From the Chair
Tracey Rudnick, University of Connecticut

It is hard to believe four months have passed since MOUG members celebrated the NACO-Music Project’s twentieth and MOUG’s thirtieth anniversaries in Chicago. We bade farewell and gave deepest thanks to departing MOUG Board members, Past Chair Neil Hughes (University of Georgia) and Treasurer Deborah Morris (Roosevelt University). MOUG now welcomes new Treasurer Diane Napert (Yale University), whose background in financial services and experience leading the Music Library Association’s New England chapter will serve MOUG well. We also welcome new Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect Steve Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado), who has years of previous MOUG Board experience and more recently served as MOUG’s Reference Services Committee chair.


(Continued on page 3)

Mickey Koth Receives MOUG Distinguished Service Award
by Stephen Luttmann

The Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is honored to name Michelle “Mickey” Koth as the eighth recipient of MOUG’s Distinguished Service Award. This award was established to recognize and honor those who have made significant professional contributions to music users of OCLC. The MOUG Executive Board selects recipients based on nominations received from the MOUG membership. Koth received the award in Chicago during MOUG’s annual business meeting on February 18, 2009.

Koth's achievement lies in both her prodigious output and her commitment to supporting others through teaching, mentoring, and the creation of practical tools, all of them developed and delivered following the highest standards of excellence known to the profession.

Koth has been a music cataloger at Yale University since 1990, but had previously been part of the Associated Music Libraries Group Title II-C retrospective conversion grant at Indiana University, where she converted over
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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.
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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>
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Hunter (National Audio-Visual Conservation Center, Library of Congress) delved into cataloging ethnic music sound recordings, focusing on problems of terminology, languages, cultural practices, cataloging practices, and users’ search behaviors. Wendy Sistrunk (University of Missouri–Kansas City) and Steve Luttmann offered illuminating and often hilarious examples of information in authority records that can aid public service.

In the open meetings, OCLC’s new public services liaison to MOUG, Michael Sarmiento, visited the Reference Services Committee to discuss music-related issues in WorldCat Local. OCLC liaison Jay Weitz led a well attended Open Enhance Session held during regular program time so more attendees could discuss OCLC’s Duplicate Detection and Resolution project, and the Expert Community Experiment, which enables cataloging members to make more changes to WorldCat records.

Thank you to all of our speakers, participants, and Continuing Education Coordinator (CEC) Bruce Evans and his Program Committee for a stimulating program!

We must also thank A-R Editions and the Music Library Association for their support and collaboration integrating MOUG into MLA’s online registration. Seventy percent of MOUG’s attendees took advantage of this service, and we look forward to further collaboration next year.

MOUG’s 2010 Program Committee already has ideas for a practical, exciting program in San Diego. Nonetheless, your ideas are still welcome; please send them to Bruce Evans or any member of the committee (Keith Chapman, Rice University; Beth Flood, Harvard University; Damien Iseminger, New England Conservatory; Mac Nelson, University of North Carolina–Greensboro; Rebecca Thompson, Missouri State University). Remember that “public service” OCLC products and end-user experiences are part of MOUG’s mission, so we welcome ideas along those lines. If you are a cataloger, please consider bringing MOUG’s mission and programming to the attention of your public services counterparts, and send us ideas that might draw them to meetings or foster critical dialogue across professional disciplines.

The MOUG Board will meet in Columbus, Ohio on August 8, 2009. If you feel there are issues to be addressed or statements to be issued to OCLC or the profession on behalf of MOUG, please contact any Board member or start a discussion on MOUG-L. This is a time of great change, including OCLC’s proposed Policy for Use and Transfer of WorldCat Records, the Expert Community Experiment, ongoing development and local implementations of WorldCat Local, and seismic changes in our economy and institutions.

Moving to more mundane matters, by the time you read this members in good standing will have received postal ballots to amend the bylaws as recommended by MOUG’s Bylaws Review Task Force. The ballot deadline is June 6.

The MOUG Board is still tentatively planning to conduct the next board election by e-ballot in October or early November, assuming the ballot initiative passes. This year we will hold elections for Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Continuing Education Coordinator. To nominate yourself or others, please contact members of the 2009–2010 Nominating Committee: Catherine Gick, chair (Brown University); Keith Chapman (Rice University); or Steve Luttmann. For full consideration, please submit nominations by May 29, 2009; nominations received after that date may also be considered.

Please also send nominations for MOUG’s 2010 Distinguished Service Award to Steve Luttmann by June 1.

That’s all for this time. Have a productive summer, with some time to relax!
15,000 music bibliographic records. She informally shared her experiences at a MOUG meeting in 1990, then published an article entitled “Workflow Considerations in Retrospective Conversion Projects for Scores” in the monograph *Retrospective Conversion: History, Approaches, Considerations*.

While at Indiana, Koth became one of the first catalogers to contribute headings as part of the NACO-Music Project. As a long-time independent member, she has contributed or updated over 20,000 records. Again, these contributions represent more than numbers: Her work was of the highest quality. In addition, she was instrumental in creating the NACO Music Project Handbook and still maintains its Web site today.

Koth has created or published several other resources that provide valuable day-to-day aid and advice to music catalogers, non-music catalogers trying to catalog music, and reference librarians. Her extensive Web site, “Music Cataloging at Yale,” was one of the first to provide specialized information on the Web for music catalogers—though it by no means serves only catalogers—and it continues to offer a wealth of definitions, quick reference tables, and readings, all of them current and accurate. She served on MLA’s original Working Group on Types of Compositions and continues to maintain the online list. She served as MOUG Board member and Secretary/Newsletter Editor from 1998 to 2002. She has been the editor of the *Music Cataloging Bulletin* since 2001, and single-handedly converted it from a print publication to an online tool available to subscribers from the MLA Web site. Just last year she published a book entitled *Uniform Titles for Music*.

Most importantly, Koth has shared tirelessly and unstintingly of her time. The music cataloging community has benefited from her music cataloging workshops over the years. She is held in the highest esteem as a trainer by her colleagues, and as the letter of nomination received by the MOUG Board stated, she has been a mentor to others who “go on to catalog at other institutions, thereby enriching the OCLC database for all music users. . . . Few people have contributed at this level.”

Koth’s efforts personify MOUG’s objectives “to promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage, and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards.” MOUG is proud to honor her for her accomplishments.

---

**From the Editor**  
**Alan Ringwood, The University of Texas at Austin**

This issue of the MOUG Newsletter includes photographs from the annual meeting in Chicago. It is hoped that the photos will recall fond memories for meeting attendees, convey a sense of what happened for those who did not attend, and help to personalize the events and proceedings of MOUG for all members.

On May 11, 2009 new postage rates went into effect, resulting in greater expense for MOUG to mail this newsletter to you. Although the amount of increase may seem small (about $50 more for the entire mailing), the MOUG Board believes it is important to keep costs low so that income derived from member dues may be stretched as far as possible. A small step was taken in that direction with this issue: addresses with barcodes were printed by a commercial mail service, allowing MOUG to qualify for reduced rates for automated mailings (i.e., those with barcodes). This lowers the amount of increase by one-third to one-half. While this may be an effective short-term solution, postage rates will increase in the future. For this reason, the MOUG Board will be discussing the possibility of making the newsletter an online publication. There are many issues to consider and details to be addressed, but MOUG would realize significant savings through the elimination of newsletter printing and distribution costs. The Board will apprise the membership of deliberations on this point and solicit members for their thoughts and opinions. Members should feel free to contact any Board member with questions, comments, or concerns.
OCLC Announces Expert Community Experiment

In response to requests from the cataloging community, OCLC is introducing the Expert Community Experiment, which enables cataloging members to make more changes to WorldCat records.

During the Experiment members with full level cataloging authorizations have the ability to improve and upgrade WorldCat master records. The Experiment began in February 2009 and will last six months.

We welcome all member libraries with full level cataloging authorizations to participate in the Experiment.

During the Experiment participants will be able to correct, improve, and upgrade all WorldCat master records, with the exception of PCC records (BIBCO and CONSER records). Library of Congress records that are not PCC records are included in the Experiment.

Participants will receive credits for those activities for which they currently receive credits. During the Experiment OCLC will not give credits for the new activity. Instead, we plan to review new activity for possible credit adjustment later in the Experiment.

OCLC Releases New Report, Online Catalogs: What Users and Librarians Want

The research report, Online Catalogs: What Users and Librarians Want, is now available for order and download. Authored by an OCLC research team headed by Karen Calhoun, Vice President, WorldCat and Metadata Services, the report presents findings about the data quality expectations of catalog end users and librarians. Among the report’s key findings:

- The end user’s experience of the delivery of wanted items is as important, if not more important, than his or her discovery experience.
- End users rely on and expect enhanced content including summaries/abstracts and tables of contents.
- An advanced search option (supporting fielded searching) and facets help end users refine searches, navigate, browse, and manage large result sets.
- Important differences exist between the catalog data quality priorities of end users and those who work in libraries.
- Librarians and library staff, like end users, approach catalogs and catalog data purposefully. End users generally want to find and obtain needed information; librarians and library staff generally have work responsibilities to carry out. The work roles of librarians and staff influence their data quality preferences.
- Librarians’ choice of data quality enhancements reflects their understanding of the importance of accurate, structured data in the catalog.

To order or download a copy of the report and to learn more, please visit http://www.oclc.org/reports/onlinecatalogs/default.htm.

New Additions to RILM Abstracts on the FirstSearch Service

RILM Abstracts on the OCLC FirstSearch service has been enhanced following the recent reload. Enhancements include:

- Non-Roman writing systems, such as Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, Greek, Hebrew, Japanese, Korean and Thai, are displayed and indexed for searching.
- Hotlinked fields connect users to related contents (authors, subjects, reviews and reviewed items, books and chapters, and Web resources).
- Full-text availability via other FirstSearch databases.
- Limit search results to abstract present, peer-reviewed journal and full text.

New interface for OCLC eContent

In July 2009 OCLC plans to make available all of its eContent resources through WorldCat.org. The approach will provide user-friendly, single-search-box access to NetLibrary eBooks and eAudiobooks, Electronic Collections Online eJournals, OCLC FirstSearch databases, ArchiveGrid archival collection descriptions, and CAMIO—the Catalog of Art Museum Images.

As a result, library users will have easier access to a wide range of eContent on WorldCat.org in a way that eliminates the need for multiple access points. This enhancement will be transparent to library staff and will not require adjustments to existing eContent purchases.

Access to all services through existing interfaces will remain available at least through FY2011 to ensure a smooth transition for library staff and users.
OCLC, EBSCO Offer Access to Full Text of Authoritative Electronic Journals

OCLC and EBSCO have signed an agreement that makes it possible for libraries that subscribe to both WorldCat Local and EBSCOhost services to provide their users with easy online access to the full text of a wide range of authoritative electronic content through the Web.

As part of the WorldCat.org Partner Program, EBSCO’s authoritative content, which includes some of the most popular databases in libraries, will be more visible to library patrons through WorldCat Local, the OCLC service based on the WorldCat.org platform that connects library users to local, regional, and global library resources through a single search box.

OCLC and EBSCO, global leaders in providing access to electronic journals and reference databases, will ensure that libraries that use both WorldCat Local and EBSCOhost services are able to provide their authenticated patrons seamless online access to the full-text information they want—whether it is discovered through WorldCat Local, or through the EBSCO Integrated Search platform.

EBSCO joins a large and rapidly growing list of OCLC eContent partners that includes R.R. Bowker; H.W. Wilson; American Economic Association; American Psychological Association; American Theological Library Association; Modern Language Association; the National Library of Medicine; Harvard University; J. Paul Getty Trust; and a variety of other leading academic and learned societies. These institutions are collaborating on a global scale to ensure that library users can find and access the valuable, authoritative content in their local library, in regional libraries, and through the OCLC network of WorldCat libraries worldwide. Today there are more than 130 million library-contributed records representing 1.3 billion items in WorldCat, the world's largest resource for finding items held in libraries.

