MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

NEWSLETTER

FROM THE CHAIR

Stephen Luttmann
University of Northern Colorado

"I have nothing to say / and I am saying it . . ." – how appropriate that I'm in San Francisco as I type this, just hours away from a session on John Cage at the American Musicological Society annual meeting, because this is the dilemma faced by a MOUG Chair writing his December column who lacks the wit to come up with something like "cataloger envy," and who, like most of the rest of you, was all too easily lost in the depths of a fall semester. As this issue goes to press, the officer election and Papakhian Grant application seasons are not quite over, so there's nothing I can report on those fronts either. Indeed, the biggest news, and greatest labors, are all Catherine's, who along with her Program Committee have come up with an exciting and innovative program for next February's Dallas meeting that's available for your consideration at http://www.musicoclcusers.org/mougmeet.html. Do make every effort to attend, remember that early registration is available through **December 31, 2011**, and note that we're again holding down the costs: the member rate is only $90, with deep discounts for first-time attendees and students.

This isn't to say that our other Board members have been slouches (like me). Marty has been fielding all kinds of publicity-related matters, and discovering lapses in the Officer Handbook that we hadn't noticed lo these many years; Diane keeps crunching numbers promptly and accurately, and together with her successor Casey has been working toward online membership forms (for 2012 you still have to do paper – but the forms are online, at http://www.musicoclcusers.org/mougmembership.html). And as for Damian's work, well, you're holding it in your hand.

There are two longer-term developments you might be interested in reading about. Next year's IAML meeting will be held in Montréal, and members of the IAML Program Committee have asked us if we would like to participate. Because we on the Board figured that the most sensible thing to do would be to identify a high-profile member with an uncanny ability to identify presentation topics that could be adjusted at will to fit late-breaking developments, we've volunteered the services of Jay Weitz, and are working with OCLC to share the expense of his attendance. We're confident that Jay's presentation will enhance MOUG's visibility and attractiveness to the international community of music librarians.

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

MISSION STATEMENT

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

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue. The Newsletter is a publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. It is published three times a year: June, September, and December. Editor: Damian Iseminger, New England Conservatory, 290 Huntington Ave., Boston, MA 02115-5018.

Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be submitted electronically in Word. Articles should be consistent in length and style with other items published in the Newsletter. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged. Correspondence on subscription or membership (including change of address) should be forwarded to Diane Napert, MOUG Treasurer, Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, P.O. Box 208240, New Haven, CT 06520-8240. (Dues in North America are $30.00 for personal members, $40.00 for institutional subscriptions; outside North America, $45.00 for personal members, $50.00 for institutional subscriptions; back issues for the previous two years are available from the Treasurer for $5.00 per copy.) A copy of the quarterly financial report is available from the Treasurer on request. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.

The Music OCLC Users Group is a non-stock, nonprofit association organized for these purposes: (1) to establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC products, systems, and services and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users; (2) to encourage and facilitate the exchange of information between OCLC and members of MOUG; between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general between members of the Group and appropriate representatives of the Library of Congress; and between members of the Group and similar users' organizations; (3) to promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards; and (4) to provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group. MOUG's FEIN is 31-0951917.

MOUG-L: MOUG-L is an electronic discussion list for the dissemination of information and the discussion of issues and topics of interest to music library professionals and users of OCLC products and services. To subscribe to MOUG-L, send an e-mail to listserv@lsv.uky.edu with the subject line blank. In the body of the message type: SUBSCRIBE MOUG-L <your name>

MOUG Website: http://www.musicoclcusers.org

FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR

Catherine Gick Busselen
Brown University

The preliminary program for the 2012 MOUG meeting, to be held in Dallas, is included in this newsletter and can also be found online at http://www.musicoclcusers.org/mougmeet.html. We will once again be starting Tuesday afternoon and continuing through Wednesday morning.

We will start the meeting by learning about various OCLC products that make use of non-MARC metadata, with the primary focus being on CONTENTdm. Following that, we will have the opportunity to reconnect with long-time MOUG friends and welcome our newest MOUG colleagues while enjoying some refreshments.

We will wrap up the day with a conversation about FRBR/FRAD. We'll start this session hearing from Jean Harden (University of North Texas) about what the intentions behind FRBR/FRAD are and how FRBR/FRAD has been implemented in RDA. Jay Weitz (OCLC) will also introduce us to OCLC's GLIMIR project, a global library identifiers project which extends the FRBR research to the manifestation level. At this point the session will be turned over to you, the audience. Jenn Riley (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill) will act as facilitator, gathering talking points and questions that warrant further exploration from all of you. We will then break out into smaller groups to discuss those talking points and questions more thoroughly before reconvening to share our ideas with rest of the group. While we do not expect to come to any final conclusions during the session, we do hope to open up a greater conversation that can continue beyond the confines of the MOUG meeting in Dallas.

Based on the responses we got from last year's survey, we have opted to allow everyone to do breakfast on their own on Wednesday in favor of a low registration rate. We will, however, be offering coffee and tea to help start your day followed by MOUG Hot Topics.

Our final plenary session promises to be a lot of fun! We will hear lightning talks about some of the weird, unique, unusual or just plain difficult to deal with items and collections that some of our colleagues have encountered over the years and how they ultimately dealt with them.

Thanks to the hard work of A-R Editions and the Music Library Association we are once again able to make online registration an option this year and is available at https://mla.areditions.com/conference2012.asp. While online registration is preferred, you may print off an MLA 2012 Registration Form, fill out the MOUG portion and mail it to the address listed on the form. The mail-in forms are available in Word or PDF formats at https://www.areditions.com/mla/MLA-2012/MLA-Packet.htm.

We would like to give you the opportunity to send your questions to our presenters in advance of the meeting. If you have burning questions on any of the session topics or would like something in particular brought up at the MOUG Hot Topics session, please send them to me at Catherine_Busselen@Brown.edu. We also have a couple of slots available in our Lightning Talks session so if you are interested in giving a very short (3-5 minutes) presentation on anything out of the ordinary that you have had the opportunity to work with, I'd like to hear from you.

Finally, we would greatly appreciate your assistance on the MOUG registration desk. If you would like to volunteer to help out on Tuesday afternoon, evening or Wednesday morning, please contact Peter Bushnell at petbush@uflib.ufl.edu.

I would like to give my sincere thanks to the MOUG Program Committee and MOUG Board for all of their assistance with the planning of this meeting. I look forward to seeing all of you in Dallas!!!

From the Chair

And finally, there's the 501(c)(3) application. Once again we're in "hurry up and wait" mode. Having reviewed all of the good work of the Task Force, including its discovery of updated requirements that are articulated nowhere on the 501(c)(3) application itself, we noticed a glaring ambiguity in the IRS rules: does "five years worth of financial information" mean "four complete years plus the current year in progress," a practice mandated in some contexts, or "five complete years," as mandated in others? After spending some time on the phone with the IRS, I discovered that in fact the latter is the case. This meant that we either had to compile data for 2006, or wait until the end of 2011 and submit data for it, and the Board opted for the latter, recognizing that current data is bound to impress the IRS as more meaningful. So the completed application will go in promptly right after New Year's. Another silver lining in the cloud: according to the Ohio Secretary of State's office, this means that we can both renew our incorporation with the State of Ohio *and* amend our articles of incorporation (as approved by you in the recent Bylaws amendment vote) in one application and fee instead of two.

