From the Chair
Tracey Rudnick, University of Connecticut

This is MOUG’s 100th newsletter! Enjoy a blast from the past with some columns from the past. Don’t miss the reprint of Ralph Papakhian’s “From the Chair” column concerning cataloger envy (no. 61, August 1995, p. 1, 4). OCLC Liaison Jay Weitz recently remarked in an email that Ralph’s column was “amazingly prescient in light of what Lynne Howarth and Janet Swan Hill had to say [in September] at the OLAC/MOUG meeting about how everyone wants to be a cataloger now (see Library Thing, social tagging, etc., etc.).”

Observant readers will notice that this anniversary issue also launches a new look. The previous format originated in the day of the typewriter and the mimeograph machine. Taking advantage of modern desktop publishing software, the new format offers more flexibility in design, easier incorporation of pictures and other graphics, and (hopefully) an eye-catchin g look.

This anniversary newsletter coincides with MOUG’s thirtieth anniversary (2008) and the NACO Music Project’s twentieth anniversary (2007). We will have a celebration cake on the Tuesday night of MOUG’s annual meeting, February 17-18, 2009 in Chicago. Continuing Education Coordinator Bruce Evans (Baylor University), with input from the program committee and the MOUG Board, has assembled a rich program; find details elsewhere in this newsletter.

This year’s meeting registration will be integrated into the Music Library Association’s online registration. The online

Final Report of the Task Force to Revise MOUG’s Mission and Objectives

Editor’s note: The following is an abridged publication of the Final Report of the Task Force. The complete report is available from the MOUG Web site.

The Task Force to Revise MOUG’s Mission and Objectives was formed on April 17, 2007 and consisted of Joseph Hafner, Chair (McGill University), James L. Soe Nyun (University of California–San Diego), and Sue Ellen Stancu (Indiana University). Neil Hughes, MOUG Past Chair, was an ex officio member of the group, followed by ex officio member Tracey Rudnick, MOUG Chair.

Our Task Force began with encouragement from Neil Hughes as a unique opportunity to review an organization that has been an important part of our professional development over many years.

We reviewed the Mission and Objectives of MOUG and our Task Force’s official charge from MOUG. We also re-familiarized ourselves with MOUG’s history, relying on the synopsis currently on the MOUG Web site, as well as Jay Weitz’s and Neil Hughes’s “MOUG Time

(Continued on page 3)
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.

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue. The Newsletter is a publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. It is published 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, $30.00 for personal members, $40.00 for institutional subscriptions; outside North America, $45.00 for personal members, $50.00 for institutional subscriptions; 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-L: 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 and users of OCLC products and services. To subscribe to MOUG-L, send an e-mail to listserv@lsv.uky.edu with the subject line blank. In the body of the message type: SUBSCRIBE MOUG-L <your name>

MOUG Web site: http://www.musicoclcusers.org
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form accepts credit cards. Paper registration forms will be distributed as usual, but the MOUG Board encourages you to register online; please note that the deadline for early registration is unusually early this year (December 31). Find the online registration form at https://www1.areditions.com/mla/conference-registration. Many thanks to MLA; MLA treasurers Michael Rogan and Brad Short, A-R Editions, and A-R’s Director of Sales & Marketing, James L. Zychowicz, for their support and enthusiasm.

At this year’s February MOUG meeting, you will meet the new Reference/Public Services Liaison between MOUG and OCLC, Michael Sarmiento (Product Support Specialist I, OCLC FirstSearch/Content Integration). Michael will be at the Ask MOUG session and may attend the Reference Services Committee’s meeting. Please bring questions for Michael; even better, send them in advance to any Board member or Reference Services Committee member so Michael might have an opportunity to investigate answers before the meeting. Thank you Jay Weitz and Mark Blanchard (Manager, Database and Collections Section, OCLC) for arranging a new liaison.

As part of ongoing MOUG program development, the MOUG Board recently reviewed the reports of the Task Force to Study MOUG’s Mission and Objectives (Joseph Hafner, Chair (McGill University); James L. Soe Nyun (University of California San Diego); and Sue Ellen Stancu (Indiana University)) and the MOUG Bylaws Revision Task Force (Stephanie Bonjack, Chair (University of Southern California); Nara Newcomer (East Carolina University); Jeannette Thompson (Tulane University)). Find reprints of or URLs to the reports in this newsletter. Thank you to both task forces for your care in assembling these reports and meeting deadlines. Thanks also to Past Chair Neil Hughes (University of Georgia) for launching these investigations.

The Board will continue discussion of the Mission Task Force’s report at the February 2009 Board meeting, with the intent of devising specific strategies that will help MOUG address the task force’s recommendations. Ideas from the MOUG membership are most welcome.

As per the Bylaws Task Force’s recommendations, the Board will hold a bylaws amendment ballot in spring or summer 2009. The proposed amendments clarify roles or bring the bylaws into “best practices” followed by other non-profit organizations, but do not fundamentally change the way MOUG does business. To preview proposed changes (we will also distribute changes as part of duplication costs and postage associated with ballots and make voting more convenient for members. Details still need attention, but the University of Texas at Austin has graciously allowed the use of its Survey Monkey subscription for MOUG ballots (thank you, Alan Ringwood, for making arrangements.) If you have advice or horror stories about e-voting, please share your comments with any MOUG Board member via e-mail or at the February MOUG meeting. Likewise, we would welcome a volunteer to help plan and troubleshoot e-voting. Thanks goes to the Bylaws Task Force for their initial e-voting research, and to Robert Bothman (OLAC chair, Minnesota State University–Mankato) for sharing his expertise about OLAC’s e-voting procedures.

Speaking of voting, by now members in good standing should have received election ballots. Candidates are Catherine Gick (Brown University) and Diane Napert (Yale University) for Treasurer, and Rebecca Littman (University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee) and Stephen Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado) for Vice-Chair/Elect. Please vote!

In other business, you already know the Board is investigating credit card payments for Best of MOUG and dues. (The online form for registration already takes credit cards.) MOUG is poised and options are promising. However, the Board feels it would be prudent to smoothly transition to this year’s new treasurer before assuming a new fiscal responsibility; we hope to revisit credit cards this summer. Note that transitional delays should be reduced in future years when the new treasurer-elect position takes effect in 2011.

Finally, let us return to the recent joint OLAC/MOUG conference. It was the largest to date with 290 attendees; 53 were MOUG members. (Thanks to Jay Weitz for keeping track.) At this writing, handouts were still available at http://www.notsl.org/OLAC-MOUG/Handouts.html. Thanks must go to the OLAC Board, conference organizer Sevim McCutcheon (Kent State University), and to NOTSL (Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians) for their local arrangements.

At the OLAC/MOUG closing meeting Dr. Joanna Fountain (Sam Houston (Continued on page 5)
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Line‖ article in issue no. 70 of the Music OCLC Users Group Newsletter.

After our initial review of our charge and MOUG’s history, and after some initial brainstorming about the process, we created a wiki with information about our mission for the MOUG members. The URL is: http://moug.pbwiki.com/. Although we did not receive any comments other than from our Task Force members, it was useful for us to have a place to review our work.

Throughout the process we each collected from individual members their thoughts about issues related to our Task Force. We approached several current and former MOUG Board members, many MOUG conference attendees, along with others familiar with MOUG as an organization.

The Task Force’s discussions included a conference call on Tuesday December 18 to review progress, plan for an input session during the MOUG Conference, and plan for the future. We developed a series of questions designed to gather feedback from the membership about what they felt the strengths of MOUG were currently, and where they wanted to see the organization go in the future.

On Thursday January 17, 2008 Jim Soe Nyun sent an e-mail message to the MOUG and Music Library Association listservs about our Task Force and inviting members to a session at the MOUG Conference. We posted information about the questions and session on our wiki.

During the MOUG meeting in Newport, R.I., we had a session on February 19, 2008 at 8:30 PM to gather information from members concerning the charge of the Task Force. Bruce Evans worked with us to include this on the formal MOUG agenda. Approximately thirty-five members participated in this interactive session to share their memories, ideas and suggestions.

The Task Force reviewed the comments made at the public input session and considered the comments each of us gathered from our individual contacts. We reflected on the issues raised and used our individual experiences with MOUG and the library world in general to filter out what we considered to be the most prevalent, pressing, or interesting concerns and reactions, which we summarize below. Using this input we formed our final recommendations related to our charge. The recommendations appear in the final part of this report.

Summary of Comments Received

General satisfaction: The input from the February 19, 2008 public input session echoed the comments we received during our informal discussions. Overall, a majority of attendees felt that MOUG is working well and meeting the needs of the group. There was little drive or interest in a large overhaul of the current structure and system.

Organizational and meeting structure: Some of the general suggestions include having a structure more similar to OLAC, including meeting only every other year. Some felt MOUG could include other vendors, but others felt strongly that we should not.

Public services representation: There was raised the longstanding concern that more public services librarians should be involved in the organization. MOUG has roots as a cataloging group, and this continues to affect the fabric of the group. MOUG should take steps to make non-catalogers feel welcome and interested in the organization by broadening its programs and engaging OCLC in areas outside of technical services. One of the new areas that has potential to bring more public service interest to MOUG is the growing popularity of WorldCat Local, which many of us fear doesn’t handle music satisfactorily at this point. Another product from OCLC that would be of interest to both acquisitions librarians and selection librarians is WorldCat Selection.

Environmental issues: This is a period where many items related to catalogs and libraries seem to be in a state of transition and flux. There has been a consolidation of library vendors, including the vendors which are now part of OCLC. There are also issues around the implementation of FRBR for OCLC and our various ILS vendors, as well as upcoming changes in rules related to RDA on the horizon. There is also growing discussion in the library community about the longstanding viability of using MARC and what could replace it, if there is a move away from it. MOUG must stay engaged with these changes, particularly with how they might impact OCLC’s products.

Relationships with OCLC: There is a concern that we need to have a stronger, more formal, and more proactive relationship with OCLC, including Jay Weitz, who is a valuable part of the MOUG organization. There is a feeling that collaborative relationships are not playing a sufficiently large role in the research efforts at OCLC. Maybe things need to come full circle to when MOUG originated in 1977 as a task force to provide advice on issues related to music in the MARC records format. It seems our expertise could once again be used to assist with the development of new products like WorldCat Local.

Recommendations

To address the issues in our charge, the following parts in bold text are the charge followed by our recommendations in italics.

Examining all aspects of MOUG’s current mission statement (found in the masthead of each Newsletter) and objectives (MOUG Bylaws, Article II) in the light of recent changes at OCLC (e.g. the merger with the Re-
From the Continuing Education Coordinator
Bruce Evans, Baylor University

Both the preliminary program and the registration form for our annual meeting in Chicago are included in this issue of the Newsletter. I hope you will join us for a program filled with timely and engaging topics. For our opening plenary session on Tuesday we have a very special guest. Joining us to speak about his views on the recommendations of the Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control will be David Bade, Monographic Cataloger and Senior Librarian from the University of Chicago. (David tells me that he used to be a music cataloger once upon a time, so he is familiar with the issues we face.) A formal response from Tom Caw, Music Public Services Librarian, University of Wisconsin–Madison, will follow. After the plenary we will have a two-hour break for dinner (on your own). Following dinner, we will reconvene with the ever-popular Ask MOUG. As usual, Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, OCLC, Inc., will take your technical services-related questions. Joining Jay this year to take your public services-related questions will be Michael Sarmiento, Product Support Specialist I, FirstSearch/Content Integration, OCLC. Welcome Michael!