Members Council Approves Global Council Bylaws, Governance Protocols

OCLC Members Council conducted its first-ever virtual meeting February 9-11, 2009 to discuss opportunities and challenges confronting the global information community, to learn more about collaborative services, and to continue the transition to a Global Council and Regional Councils.

In the coming year the current Members Council will transform into a Global Council that connects with Regional Councils around the world. Some of the meetings in the new governance structure are planned as virtual meetings.

Delegates evaluating the virtual meeting gave it high marks. The virtual meeting approach shortened the length of the typical meeting time, eliminated travel for most delegates, and cut costs.

Continuing its governance transition, Members Council voted to ratify the Global Council Bylaws as approved by the OCLC Board of Trustees, and also approved new Membership and Governance Protocols and referred them to the Board with the recommendation that the Board approve them.

OCLC, Regional Service Providers to Improve Efficiencies, Lower Costs

OCLC and its network of U.S. Regional Service Providers are implementing new programs designed to increase value and reduce overall service costs for OCLC member libraries. These new infrastructure and service design changes are intended to make it possible for most OCLC members to see flat or reduced cost levels for OCLC service for the next fiscal year.

These service cost savings, in combination with OCLC’s goal to keep product prices at current levels, will help libraries face the challenges brought on by the current economic downturn.

The new service initiatives, developed by OCLC and its network of U.S. Regional Service Providers over the last twenty-four months, include streamlined billing statements, more account information online, simplified account administration, a centralized training calendar offering easy access to national training and education opportunities, and strengthened product support infrastructure.

The programs are designed to take full advantage of current technologies and collaborative programs, to enhance access to OCLC products and services, and to improve cost efficiencies for libraries. OCLC and its U.S. Regional Service Providers continue to strive to deliver consistent, high-quality services to all member libraries, regardless of location, size or type.

OCLC was created with the idea that libraries can do more by working together than they could ever do by themselves. This is particularly important in difficult economic times.
**OCLC Board of Trustees, Members Council Name Review Board**

The OCLC Board of Trustees and Members Council have named a Review Board of Shared Data Creation and Stewardship to represent the membership and inform OCLC on the principles and best practices for sharing library data. The group will discuss the Policy for Use and Transfer of WorldCat Records with the OCLC membership and the global library community.

Members of the Review Board of Shared Data Creation and Stewardship are:

- Christopher Cole (FEDLINK), Associate Director for Technical Services, National Agricultural Library
- Poul Erlandsen (EMEA), Head, Document Access Services and Collection Management, Danish University of Education, National Library of Education
- Pat French (OCLC Western), Manager, Collection and Technical Services, Multnomah County Library
- Clifford A. Lynch, Executive Director, Coalition for Networked Information (CNI)
- Brian E. C. Schottlaender (OCLC Western), The Audrey Geisel University Librarian, UC San Diego Libraries
- Ted Schwitzner (ILLINET), Head, Bibliographic Services Division, Illinois State University, Milner Library
- Roberta Shaffer (FLICC/FEDLINK/LC), Executive Director, Federal Library and Information Center Committee, Library of Congress
- Lamar Veatch (COSLA/SOLINET), State Librarian, Georgia Public Library Service—University System of Georgia
- Elsie Weatherington (SOLINET), Dean, University Library, Virginia State University
- Jennifer Younger (INCOLSA), Edward H. Arnold

Director of Hesburgh Libraries, University of Notre Dame.

Another member from a European national library is expected to be appointed to the Review Board.

Dr. Younger, who is also an OCLC Members Council delegate, will chair the Review Board. Karen Calhoun, Vice President, OCLC WorldCat and Metadata Services, will serve as liaison between the Review Board and OCLC.

The Review Board on Principles of Shared Data Creation and Stewardship will:

- consult with librarians and member representatives as appropriate;
- review reports, letters, and comments including blog and listserv messages from the global library community regarding the revised Policy;
- recommend principles of shared data creation and changes in the Policy for Use and Transfer of WorldCat Records that will preserve the community around WorldCat infrastructure and services, and strengthen libraries.

The Review Board began its work with a meeting on February 4, and is already putting in place the means for Members Council delegates and other constituencies to offer input and comments. The Review Board will ultimately provide findings to the President of Members Council, the Chair of the Board of Trustees, and the OCLC President and CEO.

Implementation of the Record Use Policy had been set for February 2009, but implementation has been delayed and the Policy will be under further review by the Board of Trustees and Members Council into the third quarter of 2009.

Questions or comments can be directed to the Review Board at reviewboard@oclc.org. Questions about the Policy can be e-mailed to recorduse@oclc.org.

---

**EZproxy 5.1c Now Available**

The library industry's leading authentication and access solution has been enhanced again. OCLC encourages all users to upgrade to this latest version (EZproxy5.1c) to stay current with product improvements and fixes. Enhanced features include:

- When using the Shibboleth Discovery Service in previous versions of EZproxy, only Shibboleth 2.0 IdPs could be accessed. This release now supports both Shibboleth 1.3 and Shibboleth 2.0 IdPs.
- Introduces RedirectSafe directive to identify Web sites with free content to which EZproxy should redirect users without generating a warning about the resource not being configured. This directive is intended for use by sites that currently use “Option RedirectUnknown” which suppressed the same warning, but operated for any destination URL. Phishing sites have begun to employ this behavior to create links that start with the EZproxy server name, but that lead to their own servers.

News from OCLC

HathiTrust, OCLC to Enhance Discovery of Digital Collections

HathiTrust, a group of some of the largest research libraries in the United States collaborating to create a repository of their vast digital collections, and OCLC will work together to increase visibility of and access to items in the HathiTrust’s shared digital repository.

Launched jointly by the 12-university consortium known as the Committee on Institutional Cooperation and the 11 university libraries of the University of California system, HathiTrust leverages the time-honored commitment to preservation and access to information that university libraries have valued for centuries. The group's digital collections, including millions of books, will be archived and preserved in a single repository hosted by HathiTrust. Materials in the public domain and those where rightsholders have given permission will be available for reading online.

OCLC and HathiTrust will work together to increase online visibility and accessibility of the digital collections by creating WorldCat records describing the content and linking to the collections via WorldCat.org and WorldCat Local. The organizations will launch a project in the coming months to develop specifications and determine next steps.

HathiTrust provides libraries a means to archive and provide access to their digital content, whether scanned volumes, special collections, or born-digital materials. The representation of these resources in digital form provides expanded opportunities for innovative use in research, teaching, and learning, and will be done with careful attention to effective solutions for the curation and long-term preservation of digital assets.

For more information, visit www.hathitrust.org.

OCLC Releases New CONTENTdm Version that Supports Unicode

OCLC has released CONTENTdm 5, a new version of the popular CONTENTdm Digital Collection Management software that fully supports Unicode, the industry standard used to recognize text in most of the world's non-Western languages, including Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Greek, and Hebrew, among others. In direct response to input provided by more than 1,000 CONTENTdm users, OCLC development staff designed new features and improved existing features as part of CONTENTdm 5. The new release includes fundamental changes for both end users and libraries.

For end users, CONTENTdm 5 provides a new experience with powerful search improvements, including the integration of Find—the search engine behind OCLC’s WorldCat.org. Offering capabilities beyond full Unicode searching, CONTENTdm 5 also features faceted browsing to help refine search results, as well as relevancy ranking similar to what end users experience when searching WorldCat.org and other popular search engines. These improvements ensure a library achieves its ultimate goal for its digital collection—to help end users find, get, and use the digital items they need.

For libraries, the new CONTENTdm includes a totally redesigned Project Client, offering more streamlined collection-building workflows that will reduce the time needed to create a digital collection, reducing project costs and maximizing results.

Other CONTENTdm 5 enhancements include a new reports module designed to better track and assess collection usage; nine integrated thesauri, which will improve efficiency by providing controlled vocabularies; and increased capacity that supports more collections, items and metadata fields as well as larger volumes for batch processing.

CONTENTdm 5 offers improvements for handling EAD (Encoded Archival Description) files, including how finding aids are imported, displayed, and searched. Early beta testing of CONTENTdm 5 began with a grant from Canada's Department of Heritage Partnership Fund for a Multicultural Canada digitization initiative at Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada, in October 2007. To see how some libraries are using CONTENTdm, visit www.oclc.org/contentdm/collections/.

More information about CONTENTdm can be found at www.oclc.org/contentdm.

OCLC Loads MARC Records for Playaway Titles into WorldCat

Findaway World, the maker of Playaway audio devices, is now sending their MARC records to OCLC for addition to WorldCat.

Playaway is the only format of audiobook that does not require a separate player, so it comes ready-to-listen, without the need for a certain type of player or advanced technical know-how. Additionally, Playaway allows the listener to control the speed of the narrator's voice and automatically remembers where you left off when you power down. Findaway World is located in Solon, Ohio.

The OCLC symbol for these records is PLAYA; the vendor identifier in field 938 is PLAY. For information about Findaway World, see their Website at: http://www.playawaydigital.com.
The Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate (ABA) reorganized in October 2008. The new organizational structure merges acquisitions and cataloging functions, based on the regional origin of materials selected for addition to the Library’s collections—more than 2.5 million items each year. Approximately 615 ABA staff members, formerly working in fourteen divisions, are now assigned to nine new divisions. Additionally, approximately twenty staff who catalog music and sound recordings were reassigned from the ABA Directorate to the Music Division, Collections and Services Directorate on October 1.

**Important Division Trends:** The Music Division took several steps forward in Fiscal Year 2008 to improve access to its collections. With a mobile scanner and help from the ITS scan lab, it digitized the treasures of the Whittall collection (110 manuscripts of European masters such as Bach, Mozart, Beethoven and Brahms), which will soon be available on the Performing Arts Encyclopedia web site. Other upcoming releases will include selections from our collections pertaining to Felix Mendelssohn, Coptic Orthodox Liturgical Chants and Hymns, and Ballets Russes de Serge Diaghilev. Renowned scholars have told us they are thrilled that these will be put on line. In addition, new scans include presentations on American Choral Music, John Philip Sousa, Concerts from the Library of Congress, and Musical Instruments at the Library of Congress, providing direct access to collection items and past concert performances. Fifteen new entries for special collections were added to the Performing Arts Encyclopedia. A Request for Proposals was issued to contractors to scan the card catalogs in preparation for retrospective conversion that will give new internet access to the Music Division’s bibliographic records predating 1981. And closer cooperation with the two Music Cataloging Teams has led to greater access to items the Music Division considers top priority based on usage, value, and security.

The Music Division has made a partnership agreement with RIPM to scan selected 19th-early 20th century periodicals in the Library. The goal is to provide access to complete runs of these serial titles by amalgamating holdings from other libraries working with RIPM. Another goal is to have these available on RIPM’s web site.

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

**Digital Resources:** The Performing Arts Encyclopedia: In February 2008, the Performing Arts Encyclopedia was combined with the Library of Congress Presents: Music, Theater and Dance Web site; the new Performing Arts Encyclopedia now conforms to Library Web site standards. We encourage MLA members to check out the new site and give us feedback.

**Processing:** The Music Division added some 256,041 items (including 13 special collections) in fiscal year 2008. Eight new finding aids were completed and descriptions of 15 special collections were made available for the first time on the Performing Arts Encyclopedia Web site.

**Reader Services:** The Reader Services Section conducted 45 orientations and/or tours of the Music. Most tours included a display of music manuscripts.

In addition, the Music Division provided the following reference assistance in fiscal year 2008: 2,100 requests originated from the Library’s Web-based “QuestionPoint/Ask a Librarian” correspondence system or other e-mail; 2,562 were received by telephone; 5,630 came from personal visits by patrons to the Performing Arts Reading Room; and 631 inquiries were posed by letter. There were some 109,875 requests for material to be examined in the Performing Arts Reading Room.

