If you’ll permit me to paraphrase our former Continuing Education Coordinator Michelle Hahn (Indiana University), as she stated in the publicity materials for our 2015 Annual Meeting in Denver, I’d like to open this issue of the newsletter by basking in the glow of the robustness of our organization. We are fiscally healthy, both in terms of our operational solvency year after year and by virtue of our growing Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant fund, which our Fundraising Czar Stephen Luttmann is now tending to. Our personal membership numbers are up from recent years. The most recent Annual Meeting in Cincinnati (which you’ll read all about in the following pages) saw record-breaking attendance and an expanded footprint, indeed bursting at the seams with engaging and substantive content.

Our administrative structure has grown as well. Due to your ratification of a bylaws amendment in 2015, the Reference, Discovery and Collection Coordinator (formerly the Reference and Collection Services Coordinator) has been added as a voting position on the Executive Board. What's more, the RDC Committee (formerly RSC Committee) will soon be reinstated by the RDC Coordinator, so that we will have a dedicated group of individuals to monitor and study the latest developments in this sector of OCLC’s products and services. Our current RDCC Rebecca Belford will be sharing with you the latest in this arena. Please join me in thanking her for her devoted service to MOUG over the past several years, and for her steadfast efforts to come in preparing to hand off the reins to the future incumbent of this retooled position.

Another coming addition to the MOUG administrative structure is the Joint MOUG/MLA Worldshare Management Services (WMS) User Group. An ad hoc meeting of WMS users during MLA in Cincinnati demonstrated the need for a permanent channel of communication for this segment of our community. This group will be co-governed by both organizations, benefiting from the meeting timeslot and web presence provided by MLA, along with a direct line to the MOUG Board for program planning purposes and broader dissemination of the latest group “chatter” through this newsletter or other means. The WMS User Group is expected to be officially formed this summer. Watch this space!

The months following the Annual Meeting may seem quiet in compari-
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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: Jennifer Vaughn, Syracuse University Libraries, 222 Waverly Avenue, Syracuse, NY 13244.

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 Tomoko Shibuya, MOUG Treasurer, Metadata and Discovery Services, Northwestern University Libraries, 1970 Campus Dr., Evanston, IL, 60208. (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 501(c)(3) 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
MOUG Announces 2016 Distinguished Service Award Recipient

The Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is honored to name Neil Hughes (University of Georgia) as the thirteenth recipient of MOUG’s Distinguished Service Award. This award was established to recognize and honor those who have made significant professional contributions to music users of OCLC. The MOUG Executive Board selects recipients based on nominations received from the membership. The award was presented to Neil at the MOUG Business Meeting in Cincinnati, March 2, 2016.

Neil’s contributions to MOUG are both extensive and varied. To begin with, Neil has served on the MOUG Board on two different occasions, once as Continuing Education Coordinator, and then as Chair. If one surveys Neil’s accomplishments as Chair, it will be readily apparent that MOUG finds itself in such strong standing in large part to efforts Neil championed and drove during that time. During his first year as Chair in 2006, Neil appointed a task force to investigate MOUG’s potential for becoming a tax-exempt, charitable, educational organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. Tax Code. In 2012, 501 (c)(3) status was finally granted, thanks to the long-term efforts of Neil and others. That same year, Neil proposed that MOUG sep-
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**Tribute to Sue Stancu**

by Michelle Hahn

Hello! I'm up here THIS time to pay special tribute to Sue Stancu, who retired from the profession in December of 2014 after 35 years of service. Sue has been a force of nature in the field and especially in MOUG and we would like to take a moment to recognize her for that.

If everyone would indulge me for a second, I'd like to start this tribute with a visual aide. So, if Sue was your NACO reviewer, please stand up. And stay standing. If you did an internship with Sue, stand up. If you worked with Sue at Indiana University, stand up. If you ever had ANY contact with Sue, maybe a phone or email conversation, or you sat next to her at a meeting, stand up. If you've never met Sue but have ever worked with someone who is standing, then stand up. If you are in this room and not yet standing, then go ahead and stand up, too.

As you can tell, there is no one in this group who has not been influenced by Sue. Whether you know her or not, it is guaranteed that you have at least learned something because she taught it to someone else. Ok, you can sit down now.