After Ask MOUG concludes we invite you to a celebration to commemorate two different milestones. We will mark both MOUG’s 30th anniversary, and also the NACO-Music Project’s 20th anniversary (albeit each of them a year or two late). Please join us for cake, as well as socializing and networking with your MOUG colleagues!

As happened at last year’s meeting, Wednesday morning will begin with a complimentary full breakfast. Following breakfast we will have the long-awaited return of breakout sessions to the program. Your first choice will be a workshop covering special considerations for cataloging ethnic music sound recordings, taught by another special guest–Caitlin Hunter, Processing Unit Head, Recorded Sound, Library of Congress, National Audio-Visual Conservation Center. Your other choice will be a special Open Enhance Session, featuring, once again, Jay Weitz. This session will be open to anyone who wishes to find out more about the Enhance program, and will also take the place of the usual Enhance Working Session.

To wrap things up, we will have a plenary session featuring an in-depth look at authority records, with a special emphasis on what they offer public service. Wendy Sistrunk, Music Catalog Librarian, University of Missouri—Kansas City, will begin by addressing this topic from the cataloger’s perspective, and Steve Luttmann, Music Librarian, University of Northern Colorado, will address this topic from the reference librarian’s perspective. Even if you are not involved in public services, I’m sure you will learn many new things about authority records and just how helpful they can be in your work.

For the first time you have the option of registering for the annual meeting online. We strongly encourage everyone to take advantage of this opportunity, but you may use the paper form if you wish. Our thanks to A-R Editions and the Music Library Association for working with us to make this convenient option available.

We extend to you the opportunity to send your questions to our presenters in advance of the meeting. If you have questions on any of the session topics that you would like the speakers to address, please submit them to me at Bruce_Evans@Baylor.edu.

Finally, I ask you to please volunteer to help staff the MOUG registration desk. For those of you arriving early on Tuesday, we would greatly appreciate your help that afternoon with registration. Please contact Keith Chapman at kochpman@rice.edu if you are interested in helping Tuesday afternoon, Tuesday evening, or Wednesday morning.

My sincere thanks to the MOUG Program Committee and the MOUG Board for all of their hard work and assistance in putting together a fantastic program!
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State University) reminded attendees that today’s library and information science instructors are not going to be around forever and warned that adjuncts are increasingly required to have doctorates. She urged today’s practitioners to consider earning doctorates and sharing their knowledge with future generations in a formal degree setting. Indeed, we should think about all that our predecessors did for us, and consider who will be there for future generations.

View the complete preliminary program in the center section of this Newsletter or online at www.musicolcusers.org.
search Libraries Group) and in the profession of music librarianship at large, and making recommendations to MOUG’s executive board either for change or maintaining the status quo in the following areas:

a) The stated goals and purposes of MOUG, especially regarding our relationship with OCLC, Inc.;

   Include continuing education in the mission statement. Also modernize OCLC’s official name:

   The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication, assistance, and continuing education for those users of the products and services of the OCLC Online Computer Library Center concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.

b) MOUG’s relationship with the Music Library Association (MLA);

   Status quo, but several people mentioned the importance of also meeting with groups like OLAC.

c) MOUG’s relationship with the NACO-Music Project (NMP);

   Status quo; many members expressed strong satisfaction with this program, saying that it is a real strength of our organization.

d) MOUG’s relationships with the various vendors of MOUG members’ integrated library systems (ILS);

   Status quo, because many felt there were other avenues to work with other ILS vendors.

e) The content and format of annual meetings;

   Status quo with an eye towards finding ways to include more public services librarians. With new products like OCLC’s WorldCat Local and WorldCat Selection there may be more opportunities for programs related to these product for public services librarians.

f) The composition, structure, and function of MOUG’s Executive Board, especially as they relate to carrying out MOUG’s mission and objectives efficiently and effectively.

   Status quo, because there were no significant issues surrounding this topic.

With regard to 1. a-d, preceding, focusing particularly on whether or not MOUG’s relationships with these other organizations should become closer (e.g., attempting to formalize and increase MOUG’s advisory role at OCLC for interface design;

It is strongly suggested that we work more closely with OCLC in relationship to the future development of OCLC WorldCat Local to make sure that music issues are addressed.

more jointly sponsored workshops with MLA;

Few comments on this topic, but in general status quo in relationship to MLA. Many members enjoy having the two conferences back to back, to save on costs and have a synergy between the two groups, instead of having them at separate times.

collaborating more closely with MLA committees and/or vendor user groups to assess and/or articulate music-friendly standards for ILSs and federated search systems;

Few comments on this topic, but in general status quo maintaining and perhaps even strengthening MOUG oversight of the NMP;

Continue with status quo attempting to formalize and increase MOUG’s advisory role among ILS vendors for interface design, and encouraging them to work more closely with OCLC)

Given changes in the current marketplace in relation to the number of ILS vendors, the availability of more open source options, the increasing influence of search tools like Google Scholar, and OCLC’s own product, WorldCat Local, there is a feeling that continuing to focus on the relationship with OCLC is the most productive route for MOUG.

or more distinct and separate (e.g., cutting the NMP loose from MOUG oversight and MOUG Board representation; building stronger affiliations with library professional organizations other than MLA and OLAC).

Interest in the status quo for this area, and many members expressed the importance of continuing our relationships with MLA and OLAC.
The task force should feel free to consider any other broad, related issues not mentioned above that may occur to you during your deliberations, e.g., communication (Web site, newsletter, electronic discussion list, etc.);

It would be interesting to keep reviewing the options available for updating the Web site technology, the distribution of the newsletter, etc., in the advent of ever changing options like blogs, Facebook, online chat. For now, the status quo seems effective.

outreach (educational or otherwise); publicity; etc.,

Stronger ties to the MLA Education Outreach Program, including the cataloging workshops was suggested, including having the workshops be a part of MOUG programs in the future. For publicity and outreach, bringing in more public services librarians was suggested, mainly by having programs of interest to them.

and make recommendations regarding such issues, especially with regard to changes in documentation or to the functionality of any of these that might affect 1 or 2 preceding.

As previously noted, some members suggested an approach that is more like OLAC, where the group would meet on a biannual schedule. Other members felt it was important to continue meeting every year, and others felt that if we meet with another group like OLAC then we shouldn’t also meet with MLA. While there was no consensus on these, the group seems to favor the status quo.

Final Thoughts

Overall this has been an interesting review for our Task Force, and while some issues were raised, there is a strong feeling that the organization continues to be on the right track and has achieved its goals well over the history of the group. There do seem to be large issues in the near future that could change the landscape of library automation: FRBR and RDA, the uncertain future of MARC, the desire of libraries to have new search interfaces that pull together all of the various catalogs into one search engine, and alternative search interfaces like Google Scholar and WorldCat Local.

Over the last several years OCLC has consolidated its position as the preeminent organization devoted to library automation. In this transformation it continues to absorb other vendors, develops new products designed to be front end search interfaces, creates one stop selection tools, offers digitization services, partners with companies like Google and expands the types of services it provides to the library community.

Even as OCLC grows larger and develops conceptually intriguing projects, it raises concern within the music community every time it releases products where functionality for music seems to have been an afterthought. The WorldCat Local interface seems much better for searching print monographs than musical scores and recordings. In some ways this is déjà vu for those of us who remember early ILS systems, so we know there is hope for improvement. The desired improvement, however, comes about mainly through the activism of a vocal constituency. As the technological landscape changes we must continue to provide excellent services for clients in our libraries. MOUG remains uniquely positioned to help us achieve those goals.

In areas of past success for MOUG, the important work done with the NACO Music Project must continue, because it is one of our strengths.

In conclusion, because OCLC is so increasingly important to libraries, MOUG needs to continue to communicate with OCLC and our members on issues related to music, assist members in various ways using OCLC products, and provide a forum for continuing education on various levels for services related to OCLC. If MOUG strives to fulfill these clear needs, its future will be assured far into the future.

Submitted by Joseph Hafner (McGill University), Chair, July 11, 2008. Prepared by the Task Force, Joseph Hafner, James L. Soe Nyun (University of California–San Diego), and Sue Ellen Stancu (Indiana University).
OCLC to Provide U.S. Libraries with Expanded Options for Service and Support

OCLC senior management staff and members of the United States Regional OCLC Network Directors Advisory Committee (RONDAC) met September 9, 2008, to begin the rollout of a new service model that will provide OCLC members in the U.S. with an expanded set of product and service options.

The new service program is the result of more than three years of studies and discussions with partners, member libraries and service experts intended to ensure that OCLC is providing service and support that deliver maximum value and efficiencies for today's libraries.

Since OCLC was founded more than 40 years ago, OCLC has partnered with a network of regional service providers to deliver services and support to member libraries across the United States. This original partnership model will be updated and expanded to incorporate the many new service capabilities and cost sharing opportunities now available via the Web and other technologies. The new service model is designed to take full advantage of current technologies to support the strong and growing team of library and library system talent represented by the OCLC partner community across the country. Rollout of the new program will begin July 1, 2009.

The new structure will provide OCLC member libraries in the United States with enhanced service options including communications, distribution, service and support. Benefits to libraries will include an expanded set of product training materials and access to an OCLC national training calendar; enhanced online ordering; improved and simplified billing and administrative services; more online product information; simplified product pricing options; and an expanded network of training and education partners. More information and timelines for the expanded service programs will be available later this year at www.oclc.org.

Jay Jordan IFLA/OCLC Early Career Development Fellowship Program 2009

OCLC, along with the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), and the American Theological Library Association, has named librarians chosen to participate in the Jay Jordan IFLA/OCLC Early Career Development Fellowship Program for 2009. The 2009 Jordan IFLA/OCLC Fellows are:

- Mr. John Kiyaga, Library Assistant, Uganda Christian University, Mukono, Uganda.
- Miss Ani Minasyan, Circulation/Reference Librarian, American University of Armenia, Yerevan, Republic of Armenia.
- Mr. Caleb Ouma, Librarian, Nation Media Group, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Miss Saima Qutab, Librarian, Directorate General Mines & Minerals, Lahore, Pakistan.
- Mr. Raymond Sikanyika, Senior Library Assistant, Copperbelt University, Kitwe, Zambia.
- Ms. Vesna Vuksan, Head, Library Development, Belgrade City Library, Belgrade, Serbia.

The Jay Jordan IFLA/OCLC Early Career Development Fellowship Program supports library and information science professionals from 28 countries.

Since its inception in 2001, the Jay Jordan IFLA/OCLC Early Career Development Fellowship Program has welcomed 44 librarians and information science professionals from 28 countries.

During the five-week program, which will run from April 26 through May 31, 2009, the Fellows will participate in discussions with library and information science leaders, library visits, and mentoring programs. Four weeks will be based at OCLC headquarters in Dublin, Ohio, USA, and one week will be based at OCLC in Leiden, Netherlands. Topics and issues explored include information technologies and their impact on libraries, library operations and management, and global cooperative librarianship. In May 2008 the OCLC Board of Trustees announced that OCLC would expand the program to include a sixth Fellow and that the program would be renamed the “Jay Jordan IFLA/OCLC Early Career Development Fellowship Program” in honor of Mr. Jordan’s 10th anniversary as President and CEO of OCLC.
OCLC Pilots WorldCat Copyright Evidence Registry

OCLC is piloting a new service for libraries that encourages librarians and other interested parties to discover and share information about the copyright status of books.