The Division loaned 64 items for exhibition at several institutions, including the Alvin Ailey exhibit at the Disney Music Center in Los Angeles, and the Star-Spangled Banner exhibition at the Smithsonian Institution. In-house exhibits included 200 items for: the reopening of the George and Ira Gershwin Room; an exhibition of presidential campaign songs titled *Voices, Votes, Victory*; the Bob Hope Gallery of American Entertainment and the installation of Gerry Mulligan’s saxophone in a new exhibit case located outside the entrance to the Performing Arts Reading Room. Materials from the collections of the Music Division were displayed.

(Continued on p. 10)
Music Division
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in conjunction with thirty-four concerts, lectures, and other events in the Library’s Coolidge Auditorium.

Music Division Personnel

Appointments:
• Chris Hartten, Specialist, Acquisitions & Processing, Music Division, Jan. 21, 2009
• Caitlin Miller, Specialist, Reader Services Section, Music Division, Jan. 5, 2009
• James Wintle, Specialist, Reader Services Section, Music Division, Feb. 2, 2009

Resignations:
• Catherine Dixon, Head, Reader Services Section, Music Division, Jan. 31, 2009

Music Bibliographic Access Section (MBAS)

FY 08 Bibliographic production and maintenance:
New bibliographic records added to the database consisted of 4,006 scores, 3,715 sound recordings, 3,566 books, 24 manuscripts, and 2 ERs. This totals 11,313 new bibliographic records added to the database. This includes 4,348 records for English language materials and 5,200 records covering a range of 153 other languages. Maintenance included 523 CIP Verifications and modifications to 4,462 bibliographic records.

FY 08 Authority production and maintenance:
7,041 name authority records were added to the database and 2,416 name authority records were modified; 87 subject headings were created and 23 modified; 30 class numbers were established.

Personnel: The MBAS section, composed of two teams, lost one cataloger to retirement (David Sommerfield) and two technicians to the ABA reorganization (Oriana Powell, Gwen Gray). Currently, the two teams include seven music cataloging specialists, six senior catalogers, four technicians, one intern, and one team leader (includes temporary “acting” responsibilities for MBAS2).

Workflows: Copy cataloging has become the section’s initial approach to all current materials. Copy cataloging of books about music and music scores was introduced to 2 technicians. Gradually, much of the book and score copy cataloging was taken over by technicians in the course of the 2008 fiscal year. All subject headings, authority work, and call numbers remained the responsibility of one senior cataloger.

Sound Recordings: FY08 was the first full year of the new sound recording cataloging workflow for those sound recording genres that remain the responsibility of MBAS – classical and ethnic music. Three technicians spend a portion of their time (approximately 20-33%) performing copy cataloging operations on all CDs. Those records for which all headings verify in the Voyager heading validation window are finished by the technicians. Those records needing authority work are forwarded to the catalogers. Those records for which copy is not available are forwarded to the catalogers for core record production.

New Projects: The MBAS teams worked closely with the rest of the Music Division in determining bibliographic access priorities and designing projects to meet the greatest needs. Many of these projects represent the increasing attention paid by the Division to provision of access for previously hidden collections and materials. Examples of these projects include the following:

1. Establish a workflow that will enable prompt cataloging of material on a case-by-case basis when uncataloged items are “discovered.” Start with those uncataloged “treasures” identified in previously proposed projects.

2. Rare, one-of-a-kind items will receive priority. All of LC holdings in RISM will be checked against the OPAC/card catalog and cataloged if no record exists. Where a record exists only in the card catalog, it will be put online.

3. The ML96s will be shelf-read and checked against the OPAC/card catalog—including the ML96s in boxes—much of this material is not cataloged anywhere.

4. Continue the cataloging of M3.3 first editions.

5. Catalog the pre-1600 music manuscripts.

6. Add holdings information for historical music periodical records in the OPAC.

7. Continue the cataloging of the M1508s.

8. Several special collections require item-level cataloging: The Heineman collection, the Batchelder collection, and the Selden-Goth collection. The name of the collection will be included in the catalog record for efficient retrieval.

9. Miscellaneous collections classed in ML94 and ML95 will be cataloged. Many of these are included in online utilities such as ArchivesUSA.

10. The songsters.

11. Record catalogs.

12. Electronic Resources

13. Jazz copyright deposits

14. MusDiv Copyright Discoveries 2007

While a small number of these projects require more development, most of the projects are underway and have achieved reportable production with teams composed of cataloging specialists, music specialists, and technicians working together.

Digitization Metadata: The Music Division has been digitizing more parts of its collections in FY08. The Division recognizes that adequate metadata must exist so that these materials, represented in the Performing Arts Encyclopedia can be accessed for further discovery via the Library’s
OPAC. The MBAS teams have completed metadata production for five collections:

- American Choral Music, 1870-1923
- William Billings (1746-1800)
- Elliot Carter Sketches
- Music Printed of Copied in Manuscript Before 1700 (LC Class M1490)
- Gertrude Clarke Whittall Foundation Collection

Musical Theater Sheet Music: The M1508 project saw great gains in FY 2008: 38,381 entries added to the database. There are now over 49,000 songs from more than 14,000 individual shows represented in the database. The designs for the MARC record and the PAE presentation are in the final stages. The Music Division anticipates loading more than 50,000 MARC records for individual song titles into Voyager this spring.

Retrospective Conversion: During FY08, this project moved from its initial status to an RFP posted by the Contracts Office to begin stage one, the scanning of the cards. The Music Division anticipates that the scanning will start in early spring 2009 and will take twelve months to complete. Work on the RFP for the actual conversion is underway.

NACO Participation:
- Queries Received: 406
- Policy Questions as a result of these queries: 41
- NARs Made: 10
- NARS Modified: 351
- Subjects Proposed: 7
- Bib Records Changed: 737
- NARS deleted: 107

NATIONAL AUDIO-VISUAL CONSERVATION CENTER
Reported by Caitlin Hunter

Fiscal Year 2008 provided the initial year of operational ramp-up at the Packard Campus of the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center (NAVCC). The first phase of work on the sound preservation laboratories resulted in the completion of three of the nine expert audio reformatting (A1) rooms. Work on the second phase, which began summer 2008, will address high-efficiency audio reformatting (A2 rooms), as well as the born digital and live digital acquisitions components.

Remaining MBRS staff relocated to the Culpeper campus. Significant work on the hiring of new staff also took place and position descriptions were written for more than 15 additional approved positions. The positions of RS Curator and RS Processing Unit Head were filled and the Recording Laboratory Head, Allan McConnell, retired.

New Acquisitions: The Recorded Sound Section acquired a number of significant collections this year, most notably the David Canfield Classical Composer Archive, in a joint purchase with the Music Division. This year the first of five annual shipments was purchased and staff selected from that shipment 5,000 items which are new to the Library of Congress. The unselected items will be returned to the seller for exchange. At the end of the five-year term, 25,000 recordings will have been selected for the Library’s collections. This acquisition means that the Library will hold a recording of virtually every classical music work ever recorded.

Collection Processing: Recorded Sound catalogers and technicians continued processing audio and paper materials and cataloging them in ILS and MAVIS. Recorded Sound collections processed in 2008 included: Tony Schwartz Collection radio broadcasts and interviews; Washington Bach Consort live performances; David Canfield Classical Composer Archive compact discs; WWOZ New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival recordings; David Hummel American Musical Theater recordings; and Wanda Landowska Collection lacquer discs and 78rpm albums, in addition to other collections. Work also continued on current audio copyright deposits, purchased Classical and ethnic recordings, the NARAS collection, spoken word, and OVOP Field Office acquisitions from New Delhi, Nairobi, Islamabad, and Cairo. Recorded Sound processed a total of 73,140 items, which included 3,819 core level and 15,541 minimal level records.

Continuing Programs and New Initiatives

NRPB Activities: Working with the Librarian, MBRS continued to administer the activities of the National Recording Preservation Board (NRPB). Twenty-five new sound recordings were selected for the National Recording Registry in May 2008. Legislatively, the U.S. Congress approved reauthorization of the National Recording Preservation Act and the work of the Recording Board through FY2016. President Bush signed this into law in early October as Public Law 110-336.

As part of the Library’s mandate to conduct a national recording preservation study, the Library continued research and preparation of the study. During FY2008, additional “white papers” related to the study were commissioned and the comprehensive study itself will be published in FY2009. At that time the Library will also begin the process of developing a comprehensive national plan for sound recordings.

(Continued on p. 12)
by constituting a number of task forces involving key stakeholders in the field that will address major issues related to sound preservation. A key public relations coup resulted from the continuation of the five-part NPR series, “Saving America’s Sounds,” on five Recording Registry selections. Additional programs on NPR are planned for the upcoming year.

Sony Music, Inc. “National Jukebox” Project: A collaborative agreement between the Library and Sony Music, Inc. was approved this year. Tentatively called the Library of Congress National Jukebox, the project will make tens of thousands of historic sound recordings from the 78rpm era available for online listening in the Recorded Sound reference center. In addition to digital copies produced at the NAVCC from LC holdings, the project involves a partnership with the University of California Santa Barbara to integrate extensive discographic data into the site. Initially, the project will focus on pre-1925 recordings on the Victor and Columbia record labels, with particular emphasis on ethnic, ragtime, great classical singers, and vaudeville records. The site will feature playlists and selected “collections” compiled by guest curators, experts and scholars. It is hoped the site will launch in late 2009.

The new Policy and Standards Division (PSD or Policy; chief, Barbara Tillett) performs all the functions of the former Cataloging Policy and Support Office. In recognition of the growing importance of policy and standards for acquisitions as well as cataloging, the division has gained a full-time policy specialist focusing on acquisitions. The product development functions of the Library of Congress Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) have also become the responsibility of Policy and Standards, while the CDS cost-recovery functions moved to the new Business Enterprises organization in the Partnerships and Outreach Programs Directorate. PSD’s email address has been changed to policy@loc.gov, but the email addresses and phone numbers of individual staff members in the Division remain unchanged.

CPSO’s former Subject Headings Editorial Team (SHED), Classification Editorial Team (CLED), PREMARC, and Quality Control and File Management Team (QCFM) are now merged into the new PSD Database Integrity Section under the supervision of Ron Goudreau.

The Division hired three new staff in 2008, two in the Policy Section, and one in the relocated and renamed Product Services Section, formally part of the Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS). Elizabeth Dechman and Janis Young joined the Policy Section to fill behind senior subject cataloging policy specialists Lynn El-Hoshy and Milicent Weverka, who retired in 2008. Ms. Dechman’s and Ms. Young’s areas of subject expertise and language skills complement those of other Policy and Standards Division staff.

International Cataloguing Principles (IFLA – International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions): PSD has been engaged for eight years in the work towards a new “Statement of International Cataloguing Principles” that updates IFLA’s Paris Principles of 1961. The final draft underwent worldwide review that produced excellent suggestions for improvements, most of which were incorporated in the final version of the Statement and the accompanying Glossary. The final versions of the Statement and Glossary are awaiting approval from the IFLA Division IV: Bibliographic Control standing committees of the Cataloguing Section, the Bibliography Section, and the Classification and Indexing Section. Work on the publication of the text is underway, enlisting the help of colleagues worldwide with the translation into at least all of the languages from the five International Meetings of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code (IME ICC) that led up to this new statement. The printed text should be available before the next IFLA conference in August 2009, and a free pdf version is being negotiated with the publishers.

