



M U S I C O C L C U S E R S G R O U P

<http://www.musicocclusers.org/>

## NEWSLETTER

ISSN 0161-1704

June 2008

No. 98

### From the Chair

**Tracey Rudnick, University of Connecticut**

Welcome to my first “From the Chair” column. Neil Hughes (University of Georgia) is a tough act to follow in both word and deed, and my very first words must be an expression of gratitude for Neil’s outstanding work as MOUG Chair (2006–2008). He constantly impressed me with his wide-ranging knowledge, “deep MOUG” and business experience, free-flowing prose, sense of humor, and dedication to all things MOUG. As Past Chair, he continues spearheading tasks with the same energy (but I hope less stress), and I am grateful for his support and advice. Thank you Neil!

In this time of transitions, please welcome new Secretary/Newsletter Editor, Alan Ringwood (University of Texas) into the fold; his articulate, thoughtful comments on MOUG business matters are already greatly appreciated, and we look forward to his newsletters!

Accepting a new office stimulates much reflection and nostalgia about our organization. My very first professional library meeting was the 1994 OLAC/MOUG conference in Oak Brook, Illinois. I had been assured that this would be an excellent resource for further cultivating my music cataloging skills. My overwhelmingly positive experience—so much knowledge gained and so many kindred spirits—convinced me to join MOUG. Neil Hughes had a similar experience at that same meeting, but he was a continuing MOUG member who ended up joining OLAC because of that meeting.

This year another joint OLAC/MOUG conference will be held in Cleveland, September 26–28, 2008. (The last joint conference was in 2000 in Seattle.)

This is your chance to benefit from three solid days of the practical “MOUG experience” that so many of you already enjoy at the February MOUG meetings. Continuing Education Coordinator, Bruce Evans (Baylor University), provides more detail elsewhere in this issue. Please take advantage of these continuing education opportunities, make new contacts, and encourage your colleagues or students to attend. Maybe you can bring someone new into MOUG’s fold!

For those who inquired, there will still be a regular MOUG meeting in Chicago next February. Your MOUG Program Committee, chaired by the tireless Bruce Evans, is hard at work planning an exciting program. Send your program ideas to Bruce or any member of the 2009 Program Committee (names appear elsewhere in this newsletter).

Of course, last year’s Program Committee must be congratulated for assembling an exciting program that included Glenn Patton (Director, WorldCat Quality Management, OCLC) and Paul Cauthen (University of Cincinnati) wading into a hot topic: vendor bibliographic record quality in OCLC; see summaries

*(Continued on page 3)*

### **IN THIS ISSUE:**

From the Past Chair .....	3
From the Continuing Ed. Coordinator .....	4
News from OCLC .....	4
New Listserv: MOUG-L .....	7
News from LC .....	8
Q & A by Jay Weitz .....	12
<i>The Best of MOUG</i> , 8th ed. ....	17-18
2008 Annual Meeting Reports .....	23
Minutes of the 2008 Business Meeting .....	27

**CHAIR**

Tracey Rudnick, Music Librarian  
 Music & Dramatic Arts Library  
 University of Connecticut  
 1295 Storrs Road, UNIT 1153  
 Storrs, CT 06269-1153  
 Phone: 860-486-0519  
 tracey.rudnick@uconn.edu

**PAST CHAIR**

Neil Hughes, Head, Music Cataloging  
 University of Georgia Libraries  
 Athens, GA 30602-1641  
 Phone: 706-542-1554  
 Email: nhughes@uga.edu

**TREASURER**

Deborah Morris, Technical Services Librarian  
 Performing Arts Library  
 Roosevelt University  
 430 S. Michigan Ave.  
 Chicago, IL 60605  
 Phone: 312-341-2328; Fax: 312-341-2425  
 Email: dmorris@roosevelt.edu

**SECRETARY/NEWSLETTER EDITOR**

Alan Ringwood, Head, Music Cataloging Unit  
 University of Texas Libraries  
 The University of Texas at Austin  
 P.O. Box P, Mail Code S5453  
 Austin, TX 78713-8916  
 Phone: 512-495-4191; Fax: 512-495-4410  
 a.ringwood@austin.utexas.edu

**CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR**

Bruce J. Evans  
 Music and Fine Arts Catalog Librarian &  
 Bibliographic Access Unit Leader  
 Baylor University Libraries  
 One Bear Place #97151  
 Waco, TX 76798-7151  
 Phone: 254-710-7863; Fax: 254-710-3116  
 Bruce\_Evans@Baylor.edu

**OCLC LIAISON**

Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist  
 OCLC Online Computer Library Center  
 MC 139  
 6565 Kilgour Place  
 Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395  
 Phone: 614-764-6156  
 Fax: 614-718-7195  
 Email: jay\_weitz@oclc.org

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue. The Newsletter is a publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. It appears three times a year: June, September, and December. Editor: Alan Ringwood, Mail Code S5453, P.O. Box P, University of Texas Libraries, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78713-8916.

Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be submitted electronically in Word. Articles should be consistent in length and style with other items published in the Newsletter. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged. Correspondence on subscription or membership (including change of address) should be forwarded to Deborah Morris, MOUG Treasurer, Technical Services Librarian, Performing Arts Library, Roosevelt University, 430 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL 60605 (Dues in North America, \$20.00 for personal members, \$25.00 for institutional subscriptions; outside North America, \$35.00; back issues for the previous two years are available from the Treasurer for \$5.00 per copy). A copy of the quarterly financial report is available from the Treasurer on request.

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's FEIN is 31-0951917.

**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.

(Continued from page 1)

in this issue. Also from that MOUG meeting came an initiative: Patton, upon hearing Cathy Gerhart's (University of Washington) presentation on WorldCat Local, suggested that MOUG assemble a group to give feedback on WorldCat Local directly to developers. As such, the intrepid leader of MOUG's Reference Services Committee, Stephen Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado), recruited several new committee members to jumpstart this inquiry: Rebecca Belford (University of Oregon), Cathy Gerhart (University of Washington), and Daryll Stevens (Colorado College). Past committee chair, Robert Acker (DePaul University), will continue lending his considerable experience and valuable insights. If you are interested in joining this effort, please contact Steve or me.

Speaking of intrepid, the 8<sup>th</sup> edition of *The Best of MOUG*, compiled by Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University) with assistance by Robert Sherrane (The Juilliard School), is now available for purchase! This valuable resource helps catalogers and reference librarians identify uniform titles for prolific composers. Keep it around for quick access or for composers who are difficult to search online. Find order information elsewhere in this issue.

In other business, it looks like the 2008 annual MOUG meeting costs came in under budget this year, no doubt thanks in part to MLA Convention Manager Gordon S. Rowley, Assistant Convention Manager Paula Hickner, and the Hyatt Regency Newport Hotel.

MOUG is well on its way to more solid financial footing, but the next step now looms. By the time you read this, members in good standing will have received postal ballots to raise annual dues. This small change is part of a multi-year, multi-pronged effort to bring (and keep) MOUG's operational expenditures and income in balance. That strategy includes occasional dues increases, with an eye toward keeping both expenses and dues relatively low.

Modest dues increases will help offset rising costs such as Board travel (despite conscientious efforts to limit expenditures by re-assessing practices and approaching our own institutions for funding), and a May 2009 US postal rate increase that affects everything from newsletter to ballot mailings. Modest dues increases can also help support new initiatives, such as MOUG perhaps becoming an ALA Affiliate, costs associated with becoming actively involved with imminent changes in OCLC's governance structure, or Web site development and redesign—including pos-

sibly e-voting and online dues payment. Please mail your ballots well before the July 1 due date so your vote can be counted. MOUG is your organization. Please participate in its governance.

You can also participate in MOUG's governance—and gain valuable professional experience—by running for office or nominating others. This year we will elect a new treasurer and vice-chair/chair-elect. To nominate yourself or others, please contact members of the 2008–2009 Nominating Committee: Jenny Colvin (Furman University, chair), Hermine Vermeij (University of California, Los Angeles), or Neil Hughes.

That's all for this time. If you have questions or concerns, feel free to contact me or any MOUG Board member. Find our contact information at <http://www.musicoclcusers.org/mougoff.htm>. Have a great summer, and we will see some of you at the OLAC/MOUG conference in Cleveland!

---

### From the Past Chair

Neil Hughes, University of Georgia

---

Nominations are now being accepted for the 2009 Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) Distinguished Service Award. This award recognizes and honors someone who has made significant professional contributions to music users of OCLC. The MOUG Executive Board selects a recipient based on nominations received from the MOUG membership.

Eligibility for nomination is as follows:

- Nominees must have made professional contributions which significantly address the needs and concerns of music-oriented users of OCLC's products and services.
- Nominees may be MOUG members, but membership in the organization is not a requirement.
- The nomination must be accompanied by a statement that provides supporting evidence of the nominee's qualifications.

Nominations should be sent to Neil Hughes at the address below by email or U.S. Mail. Nominations and accompanying statements must be postmarked no later than **June 30, 2008** and must be received no later than **July 14, 2008**. The Executive Board will select an award recipient at its fall meeting.

(Continued on page 4)

*(Continued from page 3)*

The award recipient will receive an engraved plaque containing an inscription recognizing his or her special contribution to the field, complimentary registration for the MOUG meeting at which the award is being presented, and a lifetime complimentary membership to MOUG.

Past recipients of this award are Charles M. "Chuck" Herrold, Jr. (2007; Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh), Bettie Jean Harden (2006; University of North Texas), Ralph Papakhian and Sue Stancu (joint recipients, 2005; Indiana University), Jay Weitz (2004; OCLC, Inc.), Judy Weidow (2003; University of Texas), and Kay Burnett (2002; Smith College).

For more information about MOUG, please visit <http://www.musicoclcusers.org/>. Questions and nominations can be sent to:

Neil Hughes  
MOUG Past Chair  
Head, Music Cataloging  
University of Georgia Libraries  
Main Library  
Cataloging Department  
Athens, GA 30602-1641  
[nhughes@uga.edu](mailto:nhughes@uga.edu)

---

### **From the Continuing Education Coordinator Bruce Evans, Baylor University**

---

This is a unique year for MOUG, as we are not working on just one program, but two. As I hope most of you have heard by now, MOUG will have a joint meeting with OLAC September 26–28, 2008 in Cleveland, Ohio. There is quite a wealth of workshops for anyone who catalogs either music or A/V materials. On Thursday, September 25, there will be a pre-conference workshop on map cataloging. The conference then begins in earnest on Friday. The sessions will include basic and advanced videorecording cataloging training by Jay Weitz, electronic resources training by Amy Weiss, form/genre heading training by Janis Young, integrating resources by Joseph Hinger, basic score cataloging by Margaret Kaus, advanced score cataloging by Ralph Paphakian, basic sound recording cataloging by Mark Scharff, advanced sound recordings by Robert Freeborn, a meta-data session by Jenn Riley, an update on the development of RDA, and also an update on the development of WorldCat Local by Cathy Gerhart. Registration specifics were still being worked out at the time of

printing, but should be available at <http://www.otsl.org/olac-moug/home.htm> by the time you read this. The conference will be held at the Renaissance Hotel Cleveland. Stay tuned for more details as they emerge, such as local tours and other conference information.

The second part of MOUG program planning is for our meeting next year in Chicago. The 2009 Program Committee, which includes Robert Sherrane (The Juilliard School), Peter Lisius (Kent State University), Catherine Gick (Brown University), and Steve Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado) are hard at work with me (Bruce) on that program. While we are still very early in the process of brainstorming ideas of program topics, you can rest assured that it should be a highly stimulating and engaging program. If you have program ideas, please send them to me or any member of the Program Committee. My sincere thanks to all of them for serving in this important role for MOUG!

---

## **News from OCLC**

**Compiled by Jay Weitz, OCLC**

---

### **General News**

#### **OCLC WorldMap: Information About Collections and Libraries Worldwide**

The OCLC WorldMap is a prototype system that provides an interactive tool for selecting and displaying international library holdings represented in WorldCat, as well as publishing, library, cultural heritage, and population data. The OCLC WorldMap allows users to select countries of interest, then to compare various library holding and data by country. WorldMap will generate interactive graphs that compare several different kinds of data for up to four countries at a time. For more information and a demonstration of the prototype, see <http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/worldmap/default.htm>.

#### **OCLC Releases EZproxy 5.0 Authentication and Access Software**

OCLC has released a new version of EZproxy, the leading software solution for serving library patrons remotely, that offers new features as well as support from the world's largest library service and research organization that acquired EZproxy in January. More than 2,500 institutions in over 60 countries have purchased EZproxy software to provide libraries a solution for authenticating remote user access to licensed databases. OCLC will honor the previous service

arrangement for existing and new users whereby licensees continue to enjoy access to new releases of EZproxy and technical support at no additional charge. EZproxy 5.0 software is available to new licensees at the same price as previous re-releases. EZproxy 5.0 software enhancements allow libraries to:

- View enhanced audit details that incorporate the location associated with the source IP address.
- Search across audit data to identify suspicious activity, including options to search based on location.
- Alter user access based on location, including the ability to block access or require additional information for access.
- Display a summary of database conflicts to identify and correct configuration issues.
- Develop advanced user authentication and authorization configurations using a new administration page.

