From the Chair

Ruthann McTyre, University of Iowa

Leslie Troutman, 1957-2003

On May 18th, 2003, Leslie Troutman died after battling cancer for over a year. Reprinted here, with the kind permission of Richard Griscom, is the obituary he wrote, marking her death and celebrating her life.

"Leslie Troutman spent her entire career as a music librarian at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where she was appointed to the library faculty in 1987. As user services coordinator, she built a national reputation for the library's reference service, and she served as a mentor to dozens of music librarians who received their initial training from her while library students at Illinois.

"In her work at the University of Illinois Music Library, Leslie was refreshingly unpretentious and unflappable. Her sense of humor was generous and uninhibited, and following her departure from the library late in March 2003, those of us who worked with her had to adjust to the absence of her laugh echoing down the hallway outside her office. The Music Library staff found inspiration in the seriousness with which she approached her reference work and the care she took with patrons. She pursued difficult questions to extraordinary extremes and provided a community patron looking for the sheet music to "Anything Goes" with the same service she extended to a senior member of the musicology faculty or an undergraduate theater major. Her tenacity and her egalitarianism at the desk served as a model for our library staff and set the tone for our library's public services.

"We will remember her most of all for her healthy positivism in the face of illness, her gratifying lack of pretension, her good humor, and her exemplary librarianship. These qualities are her legacy to us, and we will do well by keeping them in mind and heart as we continue to go about our work."

Leslie will be remembered as someone who radiated joy and humor and grace, which shone even more during her illness. She took delight in her family, friends, colleagues, and work, and she instilled delight in all of us. She was a teacher and a mentor to the end. We will miss her.

Second MOUG Distinguished Service Award Winner: Judy Weidow

At its 2003 annual meeting, the MOUG Executive Board named Judy A. Weidow as the second recipient of MOUG's Distinguished Service Award.

Those who presented Judy's name in nomination called her "a quiet but persistent supporter of MOUG since its inception" and cited particularly her contributions as editor of The Best of MOUG from the 3rd edition (1989) through 7th editions. Another nominator characterized this book as "an invaluable resource [for determining] uniform titles for prolific composers." In concurring with the nominations, a member of the Executive Board called Judy's work on The Best of MOUG both "exemplary" and "not sufficiently recognized." The Board hopes with this award to redress to a small degree this lack of adequate recognition.

Judy presently serves as Head Librarian, Music Cataloging Unit in The General Libraries at the University of Texas at Austin. She received the B. Mus. from North Park College in Chicago, the M. Mus. from University of Illinois, and the MA in Library Science from Rosary College.

Congratulations, Judy!
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The Music OCLC Users Group is a non-stock, nonprofit association organized for these purposes:

1. to establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC products, systems, and services and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users;

2. to encourage and facilitate the exchange of information between OCLC and members of MOUG; between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general between members of the Group and appropriate representatives of the Library of Congress; and between members of the Group and similar users' organizations;

3. to promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards; and

4. to provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group.

MOUG MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.
MOUG's First 25 Years: Memories and Experiences
Judy Weidow, University of Texas at Austin

Note from the Editor: The speeches at this past February's MOUG 25th Anniversary Luncheon at the Austin meeting were so enthusiastically received that we received numerous requests to reprint them in the Newsletter. We are delighted to comply, and thank their authors, Judy Weidow and H. Stephen Wright, for graciously sending us their texts and allowing us to reprint them.

An old man frequented the Austin Public Library some years ago. He persistently pestered the librarians whenever he ran across something in the catalog that he felt was not cataloged quite right. As they got to know him, they discovered that he was a retired cataloger who had spent some years at Columbia. As he was reared in Texas, he returned to Texas when he retired. (Sometimes keeping a Texan out of Texas is about as hard as keeping a librarian out of libraries and bookstores). The librarians suggested to him that he might want to volunteer in the cataloging dept. He considered this for a moment and said, "Do they use computers up there?" When they said yes, he replied, "Well, I won't use anything but a pro quill pen!"

When I got my masters degree in music during the last century, in the late 1960s, I was faced with figuring out what I wanted to do with my life. The dialogue went something like this: What kind of job can I get where I don't have to listen to piped-in music all day (Muzak was ubiquitous at that time) and where I won't have to sit in a cloud of smoke all day (there were no restrictions on smoking in those days and everybody smoked. I was already an ex-smoker). Finally a flash of inspiration came to me. You should work in a Library!

One day after my inspiration, I was having lunch with a friend, and I told her I was thinking about going back to school to get a library degree. She said, "Oh, I have a friend who was a librarian and she recently retired. Why don't you give her a call?" Well, I called her and she told me that she couldn't think of a better job than working in a library. I was living in Chicago at the time, and my choices of library schools were Rosary College and the University of Chicago. I asked her which she thought would be the better school. She said, "Well, the University of Chicago is giving all those silly computer courses, which I think is just a waste of time. You'll learn a lot more about working in a library if you go to Rosary!"

So off I went to Rosary. I didn't go to library school so that I could be a music cataloger. I didn't even know what a cataloger was. I went to library school so I could work in a Library and avoid Muzak and smoke. Rosary had some required cataloging courses. I remember walking into my first cataloging class in the fall of 1972. There we all were with our brand-spanking-new 1971 editions of the Anglo American Cataloging Rules and the teacher (who was about 80 years old) came into the class, all flustered, and said, "I just found out that these cataloging rules are out of date. The Library of Congress is getting ready to institute something called ISBD! I am going to have to learn everything right along with you!" Wasn't that just the perfect introduction to cataloging? You just think you're getting it down and they come along and change the rules! One of the great challenges of cataloging is keeping up with all the rule changes.

Rosary turned out to be a good choice after all. It had a great course in Music Librarianship which was taught by Don Roberts, who was already head of the Northwestern University Music Library. I spent many wonderful evenings learning about the mysteries of music librarianship in the presence of one of our best.

I graduated from Rosary in 1973, only to find out there was a glut of librarians and the job market was very tight. I was sending out applications all over the place. Don called me one day and asked me if I could help them out with their scores reclassification project. During the 1970s, many libraries were converting their collections from Dewey to LC call numbers. Ahh, the '70s! OCLC was just figuring out how to share cataloging with other institutions within the state of Ohio. The rest of us had electric typewriters and lots of whiteout. I spent two wonderful years at Northwestern learning about cataloging music and working on reclassification while sending out job resumes. Reclassification at Northwestern consisted of pulling the scores off the shelves, pulling the complete card sets out of the card catalog, assigning an LC number, erasing the old Dewey numbers from the cards (we had lots of electric erasers for this!), typing the new numbers on each card, putting new numbers on the scores, proofreading all of this, reshelving the scores, and refiling the cards. Card sets of two or more cards were tied together with thread wrapped through the holes and tied with just the right knot. This required a staff of about five. How does this compare with how we change call numbers now? Now we go to the computer, delete the old number, put in the new number, wait for the label to print out, find the item and slap on the new label! God love those computers!

I finally got a "real" music cataloging job at the University of Texas at Austin in 1976. By this time I had decided I really liked cataloging. On my first day of work, I was shown to a desk with my new electric typewriter, my Anglo American Cataloging Rules, my new Chapter 6, which incorporated ISBD punctuation, a set of the Library of Congress National Union Catalog for Music and
Phonorecords (which consisted of copies of Library of Congress catalog cards), and something called MARC Format. By this time, OCLC was expanding nationally and UT was, at this point, using OCLC for monographs. The MARC Format for Music and Phonorecords was still being hammered out by a task force. We were not cataloging music on OCLC until the MARC format for music became available. That was OK by me and I was happily typing up my work forms and turning them over to in-house card production.

Now, let's put 1976 in context. There were no personal computers, no online catalogs, no e-mail, no World-Wide Web, no compact discs, no video recorders, no thematic index for Telemann and no helpful books for music catalogers such as those current standards by Richard Smiraglia, Jay Weitz and Ralph Hartsock.

My introduction to computers (since I was so smart, and didn't go to a library school that wasted time with computers) was learning how to search on one of the five or six OCLC terminals in the cataloging department. In the late '70s, the response time was so slow, we would take a book or newspaper with us to have something to do while we were waiting for OCLC to respond to a command. There was lots of down time. Most of the department's major work on OCLC was scheduled for before 8 and after 4, when response time was better, due to lower demand on the system.

Searching was only by derived key searches (4,3,1 for personal names; 4,4 for name titles, 3,2,2,1 for titles). Uniform titles were not indexed. 028s were not indexed. Qualifying by type (score or recording) and date was not available yet. Now imagine, if you will, and some of you remember this, searching for a Haydn symphony! Hayd,sym? Now imagine doing this on a slow computer. You wait and you wait and you wait. Then you got lots of screens. If I remember correctly, the truncated entries did not have much information. It was author-title-place (not publisher)-date. Sometimes the search was too big for the system to handle. In the beginning there was only a 256-record limit. This is why there were a lot of duplicate records in the early days. If the system couldn't handle the search, you just had to put in another record. By 1980 the limit increased to 1500 and qualifying searches by date and format became available. It was much better, but it still didn't solve all our problems. One library (Rice University) did a study of searching for a score of Haydn Symphonies no. 1-12. The score had no date. They had to resort to Hayd, Symph/aco. This retrieved 751 entries. After 83 separate commands over a period of about 40 minutes at 7 PM on a Friday evening, it was determined that there was no record in OCLC for this score.

I attended my first MLA meeting in 1977. It was in Nashville. We all went to the Grand Ole Opry that year! One evening there was a meeting, led by Lenore Coral, which was for persons interested in discussing the formation of an organization of music users of OCLC. The thought put forth was, who better can communicate the needs of music catalogers in a bibliographic utility than the users themselves? Believe it or not, this was a novel idea at the time, this being the dawn of technology. In fact, as far as I know, we were the first users group. There was a Music OCLC Task Force in place, headed by Karl Van Ausdal, which had been charged with creating the MARC Format for Scores and Sound Recordings. Members on that Task Force included Mary Lou Little and Olga Buth. Having completed their charge, the plan was for a Music OCLC Users Group to take over the tasks of implementing, refining, and, most importantly, helping with instructions and handling the questions of catalogers, such as myself, who were beginning to apply the format. This was pretty much raw format. I remember the first instructions being very sparse, and being extremely puzzled when I first began trying to apply the format. Now we have instructions nearly three inches thick. Well, it started out with just a few sheets of paper.

Karl van Ausdal put out the first MOUG newsletter and organized the first MOUG meeting, which preceded the MLA meeting in Boston in 1978. Karen Hagberg, from Eastman, was elected the first president; Karl van Ausdal became continuing education coordinator, and Olga Buth, former task force member, who had just left Ohio State for a job at the University of Texas at Austin, was vice-chair. Karen soon moved into another job and resigned shortly after being elected. Olga took over as chair and appointed Ralph Papakian as vice-chair. Olga took off running and for the first few years of MOUG, Olga was the driving force behind it. Those of you who remember Olga know that she was no shrinking violet. She was perfect for the job. Olga had a two-track mind, and those tracks were photography and music librarianship. I have to say she had a strong influence on me in both directions. She was forceful, opinionated, and had a way of getting things done. She had a lot to do with getting MOUG off the ground and setting its course. I remember walking into her office and finding her on the phone with the newsletter editor, "Now Pam, we've got to get this newsletter out now!" And sometimes in need of articles she would tell me, "Judy, we need an article for the next newsletter. Go write an article!" The first newsletter editor was Pamela Starr from Wisconsin/Madison and the next co-editors were Ralph Papakian and Sue Stanciu. The newsletter quickly became a major source of news and information for music catalogers. From the very beginning, it was a terrific source of practical information.
The highlight of the first meeting was an informal open forum question-and-answer session with Karl and representatives from OCLC. Helen Hughes was appointed to be the first OCLC liaison to MOUG. This was the beginning of a 25-year dialogue between music librarians and OCLC.

The second meeting was held at OCLC in 1979, and it featured tagging workshops. These tagging workshops would become a major part of the meetings for several years. This was the primary source for learning and getting answers to our struggles in coping with the format, as it took years to get good documentation for music.

A hot topic at the meetings through 1984 was, When in the world was LC going to adopt the MARC format for music? MARC tapes for music were not loaded until December 1985. This was seven years after the formation of MOUG. In the meantime, our access to LC cataloging was through microfiche, the National Union Catalog, and for some of us, proofs of LC catalog cards.

By the San Antonio meeting in 1980, music librarians' voices were being heard at OCLC, and OCLC was addressing our problems. MOUG members were learning their craft and building their skills. Robert Cunningham, music cataloger at Smith, became the first Quality Control Librarian at OCLC; Glenn Patton, Fine Arts Librarian at Illinois Wesleyan, was conducting tagging workshops. Glenn became our second chairperson. OCLC recognized talent when they saw it, and they quickly snapped him up and put him in a position as Instructional Coordinator in the Cataloging Section of their User Services Division. David Knapp took over as chair. Richard Smiraglia was digesting music cataloging at the University of Illinois, and he took over the position of Treasurer. I was learning how to be a trainer for AACR2 (AACR2 was implemented on January 2, 1981) and tending to my first local arrangements.

The hot topic in 1980 was a retrospective cooperative project for cataloging music materials. The aim of this project was to clean up the database, which had a large number of pre-MARC records, and to fill in large gaps in bibliographic records. A part of this project would allow certain libraries to "enhance" records in the data base. This project, under the able leadership of Ruth Henderson, City College of New York, and later by Richard Jones (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee) eventually became known as REMUS. This was the seed project that helped lead to enhance capabilities for music, and eventually the need for a cooperative authority file which evolved into the NACO-Music Project. The retrospective conversion project finally got underway in 1984 after enhance participation became a reality. In June 1988, Indiana and Eastman began submitting NACO records to the online authority file through the NACO-Music Project, coordinated by Ralph Papakian.

In 1981 music reference librarians began to share reference uses for OCLC, and MOUG began to include reference sessions at annual meetings.

The hot topic in 1981 was the impact of AACR2 on records in OCLC. AACR2 rules called for major changes of many composer's names and uniform titles. OCLC ran a massive automated conversion of them. It was an awesome effort for 1981 and it was brilliantly executed, but it left a lot a cleanup, much of which fell on the shoulders of Robert Cunningham, and then on Jay Weitz. Jay took over the quality control position as well as the position of MOUG liaison in 1982. In pre-enhance days, one of the ways quality control was achieved was by change requests submitted by users to OCLC, which were then filtered to Jay. Part of Jay's OCLC report to users included the number of months' worth of change request backlog. This was eventually whittled down to weeks.

In the year 1984, a desktop Apple computer quietly appeared in the Tech Services Department at UT. We all stood around it in wonder and circled it, wondering, "What are they thinking?" and "What possible use could we have for that?" Well, I soon found a use for it! That year I was elected treasurer of MOUG. The previous treasurer, Joe Scott, University of Connecticut, had boldly set up the books electronically using a Wang computer. I thought this to be a good idea, since I was calculator-challenged (we did have calculators in 1984). So there I was, with an incompatible program, pacing back and forth in front of that Apple, which had all of two programs: Word and Excel. There were maybe two people in the whole building that knew anything about computers. I found somebody to show me how to turn it on and get started and get into programs, and they handed me the manual and said, "Good luck!" I went to the stacks and looked through the computer books. I found something that showed me how to set up a financial program using Excel, and the next thing you knew, I started pecking away at the thing. I came up with a crude, cumbersome program, but it worked! I was so thrilled! I felt sorry for the poor treasurer who followed me. I think they were able to find a better program by then.

