The good stuff is inside. TURN THE PAGE!

When I received the email from our editor reminding me that the deadline for Newsletter items was approaching, I jokingly replied that my entire column could be those two sentences. After all, on the following pages you will find the latest news from OCLC, along with Jay Weitz’s informative and entertaining Q&A column. And best of all, Continuing Education Coordinator Mac Nelson writes about the wonderful offerings that the Program Committee has come up with for our Annual Meeting in Atlanta on February 25-26.

But upon reflection I find that I do have some more things to say in this, my final “From the Chair” column. Mainly, what I need to say is “thank you.”

First and foremost, my thanks to last year’s Past Chair, Steve Luttmann, and this year’s Vice-Chair, Bruce Evans, both excellent colleagues and friends, who have been very good at watching the calendar and keeping me on task with well-timed reminders. I would have been lost without them!

Thanks to Treasurer Casey Mullin, who is always brimming with excellent ideas and has the enthusiasm to see them through. Thanks also to Secretary/Newsletter Editor Mary Huismann, whose thoughtfulness and quiet efficiency are greatly appreciated. And, of course, thanks to our stalwart OCLC Liaison, Jay Weitz, not only for opening his home to us for our summer Board meetings, but for the wisdom and humor he brings to our discussions.

Thanks to Mac Nelson and the 2013 Program Committee, who put together an outstanding meeting in San José, and the 2014 Program Committee, who will no doubt do so again in Atlanta.

Thanks in advance go out to our Web Visioning Task Force, who have been charged with completely reimagining the MOUG website. The group consists of Bruce Evans, Casey Mullin, Tomoko Shibuya, Autumn Faulkner, Chris Holden, Sean Luyk, and Web Keeper Jen Matthews. I am especially delighted that so many members who are fairly new to the profession have taken the opportunity to serve MOUG in this effort. This bodes well for the future of the organization, and I can’t wait to see what they have for us in Atlanta!
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: Mary Huismann, University of Minnesota Libraries, 160 Wilson Library, 309 19th Ave. S., Minneapolis, MN 55455.

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 Casey Mullin, MOUG Treasurer, Head, Data Control Unit, Stanford University Libraries, P.O. Box 20262, Palo Alto, CA 94309. (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
William “Mac” Nelson
The University of North Carolina At Greensboro

This is my last report as MOUG Continuing Education Coordinator, so I would like to begin by thanking you for the support you have offered the Program Committee and me over the last two years. I was a relative newcomer to the organization when I agreed (with some trepidation) to stand for election as Continuing Education Coordinator. However, I was encouraged then, as I am now, by the spirited, substantive quality of the ongoing conversation among members of MOUG, something that had greatly impressed me back in 2009 while attending my first Annual Meeting in Chicago. Such a responsive membership is a program planner’s godsend! As I believe you will see, the offerings we have in store for you at the 2014 Annual Meeting in Atlanta bear testimony to the lively exchange of ideas so characteristic of the MOUG membership.

Recent discussion of the OCLC Enhance program has provided the concept for our opening plenary session, *Etiquette for Replacing Records*, which will begin at 2:30 PM on Tuesday (2/25). While the “hot topic” of credit and incentives has figured centrally in this conversation of late, a number of our members have also expressed interest in hearing from some of their more seasoned MOUG colleagues on particulars of the enhance process. So, the Program Committee has convened a panel that will address both matters. Jay Weitz (OCLC) will open the session with a discussion of OCLC regulations on upgrading records and the future of credit and incentives. Following Jay’s presentation, a team of veteran music catalogers, anchored by Neil Hughes (University of Georgia), will describe their institutional procedures and priorities for upgrading and replacing records. This conversation will lead quite naturally into the annual *Enhance and Expert Community Working Session* to follow.

Tuesday’s second plenary, *RDA and Authorities*, will also feature an important and familiar topic of conversation in the present era of RDA. Here again the Program Committee felt that the panel discussion format would serve the subject well, and we are happy to have convened an excellent panel inclusive of Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland), Jean Harden (University of North Texas), and Morris Levy (Northwestern University). Each panelist will present on a particular aspect of the topic before opening the floor to audience questions and discussion—and I should add in this regard that the panelists are particularly interested in having questions from the MOUG membership submitted in advance. (So, you may expect a “call for RDA and Authorities questions” to have appeared on MOUG-L by the time this issue of the Newsletter reaches you.) The *NACO-Music Project* meeting will conclude Tuesday’s offerings.

Jay Weitz will provide us a rousing start on Wednesday morning (2/26) with another welcome edition of *MOUG Hot Topics*, after which the third annual round of *Lightning Talks: Cataloging Challenges with RDA* will no doubt prove equally rousing. (What a great boon it is to be planning MOUG programs in the golden age of the lightning talks format!) This year’s cast will include both new and returning presenters, each of whom will focus on specific problems encountered while cataloging in RDA. The program on Wednesday will conclude with the MOUG Business Meeting.

If you have questions for our presenters on any of the session topics or wish to submit questions and issues for consideration in the MOUG Hot Topics session, please send them to me at wmnelson@uncg.edu. Additionally, we would very much appreciate your assistance at the MOUG registration desk. Any of you who contact me to volunteer in this capacity will be given the hero’s welcome you deserve.

Sincere thanks go to A-R Editions and the Music Library Association for enabling us once again to make online registration an option this year at http://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/events/attendees.asp?id=345198.

Finally, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the MOUG 2014 Program Committee and the MOUG Board for all their hard work and resourcefulness in putting together what promises to be a terrific program. See you in Atlanta!!!

From the Chair
(Continued from page 1)

Finally, let me say thank you to all of you, the members of MOUG. It has been a great honor and privilege to serve as Chair of this wonderful group. Your dedication, support, and excitement about the work you do inspire me, and I hope that I have managed to live up to the trust you have placed in me these past two years.