EZproxy 5.0 will be the first release to offer technical support from OCLC. For more information about EZproxy or to order the software, contact an OCLC representative at [ezproxy@oclc.org](mailto:ezproxy@oclc.org). This product includes GeoLite data created by MaxMind, available from <http://www.maxmind.com/>.

### **Collections and Technical Services**

#### **National Library of China to Add its Records to OCLC WorldCat**

The National Library of China, the largest library in Asia, will add its bibliographic records to the OCLC WorldCat database, making those records available to researchers worldwide. The National Library of China will develop software to convert the format of its records before they can be added to WorldCat. Following development and conversion of the records, the National Library of China anticipates that some 1.5 million records will be sent to OCLC in 2008. These records, when added to WorldCat, will display Chinese characters. The Library will continue adding records to WorldCat beyond 2008 once the format has been converted. OCLC opened an office in Beijing in July 2007 to better serve the growing information needs of libraries and other cultural heritage institutions in China and other parts of Asia. OCLC's relationship with libraries in the People's Republic of China began in 1986, when OCLC introduced its CJK system for cataloging Chinese, Japanese, and Korean materials. An OCLC Service Center was established at Tsinghua University in 1996, and access to the OCLC FirstSearch online reference service was made available to about 100 academic institutions in China. In 2004, the CALIS (China

Academic Library and Information System) consortium, under the leadership of Peking University, began providing access to a NetLibrary eBook collection for 80 libraries in China. OCLC was selected to be the host site for the 4th China-U.S. Library Conference in October 2007 in Dublin, Ohio. Last held at Shanghai Library in 2005, this prestigious scholarly conference brought together leaders from libraries, museums, and archives in China and the United States for three days of presentations and meetings focusing on cooperation among institutions in China and the United States.

#### **OCLC Offers Digital Archive Service for Long-Term Storage of Digital Collections**

OCLC is now providing a Digital Archive service for long-term storage of originals and master files from libraries' digital collections. The Digital Archive service is simplified to fit with a variety of digital library workflows and to keep the costs of safely storing these important files within the budget of a library's digital program. The service will provide automated monitoring and reports on stored digital collections. OCLC has been leading preservation efforts in the library community with digital archive services since 2001. The Digital Archive service builds on that experience. OCLC has integrated the service to fit typical workflows for building and managing digital collections. The service provides a secure storage environment for libraries to easily manage and monitor master files and digital originals. The importance of preserving master files grows as a library's digital collections grow. Libraries need a workflow for capturing and managing master files that finds a balance between the acquisition of both digitized and born-digital content while not outpacing a library's capability to manage these large files. Connexion is the OCLC tool that allows catalogers to perform original and copy cataloging with WorldCat, the world's most comprehensive bibliographic database. The Digital Archive service is a specially designed system in a controlled operating environment dedicated to the ongoing managed storage of digital content. OCLC has developed specific systems processes and procedures for the service tuned to the management of data for the long term. From the time content arrives, the Digital Archive systems begin inspecting it to ensure continuity. OCLC systems perform quality checks and record the results in a "health record" for each file. Automated systems revisit these quality checks periodically so libraries receive up-to-date reports on the health of the collection. OCLC provides monthly updated information for all collections on the personal archive report portal. For users of CONTENTdm, OCLC's digital col-

*(Continued on page 6)*

(Continued from page 5)

lection management software for libraries and other cultural heritage institutions, the Digital Archive service is an optional capability integrated with various workflows for building collections. Master files are secured for ingest to the Digital Archive service using the CONTENTdm Acquisition Station, the Connexion digital import capability and the Web Harvesting service. For users of other content management systems, the Digital Archive service provides a low-overhead mechanism for safely storing master files. Libraries or other cultural heritage institutions interested in more information about the OCLC Digital Archive Service should contact Taylor Surface, [taylor\\_surface@oclc.org](mailto:taylor_surface@oclc.org).

### **Resource Sharing, Contract Services, Collection Management**

#### **NetLibrary Announces Agreements with 21 International Publishers**

NetLibrary, OCLC's platform for eContent and the leading provider of eBooks for the institutional library market, has announced agreements with 21 leading publishers that will add thousands of new eBooks and eAudiobooks to NetLibrary's growing catalog of more than 160,000 titles. With increasing worldwide demand for electronic content, NetLibrary continually enhances its catalog by partnering with preeminent publishers of scholarly, trade, STM and reference content. New publisher partners adding eContent to NetLibrary include:

- A&C Black is one of the leading educational publishers in the UK, producing books in business, arts, wildlife, reference, and children's titles, and is most famous for its publication of *Who's Who* since 1897.
- Alcazar AudioWorks produces a wide range of audiobooks, specializing in books for the young listener and classical titles.
- Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc. specializes in the classics and classical languages, ancient and modern history, and offers school texts, grammars, ancillaries, and enrichment materials for Latin and Greek instruction.
- The Chinese University Press was established in 1977 as the publishing house of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, and has established itself as a notable publisher of scholarly publications on Chinese culture as well as China and Hong Kong studies.
- Cyan Communications, Ltd. is a publisher of general non-fiction books, with an emphasis in business, self-development, wellness, psychology, lifestyle, narrative non-fiction, memoir, and

humor titles.

- Éditions MultiMondes is a Canadian French-language publisher with a diverse catalog that includes books in medicine, environment, science, technology, history, and education.
- Electronic & Database Publishing, Inc. publishes high quality trade and business books, periodicals, newsletters, research reports, and other copyrighted materials, concentrating solely on electronic and database distribution channels.
- Encyclopædia Britannica is a leader in reference and education publishing and now offers many of its award-winning products in eBook format including the *Britannica Almanac*, the *Britannica Illustrated Science Library*, *My First Britannica*, *New Views of the Solar System*, the *Britannica Concise Encyclopedia*, and *Britannica's Encyclopedia of World Religions*, as well as some in audio format.
- Freeway Guides provides practical audio training for people on the go and offers titles on business/work, personal finance, public speaking, healthy eating, effective networking, and many other topics.
- Garnet Publishing and Ithaca Press are leading English-language publishers of academic books devoted to the Middle East and Arab world, with titles covering the fields of architecture, art, cookery, culture, heritage and history of the Middle East, and Islam.
- Harriman House is one of the UK's leading independent publishers of finance, business, economic and political books covering a wide range of subjects from personal finance, small business, and lifestyle, to stock market investing, trading, and professional guides.
- Hart Publishing is an independent British publisher of intellectually stimulating and innovative law books with an international scope.
- The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) is a nonprofit membership organization dedicated to improve teaching, learning, and school leadership by advancing the use of technology in PK-12 and teacher education. ISTE publishes books for classroom teachers, technology coordinators, administrators, and teacher educators.
- Kensington Books is one of the last remaining independent U.S. publishers of hardcover, trade, and mass market paperback books and is considered a leader and innovator in such areas of publishing as African-America, gay and lesbian, Wicca, alternative health, and romance.
- Kinokuniya is a highly acclaimed Japanese publisher whose diverse publishing program in-

## Announcing MOUG-L, the New MOUG Listserv

MOUG-L is an electronic discussion list for the dissemination of information and the discussion of issues and topics of interest to music library professionals. Postings routinely include discussion of music cataloging issues, OCLC products and services as related to music cataloging and reference work, related announcements, and information about conferences and other professional development opportunities. MOUG-L is an open discussion list; anyone may subscribe.

Originally established at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas by Cheryl Taranto, the list has served the organization as a discussion medium since 2000. In 2008 the list was moved to a new location at the University of Kentucky. For questions about the list or to report any problems with the list, please contact Kerri Scannell Baunach at [kscannell@uky.edu](mailto:kscannell@uky.edu).

### SUBSCRIBE to MOUG-L:

Send an e-mail message to [listserv@lsv.uky.edu](mailto:listserv@lsv.uky.edu) with the subject line blank. In the body of your message, type ONLY the following (no signature): SUBSCRIBE MOUG-L YOUR NAME (substituting your own name; commands are not case-sensitive).

Please note: If you are currently subscribed to the old listserv, you must subscribe to the new listserv if you wish to receive MOUG-L postings. The current subscriber roster will not be migrated from the old listserv to the new one.

For more instructions, see <http://www.musicoclcusers.org/listserv.html>.

cludes Western literary criticism, anthropology, mathematics, and physics. Kinokuniya's eBooks are available in Japanese.

- Mason Crest Publishing has quickly established itself as one of the leading young-adult and reference, school, and library publishers. Mason Crest publishes core-related materials for grades 4-12, books that are high-quality, and unique to the marketplace.
- Matrix Audio, an imprint of Summersdale Publishers, Ltd. publishes eAudiobook editions of Summersdale trade titles covering travel, literature, humor, self help, martial arts, gifts, and general nonfiction.
- Oasis Audio is an audiobook publisher specializing in religious and inspirational titles, as well as in fiction, health, business, children's, and audiobooks of *The Complete Idiot's Guide*®.
- Pensoft Publishers is a European natural science publisher with programs in zoology, botany, earth and environmental sciences, as well as in mathematics, physics, history, linguistics, and business.
- The Peterson Institute for International Econom-

ics is a private, nonprofit, nonpartisan research institution devoted to the study of international economic policy. The Institute publishes in the areas of country and regional studies, globalization, international finance, trade and investment, debt and development, as well as in U.S. economic policy.

- PrePublishing provides eBooks on writing successful resumes and cover letters for specific jobs in the public and private sectors such as finance, medicine, and engineering.

The full NetLibrary eContent catalog includes the latest information technology titles, reference essentials, business and economics resources, best-selling fiction titles and more. NetLibrary continually adds different types of eContent to its catalog to further its objective of helping libraries meet the digital demands of their users. A complete list of NetLibrary Publisher Partners is available at: <http://company.netlibrary.com/PublisherPartners.aspx>. For more information about titles available through NetLibrary, contact a NetLibrary representative by sending an e-mail to: [libservices@netlibrary.com](mailto:libservices@netlibrary.com).

*(Continued on page 8)*

(Continued from page 7)

### **OCLC NetLibrary Launches New eAudiobooks Subscription Collection**

The eAudiobook Blackstone Collection is available to libraries worldwide as an annual subscription with unlimited simultaneous user access. The collection features hundreds of best-selling, popular, classic and contemporary titles, read by award-winning narrators. The collection's broad subject coverage in both fiction and non-fiction categories will satisfy the recreational, professional, and educational interests of listeners of all ages. The Blackstone eAudiobook collection is delivered via the NetLibrary platform, in WMA format, seamlessly integrating with existing NetLibrary eBook and eAudiobook holdings. The subscription is delivered under a simultaneous, multi-user access model. Any number of patrons can access the same eAudiobook title at the same time through the Internet. Users have the ability to check out and download up to 10 titles at one time for a period of 21 days. More information about NetLibrary eAudiobooks can be found at [www.oclc.org/audiobooks/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/audiobooks/default.htm).

### **OCLC and Orbis Cascade Alliance to Develop New Consortial Borrowing Solution**

The Orbis Cascade Alliance and OCLC are working together to migrate the Alliance's Summit union catalog to a consortial borrowing solution based on the integration of WorldCat.org, VDX, WorldCat Resource Sharing, and a new circulation gateway in time for the beginning of the 2008-2009 academic school year. The Orbis Cascade Alliance will implement a WorldCat Group Catalog with an interface based on WorldCat.org. This union catalog will present the 28-million-volume collections of the 35 Alliance member institutions at the top of results sets, followed by results from the rest of WorldCat. The migration of Summit to OCLC's consortial borrowing solution will include an immediate initiative to increase the accuracy and comprehensiveness of member library holdings in WorldCat and the implementation of a resource sharing system that combines the best of ILL and circulation capabilities and workflows. Alliance member libraries also will have the option to implement WorldCat Local, a new service that combines the cooperative power of OCLC member libraries worldwide with the ability to customize WorldCat.org as a solution for local discovery and delivery services.

---

## **News from the Library of Congress**

### **Prepared by Steve Yusko, LC**

---

*Editor's note: The report from the Library of Congress was distributed through multiple listservs prior to the MOUG meeting in Newport. Excerpts appear below; for the full report, point your Web browser to <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/MLA2008.doc>.*

### **SPECIAL MATERIALS CATALOGING DIVISION (SMCD)**

*(Steve Yusko, MSR2, SMCD)*

**Leased Metadata:** In January 2007, the MSR teams began a pilot to create bibliographic records for popular music CDs with metadata leased from the *All Music Guide* services of All Media Guide, LLC. LC receives weekly updates to the AMG CD database. With MBRS/SMCD-developed software, the technicians located and imported AMG metadata and output the result into a Voyager MARC encoding level 3 record. While the data needed to be massaged to meet our own input standards and needs, this process all but eliminated the need for original keying of a massive quantity of data, including contents notes. As of February 10, 2008, 2,146 bibliographic records for CDs have been added to the LC database using this software.

**New Sound Recording Formats guidelines:** In order to address the burgeoning problems of cataloging new and hybrid sound recording formats, SMCD, in consultation with MBRS, CPSO, and OCLC, documented guidelines for LC catalogers and technicians. These guidelines include instructions for various CD, DVD, and electronic resource formats most of which have begun to appear over the last three years. Though originally designed as an LCRI, the need for efficient and timely updating of the document caused CPSO to mount the guidelines at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/soundrec.pdf>. Though there will be links via Cataloger's Desktop to this document from the appropriate rules in Chapter 6 of AACR2, the document is currently available to the public at this URL.