We did not have an online authority file until September 1981, when the LC name-authority file became available. It came online with a search limit of 256 records. Well, you can imagine how helpful that was! As the size of the name authority file increased, by 1983 the inevitable happened. Bach exceeded the 256 record limit and we lost access to him in the name authority file. Scan searching
was not available yet. We searched the authority file by
derived key for the composer, “bach,joh,s.” There were no
uniform title x-references. You paged through and hoped
you could hit on the uniform title you were looking for. In
those days, you prayed you could hire music majors, and
preferably graduate music students, as student workers.

The first inkling of anything resembling the Best of MOUG
appeared in the November, 1983 newsletter. Phil
Youngholm of Connecticut College published a list of all
LC AACR2 uniform titles for Vivaldi instrumental works
in the online Name Authority File, along with uniform
titles established as part of a project called the Vivaldi
project. This was a group of volunteers who were assigned
a section of the OCLC database of Vivaldi uniform titles in
order to update them to AACR2 form. This was still pre-
enhance, so all the changes were sent to Jay Weitz for
updating. Poor Jay spent a lot of his time updating uniform
titles in his first years at OCLC. In 1984, a frustrated user,
Anne McGreer of Indiana University, published in the
newsletter a complete list of Bach uniform titles with
authority control numbers which she had retrieved
from the LC MUMS database. Soon after, lists appeared
for Mozart and Schubert as they exceeded the 256 record
limit.

Word quickly got around that MOUG was publishing these
lists in the newsletter and non-MOUG members began
ordering back issues of the Newsletters so they too could
have the lists. In 1986, the board decided to compile the
lists that had already been published, along with several
new lists, and make it available for purchase. For want of a
better title, it was called "The Best of MOUG." The first
two lists were prepared by the newsletter editor, Ann
McCollough, who is now Ann Caldwell from Brown.
When it was time for a third edition, Ann didn't have time
to do it, so in 1989, the board asked me if I would take it
on. I said, "Sure." Then I thought, "How am I going to do
this?" In 1989, I still had my typewriter—remember? the
new one I got when I started way back in 1976—and I was
still happily typing away at my work forms and memos.

By this time, the cataloging department had added 2 Macs.
They had tiny little screens. Luckily my eyesight was still
good. Ann sent me a diskette of the second edition that she
had done on a PC in WordPerfect. We had Macs with
Word. I found somebody in the computer department to
help me transfer it to Mac Word (by then we had added a
few more computer specialists) and so I learned how to use
Word by working on "The Best of MOUG." The previous
edition had 6 composers. The board wanted me to expand
it. I did so by adding English references to uniform titles
in Slavic languages. Each succeeding edition added more
composers. Altogether I completed five editions. Each
one became a little bit easier as technology improved, my
learning curve became less steep, and by the sixth edition,
I had my own computer with a big screen. The third,
fourth, and fifth were all done on the Mac with the little
tiny screen.

When I completed the third edition, in 1989, we didn't
have e-mail yet. It was printed, ready to go in July 1989.
There it sat! It was so frustrating! Nobody knew about it
until the announcement came out in the November
newsletter. Then they flew off the shelf, so to speak.
When the fourth edition came out in 1991, e-mail and
MLA-L had just come along. I made the announcement on
MLA-L and orders started coming in that week. For the
first time, I saw the power of e-mail. It took four months to
notify the community before e-mail! After MLA-L the
announcement was instantaneous. What a difference
MLA-L has made! No longer were we all on our little
islands struggling with our cataloging and reference
questions. All of a sudden, we could instantly reach out to
a community of experts!

When MOUG was forming, OCLC had between two and
three million records. Now they have over 51 million
records. Over the last 25 years MOUG has had a
tremendous influence on guiding OCLC and LC to where
we are today. Look at what we have accomplished! We
have made our needs known as we progressed from OCLC-
produced cards to online catalogs, OCLC online authority
file, AACR2, retrospective conversions, numerous
searching enhancements, enhance capability, the NACO-
Music Project, detailed user documentation, and Jay
Weitz's book "Music Coding and Tagging" to help explain
it all. And now we have something called OCLC
Connexion with virtually unlimited record size. What will
they think of next? I can't even imagine what you will be
talking about 25 years hence!

We are grateful for bright music librarians who could
identify and devise ways of dealing with problems; strong
MOUG leadership; OCLC music representatives—Glenn,
Robert and Jay—who could help set priorities and lobby
our concerns to OCLC; and for OCLC's willingness to
listen and work on solutions even if it wasn't always soon
enough for us. Letter-writing from the MOUG
membership has helped to keep them motivated and on
track. It has been a great, great cooperative effort of
talented, dedicated, tenacious, stubborn people that has
brought us to where we are today. I think we can all look
back and be proud!
Community, Collaboration, and Coffee Mugs:
The 25-Year MOUG Mission
H. Stephen Wright, Northern Illinois University

My involvement in MOUG began on a cold winter day in 1983. I was a student in the library school at Indiana University, and on that day I met with the IU music librarians and the other students in the music librarianship program to discuss a road trip to the forthcoming Music Library Association meeting in Philadelphia. During the discussion, someone asked if we would be leaving early enough to attend the MOUG meeting. I had no idea what MOUG was; I heard this as “Moog,” and the only Moog I knew about was the famous synthesizer. However, if I had any doubts about the importance of this mysterious entity, they were quickly dispelled when Ralph Papakhian declared that we should make every attempt to attend MOUG, because it was “more important” than the MLA meeting!

Unfortunately, I didn’t attend MOUG that year. I was an impoverished graduate student and couldn’t afford the extra nights in the hotel that MOUG would have required. Instead, I saved my pennies and took a Greyhound bus to Philadelphia, arriving after MLA was underway. (I swore off Greyhound bus trips after that.)

My first MLA meeting was a bit baffling and intimidating. Anyone who has joined MLA in the last ten years may have difficulty understanding this, because MLA has evolved into an utterly different organization than it was in 1983. Now, it’s a very welcoming, newcomer-friendly group, with a multitude of opportunities for new librarians to become involved. When I joined, however, it seemed that MLA consisted mostly of grey-haired, pipe-smoking men in tweed jackets (the kind with patches on the elbows) who talked about Machaut and Josquin. It seemed so far removed from what I was studying in library school that I wondered what the hell I was doing there.

I didn’t make it to a MOUG meeting until 1985. I started my first professional job in the fall of 1983, but this was at a small college that didn’t really like the idea of librarians traveling to conferences. I was able to attend the 1984 MLA meeting, but MOUG met separately from MLA that year, and my employer made it clear to me that attending even one conference was pushing the envelope. So I finally made my MOUG debut in 1985 (although my boss complained and asked why I couldn’t just go every other year).

The MOUG meeting was a revelation. Here, people were talking about things that I could relate to. Instead of the musicological topics that were common at MLA plenary sessions of that era, I heard about the problems of reconciling “Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus” with “Mozart, Johann Chrysostom Wolfgang Amadeus” in card catalogs; what to do with LPs that were labeled “Digital” in big letters; and how to find things on OCLC when most searches seemed to produce either nothing or way too much.

Using an OCLC terminal was an activity that, in retrospect, seems maddeningly primitive, but at the time it was almost mystical. The terminals were huge and apparently made of cast iron. On their screens, luridly bright green letters appeared against a background as black as outer space. The characters were in a bizarre font that had never been seen before (and has not been seen since). A red light labeled “Polling” would occasionally flash, indicating that the terminal was communicating with a master computer in a mysterious place called Dublin, Ohio. And, of course, these terminals could be slow...very, very slow. Often, after initiating a search, you’d get the response “Retry momentarily,” meaning that you could take a coffee break while waiting for the system to produce some results. When things were really slow, then you’d get messages like “Retry in 15 minutes” or “Retry in 30 minutes,” which basically meant that you could forget about getting any work done for the next few hours. (When OCLC held a contest in the early 1980s to select a slogan for an OCLC button, a few of my colleagues suggested “Retry in 30 Minutes.”)

Despite these headaches, we loved OCLC, because it did something very, very important: It printed catalog cards. When I joined the profession, librarianship was slowly emerging from the era in which librarians would type catalog cards themselves or buy them from the Library of Congress. I became a librarian just in time to experience some of this low-tech work, including copying sheets of cards on huge, battleship-gray copy machines and cutting them on terrifying, guillotine-like paper cutters. I also got a taste of “overtyping,” which was the process of typing the added entries at the tops of copies of main entry cards. (This was usually done on a manual typewriter with a cloth ribbon, because subject headings were typed in red ink.)

The miracle of OCLC was that it eliminated these stunningly mundane activities; a couple of weeks after you pressed the “produce” key, neatly-packed boxes of absolutely pristine catalog cards would arrive in your library, ready to be filed. The cards were printed with a weird, unattractive typeface, but we didn’t care; they were beautiful. (Incredibly, some people did complain that OCLC couldn’t print subject headings in red.)

In 1985 I got a job at Northern Illinois University, where involvement in professional organizations was actually encouraged; finally I was able to get involved in MOUG in...
a substantive way. I volunteered for the Program Committee, and Laura Snyder graciously appointed me, although she probably had no idea who the hell I was. In 1989 I was somehow elected Continuing Education Coordinator, and found myself in the position of having to deal with things like how much food to order for receptions, how many chairs would be needed in meeting rooms, and other stuff that wasn't covered in library school. My principal innovation was eliminating the luncheon and replacing it with a cash-bar reception; I figured that people would rather mingle (and drink) than be stuck sitting in one place for an hour.

I joined the MOUG board at a pivotal time; the organization was going through an identity crisis. When I originally became a MOUG member, coping with OCLC and its limitations was the central concern among most music catalogers. By the time I was elected to the board, OCLC had reached a sort of plateau and many of their early problems (such as poor response time) had been ameliorated. MOUG had been trying to stay relevant by including program sessions that weren't strictly OCLC-related; this led to predictable (and not unjustified) criticism that MOUG was trying to be a "miniature MLA." Keeping our organization focused on its mission was proving to be a challenge, because the "misery loves company" aspect of MOUG meetings wasn't relevant anymore. MOUG was also criticized for being too cataloging-oriented, and responded by creating a Reference Services Committee. Unfortunately, this committee had very little to do for years.

Another problem was that libraries were just starting to get involved with local online systems; these early systems could be quite problematic and librarians of that era tended to be preoccupied with them. Many libraries were implementing the NOTIS system developed at Northwestern University, and for a while it looked as if NOTIS was going to consume the library world. After one of the MOUG meetings I staged, I received an evaluation form from an anonymous librarian who complained that we should devote our meetings to the needs of NOTIS users! I couldn't believe it. We were the Music OCLC Users Group, and here was someone telling us, in effect, "stop wasting our time with OCLC."

After my term ended in 1992, I took a few years off from involvement with MOUG. I did, however, chair the Nominating Committee during this period, though, and managed to persuade my mentor Ralph Papakhian into running for chair (and much to my delight, he subsequently won). I was roped back into MOUG in the late 1996, when Candy Feldt somehow talked me into allowing myself to be nominated for chair. I comforted myself with the fantasy that I wouldn't win--so, of course, I did.

OCLC had changed quite a bit in the intervening years; reference products were now OCLC's major concern, and cataloging had been relegated to a supporting role. I didn't fully comprehend that until I attended a meeting of the OCLC Users Council during my term. (I naively thought that I could lobby for MOUG's interests at this meeting; those hopes were quickly extinguished when I arrived and saw that "observers" were forced to sit in a completely different area than the actual Users Council delegates.) Throughout this meeting, OCLC's reference services were constantly and vigorously emphasized, and cataloging was hardly mentioned at all. I realized that MOUG's once-moribund Reference Services Committee was now very important.

I saw another dramatic demonstration of how OCLC had changed when the MOUG board held a meeting at OCLC's headquarters in Ohio. This was the second time I had visited OCLC, and we were given a tour of the building that included a visit to the vast subterranean room that held OCLC's mainframe computers. Almost ten years earlier I had seen that same room, and it had looked like something out of an old James Bond movie: rows and rows of massive computer consoles festooned with spinning tape drives. Now the room was almost completely empty, although I could still see depressions in the linoleum where the old computers had stood. Our tour guide walked us over to three refrigerator-sized units placed side by side, and informed us that these machines held the entire WorldCat database. They were Darth Vader black, with tiny winking red and green lights, and utterly silent. If I visit OCLC again in another ten years, I fully expect that those computers will have been replaced by something the size of a Nintendo Gameboy.

When my term began, I was chair-elect, and Karen Little was chair. We had just held a meeting that was especially well-attended, and as a result MOUG's bank account held a small surplus. We discussed what to do with that money, and I immediately had the idea of making some kind of freebie to give away to MOUG members to thank them for their many years of loyalty. However, I kept this to myself at first. Karen is sort of the Jiminy Cricket of my career, I can always count on Karen to tell me when I'm screwing up, which only a true friend will do. I thought Karen would never approve of something so frivolous, so I waited until she was off the board to have coffee mugs made with MOUG's logo on them. The mugs were a big hit at the 2000 meeting in Louisville, but I still hope Karen forgives me for them.

Mentioning the coffee mugs reminds me of something that we should never overlook: that MOUG has an absolutely beautiful logo. It was created by a brilliant graphic designer named Frankie Frey, and it manages to suggest
musical symbols, piano keys, and computer circuitry, all in one elegant design that hasn’t become a bit dated. It’s no exaggeration to say that MOUG has the best logo of any library organization anywhere.

My term was also personally memorable for the one occasion when I actually got mad at OCLC. I’m a very easygoing sort of person and I rarely get angry at anything or anybody, so this was an unusual event for me. OCLC had just introduced their new FirstSearch interface, which was drastically different than the previous incarnation. In most respects it’s an elegant and beautifully-designed product; however, it has one feature that is profoundly irritating to music librarians: the title proper (field 245) is always at the top of a record display. If the main entry is a personal name (as is almost always the case with musical works), that is buried somewhere else in the record. In effect, FirstSearch abandons the concept of main entry and fails to conform to cataloging standards. So I wrote a courteous letter to OCLC, speaking on behalf of MOUG’s membership, complaining about this problem. The response I received from an OCLC representative was jaw-dropping: we were dismissively told that FirstSearch “was designed for patrons, not librarians.” I was dumbfounded. I worked in a real library and saw real patrons every day! OCLC’s headquarters is a huge glass monolith located in an upscale suburb of Columbus, Ohio; there isn’t anything resembling a library anywhere nearby, and yet here was an OCLC employee lecturing me on the needs of patrons. [A postscript: After I finished this speech, Deb Bendig of OCLC approached me and kindly promised to reopen the main entry issue.]

This incident reminded me of something that’s easy to forget: that MOUG has an important, vital role to play in lobbying for the needs of music librarians who use OCLC products. Of course, we shouldn’t forget that OCLC has been very good to MOUG; they’ve hosted board meetings, paid for many of our conference expenses, provided a brilliant liaison in the person of Jay Weitz, and have generally been hugely cooperative and supportive. However, we shouldn’t forget that our position as users may sometimes require us to play an adversarial role. This isn’t “biting the hand that feeds us;” it’s being true to our original mission. I’m confident that MOUG will never lose sight of that mission, and that’s why I’ve always been a loyal member of MOUG and always will be.

---

News from OCLC

Compiled by Jay Weitz

General News

OCLC Registry and Metadata Services

The OCLC Rights & Resolutions initiative is currently in the analysis and design phase, with a complete requirements document due in April 2003. This initiative is focused on creating a cooperatively developed central repository of rights metadata designed to help libraries manage electronic and print-based content. Contact Bill Carney, Product Portfolio Manager, for more information.

