

BCC2003/Minutes

Bibliographic Control Committee

Business Meeting No. 1

Thursday, February 13, 2003, 3:30-5:00pm

Austin Texas

Present: Matthew Wise, Chair, Nancy Lorimer, Jay Weitz, Susan Vita, Mark McKnight, Terry Simpkins, Paul Cauthen, Mickey Koth, Kerri Scannell

1. Distribution of Documents
 - a. Matthew passed out the agendas for the business meetings and open meeting, also the current BCC roster, and the calendar for 2003-2004.
 - b. Library of Congress report
 - c. OCLC report
 - d. It was also mentioned that the web site is caught up at the moment.
2. Minutes from Las Vegas meetings
 - a. Sent out by Matthew last week. One correction was made. Send any further changes to Kerri.
3. Report from the Chair
 - a. State of the Website
 - i. Home page is in good shape.
 - ii. Subcommittee pages are vastly different from each other in content and how up-to-date they are. Take a look (yours and others) and talk to Kerri about revisions, updates, etc.
 - What's allowed on subcommittee pages? It is an official MLA site, needs to be sanctioned by MLA, if it is a document. Unofficial documents can go up.
 - iii. Music Cataloging Bulletin back issues.
 - The link currently has only one: January 1997. It was decided to get rid of the link entirely.
 - b. Preview of the open meeting
 - i. Friday at 9:00am
 - ii. Standard setup:
 - Introductions, general announcements, announce the joint subcommittee meetings, Jerry will give a brief update on Music Thesaurus Project Task Force
 - Harriette Hemmasi's presentation
 - Questions and discussion, probably on MLA's role in Metadata.
 - c. Highlights from Board's long-range financial planning meeting
 - i. Matthew attended this meeting and gave the group a summary on what happened. Some of the themes discussed included:
 - Management (external and internal)
 - Development (donors)
 - Membership (dues, etc.)
 - Conference programming process was major discussion.
4. Brief Reports
 - a. Authorities Subcommittee, Terry Simpkins
 - i. Had a tentative commitment from Sherry Vellucci to give a talk, possibly on Metadata or FRBR, but don't know.
 - ii. Subcommittee had some project ideas that may be more appropriate for Descriptive. Matthew suggested the two subcommittee's work together
 - iii. Mickey had a project proposal on MARS to do jointly with MOUG. She is writing it up for Authorities Subcommittee and MOUG board.
 - iv. Had an idea for proposal for expanded notes in public view. (Have to be a cataloger to read 670 notes.) Matthew suggested working with Paul and MARC Formats on this.
 - b. MLA/RBMS Joint Committee on Early Printed Music
 - i. Website will be public in about a month. Rough version of DCRB(M) will be viewable. Comments are welcome.