You may know her as one half of the dynamic duo, Ralph and Sue, ever devoted to her work partner and close friend, Ralph Papakhian. When you speak of one, it's almost impossible not to mention the other. We have honored both with the MOUG Distinguished Service Award, and now remember Ralph after his passing with the Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant. But today, we are singing Sue out for her substantial contributions to MOUG and to music librarianship.

Sue received her MLS in 1978 from the University of Arizona, and soon thereafter began her very first professional library position as the Sound Recordings Cataloger at Indiana University in 1979. But her career in music cataloging actually started several years before that, when she took a position out of college as a music Cataloger in the University of Arizona music library. While in graduate school, she actually TAUGHT cataloging classes.

In fact, Sue is the consummate educator, and has dedicated a great deal of her time to teaching others.

As Chuck Peters, one of her long-time colleagues at Indiana wrote in the MOUG Newsletter to celebrate her retirement, “Sue instilled in her students not only the qualities of accuracy and good judgement, but also flexibility in their decisions and a sense of commitment to their profession.” That sentiment is the THEME of Sue’s interactions with others, and it comes up time and time again. To paraphrase Janet Scott, another colleague and protégé at IU, Sue would never tell you what to do exactly --she would lay out all of the possibilities and the reasons why each would work, and then patiently wait for you to tell her what you chose in the end and why.

Mark Scharff described this so eloquently in his presentation of the Service Award to Sue in 2005. “[Sue] shaped the development of dozens, perhaps hundreds, of people entering music librarianship, among them leaders in our profession and in the larger library world. They've benefited from her penchant for critical thinking (and her expectation of it from themselves), her attention to detail, and her perseverance in the face of challenges.”

Though not officially a founding member of MOUG, Sue was indeed a foundation IN MOUG, beginning early on as co-editor of the Newsletter soon after our organization came to be. She was also a presence at EVERY meeting. I'm sure. Outgoing and outspoken, Sue made a point to meet and talk to as many people as possible. And if you were a student within a 50-foot radius of her, she would find you and introduce you to everyone she know and everyone she had just met. There are no strangers in MOUG because of her. If she had an opinion, everyone knew it, and every word spoken by her was full of passion for whatever...or whomever...the topic. Though she has often been a polarizing figure, there is no doubt in anyone’s mind that she has been an important and valuable influence on the way the music cataloging profession has developed and thrived.

Sue cares for MOUG more than any other organization and has always seen it as a powerful association which benefits its members greatly. You may not see her name repeatedly on the list of former officers, because she was more interested in leading from behind and celebrating the accomplishments of others. She has considered MOUG’s work to be above all else, in developing music description policy, creating the NACO Music Project, and encouraging the shared contributions of music Catalogers to WorldCat.

And MOUG has stood on her shoulders to accomplish these things.

I was once an intern of Sue’s, and have become her successor at Indiana, now affected by her legacy in a very different way. To follow in her footsteps is an honor, but it is an honor that I share with all of you as we continue together, carrying on her high expectations of ourselves and our work. Though she is now taking full advantage of being retired and may not be in attendance this year, Sue will always remain our mentor and friend, and one of MOUG’s biggest supporters. And for that, we are thankful.

Submitted by Michelle Hahn

(Indiana University)
arate the annual meeting budgets from the operating budgets to “help MOUG members, putting the organization on a more secure long-term financial footing by using a planning tool that will give us a clearer picture of where all of our money is going, and why” (MOUG Newsletter, December 2006), which the Board approved that summer. Everyone in MOUG, especially all subsequent Treasurers, can attest to the fact that this has been spectacularly successful in helping secure the consistently solid financial footing we find ourselves in year after year. In tandem with this, under Neil’s leadership the Board sought to increase the term of the Treasurer from two to three years, leading to the eventual passage of the bylaws amendment to create the current Treasurer-Elect/Treasurer/Past-Treasurer position, which took place during Neil’s second term as Chair. These actions, which display Neil’s financial wisdom, inspired us to appoint him to serve as the Chair of MOUG’s recent Financial Planning Work Group, charged to examine MOUG’s current financial standing and future prospects. The group’s incredibly polished and thoughtful 2014 report has provided a solid blueprint for MOUG’s future financial success. The current First 100K Capital Campaign represents a notable outgrowth of the FPWG’s efforts.