Enjoy the upcoming holidays, and see you in Dallas!

Volunteers Needed!

Volunteers are needed to compile summaries of the presentations that will be given at the 2012 MOUG Annual Meeting in Dallas. Summaries should be no more than 1,500 words and must be submitted to the Editor by Friday, March 16, 2012. The summaries will be published in the June 2012 issue (no. 110) of the MOUG *Newsletter*. If you are interested in preparing a summary, please contact Newsletter Editor Damian Iseminger at damian.iseminger @necmusic.edu.

NEWS FROM OCLC

Compiled by Jay Weitz

Executive Search Committee Appoints Community Advisory Group

The Executive Search Committee of the OCLC Board of Trustees has named 13 people to a Community Advisory Group that will be involved in the search for the next President and Chief Executive Officer of OCLC to succeed Jay Jordan, who has announced his plans to retire June 30, 2012.

Members of the Community Advisory Group will provide the Executive Search Committee with counsel regarding the selection of a new President and CEO, including input to the position profile, names for consideration, potential sources of candidates, and stakeholder perspectives. The Group will also be engaged in the final stage of the interview process.

Members of the Community Advisory Group are:

- Pam Bailey, Member Advocate, OCLC.
- ChewLeng Beh, Vice President/President-Elect, OCLC Global Council, and Senior Director Library and Professional Services and Director of SILAS, National Library Board, Singapore.
- Paul Cappuzzello, Senior Library Services Consultant, OCLC.
- William Crowe, Former Member of the OCLC Board of Trustees and Librarian Emeritus, University of Kansas, USA.
- Carol Diedrichs, Director of Libraries, The Ohio State University, USA.
- Berndt Dugall, OCLC Global Council President and Direktor/Librarian, Universität Frankfurt, Universitätsbibliothek Johann Senckenberg, Germany.
- Chrystie Hill, Director, WebJunction Community Services, OCLC.
- Patrick Losinski, Executive Director, Columbus (Ohio) Metropolitan Library, USA.
- Constance Malpas, Program Officer, OCLC Research.
- Andrew Pace, Executive Director, Networked Library Services, OCLC.
- Anja Smit, Regional Representative, OCLC Global Council, and University Librarian, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- John Ulmschneider, University Librarian, Virginia Commonwealth University, USA.
- Norbert Weinberger, Managing Director, Germany, OCLC.

The OCLC Board of Trustees announced formation of an Executive Search Committee on August 1. This Committee is leading the process to select the next leader of the OCLC cooperative:

- Chair, Sandy Yee, Dean of the Wayne State University Libraries and Library and Information Science Program.
- Ed Barry, President Emeritus, Oxford University Press.
- Maggie Farrell, Dean of Libraries, University of Wyoming.
- Bernadette Gray-Little, Chancellor, University of Kansas.
- Kathleen Imhoff, Library Consultant.
- David Lauer, Former President and COO, Bank One, NA.
- James Neal, Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian, Columbia University.
- Elisabeth Niggemann, Director General, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.

The OCLC Board has hired the executive search firm of Heidrick & Struggles to assist in the international search. On June 27, 2011, Jay Jordan announced his plans to retire as OCLC's fourth president and CEO on June 30, 2012; by then he will have served 14 years in that position, the longest tenure of any OCLC president.

Theodore Front Musical Literature Now an Active WorldCat Selection Partner

Founded in 1961, Theodore Front has a goal of providing information and materials to facilitate building institutional and private music collections. University, college, conservatory, and public libraries worldwide use Theodore Front's collection development tools, which are continuously refined to suit the most exacting and current requirements of music libraries. Approval plans and firm orders for music scores, books and audio-visual materials, standing orders, subscriptions, and out-of-print services are offered with professional expertise. Newly released materials from the United States, the Americas, Europe, and the Pacific Rim are reviewed and updated daily. A variety of electronic and online services, management reports and other facilitators are available on demand.

News from OCLC

OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats Update 2011

On Sunday, August 21, 2011, OCLC implemented the changes related to the OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats Update 2011. This includes MARC 21 Update No. 12 (dated October 2010), elements from other recent MARC 21 Updates whose implementations had been postponed, code list additions and changes published chiefly since May 2010, and other suggestions from WorldCat users and OCLC staff. Many of these elements, including those from MARC 21 Update No. 12, are related to Resource Description and Access (RDA). OCLC Technical Bulletin 260, which presents the details, is available at http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/260/default.htm. Among the points of interest:

- Definition of a new "Descriptive Cataloging Form" (Leader/18; OCLC Fixed Field: Desc) value "c" indicating "ISBD Punctuation Omitted" in the Bibliographic Format.
- Implementation of four additional 007 fields ("Physical Description Fixed Fields") for Kit, Notated Music, Text, and Unspecified, in the Bibliographic and Holdings Formats.
- Implementation of a new fixed field element in the Computer File format, "Form of Item" (Computer File 008/23 and 006/06; OCLC Fixed Field: Form) in the Bibliographic Format.
- Implementation of a new subfield $3 "Materials Specified" in field 034 "Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data" in the Bib-

liographic and Authority Formats.

- Implementation of a new subfield $u "Uniform Resource Identifier" in field 561 "Ownership and Custodial History" in the Bibliographic and Holdings Formats.
- Implementation of a new subfield $i "Relationship Information" in OCLC-defined 79X "Local Added Entry" fields in the Bibliographic Format.
- Implementation of a new subfield $5 "Institution to Which Field Applies" in Series Added Entry fields 800, 810, 811, and 830 in the Bibliographic Format.
- Implementation of three new Bibliographic indexes: Date Created as MARC ("dm:"), Entity Attributes ("en:"), and Physical Description ("p3:"). Two additional new Bibliographic indexes will be implemented later in 2011: Provenance ("pv:") and Name and Title ("nx="). All of these new indexes and other indexing changes described in Technical Bulletin 260 will gradually become apparent as WorldCat is reindexed over the next few months.

Any appropriate data conversions will begin soon. All new searching and indexing capabilities; new fields, new subfields, new indicators; and new codes announced in Technical Bulletin 260 can now be used in both Connexion browser and Connexion client.

Additional Funding for U.S. Public Library Awareness Campaign, Geek the Library

OCLC's Geek the Library community awareness campaign, piloted in 2009 and 2010 and now available to all U.S. public libraries, has received an additional grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The supplementary $726,000 provides ongoing campaign materials and field support for libraries currently running the campaign, and allows OCLC to work with additional public libraries that sign up by March 31, 2012. Funding ensures that participating libraries can use the campaign to reach their local communities through June 2013.

Since launch, hundreds of libraries across the U.S. have enrolled to run local Geek the Library campaigns—and more than 100 new campaigns have kicked off since the pilot ended. Participants are embracing the campaign, and are enthusiastically customizing content and actively involving their communities.