The WorldCat Copyright Evidence Registry is a community working together to build a union catalog of copyright evidence based on WorldCat, which contains more than 100 million bibliographic records describing items held in thousands of libraries worldwide. In addition to the WorldCat metadata, the Copyright Evidence Registry uses other data contributed by libraries and other organizations.

Digitization projects continue for books in the public domain, but books whose copyright status is unknown are destined to remain in print and on shelves until their status can be determined. The process to determine copyright status can be lengthy and labor intensive. The goal of the Copyright Evidence Registry is to encourage a cooperative environment to discover, create and share copyright evidence through a collaboratively created and maintained database, using the WorldCat cooperative model to eliminate duplicate efforts.

The Copyright Evidence Registry six-month pilot was launched July 1, 2008 to test the concept and functionality. Users can search the Copyright Evidence Registry to find information about a book, learn what others have said about its copyright status, and share what they know.

During a later stage of the pilot, OCLC will add a feature enabling pilot libraries to create and run automated copyright rules conforming to standards they define for determining copyright status. The rules will help libraries analyze the information available in the Copyright Evidence Registry and form their own conclusions about copyright status.

Jackie Dooley Joins OCLC Programs and Research Staff as Consulting Archivist

Jackie Dooley, internationally recognized expert in the fields of archives, visual materials, special collections, and archival standards, has accepted a position with OCLC Programs and Research as a Consulting Archivist. Formerly Head of Special Collections and Archives at University of California, Irvine, Ms. Dooley began working in September 2008 with colleagues in OCLC Programs and Research offices in San Mateo, California, and Dublin, Ohio. Her primary assignment will be to work with the RLG Partnership, program officers, research scientists, and product development staff to develop recommendations and an implementation plan that will expand OCLC’s global support for archives and special collections. Ms. Dooley’s contributions over the last 20 years have helped reshape the conversation within the archival profession. In particular, her 1988 article “Introduction to Authority Control for Archivists” fundamentally changed the way archivists thought about the value of authority control. Her 1998 publication *Encoded Archival Description: Context, Theory, and Case Studies* built on the work she and colleagues had undertaken to reconfigure the landscape of archival description and access for researchers. Her work is widely used in graduate archival education programs. Named a Fellow of the Society of American Archivists in 2000 and elected to the Grolier Club in 2001, Ms. Dooley has held leadership positions in the Society of American Archivists, the Association of Research Libraries, the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, and the Online Archive of California (part of the University of California’s California Digital Library). Prior to joining UC Irvine in 1995, she worked at the Getty Research Institute, University of California, San Diego, and the Library of Congress.

Language Sets Now Available in French and German

Language Sets allow English-speaking librarians to build multilingual collections. Books are cataloged in MARC format, with holdings already set in WorldCat. In addition to German and French, languages available are: Arabic, Chinese, Gujarati, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Malayalam, Marathi, Panjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, Telugu, Urdu, and Vietnamese. For more information, see [http://www.oclc.org/us/en/languagesets/options/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/us/en/languagesets/options/default.htm).
Jerome Offord Jr. Named Manager, OCLC Corporate Inclusion

Jerome Offord Jr. has been named Manager, OCLC Corporate Inclusion, where he will be responsible for building and developing external relationships and strategies to attract diverse talent to OCLC, and continuing to drive an internal culture that welcomes diversity as a critical contributor to the organization’s effectiveness.

Mr. Offord comes to OCLC from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) where he has been Director of Diversity Initiatives since 2003. There he managed various initiatives to recruit and retain librarians from underrepresented groups, including ARL’s Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce and the Leadership and Career Development Program. He also worked closely with other offices within ARL to deliver workshops, training sessions and seminars to the ARL community.

Prior to his work at ARL, Mr. Offord was Director of Finance and Operations for Us Helping Us Inc., a small, Washington, D.C.-based, nonprofit organization. He has more than five years of experience as a student affairs professional at both George Washington University and American University. He has been involved in diversity programming and serving diverse communities throughout his career.

Mr. Offord holds a Bachelor of Science degree in agriculture from Lincoln University (Missouri), a Master of Science degree in student affairs from Colorado State University, and a Master of Library Science from The Catholic University of America.

Bibliographic Formats and Standards, Fourth Edition Now Available

Bibliographic Formats and Standards, fourth edition is now available online at [http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/](http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/). The print edition is now available for ordering though the OCLC Online Service Center ([http://www.oclc.org/servicecenter/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/servicecenter/default.htm)). This guide to cataloging using OCLC’s WorldCat database provides you with essential information on creating and using bibliographic records in WorldCat, including input standards and guidelines for catalogers, tagging conventions, and links to sources of related cataloging information. A list of the major differences between the third edition and the fourth edition is available at [http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/revisionhistory/edition/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/revisionhistory/edition/default.htm).

The fourth edition of Bibliographic Formats and Standards is the final edition available in print. The fourth edition will continue to be updated online and major revisions will be announced at Abstract & Revision Notes ([http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/revisionhistory/default.shtm](http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/revisionhistory/default.shtm)). Updates will be made available at Bibliographic Formats and Standards ([http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/default.htm)) in PDF format so that holders of the fourth edition can keep their print copies up-to-date. Bibliographic Formats and Standards fourth print edition is available at $50 U.S. Every order includes shipping to U.S. and Canada addresses. Shipments outside the U.S. and Canada may require additional duties and taxes. Visit the OCLC Online Service Center ([http://www.oclc.org/servicecenter/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/servicecenter/default.htm)) to place an order. For more information visit the Bibliographic Formats and Standards site ([http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/default.htm)).

Cataloger’s Desktop Includes OCLC

The fourth edition of Bibliographic Formats and Standards, OCLC’s guide to cataloging using the WorldCat database, is now part of the Cataloger’s Desktop, the online cataloging documentation resource from the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic Formats and Standards is fully indexed and searchable in Cataloger’s Desktop and, with Desktop’s 2008 issue 4 release in November, will be linked to the service’s MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data file.

Metalogue Blog Debuts

Metalogue is a forum for sharing thoughts on all things related to knowledge organization by and for libraries, hosted by Karen Calhoun, Vice President, WorldCat and Metadata Services for OCLC.

Karen will be joined often by friends and colleagues from all over the globe who will contribute perspectives and experiences about the current and future state of cataloging and metadata.

OCLC blogs provide unvetted, OCLC staff commentary on the library landscape and beyond from a variety of viewpoints, looking for news, ideas, and other information of potential interest to the library community. View Metalogue at [http://community.oclc.org/metalogue/](http://community.oclc.org/metalogue/).
Automated Personal Name Heading Control in WorldCat

In April 2008 OCLC began using automated processing to identify, modify, and control specific types of personal name headings in WorldCat bibliographic records. This processing is based on data used to build WorldCat Identities (http://orlabs.oclc.org/Identities/) and developed by Thom Hickey, Chief Scientist in the OCLC Office of Programs and Research.

In this phase of processing, personal name headings that consist of more than a single subfield and that match the established form or a reference in the authority record were updated (if necessary); the heading was then controlled, and the record was replaced. Records affected by this processing can be identified by the symbol “OCLCG” in field 040 $d. When a problem was encountered, the record was skipped and reported for manual intervention. Dr. Hickey has posted a description of the project on his blog, Outgoing, at http://outgoing.typepad.com/outgoing/2008/04/controlling-nam.html.

On September 5, 2008 OCLC completed the first phase of the project to control more headings in WorldCat. A total of about 25.5 million new personal name headings were controlled during this first phase. OCLC staff are now beginning work on future phases and announcements will be distributed as plans become firm.

OCLC Research Launches Crosswalk Web Service Demo

Developers who need to translate metadata now have access to a new demonstration service. Developed by Senior Research Scientist, Jean Godby, and Consulting Software Engineer, Devon Smith, OCLC Crosswalk Web Service translates metadata records from one format to another and will process up to 500 records from all requests per user, per day. With the aid of the WSDL file, users can develop a client to access the service, which is available on the OCLC ResearchWorks Web site for an undecided duration.

The service was developed to handle the increasingly complicated interoperability needs of OCLC and the greater library community. It has been made available to the public to gather feedback on the API that developers use, the set of formats supported (specifically, what is missing from the set), as well as specific mappings, such as incorrect or missing mappings. Developers translating metadata are invited to use OCLC Crosswalk Web Service and are encouraged to provide feedback. For more information:

- OCLC Crosswalk Web Service Demo: http://www.oclc.org/research/researchworks/xwalk/
- OCLC Crosswalk Web Service - API: http://xwalkdemo.oclc.org/api.html

WorldCat API Lets You Build Your Own Applications Around WorldCat Data

Increase the number of links coming into your library catalog. The WorldCat Search API gives your developers access to WorldCat bibliographic records and holdings information, as well as the FRBR concepts that pull together various editions of the same work. With the WorldCat API you can:

- Query the WorldCat database, containing more than 100 million bibliographic records contributed by librarians and other information professionals at thousands of WorldCat member libraries worldwide.
- Retrieve a geographically sorted list of WorldCat libraries that own a specific item.

Each library listing includes the institution name, location, and the URL of the library’s Web catalog record for that item.

Free access to the WorldCat API is available to all OCLC governing member libraries—insttuitions that contribute all current cataloging and holdings to WorldCat—plus CBS partners and libraries that catalog in the Dutch GGC (Gemeenschappelijk Catalogiseersysteem) via their memberships. Other organizations that are interested in using the API in partnership with OCLC should contact OCLC for additional information. For more information, see http://www.worldcat.org/affiliate/tools?atype=wcapi.
OCLC and Recorded Books Agree to New Partnership

OCLC and Recorded Books have signed an agreement under which Recorded Books eAudiobooks will continue to be available to libraries through NetLibrary, OCLC’s platform for eContent. Under the agreement, OCLC and Recorded Books will market Recorded Books eAudiobooks in North America and other regions around the world. OCLC and Recorded Books will continue to offer eAudiobook subscriptions and will work together to deliver new products and packages to meet the needs of individual libraries and library groups.

OCLC and Recorded Books settled a contract dispute in November 2007 and agreed at that time that OCLC would market Recorded Books eAudiobooks through August 2008 and service contracts through August 2009. The new agreement extends and expands the partnership.

In October 2008 OCLC plans to release the NetLibrary Media Center, a downloadable application that patrons and libraries will use to manage and access their content. The new Media Center will offer personalization features and advanced search and browse capabilities. Together, OCLC and Recorded Books provide eAudiobooks to more than 500 libraries and 16 library groups. For more information about Recorded Books eAudiobooks from OCLC, send e-mail to liscervices@oclc.org or customerservice@recordedbooks.com.

Bibliothèque Nationale de France to Add Records to WorldCat

OCLC and Bibliothèque nationale de France have signed a letter of intent to work cooperatively to add records from the French national library to OCLC’s WorldCat.

Bibliothèque nationale de France and OCLC signed the document during the IFLA World Library and Information Congress: 74th IFLA General Conference and Council in Québec, Canada. Once an agreement is finalized, OCLC anticipates processing an estimated 13.2 million bibliographic records from Bibliothèque nationale de France. Once records are added to WorldCat, they will be more visible and accessible to Web users worldwide.

