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Written Communications

• Currently (or in recent past)
  ▪ Use different email lists
    ○ Core Team
    ○ RSC members only
    ○ RSC members and backups
    ○ RSC members, backups and working group chairs
    ○ Etc.
    ○ Working groups may have their own email lists
  ▪ Use collaborative workspaces
    ○ Now utilizing Basecamp and Google Drive
  ▪ Regular email reminders from the RSC Secretary about meeting agendas, deadlines, etc.
Written Communications

• Future
  ▪ Consolidate RSC email lists, and use them less for official business
  ▪ Instead, rely on collaborative workspaces
    o Use Basecamp’s functionality to
      ▪ Post and comment on issues
      ▪ Plan and archive agendas
      ▪ Set response deadlines
      ▪ Document decisions
    o Use Google Drive for
      ▪ Evolving documents
      ▪ Sharing presentations
      ▪ Etc.
Oral Communications

• Currently (or in recent past)
  ▪ Weekly Core Team virtual meetings and monthly RSC virtual meetings
    ○ Make recordings of these available to the entire RSC for later viewing
  ▪ Annual face-to-face RSC meetings
  ▪ Core Team meetings at ALA Midwinter, ALA Annual, etc.

• Future
  ▪ Phase out Core Team meetings
  ▪ Determine appropriate frequency of RSC virtual meetings
    ○ Continue to make recordings available to RSC members
    ○ Conduct asynchronous multi-day RSC meetings via Basecamp
  ▪ Continue with annual face-to-face RSC meetings
External RSC Communications
Written Communications

• Distribute RSC information via
  ▪ RSC website: http://rda-rsc.org/
  ▪ RDA Toolkit site (as appropriate): https://www.rdatoolkit.org/

• Publicize announcements, new documents, presentations, annual reports, and other useful information through posting to various email lists, including
  o RDA-L, CC:DA [rules] list, PCCLIST, lists for regional groups, etc.

• Sharing information directly with regional groups (currently EURIG, NARDAC, and ORDAC)

• Sharing information directly with affected RSC Working Groups
Oral Communications

• RSC (and RSC-related) presentations at conferences
  ▪ Selected presentations available at
    http://www.rda-rsc.org/rscpresentations
  ▪ When possible, videos are also included
  ▪ Some presentations available in multiple languages

• RDA Toolkit YouTube channel
  https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCd5pa3AoQIrl17wESE9YHcnw
  ▪ Includes videos of Toolkit training topics and RSC presentations
    ○ Not just in English
  ▪ Watch for new content throughout 2019
Proposals to Enhance RDA
Previously...

• Formal proposal process
  ▪ Primarily initiated by constituencies, who wrote a document detailing the suggested changes and providing a rationale for them
    o Constituent groups identified need, reached consensus and submitted a proposal, which included marked-up and clean copy of the affected text
    o All other constituent groups reviewed and wrote formal responses in return
    o Normally discussed (and resolved) at face-to-face RSC meetings in the fall
      ▪ Incorporated into RDA the following April
    o Entire process could take at least one year
Previously...

• Discussion papers
  ▪ For issues that could be resolved in more than one way

• Fast track process
  ▪ For less significant changes (including increasing consistency, additions to vocabularies, etc.)
  ▪ Proposed and reviewed internally by RSC members
  ▪ Folded into RDA on a quarterly basis

• Fast track plus process
  ▪ Something of a middle ground between formal proposals and fast tracks
  ▪ Introduced to accommodate addition/deletion of instructions that needed little discussion
    ○ These were officially out of scope for fast track proposals
During 3R Project

• Formal process on hold
• RSC responded to particular requests, incorporating them when possible
• No formal review by user communities
• Feedback form link in Beta Toolkit
  ▪ Responses shared with RSC; inform Toolkit content and development
• Assignments given to regional groups for development and/or analysis
• Working with an ever evolving text
Post April 2019

• After English text stabilization, many changes still on hold
  ▪ Must allow policy statement writers and translators to complete their work with a stable text
  ▪ Will not accept substantive rewording that would lead to re-translations of existing text

• However, the following types of changes can be made
  ▪ Consistency in wording
  ▪ Correction of outright errors
  ▪ Addition of new condition/option boxes in existing elements
  ▪ Addition of new elements

• Will continue to rely on Beta Toolkit feedback and comments from user communities
Future

• New proposal process needed
• Goals
  ▪ Make major changes/enhancements to RDA quarterly, rather than annually
  ▪ Continue to seek user community feedback, but through a less time-consuming process
  ▪ Rely on regional groups and RSC Working Groups to identify and resolve difficult issues before sending to the RSC for a decision
  ▪ Identify proposed changes that need consultation vs. those that require little discussion
  ▪ Enable RSC members to flag proposals for discussion at face-to-face meetings
  ▪ Make process, proposals, and decisions public
Yet to be Determined

• When does this future process start?
  ▪ Can proposals for change be considered at the RSC’s 2019 meeting and be approved for implementation in early 2020?

• Should the RSC introduce new terminology to replace “Proposal”, “Fast Track”, etc., because there will be a new approach?
  ▪ If so, what terms should be used?

• What are the roles of regional groups vs. RSC Working Groups in the proposal process? In the responses?
Yet to be Determined

• What happens if regional groups or RSC Working Groups cannot reach consensus?
• How can the user communities present coherent change proposals when the new Toolkit is not yet familiar to them?
• Who serves as a gatekeeper if the proposed change is not LRM compatible?
• How will the RSC track and communicate the status and outcome of proposals?
• How will regional groups vet and respond to proposed changes?
What is Clear...

• The RSC needs to update its existing documents in the /Policy series to reflect the post 3R environment and governance changes

• The RSC should provide a template for communities to complete when proposing a new element
  ▪ An update to RSC/Policy/5, Guidelines: proposals and discussion papers; responses to proposals and discussion papers (and Sample proposal)

• The RSC must determine what belongs in RDA itself and what is more appropriate for policy statements

• The proposal process must measure submissions against RDA editorial standards
  ▪ An updated editorial guide will help with this
What is Clear...

• Users have a continuing interest in adding more relationship elements
  ▪ No longer “relationship designators”

• Will have to submit using a proposal process, but these may still be able to be treated as a “fast track” equivalent
  ▪ When proposed, must include the inverse element as well

• Improved treatment of aggregates in RDA will have an influence on what relationship elements are needed
  ▪ A choice could be made to describe the aggregate in detail, rather than creating very granular relationship elements
Questions?