Participating libraries receive an initial kit of Geek the Library materials, such as posters and stickers, plus addi-

tional kits as the campaign progresses, along with access to a comprehensive online guide to implementing the campaign. This resource features pages of advice for each phase of a local campaign, printable documents, art templates and images, a forum to share ideas with other participating libraries, and a blog that features ideas and updates weekly. Field managers also provide assistance in planning and roll-out, and are available to respond to questions throughout the campaign period.

Geek the Library has a national campaign presence with its website, geekthelibrary.org, and social media such as Facebook, Twitter, and Flickr. Geek the Library was developed based on the results of OCLC's research published in *From Awareness to Funding: A Study of Library Support in America*. The research and pilot campaign were also funded by a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Libraries can get more information about implementing the campaign locally at get.geekthelibrary.org.

More Databases and Collections Added to WorldCat Local

OCLC has added more databases and signed agreements with leading publishers and other providers to add more content and collections to WorldCat Local, the OCLC discovery and delivery service that offers users integrated access to more than 865 million items.

WorldCat Local provides access to books, journals, and databases in a variety of formats from a variety of publishers and content providers from around the world; the digital collections of groups like HathiTrust, OAIster, and Google Books; open access materials; and the collective resources of libraries worldwide through WorldCat.

WorldCat Local can offer users access to more than 1,600 databases and collections, and more than 614 million articles.

OCLC recently added content to the WorldCat Local central index, including:

- ABC-CLIO: *World Religions: Belief, Culture and Controversy* provides a virtual textbook that covers religion across the globe, making student research on faith and belief across humanity easier, and enabling a deeper understanding of the complex issues facing us in the 21st century.

- Accessible Archives, Inc.: Developed by dedicated instructors and students of American history, *Accessible Archives*' databases contain the rich, comprehensive material found in leading historic periodicals and books. Eyewitness accounts of historical events, vivid descriptions of daily life, editorial observations, commerce as seen through advertisements, and genealogical records are available in a user-friendly online environment.

- ACM: *The ACM Digital Library* is the most comprehensive collection of full-text articles and bibliographic records in existence today covering the fields of computing and information technology. The full-text database includes the complete collection of ACM's publications, including journals, conference proceedings, magazines, newsletters, and multimedia titles

- Annual Reviews: *Annual Reviews* publications are among the most highly cited in the scientific literature, and are available in print and online to individuals, institutions, and consortia throughout the world.

- Cambridge University Press: *Cambridge Companions Online* is the electronic version of the renowned *Cambridge Companions* series, covering literature, philosophy, classics, religion, and cultural studies. Over 300 *Companions* offer lively, accessible introductions to major writers, artists, philosophers, topics, and periods. *Historical Statistics of the United States* is the standard source for the quantitative facts of American history. *Lectrix* is an innovative online resource which integrates selected classic works of Greek and Latin literature with commentaries from the world-renowned Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series for word-by-word, click-by-click access. *Shakespeare Survey Online* makes all issues of the Survey, including over 90 percent of the original images, available online for the first time.

- Gale: With over 76 million records, *Business & Company Resource Center* is a premier electronic information solution for all academic disciplines, business researchers and entrepreneurs.

- Genealogy Today: *Genealogy Today* has been publishing genealogy data and offering innovative services since 1999. This site provides time-saving resources and the latest techniques available in genealogy research.

- HAPI: *The Hispanic American Periodicals Index* (HAPI) includes over 275,000 journal article citations about Central America, South America, the Caribbean, Mexico, Brazil, and Hispanics/Latinos in the United States. HAPI currently provides over 60,000 links to the full text of articles appearing in more than 600 key social science and humanities journals published throughout the world.

In addition, the following vendor record collections are now available in WorldCat Local and WorldCat.org for libraries that subscribe to this content and have purchased MARC records from the content provider:

- Cassidy Cataloguing: *Westlaw IV - Law Journals and Law Reviews*, *Westlaw VI - International E-treatises*, and *Westlaw VII - Legal Newsletters* are now available through WorldCat Local.

OCLC also has recently signed agreements with the following providers to add content into WorldCat Local:

- *Religious and Theological Abstracts* provides objective summaries of articles appearing in scholarly journals in the fields of Religion and Theology.

News from OCLC

- The Berkeley Electronic Press: Libraries are increasingly using the *Digital Commons* platform to enable their faculty and students to publish open access, original scholarship. *Digital Commons* subscribers will now be able to select the high-value scholarly content, including library-hosted peer review journal content, they would like to make discoverable via WorldCat. The service will be available as part of the growing suite of *Digital Commons* publishing services, and will serve to further increase the discovery of this open access and original scholarship.

OCLC continues to negotiate access to critical library content on behalf of the cooperative to ensure access to libraries' most popular resources. To view a list of databases and collections from these and other publishers available through WorldCat Local, visit the website at http://www.oclc.org/us/en/worldcatlocal/default.htm.

Early Journal Content from JSTOR via WorldCat.org and WorldCat Local

OCLC's WorldCat.org and WorldCat Local services enable discovery of full-text of the Early Journal Content on JSTOR, alongside additional full-text content, evaluative information and metadata from the collections of thousands of OCLC member libraries and publishers worldwide.

JSTOR recently announced that it would make the full text of its Early Journal Content freely accessible to anyone in the world. These works are also available to be discovered through OCLC services.

The Early Journal Content from JSTOR is defined as those works "published prior to 1923 in the United States and prior to 1870 elsewhere." This subset of content is estimated to be roughly 6% of the journal content on JSTOR, which includes articles from more than 1,400 journals.

A cooperative partnership with JSTOR has been in place since 2009. Since that time, OCLC has indexed and loaded the metadata for more than 4.6 million articles—and continues to add additional new content through monthly updates. Document metadata available through WorldCat.org and WorldCat Local begins in 1603 and covers an international range of publishers.

Users affiliated with WorldCat Local libraries and WorldCat.org users will discover records for Early Journal Content on JSTOR included in result sets. Examples of Early Journal Content articles available through WorldCat.org include "Municipal Socialism and Its Economic Limitations" from *Political Science Quarterly* (1909) and "On the True Date of the Rosetta Stone, and on the Inferences Deducible from It" from *The Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* (1843). A user may discover the item and simply click the embedded jstor.org link under the heading to "Find a copy online" to access the full-text of the article.

Publishers and services such as JSTOR gain valuable visibility by working directly with OCLC to make metadata and content for entire collections available through OCLC services such as WorldCat.org and WorldCat Local. Library users benefit by having a single place to discover rich, relevant materials in libraries worldwide.

HathiTrust Full-Text Index to be Integrated into OCLC Services

OCLC and HathiTrust have signed an agreement that will allow OCLC to integrate the HathiTrust full-text index into OCLC services, enabling member libraries and their users to more easily discover resources from this important digital collection through WorldCat.

Under this new agreement, OCLC will be able to integrate the full-text index of HathiTrust collections into services such as WorldCat.org and WorldCat Local. Following integration of the full-text index, users will be able to search beyond bibliographic records to include the full text of these cooperatively built library collections in their searches.

Content from the HathiTrust Digital Library complements member libraries' collections already in WorldCat. Through a single search of WorldCat.org or WorldCat Local, users will easily find HathiTrust resources and other materials available in their own collections, and in the collections of thousands of libraries around the world that are part of the OCLC cooperative.