**Retrospective Conversion:** For the last year and a half, the Music Division and the Special Materials Cataloging Division have been jointly drafting plans, studies, proposals, and justifications for embarking on a retrospective conversion of the seven music card catalogs (3,500,000 cards). Currently, plans are underway to this effort with the cooperation of the Cataloging Distribution Service. The planning group, chaired by Howard Sanner, has been tasked to the

conversion of large catalog (675,948 cards) as a means of establishing best practices which can later be applied to all other card catalogs in LC awaiting conversion, including the six remaining music catalogs. At present, in depth catalog and workflow analyses have been initiated.

### Ongoing Projects

**Musical Theater Sheet Music:** The Music Division has approximately 1,400 boxes of M1508 (musical theater) sheet music. The vast majority of this is neither in Voyager nor in the Division's card catalogs. We established a pilot project with a work-study to input song titles, show titles, composers, lyricists, and publication dates into an Access database (designed by NDMSO) from which will be created MARC records for Voyager and MODS records for the Performing Arts Encyclopedia. The MARC records will be collection level records (per show title) and the MODS records will be for individual songs. Public access to these records will occur as soon as production has reached a critical mass. The summer of 2007 saw the influx of 5 Junior Fellows Summer Interns, who spent most of their time inputting M1508 songs and creating an exhibit of their work. Other SMCD staffers also participated, and 3 people are continuing to work on the project. To date, almost 12,000 individual songs have been entered into the database. We are starting to work with NDMSO to plan the display on the Music Division web site.

**Foreign Language Sound Recording Project:** The purpose of this project is to provide brief-level records of the sound recordings that are principally in non-Western languages and scripts. This year catalogers and technicians from two separate divisions worked together to produce a total of 933 discs/cassettes which represented 619 titles in Arabic, Hawaiian, Hebrew, Korean, Persian, Russian, and Vietnamese. Since the project's inception 3,311 foreign language sound recordings have been processed.

### Cooperation/Outreach

**Network Development and MARC Standards Office:** MSR management participated in MARC Review Group meetings in preparation for MARBI meetings. Additionally, staff provided feedback to institutions submitting proposals either through correspondence or via Music Library Association contacts. The following proposals and discussion papers were of interest to MSR cataloging:

- **Proposal 2007-01:** Definition of subfields \$b (Language code of summary or abstract) and \$j

(Language code of subtitle or caption) in Field 041 (Language code) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

- **Proposal 2007-02:** Incorporating invalid former headings in 4XX fields of the MARC 21 Authority Format.
- **Discussion Paper 2007-DP05/Proposal 2008-02:** Data elements needed to ascertain copyright facts/Definition of field 542 for information related to Copyright status in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.
- **Discussion Paper 2008-DP04:** Encoding RDA, Resource Description Access data in Marc 21 formats.
- **Discussion Paper 2008-DP02:** Making field 440 (Series Statement/Added Entry—Title) obsolete in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

### **CATALOGING POLICY AND SUPPORT OFFICE (CPSO)**

*(Geraldine Ostrove)*

**Database Improvement Unit in CPSO:** has updated over 1,000,000 records since the unit was formed in June 2004. The unit corrects dates in name authority records; obsolete subject and descriptive access points in bibliographic records; and typos, incorrect field tags, and so forth. The team also updates subject access points in bibliographic records prompted by the approved LCSH Weekly Subject Lists.

**Validation Subject Authority Records:** There will be an increase in the number of subject authority records distributed through the Cataloging Distribution Service as we gain momentum in an initiative to vastly increase the number of subject authority records. These records, which we are calling "validation records," are being created retrospectively based on valid subject strings (headings followed by one or more subdivisions) that occur in 50 or more bibliographic records. These are the kinds of subject strings that catalogers have been able to build and assign without creating authority records. Some of the validation records are being created manually while others are being generated by machine, but all of them will be reviewed before distribution by the Cataloging Distribution Service. Validation records can be identified by the presence of a 667 field that reads: "Record generated for validation purposes." So far, about 3,000 such records have been created since testing began in June. We expect eventually to produce 5,000-25,000 such records a week. Validation records are available in the Cataloger's Desktop ver-

*(Continued on page 10)*

(Continued from page 9)

sion of LCSH but will not be included in the annual print volumes of LCSH. They are also available in the iteration of LCSH in Class Web.

**Genre/Form Authority Records (MARC field tag 155):** Last September the first batch of LCSH authority records using MARC Authority Format tag 155, Genre/form term, was issued as an experiment limited to moving image headings, i.e., those for film, videos, and television programs. There are now about 200 such records. They are available for searching and display in Classification Web via a search screen accessible by clicking the new “Genre/Form Headings” link on the main Menu screen. In support of the creation and application of the moving image genre/form authority records, there is now an instruction sheet, H 1913, that was published in the *2007 Update 2* of the *Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings*. More information on genre/form authority records may be found at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsso/genre.html>. Another project, to add radio terms (approximately 70 terms) to LCSH, is well along. Under development are projects 1) to convert relevant LCSH music vocabulary from 150 tags (headings for musical works now tagged as topical terms) to 155 authority records and to add appropriate new LCSH vocabulary using 155 tags, and 2) to convert from 150 records to 155s or revise LCSH law genre/form vocabulary.

## MUSIC DIVISION

(Cathy Dixon, Music Division)

### Important Division Trends

The Library of Congress Gershwin Prize for Popular Song was inaugurated for the purpose of publicizing and improving the Library’s popular music collections, developing substantive relationships with pop music composers and artists, and increasing opportunities for music acquisitions. The first Prize was awarded to Paul Simon on May 22, 2007 at a Great Hall dinner, and a concert was held in his honor in the Warner Theatre on May 23. This concert was filmed and broadcast on WETA on June 26.

The Music Division returned to a distinguished 60-year tradition of radio broadcasts with a new 13-week series. *Concerts from the Library of Congress* is produced by the Music Division in cooperation with WETA-FM and CD Syndications. Composer and conductor Bill McGlaughlin, creator and host of the Peabody-Award winning program Saint Paul Sunday Morning, is the host of the series, which features stel-

lar concerts from the Library’s historic Coolidge Auditorium. Featured artists include Joshua Bell, András Schiff, the Beaux Arts Trio, Stephen Isserlis, the Borromeo Quartet, Barry Douglas and Camerata Ireland, among others. Listeners will have the rare chance to visit the division’s treasure vaults, through a special online series of companion packages created for each program. Original manuscripts and sketches by J.S. Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Copland, Gershwin and many others, as well as letters, photographs, and memorabilia will be accessible via the Library’s Web site, at <http://www.loc.gov>. Audio and video excerpts of the concerts will be included, as well as podcasts for selected programs.

The Music Division has partnered with the American Musicological Society to develop a lecture series featuring musicologists who have published research based on their work in the Library’s general and special collections. Prof. Judith Tick, of Northeastern University, [presented] the inaugural lecture, "Ruth Crawford Seeger, Modernist Composer in the Folk Revival: Biography as Music History," [on March 26]. Future speakers will be Jeff Magee speaking on his work on Irving Berlin and Annegret Fauser on former Music Division Chief Harold Spivacke. This initiative will be publicized on both the AMS and Music Division Web sites and will feature a Web cast and online publication of Prof. Tick’s lecture in an outreach effort to share this project with students and scholars worldwide.

The Music Division has joined with the Juilliard School, the Morgan Library, and Harvard University in a project to provide unified Web access to music manuscripts (and possibly other primary source materials, such as early editions) located in geographically remote institutions. The holdings of these institutions encompass a significant proportion of the most important music manuscripts worldwide, and providing a single point of access to these materials would be of enormous value to scholars, performers, and editors, among many others.

### Digital Resources

This year, the Music Division launched four major Web presentations:

- *The Performing Arts Encyclopedia*: Our biggest Web initiative has been the merging of our two Web sites, “The Performing Arts Encyclopedia” and “The Library of Congress presents: Music, Theater and Dance,” into one Web site that will henceforth be known as “The Performing Arts Encyclopedia.” The site features a new design

compatible with other Library of Congress Web pages, and will be the portal for performing arts resources and digital collections at the Library. The initial site is expected to go live in . . . 2008, and we anticipate updates and improvements being made to its functionality throughout 2008. We encourage MLA members to check out the new site and give us feedback.

- *Ragtime* was launched on October 31, 2006 featuring sheet music, recordings, and essays, as well as oral history interviews with renowned ragtime performers and scholars such as Max Morath and Joshua Rifkin (6,463 digital files were added).
- *African-American Band Music and Recordings* was released on February 1, 2007 and featured almost 300 band stocks and recordings showcasing African-American composers and performers of the early twentieth century (47,110 digital files were added).
- *The Amazing Grace* site was a collaboration between the Music Division, MBRS, and the American Folklife Center and was launched on April 11, 2007. The site featured a database of over 3,000 recorded versions of the song, early print versions of the song including the very first printing, and numerous recordings, both commercial and those derived from field research, from 1922 to today (3,152 digital files were added).
- A site commemorating the Guarneri "Twin" violins at the Library was launched on May 18, 2007.

In addition, the following special Web sites were launched/updated or are being planned:

- *The March King: John Philip Sousa* was launched on November 5, 2007 and contains selected music manuscripts, photographs, printed music, historical recordings of the Sousa Band, copies of programs and press clippings, and more from the Sousa material at the Library of Congress.
- The Roger Reynolds Web site was updated to feature a "Genealogy of Transfigured Wind," an attempt to show the way a composer constructs a piece through its many iterations (200 digital files were added).

In collaboration with the American Choral Directors Association, the Music Division is creating the "Choral Music of America, 1870-1923" Web site, which will initially feature twenty-one pieces of choral music from the collections of sheet music representing the music of early American composers. Included in this collection are examples of both sacred and secular music, a combination of works for mixed choirs, for women's, men's and for children's chorus. The composers include George Chadwick (1854-1931), once acknowledged as the 'dean of American composers;' Horatio W. Parker (1863-1919), a composer and educator known for major vocal and choral compositions, many of which reside as manuscripts in the Music Division; Nathaniel Dett (1882-943), a Black American composer who, as director of the Hampton Institute, developed a choir into a superior organization that won critical acclaim in both the U.S. and Europe; and Amy Beach (1867-1944), one of the first American composers to be trained completely in the U.S.A., who is a composer well-known in the American public for her gift of melodic writing.

#### Acquisitions

Among the most important items acquired this year:

- Gift. The Goldberg Barron Vitta Guarneri violin (ca. 1730), formerly owned and played by Szymon Goldberg. It is the "twin" of the Kreisler Guarneri, already in the Library's instrument collection.
- Continuing to collect important sources for the study of works by G.F. Handel, we acquired first editions of operas *Alexander* and *Scipio*, and of *The Occasional Oratorio*, *The Triumph of Time*, and *Jephtha*; *Radamisto*, as published by the author in London; and an important imprint of *Semele* (purchase).
- In addition to numerous individual letters of Puccini, we purchased a group of seventeen unpublished letters, written to George Maxwell, the U.S. representative of his publisher.
- A large collection of letters from Liszt to publisher C.F. Kahnt.
- We acquired a large archive of 61 letters and documents, dated 1907-1909, concerning the formation of the American National Opera Company. Letters addressed to Mrs. E.M.S. Fite and

(Continued on page 12)

(Continued from page 11)

to Reginald de Koven record the formation of an organization that involved many leading musical figures of the day, including Arthur Foote, George W. Chadwick, Harry Rowe Shelley, Geraldine Farrar, Franz Lehar, and many others.

- Ned Rorem holograph music manuscripts for works including the *Mallet Concerto* for percussion and orchestra; *Songs of Sadness* for medium voice, guitar, clarinet, and piano; and *Pas de Trois*, trio for oboe, violin and piano (purchase).

### Music Division Personnel

*Appointments:*

**Catherine Dixon**, Head, Reader Services Section, Music Division, July 22, 2007

**Denise Gallo**, Head, Acquisitions and Processing Section, Music Division, June 10, 2007

**Amber Thiele**, Music Specialist, CIRLA Fellow (One Year Internship)

*Resignations:*

**Stephanie Poxon**, Digital Reference Specialist, October 1, 2007

### AMERICAN FOLKLIFE CENTER

(Catherine Hiebert Kerst, *Folklife Specialist/Archivist, American Folklife Center*)

### Key Music Acquisitions

**Alan Lomax Collection:** AFC acquired the final increment of the Alan Lomax Collection, which includes various materials related to Lomax's research on cantometrics, choreometrics, performance style, and culture. These materials comprise 71,920 items, consisting of manuscripts, sound recordings, graphic images and moving images. (The majority of the Lomax Collection was acquired by AFC in 2004.)