In addition to Neil’s storied service to MOUG in official capacities, he has had extensive and pivotal contributions to both music cataloging and the larger profession. Any subscriber to MOUG-L, as well as MLA-L, will be quite familiar with Neil’s prodigious output. Readers of those lists will also attest to the incredible thoroughness and care that goes into each and every post Neil sends out. Neil also excels at calling everyone’s attention to trends and developments in the profession that he feels require closer examination, such as changes to discovery services, cataloging codes, and other matters that surround the environment in which we perform our work. Neil has been a long-standing participant of the NMP funnel, and has served on the MLA Board, several MLA-CMC sub-committees, and also as Chair of MLA’s Southeast Chapter (SEMLA).

And finally, something that permeates Neil’s interactions with others in the profession, whether through official or informal channels, is his incredible eloquence, sharp intellect, and of course, his cultivated, witty sense of humor. We can all recall laughing out loud while reading a list post or personal correspondence penned by Neil. This wit and intelligence has facilitated Neil’s ability to lead and effect change. Neil also radiates incredible charm, warmth, and graciousness, being very quick to render thanks and give credit where credit is due. And since we are all music librarians, this letter would not be complete without highlighting the fact that Neil is also an accomplished violist. In fact, Neil had a career as an orchestral musician before becoming a music librarian.

Submitted by Bruce Evans
(Baylor University)
The MOUG Nominating Committee seeks nominations for the offices of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (a 4-year commitment), Treasurer-Elect (a 4-year commitment) and Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator (a 2-year commitment). We will assemble a slate of candidates this summer for an election to be held in the fall. Terms of office will begin at the end of the MOUG annual meeting to be held in Orlando, Florida, in February 2017. Below are brief descriptions of each office, paraphrased from the MOUG Bylaws and MOUG Handbook.

**Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect**: The person in this position serves for 4 years: 1 year as Vice-Chair/Chair Elect, 2 years as Chair, and 1 year as Past Chair. The Chair directs the work of the Executive Board and is responsible for the general supervision of the organization's affairs. The Chair appoints committees and their chairs and special positions, serves as an ex officio member of all committees, and orients new Board members to their duties. Additionally, the Chair writes a column for the MOUG Newsletter, calls meetings, and serves when necessary as a liaison to OCLC and other affiliations.

**Treasurer-Elect**: The person in this position serves for 4 years: 1 year as Treasurer-Elect, 2 years as Treasurer, and 1 year as Past-Treasurer. The Treasurer serves as a member of the Executive Board and participates in general supervision of the organization's affairs. The Treasurer keeps financial accounts, pays bills and makes deposits for the organization, prepares a yearly budget, and handles financial transactions for the organization. Additionally, the treasurer serves as membership officer and handles claims for back issues of the Newsletter.

**Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator**: The person in this position serves for 2 years. The Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator coordinates activities with regard to public and collection service issues related to OCLC products and services. Additionally, the Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator also enlists members for and leads the Reference, Discovery, and Collection Committee.

If you would like to nominate someone (including yourself) for either office, or if you would like more information, please call or e-mail one of the committee members. For full consideration, please submit nominations by Friday, June 3, 2016. Nominations received after that date may also be considered. Candidates for office must be individual members of MOUG in good standing at the time the ballot is distributed.

For more information about MOUG, please see [http://www.musicoclcusers.org/](http://www.musicoclcusers.org/). Serving as an officer on the Executive Board is a wonderful and rewarding opportunity to more fully engage in MOUG's activities. Thank you in advance for your willingness to contribute to the continued vitality of our organization!

**MOUG Nominating Committee**

Karla Jurgemeyer, Committee Chair  
Catalog Librarian  
St. Olaf College  
507-786-3621  
jurgemey@stolaf.edu

Bruce Evans  
Music and Fine Arts Catalog Librarian  
Cataloging & Metadata Unit Leader  
Baylor University  
254-710-7863  
Bruce_Evans@baylor.edu

Beth Iseminger  
Senior Music Catalog Librarian  
Harvard University  
617-998-5303  
biseming@fas.harvard.edu
Greetings! I am excited to write my first column as acting Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator. I am delighted to be an official member of the MOUG Executive Board and am looking forward to continuing our advocacy for music needs in user-facing OCLC products and relaying news to the MOUG membership and music users.