As a digital repository for the nation's great research libraries, the HathiTrust Digital Library brings together the massive digitized collections of partner institutions. HathiTrust offers 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 offers expanded opportunities for innovative use in research, teaching, and learning.

Earlier in 2011, OCLC and HathiTrust began testing a unique WorldCat Local user interface for discovery of items accessible through the HathiTrust Digital Library. The WorldCat Local prototype for the HathiTrust Digital Library, available to anyone on the Web, was designed and implemented by both organizations in close cooperation as a means to further develop a shared digital library infrastructure. HathiTrust Digital Library records are discoverable through the separate WorldCat Local interface, as well as through WorldCat.org, available on the Web at www.worldcat.org.

OCLC and HathiTrust continue to 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 World-Cat Local.

Society of American Archivists Endorses "Well-Intentioned Practice"

The "Well-intentioned practice (WIP) for putting digitized collections of unpublished materials online," prepared by OCLC Research, has been endorsed as a standard by the Society of American Archivists (SAA) Council.

This practice provides the framework for an assertive approach to digitization of unpublished archival materials, such as photographs, letters, or the records of an organization's work, whose rights holders are often difficult to identify and contact. It promotes a practical approach to identifying and resolving rights issues that is in line with professional and ethical standards and emphasizes a collective approach to the management of the copyright responsibilities involved in large-scale digitization projects.

This approach is the output of a 2010 seminar in which OCLC Research convened a group of experts in archives, special collections, and law to develop streamlined, community-accepted procedures for managing copyright in the digital age that would cut costs and boost confidence in libraries' and archives' ability to increase access to unpublished materials online.

The group acknowledged that, although there is risk in digitizing materials that may be in copyright, this risk should be balanced with the harm to scholarship and society inherent in not making collections fully accessible. Based on this premise, they identified a practical approach to selecting collections, making decisions, seeking permissions, recording outcomes, establishing policy, and working with future donors, which was outlined in the "Well-intentioned practice" document. Since then, a community of practice has been forming around the WIP that will increase and significantly improve access to collections of unpublished materials for the purpose of furthering research and learning.

SAA's Intellectual Property Working Group (IPWG), which tracks intellectual property issues of concern to archivists and drafts responses or position papers as needed, provided a preface for SAA's endorsement of this practice. Both the preface and the endorsement are available on SAA's standards portal (http://www2.archivists.org/standards/well-intentioned-practice-for-putting-digitized-collections-of-unpublished-materials-onlin). The "Well-intentioned practice for putting digitized collections of unpublished materials online" document is available online at http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/rights/practice.pdf.

By endorsing WIP as a standard, SAA joins a distinguished group of organizations and individuals that support the practices outlined in the WIP. Other organizations that have joined the community of practice by endorsing these procedures include the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) of the American Library Association (ALA), the Joint National Committee on Archives, Libraries and Museums (CALM), and the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA).

Free CONTENTdm Training from OCLC

OCLC is pleased to announce that free, live-online CONTENTdm Digital Collection Management Software training is now available, in addition to the free training that's already available for Cataloging, Resource Sharing and FirstSearch services.

This free CONTENTdm training, which will be offered on a bimonthly basis, will provide new users with information about the fundamentals of using CONTENTdm to manage their digital collections.

The training is comprised of three, two-hour basic skills courses:

- CONTENTdm Basic Skills 1: Getting Started with CONTENTdm.
- CONTENTdm Basic Skills 2: Working with Text in CONTENTdm.

Music OCLC Users Group Annual Meeting

Tuesday-Wednesday, February 14-15, 2012
The Fairmount Dallas, Dallas, Texas

--- *PRELIMINARY PROGRAM* ---

Tuesday, February 14, 2012

8:00 AM-1:00 PM	**MOUG Board Meeting**
1:30-6:30 PM	**Registration**
2:30-3:30 PM	**Enhance and Expert Community Session**

3:30-4:30 PM **Plenary Session: OCLC and Non-MARC Metadata**
Amanda Harlan (Baylor University)
TBA (Amigos Library Services)

4:30-5:00 PM **Cookies and lemonade**

5:00-6:30 PM **Plenary Session: FRBR/FRAD: A Conversation**
Moderator: Jenn Riley (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
Panelists: Jean Harden (University of North Texas)
Jay Weitz (OCLC)

8:00-9:00 PM **NACO-Music Project**

Wednesday, February 15, 2012

8:00-9:00 AM	**Registration**
8:00-8:30 AM	**Coffee/Tea**
8:30-9:30 PM	**MOUG Hot Topics**
9:30-10:30 AM	**Lightning Talks Session: "What is this? And how am I going to describe it?"**
10:30-10:45 AM	**BREAK**
10:45-11:45 AM	**MOUG Business Meeting**

Music OCLC Users Group Annual Meeting

Tuesday-Wednesday, February 14-15, 2012
The Fairmount Dallas, Dallas, Texas

REGISTRATION

MOUG is offering online registration through the Music Library Association (MLA) conference registration page, located at https://mla.areditions.com/conference2012.asp. You do not need to have an account on the MLA website in order to register. The MOUG portion of the registration form is in the last half of the Web page.

A printable registration form is also available on the MLA conference website for those who prefer not to register online. The form is located at https://www.areditions.com/mla/MLA-2012/MLA-Packet.htm in both Word and PDF formats. Print out the form, fill it out, and submit it with your registration payment to the address indicated on the form.

Early registrations must be received by **December 31, 2011**. Regular registrations must be received by **January 12, 2012**.

REGISTRATION RATES

Early Registration		**Regular Registration**	
2012 MOUG Members:	$90.00	2012 MOUG Members:	$165.00
2012 MOUG First Time Attendees:	$45.00	2012 MOUG First Time Attendees:	$95.00
Non-Members:	$115.00	Non-Members:	$165.00
Students:	$40.00	Students:	$90.00

CONFERENCE HOTEL

The Fairmount Dallas
1717 N. Akard Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
http://www.fairmont.com/dallas

Hotel reservations can be made by phone at 800-441-1414 or online at https://resweb.passkey.com/go/musiclibraryassociation. Be sure to mention you are attending the MLA/MOUG meeting for the reduced rate.

Regular Single/Double: ………………………………………………………………………………….. $165/night

Deluxe (King only): ……………………………………………………………………………………… $195/night

One Bedroom Suites: ……………………………………………………………………………start at $245/night

Additional person: …………………………………………………………………………… ………$30/night

Tax/Occupancy Rate:…………………………………………………………………………………………15%

Overnight parking: ………………………………………………………………………………………….$24/day

In addition to the usual amenities, rollaway beds ($25/night) and mini-refrigerators ($25/stay) are also available. The hotel has access to a health club, which is accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with a guest room key card. There is no hotel shuttle from/to either Dallas/Fort Worth Airport or Love Field.

News from OCLC
(Continued from page 9)

- CONTENTdm Basic Skills 3: Maintaining Collections in CONTENTdm.

Advances in e-learning technologies and an increased demand for online learning now allow us to provide training at greater economies of scale. OCLC is passing these savings on to members by offering free training on our most-used services.