Virtual International Authority File (VIAF): On December 11, 2008, the Library of Congress and the Bibliothèque nationale de France were among the partners (along with the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek and OCLC) signing a new agreement to add the National Library of Sweden as the latest partner to the VIAF. Seven other potential partners have submitted applications to join and are expected to be added during 2009. VIAF is a service that matches and links the world’s large personal name authority files. The prototype system is expected to move into a beta version during 2009. Currently more than 9 million personal name authority records are accessible at viaf.org. During 2008 we saw the expansion to include non-Latin characters. Future plans are to expand to geographic names, corporate names, and uniform titles.

Resource Description and Access (RDA): Work continues to develop the new international cataloging code.
Descriptive policy specialists have developed proposals and responses to drafts in collaboration with cataloging staff throughout the Library and in consultation with colleagues worldwide. Barbara Tillett started a series of Webcasts to help LC staff and PCC partners understand the background and underlying concepts behind RDA. Two of the Webcasts are available:

- Resource Description and Access: Background and Overview (May 14, 2008)
- Cataloging Principles and RDA: Resource Description and Access (June 10, 2008)

Additional Webcasts are planned during 2009. Announcements will be made when the new Webcasts are available.

LC continues plans with the National Agriculture Library and National Library of Medicine to test the use of RDA before making a decision regarding implementation. A planning meeting was held during ALA in Denver and more details of the testing will follow that meeting.

5JSC/LC/12: In April LC submitted a paper to the JSC (5JSC/LC/12) concerning draft chapter 6, Identifying Works and Expressions, in which we recommended broad changes, principally to the instructions headed “Identifying Musical Works and Expressions.” JSC members submitted formal responses to it in time for their April meeting, but instead of taking the responses up there, the JSC asked LC to convene a meeting of music cataloging experts from ALA, CCC, and LC constituencies to address the comments from all the JSC constituencies and to propose agreed-upon revisions to the JSC. An all-day meeting was held at the Library of Congress on May 16, 2008. Participants included four representatives from ALA, one representative from CCC, and three representatives from LC.

Because there were too many unresolved topics in the constituency responses to be addressed during a single day’s discussion, an agenda for that day was developed by LC to include the important topics most likely to be resolved in a day’s discussion; the agenda was distributed to participants for the addition of other topics before May 16. That discussion was continued during a May 28 conference call and via email. Subsequently, LC issued two further documents, 1) an updated version of the original paper, 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up (issues raised by ALA or CCC participants within the May Group after the May 16 and May 28 discussions not in line with the proposals as originally proposed by LC were not included in this document); and 2) 5JSC/LC/12/LC follow-up/2, which addresses other original 5JSC/LC/12 proposals not yet approved by other JSC constituencies and also offers further simplified wording. JSC constituencies were reviewing and preparing comments on these two LC documents as this report to MLA was being prepared.

LC Genre/Form Headings: In July 2008, the Library of Congress’s ABA managers authorized five new genre/form projects within LCSH to be undertaken by PSD: cartography, law, literature, music, and religion. In November 2008, the ABA managers approved PSD’s four-year timeline for the projects. All SACO members are invited to contribute proposals for moving image and radio program genre/form headings. All proposals should be entered into the fill-in form for genre/form headings, which will be made available to members through the SACO web site. For general information about genre/form and LCSH at the Library of Congress, including a Genre/Form Frequently Asked Questions PDF document and a full timeline, visit: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/genreformgeneral.html.


Subject validation records: To date, approximately 35,000 validation records have been created and are being maintained (e.g. updated when the form of a base heading is changed). Validation records are not printed in the LCSH “Red Books,” but are available in Classification Web and are distributed through the MARC Distribution Service. Production of validation records was stopped in mid-2008 due to a problem with the software, which caused duplicate records to be created for some headings. PSD plans to create additional validation records after the software glitch is corrected.

Cooperative cataloging programs: The PCC has made a final decision to make series tracings and series authority work optional for all members. BIBCO training materials, currently in revision, will include this new policy. BIBCO will also begin investigating a BIBCO Standard Record, in order to use a single bibliographic record rather than various types of bibliographic records.

The PCC Task Group on the Internationalization of the Authority Files is co-chaired by Joan Schuitema, chair of the PCC Standing Committee on Standards, and Barbara Tillett, chief, LC Policy and Standards Division. This group is reviewing current models for an international authority file and will assess each in terms of feasibility for PCC participation. It will address subject as well as name authorities. (See above in the PSD report, Virtual International Authority File.)
Questions and Answers  
Jay Weitz, OCLC

Enhanced DVD-Audio

Q: I am cataloging a two-sided musical DVD-audio disc that can be played on both a DVD-audio player and a regular DVD-player, depending on the side. It is a sound recording. Even when played on a DVD-player, there is no video content, just music plus some liner notes and a photo gallery. I have been trying to follow the draft of the OLAC DVD Cataloging Guide Update Task Force. Under the DVD-audio section, it says that for DVD-audio discs with additional video content, “to consult other portions of the guide.” Although it doesn’t say which section to consult, I can only assume that this “other” portion is the “DualDisc” section. However, I'm a bit hesitant to catalog this as a “DualDisc” since I don’t think most of our patrons know what a “DualDisc” is, and I would rather call this a “sound disc” since the sound is the dominant aspect. As I said, there is no moving image content. Do you think the following would be appropriate in this situation:

```
007    s h d f e s n g h n i n m e n d
007    v h d c e v f a g i h z i q
300     1 sound disc : $b digital, stereo. ; $c 4 3/4 in.
500     Enhanced DVD-audio.
538     “2-sided disc: DVD-audio 88.2kHz/20-bit surround, 8.82kHz/24-bit stereo, playable only on DVD-audio players. DVD-video: DTS and Dolby audio programs, playable on DVD-video/DVD-ROM players”--Container.
500     “This disc will not play on a CD player”--Container.
```

Also, the DVD-audio portion of the guide says to code byte 4 of the 007 (subfield $e Configuration of playback channels) as “z” for other. Since this disc has both stereo and surround sound, how do you think I should code it? Should I code it as “s” for stereophonic, and include “stereo.” in the 300 field?

A: DualDiscs usually identify themselves as such, and by definition, they are one side standard audio CD (as opposed to a DVD-Audio) and one side standard DVD. It sounds as though your item meets neither of these criteria, so you appear not to have a DualDisc. Additionally in my limited experience with these, DualDiscs have always been identified as such. As you've determined, it sounds more like an “enhanced” DVD-Audio, even if it may not call itself that explicitly. The GMD would be “[sound recording]” and all of your other suggestions sound perfectly reasonable to me. The Guide suggests coding the Sound Recording 007/04 as “z,” I think, because there is no code defined in this position specifically for surround sound (unlike in the Videorecording 007/08). Because you have more thoroughly explained the sound configurations in the 538 field, you could omit it from the 300, but I think it's also OK to leave it as is.

Mysteries of the 007 Field

Q: Could you please explain the functions of 007 to me? How do those subfields work both for system use and for searching purposes?

A: In the MARC 21 Bibliographic format, the 007 fields are actually stored as simple strings of characters. The subfield-ing is merely an OCLC display convention for the convenience of users. (As an example, the Electronic Resource 007 subfield $d in WorldCat corresponds to the MARC 21 Electronic Resource 007/03.) There are complete details on this in OCLC’s Bibliographic Formats and Standards in the sections on the 007 fields (http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/default.shtm). In WorldCat, various elements of the 007 fields are used to identify aspects of records for purposes of record matching, indexing, displays of search results, and so on. You can get a little flavor of some of these purposes if you look at the “Format and Material type values indexed” section toward the end of the “Searching WorldCat Indexes” document (http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/searching/searchworldcatindexes/#search_worldcat_materialtypes.fm). The “Values Indexed: Material Types” table in particular has a 007 column that tells you which values are used for indexing purposes.

Searching Miniature Scores

Q: Is there any way, in our searching of OCLC to limit to the term “miniature score” (or any other designation in the 300 field)? I am scouring the OCLC searching documentation, but to no avail.

A: None of the 3XX fields are indexed in this way, for better or worse, and I know of no other way to limit a search to miniature scores. The entire 300 field is included in brief displays, however, and you can switch any truncated display to a brief display by going to the View menu and down to List Type. That way you at least don't have to look at every full record.
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
**ORDER FORM**
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2008

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per 2 volume set (includes shipping):</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$36.00 (United States)</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
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<td>______</td>
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All orders must be *prepaid*, with checks made out to the **Music OCLC Users Group**.
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Language Notes, “Main Content,” and Accompanying Material

Q: Has the meaning of field 546 changed? When it first came out, I remember it being drilled into us that it was to be used only for the “main” content of the item, not for accompanying material. For recordings, that meant the sung or spoken content on the disc, the sound only. For scores, it was the language(s) found within the music notation, did not apply to the texts printed separately nor to prefaces, critical commentaries, and the like. However, I just reviewed field 546 in BF&S and MARC 21, and the definition doesn’t really say that. It just says “language(s) of the described material.” Examples are ambiguous; there is one where the main language is stated plus the languages of summaries, but that could apply to something like Fontes Artis Musicae, where the articles are either in French, German, or English, always with summaries in the two other languages right along with the article, and that seems to me to qualify as part of the main content. I’m running into a fair amount of recent copy where the language(s) of “other stuff” is recorded in the 546. Mainly it is for scores where the text is printed separately in the preliminary pages. (see OCLC #259717213). Is this correct?

A: Going back through past editions of MARC, the definition of field 546 hasn’t changed in any significant way. The restrictions about limiting its use to “the main content” derives from the LC Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual (which is available in Cataloger’s Desktop). There, the first three sentences remain the same, but then the definition of the field goes on: “In Library of Congress practice the use of field 546 is limited to notes that actually state the names of the languages/scripts of the main content of the item in hand (including summaries). It is not used for notes that are limited to stating the language from which the text of an item is translated.” Although the examples are all different from those found in MARC 21, they do seem to corroborate this LC practice; they are as follows:

546 ## $a English and French words.
546 ## $a Sung in Italian.
546 ## $a Hebrew words $b (romanized).
546 ## $a In Panjabi $b (Arabic script).
546 ## $a English or Hebrew (romanized) words; Hebrew words with English translations also printed as text.

That fifth example suggests that interlinear words, words printed as text, and their translations can all be considered aspects of “the main content” rather than as accompanying material in this context. So the OCLC record that you cite seems to be OK. Because the limitations on the use of field 546 in the manual are labeled as “Library of Congress practice,” I suppose one could choose not to follow them. Until Format Integration, the use of field 546 was limited to Serials format records and to Archives and Manuscripts format records, and there was rarely if ever any question about distinguishing between “main content” and “accompanying material.”

Book as Libretto

Q: When cataloging musicals (vocal scores, sound recordings, or video recordings), should the writers of books (if traced, and given subfield $4 relator codes) be treated as “aut” for authors, or follow the opera practice and code them “lbt”, treating them as “librettists?” I’m leaning to the side of “aut” because musicals aren’t listed under the MARC code definition of librettist (under “lbt”). We already have a code for lyricists (“lyr”). Does anyone have thoughts?

A: The “book” of a musical is its libretto. If you read closely into the “etc.” that ends the definition of “librettist” in the list of relator codes (“Use for a person or organization who is a writer of the text of an opera, oratorio, etc.”), I think you’ll see “musical” in there, in microscopic print.

ISBNs and CDs

Q: I’m cataloging a CD that accompanied a book. The CD has the ISBN and the “book number” (i.e., an 028 52; Merseburger is the publisher) of the parent book printed on the CD label. Do I remember correctly that this would be a situation where the 020 would be given in a subfield $z because it really describes the book, or would it be considered to “cover” both the book and CD? One thought is whether putting the CD number in subfield $a might tempt a merge program beyond its limits.