Perhaps no surprise, WorldCat Discovery Services seems to be demanding (and receiving!) the most attention from the music library community. The biggest WorldCat news from OCLC is the announcement of a revised roadmap for FirstSearch and WorldCat Discovery and a renewed future for FirstSearch. Briefly, from the WorldCat Discovery Services overview: “In addition to ongoing WorldCat Discovery enhancements, OCLC will continue the full-featured WorldCat searching valued in FirstSearch in a new version of FirstSearch” (http://www.oclc.org/worldcat-discovery.en.html, accessed May 13, 2016). One way I have been keeping up with information about WorldCat Discovery Services as well as plans for FirstSearch is through OCLC’s webinars. For those of you interested in current, first-hand information, I would highly recommend a live or archived viewing. You may see selective reminders from me on MOUG-L, and of course the full list is on OCLC’s website. Furthermore, those of you who work at an institution that uses Discovery are encouraged to participate in the OCLC Community Center (http://www.oclc.org/community). This is an opportunity to share music-related (or other) concerns, challenges, or advice in a variety of discussion forums.

As mentioned in issue 121, I am a member of the joint MLA-MOUG OCLC Search and Discovery Task Force. Convened in 2015, the task force was charged with assessing the suitability of Discovery for music users and making recommendations for specific improvements to WorldCat Discovery. I am pleased to say that the task force fully expects that by the time you are reading this, the report will be complete. The task force began its work with the projected end-of-life of FirstSearch as the end of 2015, and was undeterred by the change in FirstSearch development. Discovery’s growing prominence as an alternative (or primary) route to end-user access to WorldCat demands moving forward with making our recommendations.

Although WorldCat Discovery is of imminent concern, particularly for libraries using WorldShare Management Services, it is only one of OCLC’s many products. If you have concerns or questions about any reference-, discovery-, or collection-related products that you would like MOUG to address, I urge you to share them. Music users—ourselves included—deserve our attention and advocacy. I look forward to all of us working together and with OCLC toward continual improvement.

The MOUG Executive Board awarded three Ralph Papakhian Travel Grants for the recent annual meeting:

**Alyssa Hislop** is a Project Sound Recording Cataloger at the Archive of Recorded Sound at Stanford University for the Player Piano Project.

**Laura Thompson** is Reference/Music Librarian at Central Michigan University.

**Rahni Kennedy** is currently the Temporary Music Cataloging/Metadata Specialist at Southern Methodist University.

Congratulations to all three recipients!
Inventories & Hidden Collections: Opportunities for Clean-Up and Enhancement

Sarah Cohen (Florida State University)
Jean Harden (University of North Texas)

Inventories & Hidden Collections: Opportunities for Cataloging, Data Clean-Up and Enhancement

The opening presentation of the 2016 MOUG Annual Meeting saw a two-part presentation given by Sarah Cohen (Florida State University) and Jean Harden (University of North Texas). Cohen’s presentation was entitled “Inventory Projects: Opportunities for Catalog Enhancement.” Cohen outlined the process of an inventory/clean-up project within Florida State University’s Allen Music Library. This was initiated by the library’s potential move to another ILS. Cohen emphasized that before starting this kind of project one should consider the time, the possibility of new issues coming up, and dealing with previous cataloging decisions. However when done right, this can mean less work for the next inventory, make day-to-day cataloging operations easier, and can be combined with weeding projects.

The project that Cohen discussed was started in 2013 with the start of circulation efforts to clean-up patron records in regards to overdue items in which all music library staff members became involved in this. In particular for catalogers, this included making decisions on withdrawals, updating the status on missing items (particularly if they could not be found on patron records), and cleaning-up multi-volume sets. The importance of this included the fact that it had been 20 years since this was done and cataloging decisions of the past needed to be confronted.