- ii. Mini-conference will be held at Yale as invitation only.
- c. Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging
 - i. No projects
 - ii. Current work:
 - Conventional terminology still around. Now called controlled conventional terminology. Nancy explained what happened with the various proposals at the recent ALA meetings. Basically, SMDs will be expanded. LC will have to maintain list.
 - Nancy also reported new outlook on electronic resources which is a new ALA task force, the Task Force on the Re-conceptualization of Chapter 9. They will be putting electronic resources in content chapter and taking them out of Chapter 9. Also working with Jay and subcommittee on chapters 5 and 6.
- d. Subcommittee on MARC Formats
 - i. RISM has approached committee, wants to move away from their old format for recording their data to one or more of the current bibliographic standards. Need records that are capable of accepting their current data.
 - Sorting out RISM's needs is complicated.
 - No time table at moment—RISM moves slowly.
- e. Subcommittee on Subject Access
 - i. Planning a program as a pre-conference next year, started off as a SACO program but since it is going through revision, we will be gearing it toward LCSH. MOUG has been approached about co-sponsoring it.
 - Discussing how to include public librarians as well as technical librarians.
 - Several topics can be addresses.
 - Looking into taking advantage of being so close to LC next year, use expertise there.
 - Aspects of the program were discussed.
- f. BCC Website
 - i. Main page is up-to-date.
 - ii. subcommittee pages are as up-to-date as can be found. Need input from the subcommittee chairs for updating.
 - iii. Up dates are happening much faster now than in the past.
- g. Music Cataloging Bulletin
 - i. Working with A-R Editions to get back issues for individuals.
 - ii. A-R is now printing and mailing the MCB.
 - iii. Will be on Ask MLA panel. Will be soliciting contributions to the MCB.
 - iv. LC has been slow reporting Subject Heading changes.
 - v. Publication is changing somewhat.
- h. Library of Congress
 - i. Not much to add to formal report. Mentioned the Morinzsky Theater Project, LC Rule Interpretations, LC has some cataloging vacancies and more will be coming open soon.
 - ii. Since MLA is going to be in Washington, DC area next year, consider asking LC to do things might not normally be able to get done when MLA is in other parts of the country (tours, speakers, etc.)
- i. OCLC
 - i. OCLC Report:
 - Did MARC Format updated for 2002 effective December 1, 2002. Included: unstacked 041, lays groundwork for integrating resources (repeatable 260 field, etc.), new code v in 007 for DVDs subfield e.
 - Jay revised the OCLC Cataloging Electronic Resources Guidelines, it is up on the web and the URL is on the report.
 - Report also includes a large section on OCLC Connexion.
 - ii. Report from Reference are: First Search
 - The direction First Search is moving in is also the direction OCLC as a whole is moving in regarding indexing and display.
 - With new Oracle platform, goal is to harmonize how reference products and cataloging products work.

- iii. Most recent “What’s New at OCLC”
 - Lots of stuff in this report.

Lots of time left, moved on to Saturday’s Agenda:

5. Laura Dankner will be coming on Saturday to discuss budget issues with us.
6. FRBR
 - a. We need to maybe get things rolling for doing a FRBR session at MLA next year.
 - b. VTLS has a “FRBR-ized” product they are trying to promote. Some doubts as to if it is a worthwhile product. Focus Group to look at VTLS Product?
 - c. Could do a program that does not include VTLS. However, is FRBR at a stage that we could present something?
 - i. Discussed possibilities and general knowledge. No one really knows *what* it is. Discussed possibilities for type of program to do.
 - Concepts need to be put into the rules
 - Don’t need a practical demo yet, rules (if done correctly) will take care of it.
 - Forego for now.
 - ii. VTLS will be a commercial program, no need to bring that in. However, BCC needs to keep an eye on the product to see how it develops.
 - iii. More discussion:
 - Can put FRBR documents on web site
 - Avoid forcing people into understanding it is rules will take care of it.
 - No FRBR demo next year.
7. Chair for Authorities Subcommittee
 - a. Invite any potential candidate to come to Saturday’s meeting.
8. Open meeting is tomorrow at 9:00am
9. Meeting Adjourned.

Open Meeting

Friday February 14, 2003 9:00-10:00am

1. Matthew opened meeting and welcomed everyone. Members of the Committee were introduced and the agenda presented.
2. Announcement of Subcommittee vacancies:
 - a. Openings on all subcommittees: please send a letter of interest to subcommittee chairs.
 - b. The process was explained.
3. Announcement of the Joint Subcommittee open meetings:
 - a. There will be two joint sessions:
 - i. Friday, 10-12, Authorities and Descriptive Cataloging
 - ii. Friday 1-3pm, MARC Formats and Subject Access
 - b. Please give us feedback on this format.
4. Music Thesaurus Project Update, Jerry McBride, Chair
 - a. Explained the process the Task Force undertook over the past two years. How they deconstructed LC terms.
 - b. Also explained what they found:
 - i. 734 form/genre headings
 - ii. 550 medium
 - iii. 400 languages
 - c. Many issues were raised and the task force is still discussing these issues and will continue to deal with the various questions that come up.
 - d. This year a similar project is being worked on at Simmons, the data is being coded in XML on a web site. Has 1483 terms total.
 - e. Also this year, the task force further developed the list and dealt with questions that have come up.
 - f. Jerry took questions from the audience.

