One of the great joys of serving MOUG — and this has proven true throughout my involvement in the organization — involves not just the incredible concentration of talent present in our membership, but also everyone’s spirit of friendliness and helpfulness. This was vividly on display at our annual Summer Board Meeting, held in Columbus, Ohio, August 3-4. Not only did we have our usual day-long meeting, but we also had the privilege of meeting with key folks at OCLC headquarters, including OCLC President and CEO Skip Prichard.

We began our time at OCLC meeting with Bridget Dauer (Senior Product Analyst for End User Services), and John McCullough (Senior Product Manager for End User Services) to talk about public services-related concerns, which, unsurprisingly, involved WorldCat Discovery Services. They also prepared for us a detailed, point-by-point response to our WorldCat Discovery Display Preferences for Medium of Performance Report, submitted by our Reference and Collections Services Coordinator, Rebecca Belford, back in March of this year. We appreciate them taking the time to respond to our report so thoroughly!

Next we met with Skip Prichard (OCLC CEO), Mary Sauer-Games (Vice President for Product Management), and John Chapman (Product Manager for Metadata Management). We had a fruitful discussion with them on a number of matters, such as larger issues surrounding the future of cataloging and metadata over the next several years, including the future of Connexion, the development of Record Manager, full Unicode compliance, duplicate record issues, and accommodation of new thesauri in the authority file. Skip, Mary, and John also spent a great deal of time stressing the primary importance of meeting the cooperative’s needs. We were greatly pleased with the results of both meetings.

We ended our time at OCLC with a tour of the OCLC Library, which included seeing a display of the book with OCLC record #1. Of course, none of this would have been possible without our superlative OCLC Liaison Jay Weitz making arrangements for these meetings. Jay, we cannot thank you enough for all of the benefits you realize for MOUG because of your role and connections at OCLC!

Now onto highlights from our Board meeting. As with all Summer Board Meetings, the Board approved
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the slate for this year’s election. The candidates for Continuing Education Coordinator will be Molly O’Brien (Curtis Institute of Music), and Jaro Szurek (Samford University); the candidates for Secretary/Newsletter Editor will be Jacob Schaub (Vanderbilt University) and Jennifer Vaughn (Syracuse University). Many thanks to all of them for agreeing to run! A heartfelt thanks also goes to this year’s talented Nominating Committee (Catherine Busselen, Chair; Damian Iseminger; Casey Mullin, Board Representative) for their thoughtful and careful work in putting together such a strong slate!

The Board devoted a good amount of time discussing and reflecting on the implementation and debut of our new website. I hope everyone agrees that the new Membee-based website — which features streamlined and enhanced functionality — looks incredibly attractive. In particular, the Board discussed and considered potential services — particularly involving communication with and within the membership — that the new website could enable. We also recognized that pending spelling out responsibility for ongoing development of the website, the work of the Website Implementation Task Force (WITF) should be considered complete. With that I would like to thank the individual members of the WITF — Rebecca Belford, Chris Holden, Sean Luyk, Jennifer Matthews, Casey Mullin, Molly O’Brien, Tomoko Shibuya, and Autumn Faulkner, the group’s chair — for charting out the implementation of our new website. I would also like to thank Autumn, Jennifer, and our Treasurer, Nara Newcomer, for working closely with Membee to execute the frontline work associated with getting the new website up and running.

As I hope has been plain to see, our creative and visionary Continuing Education Coordinator, Michelle Hahn, has devised all kinds of new ways to plan and put together our 2016 annual meeting in Cincinnati, such as premiering the practice of sending out calls for program submissions, and then soliciting speakers for those submissions through her numerous “Program Builder” messages. Kudos to you, Michelle, on taking program planning in a bold new direction! Of course, none of this could be realized without the help of our talented Program Committee. I would like to thank Rebecca Belford, Colin Bitter, Matt Ertz, Chris Holden, Sophie Rondeau, Darryl Stevens, and Amy Strickland for serving on this year’s Program Committee. I, along with the rest of the membership, cannot wait to see the engaging program you all put together!