Collections and Technical Services

Changes to 245 Subfielding Practice

In MARC 21 Update No. 2 (October 2001), the Library of Congress made a subtle change to subfielding practice for field 245, allowing subfield $n (Number of part/section of a work) to precede it. Appropriate adjustments have been made to both the PDF and HTML versions of “Bibliographic Formats and Standards,” 3rd edition, and will be included in the next set of print revision pages. For details, see OCLC System News.

OCLC-MARC Format Update 2002

The OCLC-MARC format changes announced in Technical Bulletin 247 “OCLC-MARC Format Update 2002” (http://www.oclc.org/technicalbulletins/247/) became effective in December 2002. In addition to the bibliographic format changes and the newly defined codes, users should follow the new practices for coding field 041 (Language Code) and for cataloging integrating resources. Please see TB 247 and OCLC System News for additional details.

DVD Code "$v$" for 007 Subfield $e$

In December 2002 a new code "$v$" specifically for DVD format videorecordings was implemented for the Videorecording 007 field subfield $e$ (007/04). The new code "$v$" is to be used to identify all DVD videos. DVDs use the digital PCM (Pulse Code Modulation) technique to represent video information on a grooveless, smooth, round plastic disc. Most DVDs are 4 3/4” in diameter, although some smaller 3” discs have also been commercially produced. DVDs have been commercially available only since 1996. The existing Videorecording
007 subfield $e$ value "g"—previously defined as "Laser optical (reflective) videodisc"—has been redefined more narrowly as "Laserdisc." Code "g" is now to be used only for videodiscs that use the analog PWM (Pulse Width Modulation) technique to represent video information on a grooveless, smooth, round plastic disc. Laserdiscs exist in three standard commercially produced sizes: 12", 8", and 4 3/4." The 12" discs are the most common, typically used for movies. These analog laserdiscs became commercially available in 1978, but production declined rapidly after 1998 because of the success of the DVD digital format. The code "g" should no longer be used for DVDs.

"Cataloging Electronic Resources: OCLC-MARC Coding Guidelines" Revised

In conjunction with the December 2002 implementation of new practices for cataloging integrating resources, OCLC's "Cataloging Electronic Resources: OCLC-MARC Coding Guidelines" (http://www.oclc.org/connexion/documentation/type.htm) has been revised.

OCLC Connexion

Maintenance and Enhancements: We continue monthly maintenance and quarterly enhancement installs to OCLC Connexion. Details may be found in the monthly install messages, Connexion News, the OCLC Connexion Enhancements page (http://www.oclc.org/connexion/enhancements/), and the November Enhancement Memo (http://netweb.oclc.org/netweb/newpost/Connexion_200211_Install_Enh Memo_nw.doc); here is summary of the changes since the last update:

- October 2002: Resource Catalog, Cataloging Save File, and Cataloging Constant Data File moved to Oracle.
- November 2002: Choosing Tab Changes Screen Display; New Logon Screen with Related Links; Quick Tips; Cataloging Search Results Brief List Display expanded; Hot Link to Record on Record Number; Jump Bar Improvements; Edit/Action/View Lists changes; Select and Apply Constant Data on the Fly; Authorities Search Results sort order options; Dewey-Only Session Timer Extended to 120 Minutes; Automatic Logon From Dewey-Only Session to Cataloging (and vice-versa); Pathfinders database moved to Oracle.

The February 2003 quarterly enhancement install includes: Record Display changes and options, including new record ID area and option to display fixed fields and status areas at either top or bottom of record; Diacritics entry and display changes, with diacritics entered after characters; Constant Data enhancements, including changing "current" constant data to "default" constant data and addition of "My Status" for CD; Authority Controlling improvements, with more automated matching of headings, especially when an exact match is not found; Preferences terminology updates and enhancements. For more information about these enhancements, as well as other planned changes, see "What's Next" on the OCLC Connexion Enhancements Web page (http://www.oclc.org/connexion/enhancements/upcoming.shtm) and the February Enhancement Memorandum.

Passport End of Support and Life: On December 31, 2002, OCLC ended support for Passport for Cataloging, with end-of-life to follow next December 31, 2003. Passport users are encouraged to begin planning to move either to Connexion or to CatME by December 2003. To compare Passport and CatME functionality with Connexion features, see the features spreadsheet at http://www.oclc.org/prod/cataloging/features.xls.


Windows Client: Development is underway on the Microsoft Windows client for OCLC Connexion, which OCLC expects to release during the second quarter of 2003. The first release of the client will focus on online interactive cataloging, macros, and labels. The second release, which OCLC expects to release in the third quarter of 2003, will include NACO support and functionality to catalog electronic resources. The third release, which OCLC expects to release by the end of 2003, will include offline cataloging functionality including a local file and batch processing.

Tutorial: "Using OCLC Connexion Browser: An OCLC Tutorial," originally released in late October 2002, was revised in December to incorporate November 2002 enhancements. All modules have been revised except the final one on Managing Constant Data, which will be revised after the constant data enhancements in early 2003.

Diacritics in OCLC Connexion: Beginning February 16, 2003, OCLC Connexion browser users will enter diacritics following the character they modify instead of preceding...
the character. This change will conform to Unicode standards and bring OCLC's handling of diacritics more in line with worldwide practice. Users will continue to have the option to enter diacritics using bar syntax, copy and paste, or a Unicode-enabled keyboard. Display of bar syntax when in edit view will be optional. Users can select the option to display bar syntax under Admin Options in Connexion. Diacritics can also be entered by selecting the characters from a pop-up dialog box in Internet Explorer. This will be very similar to the character selection box currently used in Passport and CatME. Important points to remember:

- A pop-up box for easy diacritics entry will be available for Internet Explorer users.
- When using Connexion, you will enter the diacritic following the character.
- There will be no change to the entry of diacritics in Passport or CatME.
- No changes will be required for record export; records will be exported in their current format.

**OCLC CatME for Windows**

OCLC ended support for older versions of CatME for Windows on October 31, 2002. OCLC currently supports CatME 2.10 (English) and CatME 2.11 (Spanish). Both are available on the OCLC Access Suite compact disc. At some point in the future, CatME will be discontinued. However, the end of life for CatME will not be determined until all CatME functionality has been added to OCLC Connexion.

**Windows 98 and NT Support to End June 30, 2003**

OCLC will discontinue support for Windows 98 and NT 4.0 on June 30, 2003, at the time that Microsoft discontinues support. OCLC expects that applications will continue to work; however, no testing will be completed and no support will be offered for Windows 98 and NT 4.0 after this date. The OCLC Access Suite Applications System Requirements document on the OCLC Web site at http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/suite/systemrequirements.htm has been updated to reflect this change.

**Quality Control (QC)**

For the first half of the fiscal year ending December 31, 2002, the Quality Control Section received a total of 28,649 requests to change bibliographic records. This total also includes duplicate error reports. QC staff have manually merged 6,802 sets of duplicate records and have made changes and/or corrections to 4,894,696 bibliographic records in the WorldCat database, manually, or, via macros, as well as corrected a total of 1,937,564 records via automated scans. In the past 18 months, more than 400,000 invalid LC class numbers have been modified or deleted. While there are still pockets of problems, users can rely more on the accuracy of the structure of LC class numbers they find in WorldCat. We have also begun looking at ways to identify and modify records for fiction that are coded as non-fiction and will be modifying tens of thousands of records in the next few months. We completed a project to update the obsolete second indicator value blank to zero in field 053 in name authority records. Over 100,000 records were changed and contributed to the Library of Congress.

**QC: Database Enrichment**

OCLC implemented enhancements to Database Enrichment functionality on September 22, 2002. The enhancements add additional fields to the list of those that any cataloging user may add to a bibliographic record; expands the list of fields that any user may modify in an existing bibliographic record; and allows any user to add local subject headings (with a second indicator value of 4) to any cataloging record. The only restriction to these enhancements is that authenticated CONSER records cannot be modified.

**PromptCat**

The following changes and fixes have been made to PromptCat since the last update:

- Twice-a-day label processing. PromptCat's processing runs overnight, delivering the records, labels, and reports around 11 p.m. We've added a second daily process in late afternoon that delivers labels only. This allows vendors who print and affix spine labels for PromptCat materials to get those materials processed and to the libraries faster.
- Field indicators for moved call numbers. PromptCat was deleting the indicators in 9XX fields when it moved a call number. This problem was fixed.
- "No Site ID found" added to Cataloging Report. A line has been added to the Grand Summary of the Cataloging Report to account for titles that did not have a Site ID in the manifest. In the past, this situation caused blank Cataloging Reports.

We are currently working on a project that will improve match and delivery rates. The project includes:

- Adding Ingram records to WorldCat. Ingram's records are of high quality. This project will not only benefit PromptCat by allowing more records to be delivered, but it will also increase the number of records in
PromptCat participation has increased to 206 active libraries, delivered 246.7 records.

PromptCat: New Vendor

In September 2002, BUSCA, Inc. became the 18th OCLC PromptCat vendor partner. Established in 1997 and based in Ithaca, New York, BUSCA is an international distributor, importer, and exporter supplying mainstream and alternative titles, out-of-print and obscure monographs. (BUSCA means "search" in several languages.) BUSCA also offers journals, all AV formats and software. For more information about BUSCA's services, you may visit the company's website at: http://www.buscainc.com.

Reference Services

Availability of Union List Data from Serials Records in WorldCat on FirstSearch

Holdings information as recorded in Local Data Records (LDRs) in the OCLC Union List service is now accessible from within the WorldCat database on the OCLC FirstSearch service. Users will see union list data for their institution on the detailed record display, and for other institutions when holdings are displayed from a WorldCat serial record. Though the OCLC Union List service is updated in real time, the holdings visible from WorldCat on FirstSearch will be updated every 24 to 72 hours. They will be much more up-to-date than the FirstSearch Union Lists database, which is updated twice annually. The default setting for the display of union list data in the administrative module will be "on". If an institution chooses to turn the display of union list information off, no union list information for that symbol will display to any FirstSearch users, including the institution's own users.

Link to Other FirstSearch Databases from WorldCat Detailed Records

WorldCat detailed records include new links to related information in the following FirstSearch databases: Books In Print, Book Review Digest, CINAHL, PAIS International, PapersFirst, and PsycINFO_1887. Others will follow in the future. These links appear in an area labeled "More About This In" that follows the "More Like This" area in the detailed record display. The library must provide access to both WorldCat and the linked database, but no further action is required to activate these links, and they cannot be turned off.

New OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online Journals

Nineteen new journals from nine publishers, including new publishers The Idea Group Inc. and The Agricultural Institute of Canada, have been added to OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online, bringing the online total to 4,375 journals available. The new titles and their ISSN ranges are available at http://www2.oclc.org/oclc/fseco/index.asp.

MLA Names File in MLA International Bibliography Thesaurus

Users of the MLA (Modern Language Association) International Bibliography database thesaurus can now search the MLA Names File. As with other FirstSearch thesauri and subject heading files, users access the MLA Names File in the MLA thesaurus by clicking the Subjects icon on the basic, advanced, or expert search screen, then typing in a word, name or concept. The MLA Thesaurus supplies preferred term(s) for the search concept, along with broader and narrower terms, that may be expanded. Additional classification information for names, such as national literature and language, is also provided. Clicking a hotlinked term automatically launches a search.

Search Term Suggestions Available in All FirstSearch Databases

Typos or misspellings in search terms are a major cause of online search failure. A new feature now available in all FirstSearch databases offers search term suggestions when a search retrieves zero records, similar to what users see in Amazon.com or Google. The search term suggestions increase the likelihood that the user will get results. Suggested terms come from WorldCat and applicable indexes in the database being searched, and hover text...
The OCLC ILL Library Policies and Technology Directory was released in Spring 2003, replacing the Name-Address Directory (NAD) for ILL policy information later this year. The directory is a completely new, Web-based system that will allow libraries to provide detailed information about their hours, collections, holiday schedules, contacts, loan period and charges, and, in the future, information about technical implementations (e.g., Z39.50). Libraries will continue to be able to offer summary information as well.

**Union Listing**

Effective November 2002 all lending requests include a copy of the library’s serials holdings information to help libraries process requests more quickly. In a further enhancement in early 2003, WorldCat records in FirstSearch will display serials holdings statements for holding libraries. This is an optional feature; if your library does not contribute serials holdings statements (Local Data Records/LDRs), your symbol will still display for titles you have cataloged. Participating in union listing is much easier than before. OCLC no longer requires MARC Holdings Format-compliant data for batch loading via the LDR Updating option. In most cases, library data in electronic format and predictable patterns (such as labeled or delimited fields, fixed field length) can be used for loading and updating serials holdings information in WorldCat.

**Batch Processing**

OCLC has updated the OCLC website to include a section describing batch processing: http://www.oclc.org/batchprocessing/. In addition, a "Concise Batch Processing Guide" has been issued (http://www2.oclc.org/batchprocessing/documentation/concisebatch/concisebatch.pdf).

**Metadata Capture**

Batchload Redesign (Phase 2 of the Metadata Capture project) continues in the design and prototyping phases. This phase of the project will contain three GUI interfaces: Batch Services (BS) GUI, Process GUI, and the System GUI. The Batch Services GUI, the interface that will allow database specialists to create test setups for their projects, is being tested by Batch Services. The Process Control GUI is the interface used to monitor the Batch Process Control System, view and control orders, control processes, produce reports, etc. The System GUI allows the system manager to view all system activities. All three

---

**Resource Sharing, Shelf-Ready, and Contract Services**

**ILL Policies Directory**

OCLC FirstSearch now allows libraries to authenticate users against their existing patron circulation files using the NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol (NCIP). There is no need for libraries to maintain additional patron files to use NCIP. This feature can be set up in the FirstSearch administrative module when a library has a local system capable of communicating using the NCIP protocol. Note: Though OCLC is not aware of any local systems that have implemented this capability yet, vendors are likely to adopt the NCIP protocol in the near future, especially if they hear from the library community that they want to buy systems that can use it. NCIP will let remote library users access FirstSearch more easily by using their library barcode or other unique patron number designated by their affiliated library. The NCIP patron authentication feature does not replace any existing authentication methods for FirstSearch (manual logon, IP address recognition, scripted access, IP referer and Athens authentication), but provides an additional method of authentication to a library's FirstSearch account. This is the first feature OCLC has developed based on NCIP, and OCLC will continue to work with NCIP to meet the needs of users.

---
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GUIs have been prototyped and are being actively tested by OCLC staff. It is anticipated that Batchload Redesign will be completed Summer 2003. Preliminary work on the creation of new Matching Algorithms (Phase 3 or the Metadata Capture effort) has also begun. This effort requires close coordination with XWC (Extended WorldCat) searching and matching.

**Language Sets**

The Language Sets Web Store opened for business on October 21, 2002. The goal of this new order option is to deliver a convenient, secure, easy-to-navigate ordering mechanism that can speed ordering, reduce order errors, and simplify repeat order processing. The Web store incorporates many of the conveniences of popular online stores, including secure logon, credit card processing, persistent customer profiles, confirmation that an order has been received (on-screen and e-mail) and links to additional information. To visit, follow the link at http://www.stats.oclc.org/wcs_list.html.

**OCLC MARC Record Service (MARS)**

Automated updating and correcting of form/genre headings is now available from OCLC MARC. Libraries can now have obsolete form/genre headings updated to the latest forms used in Guidelines on Subject Access to Individual Works of Fiction, Drama, etc., second edition, 2000. MARS also now provides authority control for the list of genre terms authorized by the National Library of Medicine (NLM) for use in 655 fields.