OCLC and Bibliothèque nationale de France have worked together on other projects, such as the cooperative effort to create the Virtual International Authority File (Fichier d'Autorité International Virtuel), which virtually combines multiple name authority files into a single name authority service, and French translations of the Dewey Decimal Classification system.

The WorldCat database continues to grow at an extraordinary rate, with many of the records entered into the world's largest bibliographic resource coming from outside the United States, in non-English languages. Between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008, records from the National Library of Sweden, Swiss National Library, National Library of Australia, and National Library of New Zealand were added to WorldCat.

In 1998, about one-third of the WorldCat database represented non-English-language work. This year, for the first time ever, WorldCat contained slightly more records representing non-English language materials than for English. More information, a complete list and world map illustrating OCLC’s work with national libraries can be found at www.oclc.org/us/en/worldcat/catalog/national.

NetLibrary Participates in Serials Solutions KnowledgeWorks Certification Program

NetLibrary, OCLC’s platform for eContent and the leading provider of eBooks for libraries, has announced its titles are now certified through Serials Solutions KnowledgeWorks, which will ensure accessibility and support for NetLibrary through the popular knowledgebase. Libraries that subscribe to both Serials Solutions and NetLibrary eBooks may now access their content directly through Serials Solutions KnowledgeWorks, the comprehensive knowledgebase of content for libraries.

As a KnowledgeWorks-certified provider, NetLibrary will offer new ways users can find and access titles in their subscription databases through Serials Solutions e-resource access and management services. NetLibrary eContent is also available through OCLC’s WorldCat Link Manager, an OpenURL linking and listing service that allows users to link from citations in WorldCat and other databases to full-text electronic resources. NetLibrary’s work with Serials Solutions expands the number of access points to NetLibrary eContent.
WebJunction’s New Online Experience for the Library Community

WebJunction, the online learning community for librarians and library staff, has launched a new social and learning experience in close collaboration with partners in 15 state libraries. The new site builds on the deep repository of helpful content, relevant courses, and active discussions that have been the hallmark of WebJunction since 2003.

The new capabilities make it easier for librarians and staff to:

- Connect with friends, peers, and colleagues from across the library community using powerful new social tools such as friends, public profiles, groups, discussions, tagging, and recommendations.
- Create their own content, conversations, and spontaneous communities with fast, fun, and easy-to-use tools.
- Learn the skills they need to thrive in their careers with new and more flexible online courses covering general business, technical, and library skills, complimented by powerful social and learning management tools that add depth to the experience.

Originally launched five years ago with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, OCLC, and partners from across the library community, WebJunction has grown to over 30,000 registered members and has delivered thousands of courses.

Along with the new central site, 15 state libraries launched branded WebJunction portals for libraries and staff in their states. Eleven existing partners migrated their prior sites to the new platform over the past few months: Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records; Connecticut State Library; Illinois State Library; Indiana State Library; State Library of Iowa; State Library of Kansas; Maine State Library; WebJunction Minnesota, a statewide partnership between Metronet, MINITEX and Minnesota State Library Services; New Hampshire State Library; Vermont Department of Libraries; and the Washington State Library.

WebJunction has also announced that four new state library portals are launching for the first time: Georgia Public Library Service, the Idaho Commission for Libraries, the State Library of Ohio, and Rhode Island Office of Library & Information Services. To see a complete list of links to WebJunction partner portals, visit www.webjunction.org/partners.
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Lynne Howarth, of the Faculty of Information at the University of Toronto, began with a look back at the keynote address she presented in 1998 at an OLAC meeting touching on the pace of new media and its cataloging. At that point in time, there had been an increase in Web sites, CDs, DVDs, interactive multimedia, digital media, e-commerce, social commerce, and digital libraries. Such materials as iPods, mp3 players, camera phones, handheld devices, USB sticks, social networking, social tagging, blogs, wikis, RSS, and virtual worlds had not yet emerged. Along the same lines ten years ago, the cataloging world was considering the future development of AACR after the Toronto Conference, implementing updates to ISBD, rolling out Dublin Core, and starting to think in terms of metadata. But RDA, ISBD Consolidated, International Cataloging Principles, WorldCat, recent versions of OPACs, and social, online catalogs had not yet made their debuts.

In the last ten years, however, media has gone beyond the digital revolution and into the digital mainstream.

In a bit of a segue from cataloging and media to public services, Howarth introduced the crowd to the “metaverse,” as described in a book titled Snow Crash, by Neal Stephenson, where humans are represented by avatars and interact in a digital environment meant to replicate the physical world. An example of a “metaverse” is the online environment, Second Life (also, a Multi-User Virtual Environment, or MUVE), where such avatars are created by the users, who then interact with the avatars of other users, and go about exploring a virtual world created and maintained collectively by users. More than 400 librarians participate in Second Life, making over 30 libraries visible to Second Life users.

To segue back to the cataloging end, Howarth asked, “But where are the catalogers?” Revisiting what has happened in the last ten years, the most recent transformation of AACR began at the International Conference on the Principles & Future Development of AACR (commonly known as the Toronto Conference, 1997), where incorporating FRBR concepts dealing with user tasks and entities was considered, as well as carrier vs. content in describing material. The Joint Steering Committee continued to issue updates and revisions to ISBD, and looked toward AACR2, and then toward AACR3, which then transformed into RDA. Expected to be available in draft for review by mid-October 2008, and released in its final state mid-late 2009, RDA has been through many transformations of its own since inception and now will exist as a document in ten sections, with thirty-seven chapters. This, along with the content vs. carrier discussions and a move to ISBD Consolidated, will provide many avenues for further discussion, consideration, review, and implementation that may affect the cataloging community a great deal.

Howarth commented on the fact that, although it didn’t necessarily seem that way at the time, the trends in formats and cataloging in 1998 are simpler than the trends seen today. However, the cataloging community is armed with much more this time around as far as tools, technologies, sources, and collaborators. As she said, “we have places at multiple tables, and even more credibility” in this new era, with a lot more to look forward to as these developments progress.

This progress will not go without its hindrances, such as the abundance of A/V materials, especially those born digital, that has grown and will grow exponentially while standards, budgets, and personnel have not; and the de-emphasis of cataloging in LIS education. But, if catalogers are able to make themselves flexible and adaptable by dealing with new materials in new formats, as well as putting new standards into context with current and upcoming practices, the future could prove to be great.

Getting back to the Web 2.0 correlation, Howarth suggests a few ways in which catalogers can assist with the progress, by finding ways to gather user-created metadata to complement standards-derived metadata, thereby creating “OPACs for the people (and a little bit by the people),” and determining where to draw the line between professional structure and public involvement.

“Melville’s world is changing, but the foundations still pertain.”

If catalogers are able to make themselves flexible and adaptable by dealing with new materials in new formats, as well as putting new standards into context with current and upcoming practices, the future could prove to be great.
Announcing The Best of MOUG, 8th edition  
Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University), editor

The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is pleased to announce the publication of the 8th 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 1st through 7th editions, Ann (McCollough) Caldwell (Brown University; 1st-2nd eds.) and Judy Weidow (University of Texas at Austin, ret.; 3rd-7th eds.), who laid the groundwork for the present edition.

The cost per two-volume copy of the 8th 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, 8th 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
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Metadata for Audiovisual Materials and Its Role in Digital Projects
Jenn Riley, Indiana University–Bloomington
Report by Lauren K. Marshall, John Carroll University

Jenn Riley took her audience on a “whirlwind tour” of a representative sample of metadata standards compatible for use with images, audio, and video. The primary focus was on those standards used by cultural heritage institutions (e.g. libraries, archives, museums). She emphasized the importance of finding the right fit between one’s needs and an appropriate metadata format. Also significant was the idea that metadata standards reflect the values of those who created them to serve specific needs in describing, managing, and/or providing access to their resources. Objectives of the workshop were to lessen apprehension about metadata formats and to aid participants in knowing what questions to ask themselves in making metadata decisions for digital projects.

The workshop began with an introduction to XML (extensible markup language), which is used to encode many metadata formats. The use of XML as a background encoding of metadata formats enhances the shareability/interoperability of formats across systems and environments. Riley then explained four general types of metadata: descriptive, administrative, structural, and markup languages. Descriptive metadata serve to describe properties of resources, such as title, dates, publishers, etc. Administrative metadata help manage aspects of resources, such as preservation information, usage rights, or technical information. Structural metadata help the user navigate within a resource or between related resources, e.g., within a digitized set of 10 audio CDs, organizing information related to the order and navigation of the CDs, tracks, and related text. Markup languages are not technically metadata, but are XML coding that “marks up” the full content of a resource with metadata, e.g., “header,” “paragraph,” etc., within a text document.

The next part of the workshop was a barrage of metadata schema examples (only a few of which are mentioned here), with information about their properties, interoperability, and usage. First, general descriptive metadata schema, e.g. MARC, Dublin Core, were covered. These are intended for use with a variety of media/resource types and tend to be bibliographic in nature. Media-specific descriptive metadata formats were discussed next; these standards reflect specific needs related to the description and access of a particular media type (still images, music, artworks, video, etc.) and do not work well for generalization to other types of resources. Media-specific administrative metadata formats emphasize technical information involved in the creation, storage, and access of resources, e.g., file type and size, or camera/audio equipment settings at time of creation, and are often created by machine directly from digital file information. The primary structural metadata format discussed was METS (Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard), which Riley termed a “wrapper” for packaging many types of metadata for a resource together, connecting descriptive and technical metadata with content, for example. METS documents would be generated by software tools, not people.

Riley concluded the workshop by presenting several scenarios and possible choices for implementation of metadata standards to meet the needs of those situations. She emphasized that in order to implement any metadata format, there must be tools and systems available to utilize it, and it must address the needs of the users and resources. Decisions about metadata implementation need not be constrained to the formats currently available, and Riley encouraged participation and leadership from the cataloging and metadata specialist community to contribute to the creation of useful metadata formats and the tools/systems needed to implement them. Overall, despite the rapid pace of the presentation, Riley succeeded in imparting a level of understanding that should increase comfort levels of working with and making decisions about metadata formats and their uses.

The PowerPoint slides for this presentation are available at http://www.dlib.indiana.edu/~jenlrile/presentations/olac2008/olac.ppt.