I would like to relate two more major bits of news before closing. The first involves highlighting the ongoing work of the Joint MLA/MOUG WorldCat Discovery Task Force. The full charge of the group, also accessible on the MLA website, is as follows:

“Working with the Music OCLC Users Group, investigate OCLC’s WorldCat Discovery Services to determine if it will be sufficient to meet the needs of music users. If the Task Force determines that WorldCat Discovery Services is not sufficient, it will recommend a course of action to petition OCLC to continue to provide the FirstSearch interface for WorldCat after December 31, 2015. It will also recommend a course of action to petition OCLC for specific improvements to WorldCat Discovery Services to meet the needs of music users.”

Obviously with the recently announced extension of unlimited access to FirstSearch through late 2016, the Task Force now has more time to perform its work. In the meantime, I would like to express my thanks to MLA President Michael Rogan, and Task Force Chair Mike Duffy, for their partnership in the creation of this joint task force. Also, thanks to Rebecca Belford, Marty Jenkins, Hermine Vermeij, and Brad Young for serving as the MOUG representatives on the task force.

The second bit of news surrounds the fact that for the first time in several years the membership will have the opportunity to vote on proposed amendments to the by-laws. Stay tuned for a more detailed announcement on what that entails. Of course, as with any election, only members in good standing will be able to cast ballots. So please make sure your membership is current in order to participate in voting for both our slate of candidates, and the proposed bylaws amendments.

At the beginning of this column I highlighted the spirit of helpfulness and friendliness of MOUG members. The Board exemplified this spirit through their passionate contributions during our discussions at OCLC, and also during our day-long meeting the next day. I continually give thanks for the privilege of not only working with them, but also serving you, the membership. Thanks to all of you for your part in helping solidify MOUG’s position as a vibrant and influential force in the library profession.
The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is now accepting applications for the Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant. The grant supports attendance at the annual MOUG meeting and, in recognition of Ralph's mentoring role in music librarianship, is especially intended to support newer members of the profession in both public and technical services.

The award offers a first-time MOUG attendee free conference registration for the MOUG annual meeting (March 1-2, 2016, immediately preceding the Music Library Association annual meeting); one year's free membership in MOUG, including three issues of the MOUG Newsletter; and reimbursement of up to $200 in associated expenses (lodging, meals, etc.).

Preference will be given to applicants who are students, paraprofessionals, or professionals in the first five years of their professional careers; and who are likely to benefit from MOUG's educational opportunities. This includes everyone who works with music materials in libraries or in library systems, whether they are music specialists or generalists. Professional and workplace need, financial need, past training and experience, demonstration of initiative, likely further contributions to the profession, and comments from reference letters are also considered. Applicants need not be current members of MOUG.

Applications are due October 1, 2015 and shall consist of a letter that includes a rationale for attending the MOUG annual meeting, an explanation of financial need, a brief vita, and the name of at least one person who will submit a letter (also due October 1) in support of the application.

All application materials shall be sent by e-mail, either as in-text messages or as attachments in .pdf, .doc, or .docx format, to the MOUG Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Casey (casey@mullingroup.com). Letters of support should be sent directly by their authors, not by the applicants.

Applicants will be notified of the outcome by e-mail no later than November 1, 2015.

For more information about MOUG, please see http://www.musicoclcusers.org. MOUG has helped train and mentor dozens of music library professionals, and has helped shape the OCLC products and services we use every day.

Past Award Recipients:

2015
- Anna Alfeld LoPrete, Indiana University
- Colin Bitter, Music Library, University of North Texas
- Sophie Rondeau, University of Syracuse

2014
- Elizabeth Hille Cribbs, Northern Illinois University
- Chris Diamond, Baylor University
- Keith Knop, Florida State University
- Jennifer L. Vaughn, Syracuse University Libraries
- Elin Williams, Victoria Conservatory of Music (British Columbia)
- Mark Zelesky, Rowan University

2013
- Claire Marsh, Leeds College of Music
- Christina Linklater, Harvard University
- Jacey Kepich, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
- Karla Jurgemeyer, St. Olaf College
- Kristen Heider, Southern Methodist University

2012
- Sonia Archer-Capuzzo, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

2011
- Sally Bauer, New York Public Library
- Sandra Schipior, Juilliard School of Music
- Tim Smolko, University of Georgia
Does anyone else remember . . . ?

• How MOUG began?