Cohen stated that the first part of any project of this nature is to create a shelflist which can be a difficult task depending on your ILS. In terms of statistics, this lead to declaring 105 book items missing and withdrawing over 700 (mostly duplicate copies). In regards to the scores, 110 were declared missing and over 1,000 were withdrawn. Several issues that came up included:

- Differences in what was in the catalog from the physical label on the item
- Items with different call numbers for the same work
- Volume and copy level clean-up
- Items not in the catalog at all
- Adding piece counts to multi-part items

In addition to all this, it was mentioned that FSU is part of consortium with 12 other universities in the state. So there were records merged from other libraries which leads to an ongoing clean-up of the union catalog since FSU has the only full-time music catalogers in this consortium.

Currently, the project is dealing with the CD collection. There are less issues these because they are more recent (within the last 25 years). However, some common issues are:

- Missing items
- Physical damage (mostly broken cases)
- Label issues
- Adding piece counts for multi-disc sets

The DVDs and LPs are still to be done. It is anticipated that the DVDs will not cause many issues since they are recent. However, the LPs are older, in poorer condition, and have not been converted from AACR.

The second part of the presentation was given by Jean Harden and entitled “Hidden Collection of LPs: Cataloging with Connexion and MarcEdit.” Harden explained a current project in which 600,000 LPs need to be cataloged in a hidden collection at the University of North Texas. The challenge of this project is to get them cataloged quickly, but still have good records for discoverability.

The pilot part of this project was started with 2,000 gift LPs which was used to establish and troubleshoot the process. It was established that one student worker would find records in Connexion Client and Harden use MarcEdit for further editing. Another librarian cataloged the ones not found in Connexion (only a small number). Based on this, instructions were written this
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past summer and given to another librarian (non-cataloger) to see if they could be followed. The initial goals were to:

- Find out how many items could found through batch-searching
- Get a significant amount cataloged this year
- Estimate in student hours how long it would take to finish the initial 2,000 LPs

From here, a student worker (library student with a music background) was hired and trained specifically for this project. The student searches for copies using batch searching in Connexion. If nothing is found by batch search, then a keyword search is used. For the items found, the student eliminates duplicate records and applies a constant data record which outlines the information for UNT’s standards. From here, Harden applies MarcEdit in the following way:

- Delete all call numbers fields (could possibly skew subject analysis)
- Fix 049 field for bibliographic location
- Change “sound disc” to “audio disc” (RDA)
- Add 099 “LPZ” and 901 “LP Project” (local use)
- Use RDA helper to add RDA elements including automatically adding the correct 336, 337, 338, and 344 fields (runs off type code in 007)

Running all this takes Harden under 5 minutes for a box of LPs. The records are reimported into Connexion and the student runs a batch search to import them into the catalog. This generally adds 80-100 records to the catalog in just a few minutes.

In the future, Harden hopes to improve the batch search to get a higher batch find rate. Also, there is the possibility that these procedures will be adapted for other large gift projects.

Reported by: Rahni Kennedy
(Southern Methodist University)

Making Heads AND Tails of It:
Contract Cataloging from Both Sides of the Process

Jeannette Thompson (Tulane University)
Lynne Jaffe (At Your Service, Library Contract Cataloging)

Outsourcing is no longer viewed with the suspicion that was evident when the concept began in 1993 with Wright State outsourcing all of its cataloging to OCLC. Today you decide what needs cataloged, make careful guidelines, make a list, box it up, send it to the outsourcer who reverses the operation and sends back cataloged materials. No muss, no fuss.

University music librarian, Jeannette Thompson and outsourcer, Lynne Jaffe explained their workflows and solutions to getting the music materials cataloged.

Background: Tulane hired Jeannette as the music cataloger in the 1970s but ran into budget shortages, the Katrina flood, and evolving job responsibilities that took Jeannette away from music cataloging off and on. A backlog of 400,000 titles in 1998 was lurking and unprocessed. In addition Tulane has large collections in the Latin American Library and the Hogan Jazz Archive. Something needed to be done. Administrators needed to be educated about high quality cataloging and the necessity of getting the materials processed. Outsourcing seemed to be the answer.

Lynne is a subcontractor with Flourish Music Contract Cataloging and as well operating independently under her own company’s name. Lynne works from her home with physical and online connections to cataloging resources. She keeps current on cataloging procedures and description by professional reading and conference attendance. It is important that you know you are getting a qualified cataloger.