[The Editor thanks Amy Weiss, OLAC Newsletter Editor, and the OLAC Executive Board for permission to publish this report.]
OLAC-MOUG 2008 Summary Reports

Resource Description and Access
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Heidi Hoerman, University of South Carolina
Report by Dr. Robert Ellett, San Jose State University

Glenn Patton, Director of WorldCat Quality Management at OCLC, discussed the history of RDA and the current and future state of development of the proposed cataloging code. He stated a caveat about his presentation in that some of the projections were over 18 months in the future. The RDA prospectus indicates that while RDA was built on the foundations of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition, revised (AACR2r) and originally called AACR3, its broader scope included not only libraries but also other metadata communities such as archives, museums, and publishers. The constituent organization responsible for the development of RDA includes U.S., U.K., Canadian, and Australian library organizations including the Library of Congress and the British Library. RDA has taken its roots from AACR2, Paris Principles (1961), International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD), Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) and Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD), the growth of electronic and digital resources with the proliferation of the Internet, University of Toronto Conference (1997) and the International Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloging Code. RDA includes element sets which encompass FRBR attributes and relationships. Mappings to the encoding standards of ISBD, MARC21, and Dublin Core will also be included as well as standardized terminologies known as RDA vocabularies. These vocabularies will make distinctions between content type, carrier type, media type, and relationship designators. Patton introduced the concept of element set, such as title including sub-type elements of title proper, parallel title, other title information. RDA’s core elements are influenced by the FRBR tasks of find, identify, select, and obtain and the FRAD user tasks of find item, identify in a catalog, contextualize, and justify. Patton then discussed the FRBR Group 1 entities of work, expression, manifestation, and item. An outline of RDA structure will include a general introduction, two main parts on recording attributes and recording relationships, and a number of appendices. Other communities such as publishers are working on a framework with RDA and ONIX data. A draft of RDA is projected to be available in late October with the initial release as an electronic document in the third quarter of 2009. Lastly, Patton discussed implementation issues such as testing and training.

Heidi Hoerman, Instructor, University of South Carolina School of Library and Information Science, gave a very humorous presentation entitled “How Should I Prepare for RDA? Should I Prepare for RDA?” Being a cataloging instructor, Hoerman stated clearly she “didn’t have a horse in this race”. Her best guesses about RDA were derived from reading, poking informants, and thinking about the process. Hoerman predicted that due to time constraints and economic downfalls, RDA will not be published, but instead AACR2/2010 would be published with some underlying RDA principles. RDA’s goals of getting rid of AACR2 baggage, being more global, and solving the multiple versions problems are too drastic a change for the cataloging community. Hoerman indicated that goals for RDA are conflicting—both to break from the past but also be compatible with AACR2. Hoerman stated that there are several nails in the RDA coffin, including the Library of Congress Working Group on Bibliographic Control’s decision to suspend work on RDA, and the national libraries’ reluctance to implement it prior to extensive testing by the national libraries and cooperative partners. Hoerman insisted that while the value and merit of RDA was being debated, the cataloging community still needs to update its existing cataloging rules.

[The Editor thanks Amy Weiss, OLAC Newsletter Editor, and the OLAC Executive Board for permission to publish this report.]
Janis Young discussed the ongoing implementation of genre/form headings by the Library of Congress. LC has two main objectives for the project as a whole: 1) to assist retrieval by creating access points for genres and forms of expressions, and 2) to have a system of authority records that permit future development and maintenance and that support automatic validation of headings. LC began genre/form implementation with projects in moving images and radio programs. These areas were chosen in order to identify issues and determine policies in the context of a relatively small group of headings. These smaller projects will be used to inform projects with larger sets of terms such as music and literature.

A pilot project is currently underway in which two libraries are contributing new and revised genre/form authority records through SACO and are testing a Web fill-in form and workflow. LC will begin accepting genre/form proposals from all SACO libraries when the pilot project is completed, which should happen soon. In the next few months, LC will begin using moving image and radio program genre/form headings in their cataloging. LC is also formulating timeline recommendations for implementation in two new areas (music and law), to be approved by LC management. LC is working with the music and law communities to determine the best way to proceed.

An important distinction made during this presentation was the conceptual difference between genre/form headings and subject headings. LC considers genre/form headings not to be subject headings. Rather, genre/form headings are headings that describe what a work actually is, instead of describing the subject of the work. An implication of this decision is that a bibliographic record can contain both topical subject headings and genre/form headings.

Genre/form headings are headings that describe what a work actually is, instead of describing the subject of the work. An implication of this decision is that a bibliographic record can contain both topical subject headings and genre/form headings.

It is currently permissible to use LCSH topical headings.

(Continued on page 21)
The 2008 OLAC-MOUG Joint Conference closed with Janet Swan Hill’s remarks about the three days’ events. She began by recalling that she had not attended OLAC since 1992 when she compared cataloging to baseball in a paper read at that meeting. Today, she has decided that cataloging is more like a decathlon in that catalogers need to be able to do many different activities in their daily work: demonstrate a mastery of the principles of description, subject analysis, and database structures, and even be willing to venture into metadata schemas. She indicated that the nature of the closing conference summary does not easily permit advanced preparation; the summary is compiled by visiting conference sessions, taking notes, and trying to connect threads of themes from one presentation to another.

Ms. Hill noted that every presentation seemed to begin with a lesson on the history of the given topic. This is useful for the presenter because it gives him or her a place to begin and helps to draw people into the new information by first covering what they already know. Beginning with her own historical references, she acknowledged that her career began almost 40 years ago as a cataloger of maps, what she termed a “funny format.” During her early career she tried to catalog as best as she could, using the book-based rules available to her.

Returning to the present, Ms. Hill attended the conference cataloging sessions on maps, sound recordings and scores. She observed that each session was filled to capacity and that everyone was paying close attention to what was being said. She concluded that these “funny formats” are becoming increasingly important. Today’s non-book catalogers still have to be inventive when it comes to describing our materials, which may involve cobbling together processes for items that do not fit into pre-existing categories.

Multi-media catalogers used to be a very small community that did not try to join the mainstream formats cataloging community, and preferred to remain what Ms. Hill referred to as “down-trodden elitists” since they assumed that no one else could possibly understand the materials they worked with. Within our groups, we non-book catalogers are well-organized and tend to relate to complex situations step by step and with bullet points. The dedication to detail was evident to Ms. Hill in the lists of resources for additional reading she encountered in many of the sessions. She commented that we need so many additional reading lists because we have so many tools that need additional explanation, including the FRBR and FRAD standards.

Ms. Hill insisted that standards development needs to be more coherent and the different standards need to work better with each other. Cataloging rules are not and never have been intuitive because our materials are complex. As such, people who attended workshops at this conference that discussed these standards were very attentive, although they will probably need to visit these workshops more than once to completely understand everything. Ms. Hill opined that OLAC President Bobby Bothmann was right when he said during the conference, “Be a maverick in your own catalog, but in OCLC, follow the standards.” She coined this mantra Bothmann’s Corollary to Wajenberg’s Law. (Wajenberg’s Law reads, “If you follow a nonstandard practice, some day, someone, somewhere, will curse your name.”)

Ms. Hill warned that there are major changes coming in the future. Some of these include RDA, FRBR, and incorporating other constituencies’ bibliographic data into our catalogs. With these changes come opportunities that we may have missed in the past. Under older rules and standards, we might have transferred materials elsewhere because we did not know how to catalog them. Under new standards we will have the chance to retain these more difficult materials for our own collections and to provide access to them.

Returning to her commentary on the characteristics of A/V catalogers, Ms. Hill suggested that this previously marginalized group could become more mainstream within the larger cataloging community. A/V catalogers have to be flexible and adaptable, and we honor the principles of cataloging in creative ways. These traits may become essential for survival in the world of new formats cataloging. She suggested that
 headings as genre/form headings in some cases, when a scope note indicates the term stands for a type of work, rather than the subject of a work. If no scope note is present, catalogers should use their own judgment to determine if a term represents a genre/form. For example, the headings “Cantatas (Equal voices),” “Detective and mystery stories,” and “Nautical charts” can be correct as genre/form terms, but the heading “Human figure in art” is not correct and can only be used as a topical term. Headings used in bibliographic records which are not in the authority file yet should currently be coded as local headings: 655 7 $a [heading] $2 local

To assist in implementation of genre/form terms, a subcommittee has been formed through ALCTS-CCS Subject Analysis Committee. The Genre/Form subcommittee is charged with facilitating communication between LC and cataloging communities interested in genre/form implementation. The subcommittee has recently set up a listserv, accessible at http://lists.ala.org/sympa/info/form-genre. Questions about genre/form headings and LC’s implementation of them may be directed to Janis Young, LC PSD, at jayo@loc.gov.

Form/Genre Headings
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Closing Address
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we eschew one of our less desirable tendencies, elitism, and instead reach out to others in the cataloging community.

Ms. Hill concluded with some comments about RDA. Her beliefs about RDA tend to vary between the inevitability of its adoption and the possibility that the project is effectively dead. For the foreseeable future, she warned that we are in for a period of unrest and angst. To be sure, she had similar concerns when AACR2 was being implemented, but the changes were nowhere near as dramatic as those we will likely see when moving to RDA. She was a member of the LC Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control that released the recommendation that further development on RDA cease; this recommendation was intended to raise awareness of the issues involved with the project. She recommended that we who are RDA’s ultimate users become more involved with the discussions surrounding its development.
Newsletter Retrospective: Celebrating the 100th Issue of the MOUG Newsletter

**Editor’s note:** To celebrate the 100th issue of the MOUG Newsletter we present a selection of columns, news, and trivia from previous issues of the Newsletter. Enjoy a stroll down memory lane, or learn a little MOUG history, with the following “greatest hits” of the MOUG Newsletter.

The very first “From the Chair” column (Newsletter, no. 2, Sept. 1978):

**FROM THE CHAIRPERSON . . .**

It will be a privilege to serve as the first Chairperson for this Group over the next two years, a period during which time we may expect to see our members, along with the technicians at OCLC, begin to refine the implementation of the MARC Format for Music. Our work will serve as a model for others in the use of the format, as this is the only time a MARC format has been implemented by a group of users before being used at the Library of Congress. Our mission, therefore, is both an exciting and challenging one.

Our goal is to help the OCLC system provide the optimum implementation of MARC II for Music. We hope to achieve this by (1) providing a free and direct channel of communication to OCLC for the problems of music catalogers, (2) developing and publishing a manual for music cataloging at the OCLC terminal, (3) contingent on financial constraints, sending mailings to our members, as often as necessary, to communicate news and changes as quickly as possible so that the highest uniformity may be achieved, and (4) helping networks to develop effective ways to maintain standards for and to deal with problems of music cataloging among their libraries.

As of this writing, we have 114 individual and 70 institutional members, indicating a strong interest in the concerns of our Group. I hope that all interested librarians will join us so that high-quality, shared music cataloging will soon become a reality, enabling music catalogers everywhere to devote more of their time, talents, and energies to unique material in the respective collections.

Karen A. Hagberg

**MOUG’s original dues structure (Newsletter, no. 2, Sept. 1978):**

**MEMBERSHIP**

As reported elsewhere in this issue of the Newsletter, the dues for the calendar year 1978 are three dollars for individual members and five dollars for institutional members. The dues entitle you to all publications and mailings of the Music OCLC Users Group, including the Newsletter, from issue no. 1 . . . .

**NACO-Music Project Update from no. 37, Nov. 1988:**

**NACO-MUSIC UPDATE**

The immediate goal of the MOUG’s NACO-Music Project (NMP) is to increase, cooperatively, the number of music related name and name-title authority records in the national authority file. In order to implement the project expeditiously, Tim Robson prepared a detailed proposal and submitted it for consideration in February 1988 to Suzanne Liggett, Coordinator of Cooperative Cataloging Projects at the Library of Congress. The response from LC was most encouraging. While NMP was initiated and sponsored by MOUG, progress in implementation was only possible with the cooperation of numerous offices and staff members at LC and OCLC. Since February several significant steps have been taken toward making the project successful.

