats and Standards to the searching WorldCat indexes. Each field will have a link to the corresponding field in the indexes.
iv. Great improvements were made last year in controlling headings in Connexion. Please report any headings that do not control properly. More controlled headings functionality will be introduced later in February.

v. The upcoming version 2.40 will be released in late March or early April. This release will include the following:
   1. The ability to display search results according to GLIMIR algorithms.
   2. New RDA work forms as well as revised existing work forms.
   3. Changes to the various dropdown boxes

vi. OCLC is working on MARC 21 update #13 that was published in late September. They hope to have that installed before end of June. The big changes in this update are the addition of the 264 field and the 34X fields (several of these relate to music)

vii. OCLC has developed a new platform called OCLC WorldShare.

g. Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music) (Lorimer)
i. Nancy provided an update on the current status of DCRM(M) from ALA Midwinter. New draft will be available shortly. Edits include:
   1. Changes from input streams from BCC and RBMS and others.
   2. DCRM editorial guidelines have changed as well.
   3. Replacing the term music with resource.
   4. Area 5 was rewritten to separate single volume resource from multi volume.
   5. The Glossary was completely revised.
   6. Alternate rules for catalogers using DCRM(M) with RDA have been incorporated where necessary. ISBD Area 5 still needs RDA additions.
   7. Jain Fletcher rewrote all the rules governing the transcription of parallel language information.

ii. The RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee agreed to the changes, although they will not be helpful to other DCRM projects.

iii. Timeline: This version could be finalized by fall of 2012, though it might be delayed by RDA. The group continues to search for examples. They may have to make up examples, since finding specific cases has proven difficult.

iv. MLA should do another review, though it does not have to be as intensive as the previous review. Further discussion about BCC’s role in responding to the latest draft will be part of the 2nd BCC business meeting at this conference.

h. RDA Music Revisions Facilitation Task Force (Yusko/Freeborn)—just met this morning. [Feb. 16, 2012] This seven-member task force, representing three different JSC constituencies, (LC, MLA/ALA, CAML/CCC), was charged in October 2011 to identify known RDA music issues, prioritize them, and assign them to one of the three constituencies for proposals to resolve the issue. They have identified 48 separate issues and ranked them as either high or medium priority. During this morning’s meeting, they examined a list of 22 high priority music issues. The list also included music cataloger’s high-priority concerns as well as three issues from 2010. The results of Feb. 16’s meeting were: 18 issues/actions examined and constituents and
methodologies were assigned for Task Force members to track. There were four issues from Chapter 2, two issues from Chapter 3, eleven issues from Chapter 6, and one Glossary issue. The Task Force will use the BCC wiki to track their work for proposals and discussion. The Task Force will have proposals ready for the JSC’s November 2012 meeting.

i. Emerging Technologies & Services (Matthews)—
   i. Group membership has changed slightly. Current members: Nara Newcomer (leader), East Carolina University; Rebecca Belford, University at Buffalo; Deb Kulczak, University of Arkansas; Jennifer Matthews, University of Notre Dame; Misti Shaw, Depauw University; Kimmy Szeto, SUNY Maritime College.
   ii. The first draft of the document was distributed for comment Nov. 16, 2011 with comments due Dec. 5 (via MLA-L only).
   iii. The second draft was distributed Feb. 9, 2012 with comments due Mar. 16 with wider distribution to related lists: OLAC, IAMCL, NGC4LIB, AUTOCAT, metadata librarian’s list, ILS lists, etc.
   v. The final version is scheduled for finishing in mid-April for approval at the MLA Board May/June meeting. Also the group is investigating publication in Notes along with a companion website, with document and extra features, such as sample mappings, listings of people willing to be contacted per their usage of certain products/features, evaluations of particular tools against the document, etc.
   vi. Future: promotion of the document to vendors and the library community at large.
   vii. Presentation of the document as part of an Emerging Technologies and Services Committee program in Dallas.
   viii. Already have reports of people using the first draft to help them configure systems and advocate for needs posed by music materials; student at IU is planning a project this spring to evaluate Blacklight against the document.
   ix. Nara Newcomer particularly wants to thank the BCC for their comments. The BCC has been very helpful and the Music Discovery group welcomes your continued feedback.
   x. One final note: the group has identified problems for discovery by deficient metadata recording/encoding throughout the document, and discusses future possibilities. The document does not give extended solutions (since focus is discovery, not data recording/encoding), but the group is happy to give input on related areas from a discovery perspective.