Workflow considerations: Careful guidelines and documentation were created before the project got underway. Field by field requirements were laid out. RDA and copy cataloging specifications were noted. Documentation needed to be updated regularly as things changed. A three-way contract with Voyager and Flourish made the use of
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the local system legal. The call number is written in the piece. Communication is by email and sticky notes on necessary items. Each box is photographed before shipping for insurance purposes. Materials are sent via FedEx or UPS Ground. Shipping costs average out at $2.00 per title. Finally, an invoice is sent to the library.

Lynne catalogs scores, CDs, and DVDs. A big reason for the success of this project is that Tulane allows Lynne to use the Tulane local catalog to creating records. She works almost like a member of the Tulane staff. The local save file is used in the workflow. This vastly eases the workload at Tulane. Routine analysis and spot checking of work is carried out as necessary.

Tulane has had great success in its outsourcing venture and recommends it as a solution for libraries in a similar situation.

Bibliography:
An excellent source of information on outsourcing has been prepared by Taras Ortynsky, Head, Technical Services, Villanova University, on the ALCTS web site: Outsourcing, 1995-1998. http://www.ala.org/alcts/resources/org/cat/research/outsource98


Reported by: Robert L. Cunningham
(Boston Public Library)

Even Cataloging Sounds Better on Vinyl:
Repurposing Metadata from discogs.com to Catalog Sound Recordings at Michigan State University

Autumn Faulkner, Joshua Barton (Michigan State University)

Autumn Falkner and Joshua Barton presented on their experiences of repurposing metadata from www.discogs.com to create bibliographic records and to link authorities for sound recordings. Two others were listed on the project, but did not present: Devin Higgins and Lucas Mak. All are from Michigan State University (MSU).

Barton started the presentation by describing that their experience was based on working with a gift of 1,200 LPs. This work was in preparation for working with the Rovi Media Collection, which contains over 850,000 items (14 semi-trucks worth of material!). They were very clear that their practices did not have the goal of creating the best of traditional cataloging. Rather, it is something that they hope will work well for describing and making known the upcoming large collection.

Discogs is an online community made up of experts that create metadata about sound recordings. The website has contributor guidelines and a voting process that help ensure powerful and correct metadata. The presenters described creating a record for Discogs as being similar to, but less complex than creating a Wikipedia page. In their initial check, they found about 40% of their collection already has records created in Discogs.

MSU hired an on-call staff member who already has expertise and voting rights on Discogs. Because of this, she was able to assist in starting to create metadata through Discogs more quickly. MSU created all of their records under the same user name so that all records will have the MSU logo attached as the metadata contributor in addition to being able to view all of their created records under the same name. MSU has since added over 400 records to Discogs, and a list of their contributions can be viewed at the following link: www.discogs.com/user/MSULibraries

The record at the following link is a sample record in Discogs that Barton shared: https://www.discogs.com/Gipsy-Kings-Bamboleo/master/75312

After showing some examples of contributions to Discogs, Barton discussed some of the vocabulary that can be mapped from Discogs to RDA terms and the differences in usage. One notable difference is how Discogs
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Another area that will require new mapping is how Discogs defines “roles” in comparison to “relationship designators” in RDA. Compiling this information to be automatically included in the bibliographic record will be difficult. The example shared here was for Django Reinhardt’s album, Djangology 49 (https://www.discogs.com/Django-Reinhardt-Djangology-49/release/4026082). There is no role designation in the title, but this information can be pulled from data found further down in the record in Discogs.

Another issue that they discovered was related to inconsistencies of the addition or exclusion of non-Roman scripts. Depending on who was providing the metadata for existing records, the non-Roman script might have been skipped. They are still struggling with what to do when there is no transliteration provided, especially if this information is the name of the artist.

They currently do not have a way to create authorized access points for musical works based on the data that they can pull from Discogs.

Their current practice is to default to not include a 1xx field in the bib records that they create based on metadata from Discogs.

One thing that they are still struggling with is whether or not to harmonize all of the bib records that they create with WorldCat so that others can access these records. In this part of the presentation, Barton stated “We are making a tradeoff – high quality metadata and records versus time availability.” Considering this tradeoff, he said that they are “feeling okay about it” and went on to discuss that for the purposes of their data and time availability to work on this upcoming collection, the tradeoff is worthwhile.