I happened to sit with Ralph Papakhian, Sue Stancu, and a few others at lunch at an MLA conference in either NYC or Boston around 1977 or 1978 and witnessed the conception of MOUG (MOUG was formally established at the next annual MLA meeting in San Diego).

• When the hot topic in music collection development was, “What do we do with our 78 rpm record collections?”

Are CDs and DVDs already “so yesterday?”

• When music copy cataloging was done by one of these advanced technological methods?

First, finding images of LC main entry cards, printed three columns to a page, from NUC catalog subsets for music materials, begun in 1955 (the red book) and going into the late 19760s, I’d guess, (green books), and a “blue book” (MLA publication? ALA?) of reproductions of cards for original cataloging done by MLA catalogers.

Then:

• Photographing each card with a fixed lens distance gadget attached to a Polaroid camera
  • trimming the picture to leave only the printed area,
  • pasting it to a bank 3 x 5” catalog card,
  • counting how many added entries there were, penciling the number on the back of the card, then
• Sending the original out to a copying company to have photographing onto card stock done in batches depending on the number of copies needed
  or,

• Filling out a pink and white LC form by typing onto it the LCCN, to order sets of cards (each set the same fixed number of cards, regardless of number of added entries (!))
• Filling out additional forms if the copy filled multiple catalog cards
• Mailing completed forms to the Library of Congress

then, waiting for such orders to be filled,

then, typing each added entry across the top of a copied card
  • Name and title entries in black
  • Subject headings in red, or SOLID CAPITAL LETTERS
  • Using liquid paper or little rectangles with white adhesive powder which could be use to cover over or type over errors

not to mention:

• Sorting batches of cards into alphabetical order, and, possibly, grouped into categories: Books, scores or recordings, and, within each, Composer name/title, Title, Subject; and, for recordings, Performer.

• OCLC activity was done on one of the first IBM PCs requiring me, initially, to book time on a workstation at the main library?
  • Green screens
  • 1200 baud modems
  • Printing copies of records on “silver sheets,” rolls of thermal paper upon which letter shapes were electrically burned off the silver paper by the print head leaving black letters contrasting with the silver surface of the paper
  • Only memory (data, operating system, or programs) was stored on 5-1/4 in floppy magnetic disks

• When the availability of OCLC’s Cataloging MicroEnhancer (CatME) allowed you to greatly improve the efficiency of your workflow?

(Continued on page 6)
All of your burning questions will be answered in another round of Ask MOUG, and we will have a rousing game of “Name/Title That Tune” so bring us your doozies! Topics include archival description standards and their use in our catalogs, utilizing internet resources for description, tackling inventory projects, and getting started with contract cataloging. Other presenters will show us how to clean our data to make it more uniform and accessible to our catalogs and discovery layers. And, speaking of discovery layers, you can look forward to insights from early implementers of WorldCat Discovery!

I hope you will come and join us!

For the 3rd year in a row, attendees at the annual meeting of MOUG will receive all the benefits of the meeting FOR THE SAME GREAT PRICE!!! That’s right, $90.00 for full-member, early bird registration gets you in the door for another great year of MOUG programming in Cincinnati. Thanks to the great work of the 2016 Program Committee in implementing a new process for program planning, we are able to bring a variety of hot topics to the audience. This year will certainly not disappoint!

Musing from a Long Time Member
(Continued from page 5)

- When in early 1977, the MARC music formats for scores and sound recordings were relatively new to OCLC users?

  But before then, some libraries had been too impatient to wait, and at least one even retrospectively converted their scores collection using the books format using their shelf list cards (very brief records) . . . Enough said, I think!

- The joy of receiving your first box of OCLC cards for music materials?

- “Purple sheets?”

Katherine ("Kitty") Skrobela, Music Librarian at Middlebury College in the late 1970s, distributed what were called "purple sheets," periodically issued lists of authority headings for music works, named for the print color of the product of the printing method used, spirit duplication (ditto machines). These were precursors of Judy Weidow’s *The Best of MOUG: a List of Library of Congress Name Authority Records for Music Titles of the 10 Most Prolific Composers*, first published in 1991.

- The adoption by the library community of AACR2 in 1980? (And the resultant changes to name entries, particularly, Tchaikovsky? Or was it Tschaikowsky? Or Chaikovskii?)

- Joining the brand new MLA LISTSERV-L in 1989?