6. Brief Reports from Subcommittee and Task Force chairs (highlights of issues to be covered in the business meetings)
   a. Authorities Subcommittee – The Authorities business meeting will end with a joint meeting with the Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee. Agenda items include:
      i. Highlighting RDA decisions made recently.
      ii. PCC decisions that will be affecting the use of the LC/NACO Authority File.
      iii. Other issues that arose during this meeting.
iv. Music authority training for RDA.


b. Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee – This meeting will include:
   i. Developments from the JSC and related discussions from Midwinter.
   ii. RDA 7.24: is the subcommittee finished with this?
   iii. Sources of information proposal, any further thoughts?
   iv. Revising charge.
   v. Discussion about CC:DA Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3
   vi. Assist with developing RDA vocabularies for music.
   viii. Ideas for future meetings

c. MARC Formats Subcommittee – The agenda involves:
   i. MARBI activity from past year, including the successful proposal for medium of performance field and for source of thematic index number.
   ii. The future of MARBI, especially in relation to the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative.
   iii. MARC news reported from OCLC and LC.
   iv. Other issues that may end up as MARBI proposals.
   v. The 13 digit ISMN: can it work like the ISBN does?

d. Metadata Subcommittee – There will be a large turnover in membership in 2013, so the group needs to do some planning for that. The subcommittee is open to new members this year. They are attempting to put together a music metadata clearinghouse, with a goal of finishing this spring. They need to figure out how the clearinghouse will be maintained over time.

e. Subject Access Subcommittee
   i. The agenda includes:
      1. Medium performance and how it relates to genre/form.
      2. Working list of agreed-on medium terms from LC.
      3. LC discussion papers:
         a. Vocal music terms.
         b. Role of speakers, dancers, and other “non-music” performers.
         c. Functional requirements of medium performance.
   ii. Hermine extended an invitation to attend the “What it is!” program session after this meeting.

f. MLA-BCC Genre/Form Task Force – The task force will discuss issues that arose during the creation of their genre hierarchies. They will also discuss next steps, including creation of genre/form authority records.

g. RDA Music Implementation Task Force (Mullin) – The task force will review their charge and members. Casey has charted out which RDA rule numbers would be most relevant
to their charge, and the group will be making some preliminary decisions. The group also will decide how they will liaise with other subcommittees and groups and how they will organize their work in the areas identified on the wiki.

7. Approval of latest update to BCC Procedures Manual (latest version 1/12)—BCC approved the Jan. 2012 version of the BCC Procedures Manual. Major changes included: adding a table of contents, updating links and statements, add NACO funnel coordinator (non-voting), and moving SACO Music Funnel coordinator to non-voting.

8. Discussion of potential changes to BCC charge (Glennan)—Kathy led the discussion of the proposed changes, drafted by Damian and Mark. The changes are mostly wordsmithing and do not address the broader issues of non-descriptive metadata and archival materials. BCC agreed to make this incremental change in the charge with the idea that additional changes will be needed as the cataloging environment continues to change. BCC approved the revised charge as written. Kathy will add these changes to the marked up copy for changes to the Administrative Handbook, etc. for Beth to forward.

Meeting #2 Saturday, Feb. 18, 12:30-2:30 pm

Present: Kathy Glennan (Chair), Damian Iseminger, Mark Scharff, Bruce Evans, Jenn Riley, Hermine Vermeij, Susan Vita, Jay Weitz, Alan Ringwood, Jennifer Matthews. Incoming members: Nancy Lorimer, Tracey Snyder, Beth Iseminger. 13 guests

9. RDA Issues
   a. RDA training plans—brainstorming (all)—MLA 2013 will offer a unique opportunity for in-person RDA training. BCC discussed:
      i. The potential focus of the training:
         1. Authorities, especially as they relate to music
         2. Complex descriptive issues
         3. Public service implications.
      ii. When to offer it:
         1. Training – preconference vs. program session – or both?
         2. RDA for public service librarians – program session, maybe plenary?
      iii. How to structure a potential preconference:
         1. Several at the 2011 RDA preconference felt that 8 consecutive hours of training was too much.
         2. Could structure as a presentation followed by breakout sections for smaller group discussions. This would require attendees to do some work ahead of time, such as participating in the online NACO training.
      iv. Who to partner with:
         1. Training - MOUG, NMP, MLA Education Committee/Educational Outreach Committee, MLA Program Committee, the MLA Convention Managers (especially in relation to finding space), PCC?
         2. Public service aspect – MLA Public Services Committee, MLA Education Committee/Educational Outreach Committee, MLA Program Committee
v. What content/delivery is best for in-person vs. webinar training
   1. Training is possibly more effective in a webinar setting; should focus on
      understanding and comprehension of RDA in face-to-face training.

vi. How to move this initiative forward:
   1. To pull off a preconference, especially once that is coordinated with
      other groups, planning must start quickly.
   2. There are two aspects to the planning: logistics and content.
   3. Remember that honoraria for outside speakers must be requested as
      part of the MLA budget process.

vii. Alternatives to in-person training:
   1. Webinars.
   2. Off-the-grid discussions at MLA 2013 (say an RDA Chapter 3 dinner
      discussion).
   3. Recording of the preconference itself.
   4. Remember that whatever is offered in person will not serve all
      interested MLA members (not all attend MLA, not everyone will be able
      to attend a preconference).
   5. Whatever training is developed should be able to serve outside of the
      2013 meeting in some fashion.