I look forward to seeing many of you in Atlanta, and then to passing the gavel to the capable hands of Bruce Evans and the next MOUG Board.
Music OCLC Users Group Annual Meeting
Tuesday-Wednesday, February 25-26, 2014
Grand Hyatt Atlanta in Buckhead, Atlanta, Georgia

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

Tuesday, February 25, 2014

8:00 AM-1:00 PM  MOUG Board Meeting
1:30-6:30 PM     Registration
2:30-3:30 PM     Plenary Session: Etiquette for Replacing Bibliographic Records
                 Jay Weitz (OCLC), Neil Hughes (University of Georgia), additional music librarians (TBA)
3:30-4:30 PM     Enhance and Expert Community Working Session
4:30-5:00 PM     Cookies and Lemonade
5:00-6:00 PM     Plenary Session: RDA and Authorities Panel
                 Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland), Jean Harden (University of North Texas),
                 Morris Levy (Northwestern University)
6:00-7:00 PM     NACO-Music Project

Wednesday, February 26, 2014

8:00-9:00 AM    Registration
8:00-8:30 AM    Coffee & Tea
8:30-9:30 AM    MOUG Hot Topics
                 Jay Weitz (OCLC)
9:30-10:30 AM   Lightning Talks: Cataloging Challenges with RDA
                 Sonia Archer-Capuzzo (University of North Carolina at Greensboro), Rebecca
                 Belford (University at Buffalo), Sarah Hess Cohen (Florida State University), Beth
                 Iseminger (Harvard University), Kevin Kishimoto (University of Chicago), Tracey
                 Snyder (Cornell University)
10:30-10:45 AM  Break
10:45-11:45 AM  MOUG Business Meeting
**REGISTRATION**

MOUG is offering online registration through the Music Library Association (MLA) conference registration page, located at [http://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/events/attendees.asp?id=345198](http://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/events/attendees.asp?id=345198). You do not need to have an account on the MLA website in order to register. The MOUG portion of the registration form is located just below the MLA registration options.

Early registration ends **24 January 2014**. Registration after that date must be done (at a higher rate) either by contacting the MLA Business Office (608-836-5825) or on site at the conference.

**CONFERENCE HOTEL**

**Grand Hyatt Buckhead**

3300 Peachtree Road NE  
Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30305  
888-421-1442


Conference rates are available for several days preceding and following the conference dates.

---

**Calling All Writers — Volunteers Needed!**

Volunteers are needed to write summaries of the presentations given at the 2014 MOUG annual meeting in Atlanta.

Summaries should be no more than 1,500 words and must be submitted to the Editor by Friday, March 14, 2014. The summaries will be published in the June issue of the MOUG Newsletter.

If you are interested in writing a summary, please contact Newsletter Editor Mary Huismann at huism002@umn.edu.

Photos from the annual meeting may be run in the June issue on a space-available basis. Contact the Newsletter Editor for further information.
OCLC Adding FAST Headings to Selected WorldCat Records

FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology) is a fully enumerative faceted subject heading schema derived from the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), a widely-used subject-access vocabulary published and maintained by the Library of Congress. The development of FAST has been a collaboration of OCLC and the Library of Congress with advice from members of the ALCTS/SAC/Subcommittee on FAST.

Beginning in September 2013, OCLC is systematically adding FAST headings to WorldCat bibliographic records. The records affected will already have LCSH assigned, and the routines will be applied only to records that are attributed as being English-language-of-cataloging. FAST-enriched WorldCat records will include “OCLCF” in the MARC 040 subfield $d, have one or -- more likely -- several 6XX fields with a second indicator of “7” and subfield $2 that contains the string, “fast.” Additionally, subfield $0 (zero) will be present in the machine-process-added FAST headings -- this provides the FAST authority record number.

The processes performing this FAST enrichment work in WorldCat will run as background processes and should not adversely impact system performance. OCLC will initially prioritize the enriching records originally created by the Library of Congress and then will apply the FAST enrichment process to records from other sources. For the initial run, records will be excluded from FAST enrichment until at least six months from date of entry have elapsed.

OCLC Research and other agencies have been experimenting with using FAST for a variety of purposes and in a range of application for many years. FAST has repeatedly proven itself to be remarkably effective for clustering, indexing, analysis, and navigation of WorldCat data. The FAST headings have been drawn from a non-production, enriched copy of WorldCat maintained by OCLC Research. And as such, these FAST enrichments have not been easily available to many OCLC applications and also to interested third parties. This enrichment of WorldCat will permit more applications and agencies to take advantage of FAST.

Going forward OCLC has plans to make FAST available in its cataloging tools. In particular, a FAST assignment feature will be released in early 2014 in an updated version of OCLC WorldShare Metadata Record Manager, which is currently available to WMS libraries and will be available to all cataloging subscribers in the future. More detailed information about this enrichment of WorldCat is available at http://www.oclc.org/en-US/news/announcements/2013/enriching-worldcat-with-fast.html. Please contact OCLC-Support at support@oclc.org with any questions or concerns related to this announcement.

Issue 10 of OCLC Research Quarterly Highlights Now Available

This periodic bulletin gathers items from the previous quarter of work in OCLC Research, the OCLC Innovation Lab, and the OCLC Research Library Partnership. Issue 10 covers the period of July - September 2013. Highlights include:

- Lorcan Dempsey on how students engage with the network and open access resources.
- Brian Lavoie on the variety of topics he has investigated in OCLC Research.
- Three featured prototypes.
- Eight publications released during the quarter.
- A recap of OCLC Research news, events, webcasts, and presentations.
- The six themes that shape our work, with a featured activity from each.

OCLC, Plum Analytics Use WorldCat to Measure Impact of Research

OCLC has established a partnership with Plum Analytics, an altmetrics organization that develops analytical tools for scholars and researchers, to leverage WorldCat data to help researchers better analyze and measure the impact of their work. Plum Analytics provides a set of tools and services that capture, aggregate, and synthesize the big data created from resources, including journal articles, books, videos, presentations, and datasets, to characterize how research is used and referenced in various communities.