The two MOUG institutions identified for participation in the first year of the project are the Sibley Music Library of the Eastman School of Music and the Indiana University Music Library. A novel feature of the NMP is its “funneling” procedure. The NMP Coordinator (currently Ralph Papakhian, Indiana University) will serve as the contact person with LC and be responsible for quality control. Name authority records created by participants will be “funneled” through the Coordinator. In this way, NMP can be regarded, from LC’s viewpoint, as “one” NACO contributor. During the first few months of this year, NMP was able to contribute name authority records under the supervision of Martin Joachim, Head of the Cataloging Department, Indiana University. His generous assistance in training and supervision was a major factor toward initiating the project. In the Spring I was invited to participate in OCLC-LSP training when Glenn Patton came to train Indiana University staff. With OCLC’s cooperation, NMP was soon able to begin contributing authority records via LSP (LSP also facilitates the “funneling” procedure described above). In May I spent one week at the LC Music Section for training in music authority work under the supervision of Richard Hunter and Dean Strohmeyer (Jerry Emanuel has recently also been designated as a reviewer). And on June 1 the first NMP records were successfully transferred from OCLC to LC via the LSP link.

In July Karen Calhoun from OCLC trained Joan Swaneckamp (Eastman School of Music) in OCLC-LSP procedures. Joan then went to LC for music authority training at the end of July. The process for contribution is now routine. Staff at Eastman and Indiana create authority records on the OCLC computer and notify me when the records are ready for review. I review those records from an

(Continued on next page)
Ralph Papakhian's famous column on cataloger envy (no. 61, Aug. 1995):

**From the Chair . . .**
Ralph Papakhian

I often wonder why it is that everyone in a library (besides the cataloger) knows the best procedures for cataloging. Administrators regularly cook up schemes like “simplification,” “automated cataloging,” “express cataloging,” “minimal cataloging” and so forth. The latest fad brought to us by outside consultants is “reengineering the workplace.” In the meantime catalogers, rather quietly, have worked in the background and created workable, internationally recognized standards (AACR2/MARC) which have enabled modest accomplishments such as the OCLC Online Union Catalog. Since our work enables the proper functioning of libraries, why is it that administrators try to interfere with the rank and file cataloger's routine, I ask. Being a library scientist I set out to do a little research on this question and I think I found the answer on p. 399 of the 1968 edition of the Lndwik Feidelberg's Encyclopedia of Library Psychology (the phenomenon is not new). The condition has been identified as Cataloger Envy. The basic definition is quite clear:

**Cataloger Envy** denotes the administrator's conscious or unconscious envy of the cataloger; a normal occurrence in administrators during their early, middle and late years. Dubinsky (1919) defines Cataloger Envy in the middle aged to elderly administrator as a “hostile feeling against the cataloger associated with the impulse to deprive the cataloger of whatever pleasure she may derive from library work. The union of these two reactions constitutes envy which represents a typical expression of the strategic development phase of total quality management ideology.” --ELP

When you think about it, this observation makes quite a bit of sense. Administrators now more than ever spend less and less time engaged in real library work. They are pre-occupied with politics, electronic mumbo-jumbo, new management theories that change almost annually, down-sizing, cost-control, customer satisfaction, etc., etc. These kindly super-librarians probably even started professional careers doing some kind of real library work and may even have fond memories of answering a reference question, building a collection, or even constructing a catalog record with authorized access points. No wonder, then, that they develop the condition of Cataloger Envy, since day by day there are fewer and fewer of us who have the privilege to touch paper, speak to library users, and share the excitement of creating the cultural monuments we know as libraries. This envy is clearly indicated by the hostile feeling toward the cataloger along with the impulse to create an environment which will debase the cataloging process so much that it is no longer pleasurable. The hostility is demonstrated by almost daily memoranda calculating the great salaries paid to catalogers (and therefore the exorbitant cost of cataloging a book—or score or recording). Work environment modification comes incrementally sometimes, but also in great waves, with complicated flow charts showing how one can catalog without human intervention. Neurotic symptoms associated with Cataloger Envy are not difficult to identify: excessive focus on local computer systems, leading to the degradation of cooperative work; constant change in OPAC public interfaces so as to destroy the possibility of standardization; resource re-allocations toward accessing fairly innocuous electronic files filled with pseudo-information; and so forth. Unfortunately the condition is chronic, with little probability of cure. A similar condition (Reference Librarian Envy) has been identified in the literature . . .

**NACO-Music Update**
(Continued from previous page)

OCLC terminal and then notify LC staff. LC staff from the Music Section and from the MARC Editorial Division then view the records stored on the OCLC computer from their own terminals via LSP. Once the records are approved for contribution, I flag the records and the OCLC and LC computers execute the record transfer. Obviously this review process is quite elaborate for the sake of quality control. NMP has received “independent” status (as of August 22) from the MARC Editorial Division, which means that NMP records will now be reviewed for content designation (coding) on a sampling basis instead of 100% review. All NMP records continue to be reviewed for content by the LC Music Section. This review will continue until a virtually error-free quality level is maintained.

By November 1988, the NMP contributed over 1,043 name and name-title authority records. The large majority of these records was created by Michelle Koth, librarian for a retrospective conversion project at Indiana University. We anticipate that the rate of contribution will increase gradually but significantly.

The first year of the project is a test phase. Next Spring, all participants (including LC and OCLC) will evaluate the progress achieved and determine whether or not NMP should continue. If we continue the project, the participants will also have to determine how and when to expand the number of participants. Numerous variables are involved, most particularly the policy decisions yet to be made.

(Continued on next page)
MOUG Newsletter Retrospective

H. Stephen Wright on cataloging quotas (No. 73, Aug. 1999):

From the Chair
H. Stephen Wright, Northern Illinois University

Recently I was chatting with a colleague, a music cataloger at a major university, who was complaining bitterly about her supervisor, the head of the cataloging department. It seems that this supervisor had asked my colleague to gather information about quantitative standards for music cataloging. This information was to be used, obviously, to devise quantitative standards which would then be imposed on my hapless friend.

Now, before I get too far along with this, let me say that I do not regard the concept of quantitative goals as intrinsically bad. I learned quite early in my career that you can spend as much or as little time on cataloging an item as you wish—with obvious consequences for the quality of that cataloging. At one end of the spectrum, you can spend a few scant minutes creating a crude record that will get the item off your desk and on the shelves; at the other end, you can spend an entire morning, or even an entire day on one item, crafting a bibliographic symphony that resonates with carefully constructed access points and describes the item with consummate skill. Of course, the acquisitions department will continue to send you new items while you are engaged in this artful pursuit, so all but the most willfully isolated catalogers will attempt to balance the need for accuracy and completeness with the realities of workflow. No, quantitative standards are not bad in themselves—but in the hands of a craven administrator, they can become evil.

One of the most common misconceptions in the library world is that once you buy a book (or a score or a recording), you have finished paying for it. I’ve seen this delusion manifested many times as libraries struggled to deal with budget cuts; invariably someone suggests cutting everything except the book budget, so that the library can continue to buy just as many books as before. The fallacy of this reasoning is the notion that you can buy books without also buying the infrastructure of resources necessary to make the book accessible and keep it available: cataloging, processing, and the less palpable overhead costs of shelving to hold the book, staffing to keep the library open so people can come into the library to get it, lighting so that people can find their way to it, and so on. A 1987 study at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University revealed that the average cost to purchase and shelve a single monographic volume was $106.22, and only $42.39 of that amount is the actual purchase price of the book! Cataloging was, not surprisingly, the second largest component at $39.75 . . . and this was more than twelve years ago.

Administrators who cling to the nonsensical mantra of “do more with less” would, of course, prefer to adapt to shrinking budget resources by cutting everything except the number of items purchased. Needless to say, the services required to make those materials available will decline in quality as technical services staff positions are consolidated or eliminated; backlogs begin to grow because the library has bought materials without buying (albeit from itself) the cataloging. Rather than honestly admit that the library can’t afford to supply quality cataloging for its own materials and must now reduce acquisitions or take responsibility for inferior access, the administration retreats into the cowardly doublespeak of quantitative standards. The luckless catalogers are simply told that they must somehow meet an arbitrary quantitative standard—how they do it is left up to them. If they choose to cope with the ukase by reducing or eliminating authority work or cutting descriptive elements, thus contaminating the catalog with incorrect headings or inaccurate descriptions, then it’s their own fault, right?

To add insult to injury, the catalogers are alone among their colleagues in being subjected to this indignity. Reference librarians aren’t told that they must answer 100 questions a day. Bibliographers aren’t ordered to select a predetermined number of books within a fixed budget. Only the cataloger is subjected to these demeaning quotas, and thus the devaluation and erosion of the cataloging professional continues.

Quantitative standards for cataloging are reprehensible when they are used to maintain the library’s imposing façade while allowing the bibliographic infrastructure to decay and simultaneously allowing administrators to evade their culpability for that decay. Catalogers, the very people who are entrusted with the awesome responsibility for the catalog—the matrix that distinguishes a library from a mere building full of books—are maneuvered into degrading their own work. How can we say that isn’t evil?

NACO-Music Update
(continued from previous page)

made by OCLC and LC about the use and development of LSP.

The NACO-Music Project represents but another step in MOUG’s efforts in improving the quality of the OCLC Online Union Catalog and in facilitating cooperative music cataloging.

A. Ralph Papakhian
NMP Coordinator
Indiana University
Questions and Answers
Jay Weitz, OCLC

The Message of the Medium, Post-Format Integration

Q: Is it appropriate to use field 048 in a videorecording record? We're working from copy that we have for an audio CD of the same performance. BFAS (http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/048.shtm) implies that this field is only appropriate for scores and sound recordings: “Definition: The instrumentation of a score or musical sound recording in coded form.” The MARC21 048 definition (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd048.html) is a little more forgiving: “Two-character code that indicates the medium of performance for a musical composition.” However, the end of that definition says, “Repeated when the instrumentation of separate compositions in publications or manuscripts of music or sound recordings is recorded.” So, that also implies the pre-format integration limitation of using this field just for scores and sound recordings. What's your take on this issue?

A: Both MARC 21 and BFAS have countless such stray references that sound inappropriate in a long-post-Format Integration world. There's no reason why field 048 (or 047, for that matter) couldn't be used in a bibliographic record for a videorecording of a musical performance such as the one you mention. We should probably reword the BFAS definition, although I would take serious issue with the MARC 21 definition as it now stands, as of MARC Update No. 7 (dated October 2006). Because one can now use the three-character IAML codes in this field, the limitation to two-character codes is no longer appropriate, either. My suggested rewording: “The medium of performance for a musical composition, in coded form.” Thanks for bringing this one to our attention.

Initial Articles in Enhanced Contents Notes

Q: It is clear to me that initial articles in English titles should be included in subfield $t$, like this:

505 00 $t The final voyage of the liquid sky ...

My question is this: Do we follow the same rule in languages other than English? From the following two examples which one is correct?

505 00 $t Le nozze di Figaro ...

(initial article in subfield $t$)

OR

505 00 $g Le $t nozze di Figaro ...

(initial article not in subfield $t$ but in subfield $g$)

Unfortunately, I have not seen consistency as far as this issue goes.