A: If the ISBN is for the book only, it would be prudent to put it in subfield $z with any appropriate qualifier. If it can somehow be determined that the ISBN is intended to cover the book and the CD as a set (for instance, as stated by a qualifier), it should go in subfield $a. Regarding OCLC’s matching algorithms, ISBNs are used as match points, but many other elements would come into consideration to prevent the merging of, say, a book and a CD with the same ISBN.
Questions & Answers

DIDX Redux

Q: Is there any updated information on how to handle the DIDX (also DIDP, DIDC, and some other letters) codes sometimes found on CDs? I had always heard that they referred to the process by which the CD was molded and were bibliographically unimportant. Recently they have begun to appear fairly prominently on New World recordings, and some pretty heavy hitters (i.e., research libraries; Enhance participants) are including them in 028 fields (for example, see OCLC #259269556.) I Googled around a bit, and found one site that thought they were catalog numbers, another that said no, they were numbers used by Sony's manufacturing company, Digital Audio Disc Corporation, to identify the master copies of CDs duplicated in their pressing plants, and that the manufacturing company had used several different "DID" code series over the years (followed by a list of codes). That sounds more like a matrix number. Are there any better information and opinions out there, especially from folks who are including them?

A: In the Basic Sound Recordings Cataloging Workshop that he presented at the joint OLAC/MOUG meeting in September 2008, Mark Scharff identified such numbers as manufacturers stock numbers. From various different sources on the Web (http://www.keithhirsch.com/japan-forus-am-cds-with-didx-and-didz-numbers; http://rateyourmusic.com/wiki/Catalog%20Numbers; http://www.discogs.com/help/forums/topic/171820; http://wiki.discogs.com/index.php/Discogs_Guideline_Review_2007/08_Stage4-Label_/Catalog_Number#DIDX_And_Other_DID__Codes), these numbers sound to be matrix-like numbers, mostly associated with the Sony/CBS family and its Digital Audio Disc Corporation (DADC) manufacturing plants. The numbers apparently identify plants, pressings, and projects. Among the more common alphabetical prefixes and their meanings are:

- DIDP (Digital Identification Project or Digital Identification Popular): on Sony/CBS-affiliated rock, popular, and jazz titles.
- DIDY: on recordings pressed by the U.S. division of DADC for the Columbia House Record Club.

Because these seem to function as latter-day matrix numbers, they can probably be ignored in most cases, particularly when they take a secondary position to a more prominent publisher number as they usually do. In a Q&A that appeared in MOUG Newsletter 47 (April 1991) p. 7 (http://www.musicoclcusers.org/Newsletter/47Apr1991.pdf and as Q&A 8.26 in my Cataloger's Judgment), I had suggested erring on the side of including these numbers because of their uncertain bibliographic significance. But now that we know a bit more about what they really are, I'd suggest omitting them when an actual publisher number is present.

"Enhancing" Order of Names in 505

Q: I have a question on the enhanced 505, where I want to put the author’s name in last name, first name order. For example: 505 00 St Title / $r Last name, First name. Is this OK? I am seeing only “Sr First name Last name” order.

A: Neither a standard contents note nor an enhanced contents note is intended to substitute for controlled access to the data that appear in uncontrolled form in that note. If such controlled access is desired, you should be creating appropriate added entries. On the form of notes, AACR2 1.7A3 says in part: “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.” As I read that in relation to the contents note, the title and statement of responsibility should be transcribed as they appear (and as they would be transcribed in an actual 245 field) with prescribed punctuation added. That would preclude your suggestion of the transposition of first and last names, unless that is the way they appear. You will know best how your own local system indexes data in field 505 (both when it is all in subfield $a and when it is “enhanced” with specialized subfields $t, $r, and $g). In WorldCat, the various 505 subfields are indexed in various ways. Subfield $r is in the “Name” (au:) word index, the “Notes” (nt:) word index, and the “Keyword” (kw:) word index. So a search in any three of those indexes, such as “au:first and au:last”, should get the name “First Last” regardless of the order.
The “Ant” You Can’t

Q: Yesterday I was looking at a score of guitar music, it was titled Variations on a Catalan Folk Song by John W. Duarte. The song was identified as Cançó del Lladre. I found the folk song in the authority file, so could put it in a 730 as a related-work added entry. Recently, we’ve started to make greater use of relator codes here, and locally have defined “ant” (bibliographic antecedent) for added entries for works that have a “based on” relationship to the work contained on the item being cataloged; e.g., the book the DVD movie we’re cataloging is based on; the play the opera is based on; and also the work that contains a theme that is a basis of a set of variations, fantasy, or potpourri. Usually these are name-title added entries, but there’s no reason they couldn’t be title added entries. The last-named is the case here, so I wanted to add “$4 ant” to the title added entry. But subfield $4 is not valid in a 730 (nor for the 740) according to BFAS. I was wondering why that is so, do you have any idea? The only reference to subfield $4 is way at the bottom of the 730 page, under Printing. I figure that’s a mistake, boilerplate from another field.

A: What with RDA and FRBR, the whole notion of bibliographic relationships has been increasingly on all our minds. MARC Discussion Paper No. 2009-DP01/2 (http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2009/2009.html), which was discussed at ALA Midwinter in January 2009, deals with the topic of relationship designators. At that time, with so many of the relevant parts of RDA (especially Appendices J and K) still in flux, it was deemed premature to be making too many decisions. Parts of the discussion paper will come back as further discussion papers and some parts may be firm enough to come back as proposals at ALA Annual in July 2009. But the issue of relationship coding of some kind (such as subfields $e and/or $4) at least for field 730 was explicitly raised. OCLC follows MARC 21 in such regards, of course. As far as subfields $4 are concerned, the codes have historically and by definition been used exclusively “to allow the relationship between a name and a work” (as the introduction to the code list says, http://www.loc.gov/marc/relators/relahome.html) rather than between works. Obviously, that is evolving. The definition of “bibliographic antecedent” refers only to “... a person or organization responsible for a work upon which the work represented by the catalog record is based. This may be appropriate for adaptations, sequels, continuations, indexes, etc.” So strictly speaking, code “ant” can’t be applied to a uniform title in field 730 because it is neither a person nor an organization. In fact, I believe that if you look at pretty much every code definition in the Relator Code list, you’ll find some variation on person and/or organization or some synonym (party, agency, institution, etc.) limiting the code’s use in the same way. In short, I understand and sympathize with your inclination here, but in such cases, you’ll have to hold on for a while. And yes, that reference to subfield $4 in field 730 printing is boilerplate that we simply missed editing out. Thanks for catching that.

Indexing Sonatas

Q: Is there a difference between the “LCSH” and “Topicals” indices for the authority file? If I search “sonatas” in either I get the same number of results, 247. If I search “Sonatas (Clavichord),” I get the same heading with the identical 010, sh85124849. It is quite possible that I missed an explanation...”

A: You may want to look at the relatively new OCLC document Authorities: Format and Indexes (http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/authorities/authformat/default.htm), which replaced the old Authorities User Guide in November 2008. The section on “Indexes and Indexed Fields” indicates—oversimplifying here—that the “Topicals” (“sp:”) index covers certain subfields in authority record fields 150, 450, 550, and 750, whereas the “LCSH” (“su:”) index covers a huge array of fields including those four. You can read the full details at http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/authorities/authformat/default.htm#afsi-indexed-fields. Differences in the results of your “sonatas” search in the LCSH index will become apparent once the music form/genre 155 records start to appear in the authority file.

The Catalog Within

Q: OCLC #49005031 is an edition of J.B. Cramer’s op. 23 sonatas, published by Birchall. The resource contains a publisher’s catalog, which is mentioned both as a 500 note and as a 710: Robert Birchall (Music Publisher) St Catalogue (ca. 1805). This is a pretty big stretch to have in an AACR2 record, but I don’t know that I feel entitled to delete it or to try to whomp it into something more official. (I’d say its title proper is “Musical publications.”) Advice appreciated.

A: Hmmm, that’s a weird one. You may feel free to take out the 710 at least, though I’d lean toward leaving the note. Guess they felt that the catalog has some bibliographic significance because of its vintage?
Questions & Answers

Durations in Contents Notes

Q: We just finished adding complete tables of contents to 4,000 CD bibliographic records for our digital music streaming project. I have a question concerning the order of subfields in the enhanced 505 table of contents. We were directed to be consistent in applying the durations in subfield $g$ to precede the subfield $r$ in every case. The officially correct way is to place the durations in subfield $g$ after the composer in subfield $r$ when there is only one work or component of the work. When there is a series of movements or works by the same composer, the subfield $g$ precedes the subfield $r$. Now we are about to begin the second phase of our project, cataloging music and recital CDs and tapes of performances. To do this, we plan to create original records in OCLC. We always want to do the correct thing, and will do the tables of contents according to the rules. What is the purpose behind placing the subfield $g$ after the subfield $r$? To be honest, I don’t understand the logic of this.

A: You've got the “officially correct way” exactly right. The logic behind the usual placement of the duration after a single title and its corresponding statement of responsibility can be found in AACR2 1.7A3 under “Order of information,” which reads in part: “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.” In other words, transcription of a single title and statement of responsibility in a contents note would ordinarily correspond to the way it is transcribed in the title and statement of responsibility area (field 245). Other data such as duration (which could appear in the physical description—field 300—for a single work or possibly in a physical description note for multiple works) would usually follow, as long as the placement didn't cause confusion. When we have multiple titles associated with the same statement of responsibility, though, placing the respective duration right after its corresponding title makes for considerably more clarity.

Parenthetical Asides on Indexing Publisher Numbers

Q: How does one search for a number on a book on CD disc? We have found a number (such as XXXX 1234(5)) on a disc and couldn't call it up by that number in Connexion. We eventually did find the record by title/author search but thought it would be easier if we could have used the number found on the disc. The record included the XXXX 1234(5) number as: 028 02 XXXX 1234(5). We searched the number as a standard number, a publisher number, any other kind of number OCLC offered, and came up with a big nothing. What were we doing wrong? Is the number searchable?

A: Field 028 subfield $a$ is indexed both in the Publisher Number indexes (mn: and mn= in Connexion) and in the Standard Number indexes (sn: and sn=). Parentheses within a publisher number, however, play havoc with that indexing. If you look in Searching WorldCat Indexes (http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/searching/searchworldcatindexes/) under the Publisher Number indexes, you will see that numbers within parentheses are indexed separately. That is because in the vast majority of cases, parentheses in the context of a publisher number are intended to set off ranges of numbers, as noted in the “Multi-Disc Sets” section of LCRI 6.7B19. In the less frequent (but not uncommon) instances where parentheses are used in other ways in publisher numbers, you need to remember that numbers within parentheses are indexed separately in WorldCat. So for your example, you would have to search “XXX 1234” to find the string in question.

Library Editions

Q: We’re having some trouble with Listening Library audiobooks. We order both library and retail versions of their audiobooks. The only differences between the two versions are the ISBN, the packaging (library packaging contains the same information in a sturdier package), and the edition statement. The discs themselves (and the manufacturer’s number, etc.) are exactly the same. Are these differences enough to justify a different record? I see catalogers in OCLC both splitting them and combining them into the same record.

A: A statement of “Library edition” would justify a record separate from that for a similar resource lacking the statement. ALCTS’s Differences Between, Changes Within specifically cites “Library edition” as one of those major differences in A2a. You always have the option of using an existing record for the non-library edition and editing it locally for your own use, if creating a separate record makes you uncomfortable.
David Bade, Monographic Cataloger and Senior Librarian at the University of Chicago, offered a critique of the Library of Congress Working Group Report from cataloger’s perspective. Among the report’s shortcomings:

- The Working group focuses on management of information systems without considering the role of human communication in library transactions.
- The report dismisses knowledge of subject areas or disciplines and the information needs of different user communities. Librarianship is seen as the management of resources for anyone and everyone.
- The Working Group calls for harvesting and reusing metadata from multiple sources, yet our experiences with legacy data suggests that reusing metadata created by others is itself a problem, not a solution.
- The report states that building the global information system of the future will require cooperation and calls for the creation of basic records that may be enhanced. This is an admission that the basic record lacks information, and enhancement of that record becomes a necessity. This is not cooperation but exploitation.
- The report fails to acknowledge any difference among the various creators and users of information (e.g., libraries, publishers) in the bibliographic universe.