Plum Analytics has integrated the WorldCat Search API into its PlumX analytics dashboard to retrieve aggregate library holdings information from the WorldCat database, the largest collection of bibliographic data in the world. Access to this data is enabled by OCLC WorldShare applications, which expose Web services and data for use and reuse by third party partners. Scholars will now be able to see how well their published works are included in the collections of libraries globally to help measure the impact of their research. This partnership demonstrates OCLC’s commitment to provide broad access to WorldCat data for a wide range of creative uses. OCLC supplies analytics organizations with WorldCat data to help define how collections are being used and to provide researchers and libraries with an extended range of applications that take advantage of the same core data.

To learn more about PlumAnalysis and the PlumX application, check the Plum Analytics website at www.plumanalytics.com. To learn more about the WorldCat Search API and WorldCat.org partner programs, visit the OCLC website.

EZproxy 5.7.26 Now Available

New features added to EZproxy 5.7.26 include support for SHA-256 signing of SAML assertions. This change makes it easier to integrate with Active Directory Federation Services (ADFS) and provides support for some federations that require SHA-256 signing. Additional bug fixes include the following:

- Implemented a warning for the SSLCipherSuite directive that states that it needs to be in config.txt before the LoginPortSSL directive in order for it to take effect.
- Resolved a problem where III authentication with a Password PIN using https would fail.
- Other general bug fixes were also addressed in this release.

A hosted version of EZproxy is available. Libraries that subscribe to the hosted version are automatically and seamlessly upgraded with each new release of the service. They also enjoy 24 x 7 x 365 support for off-site authentication of electronic content with no servers or IT infrastructure required.

We encourage you to upgrade to EZproxy 5.7.26 or move to the hosted version to stay current with the latest features. Please review the enhancements page (http://www.oclc.org/support/services/ezproxy/documentation/changes.en.html) and upgrade (http://www.oclc.org/support/services/ezproxy/documentation/download.en.html) at your earliest convenience.
Publishers Partner with OCLC to Improve Workflows for Electronic Content

OCLC has finalized agreements with international content providers to add more electronic collections to the WorldCat database. Incorporating these databases into WorldCat and the WorldCat knowledge base will improve access to these collections and simplify administration for libraries that use OCLC WorldShare Metadata services. These agreements will also reduce the cost and time spent managing updates to these online collections for libraries that have registered with the knowledge base, and will provide immediate access for libraries that subscribe or want to purchase these collections. The value for libraries is that multiple applications will be able to access the metadata to simplify workflows for managing electronic materials. The following new publisher agreements have been signed since June 2013. These collections will be added to WorldCat over the next few months.

- Al Manhal, Dubai, UAE, is the leading Arabic electronic content service provider. It is the industry’s only provider of full-text, searchable electronic databases of peer-reviewed and copyright-protected Arabic publications. Al Manhal combines publishing and library industry expertise with best-in-class technology to enable academics, researchers, and library users to efficiently discover and access thousands of electronic publications from the Arab world’s leading publishers and research institutes.

- Confidential Concepts, Inc., Newark, Delaware, USA, offers hundreds of fine art titles about artists, art genres, photography, and more. These books contain hundreds of high-resolution images and are available in English, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, and other languages.

- Ecological Society of America (ESA), Washington D.C., USA, publishes to make broadly available the most significant results of ecological research, particularly those that increase the understanding and applications of general ecological concepts. ESA publishes a suite of journals, in suitable forms, that address the interests of all appropriate readers, including scientists, students, educators, resource managers, and other users of ecological knowledge.

- Henry Stewart Talks Ltd, London, UK, provides access to world-class seminars by leading thinkers and authorities from around the globe, in one online resource—wherever, whenever, and as often as it is wanted in the subject areas of biomedical and life sciences, and marketing and management.

- Internet Scientific Publications (ISPUB), Sugar Land, Texas, USA, is a collection of more than 80 peer-reviewed, open access medical and scientific journals covering a wide range of topics, disciplines, and specialties, with authorship from around the world. Recently published articles are available on ISPUB’s website and access to previously published articles is made available through ISPUB’s library of archived journals.

- New York University Press, New York, New York, USA, is committed to publishing, in both electronic and print format. The organization’s publishing program includes general interest or trade books, scholarly monographs, regional books, reference books, college texts, paperback reprints, and e-texts. It now publishes 110 new books each year.

- SciELO, São Paulo, Brazil, is known and respected globally for indexing and publishing peer-reviewed, open access academic e-journals, and most recently, for SciELO Books, which promotes the advancement of research by facilitating the communication of its results. SciELO publishes more than 1,000 journals with more than 417,000 journal articles from 17 countries, mainly from Latin America and the Caribbean region, and also including Portugal, Spain, and South Africa. SciELO Books is a collection of quality peer-reviewed, open access, and commercial e-books in the humanities, social sciences, and public health from selected university presses and other academic publishers in Brazil.

- The ciando GmbH, Munich, Germany, is one of the major e-book aggregators for academic libraries in Germany. The ciando library offers universities more than 250,000 books, most of which are German, from 1,300 publishers, and include nonfiction and literature from all relevant scientific disciplines: economics, management, law, computer, technology, medicine, psychology, education, culture, politics, history, philosophy, and religion.