5. Variations2 Project and Metadata Mapping, Harriette Hemmasi, Indiana University
 - a. Harriette's presentation, "Variations2 Metadata: Why not MARC?", introduced how the project came about, what they have done, how they got started, the metadata structure and the goals for 2002-04. Just in first phase of project. Many changes could be coming.
 - b. This presentation can be found on the Variations2 website at: http://variations2.indiana.edu/html/hemmasi-mla2003/index_frame.htm
6. Questions and Discussion
7. Matthew summarized the past metadata work of the BCC. In Las Vegas, we tried to propose a structure to be able to send representatives out to represent the music needs in metadata areas. Board did not like this idea. Now looking at establishing a new task force to take up this issue.

Business Meeting No. 2

Saturday, February 15, 2003, 1:00-3:00pm

Present: Matthew Wise, Chair, Nancy Lorimer, Jay Weitz, Joe Bartle (for Susan Vita), Mark McKnight, Terry Simpkins, Paul Cauthen, Mickey Koth, Kerri Scannell, Laura Dankner (Guest)

1. News
 - a. MTP Task Force will be discontinued.
 - Group is burned out
 - Discussion on whether MLA should pull out from project, create a new group later, or other options.
2. MLA's role in metadata:
 - a. Matthew summarized BCC activities from the past two years in regard to this area, specifically Brad Eden's group, creating "liaison" positions (not approved), and possibilities for a new task force.
 - b. Matthew has talked to Harriette about metadata possibilities.
 - c. What would a task force do
 - New schema, pulling in elements of various ones
 - A product? Our own spin on existing schemes
 - A standard that will be established
 - Need one group or several?
 - Further discussion: universal schema, one document to take to various groups outline requirements, leave discussion to established groups
 - d. Guest, Laura Dankner invited to speak/answer questions
 - Matthew explained metadata discussion and the past disappointment of not getting liaisons approved that would be un-funded.
 - Laura: a document of product may stand on its own better with the board than people
 - We need to generate a task force to work on this
 - Laura explained boards decision as best she could (not as involved in decision process a year ago), can get more information. Likes the direction we are looking at now.
 - e. Further discussion: work within current BCCstructure; better to call it a working group than a task force.
3. ALA attendance and the 2003-2004 budget request
 - a. Committee was not informed why we got \$2000 cut from budget. Neal Hughes and Matthew had a discussion that helped clarify the issue. We did not spend all the money previously allocated to us.
 - b. Laura gave suggestions, explained budget situation. Promised equitable treatment in budgets for *all* committees.
 - c. Further discussion:
 - Submit *detailed* list of budgets
 - Need more lengthy request
 - d. Laura thanked us for having her at our meeting.
4. Metadata Working Group
 - a. Need one group
 - b. Create a multi-list
 - c. Look into difference between task force and working group

- d. Matthew will contact people about creating a charge
- 5. Back to Budget discussion
 - a. Need to collect an estimate
 - b. Forward tally sheet
 - c. More text, explain situation, our representation of MLA, etc.
 - d. Our other funding goes to MLA, nothing left for ALA
 - e. We do *work* on representative committees, not just passive observers.
 - f. Try to estimate the costs of attending ALA for the open Authorities Subcommittee Chair, even though we don't know who it is yet.
 - g. Registration funding is a separate budget line
- 6. DCRB(M)
 - a. Available for review soon
 - b. We should do 2 reviews
 - c. Timing determined by Nancy's sense of things.
 - First comments (open); poll membership over MLA-L
 - As nears publication, editorial review
 - d. Rough draft will be available to anyone who wants to see it. First review does not have to be first time you see it.
 - e. Estimates: first draft up in a month (roughly), looking for big flaws and conceptual issues.
 - f. Someone in group will have to collect comments, etc. Can't be Nancy because she's on committee.

Formal meeting adjourned, non-voting members excused.

Submitted by Kerri Scannell

Last updated March 14, 2004