  Only three years after the LISTSERV application was issued, Ralph Papakhian established MLA-L as the first distribution list hosted on Indiana University’s LISTSERV server.

- Maintaining the card equivalent for owned recordings of an 028 search for record company name and publisher/catalog number?

- Photocopying shelflist cards to generate a list of recent additions to the collections?

- Retrospective conversion of a sizeable collection singlehanded but for the help of student assistants and volunteers? Thank heaven, at that point, for CATME!!

- Having to lobby long and hard to enable features of local systems to accommodate the needs unique to music?

- Finally convincing your organization to automate and outsource authority control for your automated system? Then being tapped to work with the team that wrote the specs so music needs would be met?

- Making added entries for each work on an anthology recording titled “Women's work”? And not being surprised that the cards for that single title nearly filled a large box of OCLC cards by itself?

Hmm… This might be getting interesting after all! I hope you think so!
OCLC-MARC Update 2015

The 2015 OCLC-MARC Update will implement MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings format changes announced in MARC 21 Updates No. 19 (October 2014; http://www.loc.gov/marc/up19bibliographic/bdapndxg.html) and No. 20 (April 2015; http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bdapndxg.html), including:

- Defining code “q” (Lease) in the Holdings 008/07 (Method of Acquisition).
- Implementing the First Indicator (Source of Acquisition Sequence), subfield $3 (Materials Specified), and subfield $5 (Institution to which Field Applies) in Bibliographic 037 (Source of Acquisition).
- Implementing subfields $q$ (Establishment Date) and $r$ (Termination Date), and redefining subfields $s$ (Start Period) and $t$ (End Period), in Authority 046 (Special Coded Dates).
- Broadening the scope of Bibliographic 088 (Report Number) to include series report numbers.
- Implementing Bibliographic 370 (Associated Place).
- Implementing subfield $e$ (Number of Ensembles) and making subfield $s$ (Total Number of Performers) Nonrepeatable in both the Bibliographic and Authority 382 (Medium of Performance) fields.
- Implementing Bibliographic and Authority 388 (Time Period of Creation).
- Invalidating the First Indicator in Bibliographic field 648 (Subject Added Entry: Chronological Term).
- Implementing field 884 (Description Conversion Information) in the Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings formats.
- Implementing the repeatable subfield $g$ (Miscellaneous Information) or making it repeatable in some 22 Bibliographic fields and 24 Authority fields.
- Implementing subfield $i$ (Relationship Information) in thirteen 7XX Authority fields.
- Implementing subfield $4$ (Relationship Code) in fourteen 7XX Authority fields.

We will also make additions to WorldCat indexing, validate all MARC Codes defined by LC since July 2014, and implement subfields $8$ (Field Link and Sequence Number) in some 46 Bibliographic fields. In conjunction with our ongoing work to update Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS) to incorporate RDA, we are harmonizing BFAS, WorldCat validation, and MARC 21 as to subfield validity and repeatability in both the MARC-defined and the OCLC-defined 1XX, 6XX, 7XX, and 8XX fields. All details will be available in an upcoming OCLC Technical Bulletin. We plan to install the OCLC-MARC 2015 Update during the third quarter of calendar year 2015 and will make announcements widely through the usual discussion lists and Connexion logon greetings.
A New Interface for QuestionPoint

QuestionPoint’s more contemporary interface design features easier-to-read screen displays, menus, and action buttons for librarians. It also delivers an improved user experience across devices, with screens that display as well on smartphones and tablets as they do on desktop or laptop computers. The new look is also present in patron chat and email forms, and on patron account screens. Details are available in June 2015 QuestionPoint Release Notes at http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/support/questionpoint/Release-Notes/QP%20Release%20Notes%2006_14_2015%20install_final_corr.pdf. The Cooperative Resources page accessible only to 24/7 Cooperative members has also been redesigned, to give you an easier-to-use interface that mirrors changes throughout the service. We encourage you to review the Cooperative-specific features on this page. No changes are required for your staff to use the new QuestionPoint interface. You will automatically begin to use the new QuestionPoint interface when you login to the service. You may wish to review the way your library’s logo displays in the redesigned page banner, to determine whether changes are needed for it to display appropriately in the updated banner design and colors.