**WorldCat Collection Sets (Susan Walker)**

netLibrary CliffsNotes Classic Literature, Modern Literature, and General Reference record sets are now available through OCLC WorldCat Collection Sets. Most netLibrary records in other sets were generated from the LC print version records. However, in many cases the LC print version record was not available for the CliffsNotes titles; these records were generated from print version records cataloged by various member libraries. The records are included in the netLibrary Content Support Service fee. Orders for netLibrary sets will be billed only if users select any options beyond 856 field processing and the required 049 code. As always, we are seeking cataloging volunteers for microform and electronic sets. Our set catalogers are given a special symbol to use only for cataloging the set. Using this symbol, set catalogers search freely for charge and get regular cataloging credits. We create the set by collecting all cataloging done using the special symbol. For a listing of available sets and additional information about Collection Sets please see http://www.stats.oclc.org/wcs_list.html.

---

**News from the Library of Congress**

Compiled by Joe Bartl

**Special Materials Cataloging Division (SMCD)**

**Personnel News**

David Bucknum, senior cataloger on MSR2, was promoted to the position of Automation Operations Coordinator in the Cataloging-In-Publication (CIP) Division. Paul Frank, senior cataloger on MSR1, was reassigned to the Social Sciences Cataloging Division as a senior cataloger on the Cyrillic and East European Languages Team. Milada Gessman, MSR3 Assistant Team Leader, retired on January 2, 2002. E. Bruce Swain, MSR3 senior technician retired on March 1, 2002.

**Arrearage Reduction Efforts**

In 2002 SMCD processed and removed from the arrearage 147,262 discs and tapes. The following are selected highlights:

- **78 rpm Sound Recordings Cataloging Project (Singles):** The Music and Sound Recordings (MSR) Teams processed 5,429 discs during fiscal year 2002. This includes both album sets (15) and singles (5,414).
- **78 rpm Sound Recording Cataloging Project (Sets):** This project was begun in August 2000. This fiscal year the project added 2,647 new titles to the catalog; arrearage reduction totaled 21,190 discs—an average of 8 discs per title (the number of discs per title was significantly higher this year because of the many Victor copies on the shelf). The project was completed at the end of December 2002, with all but a few sets located in special collections now under bibliographic control.
- **AFRTS Project:** AFRTS (known variously as the American or Armed Forces Radio and Television Service), the broadcast service of the Department of Defense, has been providing radio broadcasts to military personnel since the 1940s. Until the mid-1990s, commercial and AFRTS-produced shows were provided weekly to member stations on 33 1/3 rpm discs. They include informational shows, religious programming, vintage radio programs, and popular music shows. As archival materials, many of these recordings are unique. This project aims to catalog/process approximately 110,000 discs, providing access through the LC ILS. Planning began in November 2001, and processing in March 2002. Close cooperation between the SMCD and MBRS has resulted in creative methods to catalog and inventory discs that were created for use by broadcasters who
could not have been expected to consider the cataloging ramifications: Individual shows were often pressed in parts on more than one disc to facilitate DJ handling, and multiple shows might occupy a single disc. This complicates the physical processing. Two kinds of records are being created. A modified collection level format is being used for some shows, and individual records are being created for each iteration of others. Over 78,000 discs have been processed since March 2002. Personnel have included full and part-time, temporary college-age staff; and SMCD staffs working part-time on the project. We anticipate the bulk of the collection will be processed by the end of Summer 2003.

- **A-Z Cassettes Project:** MSR Teams processed 3,789 copyright cassettes in Cuadra Star and Voyager. Beginning in February 2002, the cassettes were processed in the ILS as brief records.

- **CDs:** CDs are recordable compact discs. MSR Teams processed 4,349 discs as brief records with 4,153 records created for new works and 196 discs processed as duplicates. Because these are the sound recording equivalent of manuscripts, copy does not exist on the utilities.

- **CDs workflow:** The MSR Teams processed 43,285 discs (new titles and copies) during 2002. The IDC records are then sent to OCLC to be processed through RetroCon Batch and MARS. To date, the statistics for our initial production may be summarized as follows:
  
  Total of records sent: 37,271
  Total of exact matches: 13,494 (36%)
  Total of maybe matches: 5,436 (15%)
  Total of non-matches: 18,330 (49%)

  These copied records are recognized in the LC database by a 985 field containing the term "srreplace." While some of these are tagged as completed records and are distributed, others retain their IBC/undistributed status because there they still require hands-on authority work.

- **National Public Radio (NPR):** The MSR Teams cleared a total of 8,779 reel-to-reel tapes from the National Public Radio collection during Fiscal 2002.

**Score cataloging**

In fiscal year 2002, the MSR teams produced 2141 original core/full level score bibliographic records, an increase of 34% over 2001. In addition, we provided copy cataloging for 1106 scores, and brief cataloging for 612 scores.

**Drake Pamphlet Collection**

In June, Jungja Yoon cataloged librettos included in the Samuel Gardner Drake Pamphlet Collection, a resource collection for the history of Boston in RBSCD. The librettos are written in English for European operas as they were first adapted and performed in Boston during the early to mid-19th century.

**Mariinsky Theater Project**

In March 2002, Irina Kirchik joined a small contingent from the Library that visited the Mariinsky Theater Archives in St. Petersburg, Russia. The aim of this particular visit was to get an overview of their holdings of largely Russian incidental music manuscripts. The list of the incidental musical works was prepared by the staff of the Archive and contained a significant number of obscure manuscripts awaiting discovery and possible performance.

In order to establish musical and literary authorship for the works on the list, Irina contacted bibliographic specialists from the St. Petersburg Theater Library where the dramatic works and librettos are currently held.

Some photographic materials preserved at the Archive were examined by the group for possible inclusion in the December 2003 exhibition celebrating the 300th anniversary of St. Petersburg at the Library of Congress.

After her return from Russia, Irina continued to contribute to the Mariinsky Theater Archives Project. She participated in a meeting of the Music Division and the Preservation Office representatives involved in the project with the Director of Public Service Collections D. Kresh.

At this meeting she was asked to evaluate a portion of the incidental music in the Archives and summarize its possible usage (after preservation) for the Library as well as the Mariinsky Theater.

Using reference sources in Russian available in the Music Division collections, Irina also compiled a list of Italian operas staged and premiered in St. Petersburg in the 18th and 19th centuries.

The Mariinsky Project is in a holding pattern as both the Mariinsky Theater and LC assess and evaluate the impact of a new Russian cultural heritage law recently signed by President Putin. The Library representatives involved in the project are hoping to send a team of LC staff to begin serious work on the project this fall.

**Marion S. Carson Collection of Americana**

Lenore Holm and Sharon McKinley have begun cataloging this small collection of scores (140 items) for the Rare Book Division. This collection includes 19th century American sheet music, some of which is unique to the Library's collection. These will be housed in the Rare Book Division with other parts of the Carson Collection.
The Music Subject Cataloging Working Group launched its listserv MUSUB-L. Membership includes all MSR 1-2-3 catalogers and team leaders, some MBRS catalogers, and CPSO. Membership has also been extended to Music Division and Folklife Center personnel. The listserv serves to broaden subject discussion and awareness and to archive these discussions, music subjects on tentative lists, and other important communications.

Old Catalog Records

Formerly referred to as "preMARC" records, these bibliographic records in the LC database all carry the type code for "language material" (i.e., printed monograph) regardless of what a record may actually represent, e.g., a sound recording, a book, a score, a film. Because user-specified searching parameters, including a parameter for type code, are available in the OPAC, we have started an effort to rectify type codes, beginning with sound recordings. Following guidelines which exclude items requiring complex processing, this part-time project has changed type codes for 78 rpm and 33 1/3 rpm discs through 1976. When the discs are finished, the project will move on to other sound recording formats and to scores.

Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division (MBRS)

MBRS Recorded Sound Processing 2002

Managing and refining the flow of archival recordings through the processes of acquisition, selection/prioritization, preservation, and final cataloging has been a major focus this year. Brief MARC IBC records created on the ILS by technicians that utilize barcodes to track items into the Recording Laboratory have proven useful. These records include blank note fields for engineers to add content information, notes on sound quality, and technical information about the actual transfer. End-stage processing involves a joint effort between technicians and catalogers to add the new preservation copies to the record and edit the engineer's notes. This process, while useful, has proven awkward for tracking and physical inventory. The planned 2003 implementation of MAVIS (Merged Audio-Visual Information System), a system specifically designed to provide this kind of inventory functionality, is expected to provide the kind of internal collection control needed by MBRS. Once implemented, MAVIS will be the staff only, in-house inventory system for audio, while the LC-ILS will continue to be the OPAC. Conversion programs to migrate data between the two systems are currently being developed.

Highlights of Archival Audio Collections Preserved and Cataloged in 2002

- NBC Symphony Broadcasts of conductors other than Toscanini. Glass-based lacquer discs.
- Conductor Elliott Galkin's tape collection. Acetate tapes
- Norman and Ethel Chalfin Collection lacquer discs. Includes rare recordings made by Zora Neale Hurston and an undiscovered recording by jazz great Lester Young.
- Environmental Directions radio program.
- Selected materials from the Voice of America. Tape Collection:
  - Kool Jazz Festival
  - Tribute to Eubie Blake
  - Decade of Women's Music
  - Selected live pop concerts, including the Beach Boys and the Charlie Daniels Band

Music Division

Personnel News

Henry J. Grossi was appointed acting head of Reader Services. Wayne Shirley, music specialist, retired. Catherine Dixon, Denise Gallo, Karen Moses, and Stephanie Poxon were appointed to the position of music specialist/reference librarian.

New Collections

- Adolph Bolm Collection: 400 items
- Katherine Dunham Collection: 1,000 items
- Andre Previn Collection: 6,000 items [deposit]
- Romberg Orchestra Library: 33,000 items
- Leonard P. Smith Collection: 115,000 items

Additions to Existing Collections

- Ballets Russes Collection (manuscripts and papers of choreographer Serge Grigoriev): 300 items
- Ernest Bloch/Suzanne Bloch Collection: 31,000 items
- Jerome Kern Collection: 300 items
- Moldenbauer Archives (copyist's manuscript score for Handel's operas Ottone, Tamerlano, and Floridante, c. 1720.): 1 item
World premieres and commissions

- Ellen Taffe Zwilich: Romance (McKim Commission, 4/16/2002)
- Andy Teirstein: Uneasy Dances (Choreography by Liz Lerman, 10/17/2002)

Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO)

Descriptive Cataloging

AACR2 2002 Revision: The Library of Congress implemented the 2002 revision of the 2nd edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules on December 1, 2002. Revised Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRIs) were published and are available in Cataloger's Desktop or as printed copies. A summary of significant changes that will be seen in LC's bibliographic and authority records is posted on the CPSO public Web site, http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso.

MCDs and LCRIs: A project is underway to merge the Music Cataloging Decisions (MCDs) into the LCRIs. Some updating is being done along the way. When the project is done, all subsequent commentary for music cataloging will appear as LCRIs.

Subject Cataloging

LCSH: Two long-term projects involving Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSHs) were completed. Authority records to control the more than 3,200 free-floating subdivisions in the LCSH have now been created and distributed to subscribers. The records represent topical, form, and chronological subdivisions that can be combined with main headings according to rules to create precoordinated subject heading strings in cataloging records. The records provide subdivision usage information for catalogers and can be used by cataloging systems to validate assigned subject headings. Plans call for including information on free-floating subdivisions from the records in an expanded introduction to the next printed edition of LCSH. CPSO has also posted "Subdivision Authority Records (18X)," which includes examples, at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/subdauth.html.

Since 1999, information on the form of geographic subdivisions has been included in all newly established or revised geographic subject headings that are also authorized for use as subdivisions. The project to add this data retrospectively to approximately 20,000 existing geographic subject headings was completed at the end of the year. Authorization for use of the heading as a geographic subdivision is carried in MARC21 linking field 781; if the geographic heading is not authorized for use as a geographic subdivision, the proscription appears in a 667 field.

Subject headings for music materials: We began to add authorization for geographic subdivision routinely to new headings for musical forms and types, and to add it retrospectively as we encountered such headings in the course of our work. When establishing a new musical instrument, we also began to create a heading for its music at the same time. That heading enables the instrument to be immediately available for use as a medium of performance in headings for music works, even if that was not what initially prompted establishing the instrument. Also, the 360 note in those records indicates the plural form, if any, of the instrument's name.

New headings added over the past year include approximately 20 for brands and models of electronic instruments, authorized under a new policy reflected in the Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings H 1918 Musical Instruments. Some other new headings were: Accordion in art, Alternative metal (Music), Art in music, Beguines (Music), Carols--Accompaniments, Christian rap (Music), Chromaticism (Music), Cool jazz, Country gospel music, Crying in music, Dolceola, Entartete Musik, Free reed instruments, Glass as a musical instrument; Glass harmonica music, New wave musicians, Pedal clavichord, Remixes; Simhat Torah music, Soca, Sound recordings--Remixing, Theater organ, Trad jazz, Turntablism, Turntablists, and Women musicologists.

Representative changes include the following (former headings in italics):

- Bagpipe reeds (Bagpipe--Reeds)
- Bass guitar--Harmonics (Bass guitar--Instruction and study--Harmonics)
- Bell ringers (Campanologists)
- Bugle calls (Bugle-calls)
- Catholic school songbooks (School songbooks, Catholic)
- Clarinet--Fingering--Charts, diagrams, etc. (Clarinet--Fingering charts)
- Continuo (Thorough bass)
- Damba (Drum) (Damba (Dance drumming))
- Drum machine (Electronic percussion instruments)
- Electronic musical instruments (Musical instruments, Electronic)
- Exercise music (Musico-callisthenics)
- Frottolas (Music) (Frottola)
- Guiro (Guiro (Scraper))
- Guiro music (Guiro (Scraper) music)
been replaced with headings of the type "Variations (Voice"

In addition, the former heading "Variations (Vocal)" has been behind in bibliographic file maintenance as a result of taking longer than we might like.

American Folklife Center

During 2002, the American Folklife Center was reorganized to create a collections processing unit to work specifically with Archive of Folk Culture collections. The Center also received nine new staff positions both for its Veterans History Project and for ongoing processing work to help address the Archive’s large processing arrearage.

Save Our Sounds Recorded Heritage Preservation Project

The American Folklife Center’s Save Our Sounds preservation project has continued to make good progress in restoring, preserving, and digitizing its endangered sound recordings, as well as those held by the Smithsonian Institution’s Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage. For the American Folklife Center’s Save Our Sounds project, processing work during 2002 continues on eight collections, including the James Madison Carpenter Collection, the Eloise Hubbard Linscott Collection, the American Dialect Society Collection, the Collections of the International Storytelling Center of Jonesborough, Tennessee; the Eleanor Dickinson Collection, the Zuni Storytelling Collection, the Pearl Harbor Collection, and the Don Yoder Collection, consisting of wire recordings of Pennsylvania German folklore and music.

Veterans History Project

On October 27, 2000, the U.S. Congress mandated the Veterans History Project, a new national collection of oral history accounts of America’s war veterans. Since that date, the Project has distributed approximately 100,000 project kits providing guidelines, sample questions, and release forms for conducting oral history interviews with veterans. During 2002, there were over 3,200 project submissions to the collection. The Veterans History Project’s Web site (http://www.loc.gov/folklife/vets/) includes a wide variety of information about the project’s outreach activities, workshops, and associated partners.