Both WorldCat and the WorldCat knowledge base continue to grow with new providers and collections. For more information on current content lists, see the WorldCat Local and WorldCat knowledge base pages on OCLC.org.
Three Canadian Institutions Using OCLC WorldShare Management Services

Lethbridge College, Tyndale University College and Seminary, and University of New Brunswick in Canada are now using OCLC WorldShare Management Services (WMS), moving library management services to the cloud. More than 240 libraries worldwide have selected WMS; more than 150 libraries are currently using the services. WorldShare Management Services streamline cataloguing, acquisitions, license management, and circulation workflows, and offer the WorldCat Local discovery service for library users. WMS is a cooperative, cloud-based library management system. It moves shared data and routine yet critical library functions to the cloud. These, combined with the use of the WorldCat database, generate cost benefits, simplified workflows, and time savings for libraries, which weren’t previously possible when using disparate and specialized library systems. The data centre in Toronto enables OCLC to support access and data privacy requirements in Canada, as well as technical standards that promote the cost-effective, worldwide sharing of information across platforms, scripts, languages, and cultural materials. The Toronto data centre employs best-in-class technologies to ensure the highest levels of performance, reliability, scalability, and cost-effectiveness.

OCLC Acquires Dutch Library Systems Provider HKA

OCLC has acquired the shares of Huijsmans en Kuijpers Automatisering (HKA), a Dutch organization that develops, implements, and manages systems for libraries, educational and cultural organizations. The addition of HKA, which offers the Wise line of library systems and services, enhances and extends OCLC services for libraries in the Netherlands. OCLC currently manages the infrastructure for interlibrary loan for many Dutch libraries and offers cataloging services through the GGC, the Dutch shared cataloging system, and the WorldCat global shared cataloging system. OCLC and HKA staff will now work together to accelerate the development and delivery of innovative services for libraries. The HKA staff of 29 will continue activities from current locations in Paterswolde and Oss in the Netherlands. The Wise line of library systems, including bicatWise, will continue to be developed and maintained. Moving forward, the staff will also deliver new cloud solutions for the combined user base. Henk Kuijpers, Jos Huijsmans, and Paul Lucassen will continue as directors of HKA.

National Library of New Zealand Moves Te Puna Interloan Service to OCLC

The National Library of New Zealand is working with OCLC to improve interlibrary lending and reduce costs by moving the infrastructure of the national Te Puna Interloan network to the hosted version of OCLC’s VDX resource sharing system. OCLC’s VDX document delivery and management system fully automates the requesting and supply of books and journal articles for libraries that use the Te Puna Interloan system. The National Library of New Zealand has selected OCLC to host and manage this system, which greatly reduces the organization’s administrative workload and reduces maintenance tasks. The national interlibrary loan infrastructure is now hosted in OCLC’s data center, with local support provided by OCLC staff, in Melbourne, Australia. Eighty-eight percent of New Zealand libraries use Te Puna Interloan, including small public libraries, large university libraries, and a variety of special libraries. The system generates approximately 102,000 requests per year and includes interlibrary loans between libraries in Australia and New Zealand. VDX facilitates Te Puna’s interloan payment service, tracking the financial transactions between the supplying and requesting organizations, which enables the National Library to generate invoices. This move positions Te Puna Services and the National Library of New Zealand for additional next-generation technology.

For more information about the National Library of New Zealand and its Te Puna Services, visit http://natlib.govt.nz/librarians/te-puna. More about OCLC’s VDX service is on the OCLC website.
Role of Data Reuse in the Apprenticeship Process

Written by Adam Kriesberg, Rebecca D. Frank, Ixchel M. Faniel, and Elizabeth Yakel, "The Role of Data Reuse in the Apprenticeship Process" describes how data reuse provides a pathway to internalizing disciplinary norms and methods of inquiry for novice quantitative social scientists, archaeologists, and zoologists on their way to becoming members of their respective disciplinary communities. The paper will be published in the forthcoming ASIS&T 2013 Annual Meeting Proceedings. A preprint is currently available online at http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2013/faniel-data-reuse-apprenticeship.pdf. Key findings from "The Role of Data Reuse in the Apprenticeship Process" include:

- Data reuse provides a unique opportunity for advisors to mentor students through the research process by both guiding the student’s research project and walking them through the research of others.
- Beyond learning how to select and analyze data, reuse was a pathway to various aspects of disciplinary culture, including the formation of ethics, norms for evidence, and interdisciplinary approaches to research.
- In addition to traditional interactions with advisors, students observed data reuse in the literature and critiqued data producer's documentation to learn what constitutes acceptable vs. unacceptable research practices within their discipline.
- Repository tools and services matter: Well-written documentation, data citations, and links to works were used by students to see whether data production and analysis aligned with disciplinary norms and could be reused to answer new research questions.

This work is related to an earlier research project reported in a 2012 paper written by Ixchel M. Faniel, Adam Kriesberg, and Elizabeth Yakel, "Data Reuse and Sensemaking among Novice Social Scientists." The 2012 report explains how novice social science researchers make sense of others’ data. The findings also indicate that novices are heavily influenced by more experienced social science researchers when it comes to discovering, evaluating, and justifying their reuse of other’s data. Published in the ASIS&T 2012 Annual Meeting Proceedings, it is also available as a preprint online at http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2012/faniel-data-reuse-sensemaking.pdf.

New Schedule for the Transition to WorldShare Interlibrary Loan

In response to requests from many members of the OCLC resource sharing community, OCLC has extended access to WorldCat Resource Sharing through 19 May 2014. The new transition schedule provides additional time for ILL staffs to fully learn the new WorldShare ILL service while retaining access to WorldCat Resource Sharing. New WorldShare ILL transition dates are:

2014 April 14: End of placing new requests in WorldCat Resource Sharing.

2014 May 19: End of access to WorldCat Resource Sharing.

Thank you to those of you who have completed your transitions from WorldCat Resource Sharing to WorldShare ILL. You have provided leadership for others whose transitions are in process. We invite you to share your WorldShare ILL experiences with others through an upcoming webinar or a written summary we can share on the OCLC website. Please let us know of your interest in helping your ILL colleagues by sending an email to ILLstory@oclc.org. OCLC will continue to add new features to the service. There are no planned releases of new functionality between November 2013 and February 2014, to give you an opportunity to become more familiar with WorldShare ILL during a three-month period when the service remains essentially unchanged.
Updates to ArchiveGrid Index and Interface Improve User Experience

Recent changes to the OCLC Research ArchiveGrid collection of archival material descriptions have resulted in a better experience for ArchiveGrid users.