The issues that we face are related to what we do, for whom, and why. Communication among various players (e.g., publishers, students, faculty, librarians) is what happens in libraries. The challenge for bibliographic control is to facilitate and improve communication among these human agents.

If the Working Group’s vision of the future should come to pass, and if administrators feel it important to have at least one librarian with a knowledge of music, a possible way forward would be to have that person perform cataloging, bibliography, and reference. Experience in each area will dovetail with and enhance knowledge and experience in the others, e.g., “participation in reference work will be a constant source of knowledge and ideas for improvement of cataloging and cataloging tools from the users’ perspectives, as well as guiding the selection of materials to support the interests and needs of a constantly varying student body and faculty.” However, if administrators adopt the Working Group’s premise that collection development and cataloging are impossible and unnecessary in a boundless global digital library, then the question for music librarians is “whether there is any justification for a digital departmental library or at least a music specialist.”

Tom Caw, Music Public Services Librarian at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, proceeded to speak about the Report from a public services perspective. Comparing the Working Group’s vision of the future to the pending change of television transmission from analog to digital, he wonders what the reaction within our profession would be if Librarian of Congress James Billington decreed, “Your bibliographic universe is changing.” The anxiety and opposition to the view set forth in the report reflect 1) a desire to “have a say in how the bibliographic universe we live in, maintain, and sustain is defined,” 2) a sense that the recommendations in the report are based more on financial considerations than on sound bibliographic philosophy, and 3) a feeling that access to library materials will be compromised if the report’s recommendations are implemented.

The report never mentions distinctions that exist between library users. Librarians should “acknowledge the different types of information needs that exist among users while keeping value judgments about one or another being better or more important out of the conversation.”

The report recommends increasing the efficiency of bibliographic record production and maintenance by relying on contributions from others outside the library. The potential for errors may explain the fear some have about this approach. Yet “erroneous bibliographic data makes its way throughout the bibliographic universe already, but it is easily corrected for all once errors are identified . . . and submitted” for correction. Such ease of correction may have been in the minds of the report’s authors, although the quality of bibliographic records will depend on who is involved in their creation and maintenance.

The Working Group makes a strong case that controlled vocabularies remain intact, stating that keyword searching is no substitute for controlled vocabularies. Federated searching is not effective for finding music. The question remains, though, what the report’s authors mean when they recommend “[engaging] publishers and authors . . . in the process of unambiguous creator identification.”

The recommendation to increase access to rare, unique, and special materials is idealistic and based on internal LC policies. Every library has uncataloged backlogs of special collections. Until there are robots who can do this work correctly and efficiently, this will remain so.

Caw likened the experiences of library users to a road trip. “If the access points end up getting changed as a result of any of the Working Group’s recommendations being im-
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Bruce Evans introduced Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, OCLC, and Michael Sarmiento, Product Support Specialist I, First Search/Content Integration, OCLC. Michael Sarmiento then proceeded to read two previously submitted questions and their corresponding answers.

Q: Now that we have WorldCat Navigator (Local) for our consortia catalog, I am becoming increasingly conscious of the “view all editions and formats” function. I have heard that the matching algorithm uses/favors uniform titles, although on screen it appears the search is using the information in the 245. Does it make a difference or help if a 240 is present in addition to an identical 245 $a? Usually I only add those 240s locally for display purposes, because I am worried about it looking like I have added an unnecessary field. Should I be less reluctant to leave these in?

A (from Thom Hickey, OCLC): The short answer is that no, if the 240 is the same as the 245, its presence in the record does not affect the matching. If they were different we normally favor the 240 over the 245. Since [you] are wondering about this, [you] might be interested that the latest code (not in production yet) treats 240 in LC contributed records slightly differently. When we see one of those, we treat it as though the uniform title was in the authority file and that changes how other records with that title might cluster.

Q: There seems to be a conflict between following the very sensible practice in Ask-MOUGs, BF&S, and Differences Between... of “if in doubt, don't” (don't add local information, don't create new records if you are not certain you have a new edition, don't edit a master record based on assumptions, in cases of doubt, edit the record locally only, etc.) and wanting accurate information and access points to appear and function in WorldCat Local, where only the master record is used. Please advise.

A (from Mela Kircher, OCLC): OCLC suggests that catalogers continue to follow the practices outlined in BF&S. We're aware of the need to make local data available (that is both displayable and searchable in WCL.) We are having active discussions at OCLC on how to make this a reality.

The panelists then took questions and comments from the floor.

There was a question about duplicate detection in Connexion. Weitz said that the vastly revised and expanded Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) software will begin running later in 2009, but users should continue to report duplicates when they encounter them. From studies that OCLC has done, they estimate that they might be able to catch and safely merge perhaps a quarter of existing duplicate records. There are many duplicates that they simply will not be able to identify with certainty, and some categories of records that are too risky to merge automatically. Parallel records that are identified as being cataloged in different languages (field 040 subfield $b) will not be merged. OCLC hopes to eventually be able to use the data in 936 fields to display these parallel records in ways that interfere less with our workflows. Searches can be limited to records cataloged in a particular language by using the “Language of Cataloging Description” (“ll:”) search, and Language of Cataloging can be displayed in brief displays.

A question was raised about MARC field 440 (Series Statement/Added Entry–Title) being made obsolete. Weitz responded that making field 440 obsolete is part of the MARC Update No. 9 (October 2008) and is included in the upcoming OCLC-MARC Update 2009. Catalogers may begin implementing the changes to 4XX/8XX fields immediately because it is mostly just changes in policy. OCLC will be converting existing fields to the extent that they can
safely do so, sometime after OCLC-MARC Update 2009 is implemented. There will be some details in the upcoming Technical Bulletin No. 257.

Responding to a question about RDA: Resource Description and Access and OCLC’s planning and preparation for its adoption, Weitz noted that OCLC has not commented publically very much about RDA. Like the rest of the cataloging world, OCLC did not see the final draft of the RDA text until it was released in November 2008 and still has not seen it in its intended electronic format. OCLC has, however, been actively participating in the RDA process through ALA’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), IFLA, the RDA Examples Groups, and the RDA/MARC Working Group. OCLC is also represented on the ALA RDA Implementation Task Force and is helping to plan for the testing and evaluation period that is planned for later in 2009.

An audience member asked if, in light of the direction of WorldCat Local, OCLC had any plans to move back into the local systems business. Sarmiento and Weitz both stated that they have not heard about any plans for OCLC to move in that direction in the U.S. market at this time.

---

Open Enhance Session
Jay Weitz, OCLC

OCLC-MARC Update 2009 is scheduled to be installed during the second quarter of 2009. (Editor’s note: It has since been postponed to the third quarter.) This update includes MARC21 Updates no. 8 and 9, which contain changes to the bibliographic, authority, and holdings formats as well as changes to MARC Code Lists. Highlights include:

- New code “s” for Blu-Ray discs in 007 field for visual materials
- New 041 subfield #j for language of subtitles or captions for moving images
- Making field 440 obsolete and replacing with a combination of 4XX/8XX fields
- Definition of new subfield #0, Authority Record Control Number, in 28 bibliographic fields
- Validation of codes for #2 in fields 047 (Musical Form) and 048 (Medium of Performance) for the two IAML code lists.

OCLC has been engaged in a multi-year project to develop duplicate detection and resolution software for the Connexion environment. The new software will deal with all bibliographic formats (not just books) and will be deployed in the near future using small and controlled sets of records. OCLC hopes to make the first full pass through WorldCat sometime later in 2009.

The initial phase of the project to control more headings in WorldCat was completed in September 2008. More than 26 million personal name headings were controlled. Future phases of the project are currently being planned.

The prepopulation of the LC/NACO authority file with non-Latin script data was completed in November 2008. At least one reference was added to nearly 500,000 authority records.

In 2008 OCLC investigated end user expectations, preferences, and needs regarding data quality. Input was gathered from focus groups of various types of library users, and from a pop-up survey on WorldCat.org. The research shows that keyword searching has become the dominant search method, and that library catalogs have higher failure rates when compared to search and discover mechanisms such as Google or Amazon. While libraries continue to concentrate on controlled vocabularies, Google and Amazon do not, and these search tools have re-shaped end user expectations.

Focus group discussions revealed that for analog materials users want more summaries, notes, and evaluative information to help determine potential usefulness of an item, and they want systems to more easily tell them if an item is available and how to get it. For online materials users want easier access to online content (text and media). For all searches users want relevance ranking. Results of the pop-up survey were similar: users want improved relevance ranking; more links, and easier linking to online content; more summaries and abstracts, and prominent placement of such; addition of professional reviews; and more details added to search results. Librarians indicated a need for more merging of duplicate records; greater ease in correcting records; more accurate and current library holdings; and more enrichment of records through the addition of tables of contents and summaries.

Over the years OCLC has expanded members’ abilities to edit master records, yet members continue to express frustration—applying for Enhance authorization is too difficult, there are too many editing restrictions, etc. In response to such complaints, as well as comments received through the Data Quality Survey, and especially with the launch of WorldCat Local, OCLC is launching the Expert Community Experiment to test a “social cataloging” model.

Anyone with a full-level or higher authorization (Enhance, CONSER, NACO) can edit almost anything in almost all records, including LC records that are not coded PCC. CIP records (i.e., Elvl 8) can be edited, but the encoding level must remain “8.” BIBCO and CONSER records may not be edited.

(Continued on p. 24)
Open Enhance Session
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Experiment participants should use the same care in editing an existing record as they would in creating a new record. Information that is correct should not be removed, the nature of the record should not be changed, and records cataloged in languages other than English should be left as parallel records. Remember the golden rule: Don’t do to a record input by someone else anything you wouldn’t want done to a record you’ve created.

System changes are scheduled to be installed February 15. No special authorizations are needed to participate, and all bibliographic formats are included in the Experiment. OCLC will be monitoring and evaluating the results.

In the Connexion client catalogers can edit and replace records without locking them first; but for complex edits, locking the record first is a good idea to safeguard one’s work. In the Connexion browser, records must be locked before editing and replacing. Work on locked records should be done as expeditiously as possible, so that other users are not frustrated and so that database quality software works properly.

Participants should refamiliarize themselves with the sorts of local data that may be present in a record but that is not retained in the master record. Details may be found in Bibliographic Formats and Standards, section 5.2.

Participants are encouraged to share their experiences with the Experiment on the OCLC-Cat discussion list. Questions can be addressed to askqc@oclc.org. For more information on the Experiment, please see www.oclc.org/us/en/worldcat/catalog/quality/expert/default.htm.

With the launch of the Expert Community Experiment, the future of the Enhance program also changes. Patton and Weitz have consulted with Enhance participants, and will continue to do so, to come up with ideas for expanding Enhance capabilities, including potential record merging capabilities. Catalogers should continue to think about other Enhance capabilities that would be useful and communicate these to OCLC.

Special Considerations for Cataloging Ethnic Music Sound Recordings
Caitlin Hunter, Library of Congress, National Audio-Visual Conservation Center

Hunter’s background in anthropology and music performance led her to the realization that the potential audience for ethnic music includes more than music students, and the needs of this audience should be considered when planning to provide access to ethnic music. She gained additional insight through her work on Indiana University’s Variations2 project and the Sound Directions project.

Catalogers need to be aware that search practices for ethnic music are different from those for Western art music. The information elements people use to find the ethnic music they want do not appear consistently in MARC records; when they do appear they may be present in a variety of different fields. There are well established cataloging practices for Western art music, but those for popular and ethnic music are not as thorough. Additionally, many music catalogers have a strong background in Western art music, but they lack similar familiarity with other types of music.