September 11, 2001, Documentary Project

On September 12, 2001, the Center launched a project to collect public reactions to the terrorist attacks of September 11 in the form of audio-taped interviews and other forms of documentation for preservation in the Archive of Folk Culture. The September 11, 2001, Documentary Project Collection is currently available through our Web site at http://www.loc.gov/folklife/nineeleven/nineelevenhome.htm
The September 11 Project was modeled after a similar initiative from sixty years earlier, when Alan Lomax, then head of the Archive of American Folk Song, issued an urgent request to folklorists to collect "man on the street" reactions to the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the declaration of war by the United States. As of December 13, 2002, this collection has also been added to our Web site under the title After the Day of Infamy: "Man-on-the-Street" Interviews following the Attack on Pearl Harbor at http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/afcphhtml/afcphome.html.

Processing

The American Folklife Center continues to create collection-level MARC records and EAD (Encoded Archival Description) finding aids for the unpublished multi-format ethnographic field collections that are being processed in the Archive of Folk Culture. During 2002, three new processing technicians were hired. In the next year, we look forward to filling several new positions, including a reference specialist and an additional cataloger. At the end of 2002, 24 of the Center's collections were in various stages of processing.

Ethnographic Thesaurus Project

A joint project of the American Folklife Center and the American Folklife Society, with funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ethnographic Thesaurus Project seeks to create a major new reference tool to address the subject access needs of archivists in making multi-format ethnographic materials accessible to researchers and the public. This year, the project hired a researcher, based at George Mason University; surveyed potential users; selected and tested software; and reviewed and enhanced an existing proto-thesaurus.

Significant 2002 Acquisitions

- **The Aaron Ziegelman Foundation Collection**, consisting of photographs, photographic negatives, letters, manuscripts, maps, videotapes, and ephemera that document a variety of cultural traditions and aspects of everyday life in the Jewish shtetl of Luboml, Poland, prior to the destruction of that community during World War II.
- **The Neil V. Rosenberg Bluegrass Collection**, consisting of field sound recordings, field notes, publications, audiotape indexes, and ephemera that document bluegrass music.
- **The Fletcher Collins Manuscript Collection**, consisting of manuscripts, correspondence, and musical transcriptions of recordings he donated to the Folk Archive in the late 1930s and early 1940s.
- A supplement to the *Vida Chenoweth Collection*, consisting of field sound recordings of the traditional music of Papua New Guinea, along with related field notes, photographs, and musical transcriptions.
- **The Julie McCullough Collection**, consisting of sound recordings, interview transcripts, and other materials related to the history of the Folklore Society of Greater Washington.
- A supplement to the *Joel M. Hapier Collection*, consisting of field sound recordings, disc recordings, paper-based records, digitized images and ephemera relating to the traditional cultures of Alaska, India, Laos, northern Sweden, and the former Yugoslavia.

Public Programs

During 2002, the American Folklife Center hosted several lectures and also inaugurated the Homegrown Concert Series, which brought back the popular traditional ethnic and regional music and dance concerts held on the front steps of the Jefferson Building, Library of Congress, not presented for several years. We are pleased to announce that recordings of the concerts and interviews with the wide variety of performing artists at these events will become part of the Archive's collections.

General Cataloging News

**Bibliographic Enrichment Advisory Team (BEAT)**

BEAT, a cataloging directorate initiative aimed at developing tools to aid catalogers, reference specialists, and searchers in creating and locating information, celebrated its tenth anniversary in November. Major components of the team's work include enriching the content of Library of Congress bibliographic records, improving access to the data the records contain, and conducting research and development in areas that can contribute to furthering these efforts. The team's membership represents a wide spectrum of the Library's functions, reflecting the Cataloging Directorate's desire to provide benefits from its projects to as wide an audience as possible and to incorporate within its program objectives the needs and interests of various constituencies beyond those of technical services.

Following are some of BEAT's activities:

- **ONIX TOC.** ONIX (ONline Information eXchange) is a means of representing book industry product information and is being used by some publishers today to communicate that data electronically. LC receives this data directly, and with programming developed by a BEAT team member, the project
creates Table of Contents (TOC) records that LC makes available on the Web. Hyperlinks are made from the TOC data to the catalog record and vice versa, thus allowing researchers to move from or to LC's online catalog, where they can make additional searches for related or other material. To date the project has created about 31,000 ONIX TOC records.

- **Digital Tables of Contents**: Another BEAT TOC initiative, the Digital Tables of Contents project creates machine readable TOC data from TOC surrogates and these materials are subsequently HTML-encoded and placed on a server at LC. The process cross-links the TOC to underlying catalog records. Both the catalog records themselves and the linked TOC data may be viewed through a Web browser by accessing LC's online catalog access options. Almost 11,000 TOCs have been created and linked in this project, and more than one million hits have been recorded on the TOC files section of the Cataloging Directorate Web pages. For information regarding the Digital Tables of Contents project, readers may contact Bruce Knarr, project chair at bkna@loc.gov.

A cybercast from January 2002 prepared as part of the LC staff Digital-Future-and-You series, containing information relating to all the TOC initiatives, may be viewed online at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/beat/etoc/jan20etoc.html. Brief descriptions of the initiatives are also available in vol. 9, no. 13 of LC Cataloging Newsline, accessible at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/lccn/lccn0913.html#3.

- **ONIX Descriptions**: An outgrowth of the ONIX TOC initiative is the creation of records that contain publishers' descriptions of books. Based on ONIX encoded materials, file creation and linking is similar to that of the ONIX TOC initiative above, and the project has created approximately 27,500 such records, although links are currently made from the catalog record only in an ongoing fashion. A sample is available at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/beat/onix.descriptions.sample.html. Questions regarding BEAT's ONIX initiatives may be sent to David W. Williamson, project chair, at dawi@loc.gov.

- **BECites+**: (Bibliographies plus: Enhanced Citations with Indexes, Tables of contents, Electronic resources and Sources cited) enhances staff-produced bibliographies, as well as the catalog records for the titles included in such bibliographies, by linking to tables of contents, indexes, and sources cited. It uses scanning and OCR to substantially enrich traditional printed bibliographies. Links in the catalog records are made for each type of data file created for the work in question as well as between all the related files for any work for which a Web file is included. Completed works within this project include guides on business history, Thomas Jefferson, and materials on immigrant arrivals to the United States. A number of additional works are in progress, including guides to film collections and manuscripts from monasteries on Mount Athos, additional resources on business, and a guide to Ladino publications at LC. Another recent initiative has been the scanning and conversion to text of heavily used but out-of-print guides to LC collections whose individual items are not easily identified in LC's online catalog. Information concerning the titles in the project are available online, and further details about the project as well as a full list of completed bibliographies and other work in progress can be found at http://www.loc.gov/rr/business/guide.

- **Web Access to Works in the Public Domain**: BEAT has launched an initiative to link LC bibliographic records to full text electronic copies of these same cataloged materials residing in collections of other institutions. Though these works, all in the public domain, have been digitized by various institutions, many of the original printed works are also in LC's collections. By linking LC catalog records to these electronic versions, LC expects to provide users with more unified and centralized access to materials of this nature as well as provide users of LC collections or catalog data with rich and substantive information about the contents of these works as well as access to their texts. The first links to resources come through cooperative agreements with the University of Michigan (for materials digitized in its Making of America project), described at http://moa.umdl.umich.edu/ and Indiana University (works comprising its Wright American Fiction, 1851-1875 project), described at http://www.lets.indiana.edu/web/wwright2.

In order for records to qualify for enhancement in these projects, the electronic versions have to be an exact version of a print version represented in the Library's collection, as established by the presence of an Library of Congress Control Number (LCCN) for the electronic version that matches the LCCN for the print version. For the University of Michigan materials, it proved possible to enhance 1,267 LC bibliographic records, and for the Indiana University project 653 LC bibliographic records were linked to the online versions. Further description of the project is available on the BEAT Web page, and at the Michigan and Indiana sites noted in the previous paragraph. A sample is available at www.loc.gov/catdir/sample.pubdomain.html.
The Library is interested in joining with other trusted partners in linking printed and digitized texts. Prospective partners are invited to contact BEAT chair John D. Byrum at jbyr@loc.gov.

Additional information regarding BEAT and its work may be found at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/beat. Questions may be directed to the BEAT Chair John D. Byrum at the address in the previous paragraph.

Cataloging in Publication (CIP)

In order to encourage electronic submission of CIP galleys during LC's mail embargo after anthrax was detected on Capitol Hill last fall, the CIP Division eased the requirements for participation in ECIP, Electronic Cataloging in Publication. The number of publishers participating in ECIP more than doubled, from 1,066 in fiscal 2001 to 2,222 at the end of fiscal 2002. More than a third of all CIP galleys—1,082 out of 53,733 galleys in all—were submitted electronically in fiscal 2002, making ECIP cataloging one of the directorate's principal workflows.

American Memory Site cataloging

The Computer Files and Microforms Team cataloged twenty National Digital Library American Memory sites in Fiscal 2002 including the following:

- America Singing: Nineteenth-Century Song Sheets
- Dayton C. Miller Flute Collection
- Emile Berliner and the Birth of the Recording Industry
- Fifty Years of Coca-Cola Television Advertisements
- We'll Sing to Abe Our Song! Sheet Music about Lincoln, Emancipation, and the Civil War

Electronic Resources Cataloging

In a pilot training project, four senior catalogers, including one music and sound recording cataloger, were detailed to the Computer Files and Microforms Team for 120 days each. Training for the cataloging of remote access digital resources at the core level was easily achieved using the OCLC Web-based educational course, Cataloging Internet Resources Using MARC 21 and AACR2. A cataloger with excellent descriptive cataloging skills can typically become independent in about three weeks after completing the course and working under the review of a senior cataloger with electronic resources expertise. Learning to catalog direct-access digital resources, such as CD-ROMs, is much harder and requires more training, and for this reason the detailed catalogers were trained to do minimal-level cataloging rather than core level for direct-access resources.

National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC)

NUCMC staff produced 3,700 RLIN bibliographic records describing collections held by repositories located throughout the United States. In addition to local, regional, and state historical societies, the NUCMC Team produced cataloging for a variety of special focus repositories including, under the heading of performing arts, the Boston University Department of Special Collections and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

NACO Program for Cooperative Cataloging

In fiscal 2002 NACO expanded with the training of seventeen new NACO libraries, the retraining of eleven libraries, and the creation of three new funnel projects (Mississippi Project, Mountain West Project, and the Minnesota Funnel Project) that collectively added twenty-seven new member institutions. There are now a total number of 223 libraries participating in 19 NACO funnel projects. Several studies measured the cost-benefits of NACO and the reduced LC expenditures resulting from more documentation being freely available to participants on the PCC Web site. In order to manage the growth of NACO the PoCo approved numerical goals (100 new and/or updated records for small libraries; 200 new and/or updated records for large libraries). Also approved was the need for a designated "back-up" NACO contact at each institution to assure continuity. The Secretariat issued letters to institutions whose annual production has fallen under the new quotas. The letters stated that the new parameters are being applied to current members and offered alternatives for continued participation. NACO institutions have one year in which to comply with the new regulations. In other developments, Judy Kuhagen (CPSO) updated the series training materials to reflect the new AACR2 revisions, and a Web site for the electronic delivery of these materials to training sites was developed as well as a the counterpart site for trainers.

SACO Program for Cooperative Cataloging

SACO, the component of the PCC for subject authority work, profited from accelerated handling of LCSH subject proposals. The major innovation was making interactive subject proposal forms available on the PCC Web site. This year contributions to LCSH from SACO libraries exceed the number of subject headings developed by LC staff. The growth of SACO participation prompted the PoCo to approve the formation of a task group to draft membership criteria and to examine the impact of folding the SACO program into a structured component of the PCC. Currently, SACO members are not represented on the PoCo nor is there a training curriculum to mirror the
NACO/CONSER/BIBCO components. SACO plays an essential role in the PCC and it is time to examine and analyze a mechanism to further develop its potential.

Copyright Office

_Eldred v. Ashcroft_

The most important copyright case in the last year was the appeal to the Supreme Court in _Eldred v. Ashcroft_. Congress passed the Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act (CTEA) during the 105th Congress. The CTEA extended the maximum duration of the copyright term from the life of the author plus 50 years to life plus 70 years (for works made for hire, anonymous or pseudonymous works, 20 years was added, resulting in 95 years from publication or 120 years from creation, whichever expires first).

The plaintiffs initially filed a complaint in U.S. District Court against former Attorney General Janet Reno, seeking a declaration that the CTEA is unconstitutional. The District Court granted summary judgment and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit affirmed, both finding the CTEA to be a constitutional exercise of congressional authority under the Copyright Clause.

The Supreme Court accepted certiorari in the case on two questions:

- Did the Court of Appeals err in holding that Congress has the power under the Copyright Clause to extend retrospectively the term of existing copyrights?
- Is a law that extends the term of existing and future copyrights "categorically immune from challenge" under the First Amendment?

The oral arguments were held on October 9, 2002. The Solicitor General of the United States, Theodore Olson, argued the case for the government and Professor Lawrence Lessig argued for the Petitioners. On January 15, 2003, the Supreme Court in a 7-2 decision affirmed the D.C. Court of Appeals decision and determined that the CTEA was constitutional. The opinion is posted on the Copyright Office's Web site (http://www.copyright.gov).

_Anticircumvention Rulemaking_

On October 15, 2002, the Copyright Office published a Notice of Inquiry in the Federal Register initiating the second triennial anticircumvention rulemaking proceeding. In this notice, the Office explained the scope of the rulemaking and provided the dates for initial comments that would propose classes of works for exemption from the prohibition on circumvention of technological measures that protect access to copyrighted works and for reply comments that would respond to these initial proposals, either in support or opposition.

The initial comment period closed on December 18, 2002, and the Office received fifty comments that were posted on the Copyright Office's Web site on December 20. In addition to again accepting comments electronically, in this rulemaking, the Office created a Web-based submission form which allowed commenters to fill in the required information and attach their comment to the form electronically. A new form was placed on the Office's Web site on January 21, 2003, for the submission of reply comments, with a submission deadline of February 19, 2003 and hearings to follow. The final decision by the Librarian of Congress is due by October 28, 2003. Further information on rulemaking as well as the entire record of the previous anticircumvention rulemaking are available on the Office's Web site at http://www.copyright.gov/1201.

The Technology, Education and Copyright Harmonization Act (the TEACH Act)

The TEACH Act became law on November 2, 2002. It implements the Copyright Office's recommendations delivered to Congress in a 1999 study on digital distance education. That report recommended amending the Digital Millennium Copyright Act to encompass digital distance education. An important part of the recommendations, however, was to add safeguards to counteract new risks encountered when works are transmitted in digital form.

Senators Hatch and Leahy introduced S. 487 on March 7, 2001, and shortly thereafter held a hearing. Following the hearing, the Copyright Office was asked to facilitate negotiations between the parties. As a result, a consensus bill passed the Senate on June 7, 2001, and the House in Fall 2002.

Sections 110(2) and 112 of the copyright law have been amended to cover online systematic mediated instructional activities carried out by accredited nonprofit educational institutions. All works, except those produced or marketed primarily for performance or display as part of mediated instructional activities transmitted via digital networks, are included. The performance or display must be made by or at the direction of, or under the actual supervision of, an instructor as an integral part of a class session. Reception is limited to students officially enrolled in the course.

Additionally, institutions must apply technological measures that reasonably prevent retention of the work in accessible form for longer than the class session and prevent any unauthorized further dissemination of the work.
in accessible form by others. Institutions must put policies in place to promote faculty, student and staff compliance with copyright law. There are a number of additional and complex provisions. For a full explanation of the various provisions, see the House and Senate reports that accompanied this legislation. See e.g., Senate Report 107-31 (Committee on the Judiciary, June 5, 2001).