- The latest ArchiveGrid index update puts the number of archival material descriptions in ArchiveGrid over the two million mark, giving users access to more archival descriptions than ever.
- The ArchiveGrid user interface now utilizes Twitter Bootstrap, which provides a "mobile first" front-end framework that enables ArchiveGrid to work well on smartphones and tablets, as well as many other responsive design and layout features.
- In addition, individual collection description pages now include more contact information for archival institutions, as well as links to related materials such as finding aids or digital images.

OCLC Research staff are evaluating ArchiveGrid's analytics to learn how these changes are improving its visibility and utility. They are also evaluating additional new features that could extend ArchiveGrid's reach. See the ArchiveGrid blog post, A fresh look for ArchiveGrid means there are more places to call home (http://beta.worldcat.org/archivegrid/blog/?p=1340), for more information about these changes.

ArchiveGrid provides a foundation for OCLC Research collaboration and interactions with the archival community, and also serves as the basis for our experimentation and testing in text mining, data analysis, and discovery system applications and interfaces.

Try the new ArchiveGrid (http://beta.worldcat.org/archivegrid/) or see the ArchiveGrid activity page (http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/archivegrid.html) for more information about ArchiveGrid.

OCLC Adds New Features to WorldShare ILL

New features now available in OCLC WorldShare® Interlibrary Loan include printing and workflow options completely new to WorldShare ILL. Several of the new features are listed below, and additional details about these enhancements are available at http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/support/release-notes/worldshare-interlibrary-loan/Releases/wsill_release_notes_2013-09.pdf. Enhancements to printing include:

- Print a request directly from within the request, eliminating the need to print from the request queue.
- Redesigned 1-per-page and 2-per-page printouts.

See a summary of WorldShare ILL printing enhancements at http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/services/Enhancements_update.pdf. Workflow enhancements include:

- New display results of request searches. Search results are now divided into separate borrower and lender result sets.
- One-step transfer of bibliographic data and holdings into new requests from a "View Holdings" display.
- Lenders can now edit request details after responding yes to the request.

View the recording of an overview of new WorldShare ILL features that includes a chat with OCLC’s WorldShare Interlibrary Loan team at http://www.oclc.org/en-US/events/2013/WorldShareILLchatandupdate92613.html.
E-resource Advisory Council Advances Electronic Resource Management

OCLC’s E-resource Advisory Council, a group of library leaders who are helping to guide the cooperative in advancing its electronic resource management strategy, has been expanded to continue work on strategy and related solutions. The new E-resource Advisory Council will work with OCLC for one year. Over the last two years, the council has helped inform the development of OCLC solutions for the acquisition, exposure, management, and access of libraries’ electronic collections. Each year, the membership of the group changes and objectives are adjusted based on progress. The council began its third term 2013 August 1 when new members were introduced. The E-resource Advisory Council has influenced the cooperative’s direction in electronic resource management since it was formed in 2011, including:

- Progress of the WorldCat knowledge base, the database which tracks library holdings of electronic resources.
- Development of WorldShare Metadata Collection Manager, the service that automatically delivers WorldCat MARC records for electronic materials to libraries and ensures that metadata and access URLs for these collections are continually updated.

Recommendations for new e-resource partnerships.

Members of the E-resource Advisory Council include:

- Audrey Bondar, Librarian, Henry Ford Hospital
- Brett Bonfield, Director, Collingswood Public Library
- David Bryant, Cataloging Supervisor, Louisville Free Public Library
- Maria Collins, Head of Acquisitions & Discovery, North Carolina State University
- Joseph Hafner, Senior Director, Collection Services, McGill University
- Dawn Hale, Head of Technical Services, Johns Hopkins University
- Christine Hoeppner, Head, Resource Analysis & Service Assessment, The University of Winnipeg
- Simone Kortekaas, Innovation & Development, project manager/consultant, Utrecht University
- Sarah Price, Assistant Director, Collection Management & Development, University of Birmingham
- Carlen Ruschoff, Director of Technical Services, University of Maryland
- Sarah Haight Sanabria, Leader, Electronic Resources & Serials, Southern Methodist University
- Gregg Silvis, Associate University Librarian for Information Technology and Digital Initiatives, University of Delaware
- Karla Strieb, Associate Director, Collections, Technical Services, and Scholarly Communication, The Ohio State University
- Adolfo R. Tarango, Assistant Program Director - Metadata Services, University of California San Diego
- Holly Tomren, Head, Metadata Services, Drexel University Libraries
- Marlene Van Ballegooie, Metadata Librarian, the University of Toronto Libraries
- Nick Woolley, Head of Academic Library Services, Northumbria University

This OCLC E-resource Advisory Council represents academic, public, and special libraries from the Americas and Europe. The group will meet regularly over the next 12 months to share their experiences and act as a sounding board for OCLC’s developments in this constantly changing area. For more information, visit the OCLC’s e-resource Advisory Council Web page (http://www.oclc.org/en-US/membership/participate/eresource-council.html), or send an e-mail to steve.taylor@oclc.org.
Keeping Tabs on the Score

**Question:** I’m curious about tablature in general. Would you say that fits under “graphical notation” and so has moved from “z” to “l” (el), once the latter is implemented? I always think of graphical notation as something like the violin parts in Penderecki’s *Threnody to the Victims of Hiroshima*, which is different from “here’s where you put your fingers.” But maybe they are just two kinds of graphical notation. What do you think? We get an occasional item that shows the guitar line twice, one below the other (with or without other instruments or vocals). Top half is in staff notation, bottom half is in guitar tablature. I’ve always called these full scores, code “a”, if there were other instruments and/or a vocal line, or “z” if it was solo guitar. It looks to me like code “l” will now always work, if tablature is indeed considered graphical. The intent is probably to cover staff OR graphical notation, not staff AND graphical notation simultaneously, but hey, why not? Using “m” seems inappropriate. Your thoughts? Then there’s the definition of code “l”, which includes the caution, “Do not confuse with Part” -- the capital letter suggesting Part is another option you can code for. But Part, by itself, is not one of the possible codes. What a circus. Maybe it will get cleaned up later, once code “a” is gone, but I’m not gonna hold my breath.