When planning to catalog and provide access to ethnic music, one should seek assistance from language and culture specialists within one’s library and elsewhere. Reference sources, such as The Garland Encyclopedia of World Music, and Richard Spottwood’s Ethnic Music On Records—A Discography, can also be helpful. Thesauri may be used as sources of local subject headings or to clarify the content of the materials under consideration. Instructions for assigning Library of Congress Subject Headings for ethnic, national, and religious groups is found in the Subject Cataloging Manual, H 1917.

It is important to establish cataloging practices that will allow patrons to search and retrieve results in a consistent manner. People need as much guidance when searching for ethnic music as for Western art music, but ethnic music often receives less thorough treatment. Print or online search guides aimed at students of music and other disciplines can be helpful in this regard.

The most frequently encountered elements that are used to search for ethnic music, and to organize reference sources for ethnic music, are geographic location, cultural or ethnic group, form/genre, and instrumentation. Secondary elements include language, dates, contributors, and content or works. Catalogers may wish to enter data pertaining to these elements in both machine readable and patron readable fields whenever possible. A sampling of records in OCLC and other online catalogs shows that inclusion of information is inconsistent, and data elements may appear in different fields. Such inconsistency may negatively impact a user’s search for desired material. Many machine readable fields employ controlled vocabularies with inadequate options for ethnic music.

For collections and unpublished materials other considerations come into play. For supplied titles AACR2 instructs the cataloger to devise a brief descriptive title. Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS) suggest using the name of the collection, an identification of the nature of the materials, and a single date or date range as appropriate, e.g., Mary Smith collection of fiddle tunes, 1965-1970.
Contents and summary notes are of particular importance when cataloging collections. Contents notes provide detailed information about works or items in a given collection. When such detailed description is not feasible, a summary note should be included. Finding aids or indexes will be needed to give access to individual works or items within the collection.

When a collection contains multiple formats—i.e., different recorded formats, accompanying materials—the cataloger will need to decide if the bibliographic record will describe only the sound recordings or if it will describe any accompanying material. The cataloger may use either one physical description field (300) to describe multiple formats, or multiple 300 fields, one for each different format.

It is advisable to give a note listing the various genres or forms of work contained in a collection. The cataloger should also consider giving a note about the provenance of a collection or item in a collection. Such a note might give the institutional repository of the original recording, the name of the collector who gathered the recordings, a narrative provenance history, or information about the existence of copies. Appropriate subject headings should also be assigned, from LC subject headings or locally assigned headings. It will be necessary to determine the number of headings assigned to a collection.

The final part of the presentation focused on the description of ethnic sound recordings in a FRBR-like model. After a brief introduction to FRBR concepts and terminology, she noted that most of the elements that are considered important in searches for ethnic music are associated with the expression level. If one’s cataloging system is work-based, it is necessary to determine if these elements will be replicated in work records, or if search mechanisms should be able to search for relevant data at different levels of the FRBR structure (i.e., in work records and expression records). In a situation where a performer plays a number of different works together and gives them a “set” title, in a FRBR system it may be possible to give the set titles at the expression level, and the individual titles at the work level.

In the first part of this presentation Wendy Sistrunk provided an overview of authority records for names and uniform titles. Important and useful information includes not only the heading itself, but cross-references, notes that provide additional information about a heading, and the sources of information used to create the heading or references. Although there are very detailed rules about formulating a heading for a person’s name, the person’s own preference concerning his/her form of name takes precedence over all other rules. Sometimes this can be determined from “usage,” i.e., how the name appears on published items.

Sistrunk presented a number of example records from the national authority file. While showing the record for Gibson, Joe D., 1929-2005 Sistrunk explained that birth and/or death dates are added to name headings whenever that data is known. Such dates are useful to distinguish persons whose names otherwise appear to be the same. Until August 2007 it was standard practice for headings with birth dates only to remain “open” if the person was deceased, but since then LC has revised its policy and catalogers may add death dates as needed. When a person’s birth or death dates are not available, catalogers can qualify the name by adding a term that denotes the person’s role, e.g., conductor, pianist, singer.

Authority records can document when a person’s name has changed. As in the case of a woman who marries and takes her husband’s surname. Sistrunk’s second example (McNeil, Joan N.) demonstrated this. The record also included a variant form of name. For each form of name, justification (field 670) is prescribed by the cataloging rules.

An authority record may contain information about how a person died (François, Claude, 1939-1978; “accidentally electrocuted in his bath”) or about a person’s gender status (Tipton, Billy, 1914-1989). A “do not confuse” note in an authority record alerts the person viewing the record of the existence of another similar heading. Known pseudonyms for a musician may also be documented in an authority record through the presence of “see” references; examples include the records for Robyn, William, 1894-1996; Morgan, Dan, d. 1865; and Marsh, John, 1907-. Sistrunk ended her presentation by telling the audience that public service librarians should be encouraged to talk to catalog librarians about confusions or conflicts that they find in authority records. Catalogers who participate in the NACO-Music Project can fix problems that are found.

Stephen Luttmann began his portion of the presentation by asking why more reference librarians don’t use Connexion? Aside from lack of access, part of the problem may be people’s bad memories of the authority file in OCLC’s Prism interface, which had a number of limitations. Fortunately searching for authority records in Connexion is a lot easier now.
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The authority file can also be a source of biographical information, such as birth and death dates for composers. Beyond that, though, authority records can be used to disambiguate between multiple people who have the same name (e.g., John Carter), or to “reintegralize” two or more headings that actually represent the same person. Here he showed an example involving twin brothers, Rafael Mendez, Jr., and Robert Mendez, who were born in 1937. No authority record exists for Rafael Mendez. There are two records for the name Robert Mendez, one qualified by birth date, the other unqualified. The record for the former heading indicates it is for a trumpet player; the latter record is for a transplant surgeon. Additional research shows that Robert Mendez the transplant surgeon also played the trumpet, and thus the two authority records refer to the same person.

Luttmann encouraged all present to use the authority file as a reference tool. He encouraged catalogers to keep adding and changing authority records as needed, and he recommended that reference librarians also work to help enhance the authority file.

Minutes, MOUG Business Meeting  
February 18, 2009 Chicago, Illinois

Chair Tracey Rudnick (University of Connecticut) called the meeting to order at 11:10 AM, then introduced the members of the Board.

1. Adoption of agenda
   Rudnick asked for permission to reorder discussion items for more efficient use of time. The agenda was adopted unanimously, with the aforementioned stipulation.

2. Approval of minutes from the 2008 meeting in Newport, RI
   The minutes were unanimously approved as written.

3. Board Reports
   a. Chair (Tracey Rudnick, University of Connecticut)
      i. Committee & other appointments
         1. Neil Hughes (University of Georgia), MOUG Board representative to the Nominating Committee (Hughes had previously appointed Jenny Colvin (Furman University) and Hermine Vermeij (University of California, Los Angeles) to the Nominating Committee).
2. Nominating Committee members for the fall 2009 elections: Catherine Gick (Brown University), Chair; Keith Chapman (Rice University), and Steve Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado).
3. Holling Smith-Borne (Vanderbilt University) to the 501(c)(3) Task Force. He was involved in early discussions, and will now help prepare financial paperwork.
4. Rebecca Belford (University of Oregon), Cathy Gerhart (University of Washington), and Daryll Stevens (Colorado College) to the Reference Services Committee, joining Chair Steve Luttmann and Bob Acker.
5. Alan Ringwood (University of Texas at Austin) to NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee as a voting member and as MOUG Board representative.
6. Reappointed Chuck Herrold (Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh) to the NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee for a four-year term as a voting at-large member drawn from NMP participants. Rudnick thanked Herrold for his continuing service on the committee.
7. Bruce Evans (Baylor University), Continuing Education Coordinator, will announce appointments to the Program Committee in his report.

ii. Correspondence
1. E-mail discussions with Ann Churukian, NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee Chair, regarding revision of the NMP application; see Churukian’s report below.
2. E-mail correspondence with Nancy Sack (University of Hawaii), MOUG Web Keeper, and Mickey Koth (Yale University), about granting Koth access to the NMP portion of the MOUG Web site to edit the NMP Handbook.
3. E-mail and telephone conversations with Jim Zychowicz (A-R Editions, Director of Sales and Marketing) and MLA Treasurers Brad Short and Michael Rogan concerning shared online conference registration for MOUG and MLA. Discussions included pricing options, Web design, data reports, and fund transfers. E-mail correspondence with Laura Gayle Green about MLA Midwest Chapter’s online registration. Additional information appears in CEC Evans’ report below. Rudnick thanked all involved for bringing this to fruition.
4. E-mail communication with Holling Smith-Borne and Joseph Hafner (McGill University) regarding ongoing development of MLA’s Education Outreach Program.

iii. Elections
1. Candidates for Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect were Rebecca Littman (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee) and Stephen Luttmann (U. of Northern Colorado). Candidates for Treasurer were Catherine Gick (Brown U.) and Diane Napert (Yale University).
2. Seventy-two ballots were cast; four were ineligible because they were sent to the wrong address.
3. Stephen Luttmann was elected Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, and Diane Napert was elected Treasurer. Both will begin their terms following the conclusion of this meeting. The Treasurer position is a transitional term of three years; in two years the four-year Treasurer-Elect position will commence. Rudnick thanked all of the candidates for agreeing to run for office.
4. Tentative plans are in place to conduct next fall’s Board elections electronically, via the University of Texas at Austin’s SurveyMonkey subscription. The Bylaws currently require that ballots be mailed, so the Bylaws must be amended first; a ballot should be forthcoming in the spring. Rudnick thanked the Bylaws Revision Task Force members for their research into e-voting; Alan Ringwood for securing use of SurveyMonkey at University of Texas; and OLAC President Bobby Bothmann for sharing information on e-voting procedures.

iv. Acknowledgements
1. Thanks to Michael Sarmiento (Product Support Specialist I, OCLC FirstSearch/Content Integration) for attending MOUG 2009 and for agreeing to be OCLC’s new public services liaison to MOUG.
2. Thanks to Web Keeper Nancy Sack (University of Hawaii) for prompt and accurate postings from the Board.
3. Thanks to OLAC Presidents Vicki Toy Smith and Bobby Bothmann, OLAC/MOUG Program Chair Sevim McCutcheon (Kent State University), and the Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians for their efforts and collaboration on the 2008 joint OLAC/MOUG meeting in September 2008. It was the largest such meeting to date (290 attendees, including 53 MOUG members). OLAC enjoyed a significant profit and will transfer $1,000 to MOUG.
4. Thanks to the MOUG Program Committee for assembling a rousing program; and to MLA Convention Manager Paula Hickner and MLA Asst. Convention Manager Bonna Boettcher for their invaluable assistance with preparations for this year’s meeting.

5. Rudnick noted that other acknowledgements are printed in the program, and meeting participants should thank these individuals and organizations for their assistance. Rudnick also thanked the University of Connecticut and the University of Texas for photocopying costs, which were not listed in the program.