You can find out more about the CONTENTdm training and sign up for the upcoming courses at the OCLC Training Portal: http://training.oclc.org/training. To see the list of available courses, look for CONTENTdm under Digital Collection Management.

Enhancing the Newly Redesigned CONTENTdm

In March 2011, OCLC introduced CONTENTdm version 6, which offered a complete redesign for the end-user experience along with new website configuration tools that enabled digital collection administrators to easily customize their collections' websites without programming expertise. In this latest release, CONTENTdm version 6.1, OCLC has further enhanced the software by providing end users with social features to comment, tag, and rate digital items, encouraging engagement with your library's digital collections.

And administrators are now able to do even more customization to their collections websites, including localizing all navigation and messaging elements into one or more languages (11 languages are supplied with CONTENTdm: Catalan, Chinese (simplified and traditional), Dutch, English, French, German, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, and Thai).

With CONTENTdm 6.1, end users can now easily download and print images and documents they find in online digital collections. For images, different sizes may be offered for download including full resolution, if stored in the Archival File Manager. And newspapers with article segmentation are now fully discoverable, allowing end users to search for and discover article-level metadata and see individual articles highlighted within each page via an enhanced newspaper viewer.

Some of the other new features available with the updated CONTENTdm include the capability to: arrange the list of collections on a collection's home page in whatever order makes sense for your library; add a customized collection home page; and group digital collections together by geography, topic, or institution for searching or browsing.

Administrators will be able to disable or enable any of these new CONTENTdm 6.1 features, either globally or by collection, using the website configuration tools. This provides your library with full control of the configuration of your unique online collections, allowing you to choose how to best display and represent them on the Web. More than 2,000 libraries, archives, museums, and other cultural heritage institutions around the world use CONTENTdm to manage their digital collections and deliver them to the Web. More about CONTENTdm is available at www.oclc.org/contentdm.

Exposing WorldCat Content via Ex Libris Discovery and Delivery Solutions

OCLC and Ex Libris Group® have signed an agreement that will enable Ex Libris to incorporate the WorldCat Search API into several Ex Libris discovery and delivery services, providing OCLC member libraries access to WorldCat through the Ex Libris Primo® and MetaLib® solutions. Ex Libris will integrate the WorldCat Search API, which provides machine-to-machine access to WorldCat bibliographic records and holdings data, into its applications to make the collections of OCLC libraries discoverable. Libraries will be able to activate this functionality by registering their key to the WorldCat Search API within their Ex Libris system.

OhioLINK–OCLC Collection and Circulation Analysis Project 2011

OhioLINK and OCLC Research have released a report of, and the data set used in, a joint study of OhioLINK circulation, to better understand the usage patterns of books in academic libraries and support further research in this area. The study, which incorporated usage data from 2007-2008, was limited to books and manuscripts because these materials typically circulate, and circulation is a significant element in evaluating collections.

The report, *OhioLINK—OCLC Collection and Circulation Analysis Project 2011* (http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2011/2011-06r.htm), provides an overview of the study, a description of how the data was analyzed and made available, and suggested uses for the data. The report is accompanied online by an extensive set of Excel spreadsheets that analyze the usage patterns observed in the study. The data used in the report was from a collaborative OCLC-OhioLINK Collection and Circulation Analysis project that joined OhioLINK circulation data with WorldCat bibliographic records to produce a base file of circulation records for nearly 30 million different books. Ninety institutions participated in the study, including 16 universities, 23 community/technical colleges, 50 private colleges, and the State Library of Ohio. The size of the combined collection and the number and diversity of participating institutions make this by far the largest and most comprehensive study of academic library circulation ever undertaken.

Perhaps the most fascinating result of the study was a test of the "80/20" rule. Librarians have long espoused the belief that 80 percent of a library's circulation is driven by approximately 20 percent of the collection. The analysis of a year's circulation statistics from this study indicates that 80 percent of the circulation is driven by just 6 percent of the collection.

The dataset generated by the project has also been made publicly available under the Open Data Commons Attribution license (an open license) to download for study and research. It is the largest and most diverse set of academic usage data for books ever collected. Because the data analysis described in the report represents only a fraction of what might be done with the data, OhioLINK and OCLC Research made the data publicly available so it could be studied to its full potential and other libraries could correlate it against their own data to determine how it compares with their individual use patterns. The current OCLC-OhioLINK project team will also continue to study the data.

New Report: *Single Search: The Quest for the Holy Grail*

This report highlights successful strategies in providing a single point of access to library, archive, and museum collections. In the era of global search engines, users are often puzzled by the realization that they can search the Internet through a single interface, yet the resources of universities and other institutions are often compartmentalized in a plethora of informational silos, each with its own dedicated system, search categories, and user interfaces.

Many institutions want to make the breadth of their local resources easily discoverable regardless of where and how the resources are managed. To address this desire, OCLC Research facilitated a working group of nine single search implementers through discussions about the opportunities for, and obstacles to, integrating single search access across an institution. Members of this group told their stories, identified issues, and acknowledged similarities and differences in their approaches. This brief report summarizes those discussions and highlights the emerging practices in providing single search access to an institution's collections.

The goal of the report is to foster successful single search implementations by sharing the experience of the working group with those who are just beginning to plan single search implementations. Read the report, *Single Search: The Quest for the Holy Grail* at http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2011/2011-17r.htm. Learn more about the Single Search for Library, Archive, and Museum Collections project at http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/lamsearch/default.htm.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Jay Weitz, OCLC

The Year of Cataloging Dangerously

Q: Bibliographic Formats and Standards states for the use of DtSt "p": "Date of distribution/release/issue and date of production/recording session when different. The date of distribution/release/issue and the date of production/recording differ by at least one year. Use Date 1 for the year of distribution/release/issue (e.g., the date the material became available). Use Date 2 for the year of production/recording (i.e., the date the material was made)." Your examples all illustrate this beautifully because they are all well over a year apart. What's confusing us is when the years used for "p" are consecutive and the recording date is known. For example, Johannes Brahms's Op. 117, recorded in Vienna, October 16, 1985. On item: p1986. One could argue that this should be "p" as the years 1985 and 1986 are at issue. Or one could argue that it is more likely less than a year between the time of recording and the time of publication as evidenced by the following:

- Dates of publication that could be less than a year: Jan. 1, 1986-Oct. 15, 1986 (287 days).
- Dates of publication that could be at least a year: Oct. 16, 1986-Dec. 31, 1986 (76 days).

I say that with an unknown date (not year) of release and with a known recording date as illustrated above, it is 3.78 times as likely that the amount of time between them is less than a year as it is at least a year. Obviously, sound is recorded at different times of the year, so the likelihood changes. If we had recorded a New Years Day concert in St. Petersburg at 7 PM in 2000 but the item said p2001, there is a much greater chance that the amount of time between the date of recording and the date of publication is at least one year (technically anything past 7 PM on Jan. 1, 2001 would qualify). The root of this problem, of course, is the ambiguity of the word "year." "Year" is both a measure of time and an identifier of time. The OED gives the former as its first definition: "1a. The time occupied by the sun in its apparent passage through the signs of the zodiac, i.e. (according to modern astronomy) the period of the earth's revolution round the sun, forming a natural unit of time (nearly = 365 1/4 days); hence, a space of time approximately equal to this in any conventional practical reckoning (considered with respect to its length, without reference to its limits: cf. 3)." The latter appears much further down, under 3a: "A space of time, of the length stated in sense 1, with fixed limits. a. esp. such a space of time as reckoned in a calendar and denoted by a number in a particular era: commonly divided into twelve calendar months, in the ordinary (Roman) calendar beginning with January and ending with December, and consisting of 365 (or 366) days: see calendar n. 1 (Distinctively called the civil year.)" Please settle this for us once and for all: Does "at least one year" mean "not in the same calendar year" or "at least 365 1/4 days between"? If the latter, is my theory sound on the likelihood of duration, or do you have another suggestion?