### Programs, Projects, & Public Events

**Ethnographic Thesaurus:** The initial three-year phase of the American Folklore Society's Ethnographic Thesaurus Project was completed on June 1, 2007. The result was a comprehensive controlled list of subject terms created to describe multi-format ethnographic research collections. It was produced with significant effort and guidance by American Folklife Center staff. Primary support for the development of the Ethnographic Thesaurus was provided by a major grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation from 2004-2007. The American Folklife Center will con-

tinue to be involved, in an advisory capacity, in the ongoing maintenance and expansion of the thesaurus. During the fall of 2007, the first full draft of the Ethnographic Thesaurus was posted on the American Folklore Society Web site, using MultiTees Pro, a thesaurus construction and management program. <http://et.afsnet.org/>.

---

## Questions and Answers

Jay Weitz, OCLC

---

### *Subject Headings with Percussion*

**Q:** I'm cataloging a piece called *Nomadic Nocturnes* for piano, clarinet and percussion. There are four percussionists involved and four percussion parts, for a total of six parts, all together. For the subject headings, do I call this a sextet or a trio? Is the proper subject heading "Trios (Piano, clarinet, percussion)" or "Sextets (Piano, clarinet, percussion (4))" or something else?

**A:** Subject headings involving percussion are always confusing, but here is the key. Check out the subject authority record for the heading "Percussion music" (sh85099763), which includes a note that reads: "The word 'percussion' may stand for any number of percussionists when used as a medium of performance or as accompaniment in other headings, e.g. Choruses, Secular (Mixed voices) with percussion; Concertos (Percussion); Octets (Trumpets (4), percussion); Percussion with orchestra; Songs with percussion." Your subject heading would actually be "Sextets (Piano, clarinet, percussion)," with the silent implication of one piano, one clarinet, and four percussionists.

### *Notes on a Cardboard Container*

**Q:** How would you describe the container for a compact disc that is issued in a cardboard container? I couldn't find any description of this type container in AACR2 revised ed. Would this 500 note be appropriate: "Program notes (3 folded sheets ([6] p.) : ill.) comprises the container."

**A:** In the era of the LP, when most containers were cardboard and often had the program notes printed on them and/or bound into the fold, we simply said something such as: "Program notes on container" or "Program notes bound in container," as appropriate and with additional details when needed. There's no reason why a cardboard CD container couldn't be

treated similarly. The exact configuration of your program notes isn't clear to me (Is it a tri-fold container with notes on it? Is it a single-fold container with notes on it and on an additional page tipped-in at the fold? Is it some other arrangement?) Either of those old LP notes would be adaptable to most CD cardboard container situations. You needn't specify the number of pages or sheets unless you considered that information to be important.

### *The Issue of Matrix Numbers*

**Q:** I'm working with some copy cataloging for a recording where the labels have consecutive numbers (XTV 20628 and XTV 20629). They are coded as being issue numbers. My first impulse was to retag them as matrix numbers, but the description of issue numbers in BFAS caused me pause. When I was coming up in the world of cataloging, most of the Melodiia numbers we encountered were in this category, and we coded them as matrix numbers, whether printed on the label or only in the vinyl. I learned to think of an issue number as something that pertained to an entire disc or set of discs, but BFAS specifically includes "side of a sound recording." The BFAS criterion seems to be where the number is found: label or package for issue, vinyl/shellac for matrix. Do I need to readjust my thinking here?

**A:** Although the BFAS version is edited somewhat, that definition of "issue number" comes directly from MARC 21, where it has read pretty much the same going all the way back to the introduction of field 028 into MARC in 1980: "The issue number is the number used to identify the issue designation, or serial designation, assigned by a publisher to a specific sound recording, side of a sound recording, or performance on a sound recording." It's my perception that the boundary between "issue numbers" and "matrix numbers" has always been fluid, especially as we've continued to move away from the days of literal pressings of recordings. Remember that matrix numbers originally identified information about the recording session, the take number, the plant in which the recording was pressed, and such things of questionable relevance to the current technology of recording. In practical MARC coding terms, I generally make the same distinction as you seem to do: matrix numbers change from side to side, whereas issue numbers apply to a whole disc or to a set of discs. Historically, it has also been the case (at least "generally," as BFAS states) that matrix numbers most commonly appeared inscribed on the disc and that issue numbers most commonly appeared on labels and containers, although neither of these was

ever exclusively true. When we're talking about pre-CD discs, it's relatively safe to consider numbers that change from side to side as matrix numbers and those that cover a whole disc or a set of discs as issue numbers, regardless of how they are presented or where they are found.

### *How Field 041 Simplifies the Complexities of Language Data*

**Q:** I am cataloging a CD of early 20<sup>th</sup> century recordings of opera arias, sung in various languages by various performers. Most works are sung in Italian, and a few of these are translated from French. Some works are sung in German, and a few of these are translated from French or Italian. One work is sung in the original English. How can I construct field 041 so that it conveys all of this information? Is it possible to do this without the 041 looking too unwieldy? How specific should I get in the 546? I am getting hung up on where to place each subfield \$h in relation to each subfield \$d, and the fact that some of the Italian and German works are translations and some are not.

**A:** Sadly, the 041 field isn't nimble enough to convey unambiguously all of the subtle details of a situation such as you describe. The information in the MARC 21 text for field 041 isn't of much use here, but if you have access to the *LC Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual* (from Cataloger's Desktop, for instance), there is this little additional "input convention" note included for field 041: "Group multiple occurrences of the same subfield together, with \$h subfields following the subfield groups to which they apply (for example, \$h subfields for the original languages of the texts of a music publication following all the \$a subfields)." Although that actually helps considerably by simplifying the data, it also maximizes the ambiguities. If I've interpreted your information correctly, here's the 041 field that I come up with:

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

That means that there are works sung in Italian, German, and English, and that the original languages of these works are variously French, Italian, German, and English. All other details are banished, but that seems to be the way the LC Manual wants it. Depending upon how complicated it all is and the level of detail you feel is appropriate to your institution's users, you can spell out as much or as little as you

*(Continued on page 14)*

(Continued from page 13)

want or need to in the 546 field. You could be as general as I've just been three sentences ago, or get as specific as you want ("Most works sung in the original Italian, except the tenth work translated from the French ..." sort of detail). That will be up to you.

#### *EANs or "Unspecified" Standard Numbers?*

**Q:** If we see a 13-digit barcode number on a DVD or CD, how can we tell if it is an EAN (and therefore has a 1st indicator "3") or an "unspecified type of standard number or code" (and therefore has a 1st indicator "8")? I understand that only Bookland EANs start with 978 or 979, so we can't use this criteria. Also, if in doubt about whether it is an EAN or not, should we use indicator 3 or 8?

**A:** If it's a thirteen-digit number that is not a thirteen-digit ISBN (that is, that does not begin with 978 or 9791 through 9799), you can probably assume that it's an EAN and code it First Indicator 3. (Those that begin with 9790 are actually new-style ISMNs, but validate as EANs and are currently coded as such.) The two instances noted in *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* for serials and paperback books are merely two specific examples that needed further explanation and are not meant to be an exhaustive listing of the uses of the EAN.

#### *Two Scores, Two Parts, and a Facsimile Between Them*

**Q:** I'm having a problem with OCLC #51955878, for Biber's *Sonata La pastorella*. There is one score, which includes the foreword, a facsimile of the original manuscript, the score (with the unrealized basso continuo), and the critical commentary. The other three physical pieces are: (1) another score with realized basso continuo, (2) the violin part, and (3) the unrealized continuo part. Currently the 300 is:

1 score (xv, 8 p.) : \$b facsim. + 3 parts ; \$c 25 x 33 cm.

I understand that the subfield \$b has to be after that first score (to reflect that the facsimiles are in it only), and I know there should be another subfield \$a before "3 parts," but it's not really three parts, since one is a realized score. And I don't want to say "2 scores" since the scores are not identical. Would it be possible to do something like:

1 score (xv, 8 p.) : \$b facsim. + \$a 1 score + 2 parts ; \$c 25 x 33 cm.

I think for our local purposes we'll be calling the realized score a supplement for marking purposes. Any help would be appreciated.

**A:** In the *MOUG Newsletter* No. 76 (September 2000) p. 14 (<http://www.musicoclcusers.org/Newsletter/76Sep2000.pdf>), a similar question was addressed. (It also appears as Q&A 5.24 in my *Cataloger's Judgment* on p. 161-162.) Your question is complicated somewhat by the mix of two scores and two parts, and by the presence of the facsimiles in one of the scores. This latter factor in particular leads me to a different solution than the one favored in the earlier situation, but one that corresponds pretty closely to what you've come up with. As I read AACR2 5.5B2 and its examples (the sixth one under the second paragraph, especially), you could do exactly what you've done, or you could include the pagination of the second score in parentheses. No third subfield \$a delimiter is needed after the second plus sign because those two statements of extent are adjacent. (In my rendering here, I've supplied an invented pagination for the second score because that information isn't included in your question.)

1 score (xv, 8 p.) : \$b facsim. + \$a 1 score (10 p.) + 2 parts ; \$c 25 x 33 cm.

There is the slight glitch suggested by both *MARC 21 Bibliographic* and the *LC Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual* (the latter worded just a bit differently): "For music, subfield \$a is repeated for *parts* information when a subfield \$b or \$c separates it from the main extent data." But I'm going to chalk up that "*parts* information" limitation to a failure on the part of the MARC format to imagine an intervening subfield \$b in a rare situation such as this (if MARC can be said to imagine anything). You'll want to include in a note some sort of explanation of the differences between the two scores and the identities of the two parts, of course.

#### *Complete Contents or Partial Contents?*

**Q:** I've got a CD record to which I am adding a contents note. This CD has works by two different composers. A couple of these pieces have titled parts or movements. I'm trying to figure out how to construct and punctuate the note. Here's what I have so far for OCLC #19252632:

505 0 Peer Gynt Suite No. 1, op. 46. Morgenstimmung (3:59) ; Ases Tod (4:45) ; Anitras Tanz (3:44) ; In der Halle des Bergkonigs (2:08) -- Suite No. 2 op. 55. Der Brautraub (4:53) ;

Arabischer Tanz (4:38) ; Peer Gynts Heimkehr (2:43) ; Solvejgs Lied (6:15) / Edvard Grieg -- Finlandia op. 26 (9:27) ; Valse triste op. 44 (6:16) ; Tapiola op. 112 (20:13) / Jean Sibelius.

Is that correct? It seems wrong to me, since in the Grieg works I am using <space> ; <space> to separate the titled parts of the larger work, and the <space> -- <space> to separate one whole work from another, yet for the Sibelius works I'm using the <space> ; <space> to separate the larger works, when I think it should be <space> -- <space>. If I do the latter, then does the statement of responsibility have to go after each work, like this:

505 0 [Grieg works as above] -- Finlandia op. 26 (9:27) / Jean Sibelius -- Valse triste op. 44 (6:16) / Jean Sibelius -- Tapiola op. 112 (20:13) / Jean Sibelius.

This seems a bit repetitive. Or would the statement of responsibility come at the end of all 3 works, like this:

505 0 [Grieg works as above] -- Finlandia op. 26 (9:27) -- Valse triste op. 44 (6:16) -- Tapiola op. 112 (20:13) / Jean Sibelius.

That seems wrong too, because it seems to imply that only the last work is by Sibelius, and the composers for the other two aren't given. One other question: When a CD has a work containing generically-titled movements, are you supposed to include them in the contents note, or leave them out and just include the title of the larger work? For example, on a Schubert CD (OCLC #20077825) I have the following:

505 0\_ Symphonie No. 8 D 759 "Unfinished". Allegro moderato (11:32) ; Andante con moto (12:46) -- Symphonie No. 9 D 944. Andante - Allegro ma non troppo (12:47) ; Andante con moto (12:22) ; Scherzo - Allegro vivace - Trio (10:06) ; Allegro vivace (11:28).

Is this overkill, or would a musician find this information useful? If so, are the movements separated by the proper punctuation? The alternative would be to leave the individual movements out of the contents note and simply put the total time after the names of the two separate symphonies. I'd appreciate any help/advice you can offer.

**A:** For OCLC #19252632, you have already accounted for the three Sibelius works in the non-collective title in field 245 and are not adding any

additional information (such as movement titles), so there is really no need to repeat them in a *complete* contents note. Instead, why don't you use a "Partial contents" note (with First Indicator 2), detailing only the movements of the two Grieg suites:

505 2 Peer Gynt suite no. 1, op. 46. Morgenstimmung (3:59) ; Ases Tod (4:45) ; Anitras Tanz (3:44) ; In der Halle des Bergkonigs (2:08) / Edvard Grieg -- Peer Gynt suite no. 2, op. 55. Der Brautraub (4:53) ; Arabischer Tanz (4:38) ; Peer Gynts Heimkehr (2:43) ; Solvejgs Lied (6:15) / Edvard Grieg.

Although there is nothing inherently incorrect about listing the individual movement designations for larger works such as symphonies or concertos in a contents note, that isn't commonly done. The way you've done it in your question, though, looks fine if you choose to include that much detail in your bibliographic record. Your decision on whether to include that information depends upon the needs of your users.