Barton mentioned that they are able to leverage the Discogs community for multiple areas of expertise. One

uses the word “release” compared to RDA and FRBR’s “manifestation”. Another difference mentioned is how Discogs uses “genre” and “style” compared to LCGFT terms.

Falkner explained how they are able to download API from Discogs records and convert it into MARC records. Many of these details can be found in her slides. She pointed out that Discogs allows the user to download metadata from any uploader, which allows MSU to create bib records from album info that already exists in Discogs. She discussed a method to automatically link to authorized access points by going through an intermediary step to a Wikipedia article when one is present.

Falkner then discussed a project that she worked on to map genre and style terms from Discogs to LCGFT, LCMPT, and LCSH terms. She showed that LCGFT terms do not match the level of specificity that the Discogs community uses. One example that she shared is a Discogs term, “Hip Hop/Instrumental”. When searching for Hip Hop in LCGFT, the user is pointed to the term, “Rap (Music)”, which generally implies vocal music. Because of the specificity already used in Discogs terms, they felt it important for their project to include a 650 .4 field to include the original Discogs term for future use and searching capabilities. In her final spreadsheet, Falkner mapped a total of 442 terms. Of these, 160 had direct matches.

Barton pointed out that Discogs adds an ambiguous number to the end of a string for an access point that has the same name as another. He shared an example of different artists using the same name, Los Chicos. Because of this, it was very difficult to discern between two performers of the same name. They were able to create 1xx and 7xx fields from access points found in Discogs, but it was often difficult to distinguish between a person and a corporate body when names were ambiguous.
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of these is language expertise that other contributors provide. This is especially helpful when they do not have that expertise on their team. Another is expertise in obscure formats. In addition, they are able to make their collection more widely known. Due to MSU’s involvement in the Discogs community, users have contacted MSU to find a way to listen to recordings that they otherwise may not have known were held by MSU.

In discussing things that they have learned from this experience, Barton stated that they have had an incredible opportunity to experiment with metadata input and management. They were also able to sharpen their metadata expertise to create bibliographic records using unusual techniques.

Barton briefly discussed ways that they are able to create visualization of their metadata by downloading API for records that they create using D3.js. He provided the following link to a visualization that they created from their metadata: http://msu-libraries.github.io/discogs/

In closing, Barton discussed the larger context of the 1,200 item gift collection that they are currently working with and reminded the audience that this is in preparation for working with the Rovi collection. At this place in the project, they are unsure whether this will be beneficial to working with the Rovi collection. But, good intellectual groundwork has already been completed that will be helpful, especially the mapping of Discogs terms to LCGFT/LCSH as well as the coding to retrieve and transform Discogs metadata into bibliographic records.

Reported by: Jeff Lyon
(Brigham Young University)

Clean Data: Utilizing MarcEdit and OpenRefine

Margaret Corby (Kansas State University)
Bruce Evans & Kara Long (Baylor University)
Jennifer Vaughn (Syracuse University)

On the Tuesday afternoon program, Margaret Corby (Kansas State University), Bruce Evans & Kara Long (Baylor University), Jennifer Vaughn (Syracuse University) presented under the session theme titled as “Clean Data: Utilizing MarcEdit and OpenRefine”. The session started with Margaret Corby’s live demonstrations for introducing MarcEdit Tool. Her presentation was designed as a live demonstration of the MarcEdit tool using the comma separated value (CSV) file that had 554 records from her library. She explained very well which Machine Readable Catalog (MARC) record fields she preferred to delete or add for specific music formats. Editing subfields by using the “find missing field” option, using MarcEdit tool feature “MARC validate” and “RDA helper tool” for creating 33x fields were some of the key features that she presented successfully.