Lynn Silipigni Connaway Elected President-Elect of ASIS&T

Lynn Silipigni Connaway, OCLC Senior Research Scientist, has been elected President-elect of the Association for Information Science and Technology (ASIS&T) for the 2016 administrative year, and President for 2017. Connaway has been a member of ASIS&T for 25 years. She has served in a variety of leadership positions within the organization, including co-chair of the ASIS&T 2011 annual meeting and a Director on the Board from 2012-2015. Becoming President-elect at the conclusion of the 2015 Annual Meeting in St. Louis, Missouri, Connaway will support 2016 President Nadia Caidi, University of Toronto, with planning and developing programs and structure. Connaway will have completed a three year term on the Board as Director at Large in November before becoming President-elect.

OCLC’s Work with Library Linked Data Detailed in New Book

OCLC’s work to help increase the visibility of library collections on the Web through the creation of library linked data—moving from a web of documents to a web of data—is described in a new book, Library Linked Data in the Cloud: OCLC’s Experiments with New Models of Resource Description. Written by OCLC Research staff members Carol Jean Godby, Shenghui Wang, and Jeffrey K. Mixter, the book focuses on the conceptual and technical challenges involved in publishing linked data derived from traditional library metadata. This transformation is urgent, the book maintains, because it is common knowledge that most searches for information start not in a library, or even in a Web-accessible library catalog, but elsewhere on the Internet. Modeling data in a form that the broader Web understands may help keep libraries relevant in the network environment. In the book, the authors explain how the new Web is a growing "cloud" of interconnected resources that identify the people, places, things, and concepts that people want to know about when they approach the Internet with an information need. They also explain why linked data is an appropriate architecture for the description of library resources. The publication aims to achieve a balanced treatment of theory, technical detail, and practical application for librarians, archivists, computer scientists, and other professionals interested in modeling bibliographic descriptions as linked data. It is available in libraries, in print from Amazon and a variety of other retailers, and also as an e-book from Morgan and Claypool Publishers.
WorldCat Discovery Adds Citations, Improves Temporary Lists, and More

WorldCat Discovery Services (http://www.oclc.org/en-US/worldcat-discovery.html) now includes APA, MLA, and Chicago citations to help students and faculty cite their sources and format them automatically. Improvements to the temporary list feature supports information-gathering for larger research projects. Many libraries also now have more time to make the transition to WorldCat Discovery, with the extension of unlimited access to FirstSearch. New features added in July 2015:

• Automated citations for APA, MLA, and Chicago: Users can now cite their sources from WorldCat Discovery automatically, in addition to using EndNote or RefWorks. The service supports APA, MLA, and Chicago citation styles to help users quickly format their citations correctly.

• Improvements to temporary lists: Now users who make a session-based list can add up to 100 items to their temporary list, and email or print the list to include local call numbers and locations. These enhancements make it easier for researchers with larger projects to follow up on all their sources—or for reference staff or faculty members to print lists for use by others.

More time to make the transition to WorldCat Discovery: Based on member feedback, OCLC will extend unlimited access to FirstSearch beyond the previously announced date of 2015 December 31 to a to-be-determined date in late 2016. Access to per-search searching on FirstSearch will end on 2015 December 31.

Stewardship of the Evolving Scholarly Record

Stewardship of the Evolving Scholarly Record: From the Invisible Hand to Conscious Coordination, by Brian Lavoie and Constance Malpas, presents a view of future stewardship models of the evolving scholarly record and their practical implications. The scholarly record is increasingly digital and networked, while at the same time expanding in both the volume and diversity of the material it contains. The long-term future of the scholarly record cannot be effectively secured with traditional stewardship models developed for print materials. This report describes the key features of future stewardship models adapted to the characteristics of a digital, networked scholarly record, and discusses some practical implications of implementing these models. Key highlights include:

• As the scholarly record continues to evolve, conscious coordination will become an important organizing principle for stewardship models.

• Past stewardship models were built on an "invisible hand" approach that relied on the uncoordinated, institution-scale efforts of individual academic libraries acting autonomously to maintain local collections.

• Future stewardship of the evolving scholarly record requires conscious coordination of context, commitments, specialization, and reciprocity.

• With conscious coordination, local stewardship efforts leverage scale by collecting more of less.

• Keys to conscious coordination include right-scaling consolidation, cooperation, and community mix.