#### *Good Grammar's Good Cataloging*

**Q:** I am asking a question because of a disagreement over the implementation of AACR2 rule 1.0F1 in a particular situation. Rule 1.0F1 is, of course, the rule that talks about using "[sic]" or "[i.e.]" to denote an inaccuracy or a misspelled word. However, a colleague of mine applied "[sic]" for the contraction in the song title "I'm so glad salvation's [sic] free." My colleague insisted that because "salvation's" is grammatically incorrect, this rule should be applied. I had a much narrower reading of this rule; thinking it should be applied only to errors or inaccuracies (this is not an inaccuracy or error; it is slang). So, what is your take on this?

**A:** A common contraction such as this one is a perfectly proper and grammatical construction, neither inaccurate nor misspelled, and therefore does not qualify for "[sic]" or "[i.e.]" under 1.0F1. I'm not even sure how it would be considered slang. Casual, perhaps, but not exactly slang. (Actually, my guess is that the author used the contraction for metrical purposes: long short long short long short long.) Any idea why your colleague didn't similarly qualify the contraction "I'm"? By your colleague's logic, we'd have to qualify such titles as Shakespeare's "All's [sic] well that ends well" because of its contraction. I don't think so. If we're (oops, If we are) talking about a 245 field here, what would be OK to

*(Continued on page 16)*

*(Continued from page 15)*

do would be to include a 246 field for the title spelled out as "I'm so glad salvation is free" or "I am so glad salvation is free," but either of those would be a matter of judgment.

#### *Dates for Re-Releases*

**Q:** We are discussing re-releases of albums that have new material (previously unreleased tracks). When a re-release, or even a compilation of music with some tracks having never been released before, has dates of performance or sound capture, the Date Type is "p" and the second date is the earliest date of recording. The Date Type would not be "r" even if the thrust of the album is to be a re-release. If the dates of sound capture are not known, the Date Type still isn't "r". It would still be "p" and the second date would be a good guess, say, "198u" or even "19uu". Can you direct me to either a Q&A of yours, or published information that supports this?

**A:** Differentiating between DtSt "r" and "p" is often difficult, depending at least in part upon what actual date information you happen to have at hand. In the CD era especially, we see lots of "re-releases" that augment the contents of the original release with such things as alternate takes, previously omitted tracks, and other previously unreleased material, taking advantage of the greater capacity of the CD over the LP. In such cases where there is new material (and so you can say that it's not strictly or merely a "re-release") and you have dates of performance/sound capture, I have no problem considering the disc DtSt "p" with the CD publication date as Date 1 and the earliest date of performance/capture as Date 2. When dates of performance/capture are not known but the date of the original (albeit partial) release is known, however, I'd lean (if only slightly) toward following the DtSt hierarchy and just coding it DtSt "r", given that the original release is a known date. I wouldn't call your approach incorrect, though. In such complex situations, date coding isn't an exact science, and different practices can be justified. That's wishy-washy, but I'm not sure there's a definitive answer when there are so many different factors to consider.

#### *Describing Hybrid CDs*

**Q:** We are having quite a taffy-pull at my institution over the issue of hybrid CDs: SACD/multi-channel CD/normal CD. LC has supplied us with a brief overview of how to handle these puppies. Two 007s if necessary (different sound byte), new GMD, and 5XX notes (when appropriate).

300 1 sound disc : digital, SACD ; 4 3/4 in.  
Fine.

500 Super audio compact disc. Well, that's fine as far as it goes.

538 (System requirements if listed). Ah, here's the rub.

With *hybrid* CDs (which most of them are) should the note read (as is usually stated on the item or on a sticker on the item): Hybrid multichannel super audio CD? Or stick with Super audio compact disc (which is only half the story)? These notes very often continue: plays on all SACD and CD players. Does this imply any sort of "system requirement"? My contention is that this would be equal to having a 538 note on all compact disc records reading, "Playable on all compact disc players;" or for VHS records, "Playable on all VHS video players." If *not* a system requirement note, should the two halves of the note be in separate fields?

500 Hybrid multichannel super audio CD.  
500 Plays on all SACD and CD players.

Or might they be combined, as they usually are on the item? In a quoted note?

**A:** It sounds as though you are familiar with the LC *New Sound Recording Formats* document (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsoundrec.pdf>), which deals with SACDs, among other things. It suggests the standard 500 note "Super audio compact disc." Then it goes on to say that you may add a 538 system requirements note, quoted from the resource if appropriate. If the resource itself says something along the lines of "Hybrid multichannel super audio CD; plays on all SACD and CD players" or the like, you could quote that as is, condense it as you see fit, or paraphrase. Because it refers to the type of equipment that is needed for reproduction, it seems like a proper "system requirements" (538) note to me. But that's open to interpretation and putting it in a plain old 500 would be fine, too. Given that some of these SACDs are hybrids and some are not, it seems prudent to include some sort of identifying note that gives the pertinent information, even if it sometimes feels as though you are stating and restating the obvious, record to record.

#### *Copyright "©" Dates on CDs*

**Q:** Some CDs that I'm cataloging raise the question of what to do when the only copyright dates associ-

*(Continued on page 19)*

**Announcing *The Best of MOUG*, 8<sup>th</sup> edition**  
Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University), editor

The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is pleased to announce the publication of the 8<sup>th</sup> edition of *The Best of MOUG*, a browsable, two-volume compendium of authorized name/uniform title headings from the Library of Congress/NACO Name Authority File for C.P.E. Bach, J.S. Bach, Beethoven, Boccherini, Brahms, Clementi, Handel, J. Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Telemann, and Vivaldi. There are also lists arranged by thematic index number for Bach, Handel, Mozart, Schubert, Telemann, and Vivaldi (by both Fanna and Ryom numbers, with a concordance from the former to the latter). Each list includes uniform titles and corresponding authority record control numbers and is current to September 2007.

It also includes an index of commonly searched English and other cross references with corresponding authority record control numbers for works by Bartók, Dvořák, Glazunov, Glière, Glinka, Grechaninov, Janáček, Kodály, Martinů, Mussorgsky, Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Rimsky-Korsakov, Shostakovich, Smetana, Stravinsky, and Tchaikovsky.

This browsable print resource is particularly handy at a reference desk to assist patrons when it may be inconvenient, if not impossible, to log on to OCLC's WorldCat® and search the online authority files. It is also an inexpensive yet authoritative resource for catalog departments that need to limit online searching of the LC/NACO Name-Authority File because of budget considerations, and has proven extremely useful in classroom settings and in workplace training situations.

This is the first new edition to appear since 2000, and the first to be issued in two volumes. The editor, Margaret Kaus, and the Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group wish to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the editors of the 1<sup>st</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup> editions, Ann (McCollough) Caldwell (Brown University; 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> eds.) and Judy Weidow (University of Texas at Austin, ret.; 3<sup>rd</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> eds.), who laid the groundwork for the present edition.

The cost per two-volume copy of the 8<sup>th</sup> edition is as follows (payable and shown below in U.S. funds only; includes shipping and handling):

\$36.00 (for orders to locations in the U.S.)  
\$46.00 (for orders to Canada or Mexico)  
\$58.00 (all other countries)

To order *The Best of MOUG*, 8<sup>th</sup> ed., use the order form on the reverse side of this page; or point your browser to <http://www.musicoclcusers.org/bestofmougorder.pdf>. Complete the form online, print it, and mail it via postal mail with your check to the indicated address. (Only pre-paid orders can be filled.)

For questions about the new edition, please contact the editor:

Margaret Kaus  
Associate Professor  
Original Cataloger  
Kansas State University Libraries  
Hale Library  
509 Hale  
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200  
mkaus@ksu.edu  
ph. 785-532-7263  
fax 785-532-7644

---

**Order form appears on reverse**

---

## ORDER FORM

### ***THE BEST OF MOUG, 8th EDITION***

### **THE MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP 2008**

*The Best of MOUG* is an excellent tool for catalogers and public service librarians because it can be kept at a desk, card catalog or online terminal for quick access to uniform titles for the composers that are the most difficult to search online.

Cost per 2 volume set (includes shipping):	Quantity	Price
\$36.00 (United States)	_____	_____
\$46.00 in U.S. funds (Canada and Mexico)	_____	_____
\$58.00 in U.S. funds (all other countries)	_____	_____
Total:	_____	_____

All orders must be **prepaid**, with checks made out to the **Music OCLC Users Group**.

SHIP TO: \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contact info

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

Please make your check payable to the **Music OCLC Users Group**

Check number \_\_\_\_\_

**Send to:** Margaret Kaus  
Best of MOUG editor  
K-State Libraries  
509 Hale  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200  
Phone: (785) 532-7263  
FAX: (785) 532-7644  
E-mail: mkaus@ksu.edu

**MOUG  
TAX no./FEIN no.:  
31-0951917**

(Continued from page 16)

ated with a recording are “c” copyright dates. See OCLC #191913789 for an example of one that I have on my desk. The LCRI for 6.4F6 says to use such dates as a basis for inferred publication dates when they appear on the container or on accompanying material. Should I be inferring from this that when a “c” date appears *on the chief source* and no other publication-eligible date appears elsewhere, the date from the chief source is transcribed as is? Would the OCLC record I’ve cited be correct? Part of the problem is that I don’t like having to make “decisions of omission.”

**A:** To be honest, the ambiguity of LCRI 6.4F1 in talking specifically about “a date preceded by the copyright symbol ‘©’ that appears on the container or accompanying matter,” but omitting mention of such dates on the chief source itself, had never occurred to me. Of course, I’m no copyright lawyer, but in my limited (cataloging) understanding of sound recording copyright, those “©” dates cannot properly apply to the sound recording itself, only to the printed text, no matter where those dates may appear. It’s my guess that the publisher is simply being careless in using the incorrect copyright symbol, but I’d be reluctant to base my cataloging on such a supposition. (That seemingly anomalous “c1976” date example in AACR2 6.4F1, I have always attributed to the significant change in the copyright laws that took place in 1978.) My inclination would be to regard even those “©” dates that appear on the chief source only as *inferred* dates of publication, and so to transcribe them in brackets and without the “©.” Because it seems plausible that this is mostly publisher carelessness, I’d omit any question mark. To ease your conscience about the “decision of omission,” you might want to include the full copyright statement from the disc label as a quoted note, for good measure.

*Some Sections Translated, Some Not*

**Q:** I’m cataloging a score for a musical work. The work itself is in two languages: four sections in Latin and two sections in English. In cases where the words are Latin, an English translation has been added in the score. Normally, when I catalog a translation, I code the fixed field for the language in hand. For example, if I have a score with original German words and translated English words, one underneath the other, I use “eng” in the fixed field. The 041 tag would be: “\$a eng \$a ger \$h ger”. I’m unsure about using this for the work I’m cataloging, since to me this coding implies that what I have is a bilingual

work, with the original language and a translation. That’s not exactly what this score is. Not all of the English is translated; some is original English. While we’re on the subject, would you add a language subfield to the uniform title? If so, would you use “English & Latin”?

**A:** The coding of field 041 doesn’t really allow the sort of distinctions that you might like to make. The field is a relatively blunt instrument in that respect. For a work in two languages, with one of those languages translated into English, the best one can do in field 041 would be the following:

041 1 lat \$a eng \$h lat \$h eng

As to the uniform title, it seems that if we have at least part of the work being translated, adding subfield \$l “English & Latin” would be proper.

*Consistency is not the Hobgoblin of Field 041*

**Q:** In the older hard copy version (3rd ed.) of *Bibliographic Formats and Standards*, field 041 gave the order of the language codes to be recorded in the various subfields. With the advent of the updated online version, some of the subfields in field 041 no longer give any such instruction. I am most concerned with subfield \$e (for librettos) and subfield \$g (for accompanying material other than librettos).

Subfield \$e

Hard copy: “Enter language codes in order of predominance. If predominance cannot be determined, enter codes in alphabetical order.”

Online: The instruction is missing entirely from the online version.

Subfield \$g

Hard copy: “Enter codes in the order of predominance. If you cannot determine predominance, enter codes in alphabetical order.”

Online: The instruction is missing entirely from the online version.

Both the online and hard copy versions state that the language code order for subfield \$b is alphabetical. Why the inconsistencies? Shouldn’t they all be predominance first, then alphabetical order? And something else I have always wondered about: What is the exquisite reasoning (if you know) behind using subfield \$d for Language code of sung or spoken

(Continued on page 20)

*(Continued from page 19)*

text, but using subfield \$a for the same type of information in every other format except sound recordings? Again, we have inconsistency and unnecessary confusion. Can we get this changed to either eliminate subfield \$d entirely, or use it for some other type of information? I apologize if this is already being discussed; I'm not current with new MARBI proposals and discussion papers coming down the pike.

**A:** Looking at the text for field 041 going back through the 1980 edition of MARC, the explicitly prescribed order for Language Codes in subfield \$a is that of predominance. For subfields \$b and \$f, it explicitly states to use English alphabetical order. Subfield \$h stipulates that "Codes for intermediate translations are recorded before codes for languages of the original." But I believe that those are the only stated MARC guidelines about code order in field 041. Explaining the differences, and especially why sound recordings are treated in such an unusual manner via subfield \$d, would entail a huge treatise on the history of the MARC format. Remember that the various MARC bibliographic formats were originally developed separately (books, films, music, maps, manuscripts, serials, "in process materials," and authorities) mostly during the 1960s and 1970s. Things were always book-centric, and often the result was inconsistent treatment of things that were not books. Format integration in the mid-1990s tried to address some of those inconsistencies, with varying degrees of success, resolving some problems and greatly exacerbating others. It so happens that trying to reconcile all of the various practices among the different bibliographic formats, along with the relative simplicity of coding languages for most books versus the relative complexity of coding languages for such things as moving images and sound recordings in particular, resulted in a huge mess within field 041. MARC 21 is still trying to work out some of those kinks, as witness such recent MARC Proposals as No. 2008-03 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2008/2008-03.html>), No. 2007-01 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-01.html>), and No. 2005-07 (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2005/2005-07.html>). As with so much else in MARC, there are historical reasons for many of the discrepancies and inconsistencies, and if we were starting over we'd do many things quite differently. Talk in RDA circles is now heavily leaning toward a post-MARC 21 schema, so perhaps we'll be able to apply some of what we've learned in the not-too-distant future.