A: Initial articles are title information regardless of the language, and so belong in subfield $t$ when the cataloger chooses to use the enhanced contents note coding. No initial article in any language should be coded in subfield $g$. In Connexion, field 505 subfield $t$ appears in only three indexes. Two of those, “Notes word” (nt:) and “Title” (ti:), are keyword indexes in which “a,” “an,” and “the” are stopwords that are ignored in any case. For the third of those indexes, “Title phrase” (ti=), OCLC has done special programming to ignore the initial articles “a,” “an,” and “the” in field 505 subfield $t$. As an example, the contents note “St The final voyage of the liquid sky” may be searched as “ti=final voyage of the liquid sky”. Initial articles in languages other than English will NOT be ignored in field 505 subfield $t$. The correct transcription of formal contents notes is governed by AACR2 rule 2.7B18, its LCRI, and the corresponding contents note rules (and LCRIs) in subsequent AACR2 chapters. Data in contents notes were never intended to be controlled access points. In cases where controlled access to such data is desired, the appropriate 7XX fields should be used (for instance, as name/uniform title entries in 700, 710, or 711; or as uniform title entries in 730).

Uncontrolled related and analytical titles, which may be manipulated to eliminate initial articles, belong in field 740.
Questions & Answers

Fragments and the Whole Score

Q: I am struggling with the physical description of a piece of music: Five fragments / Ben Johnston. Performing this work in its entirety requires medium voice, oboe, cello, and bassoon. Different forces are required for each of the five “fragments”:

Fragment 1: first half of p. 1, medium voice alone.

Fragment 2: p. 1-2, medium voice and oboe.

Fragment 3: p. 3-4, medium voice and cello.

Fragment 4: p. 5, medium voice and bassoon.

I have two copies of a score for p. 1-5. Then:

Fragment 5: p. 6-7, medium voice, oboe, cello, and bassoon.

I have four copies of a score for pages 6 and 7. There is a break in between each fragment, so presumably the publisher/composer decided that each performer only needs a copy of the sections where they are playing. That is, the singer would have p. 1-7; the oboist p. 1,2,6,7; the cellist 3,4,6,7; the bassoonist 5,6,7. The item came to me in a folder containing loose sheets with the pages of each number grouped together, that is, both p. 1s, then both p. 2s., then both p. 3s etc. There are also four unnumbered leaves of preface material and instructions on producing the microtonal pitches. OCLC #80443204 and #2012166 are close matches. (Another record, #223014082 states that each score has 9 p.) OCLC #80443204 describes it as: “7 leaves of music, [4] leaves ; $c 28-36 cm.” OCLC #2012166 has: “2 scores (7 t. each) ; $c 36 cm.” (This is an ISBD record.) I’ve come up with a few possibilities for describing this resource, though none seem quite right:

300 4 scores, [4] leaves ; $c 28-36 cm.

500 Two copies each of p. 1-5, containing the sections for voice and 1 instrument; 4 copies each of p. 6-7.

OR

300 2 scores (7 leaves each), [4] leaves ; $c 28-36 cm.

500 Includes 2 additional copies of p. 6-7, necessary for performance.

How would you describe this item?

A: An underlying goal in any act of bibliographic description is to be as clear and as accurate as possible without misrepresenting the resource being described. When a publisher presents a situation as convoluted as the one you’ve described, we can do only the best that we can. You seem to have boiled down the actual situation to its physical essence. Setting aside all of the complexities of which performer needs which pages at which point in the performance, there do seem to be two complete sets of the leaves that constitute the score, plus what amount to two additional copies of the leaves that all four performers need in Fragment 5, and the four unnumbered preface leaves. Given all of that, I’d say that your second suggestion of 300 and 500 present the description about as clearly, accurately, and succinctly as could be expected under the circumstances.

Different Titles, Different Records

Q: I have a score that has copy in OCLC, but the title is worded differently from my item. I consulted “When to input a new record,” and nothing seems to apply. It isn’t a “title change.” The OCLC record has the cover title “Suite no. 5 in c, BWV 1011, originally unaccompanied suite for cello.” My copy has “Suite V, BWV 1011” on the title page, cover, and caption. The caption also includes “originally for solo cello.” It’s obviously the same thing—pagination, date, size, and arranger all match. Is a new record justified?

The final sentence in the field 245 subfield $a section of “When to Input a New Record” DOES apply to your situation: “Specific differences in the wording of the title proper (other than those noted above) justify a new record.” Your cover title differs from the cover title that you’ve cited from the existing WorldCat record. In the absence of any other information, that’s enough to justify a new record.
Uniform Titling Contents Notes

Q: I have been working on an original record for a collection of Broadway and popular songs. The catalog states there are 100 songs from stage works. In examining each one (actually there are fewer than 100), I transcribed the title (for the formatted, enhanced contents note, which we do for original cataloging of certain choice materials) as concisely as possible, usually from the cover of the item. One of my colleagues is of the opinion that, for a single song sheet music edition, e.g., “St Over the Rainbow / Sr Harold Arlen”, the 505 text for that song should really be: “St The Wizard of Oz. St Over the Rainbow / Sr Harold Arlen.” I transcribed the song titles from the pieces themselves and do not want to mislead the user into thinking that the whole musical is in this collection. I couldn't find any rule about this. I would appreciate any advice on how to proceed. I have made 700 added entries for all of the names. Should there be 700 added entries for the names with the titles of the full musicals, or is that optional?

A: In field 505, titles would be transcribed as they appear on the resource. If they appear differently in different locations on the resource, you could choose the most complete version. But you don't need to feel obligated to add information that isn't present on the resource. That would not be the case in formulating uniform titles for the songs, of course. When creating composer/uniform title 700s (or in some cases, just uniform title 730s), you would supply the authoritative form of the larger work when it was appropriate. You needn't do that in field 505. To answer your final question, giving full composer/uniform title access to every song in a collection of this sort is admirable and ambitious, but it isn't required. (And previous to the implementation of Connexion, it would usually have exceeded system limits, although this is no longer the case.) There are not any rules or LCRIs that directly address this issue in regard to printed music, as far as I can find. But we can read the “Sound Recordings” portion of LCRI 21.7B in the spirit of the “Music Videos & Popular Music Folios” portions of LCRIs 21.23C and 21.23D as an argument to limit added entries in a case such as this, if you are looking for a reason not to add all those analytics. Don't feel bound by those limitations, though. If you want to do the full treatment, you may.

As Above, So Below

Q: AACR2 Rule 1.1B1, tells us: “If the title proper as given in the chief source of information includes the punctuation marks ... or [ ], replace them by — or ( ), respectively.” That suggests that we should do the same thing to those marks when creating a contents note, but I can't find a rule to that effect. Is there one? If not, what do you do?

A: Although it makes the statement a bit more cryptically than one might like, the operant rule here is 1.7A3, under the heading “Order of information.” It states: “If data in a note correspond to data found in the title and statement of responsibility, edition, material (or type of publication) specific details, publication, etc., physical description, and series areas, give the elements of the data in the order in which they appear in those areas. In such a case, use prescribed punctuation, except substitute a full stop for a full stop, space, dash, space.” To my mind, that has always included applying the various rules and rule interpretations regarding those cited areas when transcribing any corresponding information in a note.

Global Trade Item Numbers

Q: There are bibliographic records for sound recordings to which extra 024s with first indicator 8 (Unspecified type of standard number or code) have been added. The number itself is a UPC number preceded by two zeros (00). This addition seems unnecessary because it is not searchable unless two zeroes were added knowingly in front of a UPC number on item to search. Could you explain why this extra 024 is added? Can it be stopped? It is a real clutter for us that needs to be deleted from records.

A: These fourteen-digit numbers are actually a legitimate standard called the Global Trade Item Number or the GTIN-14. These should be coded in field 024 with First Indicator “7” and a corresponding subfield $2 coded “gtin-14”. The “gtin-14” code was validated for field 024 subfield $2 in the 2008 OCLC-MARC Update, documented in Technical Bulletin 255 (http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb255/default.htm). If you are interested, you can learn more about the whole family of GTINs at http://www.uc-council.org/ean_ucc_system/education_support/cdc.html. The (currently) more common UPC is also in many of these same records and is accessible in the usual standard number (“sn:” and “sn=” indexes, as are the newer GTINs.
Questions & Answers

When Transcribed and Prescribed Punctuation Clash

Q: I am looking at a title page that is laid out something like this:

ENTRE-ACTE
GLAZUNOV/PETERSON
from the ballet
Raymonda
For Violin & Piano
Arranged by
Art & Nicolas Peterson

The question is how to treat the slash within Glazunov/Peterson. AACR2 (actually LCRI 1.1B1) says that a slash should be transcribed as is in a title proper, provided that you can close up the space on either side. I can't find a similar rule for other title information or statement of responsibility, though I can't see why the same provision shouldn't apply there. In this case, in the 245, would you do something like “... / $c Glazunov/Peterson ; arranged by Art & Nicolas Peterson”? Or would you add some bracketed words for Glazunov and/or Peterson, maybe “[composed by] Glazunov ; [arranger,] Peterson ; arranged by Art & Nicolas Peterson”? This solution seems rather repetitive to me, because the bracketed word before Peterson adds nothing that the full “arranged by” statement doesn’t cover. Perhaps a wording exists that gets around this difficulty, but none occurred to me. I used “[arranger,]” simply to avoid saying “[arranged by]”, which really makes the statement repetitive. Actually, I like the solution that retains the original slash, but I wonder whether the repetition of the slash in two different meanings (just before subfield $c and then early in subfield $c) looks odd enough to confuse people. Can you find a rule that covers this situation? What is your take on how this statement of responsibility should be done?

A: LCRI 1.1B1 is, indeed, under the heading “Title Proper,” but if we look a little more closely at the “Punctuation” section, we’ll find that it may well be intended to have much wider application. The portion designated “2)” does specify title proper, but the portion designated “1)” is all over the place. It never mentions title proper, the first example is actually for punctuation in the statement of responsibility (“Symposium: Fine Arts ...”), and the final paragraph talks about punctuation in name headings. I’d say that we can feel secure in applying the punctuation advice in this portion of the LCRI at least to title proper, other title information, and statement of responsibility, and probably to any other transcribed areas.

Composer's Name Straight, No Collective Title Chaser

Q: An example of a complex non-collective CD title, OCLC #61321579 has me confused a bit. The disc certainly has a lengthy 245, but also a note that the title comes from the container. This would suggest that nothing on the disc could be taken to serve as a title proper, but I’m not so sure, especially after being forced to study rules and LCRI s carefully again. The disc is a compilation of works by Arnold Schoenberg, the label of which reads:

Arnold Schoenberg
Ensemble intercontemporain
Jonathan Nutt
Accentus
Laurence Equilbay

My reading of 1.1B3 would suggest that “Arnold Schoenberg” could be considered the title proper; there is no LCRI to modify this rule. This assumes that I’m entitled to disregard the performers as title fodder, and that may not be the case. Of course, there is an LCRI for 6.1B1 that seems to exclude the name of a composer from being the title proper, but it specifies instances where the names in question precede the titles of individual works in the chief source. Since the disc does not list titles at all, does that exempt it from this LCRI? For what it’s worth (and that might not be much), the booklet cover and spine have similar content, except that “Arnold Schoenberg” is now just “Schoenberg.” What do you think?