• Reducing transaction costs and building trust facilitate conscious coordination.

Incentives to participate in cooperative stewardship activities should be linked to broader institutional priorities.
The Archival Advantage

*The Archival Advantage: Integrating Archival Expertise into Management of Born-Digital Library Materials*, by Jackie Dooley argues for involving archivists in the management of born-digital library materials (i.e., created and managed in digital form). Key highlights include:

- The full array of traditional archival skills is equally relevant in the born-digital context.
- Research data sets, email, websites, blogs, and many other born-digital library materials have characteristics similar to analog archival materials.
- It is beneficial for digital librarians, IT experts, curators, library administrators, and other research library colleagues who manage digital materials to be aware of archivists' skills and expertise and their relevance to the digital context.

Areas of archival expertise that other experts may lack include donor relations, appraisal, context of creation and use, authenticity, transfer of ownership, and permanence.

This essay also focuses on ten areas of archival expertise and their relevance to the digital context. These include confirming ownership, appraising the significance of content, documenting the context of creation, negotiating with collection donors and nurturing these relationships over time, recognizing and navigating legal issues, ensuring authenticity of files, and using practical approaches to creating metadata for large collections. Each of these is equally relevant for digital and analog (physical) materials. Archivists' in-depth knowledge of each area helps to ensure that the right questions are addressed. The intended audiences for this publication include library directors and other managers who set the vision and direction for digital initiatives; technology specialists who manage systems and services in areas such as repository design, hardware and software, digitization, and website development; research data curation experts; digital preservationists; liaison librarians who have close relationships with users, including knowledge of their research methods; and metadata specialists. Archivists may find value in both the explication of the ten areas of archival expertise and the arguments for including them in a wide range of digital initiatives. This work is part of our Research Collections and Support efforts to inform libraries' current thinking about research collections and the emerging services that they are offering to support contemporary modes of scholarship.

WorldShare Interlibrary Loan Release, June 2015

A new release of WorldShare Interlibrary Loan took place on 2015 June 7. This release contains many requested enhancements and new features including:

- Book-club features that let you request and track multiple copies.
- Validations that help ensure only desired charges are triggered: WorldShare Interlibrary Loan now lets you know if your ILL or IFM charge exceeds the borrower's maximum cost, as well as if you have specified IFM payment, but the borrower has not.
- Patron ID no longer passed to lender: For patron privacy, borrower data is no longer passed to the lenders who are not using WorldShare Interlibrary Loan (e.g., Clio).
- Clarified “Can you supply?” message: When saving a “Can you supply?” request, the message is now more specific.

IFM pilot of charges triggered on Shipped: In the coming weeks, several libraries will help OCLC pilot test a new workflow in which IFM payments will be triggered when the lender marks the request as Shipped. Release of this feature to all libraries is planned for August 2015, and the ability to grant IFM refunds is targeted for the following release.

MOUG Board Visits OCLC Headquarters

The MOUG Board held their summer meeting in Columbus, Ohio in August. The Board met with several OCLC staff and was treated to a tour of the OCLC Library and Museum.

The MOUG Board at the OCLC Library
(from left): Mary Huismann, Rebecca Belford, Tomoko Shibuya, Bruce Evans, Michelle Hahn, Casey Mullin, Jay Weitz.

A view of the OCLC Library from the lobby below

Kemberly Lang (OCLC) provides information on the display of early OCLC terminals in the OCLC Library.

Photo Credit: Mary Huismann, Kemberly Lang
**Questions and Answers**

Jay Weitz, OCLC

---

**Rigler-ing from RLIN to WorldCat**

**Question:** Years ago, I distinctly remember being able to search the Rigler-Deutsch Index of 78 titles (from the holdings of five institutions) electronically on the RLG service, prior to the 2006 merger with the OCLC. I have been looking in vain for a way to search the RD again, this time on WorldCat, but so far have had no luck. Is anyone knowledgeable about whether the RD was carried over to WorldCat and if there’s any way to search it separately?

**Answer:** The Rigler-Deutsch bibliographic records, in all their glory, are available in WorldCat. Although there is not literally a separate WorldCat index for them, you can limit your search to Rigler-Deutsch records in one of at least two ways:

- Including both of the following Notes index strings: `nt:rigler` and `nt:deutsch`.
- Including both of the following Cataloging Source index strings: `cs=arsc` and `cs=rlinp`.