### *Subfielding Adjacent Titles in Enhanced Contents Notes*

**Q:** We've searched all of our available music cataloging reference materials as well as general cataloging sources and can't find so much as an example of how to treat parallel titles in enhanced contents notes. Would each version of the title get its own subfield \$t, or would one put both titles in the same subfield \$t?

**A:** If you are going to use the so-called enhanced contents note practice, each adjacent title (including parallel titles) would be subfielded separately.

### *Covering the Originals and the Covers*

**Q:** I am cataloging a CD that is a compilation of cover versions by various bands of songs originally by various other bands. Do you have a suggestion on how to convey in the 505 the name of the original band who did each song? I suppose for each song title, I could put the current performer in parentheses and the original performer after a slash, but isn't the slash generally reserved for the name of the individual person who wrote the song? The songs are listed on the back of the container like this:

1. The Mighty Mighty Bosstones - "Ain't talkin' 'bout love" (Van Halen)
2. MU330 - "Motorbreath" (Metallica)

And so on. The band in parentheses is the original artist. The cover bands are in all caps in red.

**A:** What an interesting question. Performer information in contents notes generally goes in parentheses, and it's really only the cover artists who are performing, of course. Here's what I eventually came up with:

500 0 Title One (Cover Artist ; [originally performed by] Original Artist) -- Title Two (Cover Artist ; [originally performed by] Original Artist)  
-- ...

That keeps things relatively clear without too much redundancy.

### *Three Works by One Person*

**Q:** There's probably an explicit rule to handle this, but I couldn't find it. When a score includes exactly three independent works by one composer, do you trace the works, or make a 505, or some other solu-

tion that hasn't occurred to me? In the case at hand, there is a collective title. There is a rule for how to handle this situation if more than one person is responsible (in 21.7B1), but I couldn't find one for how to handle it for exactly three works by one person. Should it be:

100 for composer  
240 for collective uniform title  
700 12 for work 1  
700 12 for work 2  
700 12 for work 3

or

100 for composer  
240 for collective uniform title  
505 for work 1 -- work 2 -- work 3  
and no work-related 700s

Or (on the pattern of what you do with two works published together -- I'm pretty sure this isn't right, but it's another theoretical possibility):

100 for composer  
240 for work 1  
700 12 for work 2  
700 12 for work 3

I'm not sure what rule calls for the collective uniform title (in my first and second options), but it simply looks and feels necessary to me. Then again, I'm definitely at sea on this issue, so I may be all wet about the collective uniform title.

**A:** It seems that LCRI 25.34B-25.34C addresses the collective uniform title issue pretty directly, reading in part: "If a music publication or manuscript contains three or more works entered under a single personal name heading, enter the collection under the collective uniform title appropriate to the item as a whole." There doesn't appear to be any explicit guidance that I can find about analytical added entries for exactly three individual works in such a collection. If read strictly further on, that same LCRI seems (absurdly) to limit the creation of added entries to only two special situations for scores. But I'd say that the spirit of such rules as 21.29D ("If, in the context of a given catalogue, an added entry is required under a heading or title other than those prescribed in 21.30, make it") and 21.30M1 ("Make an analytical added entry under the heading for a work contained within the item being catalogued ... Make additional analytical entries in accordance with the policy of the cataloguing agency"), you may create analytical added

entries for all three works. I don't see anything in 5.7B18 or its LCRI that would preclude a contents note, regardless of the choices made about added entries.

#### *Two Works by the Same Composer*

**Q:** I was reading through the slides for the Sound Recordings Cataloging Workshop you presented at the MLA conference in Rhode Island. I'm hoping that you can clarify something for me. When dealing with a sound recording of two works by the same composer, I'd always thought the rule was to enter under the composer/uniform title of the first work, and make an added entry for the second work. The rule that you refer to in your slide, Choice of Entry, 21.23B1, if I'm understanding it correctly, requires the main entry to be composer/collective uniform title for both works. I'd always thought that you only use a collective uniform title when there are three or more works. Has the rule for this changed, or has it always been this way? Also, 25.7A (AACR2) and 25.34B-25.34C (LCRI) seem to contradict 21.23B1 (AACR2).

AACR2 21.23B1: "Enter a sound recording of two or more works all by the same person(s) or body (bodies) under the heading appropriate to those works. Make added entries under the headings for the principal performers unless there are more than three. If there are more than three principal performers, make an added entry under the one named first."

AACR2 25.7A: "If an item consisting of two works is entered under a personal or corporate heading, use the uniform title of the work that occurs first in the item. Make a name-title added entry using the uniform title of the second work."

LCRI 25.34B-25.34C: "If a sound recording collection contains three, four, or five musical works entered under a single personal name heading, enter the collection under the collective uniform title appropriate to the whole item. Make name-title analytical added entries for each work in the collection. For excerpts from one work, make a separate analytical added entry for each excerpt unless there are two or more excerpts numbered consecutively (25.6B1) or three or more unnumbered or nonconsecutively numbered excerpts (25.6B3)."

*(Continued on page 22)*

(Continued from page 21)

I would really appreciate your expertise to clarify this for me.

**A:** The rules for choice of entry for scores and sound recordings and the related rules for formulating collective uniform titles in appropriate instances are incredibly (and probably unnecessarily) complex and confusing, and I would hardly be surprised if I've messed up somewhere along the way. Here is how I read through the thicket of rules and rule interpretations that you've raised. As you correctly note, AACR2 21.23B1 says, "Enter a sound recording of two or more works all by the same person(s) or body (bodies) under the heading appropriate to those works." Remember that 21.23 specifically addresses the choice of access points for sound recordings. That says to me that any of its provisions (or those of related LCRI's) would overrule any seemingly contradictory stipulations in, say, Chapter 25, which is supposed to be devoted to the formulation of uniform titles (and not choice of access points, per se). So, although 25.33A (buttressed by its reference back to following 25.7) addresses the formulation of music uniform titles when two works are published together, the choice-of-access-points-specific 21.23B1 would overrule the (supposedly) formulation-of-uniform-title-specific 25.33A in regard to two works by the same composer on a sound recording. In the absence of a corresponding rule for scores (printed and manuscript music) that publish two works by the same composer anywhere in the "Musical Works" section of Chapter 21 (21.18-21.22), rule 25.33A would properly apply only to scores (and really should be part of Chapter 21). Of course, the "Sound Recordings" section of LCRI 25.34B-25.34C addresses first, sound recordings that contain three, four, or five works, and then six or more works, by the same composer. It pointedly does not address the case of two works by the same composer. That's is presumably because sound recordings containing two works by the same composer are covered in their much more proper place in Chapter 21, rule 21.23B1. Why a score with two works and a sound recording with two works would be treated differently in this respect, I have no idea. Nor have I any idea, for that matter, why some of the rules in Chapter 25 seem to encroach upon the territory that really should be addressed in Chapter 21. My guess is that these inconsistencies are instances of carelessness on the part of the rule makers over the 40-plus years of writing AACR and LCRI's, and not always thinking through the implications of rules and RIs that are often put together to address special circumstances. Sometimes, it must have seemed simpler to address both

choice of access points and the formulation of the uniform title portions of those access points in the same rule, as illogical as that properly is.

#### *Standard Numbers on Later Printings*

**Q:** I have a score printed in 2005 that matches OCLC #20318099, Universal Edition, c1967 (edition statement, publisher/plate numbers, dimensions, etc. all match). It seems clear that there is no need for a new record. However, the 2005 printing now has a UPC, ISMN and ISBN printed on the title page. Is it acceptable to add these fields to the master record for a publication that was issued originally without any of these numbers? I think I remember (but of course can't find it anywhere) hearing that it is OK to add a UPC to any record. Is that limited to cases like a CD where the lack of the field may just be an omission when the record was first entered, or can it be applied in cases where the numbers were added years later?

**A:** A similar question is answered in a different context (regarding whether a new record is justified in such cases) in the *MOUG Newsletter* No. 97 (December 2007) p. 15-16, the Q&A entitled "Differing Distributors." Answering your question more directly and briefly, all other things in the record being equal (dates, plate numbers, etc.), you may add standard numbers (UPCs, ISMNs, ISBNs, etc.) to records for resources that likely were not originally published with those numbers. Depending upon the Encoding Level of the record, you should be able to add such fields as 020 or 024 under Database Enrichment (if the field is not already present) or under Minimal-Level Upgrade.

#### *Publisher Number Variations*

**Q:** The CD in question is a 1958 Maria Callas performance of *La traviata*. There is a record in OCLC with the following publisher's numbers (I give you the 500s which explain better): "EMI: CDS 7 49187 8 (CDC 7 49187 2--CDC 7 49188 2). Additional manufacturer's no. on container: CDCB 49187 (USA only)." There are numbers for the LPs as well, though that's not an issue here. My CD set does not have the CDS number. It has the CDCB number, except that it is CDCB 7 49187 2, not CDCB 49187. Now, I probably wouldn't think of making a new record with just that, but the publisher varies as well. It is EMI Classics, which is a label name according to NAF, whereas the copy is for EMI. On first thought, that made me want a new record, but, of course, people don't always get it straight what the publisher should be; also, since this is a p1987 disc, the cata-

logging probably precedes the NAR, which seems to be from 2003. So I'm thinking that we don't make a new record and just update locally. Would you come to the same conclusion?

**A:** The first thing you need to do, if you've not already done so, is to make sure that all of the variations on the publisher numbers have been accounted for, on the disc, on the container, on the insert, wherever, to be sure that the differences are real and not just variants of completeness. Those additional numbers are sometimes CD/record club numbers, which have questionable bibliographic significance, all other things being equal. If your "CDCB 7 49187 2" number is the ONLY number on your resource (that is, you also don't have the parenthetical numbers in the existing record), you could legitimately create a new record. You always have the option of editing

the existing record locally, though, and in a case such as this with such a relatively subtle difference, that is an understandable route to take (and I'd lean in that direction). I wouldn't put too much stock in the difference between "EMI" and "EMI Classics." In my experience, EMI is utterly careless in identifying itself in various ways on the same sound recording. (I happen to have an example right here on my desk, where "EMI" is the large identifier on the spine and "EMI Classics" the identifier in the upper right-hand corner of the front of the container, with other variants such as "EMI Records Ltd." elsewhere.) The authority file is equally ambiguous, with the corporate name "EMI Classics (Firm)" as a 410 on the record for "EMI (Firm)" (no97009953) and the series authority record for "EMI Classics" (n2003082601) stating "Transcribe as label name."

**Reports from the MOUG Annual Meeting  
February 19-20, 2008 Newport, Rhode Island**

---

**Plenary Session: Vendor Bibliographic Record Quality in OCLC**

**Glenn Patton, OCLC**

**Paul Cauthen, University of Cincinnati**

*Report by Hermine Vermeij, University of California, Los Angeles*

---

In this opening plenary session, Glenn Patton and Paul Cauthen addressed vendor bibliographic records in OCLC. Many catalogers now cringe at the sight of an encoding level 3 record, knowing that it will most likely be a low-level vendor record, bearing little or no resemblance to the piece in hand, and will require extensive editing. Glenn Patton began his portion of the presentation with "938" and "ELvl: 3" appearing crossed out on the slide, pointing out that many of us would cheer if he announced there would be no more level 3 records ... "but [he's] not here to say that."

The Vendor Record Contribution Program started in the mid-1990s with PromptSelect (now defunct), and there are 27 vendors currently participating. Only Harrosowitz and Casalini do much with printed music. There is a wide range of quality and fullness of vendor records, and each level addresses varying needs in the library universe.

On one end of the range are the pre-publication records that are based on preliminary publisher's information. These are the records that can be impressively different from the actual item. The Baker and Taylor level 3 records for sound recordings in OCLC are often at this level—in the example given, the 100 field contains two performing ensembles, the 245 is in the form Composer's last name: Title (with a typo), and the 260 includes the distributor but not the label name. There is also a GTIN (Global Trade ID Number) in the 024 field—useful to stores like Wal-Mart for tracking, but of no bibliographic significance. This level of cataloging supports selection and acquisition; the record contains just enough information for a selector to make a decision and place an order.

Records in the next level include basic bibliographic data—these records much more closely resemble standard bibliographic records. An example would be the M-level Harrosowitz records, which have pretty good descriptive data, and usually include intuitive main entries (even if the authoritative form may be different). There are no added entries or subject headings, but the records are useful for selection, backlog management, and limited searching. Even better are the complete bibliographic records,

*(Continued on page 24)*

*(Continued from page 23)*

which boast access points supported by authority records. The Casalini example has full series authority work, and would need little editing to upgrade to full level. Another category of vendor records is upgraded CIP records. These have been entered by national libraries as CIP and added to by vendors when the materials come in.