Preservation

The following represent major preservation initiatives for sound recordings and film. An account of all of LC's preservation efforts can be found in LC's ALA Briefing at http://www.loc.gov/ala/an03-update.html.

Preservation of Sound Recordings

The 106th Congress passed legislation that established a sound recording preservation program and authorized a Sound Recording Preservation Board and Foundation for a period of seven years. The legislation requires the Board to develop a comprehensive national recording preservation study and action plan. The Board and Foundation met in March 2002, and in November the Board discussed entries for the first National Sound Recording Registry of historically, culturally and aesthetically significant American sound recordings. The initial Registry selections can be viewed at http://www.loc.gov/today/pr/2003/03-014.html.

Preservation/MBRS Working Group

The Preservation/MBRS Working Group continued to meet to address issues regarding the preservation of sound recordings, films and videotapes. The group accomplished much this year including the design and production of archival sleeves for sound discs, and the development of a revised specification for a plastic can and a new specification for a stainless steel film can. Examples of these will be tested in the coming months. Specifications for both types can be found at http://lcweb.loc.gov/preserv/supply/specif html.

National Audio Visual Conservation Center

Planning for the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center (NAVCC) in Culpeper, Virginia, broadened to include not only ongoing design consultation for the architectural and engineering team, but also program, business, and preservation production planning for the overall Culpeper operations. A Program and Vision Statement for the NAVCC was prepared in March 2002. During the summer, an investment and program cost model and detailed cost requirements for the entire facility across a five-year period were drafted. In other work, the MBRS

Temporary Audio-Visual Storage Center in Elkwood, Virginia, a 36,000 square foot storage facility, was acquired by the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI) for the temporary storage of the film and video materials previously stored in the Culpeper facility, until the completion of the NAVCC. PHI expenditure for this facility exceeded $1 million. All remaining nitrate collections were packed and removed from the film vault at the Suitland Federal Record Center to the Motion Picture Conservation Center at Dayton, Ohio.

The Recorded Sound Processing Unit developed a workflow system with the MBRS Recording Laboratory in which all recordings preserved receive initial bibliographic control in the ILS before preservation and complete records after preservation. There had been no systematic program for control of preservation work until this project was developed. The system was further developed to include creation of METS (Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard) records for the collections digitally preserved.

MBRS acquired the Prelinger Collection of 48,000 educational, industrial, and advertising films and independent productions from the 1930s-60s as well as the Daniel P. Moynihan video collection, 900 videocassettes that were part of the Senator's papers. MBRS also continued to participate in such key organizations as the Association for Recorded Sound Collections, Association of Moving Image Archivists, International Federation of Film Archives, International Federation of Television Archives, Music Libraries Association, Audio Engineers Society, and National Television and Video Preservation Foundation. For the first time, staff members were appointed to serve on each of the three formal commissions (Technical, Cataloging and Documentation, and Access) of the International Federation of Film Archives. NBC News gave the Library authorization to mount all NBC Radio Collection news broadcasts on the LC's Web pages.

The Audio-Visual Digital Prototyping Project refined a digital object metadata system that captured METS digital-object metadata in Oracle and Java applications hosted on LC's servers. Java tools produced the XML output from the database. More than 500 METS digital objects were added to the database.

National Film Board and Foundation

New initiatives for the National Preservation Boards and Foundations this year included the National Film Registry Web site. The National Recording Preservation Board convened for the first time in March 2002. MBRS laid the groundwork for an Internet-based Moving Image Gateway, a collaborative project of the Association of Moving Image
Archivists and LC. A $900,000 National Science Foundation grant, announced in September, would fund the two-year development of the Web portal (now known as MIC, Moving Image Collections), which would eventually be hosted by LC.

**National Recording Preservation Board**

The inaugural meeting of the National Recording Preservation Board (NRPB) was held at the Library of Congress on March 12, 2002. Librarian of Congress James H. Billington welcomed the 20 Board members in attendance, outlined the broad objectives of the National Recording Preservation Act, and introduced Marilyn Bergman, President and Chairman of the Board of ASCAP, as the new NRPB chair. The bulk of the day's discussion was devoted to two key topics: establishing selection criteria and procedures for the National Recording Registry, and identifying field-wide issues and needs to be addressed in the Recording Preservation Study and Report. The study and report are the responsibility of consultant appointed by the Librarian; they will identify crucial components of the National Sound Recording Preservation Program. As a follow-up to the meeting, the Library established a NRPB Web site and electronic discussion list to facilitate on-going dialogue among Board members. For more information, see http://www.loc.gov/rr/record/nrbp.

**Save Our Sounds**

The American Folklife Center's audio-preservation project Save Our Sounds has received a major grant from the Rockefeller Foundation of $250,000. The grant, which will be shared with the Smithsonian Institution, ensures that the two organizations will match and thus receive federal monies appropriated under the Save America's Treasures Program, now administered by the National Park Service in cooperation with the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The overarching goal is to save Smithsonian and LC collections and also come up with standards to guide preservation of sound recordings. The Library has chosen various format collections for preservation demonstration, working with MBRS and others to preserve the originals and digitize. For more information, see the American Folklife Center report above, as well as its Web site: http://www.loc.gov/folklife/sos/.

**Audio-Visual Digital Preservation Prototyping Project**

LC is developing a library-wide digital repository that will preserve every type of digital content for which it takes responsibility, including reformatted and born-digital audio-visual collections. Since audio-visual materials raise unique issues in repository design, MBRS has undertaken an Audio-Visual Digital Preservation Prototyping Project as part of the general planning for the construction of the digital infrastructure within the new National Audio-Visual Conservation Center to be constructed in Culpeper, Virginia. The combination of the MBRS AV Prototyping Project and the Library-wide repository development effort provides a platform for testing the latest technologies in creating, preserving, storing and providing access to audio-visual formats. This collaboration is experimenting with new approaches for reformatting historical materials in digital form, receiving and processing born-digital recorded sound and moving image collections, exploring how digital materials may be stored and thus preserved, and testing new ways to present them to researchers.

Access to the digital sound recordings, television and video titles and, eventually, film materials in the repository will be provided by a storage area network with nodes in Culpeper and on Capitol Hill connected by fiber optic links that serve LC's reading rooms.

During recent months, the MBRS Digital Culpeper project continued to define the digital object production and ingest functions, while also conducting feasibility tests on the metadata software packages that will accompany these digital objects. Digital preservation prototyping continued to be performed on specific audio-visual samples from the collections of MBRS and the Library's American Folklife Center. More information is available at http://lcweb.loc.gov/rr/mopic/avprot/avprotweb.html; lcweb.loc.gov/rr/mopic/avprot/avprot00103/index.htm; and http://lcweb.loc.gov/standards/metadata.htm.

**Digital Programs**

**National Digital Information Infrastructure Preservation Policy (NDIIPP)**

In September 2002, the Library held several briefings for our appropriations and oversight staff on the NDIIPP strategic plan. The plan develops a national strategy for collecting and preserving digital information. Congress specified that $5 million of the roughly $100 million appropriated for this project could be spent during the initial phase for planning and emergency acquisitions.

After consultation with the Joint Committee on the Library, the plan was submitted to the House and Senate Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittees, the Committee on House Administration, and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration for approval. The plan, which has been approved by the committees, requests release of $35 million of the $100 million to continue research to advance development of a national preservation infrastructure. The committees thanked LC for its collaborative efforts in
MINERVA

LC's mission is to make its resources available and useful to the Congress and the American people and to sustain and preserve a universal collection of knowledge and creativity for future generations. An ever-increasing amount of the world's cultural and intellectual output is presently created in digital formats and does not exist in any physical form. Materials in this "born-digital" realm includes open access materials on the World Wide Web.

The MINERVA Web Preservation Project was established to initiate a broad program to collect and preserve these primary source materials. MINERVA has had significant achievements during the past year. Four major Web collections have been undertaken in partnership with the Internet Archive, which has provided technical expertise on Web site collecting. The September 11th Web Collection, consisting of over 30,000 Web sites and 331 million objects, premiered in September 2002 and is accessible at http://september11.archive.org/. Also during the past year, Web site collecting operations have been completed for three collections (Winter Olympics 2002, September 11th Remembrance, and Election 2002). Cataloging and preparations to provide collection access at LC is in process for all four of these collections. These four collections have provided the MINERVA team, a multidisciplinary team of Library staff representing cataloging, legal, public services, and technology services, with a broad spectrum of challenges during the past year on the best methods to evaluate, select, collect, catalog, provide access to, and preserve Web site materials for future Web site collection activities.

The MINERVA team is collaborating with the Internet Archive, SUNY and the University of Washington to expand the project. The latter are assisting in identifying content and in using tools of their design to assign metadata descriptions to the Web sites collected. The resulting metadata database will be used to search, retrieve and analyze the archived collection of Web sites.

Digital Reference

The Digital Reference Team handles reference support for the digital collections and spearheads the LC's digital reference initiative. With the inauguration of QuestionPoint (QP) in June 2002, the team provides both text-based and chat services via access from LC's Web site and continues to build the knowledge base that is available to QP member libraries and the global network. The team has answered 5,600 inquires in the last six months.

In addition, the Digital Reference Team is the public interface for the LC's digital collections. The team designs and presents demonstrations, on-site workshops, and video conferences to members of Congress, distinguished guests of LC, visiting scholars, and educators. Opportunities for video conferencing and webcasting are continually expanding, with over 2,100 educators and students participating in 58 video conferences in the past year. Working with the Center for the Book, the team is responsible for creating and updating the "Read More about It" selections targeted for general readers and younger students. The Virtual Programs and Services page at http://www.loc.gov/vp/ further outlines the activities of the team.

Significant QuestionPoint developments include the following:

- LC and OCLC have recently implemented a complimentary QP subscription program for library schools. This program enables LIS Students to gain a first-hand understanding of how to set up a digital reference service, use online reference tools, and explore issues of policy and practice.
- There are currently over 300 active QP subscribers in the network.
- QP now has a Chinese interface in place, thanks to the efforts of a consortium of Chinese reference librarians. There are also plans in the works to translate the interface into German, French, and Dutch, with the expectation that a Spanish-language interface will not be far behind.
- Librarians in 11 LC reading rooms are using QP's simple "live chat" tool to provide reference help to LC's online patrons Monday-Friday, 2:00-3:00 pm via the LC's Ask a Librarian Web page. In November, the Digital Reference Team and the Science Reading Room expanded their live chat hours to 2:00-4:00 pm. Three groups of librarians, in the Prints and Photographs Division, the Digital Reference Team, and the Science Reading Room, are planning to implement QP's enhanced live chat tool sometime in the new year. The enhanced features will enable librarians to "push" Web pages to their patrons' browsers, taking them visually through database searching strategies, step by step, as well as allow for voice-over-IP (VOIP) and video communication.
- Diane Kresh, Director for Public Service Collections, was recently invited by organizers of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
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LC Integrated Library System (ILS)

Expanding access and improving service

LC has initiated an effort designed to increase the number
of external users of its online catalog as well as Z39.50
access to the LC database. Access should increase gradually over the first few months of 2003.

Upgrades

LC successfully upgraded its integrated library management system in February, 2002 to the 2000.1.3
version of the Voyager software. LC intends to upgrade to the 2001.2 version of Voyager in May 2003. Planning has also begun for the implementation of the Unicode standard for LC's MARC 21 bibliographic, holdings, and authority records. The first step was a test conversion of a full copy of the LC Database to Unicode in January, 2003. Current plans call for LC to implement the Unicode Release of the Voyager software in the summer of 2003.

Library of Congress Authorities service

LC has established a new Authorities service, http://www.authorities.loc.gov, to provide free access to LC's authority data via the Web. This service was made available on a trial basis on July 1, 2002. During the trial period, LC sought feedback from users worldwide to assist in evaluating the service. Responses were overwhelmingly positive. Based on user feedback, the Library made improvements to LC Authorities and decided to offer this free service on a permanent basis. LC welcomes user comments from users; send them to ils@loc.gov.

Auxiliary software and functionality

In 2002, LC implemented the use of BatchCat for certain database maintenance tasks. LC also implemented the first e-commerce capability by taking advantage of EDI capabilities for accepting electronic invoices from two of LC's largest subscription agents; testing is underway with a third supplier. LC has begun using the claiming functionality in Acquisition/Check-in on a limited basis, with expansion planned for Fall 2003.

National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS)

In early 2003 the NLS migrated its database to LC's ILS environment and is thus now available via the Web.

Network Development and MARC Standards Office

The following are abbreviated descriptions of LC involvement in maintaining, developing, or researching digital and metadata standards.

• ZING: Network Development and MARC Standards Office (NDMSO) has begun development of Z39.50 International Next Generation (ZING). LC has organized this initiative in order to evolve Z39.50 to a Web platform protocol that will be attractive to information providers, vendors, and users.

• Z39.50 Gateway: LC's WWW/Z39.50 gateway now contains more than 500 databases on 400 servers; 145 of the databases listed are from more than 20 foreign countries. Servers of over eighteen different library system vendors are represented.

• Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard (METS): NDMSO staff participated in the development of the Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard (METS), an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) schema for creating XML documents that express the hierarchical structure of digital library objects, the names and locations of the files that comprise those objects, and the associated metadata. NDMSO is the maintenance agency for the METS standard, which is being taken up by many digital library projects worldwide. The METS Web site is at http://www.loc.gov/standards/mets.

• MARCXML: NDMSO has developed a new XML Schema and toolkit (MARCXML) for working with MARC metadata in XML. It provides a flexible "bus" through which metadata can be transformed and manipulated. Users can now convert MARC data to and from various descriptive metadata standards such as Dublin Core, ONIX, and NDMSO's Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS). MARCXML can easily be used to display MARC records on the Web in HTML. The toolkit is being developed in a modular fashion while emphasizing the use and promotion of freely available open-source tools.

• Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS): In December the use period for MODS ended, and version 2.0 of the schema is now out for review. It is a lightweight version of MARC, using language-based tags rather than numeric ones (e.g. "Title" rather than "245"), and is intended to carry selected data from existing MARC 21 records as well as supporting
original resource description records. It targets applications that require resource descriptions richer than simple Dublin Core can accommodate, but do not require the complexity of full MARC.

- **MARC 21**: The harmonization of the MARC 21 format with UKMARC was completed with agreement among users of both formats to change to MARC 21. This is a major milestone for catalog sharing and efficient interoperability with the UK and other users of UKMARC. The 2002 updates for MARC 21 were published in December 2002. For the January 2003 MARBI meeting, three discussion papers and two proposals were prepared and put on the agenda.

**Legislative Issues, 108th Congress**

**Fair Use/Copyright Piracy**

A number of bills were introduced late in the 107th Congress that would effect the statutory limits of fair use of copyrighted materials. None of the bills was taken up and passed. Some or all of the bills will be reintroduced during the 108th Congress:

- The Senate Commerce Committee heard testimony from invited speakers representing the content side and the consumer electronic side, debating whether they could agree on standards for digital protection technology in order for the content providers (primarily the movie studios) to develop more digital content and promote broadband and digital TV. Sen. Hollings followed up the hearing by introducing the Consumer Broadband and Digital Television Act of 2002, which directed the FCC to develop regulations that will set industry standards for antipiracy mechanisms in playback equipment.

- The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on the same topic. There, a broader array of witnesses, including consumer representatives, discussed the pros and cons of government intervention in this area. Chairman Leahy and Sen. Hatch made it clear that they are not inclined to support the Hollings approach, and would like to hear more from the consumer point of view.