6. Rudnick thanked outgoing Past Chair Neil Hughes for his four years of service on the Board, noting several initiatives he undertook to keep MOUG a healthy and vibrant organization; and outgoing Treasurer Deb Morris for her service, especially for revising procedures in light of post-9/11 bank regulations and for supporting MOUG’s new accounting procedures as they relate to 501(c)(3) status.

b. Past Chair (Neil Hughes, University of Georgia)
   i. Worked on arrangements for this year’s Distinguished Service Award.
   ii. Advertising and publicity: Arranged ad exchange with MLA, in which MLA ads appear in our Newsletter and MOUG ads appear in one or more issue of Notes; continued efforts to work out an ad exchange with IAML’s Fontis Artis Musicae, but have had no response; arranged the creation of the OLAC/MOUG logo; updated the trifold brochure.
   iii. Made additional updates to the Handbook; also created a prototype MOUG Officers’ Calendar, based on a similar MLA calendar, the intent of which is to keep track of important deadlines within the organization.
   iv. Worked with Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University), Editor of The Best of MOUG, 8th ed., including drafting terms of agreement which could be used with future BoM editors.
   v. Worked with Web Keeper Nancy Sack on Web site issues.
   vi. Worked with Nominating Committee on the election.
   vii. Hughes thanked MOUG members for their trust, and noted his love for MOUG.

c. Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Alan Ringwood, University of Texas at Austin)
   i. Three newsletter issues were produced and distributed in 2008; total cost of production and distribution was $2,839.76. On average, 470 newsletters were distributed each time.
   ii. A new newsletter design was unveiled with the December issue, about which some members have expressed positive comments; anyone with suggestions for further refinement or improvement, or concerns about the new design may contact Ringwood.
   iii. As Secretary, regular liaison reports were submitted to MLA for their Board meetings.
   iv. Rudnick thanked Ringwood for his service, especially for the new newsletter design and for assembling the newsletter retrospective in the 100th issue.

d. Treasurer (Deborah Morris, Roosevelt University)
   i. Balances
      - Checking: $11,531.86
      - Savings: $8,404.18
      - CD: $11,093.17

      MOUG is currently operating without a deficit, thanks to meeting registration fees sufficient to offset meeting costs, and dues sufficient to cover operational expenses.

   ii. Membership: There are 234 institutional members, and 243 personal members. Twenty-seven new personal members joined during 2008.
   iii. Online meeting registration was introduced for this meeting.
   iv. 501(c)(3): MOUG has sufficient financial data to formally apply for non-profit status.
   v. Morris thanked MOUG members for their trust.

e. Continuing Education Coordinator (Bruce Evans, Baylor University)
   i. Meeting attendance: 96 (92 pre-registants; 4 on-site).
   ii. Evans asked first-time attendees to stand and be recognized (there were 18).
iii. Evans thanked Program Committee members for all their hard work, and introduced Program Committee members for the 2010 meeting: Keith Chapman (Rice University), Beth Flood (Harvard University), Damien Iseminger (New England Conservatory), Mac Nelson (University of North Carolina–Greensboro), and Rebecca Thompson (Missouri State University).

iv. The MOUG Board would appreciate feedback from members about the online meeting registration process and credit card payments; Evans thanked MLA, in particular Treasurers Brad Short and Michael Rogan; and Jim Zychowicz and the staff of A-R Editions, for their assistance in making online registration for this year’s meeting possible.

v. PowerPoint slides and handouts from the meeting sessions will be posted to the MOUG Web site.

vi. Evans asked members to fill out their evaluation forms and place them in the marked receptacles, or mail them to him.

4. Other Reports
   a. Reference Services Committee (Stephen Luttmann, University of Northern Colorado)
      i. The Committee is working on a list of WorldCat Local enhancement requests to submit to OCLC.
      ii. The Reference Services page of the MOUG Web site needs to be updated.
      iii. The Committee is in need of a new Chair; please talk to Luttmann or Rudnick if interested.

   b. NACO Music Project Advisory Committee (Ann Churukian, Vassar College)
      i. NMP celebrated its 20th anniversary in 2008; it was the first NACO funnel project; initiated by Ralph Papakhian, Indiana University and the Sibley Library at the Eastman School of Music were the first participants; there are now 79 participants representing 62 libraries.
      ii. Contributions in 2008 were down 16% from 2007; NMP contributions accounted for 9.6% of all NACO records.
      iii. NMPAC worked with the MOUG Board on revisions to the NMP application form; obsolete questions were removed, new questions were added, and all were arranged to account for different types of application (new personal and institutional member; new personal member only; new institutional member only).
      iv. Rudnick thanked Churukian and the entire NMPAC for their work on the application revision, noting that Board members were well satisfied with the results.

   c. Best of MOUG (Margaret Kaus, Kansas State University)
      i. To date 158 copies have been sold; there are 22 copies remaining.
      ii. One hundred three orders were placed by academic libraries; fifteen by public libraries; twenty-six by vendors, and twelve by individuals.
      iii. Kaus asked members to make sure orders were sent to the correct address; several had been misdirected.

   d. OLAC Liaison report (Neil Hughes for Mary Huismann, University of Minnesota)
      i. OLAC has a new Web site. The URL is the same: http://www.olacinc.org.
      ii. The joint OLAC/MOUG meeting was very successful; handouts from the meeting are available at the OLAC Web site (http://www.olacinc.org/drupal/conference/2008/WorkshopDescriptions.html).
      iii. CAPC’s Guide to Cataloging DVD and Blu-ray Discs Using AACR2r and MARC 21 and the Guide to Cataloging Playaway Devices Based on AACR2r Chapters 6 and 9 are available on the OLAC Web site.
      v. OLAC is seeking applicants for the OLAC Research Grant, awarded annually to encourage research in the field of audiovisual cataloging. Submission guidelines are available at the OLAC Web site. Submission deadline is March 1, 2009.
      vi. OLAC is co-sponsoring an ALA pre-conference program, “Cataloging Digital Media: Back to the Future!” on Thursday, July 9, 2009.
      vii. Paige Andrew is the recipient of the Nancy B. Olson Award, for his contributions to map cataloging. The award will be presented at the ALA annual meeting.
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e. Report from Library of Congress (Joe Bartl, Library of Congress)
i. The number of Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access divisions has been reduced from fourteen to nine; the Cataloging Policy and Support Office has been renamed the Policy and Standards Division; the music teams are now part of the Music Section.
ii. A number of collections and manuscripts were put online.
iii. The Performing Arts Reading Room is set for a redesign, to begin in late 2009. The new room will support all performing arts, not just music, and will include sound and video resources.
iv. Seven card catalogs will undergo retrospective conversion.
v. The sound preservation lab at the National Audio-Video Conservation Center is working; Caitlin Hunter is the new Head.
vi. The National Jukebox Project and the Web Radio Project will be launched in 2009; see the written report for details.
vii. The Policy and Standards division has three new staff members, including Janis Young, who is head of form/genre efforts.

f. Report from OCLC (Jay Weitz, OCLC)
i. The full report is in the meeting folders.
ii. OCLC has named a board of reviewers to review the Record Use Policy; board is headed by Jennifer Younger; comments may be sent to the board at reviewboard@oclc.org; questions about the policy may be sent to recorduse@oclc.org.
iii. The Expert Community Experiment began on Monday.
iv. Guide to Cataloging Playaway Devices Based on AACR2r Chapters 6 and 9 has been issued; this is a joint project of OLAC CAPC and MLA. OCLC is loading record that conform to the Guide.
v. OCLC has announced a pilot project to provide access to WorldCat.org via mobile phones.
vi. Rudnick thanked Weitz for his service and dedication.

5. Old Business
a. Bylaws amendment ballots
i. MOUG members voted to raise the annual dues in spring 2008. Eighty-two ballots were cast, two additional ballots were invalid and not tabulated. The increase will keep MOUG’s operational expenditures and income in balance and will help support new initiatives.
ii. There will be another bylaws amendment ballot this spring. The amendments are based on recommendations of the Bylaws Revision Task Force, and will clarify roles or bring the bylaws into “best practices” followed by other nonprofit organizations. Rudnick thanked Task Force members: Stephanie Bonjack (University of Southern California), Chair; Nara Newcomer (East Carolina University); and Jeannette Thompson (Tulane University).

b. Use of credit cards
i. The Board investigated the use of credit cards for making Best of MOUG and dues payments, but decided to postpone further action until after the treasurer transition.

c. Mission Task Force follow up
i. Rudnick read a brief report from Joseph Hafner regarding the MOUG Mission and Objectives Task Force.
ii. Rudnick noted that the report contains several noteworthy recommendations, and the Board will follow up on these in the future.

6. New Business
a. Distinguished Service Award presentation
i. Rudnick presented the 2009 Distinguished Service Award to Mickey Koth (Yale University), citing her accomplishments as a music cataloger, NACO-Music Project participant, teacher, and mentor. [Note: the full text of the award letter appears on p. xx of this Newsletter.]
ii. Hughes presented Koth with a plaque and read the inscription:
Music OCLC Users Group  
Distinguished Service Award  
February 18, 2009  
Presented to its eighth recipient,  
Michelle Koth  
Acknowledging Mickey’s exceptional dedication  
to the craft and art of music librarianship  
through her leadership  
and genesis of invaluable cataloging tools and resources.

iii. Koth thanked Linda Fidler and Ralph Papakhian for their encouragement and support in her early career.
iv. Rudnick noted that Luttmann would soon issue a call for DSA nominees for 2010.

b. Future of face-to-face MOUG meetings in difficult economic times
i. Rudnick began discussion by noting the current economic climate, reduced institutional support for professional travel, and the need to control meeting costs. She then opened the floor to discussion.

Some members stated they would not attend MOUG or MLA in San Diego, due to potentially higher meeting costs, reduced travel funding, and/or increased out-of-pocket travel expenses. Others indicated they would attend next year’s meeting regardless of cost, because they reap significant personal and professional benefits from MOUG meetings.

A number of members expressed interest in meeting every other year, as OLAC (Online Audiovisual Catalogers) does. Others asked about having more frequent joint meetings with OLAC, and having them more regularly; was also suggested that in such years MOUG could perhaps skip its meeting with MLA.

A few people asked if MOUG could meet with OLAC instead of MLA, while wondering if MLA’s needs and requirements drive up meeting costs (esp. regarding hotel space). Several members countered that they would incur additional costs if they had to attend MOUG and MLA meetings separately, and that such incursions might force them to skip one group’s meeting (MOUG’s?) because they couldn’t afford to attend both. Public services members would have significantly less access to MOUG meetings since OLAC’s focus is cataloging. Steve Wright stated that MLA was not receptive to a severance of MOUG and MLA meetings when the idea was floated in the past. MOUG should notify the MLA Board well in advance of any potential breach of the existing arrangement.

A question was asked about possibly shortening the annual meeting, but it was noted that meeting had already been shortened and further shortening might not be feasible or desirable.

Second Life, teleconferencing, and Webinars were suggested as possible alternatives to face-to-face meetings. The availability of appropriate hardware, software, and support at one’s site could be a barrier to effectiveness. Several people said that one of the benefits of face-to-face meetings is the knowledge and information gained and shared through informal conversations with colleagues, and that such would not happen with virtual or distance conferences.

Overall, there was a general sense that members desire to continue face-to-face MOUG meetings, and that they would prefer more programming, not less. There seems to be a sizeable group of members who state they will attend MOUG meetings no matter the cost of attendance, but meeting attendance for some may become too expensive.

In closing, Rudnick stated that the Board would review these points and continue to engage the membership in ongoing discussion of this topic.

c. New business or announcements from attendees: no new business was brought forward.

7. Adjournment
A motion was made to adjourn the meeting, seconded and passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:22 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Alan Ringwood, Secretary/Newsletter Editor
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal Membership is $30.00 (North America) and $45.00 (outside North America); institutional membership is $40.00 (North America) and $50.00 (outside North America). Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members will also receive any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor.

NAME ____________________________________________

PREFERRED ADDRESS __________________________________

CITY ____________________ STATE ________ ZIP ____________ COUNTRY __________________

WORK PHONE ( ) __________________________ FAX NUMBER ( ) __________________________

INSTITUTION NAME ____________________________________

POSITION TITLE _____________________________________

E-MAIL ADDRESS ______________________________________

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

$30.00 Personal Membership (North America)

$45.00 Personal Membership (outside North America)

$40.00 Institutional Membership (North America)

$50.00 Institutional Membership (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Diane Napert, MOUG Treasurer, Irving S. Gilmore Music Library, Yale University, P.O. Box 208240, New Haven, CT 06520-8240.