

**Background information for discussion of Agenda Item 16 on BSC Midwinter
Agenda: Formalizing relationship between RBMS/BSC and CC:DA**

Historical background:

Membership on CC:DA (Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access) consists of 9 voting members, 2 interns, 5 *ex officio* representatives, and approximately 30 non-voting liaisons from various ALA and non-ALA organizations, one of which is the ACRL Division CC:DA Liaison.

Early on in the history of this liaison, the ACRL appointing officer would simply make the appointment from among volunteers. However, starting in 2000, BSC began recommending a candidate for the liaison position, who would then be formally appointed by the ACRL President-Elect. Apparently this nomination arrangement is an informal one, with no officially documented selection procedure. ACRL can choose to appoint the BSC-nominated candidate or not.

In addition to Bibliographic Standards Committee of RBMS, the CC:DA liaison reports to several other committees, including SEES (Slavic & East European Section), WESS (West European Studies Section), and AFAS (African American Studies Section). However, traditionally, these units have not gotten much involved with CC:DA issues.

On the other hand, the Bibliographic Standards Committee, which represents rare book, manuscript, and other special collections librarians in all matters involving bibliographic standards for description and access, has worked closely with CC:DA. BSC looks to CC:DA to represent them and advocate for their interests with the Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA, and CC:DA has come to rely on BSC to provide expertise specifically on cataloging and access issues related to rare materials. In addition, the BSC-nominated liaison has traditionally kept those other subject groups (SEES, WESS, AFAS) informed about issues relevant to them.

The issue of improving the composition of CC:DA has arisen in the past, specifically in 2009 when CC:DA was renewing its charge. At that time, the possibility of having RBMS, as representative of the rare book and special collections cataloging community, petition for individual representation was discussed. Would it be acceptable to have one section-level representative (RBMS) and one representative for the remainder of ACRL?

Desirability of formalizing BSC relationship to CC:DA:

Because of RBMS/BSC's interest in helping to develop and formulate bibliographic standards for cataloging rare materials, especially now with the arrival of RDA and the implementation of major changes in cataloging rules and standards; and because CC:DA has come to rely on the expertise of the rare materials cataloging community in order to do its work, it seems appropriate that RBMS/BSC "formalize" its relationship to CC:DA.

Some options:

1) Petition for a liaison to CC:DA from RBMS/BSC

If BSC decides to pursue this option, the committee would submit a petition to the Executive Committee of CaMMS (Cataloging & Metadata Management Section), making the case for being a stakeholder organization that provides unique expertise; see CCS Policy on Eligibility of CC:DA Representatives <http://alcts.ala.org/ccda/docs/CCDAliaisonPolicy.pdf>

Pros:

1. Current CC:DA Chair has indicated support for this option.
2. There is a recent precedent for establishing a new liaison when necessary, with the appointment of a new liaison from SAC; CaMMS Exec Committee seems open to considering new liaisons.
3. If Option #1 is unsuccessful, Option #2 could be pursued

Cons:

1. A dedicated RBMS/BSC liaison might leave other groups (SEES, WESS, AFAS) feeling disenfranchised.
2. Because it's unlikely the CaMMS Executive Committee could change the existing ACRL liaison position, the result of having an RBMS/BSC liaison would be 2 ACRL liaisons: one at the division level, one at the section level.

2) Formalize BSC role in the nomination process of the ACRL liaison to CC:DA

The ACRL liaison would officially come from the RBMS community, nominated by the chair of BSC, and appointed by ACRL President-Elect on that recommendation.

This option was initially suggested by ALA, but I have had no response to follow-up queries on how BSC would proceed.

Additional information:

CC:DA web page: <http://alcts.ala.org/ccda/index.html>

Orientation Document for new members & liaisons: <http://alcts.ala.org/ccda/orientation.html>

ALA Hierarchy:

ALA	ALA
ALCTS (division)	ACRL (division)
CaMMS (section)	RBMS (section)
CC:DA (committee)	BSC (committee)