**Answer:** RDA defines tablature as follows: “Any notational system from 1300 or later that uses letters, numbers, or other signs as an alternative to conventional staff notation.” Once it is implemented, the new 008/20 code “l” for score will be defined as: “Graphical, symbolic (e.g., staff), or word-based musical notation representing the sounds of all the parts of an ensemble, arranged so that they can be read simultaneously, or a work for solo performer or electronic media. Do not confuse with Part.” As I read those definitions, code “l” would be used for any notated music, including tablature, that represents “the sounds of all the parts of an ensemble” or a solo performer. In other words, staff AND/OR graphical notation. If all the parts are not represented, a code other than “l” would be appropriate. So a solo guitar work that includes both staff notation and tablature would be coded “l”. The key (no pun intended) differentiating factor has now become whether the sounds of all parts are represented. That “Part” may be capitalized with the RDA definition in mind: “In the context of notated music, a component consisting of the music for the use of one or more, but not all, performers.” That again reinforces the difference between the sounds of all parts being represented or not all parts.

Hanging Out with the FAST Crowd

**Question:** Following up on the recent announcement that FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology) headings were being added to selected WorldCat records, I was wondering: Since the FAST music headings are very similar to (or the same as?) LCSH headings, will this affect music bib records?

**Answer:** My Office of Research colleague Kerre Kammerer offers the following response: Basically, we convert the subfield $v$ to a subfield $x$ in order to keep the music subdivisions together:

- **LCSH:** 650 Orchestral music $v$ Scores and parts
- **FAST:** 650 Orchestral music $x$ Scores and parts

$2$ fast $0$ (OCoLC)fst01047299

Kerre also refers us to the Fast Search Tool (http://fast.oclc.org/searchfast/) and the FAST Conversion tester (http://experimental.worldcat.org/fast/fastconverter/) for additional information and to play around with.
Questions & Answers

Too Much Information?

**Question:** I have encountered a few records recently that have confused me a bit, and I wanted to try to gain some perspective with your help. Basically, what I’ve seen is RDA records that include information that I’m not sure is supposed to be there. A few times, I’ve seen Score records with 380, 382, and 383 fields. I thought these were for use with authority records, but are they also something that we can/should use in bibliographic records? Also, I found a record that had a 260 field and two 264 fields. The information in the 260 is all repeated in the 264s. What would be the correct course of action with a record like this? Delete the 260? Leave it there?

**Answer:** The 380-384 fields clearly make the most sense in authority records for works and/or expressions. The MLA draft document "Best Practices for Music Cataloging Using RDA and MARC21" (http://bcc.musiclibraryassoc.org/BCC-Historical/BCC2013/RDA_Best_Practices_for_Music_Cataloging.pdf) also recommends giving each of the elements in the respective 38X field when that element is being given as a component of an access point. See 6.3 Form of Work (380), 6.15 Medium of Performance (382), 6.16 Numeric Designation of a Musical Work (383), 6.17 Key (384), and 6.18 Other Distinguishing Characteristic of the Expression of a Musical Work (381) for specific details.

As for the 260/264 dilemma, the "PCC Guidelines for the 264 Field" (http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/264-Guidelines.doc) state:

"The following guidelines assume that 260 and 264 fields may co-exist in pre-RDA records and RDA records created before implementation of 264." For your own use, it would make sense to locally edit the record to remove either the 260 or the multiple 264s, depending upon your local practices.

Repeating Ourselves

**Question:** We’re in the middle of cataloging a massive set of Artur Rubinstein sound recordings, with two accompanying DVDs (for a total of 144 discs). We have language content associated with the CDs (an interview in English, plus the program notes) and language content associated with one of the DVDs (in English, with optional French and German subtitles). I was wondering how to slam this all together into a single 041 when it occurred to me to check if the 041 is repeatable — and it is. However, there are no examples I can find in either BFAS or in the MARC documentation about when to repeat field 041. And without the subfield $3? I’m not sure how you’d designate which 041 went with what. Would this be a situation where separate 041s for the CDs and the DVDs would make sense?

**Answer:** MARC 21 doesn’t say it outright, but the intention was to repeat field 041 only when more than one type of language coding scheme is used. Here’s what the “Content Designator History” says, in part: “In 2001: the practice of placing multiple language codes in one subfield, e.g., $a engfreger, was made obsolete and subfields $a, $b, $d, $e, $f, and $g were changed from Not-repeatable (NR) to Repeatable (R). The field was also changed from Not-repeatable (NR) to Repeatable (R) to accommodate non-MARC language codes.” In that final sentence, you have to read between the lines to determine the intention of repeating the field. If you are cataloging the whole shebang on a single bibliographic record, the 041 would be something like the following, if I’ve interpreted things accurately: 041 1 eng $j fre $j ger $h $d eng $g eng. It’s doubtful that Connexion would object to the input of multiple 041s using the same encoding scheme, but as you note, there’s no way to delineate (via subfield $3, for instance) what is what. You can outline the details in a 546 and/or 500 and/or 505, as appropriate.
Performance Anxiety

**Question:** We’re currently wondering how/where to enter the performer of a sound recording in RDA records. From what I can determine, it is inappropriate to enter the performer in a 1XX unless they have “substantial creative responsibility” (RDA 6.28.1.5). Does this mean that unless we know that the performer is also the composer that we must enter the performer in a 7XX? For example, we have a Johnny Cash Christmas album, and he clearly didn’t compose many of the selections.