A: The way that LCRI 6.1B1 is worded, there seems to be no way to apply this rule interpretation to a composer's name that does not appear in conjunction with the titles of compositions. That leads me to believe that AACR2 1.1B3 would apply here and that “Arnold Schoenberg” could legitimately be the title proper. As far as I can tell, there isn't any other meaningful advice (in 1.0A, 6.0A, or their LCRI s, for instance) about resorting to another source for the title proper in a case such as this where there appears to be no other candidate for collective title.
Implied Parentheses in Physical Description

Q: Where does it say that the pagination of any kind of score (or a part) goes in parentheses? Not in 5.5A1—parentheses are mentioned only for accompanying material. Rule 5.5B2 sends you to 2.5B for rules on recording pagination. The only place parentheses is mentioned (at least that I can see) in that chapter is way down in rule 2.5B19, which is speaking specifically about when “v.” is used for “volumes,” how to record pagination in continuously-and-individually-paged multiple volumes. For me, it doesn't automatically follow that you'd also do it following any of the nine specific material designations listed in 5.5B1. I must have learned to use parentheses all those years ago by (Horrors) following the examples in the Chapter 5 rules. What do you think?

A: That is so interesting. It doesn't seem to say explicitly anywhere in AACR2 or in the LCRRs, as far as I can find either, that pagination data such as this goes in parentheses, not in 1.0C, not in 1.5, not in 2.5, and not in 5.5. In 1.5B3 and 5.5B2, the parentheses are suggested solely by the examples. Where parentheses are explicitly mentioned, it is in a specific context (for instance, for publications in more than one volume in 2.5B19, for tactile scores in 5.5B3) rather than as a general rule or particularly in regard to single volumes of printed music. We have to go back to the AACR1 rules on description of printed music, Rule 246A, to find the parentheses mentioned: “Following the term for the score, the paging is stated within parentheses.” The same wording appears in the 1949 “Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress,” in Rule 9:5 A. If it's any comfort (which it isn't), the same lack of explicit reference to parentheses seems to be found in almost every other chapter of AACR2 Part I, expect for electronic resources, where Rule 9.5B4 actually says “Enclose additions in parentheses.” In a separate e-mail response to this question, Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland) pointed out:

“It’s really much clearer in ISBD (http://www.ifla.org/V111/s13/ pubs/ISBD_consolidated_2007.pdf): “5.1.3. Extent. As a further measure of extent, the pieces of a resource are specified as appropriate (i.e. the number of pages, leaves, sheets, frames, pieces, etc.) and (where applicable) the playing time (see 5.1.5). This further statement of extent is enclosed in one pair of parentheses ().” You'll be glad to know that the latest available draft of RDA (http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/ds5rda-parta-ch3rev.pdf) addresses this more clearly (although I make no promises about what the final version will say): “Notated music. 3.4.0.3.1b.1. For a printed or manuscript resource consisting of notated music (with or without accompanying text and/or illustrations) record the extent by giving the number of scores, parts, etc., followed by the number of volumes and/or pages, etc., in parentheses, as instructed under 3.4.2.”

In fact, the ISBDs are, and pretty much always have been, explicit about using parentheses in these cases. (Going back to the 1980 ISBD(PM), for printed music, Rule 5.1.3 says in part “… the pagination is given in parentheses following the volume number.” Kathy has kindly cited the rule in the current Consolidated ISBD, which happens to be the same number but has different wording.) Now if we want to be generous to those who wrote AACR2, we can take the text of the AACR2 introduction (Rules 0.21 through 0.29) and its repeated references to ISBD as the basis for these Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules as the implicit justification for the parentheses in question. But I’ll leave it up to you to decide how generous you’re feeling today. It’s hard to reach any other conclusion but that the rules have forced us to catalog by example in this instance.

Indicators and Analytics

Q: What would the second indicator be in a name-uniform title entry: “2” or “blank”? In cases like these, for years, I have used “2” as a second indicator. However, I do see a lot of records using as a second indicator “blank”. Which one is right? In relation to this, are name-uniform title entries in 700 fields considered to be analytics when they come from an enhanced 505 note?

A: If the work represented by the name-uniform title heading is actually present in the resource, the second indicator “2” is proper because the added entry is an analytic. For example, a composer-uniform title added entry representing one of the musical works on a sound recording that has several such works would be coded “2.” So in that sense, an added entry that represents part of the contents of a resource (and might appear in field 505) would usually be analytical. If the work represented by the name-uniform title heading is not present in the resource, the second indicator would be “blank” because it is a related work added entry, not an analytic. For example, a name-uniform title added entry for a novel that serves as the source of an opera would be a related work that is not itself present in the resource being cataloged.
Questions & Answers

DtSt, Collections, and Editions

Q: I’m working with OCLC #25641965, a score of 17 solo piano works by Turina published in 1991 by Salabert. Each of the 17 works was previously published separately by Rouart-Lerolle between 1913-1936; all of the original copyright dates and plate numbers appear in the Salabert score. I’m trying to figure out if DtSt “r” is appropriate for this publication, and I’ve been thrown off interpreting this sentence from the first paragraph under “r” from BFAS: “Do not use for items that have changed enough to be published as new editions.” There’s also the following in BFAS, a bit later in this section: “Do not use code r for the following: New editions, including new editions published under a different title.” However, a bit further on, there’s an example that appears to support using DtSt “r” in a similar situation:

DtSt: r
Dates: 1990,1855

[I item is reproduced from two or more works. This edition 1990 republication of Crotchets and quavers, originally published in 1855 and Sharps and flats, originally published in 1890.]

I clearly have a new edition; from what I can tell, this is the first time these 17 works were published together with this title. However, all of the individual contents are reprints, without any obvious changes to the intellectual content. So, is it:

DtSt “s” and Dates 1991
OR:
DtSt “r” and Dates 1991, 1913

Thanks for your help.

A: All collections of previously published material would have, by definition, “changed enough to be published as new editions,” so let’s make the logical leap to conclude that the sentence you cite can’t be referring to that sort of circumstance. Admittedly, the jumble of sentences in the BFAS definition of DtSt code “r” is not clear, but I think that if we concentrate more narrowly on the AACR2 concept of “edition” both in that particular sentence and in the later “Do not use code r” bullet, it may help. The AACR2 definitions of “edition” for the various types of published materials all emphasize two notions: (1) production from the same type image or master copy resulting in sameness of content, and (2) issuance by the same entity. A publication that collects previously published scores into an entirely new publication issued by a different publisher squares with neither of those notions. So neither of the restrictions you cite should apply here, because both of them are talking about new “editions” in the narrow AACR2 sense, I would argue. Your publication is a new collection of piano pieces previously published separately over time by a different publisher. You know the publication date of the collection and you have dates for all of the previously published constituent parts. Type of Date “r” seems appropriate, with the date of the collection (1991) as Date 1 and the earliest date of the original publications (1913) as Date 2, as in your second suggestion.

Two (Sides) Equals One (Disc)

Q: I would like to confirm or disprove my thinking regarding subfields $a$ in the 300 field for LP sound recordings. I see in a lot of older records in my local catalog where LPs use “2 s.” Does this stand for “2 sides”? If not, what did “2 s.” stand for?

A: The designation of the sound recording physical description in terms of “sides” (1 s., 2 s., etc., as well as fractional numbers) was in accordance with the AACR1 Rule 252D1 (Chapter 14: Phonorecords, Description, Processed Phonorecords, Collation, Phonodisc) which reads: “The number of volumes (albums) if more than one, and/or sides, or fractions of the latter are indicated; blank sides are disregarded. This is followed by the diameter to the nearest inch (if sizes differ, inclusive figures are given) and speed (revolutions per minute). The term ‘microgroove’ or ‘stereophonic’ is added when applicable.” Examples followed. These rules were in effect more-or-less until the implementation of the AACR1 Revised Chapter 14: Sound Recordings, which was published in 1976. The Revised Chapter 14 began the transition toward AACR2 for sound recordings, changing the “2 s.” designation to “1 disc” (which under AACR2 would become “1 sound disc”). The AACR1 practice of cataloging individual musical works that were on the same disc separately, connecting the separate records via “with” notes, became an infrequently-used option under AACR2 (see Rule 6.1G). You can still find many older, pre-AACR2 records for sound recordings in WorldCat that were cataloged under either AACR1 Chapter 14 (#47269413, #5531970, #5531811) or the Revised Chapter 14 (#5542348, #4123350, #4123337). Some have been upgraded to AACR2 form in the intervening years, but many have not. If you happen to have any of the older LC printed catalogs, the National Union Catalogs for music from the mid-1970s or earlier, you can see thousands of such records.
Parenthetical Ranges of Numbers in Uniform Titles

Q: I have a question regarding LCRI 25.32B1, which LCRI instructs cataloguers to “apply 25.6B1 to parts of a musical work only when, under 25.32A1, the numbers of the parts are used in the uniform titles for individual parts of the work.” It gives the following as an example: Ungarische Tänze. Nr. 5-6. Does this allow applying 25.6B1 to cases when the number of the part in the set is given in parentheses per 25.32A2 (e.g., Maestro. Pavana (No. 23))? For example, would a uniform title like this one be allowed? Gabrieli, Giovanni, 1557-1612. Canzoni et sonate. Canzon, voices (12) (No. 16-17)

The reason I'm asking this question is that the LCRI, if applied in a strict manner, would not authorize applying 25.6B1 when the numbers of the parts have been added per 25.32A2. However, one can find examples in LC's authority file such as this one:

Frescobaldi, Girolamo, 1583-1643. Recercari et canzoni franzese. Canzon, no. 1-5

where adding the numbers is the result of applying the first paragraph of 25.32A2, not 25.32A1. I haven't been able to find examples of consecutive numbers added per the second paragraph of 25.32A2, though, so I don't know if extending 25.6B1 to such cases is a legitimate practice.

A: If I am reading all of the rules and understanding your question correctly, LCRI 25.32B1 would not apply to uniform titles formulated according to 25.32A2. Rule 25.32A2 can be applied only in cases where the part “lacks a number,” whereas 25.6B1 and the portion of LCRI 25.32B1 that refers to numbered parts both apply only to parts that are explicitly numbered. AACR2 25.32A2 is talking about parts that need to be differentiated but are not actually numbered and cannot otherwise be distinguished by such elements as medium of performance, key, date of composition or publication, and so on. In those cases, the parenthetical number is supplied by the cataloger formulating the uniform title: “... determine the number of the part in the set and add it, enclosed in parentheses.” Note the way that is worded, suggesting that the number must be “determined” rather than simply recorded. Note also that 25.32B1 refers us back to 25.6B as a whole, where 25.6B talks about “two unnumbered or non-consecutively numbered parts of a work.” Now reading this strictly, you would have to use separate uniform titles for two unnumbered parts, even if 25.32A2 would have you “determine” and supply numbering and regardless of whether those “determined” numbers were consecutive. That does appear to be the result of the way all of these rules and interpretations are worded, although such a limitation seems silly and officious and one wonders if it was truly intentional. My guess is that this is another one of those cases where all of the implications of interrelated rules were never quite thought through (understandably enough). Like you, I can find no examples of a consecutive range of these parenthetical numbers in the authority file (which would not be easy to find, in any case). I must say that I'm torn between honoring what appears to be the letter of the law in not allowing these parenthetical ranges of numbers and fudging the letter of the law in the spirit of pretty much every other AACR2 treatment of consecutive ranges of numbers. But somewhere, I remember someone admonishing me not to agonize about these questions, so I think I'll come down on the side of fudging.
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