A: First, the really crucial question. In your calculations, did you take into account the Poynting–Robertson effect, by which the pressure of solar radiation shortens the year by about 30 nanoseconds? But seriously. You will find this hard to believe, but that very passage ("differ by at least one year") has long bothered me, and for the exact reason that has caused your unfortunate disagreement. I was hoping to be able to blame the ambiguity on MARC 21, but after looking back through most earlier iterations, I'm not sure that I can. For a long time, the MARC 21 text describing code "p" has read, in part: "Both a date of distribution/release/issue (008/07-10) and a date of production/recording (008/11-14) are present because there is a difference between the two dates." That sounds comparatively clear and better reflects the actual definition of code "p" itself as "Date of distribution/release/issue and production/recording session when different," without introducing the ambiguity we at OCLC seem to have done with our well-intentioned elaboration. I'll see about getting that ambiguity fixed. The intended use of "p" is in instances where the date of distribution/release/issue and the date of production/recording session are not in the same calendar year. Simple as that.

Dancing Around an FMus Question

Q: When the physical description is "1 piano score," what is the proper value in FMus? I've got a ballet. Locally, we've done several things, including "Unknown", which might actually be best. Tried some LC records; hard to tell as the 008 is a string of bytes, maybe "c"?—other appear to be blank. That doesn't really fit; the piano reduction is not an accompaniment to a solo instrumental or vocal/choral lines,

but neither does anything else, as far as I can tell. Also noticed the LC classification schedules have three options for ballets: 1) Scores. Parts. 2) Vocal and chorus scores without accompaniment. 3) Keyboard scores. Vocal scores with keyboard accompaniment. And here I thought ballets typically didn't have singers.

A: My inclination would be to simply use "z" because it's solo piano music and nothing else is strictly appropriate.

The easy way out, of course, would be to take advantage of the fact that FMus is optional and to leave it blank. I can't account for the oddities in the LC Classification schedules. But remember that Tchaikovsky's score for *The Nutcracker*, probably the most famous ballet of all, does have vocal parts (wordless, but vocal nonetheless) in at least one section. There are also vocal and/or choral parts in Ravel's *Daphnis et Chloé* and Stravinsky's *Les noces*, to name just two other popular ballets.

Demanding an Answer

Q: This question came up back at the MOUG Hot Topics meeting in February 2011. It was asked whether new OCLC records were needed for various on-demand printings of G. Schirmer or AMP/Associated Music Publishers scores printed by the G. Schirmer Rental Library. There was a bit of a debate without a final resolution, but now I can provide an example. This is a score and parts with an AMP imprint, printed in 2010 from the G. Schirmer Rental Library. The cover and title page are reproduced here: http://www.flickr.com/photos/67416837@N02/sets/72157627652973028/. In WorldCat are these two records:

> #668243593
>> Form "r" Dates "t" 1998, 1997
>> 260 New York : $b Associated Music Publishers, $c [1998?], c1997.
>> 300 … no $c
>> 533 Photocopy. $b [Chester, N.Y.] : $c G. Schirmer Rental Library, $d 2010. $e 1 score (79 p.) + 4 parts ; 32 cm.

> #471762813
>> Form # Dates "t" 2009, 1997
>> 260 New York : $b Associated Music Publishers, $c [2009], c1997.
>> 300 … $c 33 cm.
>> [no mention of Schirmer Rental Library]

There are seemingly endless variations—sometimes the original imprint is Schirmer; sometimes there are more records to choose from, which may or may not include a record for the "original," a record for a reproduction, or a record that matches the printing year of the score in hand. I suspect BFAS 3.2 on "on demand" photocopies addresses this, sort of, but I'm having trouble making the right connections. I do not want to input unnecessary records, and I'd like to make the most logical local edits possible. Or, do these actually call for new "reproduction" records if one does not exist? Any kind of new records? In the above case I determined that a new record was not justified and tweaked the second record locally. I still have more of these to go, so insights are most welcome.

A: One of the points of the (admittedly convoluted) practices regarding "on-demand" reproductions under AACR2 LCRI 1.11A and OCLC's related recommendations is to try to avoid multiple records for what amounts to the same tangible resource being reproduced again and again. So following the LCRI, one would emphasize description of the original publication, relegating description of the tangible reproduction to the 533 note, as BFAS 3.2 explains. Then when we refer to BFAS Chapter 4, "When to Input a New Record," under field 533 we read "A difference in reproduction publication dates does not justify a new record." So in other words, if you find an existing record for the on-demand reproduction from the same reproduction publisher but it has a different date of reproduction, use that record anyway, editing the 533 subfield $d date of reproduction locally. If your tangible reproduction is from a different reproduction publisher (in this case, other than G. Schirmer Rental Library), you may input a new record. Your choice of using #471762813 and editing it locally to reflect the reproduction you hold is certainly permissible, and an option you always have. More in line with LCRI 1.11A and OCLC's corresponding suggestions would have been to use #668243593, editing its reproduction date locally, if needed. (In this, I'm making the unsubstantiated assumption that the bracketed publication dates in the 260s of the respective records represent merely different guesses about the date of the original, rather than an actual difference. If your reproduction does, in fact, reflect a 2009 date for the original and not some earlier date, then you might have been justified in adding a new record derived from #471762813 but with the appropriate 533 reproduction note.)

Questions & Answers

Revised Edition, Copyright Addition?

Q: When one is cataloging a revised edition, should the DtSt, Dates, and 260 subfield $c reflect the copyright date as well as a newer publication date? For instance, #722788502 is a vocal score that has "c1992" printed on it, and the two dates indicated in the coding of the record, also with:

    250 Rev. ed.
    500 Complete vocal score based on the 2004
    production.
    260   … $c [2011?], c1992.

It seems to me that a new edition would be a new publication, and that the copyright date would not be included in the record for this score. Yet I've come across a good number of records which are similar to the one mentioned above, which include the older copyright date.