Those records, each originally for an individual side of a 78 rpm audio disc, have an interesting pedigree. Here’s a brief description of the records from back in 1992 by Richard Koprowski of the Stanford Archive of Recorded Sound: “The Rigler and Deutsch Record Index (RDI) is a union catalog of pre-LP discs held in five U.S. institutions as of 1981: The Library of Congress, The New York Public Library, and archives at Stanford, Syracuse, and Yale Universities.” The file, as I understand things, was originally created by the Associated Audio Archives (AAA) of the Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC) and made accessible through a series of microform indexes. The records were made available in RLG’s Research Library Information Network (RLIN) database around 1992 and were added to WorldCat as part of the RLG-OCLC merger in 2006. Ed Glazier of RLG and later of OCLC described the origins of the “catalog” of 78 rpm discs as follows in 2007: “[T]he actual 78 disc sides were microfilmed, once to get the label info and once to try to capture the matrix numbers etched into the discs. Data from the microfilms was then hand-keyed into a database, later converted (mostly by contract labor) into a file that was converted to MARC records when loaded into RLIN … No one actually viewed the discs when creating the data.” The creation of the RDI was made possible by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and by a grant from Lloyd E. Rigler and Lawrence E. Deutsch. Currently, there are some 488,721 Rigler-Deutsch bibliographic records in WorldCat, many of them having been upgraded, corrected, and/or merged.

---

**To Each Its Own**

**Question:** If you have a set of identical scores (published and sold together), do you use

- 300 2 identical scores (16 pages each)

Or

- 300 2 scores (16 pages each)

Or something else? "Identical" comes from RDA 3.4.1.6 and "each" from 3.4.1.9.

**Answer:** As I read the various parts of RDA 3.4.1 that you cite, your first suggestion seems to be the inevitable conclusion.
Questions & Answers

Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed

**Question:** I have a CD that contains 10 tracks that were previously issued, plus 5 tracks issued for the first time here. I know that if all tracks were previously issued, I could use DtSt “r” with Dates <current issue date>,<earliest previous issue date>. At least I think I know this. Am I right? In the current situation (2/3 of the disc previously issued, 1/3 new), would I do DtSt and Dates just as I would for an entire new disc? Or do I take the original issue dates into account somehow? If so, how?

**Answer:** This situation is common enough that one would think it's been answered before, but I'm not finding anything among my files. Had all of the tracks been previously issued, there is no question that DtSt would be coded "r" with the current issue date as Date 1 and the earliest previous issue date as Date 2. My inclination is to cut through the agonizing and do the same for your situation. Or I could continue to agonize.

A Previously Issued Issue

**Question:** I have a CD that contains ten tracks that were previously issued, plus five tracks issued for the first time here. I know that if all tracks were previously issued, I could use DtSt “r” with Dates <current issue date>,<earliest previous issue date>. At least I think I know this, right? In the current situation (2/3 of the disc previously issued, 1/3 new), would I do DtSt and Dates just as I would for an entirely new disc, or do I take the original issue dates into account somehow? If so, how?

**Answer:** This situation you describe is common enough that one would think it's been answered before, but I'm not finding anything among my files. Had all of the tracks been previously issued, there is no question that DtSt would be coded "r" with the current issue date as Date 1 and the earliest previous issue date as Date 2, just as you suggest. My inclination is to cut through the agonizing and do the same in this case. Or I could continue to agonize.

You Can Call Me A/L

**Question:** What is the difference between “a” and “l” in the 008/20 position Format of music? In the examples in the Best Practices document, “l” is used. I have been using “a” in my originals, because the music is written with staff notation. I thought “l” was for other kinds of music notation such as: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Graphic_notation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Graphic_notation). I have a feeling that this is one of those situations where “l” is not wrong, so if a record comes in with “l”, I should just accept it.