- On the House side, Rep. Berman announced introduction of the "P2P Piracy Prevention Act." The bill is intended to create a safe harbor from liability so that copyright owners may use technological means to prevent the unauthorized distribution of that owner's copyrighted works via peer-to-peer ("P2P") networks.

- Rep. Lamar Smith introduced a piracy protection bill that provides a private cause of action in federal court, with a three-year statute of limitations, to recover damages due to piracy of copyrighted materials (trading in counterfeit software, films, music, etc.). In addition, if a person violates the anti-counterfeiting laws a second time within three years, treble damages will be available. A similar bill was introduced by Sen. Biden. Libraries and universities have warned that the antipiracy legislation could conflict with the TEACH Act, which allows use of copyrighted materials in distance education, and criminally sanction otherwise lawful conduct.

- On August 8, 2002, the Federal Communications Commission issued a notice of proposed rulemaking relating to requiring broadcasters to use a "broadcast flag" that would block consumers from copying digital broadcasts, as proposed under the Hollings bill. Comments were due by October 30. The House and Senate Judiciary Committees sent the FCC a letter warning that it should take no action in this area without consulting with Congress.

- Rep. Rick Boucher issued a statement urging Congress to reaffirm fair use rights, outlining ways that these rights are at great risk in the digital environment. He later introduced the Digital Media Consumers' Rights Act, intended to reinstate fairness and fair use into the legal arena. The bill would amend copyright law to permit otherwise prohibited conduct when engaged solely in furtherance of scientific research into technological protection measures, and ensure that "non-standard discs" (i.e., CDs that have copy protection measures that prohibit certain types of play or fair use copying) are properly labeled to give consumers adequate notice of all dysfunctions.

- Rep. Lofgren introduced the Digital Choice and Freedom Act, which intends to ensure that consumers have the same fair use rights with respect to digital and analog content. The bill would expressly create a "digital first sale" right, and would also amend the Digital Millennium Copyright Act to make it lawful to circumvent technological safeguards if the user's intent is to make a noninfringing use of the work.

**Film Preservation**

The National Film Preservation program, including the National Film Registry, was last reauthorized in 1996 (P.L. 104-285). The current authorization expires in October 2003. LC will be asking Congress to reauthorize the program for a 10-year period. The program is still needed, and in fact will become more important as LC proceeds to relegate its audio-visual collections and preservation efforts to the National Audio Visual Conservation Center at Culpeper, Virginia. Some amendments to the current authorization are necessary to move the program into the digital age and dovetail the film preservation efforts with the recently authorized sound preservation program.
Questions and Answers

Jay Weitz, OCLC

Q: I am working on a score of the Gubaidulina String Quartet No. 4. There are 2 bib records for this score in WorldCat, and the two records appear to differ mainly in that one reports

300 1 score (48 p.); $c 30 cm.

and the other one reports

300 1 score (48 p.); $c 42 cm.

The item in hand, however, is 33 cm. Both bib records are for manuscript facsimiles from Sikorski, as is the item in hand. The second record is from DLC. Should I create a new record, or should I go with one of the ones already in WorldCat, despite the incorrect size? Please advise.

A: Differences of score size are always tricky, at least in part because of the wide variety of binding practices from institution to institution. (Has the item been measured before or after binding? Cloth or cardboard? Quick and dirty or professional?) Plus we've all seen different printings of what is ostensibly the same score from the same publisher with relatively small size differences. Another factor to consider is the effect of rounding up (as instructed by AACR2 2.5D1) to the next whole centimeter. When the difference is as large as that between 30 cm and 42 cm, we can usually be sure that we're referring to legitimately different items. When the differences are only a few centimeters, you have to use judgment. You may come up with your own limits, based on your own experience, but for scores, I tend to ignore differences of height up to three centimeters, considering any larger difference to be meaningful. By that standard, I would edit the existing 30 cm record, all other things being equal.

Q: I'm cataloging a recording that uses the cents symbol in the title and I thought there was a way to create that symbol since it's not in the ALA list of diacritics. Do you happen to know how to create this symbol? The title is "10 cents a dance" using the cents symbol.

A: There is currently no way to enter the cent sign as a legal character. Instead, follow AACR2 Rule 1.1B1 and enter it as "[(cent sign).]" You'll probably want to include some variant titles as 246 fields as suggested by LCRI 21.301.

Q: Concerning the new practices for field 041, I understand the instructions to put only one 3-letter language code in each subfield and repeat the subfields for subsequent codes. Technical Bulletin 247, however, has no mention of subfield $h. I remember this as something of a sticking point at the discussion of changes to 041 during MLA 2002. People were even interested in doing away with it. So how do we handle subfield $h now?

A: The TB doesn't mention subfield $h because nothing about it has changed. It was already repeatable, as you know. (Don't get me started about these changes to 041. Some of us argued strongly against this needless complication of an already complex field, but the music and visual materials communities were overruled.) Continue to do pretty much what you've always done with subfield $h, except that it should follow the last of any multiple subfields that it is referring to, and if there are multiple original languages, each gets its own subfield $h. Here are a few examples:

Sound recording of work sung in Italian, with accompanying libretto translated into English, French, and German.

Old practice:

041 0 $d ita $e ita $e eng $e fre $e ger $h ita

New practice:

041 0 $d ita $e ita $e eng $e fre $e ger $h ita

Sound recording of works sung in English, translated from French, German, and Italian.

Old practice:

041 1 $d eng $h fregerita

New practice:

041 1 $d eng $h fre $h ger $h ita

Q: Let me see if I've got TB 247 straight. Here is the way it is today:

041 0 $d ger $g eng$fr

This will now become:

041 0 $d ger $g eng

041 0 $d ger $g fre

041 0 $d ger $g ger

True or false?

A: False. The effect of the new practice is simply to split up multiple codes, formerly in the same subfield, into their own iterations of that subfield. Thus

041 0 $d ger $g engfreger

becomes

041 0 $d ger $g eng $g fre $g ger
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Although field 041 is now repeatable, the only correct case in which one would find more than one 041 is when one 041 has MARC Language Codes and another 041 has non-MARC language codes (using a code list noted in subfield $2).

Q: I have a question about the recent change in placement of the 245 n/p. Until recently, these fields had to follow the $a. As much as that sometimes caused problems, it made sense to me since these fields are considered to be part of the title proper. Now, we are "allowed" to place the n/p subfields after $b, which means we can have the title proper split in two, the 2 halves separated by the $h and $b. My first question is, am I understanding this rule change correctly? If so, what I think I'd like to do in some cases is to include a 246 with: "246 3 Title proper. $a Number, $p Part title" in order to bring the various scattered parts of the title proper together. Does this seem reasonable? I don't particularly like or understand this change; it doesn't seem to make sense intellectually. But then again I don't understand a lot of recent changes such as the recent 041 change (i.e., why make life more difficult for folks using MARC language codes in order to better accommodate those using non-MARC [two-character] coding, all within the MARC structure? Why not just code the non-MARC language codes differently using an indicator?). But that's another harangue.

A: Don't get me started about the 041 changes. Many of us (as you know) argued strenuously against them, pointing out the hardships they would cause music and visual materials catalogers, in particular. To my regret, we lost that fight. Guess we need to get over it. As you've pointed out, the changes allowing wider latitude in the placement of subfields $n and $p, there may be cases where it results in the unfortunate separation of certain title elements. But I think these will be far outnumbered by the cases where the new subfielding capabilities will be welcome (parallel titles, especially). Keep two things in mind. As you've pointed out, field 246 will allow you to rejoin title elements that MARC has torn asunder (so to speak). Plus, there is nothing to prevent you from using the same sort of punctuation tricks we had already been using in order to keep things together that we wanted kept together. Thus

245 10 First part of title $h [sound recording] : $b ambiguous subtitle. $a Number, $p Part title / $c Statement of responsibility.

in some cases, at least, might be rendered alternatively as

245 10 First part of title, ambiguous subtitle. $a Number, $p Part title $h [sound recording] / $c Statement of responsibility.

This sometimes happens, for instance, when the "First part of title" is a proper name that may or may not be construed as part of the title. Anyway, I suspect that the new practice will prove to be useful more often than it will be problematic, and that when it is problematic, the problems can be alleviated by judicious use of 246.

Q: I have been in correspondence with several colleagues about the matter described below. I am interested in your take on the situation. One esteemed colleague came down on the side of separate bib records; the other demurred. My own take is that I might be justified in making a new bib record for the copy with added title pages, since their presence suggests a different mode of issue. We just bought the John Walsh voice/continuo score to "Love in a Village." Since we already had a Walsh edition of the work in the catalog, I did comparison shopping. The upshot is that I don't know how to handle the differences I found-- one catalog record or two? I guess what I'm looking for is a sense of how many editions are being dealt with here. Among the variations: The wording on the t.p. of each is identical, but the "new" copy is in slightly larger type, the title proper ends with a period, and a few words that were in block letters in the "old" copy are in script in the new. The "new" copy renders the publisher's name as "Walsh", i.e. with the old-style "s" (rather than "Walsh"). The contents pages appear to be identical in all respects. The "old" copy has 4 title pages, which aligns with Smith and Humphries' accounting of the piece as originally being issued in 4 collections from 1762-1763. The new copy has no intervening pages. The pages are numbered the same in both copies, though only the "new" copy has the added page numbers in the overture mentioned in Smith and Humphries. Most of the page numbers in the new copy are enclosed in parentheses. Around 7-8 pages of music appear to be from the same plate, unaltered; a few of the remainder may be from altered versions of the same plate, but many appear to be re-engravings. In general, the "new" copy has more instances of the upright sharp sign as opposed to the sideways one.

A: In cases where you are, in any way, uncomfortable adding a new record, the safe route is to edit the existing record for your own local use. That being said, this is certainly a curious situation, and since you have in hand two of what appear to be identifiably different manifestations of this score, I lean toward thinking that separate records are justified. You mentioned nothing about the possibility that the version with the four separate title pages may have been bound together after publication by someone other than the publisher, nor anything about any dates actually on the piece. If the publication is pre-1801, and your local policies call for cataloging under "Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books" or some other
standard, you may have more latitude in, and guidance for, describing this adequately. But that's really outside my area of expertise, such as it is. Assuming you are going to stick with AACR2 proper, I would suggest including some sort of note on the record for your "new" copy explaining, at the very least, that there exists another issue with the four separate title pages. Any other differentiating details you feel the need to include (with reference to Smith and Humphries, if appropriate) is your decision. How you are going to decide which existing bibliographic record represents your "old" copy, I have no idea.

Q: I have a question/ribble for you about your answer about durations in the 300 field in MOUG Newsletter 82. This is an interpretation I hear quite often from people, but when I read AACR2 1.5B4, 6.5B2, and their associated LCRIs, to me this is not what they seem to say. 1.5B4 clearly states that if an item has a playing time, that information should be recorded in the physical description, and 6.5B2 says to follow this. The LCRI to 6.5B2 then discusses situations in which no playing time given. The MCD elaborates by saying: Apply the "Interpretation" in LCRI 6.5B2 and give the total duration in the physical description area if the recording contains only one work. This is where the one-work bit comes in, but when I look at this, it seems to me to apply only when you are applying LCRI 6.5B2, that is, when the total playing time is not stated but the playing time of the parts is. The MCD then restricts this LCRI for use only if there is a single work; the durations of the parts can be added up and put in the physical description field. If the MCD is intended to apply to any CD with more than one work, whether or not durations are given, why is it referring to the LCRI and not to the rule itself? Am I really the only person in the world that reads it this way?

A: Are you forgetting the final paragraph of MCD 6.5B2, which says: "For sound recordings containing more than one work, apply LCRI 6.7B10 and MCD 6.7B10"? As I interpret MCD 6.5B2 as a whole, the instruction is: (1) to "give the total duration in the physical description area if the recording contains only one work (as defined in Appendix D, 'Musical work' (1)) . . . " and (2) give durations in a note when the recording contains more than one work. The definition of "Musical work" has moved from the AACR2 Glossary to footnote 9 of 25.25A, but the point still seems to hold. In general, I think of AACR2 proper as the basic, unadorned rules; the LCRIs as the rules interpreted by the U.S. cataloging community (represented by the de facto policymaker, the Library of Congress); and the MCDs as the rules further interpreted by the music cataloging community (represented by the de facto policymaker, the Library of Congress's Special Materials Cataloging folks). Here's how I read the succession of events: The blanket statement of 6.5B2 is refined by the LCRI for the instance where the total playing time of a sound recording isn't explicitly stated but needs to be added up from the durations of its individual parts. Then on further reflection, the MCD limits the placement of total durations in the physical description area to sound recordings containing a single work, further instructing us how to handle recordings with more than one work (following the references to LCRI and MCD 6.7B10 and subsequently from there to LCRI and MCD 6.7B18, that is, listing individual work durations in a Duration note or as part of a Contents note). I can see the subtle distinction you're making, and I know how tortured our logic can sometimes get when we're trying to decipher LC's pronouncements. Not to suggest that AACR2, LCRIs, or MCDs are ever carelessly, ambiguously, or cryptically worded, but I think that if MCD 6.5B2 were meant to say what you're suggesting, it would properly have said something like: "Apply the 'Interpretation' in LCRI 6.5B2, giving the total duration in the physical description area when the total playing time is not stated but must be added together from the duration of the parts, if the recording contains only one work . . . ." From the way that I regard the relation of AACR2, LCRIs, and MCDs, I can't really see it that way. Given the way I write, I'm in no position to accuse LC of constructing convoluted sentences, but perhaps this MCD would be more clear if it said: "Apply the 'Interpretation' in LCRI 6.5B2, giving the total duration in the physical description area if the recording contains only one work . . . ." Did that make any sense?

Q: I have a score that is a selection from Verdi's Trovatore arranged for violin and piano. The date on the score says "published 1892 by Carl Fischer." Should I use DtSt "m" and 260 subfield $1 "1892-1911," or DtSt "s" and 260 subfield $c c1911, and a 500 note for the publication date on the score? Any advice would be welcome. The arrangement is by Jacques Blumenthal and is part of the series "The Opera." It appears to be another edition of OCLC #33179763.

A: You should treat this as a multipart monograph, following 1.4P8 (tracing back from 5.4F1 to 1.4P). This would mean DtSt "m" and the 1892-1911 range of dates.

Q: Our intrepid Catalog Librarian is trying to formulate subject headings for a composition dissertation. The piece in question describes itself as a "symphonic poem"--for orchestra and SSAATTBB chorus. She'd like to know if there's any way to formulate a subject heading that indicates this--perhaps "Symphonic poems (Chorus with orchestra)"--except that of course there's nothing in the authority file that indicates vocal complements under the
rubric of symphonic poem. On the other hand, is there anything forbidding this? Also, just in case you're curious, the chorus parts are untexted—there isn't even an indication of which vowel they're supposed to vocalize on.

A: This is a sort of roundabout way to approach the question, but perhaps we can take a cue from Music Cataloging Decision 25.27A1, Footnote 10. It has to do with uniform titles, specifically for titles that include the name of a type of composition (which "symphonic poem" really isn't, according to "Types of Compositions for Use in Music Uniform Titles"). Nonetheless, maybe we can re-apply the idea, given a lack of explicit guidance in the Subject Cataloging Manual. The MCD states, in part: "When a composer uses a word which is normally the name of a type of composition as the title of a work which is definitely not a work of the type designated by the word, do not consider the title to be the name of a type of composition." Some of us who have been cataloging long enough will recall the wonderful little story behind this MCD, which is explained briefly (as only catalogers can) in the authority file record for Ezra Sims' "String quartet #2 (1962)" (n80091010), which is the final example in the MCD. We could extrapolate from this that, generally, if a composer borrows the designation of some "form" for a work that does not exemplify that form, headings for that form (be they uniform titles or subject headings?) do not properly apply to the work.