In the past, OCLC formed the Cataloging Partners Program to partner with materials vendors to create, customize, and deliver MARC records in coordination with materials orders (emphasizing non-print and non-English materials). Now the Cataloging Partners Program is being merged with PromptCat to form WorldCat Cataloging Partners. In this program, full MARC records are available for new titles early in the publishing/acquisitions cycle.

OCLC's partnership with Baker and Taylor has benefits as well as challenges and problems. On the good side, records and OCLC record numbers are available at the point of order—a very attractive aspect, since OCLC numbers have become important linking devices. However, the implementation was slow, and the initial dates were not met. Data requirements continue to shift, and the data is of varying quality. All of these drawbacks have led to unhappy catalogers in OCLC libraries, who have been confronted with low-quality Baker and Taylor records and haven't known much about them or what to do with them.

Both sides of the partnership have learned some very hard lessons, especially about communication. OCLC plans to communicate better with catalogers and library managers, as well as working with Baker and Taylor to improve the records they contribute. OCLC also plans to merge the existing duplicate records (there are nearly 200,000) and significantly reduce the loading of new duplicates.

In the future, OCLC anticipates that its work with vendors will continue and increase. The cataloging process will move further upstream. We are living in a much more complex technical services environment than seven or ten years ago, and many different workflows, new standards, and expectations exist at libraries everywhere. Publishers and vendors are dealing with many of the same problems that libraries are—too much stuff and user expectations of fast Web exposure of new materials, easy information retrieval, and immediate access to materials.

Creation of bibliographic metadata is expensive and labor-intensive, but necessary; the danger of hidden

materials is great. For libraries, that would mean no or limited access to materials and implications for collection analysis and other reporting. For publishers, it would mean no sales (because there would be no information about their products) or reduced sales (for incomplete or incorrect metadata). However, there is still enormous duplication of effort in work on metadata for the same set of titles. In libraries, many complex local practices exist, often because “it's always been done that way,” and often not all metadata creation or enhancement is shared (because of agreements or local editing). In the publishing and vendor world, multiple staff and systems often exist for creation and enhancement of metadata, review and manipulation of metadata, addition of library-specific metadata, and MARC record creation. The bibliographic world is very complicated, and libraries are not the biggest or most central piece of the puzzle—they don't drive what happens elsewhere.

It seems that current bibliographic control models are not sustainable, and the library world must adopt new strategies to meet the new challenges. One of the LC Working Group report recommendations was to increase the efficiency of bibliographic production and maintenance. A catalog record can grow up over time; it does not have to be complete from its inception. There must be better metadata management workflows and practices to allow easy ingestion and use of existing metadata. We must not give up our core values as catalogers. Controlled vocabularies, access points, and authority control in general are more important now than ever, but we may need to figure out how to work with those core values in the context of a different set of processes. Automating descriptive tasks should not be regarded as “dumbing down the catalog” or abandoning quality because we would be re-purposing our intellectual effort to those tasks deemed most critical for resource discovery. Streamlining acquisitions and technical services workflows for new, commonly acquired materials might free up staff to work on providing access to hidden materials, another recommendation from the LC Working Group. Not every item needs a full-level record. Hopefully metadata will be interoperable and easily shared (which would mean vendors might have to give up regarding their data as proprietary).

OCLC's “Next Generation” Cataloging pilot program seeks to achieve automated capture, crosswalk, and enhancement of publisher ONIX metadata (ONIX is an XML-based data structure developed by publishers and vendors). The publisher and vendor pilot partners will provide title data in ONIX, OCLC will convert the data to MARC, the metadata will be en-

riched through data mining of WorldCat and data mapping from existing data elements, the MARC record will be added to WorldCat, library pilot partners will give feedback on the records, and finally the enhanced data will be converted back to ONIX and returned to the publisher or vendor for review and feedback. There will be a report on the pilot results at BookExpo America and ALA Annual in 2008. So far there are three library pilot partners and three publisher/vendor pilot partners (with more discussions in progress).

One of the strong messages to come out of this presentation was that we all need to try as much as possible to improve the quality of the records that we see (and help them “grow up”). ELvl M and K records need only full level authorization to be replaced, and libraries with Enhance can add additional information to I-level records. When we find issues in the OCLC catalog, we need to bring them to OCLC’s attention, especially if we see a pattern of problems.

---

### **Ask MOUG: Public and Technical Services Issues**

**Glenn Patton and Jay Weitz, OCLC**  
*Report by Scott Phinney, University of South Carolina*

---

Bruce Evans introduced panelists Jay Weitz (JW) for technical services and Glenn Patton (GP) who agreed to fill in for public services. Jay began by reading and answering a series of previously submitted questions.

**Q:** Should undifferentiated name tags be controlled?

**JW:** OCLC requests that you control such name tags (coded b in authority file fixed field) The presence or absence of diacritics are not reasons to leave the headings uncontrolled.

**Q:** What should we do about ambiguous analytics from vendors—for example, when the 245 and 300 fields look as though the record is for the entire set, but the 505 field says it’s for one particular volume?

**JW:** Consider these to be records for the volume indicated in the 505. Please edit, particularly fields 245 and 300, to upgrade the record. Most of these are ELvl 3.

**Q:** Regarding logistics of reporting errors, should we report errors in the 700 fields before or after editing?

**JW:** Edit the record first, then submit the error report.

**Q:** [Expressing frustration with MLA-L used for reporting OCLC errors.]

**JW:** Please use OCLC standard reporting avenues instead of listservs: [authfile@oclc.org](mailto:authfile@oclc.org) or [bib-change@oclc.org](mailto:bib-change@oclc.org). Use Connexion News to get instructions on how to report errors.

**Q:** Proposal to make all 041 subfields besides \$a obsolete as no ILS makes a distinction between these.

**JW:** I would do things differently if I were developing MARC today instead of 40 years ago. The fields are sometimes useful. OCLC used \$h several years ago when we were converting Pinyin records to determine the original records. At any rate, this decision is not up to OCLC; it should go to MARBI at ALA.

The floor was then opened to questions from the group of attendees.

**Q:** Congrats to OCLC for acting on suggestion to separate out Dutch records in Connexion 2.10. Regarding the discussion of duplicates and brief records: the problem stems from all of the batch loads from different cataloging agencies. Is OCLC going to do anything about this?

**GP and JW:** Yes, OCLC is doing something about it, but records in different languages do have a legitimate purpose. The long-term plan is to use the 936 field to link parallel records in different languages of cataloging. In theory, OCLC will be able to link all of these together so we can see all of them together. This has not been implemented yet. As for real duplicates, this is a discussion for another time. OCLC has been working on a project to de-dupe the database using Connexion and expand it to all formats, not just books and serials. When we moved to the current system, we couldn’t de-dupe records like we used to. We are making progress, but we are not there yet. We hope to have something running experimentally by the end of this calendar year that will cover all formats. The challenge is that algorithms have to be created for data that are correct, and of course, that is not always the case.

Follow-up question: Regarding a thread on MLA-L: does anyone report duplicates anymore? Some of the responses are “no” because there are so many of them.

*(Continued on page 26)*

*(Continued from page 25)*

**GP and JW:** OCLC has been loading lots of records, some of which are less than perfect. There are a lot of duplicates, but we haven't been able to run DDR since the move to Connexion in 2005. Part of this is a perception screen as there wasn't the ability to filter out multi-language catalog records.

**Q:** Public services question. People ask why some records are cataloged in other languages. Can OCLC allow patrons to suppress records (by language, by libraries who will loan to the given library)? Make the database ILL-friendly.

From the audience: WorldCat Local does a lot of this; come to tomorrow morning's plenary session.

**GP:** There are some things you can do now to restrict requests a patron can make.

**Q:** Follow-up from last year: Can we search for publisher numbers in different ways, using truncation, middle of field, etc. for sound recordings?

**JW:** This is related to the practice of some music publishers using only part of the number for their products. You can right-truncate in WorldCat, left truncation is not currently possible. We're looking into the possibility for the future.

**Q:** Observation about 041 subfields becoming obsolete: Those subfields may actually get used more as RDA takes shape. There are changes related to language of materials. The current draft has two access points, one for one language, and one for the other. If this proposal goes through, the 041 will be necessary. Public service question: Using FirstSearch or WorldCat.org doesn't really allow for alphabetical browsing. Will FirstSearch and WorldCat.org ever approximate Connexion with browsing?

From the audience: Programmers believe in relevance, not in alphabetical lists. You can pick a different arrangement, but Google does relevance and so programmers choose it as well.

**Q:** Regarding error reporting after editing the record; are there certain things that we should be putting in reports? What makes things easier for OCLC staff?

**JW:** The original question about this assumed that the institution that has been sending these requests over MLA-L could not fix the record themselves. How much information is needed in reports depends on how complex the error is. OCLC staff can usually

figure out what the problem is, though the more detail you give (particularly the OCLC number), the better.

**Q:** I report duplicates when I see them. I am often not happy with any of them, so I pick the record that's the best, enhance the record, then report the others as duplicates. I have been told that this order is incorrect.

**JW:** It's okay to enhance the record, then report the duplicates to be merged with it. OCLC tries to choose the best record to be the master when they merge duplicates. They look at records that will be deleted for any information that needs to be transferred over, though there is also an algorithm to transfer certain fields automatically, for better or for worse. OCLC tries to retain unique and relevant information whenever there is a merge.

**Q:** On the topic of detecting duplicates and matching sound recordings, my local Head of Tech. Services is talking about reclamation of records holdings. How problematic is this for music materials?

**GP:** OCLC now takes the entire database and removes only those records that aren't affected by the most recent load. This is different from earlier reclamation matching processes, and is a much more complex process than it used to be. OCLC is trying to bring together the algorithm used in the matching process with that used in batch loading. As to whether there are any music-specific fields, OCLC uses 028 fields as matching points, which we didn't used to do. Washington University in St. Louis has done this and didn't have any particular problems with music materials, but most of their records had OCLC numbers to begin with, which is different if your records are loaded from Blackwell North America. Washington University gained about 200,000 holdings out of 1.6 million records.

**Q:** I have old mimeographed scores that I have been avoiding cataloging, even though I have been assured they were legitimately purchased. They are printed in blue ink. What are these things and what should I do with them?

**JW:** These are probably spirit duplicates, which were usually printed in blue ink. The consensus from the group was that these are legal copies. These should be cataloged as holographs.

**Q:** With vendors, 15-20% of the time you will have an untouched Harrassowitz record, with an institu-

tional record attached that looks good. Which record is preferred, master or institutional, and which should be edited?

**GP:** I haven't seen these and would like to see some examples of it. Some large academic libraries receive enhanced records (for an additional charge) from Harrassowitz.

**Q:** Is there any process in place for taking a complete institutional record and making it the master record?

**GP:** This only happens if the incoming record is coded as PCC.

---

**Plenary Session: WorldCat Local**  
**Cathy Gerhart, University of Washington**  
*Report by Beth Flood, Harvard University*

---

WorldCat Local is a way to implement WorldCat.org in a library's local environment. It shows the library's holdings to users first, and simplifies searching by providing one search interface for local titles as well as all of WorldCat.

The University of Washington implementation of WorldCat Local uses a tiered display of holdings, showing local, consortial and national/worldwide holdings. Also, it includes article citations from ArticleFirst, ERIC, GPO and PubMed. OCLC is beginning to add records for CONTENTdm images which will be available in WorldCat Local. Users can register in WorldCat Local and add reviews to items.

WorldCat Local integrates three delivery systems: Innovative Interfaces (Millennium), SirsiDynix (Horizon and Unicorn), and Ex Libris (Voyager). OCLC plans to continue integrating WorldCat Local with other ILS vendors.

Some library materials are not included in the University of Washington's implementation of WorldCat Local. These include licensed third-party record sets and some microform sets, records for on-order and in-process titles, records for some special collections titles, and records for anything with minimal level cataloging. In actuality, this means that materials such as music department records and local theses are not included in WorldCat Local.

Problems with WorldCat Local include incomplete indexing of bibliographic records, awkward naviga-

tion, and incomplete display of information from bibliographic records. Of special concern to the music community is the absence of uniform title (240), performer (511) and recording (518) information in record displays. An editions tab provides ways to limit a search; however, the list of composers' names for limiting is in order by the number of entries per composer, rather than in alphabetical order. This is quite problematic for generic titles and does not serve users well.

Improvements to be made include displaying more information from bibliographic records, adding the ability to email citations and save searches, adding RSS feed capability, and integrating other products such as WorldCat Identities and Fiction Finder.

---

**Minutes of the 2008 MOUG Business Meeting**  
**Newport, RI, February 20, 2008**  
*Kerri A. Scannell-Baunach, University of Kentucky*

---

The meeting was called to order by Chair Neil Hughes (University of Georgia) at 10:21am.

**1. Adoption of agenda**

The agenda was approved by unanimous vote.

Following the adoption of the agenda, Hughes introduced the members of the Board.