A: True, a new edition would usually be a new publication in AACR2 terms, and 1.4F3 does support the notion of omitting a copyright date in the presence of a date for the named edition: "Give the date of a named revision of an edition as the date of publication only if the revision is specified in the edition area (see 1.2D). In this case, give only the date of the named revision." In the example you cite, however, the "[2011?]" date sure looks like an inferred date of publication rather than one present on the resource. Further on in the rules is 1.4F5, which reads: "Optional addition. Give the latest date of copyright following the publication, distribution, etc., date if the copyright date is different." LCRI 1.4F5 specifies: "LC practice: Apply the optional rule to materials other than books and printed serials whenever the copyright date of the item is different from the date of publication etc." That sound like permission, at least, to include a copyright date in an instance such as this. That is reinforced by 1.4F6: "If the dates of publication, distribution, etc., are unknown, give the copyright date or, in its absence, the date of manufacture (indicated as such) in its place." LCRI 1.4F6 backs this up with the general inclination to include a copyright date when it is present, especially when the date of manufacture and the date of copyright differ. Given the inferred date of publication in this instance, the inclusion of the copyright date and the DtSt coding of "t" seem permissible and possibly even preferred.

The Proverbial Leonard Bernstein Problem

Q: Would the input convention for the MARC record have the Name/Title entry and also add a subfield $4 prf if the composer is also the performer? Or do I need two separate entries? I don't think I've ever run into this in 20 years of cataloging.

A: You would need a separate added entry for the person as a performer with the proper subfield $4. Strictly speaking, a composer/title entry should be considered the heading for that particular work, not for the person alone.

More Than a First Impression

Q: I am cataloging a score that has a phrase I have never seen before. On the title page verso, under the copyright date of 2007 is this: "Amended impression 2009." Should I take this to be the equivalent of a reprint and use the existing record or a revision and create a new record?

A: This strikes me as a statement indicating a new printing with revisions. To my mind those revisions would justify a new record with an inferred publication date of 2009 and your quoted statement in field 250 (without quotes, of course). Unless there is more information somewhere stating that the "amendments" are insubstantial or mechanical (or if you have a way to compare the 2007 original with the "amended" 2009 version), that would be my suggestion.

Auflaging an Edition Question into Submission

Q: I'm having trouble remembering and finding documentation for what to do in the case of "Aufl." I seem to remember seeing or hearing that German publishers tend to use "Aufl." alternately as "Edition" and "Printing" and to not put too much stock in the presence of Aufl. as an edition statement. I have in front of me a Bärenreiter Urtext of Bach's Four Sonatas (BWV 1030, 1032, 1034, 1035) for flute and harpsichord. Being the good German publisher that it is, Bärenreiter has included "19. Auflage / 19th Printing 2011" on the title page verso. Looking in OCLC for this, though, I see several different records for this 1966 copyright, including several that seem to be using the Auflage statement as justification for a new record (#57967478, #123343449, #662470794). Is this something we should be doing? More to the point, is this "19. Auflage / 19th Printing 2011" alone justification for a new record in my case?

A: "Auflage" is one of those terms used variously to mean either a bibliographically significant edition or a bibliographically insignificant printing/impression. No specific terms are mentioned in OCLC's "When to Input a New Record" (http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/input/default.shtm), but "Auflage" is one of those meant in the field 250 specifications that reads: "Edition statements appearing on some foreign language publications (e.g., Romance language imprints) reflect printing information rather than edition information. If the edition statement appears in conjunction with the printer's name or the number of copies printed, generally consider the edition statement to reflect printing information and use the existing record. In all other cases, use judgment." Because Bärenreiter has kindly disambiguated its use of "Auflage" by providing the English translation as "printing," you can be sure that the statement should be disregarded and a separate record is not justified.

Ultra Super Audio Hype, in Mono

Q: I'm upgrading an Encoding Level 3 record. It's titled "The Genius Sings the Blues" and is Ray Charles singing, backed by a large jazz ensemble including piano, which he is presumably playing. First came out on Atlantic in 1961. The reissue is from MoFi, aka Mobile Fidelity Sound Lab which apparently is a label name as well as who knows what else. The disc face has a square with all the "super" info and reads thus:

> UDSACD 2049 / MONO
> Compact Disc Digital Audio (arranged in the usual square "logo") | DSD | SACD
> ULTRADISC UHR
> GAIN 2 ------with OSO (or maybe it's DSD, OSD, or DSO. The only thing I'm sure of is that the middle letter is S; the others are either D or O)

There's a little folder enclosing the CD inside the case that explains those last two a bit. First is "Ultradisc UHR (Ultra High-Resolution) SACD Hybrid," described as "The next level of high-end audio software" and appears to affect both the standard CD and the SACD layers. Looks like the DSD recording is made first. They wax poetic about the sampling rate and frequency response, apparently in the software they're using, then there's a "high-precision down-conversion" for the standard CD, so even it is better than usual, or so they claim. Next is GAIN 2 (Greater Ambient Information Network), described as a mastering system, and that information goes on to talk about the "high-precision" analog-to-digital converter used. No clue what the O/DSO/D refers to. What is the effect on 007 and 300? You have

previously suggested putting any indication of stereo in a 500, not the 300. But I'm thinking maybe my "mono" should go in the 300, as it is not associated with statements such as "Multi-channel" or "surround." Indeed, there is no claim of anything more than a single channel and big fat MONO, so do I just use "m" in 007 $e? Whew. Any clue?

A: Looking at the Mobile Fidelity Sound Lab site (about the "GAIN 2" system at http://www.mofi.com/store/pc/viewcontent.asp?idpage=9 and what seems to be the SACD you're cataloging at http://www.mofi.com/store/pc/viewPrd.asp?idproduct=200&idcategory=8#details, among other things), here's what I come up with. The questionable "OSO" you're seeing is probably just a reiteration of DSD or Direct Stream Digital. The description of "GAIN 2" at the first of those two ULRs reads in part: "The key accomplishments of GAIN 2™ System are 1) the ability to extract all the musical information as possible through the Ultra High bandwidth analogue tape playback system with proprietary custom tape playback heads, reproducer electronics and 2) transparently capturing and storing that information *with the Direct Stream Digital recording system*" (italics mine). That's my guess. They also make it clear that this is a mono recording, and I'd suggest coding the 007 as such and including "mono." in the 300. In my previous response, I don't think I was intending to suggest a blanket omission of either "mono." or "stereo." from the 300 subfield $b, just that the way it was presented, as part of the phrase "Stereo Multi-ch," rendered it ambiguous (that is, both two-channel and more-than-two-channel).

Questions & Answers

Long Players from Long Ago

Q: Can you advise please concerning entry of LCCNs in field 010 for a mono LP? I am creating an AACR2 master record to describe the disc as a unit. It was previously described with multiple separate records. On the slipcase are four LCCNs, two for the mono version and two for the stereo. Should I put both mono numbers in subfield $a as well as both stereo numbers in subfield $z? Or should I put all four in separate subfields $z? I'm leaning toward this solution, since the LCCNs serve as identifiers for bibliographic records, as in the formerly used phrase "LC card number" and those records are different ones from the one I'm creating.

A: Because you are recataloging the LP to AACR2 with the resource in hand, include both LCCNs for the mono version in separate subfields $z in field 010. Ignore those for the stereo version.

London's Decca Falling Up?

Q: We have a 1994 CD issued on the London label (OCLC #31429452), but we had to order a replacement. The new CD is identical to the old one (publisher number, UPC, etc.), except that it is on the Decca label, and it was made/printed in Germany instead of the U.S. Per Wikipedia: "For many years, Decca's British classical recordings were issued in the US under the London Records label because the company was not allowed to use its name there. When the MCA and PolyGram labels merged in 1999 and created Universal Music, the practice was eliminated." So, is it correct to input a separate record, as has been done in OCLC #607321882 (which would need editing before using)? Or would some other approach be more appropriate, such as using the London record but adding a note about some copies being on the Decca label, with a corresponding 028 for Decca?