Actually, although I find no specific help in the SCM, we can take another corroborating hint from a passage in H 1917.5, section 5e, which states in part: "Concerto headings are not assigned to chamber music, where there is only one player to a part, even if the composer has used the term 'concerto.'" This is all a convoluted way to suggest that perhaps the subject heading(s) assigned should be limited to medium of performance, such as "Choruses, Secular (Mixed voices) with orchestra."

Response from Brian Newhouse (Princeton University): This strikes me as a terrible idea that would severely limit the usefulness of our subject cataloging. When a composer uses a generic term such as "symphony", "symphonic poem", "concerto", etc. to name a work of his, he is more often than not implying that the said work belongs to, or relates to in some way or other, the history of the genre. This sets up expectations for the listeners that will generally be reflected in future demand for and interest in the work. People looking for a specific symphonic poem which happens to have chorus in it will be as likely to be looking for it as a "symphonic poem" as they would be looking for it as a work for "chorus and orchestra." Deleting the generic subject heading in favor of the medium-of-performance subject heading would be depriving those users of a major access point. A precedent for using both generic and medium-of-performance subject headings for a single work can be found in the current policy for dance-form subject headings such as "Waltzes." A work can only have one uniform title, but it can have more than one subject heading. We assign multiple subject headings to books all the time.

A (Take Two): Brian, as always, raises some good points, and I would like to hereby take advantage of the fact that I hedged my earlier response "to suggest that perhaps," and so to change my mind. At least somewhat. I would continue to hold generally that assigning a subject heading to a work that does not exemplify the concept defined by that subject heading violates one of the basic principles of subject cataloging. The Subject Cataloging Manual H 180, section 12, "Concepts in titles," states in part: "Titles and subtitles are important because they sometimes state in the words of the author or publisher the subject matter of the work. Bring out or account for each topic of subject retrieval value that is identified in the title or subtitle and discussed in the work. Apply judgment and consider the following points when applying this principle." The very first point states: "If the title is misleading, euphemistic, or cryptic, do not use the title as a guide to the contents of the work." The "Concerto" issue in SCM H 1917.5, section 5e, which I cited previously, appears to be the only explicitly stated musical instance of this. But we'd all agree that applying the subject heading "String quartets" to Sims' "String quartet #2 (1962)" because that's what Sims titled it, would be absurd and misleading. (The work is actually for flute, clarinet, violin, viola, and cello and was composed in 1974, no matter what the title says.)

This discussion, however, has been occurring in a sort of vacuum, as we don't know the actual title of the "symphonic poem" in question, nor whether the work actually resembles a symphonic poem by definition, disregarding the presence of the chorus. If the work can be said to resemble a symphonic poem (chorus aside), I'm thinking now that we probably CAN apply that subject heading to it. But just as we don't add a parenthetical medium qualifier including chorus to the subject heading "Symphonies" for such works as Beethoven's Ninth or Lizz'z "Faust-Symphonie" ("symphonies" that include chorus), I think we would not add a parenthetical qualifier in this case. A second subject heading for the medium ("Choruses, Secular (Mixed voices) with orchestra") would still be a good idea. Please let me apologize for my previous hasty overgeneralization.

Q: Something came up regarding 041 subfield $h$ that I have long wondered about. Don't know why it never occurred to me to ask. BF&S, under field 041, states: 'For
works in multiple languages, the codes for the languages are recorded in the order of their predominance." There's my favorite undefined word: "predominance." (AACR2 full of iterations of it, too.) What criteria should you use in determining predominance among the languages? I've heard three interpretations: whichever language appears the most (more stuff in German than in English); whichever language is the original; whichever language appears first (like in a booklet's program notes). I suspect that whichever is correct, the order will end up as alphabetical much of the time anyway. But what's the word on this?

A: My initial thought was that the first criterion would be correct. There are, however, at least two MARC 21 examples (involving subfield $\text{fa}$, but found among the examples for subfield $\text{fa}$) that dismiss both the first and second criteria, suggesting it must be otherwise. In the final set of 041 subfield $\text{fa}$ examples (on p. 4), the next to last example is:

008/35-37  fre
041 1  $\text{fa}$ fre $\text{fh}$ ger $\text{fh}$ rus

[Text is in French and contains three works, the first translated from German and two from Russian.]

Of course, we have no information on the length of any of the three works in question, but assuming that the pages of the two Russian works outnumber the single German work, this example suggests that "predominance" has to do with order found in the piece rather than sheer number of pages (or its equivalent in other media). That argues against the first criterion and for the third. Go up a few examples to the second one in that same final set:

008/35-37  eng
041 1  $\text{fa}$ eng $\text{fh}$ ger $\text{fh}$ swe

[Text is an English translation of a German text which was originally published in Swedish.]

If I'm reading this correctly, that means the original language was Swedish and that German was an intermediate translation. So the original language doesn't go first, either, eliminating the second criterion. By default, I guess we have to go with the order in which the languages appear.

Q: I have a CD with a p date of 1994 on the disc, but a p date of 1999 on the container. Do I still use the date on the disc for a publication date? The music number is CPO 999 172-2. This is from their set of the complete symphonies of Luigi Boccherini; a number of other discs/containers in the set are in the same situation.

A: For sound recordings, generally use the latest "p" date. Since the container and accompanying textual material are prescribed sources of information, the date need not be bracketed (AACR2 6.0B2). You may want to indicate in a note the differing date on the disc itself. If there is other date information on the item (in program notes, for instance), it may shed light on the presence of these differing dates.

Q: In your coding book, p. 90, you show an example of ISMNs with volume designations. There is no subfield for the parenthetical volume designation. That must be intentional. So, in this record, is it incorrect to place the volume designation in subfield $\text{fc}$? I see that in MARC 21, the definition of $\text{fc}$ is rather broader than its name:

$\text{fc}$ - Terms of availability. Subfield $\text{fc}$ contains the price or a brief statement of availability and any parenthetical qualifying information pertaining to an item associated with a number being recorded in the field. Information is only recorded in this subfield when a number is present in subfield $\text{fa}$.

"Any parenthetical qualifying information" seems to suggest that more than "terms of availability" can be included in that subfield. Please advise.

A: MARC 21 does sound pretty clear, doesn't it? I based my information on LC's "Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual" (1999), which includes more detail about both subfield $\text{fa}$ ("Parenthetical qualifying information, such as the publisher/distributor, binding/format, and volume numbers, is included in subfield $\text{fa}$ when subfield $\text{fc}$ is not present. It is not separately subfield coded.") and subfield $\text{fc}$ (concerning prices and "Rental material"). Among the field examples in the LC manual are included two ISMNs with parenthetical volume designations in subfield $\text{fa}$. I have no idea why these two documents differ, but I guess I went with the LC manual because its practice paralleled that for 020. Maybe Richard Hunter, who compiled the LC manual, can shed some light?

Follow-up: Richard Hunter of LC kindly did some investigation into the question and responded with the following answer: "We slipped up and didn't catch the implications of the addition of subfield $\text{fc}$ back in 1993. Kay Guiles says, in part: 'Subfield $\text{fc}$ was added in MARBI proposal 93-7 adopted by MARBI June 28, 1993 and confirmed by LC August 4, 1993. The wording in the proposal is "Subfield $\text{fc}$ contains the price or a brief statement of availability and any parenthetical qualifying information pertaining to an item associated with a number being recorded in the field." There is some additional wording about where to record price under various
conditions. It looks to me that indeed the intent was to record qualifiers in subfield fc. Since this is contrary to the practice for ISBNs, I can only speculate that it was judged better to keep the number "pure" for data manipulation purposes. It may be that we were so influenced by ISBN practice that we overlooked what was called for in 024. I'll correct the examples in MOIM 024.

Q: So, where do I start with a DVD-Audio? Do OLAC or LC have any guidelines yet? Do I catalog this as a video or as sound recording, with an 006 field for the other format? I did some searching in OCLC, and found 4 bib records with DVD-audio catalogued on the video format, and 6 catalogued on the recordings format. We don't even have the right equipment to play them. On one DVD machine we were able to get the video portion (at least some). We can get the audio on all the machines. But according to the container, we should be able to see "liner notes, music analysis, organ registration and more." I'm tempted to lose this on my desk for a year or two, but unfortunately a faculty member is waiting on it.

A: My vote is to lose it. But seriously, I don't think there are any guidelines on DVD-Audio yet. Here are my suggestions. Catalog it basically as you would any sound recording. Add 006 for the video aspects. Use 538 to indicate what it calls itself, such as "DVD-Audio" and any system requirements. Depending upon how it is presented, the extra stuff can be part of the general contents or as a separate note.

Q: I've got an arrangement of "Lascia ch'io pianga" (from Rinaldo—it's an aria) for organ. It's a PWM Edition, one of those Polish publications. Nothing in the title proper or the statement of responsibility indicates that this is an arrangement besides the presence of the editor's name. But the music writing makes it abundantly clear. Which of the following should be done?: (a) Add "[for organ]" after the complete title and other title info before the statement of responsibility; (b) Add a 500 note "For organ;" or (c.) both? Smiraglia and AACR2 don't really address this. I think it is a style issue more than a rule issue. Your take? I read 5.7B1, but I was a little dumbfounded.

A: Although either solution would be acceptable, Rule 5.7B1 and its LCR1 suggest that a note would be preferable. In particular, LCRI 5.7B1 says in part, "If a work is published for a medium of performance other than the original, give the original medium of performance in a note if it is not clear from the rest of the description or the uniform title and the information is readily available." That would mean a note something along the lines of "Opera excerpt arr. for organ; originally for orchestra" or whatever might be appropriate. The LCRI passage by itself isn't terribly enlightening, but read in light of the rule proper, it becomes a little more clear. We're identifying the original musical form, the original medium of performance, and the medium of this particular arrangement, as none of those seem to be clear from the rest of the description.

Q: I am pondering how one could index "Facsimile" and "Urtext." Has anyone proposed a field for "Type of Music Edition?" I see that at one time Facsimile existed as a field describing microfilm. I conducted interviews with music faculty and they were most interested in obtaining, after manuscripts, Urtext and facsimile editions. Just seems like we are losing a very useful access point to users. I also understand that when one has a score and parts, only the score is considered in coding the Format of Music fixed field; however, has anyone proposed a way to account for the combination of "score and parts?"

A: Field 250 is not indexed in OCLC, but you are free to try to convince your local system folks that it is a useful access point. Of course, both "facsimile" and "Urtext" often appear elsewhere in a bibliographic record than in an edition statement, depending on how the information is presented on the item. Many of those other instances would be indexed (in 245 or notes, for example). Of course, the best way to give access to all facsimiles is the subject heading route, using "Music $v Manuscripts $v Facsimiles" as a subject heading (see sh2002012494). This is infinitely more efficient and allows for much more consistent and reliable access to such materials. See the LC Subject Cataloging Manual H 1595 and H 1855 for details on that. Likewise, subject headings provide the most consistent and reliable access to "Scores and parts" though that subject subdivision (see sh99001780).
NACO-Music Project Cumulative Statistics through September 30, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>NUC</th>
<th>NARs</th>
<th>SARs</th>
<th>Chg NARs</th>
<th>Chg SARs</th>
<th>Total New</th>
<th>Total Chg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>OBgU-MA</td>
<td>4119</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4119</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>MWaIB-CA</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>UPB-Mu</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>RPB-M</td>
<td>5524</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5623</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>5936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>PPI-MA</td>
<td>12196</td>
<td>12643</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12196</td>
<td>12644</td>
<td>24840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Public Library</td>
<td>OCI-FM</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Computer Services</td>
<td>IAhCCSM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>NIC-Mu</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3212</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>3655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton and Montgomery Co. PL</td>
<td>ODa-Mu</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman School of Music*</td>
<td>NRU-Mus</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>InU-Mu</td>
<td>16406</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3274</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16561</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>19868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana U., Archives of Trad. Music</td>
<td>InU-AT</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville (FL) Pub. Lib</td>
<td>FJ-PA</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>OOm-Mu</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td>VtMiM-Mu</td>
<td>3015</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3107</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>3875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina School of the Arts</td>
<td>NcWsNMU</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>IEN-Mu</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL, Performing Arts</td>
<td>NN-PAC</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL, Rodgers &amp; Hammerstein Arch.</td>
<td>NN-RH</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>OOC</td>
<td>6574</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>OCoLC-M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>PSt-AM</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>CSjU-CM</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith College</td>
<td>MNS-J</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>CST-Mus</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>NBuU-Mu</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Stony Book</td>
<td>NShSU-M</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>LNTUM</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>OAKU-MCU</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>CU-MUSI</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>CU-SMU</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>ICU-JRM</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*has also contributed a total of 322 BIBCO records
### NACO-Music Project Cumulative Statistics through September 30, 2002 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>NUC</th>
<th>NARs</th>
<th>SARs</th>
<th>Chg NARs</th>
<th>Chg SARs</th>
<th>Total New</th>
<th>Chg Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>OCU-Mu</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td>COU-MU</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>GU-Mu</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hartford</td>
<td>CtWhU-Mu</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>TxHU-Mu</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>ICIU-MU</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>KyLoU-Mu</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>MdU-Mu</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Amherst</td>
<td>MU-Mu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri, Kansas City</td>
<td>MoKU-MML</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>NmU-Pa</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
<td>NeU-Mu</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td>FJUNFCM</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>TxDn-Mu</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>InNdHIMu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>OrU-Mu</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PU-AML</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>2123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>CLSU-ML</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas, Austin</td>
<td>TxFU-Mu</td>
<td>4585</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4589</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>5190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>VIU-Mu</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassar College</td>
<td>NPV-Mu</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>MoSW-Mu</td>
<td>3248</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3471</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>5198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>MqDWPKMu</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster University</td>
<td>MqWgWMU</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Choir College</td>
<td>NjPWCT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>KwiU-M</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>CtY-Mu</td>
<td>7653</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2192</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7798</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>84160</strong></td>
<td><strong>1048</strong></td>
<td><strong>27160</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
<td><strong>85208</strong></td>
<td><strong>27334</strong></td>
<td><strong>112542</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Personal Membership is $15.00 (North America); institutional membership is $20.00 (North America); international membership (outside North America) is $30.00. Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members receive all newsletters for the year, and any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor.

NAME: ________________________________________________

PREFERRED ADDRESS: ___________________________________________

CITY ______________________ STATE _______ ZIP ___________ COUNTRY ___________

WORK PHONE: (____) ___________________ FAX NUMBER: (____) ___________

INSTITUTION NAME: ____________________________________________

POSITION TITLE: ________________________________________________

E-MAIL ADDRESS: ________________________________________________

A check payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP must accompany this application. Rates are as follows:

$15.00 Personal Membership (North America)
$20.00 Institutional Subscription (North American)
$30.00 Personal Membership or Institutional Subscription (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Ruth A. Inman, MOUG Treasurer, Kennedy-King College, 2538 W. 119th St., Chicago, IL 60655

Stephen Luttmann
MOUG Secretary/Newsletter Editor
University of Northern Colorado Music Library
Campus Box 68
Greeley, CO 80639-0100

UNIV OF NORTHERN COLORADO
JAMES A. MICHERNER LIBRARY
SERIALS DIVISION
501 20TH ST
GREELEY, CO 80639-0000