**Answer:** As RDA and my understanding of it currently stand (both subject to revision, and with best practices still in draft and under development), a performer would have to be the composer as well in order to be properly recorded in a 100 field in an RDA record. It's also my understanding that RDA has abandoned the AACR2 concept of the "principal performer" and no longer makes the AACR2 "serious" idiom versus "popular" idiom distinction. So in a case such as the Johnny Cash Christmas album, Cash cannot be a 100 field, but must be a 700 field under RDA. Whether he's in a 100 field (only as part of a local edit) or in a 700 field, using the "performer" relator terms/codes is correct. There's a CC:DA task force involving members of both the Music Library Association and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers currently trying to rationalize RDA's treatment of statements of responsibility when performance is involved (moving images and performed music; MARC 245 subfield $c, 508, 511, and elsewhere), and we eagerly await what they come up with.

Well Qualified

**Question:** This is in reference to OCLC #419493206. I was unable to retrieve the record, even though I got to it a month ago. I kept simplifying my search (in the keyword/numeric search box), until I had only Knussen as a personal name and 2009 as a date. The only thing close was a Dutch-language record. Then on a whim I changed "Not internet" to "Any," and then I was able to retrieve it. I often have "Not internet" selected so I can avoid wading through streaming media results, and I've not encountered this problem until now. I don't see any coding in the Knussen record that seems awry. Am I missing something, or am I using "Not internet" improperly?

**Answer:** If you check the document "Searching WorldCat Indexes" ([http://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/searching/searchworldcatindexes.en.html/internet](http://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/searching/searchworldcatindexes.en.html/internet)), you'll see that the "Internet" qualifier is determined merely by the presence of field 856 in a record. For the record in question, there happens to be an 856 link to the cover art, which misleadingly throws the record into the "Internet" pile, so to speak. Unfortunately, the "Internet/Not Internet" qualifier is a blunt instrument in this respect, taking only the presence or absence of field 856 into account. Additionally, in this particular record, the 856 indicators followed obsolete practice regarding the indicators and use of subfield $2, dating from before the First Indicator value "4" for HTTP had been validated. I've corrected the 856 and now the record is not assigned the "Material Type "url" (defined in the "Searching" document). Instead of using the "Internet/Not Internet" qualifier index, try adding the somewhat more precise "not mt:url" key to your search. It intends to provide nuance that the Internet" qualifier doesn't. It tries to eliminate records that purport not to be Web resources themselves but merely to contain links to related resources by taking both "Form" and 856 coding into account. Remember though, that in searching we are always at the mercy of record coding and cataloging quality. A poorly cataloged or badly coded record will be that much more difficult to retrieve no matter how exacting we try to make our indexing.
Questions & Answers

If Four Were One

Question: I’m working with some items from a gift, and am running across a situation I haven’t seen since my undergraduate days. These are volumes where 4 pages of miniature score are reprinted on a single page of the new volume. The pagination of the original mini score of ca. 18 cm. is retained, so counting those I have 461 pages. But each page of the reprint volume, at 35 cm., is also paged; counting those, I have 116 pages. The copy I’m finding is AACR2, so that is the code I’m following to catalog these. I have combed the rules in 2.5B and find nothing that applies. AACR2 2.5B8, which covers “complicated or irregular” paging, is clearly meant for a different purpose. Same for using “1 v.” No one in WorldCat has used this rule for my situation. What I am finding in WorldCat is both ways: as 1 score (461 p.) and as 1 score (116 p.). Once I found a combination (461 p. on 116 p.), which makes a lot of sense but is not covered anywhere in the rules. Perhaps that person was extrapolating from 2.5B18, which covers the difference between bibliographic and physical volumes, e.g., “8 v. in 5.” Given the lack of consensus in WorldCat, it seems likely I’m not missing a rule somewhere, but if someone can make a compelling case for a way to do this, I’m all ears.

Answer: The situation you describe reminds me of the “Longmans miniature arrow score series,” published by Longmans, Green in the 1940s. Like you, I can find no guidance on this sort of pagination-within-pagination in AACR2 or its LCRIs without resorting to distortional extrapolations. By far, the most promising extrapolation would be the one you cite from 2.5B18, although the resulting formulations of “XX p. on XX p.” or “XX p. in XX p.” strike me as sure to cause end-user confusion. In this case, the simplest solution may work best and be most understandable to users. In field 300 subfield $a$, include only the pagination of the reprint volume. Then invoke 2.7B10 and create a note explaining the presence of four pages of the original miniature score on each page of the present reprint. For good measure, so to speak, include the original pagination, especially if it is continuous. If it’s not continuous, in cases where miniature scores not previously published together each have their own sub-paginations, that may merit further explanation. For what it’s worth, that would be my suggestion.

Cataloging in the Mixed Material World

Question: I know what extent, physical details, dimensions, and accompanying materials are. What are unit type, unit size, and Materials Specified?