**Answer:** The definitions in FMus (SCO 008/20) have caused lots of confusion, in part because they have been in flux for a while. Nine of the codes have been newly implemented, renamed, or re-described at least once since 2009. In fact, there is an effort in the music community to try to harmonize the various definitions of the formats of music that are found in RDA, MARC, and elsewhere. Code “l” was added to MARC 21 in 2013 and is intended to take the place of most former uses of the code "a" as well as some that would previously have been considered code “z”. The best practice now would be to prefer using code “l” when it is appropriate.
Questions & Answers

Ads Can Really Hang You Up the Most

Question: I’m working through some donated piano music scores. This afternoon I got hung up on what to do in relation to OCLC #798353469. The description matches our copy, except for the note: “Advertising includes musical incipits for ‘In hanging gardens’ by Evan Davies and ‘Thoughts at eve’ by Marion Lord.” (Instead, our advertising/incipits are for: Dolores / Artie Matthews ; Garden of dreams / A.G. Macdonald ; Flitting butterflies / Vera Roundtree ; Even-song reverie / Marion Lord ; The dream of an hour / John Franklyn ; Chatter / E.C. Lowell. Unlike some institutions, we don’t care about recording this information.) In the old days, the answer would be simple: import the record to our local system and strip off the offending 500. However, since we’re using WorldCat Local (and soon WorldCat Discovery) as our primary user interface to catalog records, this isn’t a viable solution for us. What do you suggest instead?

A few possibilities:
- Modify the 500: “Some copies have advertising with musical incipits for ‘In hanging gardens’….
- Add “$5 MoKU” to the 500 [but I don’t think that helps our display problem in WorldCat Local].
- Delete the 500 (but UMKC probably really wants it there).

Other ideas?

Answer: RDA 3.4.5.3.2 regards unnumbered sequences of advertising as “Inessential Matter” to be disregarded when recording extent, except for early printed resources under certain circumstances. This suggests to me that advertising might deserve to be disregarded entirely, including in notes. But as you say, things are more complicated than they once were. Each of your three options has its appeal, but I think I’d lean toward the first, editing the 500 to say that only some copies contain these specific advertisements.

Spinning Plates

Question: I often see plate numbers that end with a hyphen and (usually a single) digit (for example: 5770-8). Some OCLC records include the complete plate number as it appears (with the hyphenated number) in the 028 (5770-8) and some do not (5770). Which is correct?

Answer: To answer this question, we have to read between the lines of RDA 2.15.3, “Plate Number for Music,” and then delve deep into the music cataloging past. Here is what RDA 2.15.3.1 says: “A plate number for music is a numbering designation assigned to a resource by a music publisher. The number is usually printed at the bottom of each page, and sometimes also appears on the title page. A plate number sometimes includes initials, abbreviations, or words identifying a publisher. It is sometimes followed by a number corresponding to the number of pages or plates.” That sounds innocuous enough, but re-read that last sentence. As I read it, the implication is that the “number corresponding to the number of pages or plates” is not to be considered part of the plate number itself. Now if we go back to AACR2 5.7B19 (“Publishers’ numbers and Plate Numbers”) and its corresponding LCRI, there is nothing resembling that or even mentioning numbers that follow a plate number. Before there were LC Rule Interpretations for music, however, there were Music Cataloging Decisions (MCD). They were published regularly in the Music Cataloging Bulletin (MCB) and in 1992 were compiled into a separate publication by the Music Library Association. In 2005, many of the MCDs were absorbed into the LCRIs. In the March 1981 MCB (12:3, pages 1-2) an MCD 5.7B19 was first published, but it was revised somewhat in the January 1982 MCB (13:1, page 4). The relevant sentence did not change, however, and read: “If an additional number, corresponding to the total number of pages or plates, follows the plate number (often after a dash), do not consider it part of the plate number.” As part of the 1985 Revisions to AACR2, that MCD was rescinded and instead the AACR2 Glossary definition of “Plate Number (Music)” was revised to read in part: “It may include initials, abbreviations, or words identifying a publisher and is sometimes followed by a number corresponding to the number of pages or plates.” Knowing this convoluted back-story and seeing that essentially the same text is now part of RDA 2.15.3, I think we can conclude that when we record plate numbers, any number following the plate number proper that corresponds to the number of pages or plates is not intended to be recorded. The MLA Best Practices for Music Cataloging document does not offer any guidance on this in 2.15.3, but perhaps it should. In the meantime, and given RDA’s general dictum to “take what you see,” it might be prudent to record one 028 field without the dashed-on number and another with it.
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