A: The old London/Decca problem, and many similar situations in this era of mergers and acquisitions, drives us catalogers crazy. Following AACR2; "Differences Between, Changes Within;" and "When to Input a New Record," there doesn't seem to be any conclusion but that separate records would be justified. You *always* have the option of following your second approach of locally editing an existing record.

Deposit Questions Here

Q: I have a CD bearing what seems to be a legal deposit date, which I don't think I've seen before, except on books. Even with books, I was never quite sure how to handle legal deposit dates in the 260. The record label is Poll Winners Records, which is based in Andorra (or possibly Spain), judging by a few pages I saw on the Internet. I am sure this CD was released in 2010; the liner notes were written in 2010, and Amazon gives a date of May 11, 2010. There is no straightforward date on the piece, but on the back of the container is this:

> P & C Poll Winners Records
> D.L. AND. 829-2010 Made in the EU

What do you recommend for the 260 subfield $c? "p2010" or "[2010]"? Would the solution be the same regardless of whether or not I knew for a fact that it was released in 2010? Is it legal to transcribe what I see on the container as "p2010"? What do you make of 829? The OCLC number is #758887906.

A: Legal Deposit dates on sound recordings have been brought to my attention at least once before that I can recall. In the MARC 21 definition of Type of Date/Publications Status (008/06) code "t" for Publication Date and Copyright Date, it states in part: "Deposit dates (i.e., those preceded by "D.L." (Dépot légal), etc.) may be treated as copyright dates" (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd008a.html). Given what you say here and what is in the bibliographic record, I think I'd go with "[2010?]" as the inferred date of publication. Regular copyright dates are not supposed to apply to the sound recording itself, but to other, usually textual matter (or package design and the like) that is associated with the recording. Not knowing if legal deposit dates on a recording can be interpreted as a phonogram copyright date, I'd err on the side of using it only to infer a date of publication, and would limit my use of phonogram copyright dates as a substitute for a date of publication to those dates that are explicitly identified as such (with the ℗ symbol). My initial guess was that the designation "AND. 829-2010" was the Andorran legal deposit number. The legal deposit information page on the website of the Biblioteca Nacional d'Andorra (http://www.bibliotecanacional.ad/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=16&Itemid=22) seems to corroborate that. So the "AND. 829-2010" could go in field 017 subfield $a, if you're so inclined, with "Biblioteca Nacional d'Andorra" as the name of the "Assigning Agency" in subfield $b.

When Subject Headings are Blunt Instruments

Q: I am looking at *Cataloger's Judgment*, question 7.4, regarding the subject headings "[Instrument] music (Jazz)" and "[Instrument] with jazz ensemble." You said either or both would be appropriate for a saxophone with rhythm section. Is that still your take on the matter? Lately, I have encountered a lot of records for jazz CDs with just a rhythm section, where the pianist is the leader (Gerald Clayton, Orrin Evans, Benny Green), and they don't consistently use one or the other heading. However, I have noticed that the records that are in better shape overall tend to use "Piano music (Jazz)," and that the ones that need some work tend to use "Piano with jazz ensemble." That latter heading doesn't strike me as being quite right, and I have formed the impression over the years that the former heading would be the one to use when bringing out one of the instruments, such as the leader of a jazz trio or quartet. What do you think?

A: The original Q&A that you cite dates from May 2000. The whole world has changed since then, apparently including the *Subject Headings Manual* H 1916.5 ("Music: Jazz and Popular Music"). The text that I quoted has been greatly altered in the interim. The relevant passages now read:

> a. *Jazz*. Assign the heading **Jazz**, with geographic and chronological subdivisions if appropriate. In addition:
> *(1) Solo jazz*. Assign headings of the type **Piano music (Jazz)** or **Guitar music (Jazz)** to jazz for a solo instrument.
> *(2) Solo instrument(s) accompanied by jazz ensemble*. Assign headings of the type **Trumpet with jazz ensemble** or **Concertos (Piano and saxophone with jazz ensemble)** to music for one or more solo instruments accompanied by a jazz ensemble.

As I read the current text, it sounds as though "[Instrument] music (Jazz)" headings are now used *only* for solo instrumental music. Reading between the lines here, in such subject headings as "Jazz" (sh85069833; "Here are entered jazz instrumental works for two or more performers"), and looking through the list of established headings in the subject authority file that have "jazz" and/or "jazz ensemble" somewhere within them, it appears as though headings of the type "[Instrument] with jazz ensemble" are now used whenever a solo instrument or solo instruments are accompanied by two or more other performers. This is bolstered by SHM H 1917.5, Section 5.b(6), which reads: "Jazz ensembles. The term 'jazz ensembles' is not used as a main heading (cf. the see also reference in the authority record **Jazz**). However, it may be used as a medium of performance to designate a group of two or more solo instruments with other accompaniment, or to designate the accompanying group itself." So "jazz ensemble" can be used to designate only two or more instruments, logically enough. All of the formerly valid headings for "jazz duets" (such as "Double bass and piano music (Jazz)") are now no-longer-used 450s in the "Jazz" authority record. There appears to be no heading other than "Jazz" itself to cover a featured instrument accompanied by another single instrument. In other words, it appears that one can no longer bring out in subject headings the fact that one of two instruments is featured, although one can do so when the accompaniment consists of two or more instruments. That puzzled me, but seems to be just the way it is. So if you've got a featured saxophone accompanied by a rhythm section consisting of two or more performers, "Saxophone with jazz ensemble" (sh85117864) would be the correct subject heading. On the other hand if the rhythm "section" is a single performer, there seems to be no way to highlight the soloist. Oh well. It ends up that I made it much more difficult than it really was.

Hello Goodbye, GMD Edition

Q: My question is about subfield $h [music] (example: OCLC #271808618). This GMD is permissible per AACR2, but I know many libraries do not use it, or at least the majority of score records do not contain it. I have the same resource to catalog. Is it wrong to remove subfield $h [music] from the master record when I replace the record with more information? Should I only remove subfield $h [music] from local edits but leave it in the master record? I have seen subfield $h [music] many times, so I thought I'd better ask about OCLC policy on this.

A: The list of GMDs that the Library of Congress applies is documented in LCRI 1.1C. OCLC refines that list in *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* Chapter 2.1, Original Cataloging and Copy Cataloging (http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/onlinecataloging/default.shtm#BCGFECEG), in the section entitled "GMDs and Library of Congress Rule Interpretations." The GMD "[music]" is not one of those sanctioned by either LC or OCLC, so you may feel free to edit it out of the master record. Those institutions choosing to use the GMD "[music]" should use it only locally.

Damian Iseminger
MOUG Newsletter Editor
Spaulding Library
New England Conservatory
290 Huntington Ave.
Boston, MA 02115-5018   ADDRESS SERVICE REQUEST

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal Membership is $30.00 (North America) and $45 (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. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.

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, Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, P.O. Box 208240, New Haven, CT 06520-8240.