Answer: RDA defines "unit" as "A physical or logical constituent of a resource (e.g., a volume, audiocassette, film reel, a map, a digital file)." MARC 21 field 300 subfield $f$, "Type of Unit," says: "Terms such as page, volumes, boxes, cu. ft., linear ft., etc. that are used to identify the configuration of material and how it is stored." Subfield $g$, "Size of Unit," says: "Size of a type of unit given in the preceding subfield $f$." Most commonly, these two subfields $f$ and $g$ are used in physical descriptions of various kinds of Mixed Materials, archival materials, and collections that tend to be housed in storage containers, boxes, drawers, and the like, and to be described in terms of linear or cubic measurements. In MARC 21, "Materials Specified" (subfield $3$ in many fields, including 300) is described as "Part of the described materials to which the field applies." Subfield $3$ is used when the field in question describes or applies to only a specific part or aspect of the resource. For instance, if you are cataloging a children's book and a sound recording of the book issued together, you may want to use subfield $3$ in certain fields to differentiate fields that apply to the book from those fields that apply to the recording.
**Will the Real John Ellis Please Stand Up?**

**Question:** Does anyone have any information as to just which John Ellis is the instigator of the "John Ellis Choral Series" published by Coronet Press? I see "Ellis, John, 1943 June 6-2010" in LCNAF and the information about him on the Divine Art Records Web site indicates that he composed music for organ and also for chorus, but none of the eleven pieces I have in front of me match any title credited to him there. MusicStack has a John Ellis (choral director, arranger, teacher of singing, baritone) who was born in 1915, but I do not have the one title (Saunders, Richard Drake. *Music and dance in California and the West*. Hollywood, Calif.: Bureau of Musical Research, 1948, 311 p.) cited as a reference to check to see if it is him (I really don't think it is likely that these pieces, published 1997-2000, are his). His credit at the top includes (ASCAP), but I can't trace any of the titles to someone named John Ellis in the ACE database. VIAF has 266 headings found for John Ellis, so I can't even scan through as much as half of those results, which are limited to 100.

**Answer:** Thom Hickey, my OCLC colleague in the Office of Research, provided the following response:

Two things come immediately to mind. You can do an 'Exact Heading' search in VIAF. Here is one for 'Ellis, John*' (which will pull up all the preferred headings that start with 'Ellis, John':

http://viaf.org/viaf/search?query=local.names+exact+%22ellis,%20john*%22&stylesheet=/viaf/xsl/results.xsl&sortKeys=holdingscount&maximumRecords=100

Although this 'only' brings back 140 headings, that is still more than are displayed by default. The trick then is to edit that URL:

http://viaf.org/viaf/search?query=local.names+exact+%22ellis,%20john*%22&stylesheet=/viaf/xsl/results.xsl&sortKeys=holdingscount&maximumRecords=250

Which will at least let him look at all the records. Of course, if we had that title information for 'John Ellis Choral Series' he should be able to find that either through the 'All Fields' or 'Bibliographic Titles' search. Neither of these worked for me, so evidently we haven't seen that title. I also looked for 'John Ellis' in the 'All Fields' index with some of the other title, role and publisher terms cited, but couldn't find anything. Searching Google I found a 'John T. Ellis' associated with choral music, but he doesn't seem to be in VIAF. Only other thought I had was to try the ISNI database, since they are getting quite good coverage from the rights agencies.
Questions & Answers

Gut-Checking the 007

Question: I was reading your Q&A in the most recent MOUG Newsletter and I have a follow-up question regarding the 007 in scores and in books. I've been poring over the PCC RDA BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) Metadata Application profile (http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/scs/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.pdf). If I'm reading page 34 correctly, I should be adding the 007 for textual monographs now, as well as the 007 for scores (page 30). What is your take on this? Am I reading this wrong?

Answer: Several times now I've begun trying to answer your question but I keep getting tangled up in both what is said and what is not said in several sources: the BIBCO Standard Record document, RDA, the National Level Requirements for bibliographic records (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/nlr/), OCLC's Bibliographic Formats and Standards, and my own gut. RDA practices are still evolving but at this point, the draft document "Best Practices for Music Cataloging Using RDA and MARC21" (http://bcc.musiclibraryassoc.org/BCC-Historical/BCC2013/RDA_Best_Practices_for_Music_Cataloging.pdf) is sparing in its recommendations for the use of the 007 fields. Setting aside the extensive "Guidelines for Describing and Encoding Attributes of Sound Recordings Carriers" (pages 39-46), only in RDA 3.2 Media Type and RDA 3.3 Carrier Type does it mention the 007 field to be used for "Books or scores issued with audio/video carriers." Regarding the BIBCO Standard Record document, the "Required Non-RDA and MARC Data" tables (pages 18-36) need to be read within the context of the "RDA Core & PCC Core Elements" tables (pages 6-17). For the 007 fields, the relevant section of the latter is "Describing Carriers" on pages 11-13. You'll notice that the plus sign ("+") indicates "PCC Core Element," but that there is no "+" at "Carrier Type" RDA 3.3, which reads: "Always record Carrier type in 338. For some other resource types, 007 field(s) will also be required; also record the Specific Material Designation (007/01) for resources other than textual monographs." Although "Dimensions" RDA 3.5 is designated as Core, there are no relevant codes for dimensions in either the Textual Materials or Notated Music 007 fields. So in those cases, this element must be referring to MARC 300 and/or 340 as Core, except for such carriers as microforms and electronic resources.

Moving to the "Required Non-RDA and MARC Data" tables, in the case of Textual Resources (on page 34), the reference in the "Notes" column is specifically to Category of Material (007/00) value "h" for microforms. For Notated Music (on page 30), there is nothing in the "Notes" column, suggesting that the Notated Music 007 would be required. And yet, as one of the members of the PCC Standards Committee who worked on the BSR, I know how much we condensed and generalized, so here is my take. The Notated Music 007 itself does not seem to be particularly useful under any normal circumstances. My gut tells me that a bibliographic record for notated music would have the respective 007 if the score were an electronic resource, tactile material, a microform, or were accompanied by an audio or video carrier. Because the Text 007 does have useful codes in its 007/01 position (for Braille, large print, loose-leaf, and so on), I can see its usefulness to indicate those circumstances, as well as the respective 007 if the text were an electronic resource, tactile material, a microform, or were accompanied by an audio or video carrier. To double check my gut, I looked at a bunch of RDA records for scores and books created by PCC participants and found no uses of any 007 field outside of these circumstances. That was an unexpectedly long-winded response to a seemingly simple question, but I hope it helps.
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