viii. Next steps:
   1. BCC endorses pursuing in-person RDA training in 2013
   2. Beth will discuss the possibilities with other groups (MOUG, NMP
      Advisory Committee, MLA’s Education Committee).
   3. BCC will consider forming a training task force for this initiative at a later
      date.
   4. Preconference proposal should be finalized no later than May

b. Moving proposals forward (Scharff/D. Iseminger)
   i. Joint Authorities/Descriptive proposals need to be finished by May 1 if possible,
      so they will be ready for CC:DA in time for ALA Annual.
   ii. There will probably be 3 proposals; these can be modeled on past MLA
       proposals, which are available on the CC:DA website. BCC voting members will
       be asked to review and approve each proposal before it moves forward.
   iii. Beth will notify the Board of these proposals after BCC approval and will offer to
       share them, in order to keep the Board aware of BCC’s work.

c. RDA-related resources to be maintained (all)
   i. The Types of Compositions for Use in Music Uniform Titles website, currently
      maintained by Michelle Koth, could still be useful with RDA, although it will
      need updating to make it RDA compatible. This issue should be reviewed after
      the Library of Congress issues their discussion paper on RDA 6.15.1.5 Preferred
      title is not distinctive, since they are interested in eliminating the use of
      cognates in creating authorized access points. (There will be an opportunity for
BCC to comment on this paper.) If the workload for updating the Types document is too burdensome for the Authorities Subcommittee, BCC could appoint a short-term task force instead. Casey Mullin, chair of the RDA Music Implementation Task Force noted that they need to know what the high level decision is.

10. PCC updates & incorporating MLA feedback (Glennan)
   a. Kathy mentioned the importance of engaging music catalogers in the current PCC initiatives, such as the PCC Acceptable Heading Implementation Task Group’s call for comments on handling subfield $c in personal name headings (due date 2/29/12).
   b. There needs to be some sort of formal or informal way for MLA to be involved in commenting on PCC documents. It’s important to have an official voice for the “music community” in the review of such documents. BCC agreed that we need to have a role in this. Since there are no official lines of communication between MLA and PCC, Beth will take the lead in identifying PCC documents for BCC discussion. Beth will issue an immediate call for comments on the acceptable headings document.
   c. Mark Scharff, as the NMP coordinator, may also collect comments separately from the NMP Advisory Committee and/or the NACO music participants as a whole.

   a. The genre/form task force agreed that seeking out technical advice is an important next step in their work. Rather than spending time discussing how to convert topical headings to genre/form and medium headings, it would be better to ask for help from those with more experience with these kinds of projects. Jay Weitz recommended several people at OCLC who might be helpful with this process, including Robert Bremer, Jean Godby, Rebecca Dean, and Matt Montgomery. The task force will also consider how to work with other systems vendors and will also work with LC in this process.
   b. The medium of performance project will need new MARC authority fields for medium of performance. The bibliographic 382 field does not map to a set of authority fields currently. The MARBI proposal will be a joint effort between MLA and LC.

12. Topics for next year
   a. Issues arising out of chairs breakfast—Although it was not directly stated, MLA continues to look at ways to make the conference smaller and more flexible. BCC will continue to consider ways of having a smaller footprint at the annual meetings, such as shared business meetings similar to what Authorities and Descriptive did at this conference. While BCC already conducts quite a lot of business online (via email and the BCC wiki), we should consider additional options for conducting business outside of face-to-face meetings. Some possible solutions would require technical support that MLA does not yet provide (such as web meeting software).
   b. Program planning
      i. BCC discussed having a public services related RDA session, along the lines of “what does RDA mean for the public services person?” Pursuing this as a program would benefit from partnering with another MLA committee such as the Public Services Committee. The session could address creative ways to use
RDA data to benefit users. Consider talking with Matthew Wise who is working with music discovery on the Semantic Web.

ii. Another angle that could be included in such a session is what the Music Discovery Requirements mean for public services. BCC could partner with the Emerging Technologies & Services Committee on this.

iii. Would it be possible to offer this as a plenary? Would there be a way to incorporate linked data into the discussion?

iv. Also refer to relevant sections in 9.a. of these minutes.

13. New business
   a. Response to draft 2 of Music Discovery Requirements needed (due date 3/16/12). Beth will start collecting comments for an official BCC response.
   b. DCRM(M): BCC will watch for the announcement about the release of the latest draft and should be prepared to review it.
   c. The Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee approved changes to their charge, but without a copy for BCC review, a vote to approve their changes will need to take place via e-mail after this conference. If voted on promptly, this could be put forward as part of the changes to the administrative charges after this meeting.

At 2:00 pm, the Committee went into executive session to discuss subcommittee appointments.