**2. Approval of minutes from the 2007 Pittsburgh, PA meeting**

The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

**3. Board Reports**

**a. Chair (Neil Hughes, University of Georgia) Committee & other appointments:**

The NACO Music Project Advisory Committee was reconfigured with two non-voting and three voting members. The three voting members include two from the general membership and one Board representative. Non-voting members appointed were Ralph Papakhian (Indiana University) and Joe Bartl (Library of Congress); voting members were Ann Churukian (chair, Vassar College), Chuck Herrold (Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh), and Kerri Baunach (Board representative, University of Kentucky)

Two new task forces were appointed this year. The Task Force to Study MOUG's Mission

*(Continued on page 28)*

*(Continued from page 27)*

and Objectives is chaired by Joe Hafner (McGill University) and also included James Soe Nyun (University of California, San Diego) and Sue Stancu (Indiana University). The Bylaws Revision Task Force is chaired by Stephanie Bonjak (University of Southern California) and also included Nara Newcomer (East Carolina University) and Jeannette Thompson (Tulane University).

Our Nominating Committee for this past year was chaired by Scott Phinney (University of South Carolina) with Catherine Gick (Brown University) and Tracey Rudnick (Board representative, University of Connecticut) as members. A new nominating committee has been appointed already and will be chaired by Jenny Colvin (Furman University). Hermine Vermeij (University of California Los Angeles) will also serve. The Board representative to the committee will be appointed following this meeting and will be Neil Hughes. Much thanks to the past nominating committee for the work they did this year.

As a side note: the position of Treasurer will be up next year and since the bylaw proposal to extend the term of Treasurer passed, the new treasurer will be appointed for a three-year term, to get the rotation started. Also up will be the Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect.

#### **Correspondence:**

Hughes corresponded with MLA about sharing online registration for meetings. This turns out to be too complicated an issue for our small organization at this time. We are interested in this in the future but we couldn't make it work this year.

We had a lot of correspondence with members of the MLA Educational Outreach Program regarding reduced registration options, co-sponsoring the MLA pre-conference, and including our name on the promotional materials.

Also, we now have non-profit status in Ohio. The Articles of Incorporation have been sent to the Archives for safe keeping. Thanks to everyone who was involved in making this happen. This is one step forward in our goal of becoming a 501(c)3 organization.

#### **Slate of Candidates:**

For Secretary/Newsletter Editor our candidates were Alan Ringwood from the University of Texas at Austin, and Michael Duffy from Northern Illinois University.

For Continuing Education Coordinator, Bruce Evans from Baylor University was the only candidate.

Winners of the election were Alan Ringwood and Bruce Evans.

Thanks again to the Nominating Committee for their fine work in making this election a good one.

We hope to move to electronic voting in the future to reduce some of the problems that traditional mail voting sometimes presents.

#### **Distinguished Service Award:**

This year we had no nominees for this award.

Following this meeting there will be an announcement for nominees for next year. Watch your e-mail and the Newsletter for it.

#### **Acknowledgements:**

Special thanks to Kerri Scannell Baunach for her two years of service as our Secretary/Newsletter Editor.

A personal thanks to Gordon Rowley and Paula Hickner (MLA Convention Managers) for all their help.

There are a number of other people we want to thank for helping us put this meeting together. They are all listed in your programs. Please thank these people when you see them.

#### **Remembrance:**

Hughes read the following remembrance in honor of Olga Buth.

“Many of you will have seen the sad news that Olga Buth, former music librarian at the University of Texas at Austin and—before that, and really for the main part of her career—the Ohio State University, passed away on January 18<sup>th</sup> of this year. I won't revisit here the entire obituary that was posted to MLA-L, because there will undoubtedly also be a tribute to her at the MLA business meeting on Saturday, but I do want everyone here to know that Olga

was intimately bound up with MOUG and its successful beginnings in the late 1970s. On February 10, 1976, the first meeting of the OCLC Task Force for the Cataloging of Music and Sound Recordings was held in Columbus, Ohio. This task force was charged with advising the OCLC Advisory Committee on Cataloging about implementing the MARC Music Format, and Olga Butth was a member of that task force. Olga later became Chair of MOUG in October, 1978, and over the next couple of years became the driving force (along with Ruth Watanabe, who was then MLA President) that resulted in MOUG forming the close alliance with MLA that we enjoy to this day, including support for our annual meeting from the MLA convention managers, and inclusion of our registration materials in the MLA convention mailing.

“So, whenever you look around at a MOUG meeting, or search in WorldCat, and think, ‘Well, it ain’t perfect, but really—it works pretty darned well most of the time!’ please remember that it didn’t all just happen through spontaneous combustion or parthenogenesis. We all owe thanks to those hardworking and dedicated predecessors, like Olga, many of whom are now taking their leave of us.

“Please observe a moment of silence with me in memory of Olga Butth.”

**b. Vice-Chair (Tracey Rudnick, University of Connecticut)**

**Advertising:** we had brochures at ALA meetings this past year; we did an exchange ad with MLA Notes in which they had an ad appear in our Newsletter and we had an ad in an issue of Notes. Thanks to Wendy Sistrunk (University of Missouri, Kansas City) and Kerri Baunach for making this happen.

**Distinguished Service Award:** we sent announcements to various sources about last year’s award winner Chuck Herrold. There were no nominees for this year. Please think about potential nominees for next year.

**Handbook:** the Board made numerous and extensive updates to the Handbook this past year.

**Web site:** worked with Nancy Sack (University of Hawaii, Manoa) on moving the Web site to a commercial service, Bluehost,

which offers better functionality and better technical support. We finally moved to the new service last week. Thanks to Nancy for her work and to Rebecca Littman (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee) for her help.

**c. Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Kerri Scannell Baunach, University of Kentucky)**

**Newsletter:** The total cost of the three newsletters from this past year was \$2822.83, which was under budget. On average 472 newsletters are sent out each time. Please remember that claim requests go to the Treasurer. Also, back issues through 2006 are all up on the MOUG Web site and a procedure for making back issues available is now in place.

As Secretary, regular liaison reports to MLA for their Board meetings were submitted.

Baunach expressed thanks for allowing her to serve in this capacity for the past two years.

**d. Treasurer (Deborah Morris, Roosevelt University)**

Have filled 20 Newsletter claim requests.

**Membership:** As of February 15, 2008, out of 247 institutional subscriptions, 195 are current; out of 241 personal members, 150 are current. (Members “considered” are those from 2006-2008. There has been one new institutional member and 10 new personal members.

**Bank balances, as of December 31, 2007:** checking, \$5679.91; savings, \$3376.23. Operations look grim, there may be a possible dues increase again in the future, but that is hard to decide right now.

**Certificate of Deposit:** Matures on March 1, 2008 at an APY of 5.35%, yielding an investment of \$15,818.71. Board will have to decide later if we should reinvest or not.

The Bylaws proposal to extend the length of term for the position of Treasurer passed unanimously. Thanks to everyone who voted in that election.

**Reminder:** please update your addresses if you move in order to keep receiving Newsletters, election materials, and dues renewal notices.

*(Continued on page 30)*

(Continued from page 29)

**e. Continuing Education Coordinator (Bruce Evans, Baylor University)**

**Meeting registration:** We had 79 pre-registrants; 3 [i.e. 4] on-site. Total meeting attendance was 82 [i.e. 83].

**Plug for upcoming joint meeting:** Please try to attend the Joint OLAC/MOUG meeting in Cleveland in September. It should be a great meeting.

**Program Committee:** Thanks to this year's committee for all their hard work!! If you are interested in being on the committee for this coming year, please talk to Evans after the meeting.

**Evaluation forms:** Please fill out and turn in, box is at the back of the room.

#### 4. Other Reports

**a. Reference Services Committee (Robert Acker, DePaul University)**

Last year Tracey Rudnick worked to finish the WorldCat recommendations and published those in Newsletter No. 96 (September 2006).

Steve Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado) will be taking over as Chair of this Committee after this meeting.

The Committee is looking at new tasks to tackle. We need new members and especially some cataloging members. See Steve or Tracey if interested.

**b. NACO Music Project Advisory Committee (Ann Churukian, Vassar College)**

NMP turns 20 this year (2008).

In 2007: added 4 new members and lost 4 members; currently have about 70 participants.

21,801 new name records added (11.5% of total number); 7,809 changed name or name/title records (12.5% of total); 194 new series authority records added and 52 changed series authority records

Once RDA is up and running AACR2 won't be available. At the NMP meeting there was general consensus that it is still important to have access for historical reasons. The Advisory Committee will be looking into how we

can make our voice heard about the importance of having this access.

**c. Webkeeper (Nancy Sack, University of Hawaii, Manoa)**

Made a few Web page updates.

Have been asked to redesign the look of the current Web page; if you are interested in helping with this, let Nancy or someone on the Board know.

A prototype of a redesign is currently up, basically just an experiment to see what can be done: <http://www.musicoclcusers.org/temp/index.html>.

**d. Best of MOUG update (Neil Hughes for Margaret Kaus, Kansas State University)**

The 8<sup>th</sup> edition is complete and ready to publish. It is updated through September 2007, and has doubled in size from the 7<sup>th</sup> edition. Orders will have to be pre-paid.

The Board has not settled on a price but we expect it to be around \$40 for the edition, domestically. The international cost will probably be about \$10 more.

Thanks to Robert Sherrane (Juilliard School) for his help proofing the edition.

**e. OLAC Liaison report (Tracey Rudnick for Mary Huisman, University of Minnesota)**

Highlights: the joint meeting will be September 26-28 in Cleveland, OH with MOUG. For information see: [www.notsl.org/OLAC-MOUG](http://www.notsl.org/OLAC-MOUG).

The program has been reviewed and many of the key note speakers and workshop teachers are confirmed.

CAPC is working on updating the DVD guide as well as a few other things. See [www.olacinc.org/capc/new.html](http://www.olacinc.org/capc/new.html) for more information.

**f. Report from LC (Joe Bartl, Library of Congress)**

The full report is lengthy and was distributed via email prior to the meeting. Will highlight things from two areas: Special Material Cataloging Division (SMCD) and Music Division.

**SMCD:** Went through a large reorganization

and now have two music teams instead of three; these two teams will eventually move to the Music Division, which is good news. Major efforts include: many digital projects, a Sheet Music Project, particularly a Musical Theater Sheet Music Database, which is being worked on alphabetically (currently in G's) and is not yet available to the public.

**Music Division:** Gershwin Prize awarded to Paul Simon; LC concerts being put back on the radio; the *Performing Arts Encyclopedia* is growing and many of the digital projects will be available through this encyclopedia.

There have been several significant new acquisitions that are all listed in the report.

**g. Report from OCLC (Neil Hughes for Jay Weitz, OCLC)**

The full report is in the meeting folders and the Enhance lists are included.

**5. Old Business**

**501(c)3:** MOUG has been incorporated. The Board must compile good financial information to apply for nonprofit status. We hope to move on this soon.

**Bylaws:** We are comparing our Bylaws to those of several other groups and looking in our own Handbook for information. We hope to complete this task by the next Board meeting.

**MOUG Mission Task Force:** The Task Force held a session last night to get feedback and got a lot of

good ideas. Information about their work can be found online at <http://moug.pbwiki.com>

**6. New Business**

The OLAC/MOUG joint meeting is in Cleveland, OH September 26-28, 2008

**Chicago in February 2009:** Yes we do plan on having a MOUG meeting there.

**Announcement:** We have a new listserv. The old list will go away as of July 1, 2008. We hope to have the new list going very soon. Reason for the change: we have had problems with the list at UNLV due to old software. We thank Cheryl Taranto (University of Nevada Las Vegas) for her work to get us started with a listserv in the first place. The new list will be hosted at the University of Kentucky with Kerri Scannell Baunach as the list owner. Information on joining the list will be sent out in the next few weeks and will be in the next Newsletter.

No other new business was brought forward.

**One last note on Budget:** Costs are going up and we're subsidizing meeting costs from general funds. You may see a raise in meeting registration and dues in the future. We are doing our best to keep these as low as possible. We hope to see some good news in the very near future.

Hughes closed by thanking MOUG for allowing him to serve. He then passed the virtual "gavel" to Tracey Rudnick, our new Chair. The meeting adjourned at 11:25am

**Remember to:**

- Subscribe to MOUG-L, the new MOUG listserv
- Order your copy of *The Best of MOUG*, 8th edition
- Register for the OLAC-MOUG Meeting, September 26-28, Cleveland, OH
- Nominate a colleague for the 2009 MOUG Distinguished Service Award

**Visit the MOUG Web site for more information:**

<http://www.musicoclcusers.org/>

**MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP**  
**Application for New Members**

Personal Membership is \$20.00 (North America); institutional membership is \$25.00 (North America); international membership (outside North America) is \$35.00. 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:

\$20.00 Personal Membership (North America)

\$25.00 Institutional Subscription (North American)

\$35.00 Personal Membership or Institutional Subscription (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Deborah Morris, MOUG Treasurer, Technical Services Librarian, Performing Arts Library, Roosevelt University, 430 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL 60605

---

Alan Ringwood  
MOUG Secretary/Newsletter Editor  
University of Texas Libraries  
S5453  
P.O. Box P  
Austin, TX 78713-8916