The session continued with Bruce Evans and Kara Long’s presentation about the benefits of using of OpenRefine in digitization workflows, using the example of Frances G. Spencer Sheet Music Project at Baylor University. Evans started his presentation by giving a brief information about the collection and he explained how they created the collection metadata. The Frances G. Spencer Collection of American Sheet Music is comprised of 30,000 popular American music titles from the mid-19th to early 20th centuries. The collection features pieces by prominent composers such as Irving Berlin, Scott Joplin and Stephen Foster. Baylor University acquired the print collection in 1965, and then in 2000 the BU Libraries began digitizing the collection. Shortly after acquiring the print collection, Baylor began cataloging the collection by consulting Frances Spencer’s lists and notes. When the BU Libraries began digitizing the collection in 2000, staff converted the catalog cards into MARC records. In 2003, the BU libraries decided to expand both the digitization and cataloging effort out to the remaining 29,000 pieces. After a few years, they realized that this project was above in-house staff. Therefore, they began investigating various music outsourcing services and in 2008, Baylor began contracting with Flourish Music Cataloging (FMC). The original metadata conversion process
used Extensible Stylesheet Language Transformation (XSLT) to transform the MARC records into Extensible Markup Language (XML) metadata. Then a Persistent Uniform Resource Locator (Purl) script was used to convert the XML metadata into tab-delimited metadata for ingestion into CONTENTdm (digital collection management system). However, Evans explains that although the original conversion process worked well at the beginning but later on an integral component broke down. Two librarians from the Cataloging and Metadata Unit, Allison Yanos and Kara Long, took this issue as an opportunity to revise and update the existing processes, with the goal of using newer technology and tools to streamline the metadata conversion workflow. The end result was incorporating MarcEdit, Box.com, and OpenRefine into the workflow, which has greatly enhanced the workflow’s productivity and efficiency. Then, Evans handed over the microphone to Kara Long.

Kara Long continued to the session by explaining the metadata conversion workflow to CONTENTdm (digital collection management system) with the help of OpenRefine and other new tools by giving examples from the Spencer Sheet Music Project. She briefly explained the timeline and when they started incorporating MarcEdit, Box.com (cloud based content and online file sharing system) and OpenRefine into the workflow. OpenRefine (formerly Google Refine) is an open source application for data cleanup and it runs in web browser after installation. Long explained very well how they used OpenRefine for various tasks: import and export data, facet data, transform data, reconcile data to outside data sets. The biggest advantage of OpenRefine is that it acts like a spreadsheet but more programmable like a database. Within this database, Long explained how they arranged certain things for their project: re-formatted dates, removed unnecessary punctuation, added fields that required in the collection and separated them into cells. At the end of her presentation, Long added that it would be wise to extract and save the patterns and apply them to new data sets that might need the same kind of clean in future projects.

Jennifer Vaughn from Syracuse University also talked about how she used OpenRefine application for transforming the historic sound recording metadata at Syracuse’s Belfer Audio Archive that is one of the biggest sound recording archives in the United States. During her presentation, Vaughn especially focused on how she improved the name data. There were lots of inconsistencies, variants and punctuation errors on the name data and it needed significant improvement. She explained how she used “cluster and edit column” feature for names in OpenRefine. This feature helps to find group of different cell values that might be alternative representations of the same name regardless of capitalization differences or different diacritics. Other than “cluster and edit column” feature, Vaughn also mentioned to other features (transposing, expressions and web scraping) of OpenRefine. However, she mainly focused on the “facets and filters” and “reconciliation” features. The facets and filter feature helped her to select subsets of the data that she was working on. Then she explained the goal of reconciliation feature as to connect the data sets to the specific vocabulary to a “controlled vocabulary” on the Web. Later on, she explained how she reconciled against a specific source VIAF (The Virtual International Authority File) on the Web. At the end of her presentation, Vaughn says that the name data in the Belfer Audio Archive is much better now after applying OpenRefine features, but work is still not complete.

Reported by: Nurhak Tuncer
(City Colleges of Chicago)
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WorldCat & WorldCatDiscovery: Planning and Implementation

Kristen Dougan (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)  Rebecca Belford (University at Buffalo)

A Rose by any Other Name: From FirstSearch to WorldCat Discovery Services (Kirstin Dougan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

Approaching WorldCat Discovery: Early Responses from the Music Library Community (Rebecca Belford, University at Buffalo)

This was a shared presentation by a reference and public services librarian (Dougan) and the MOUG Reference and Collection Services Coordinator (Belford). Dougan focused on the challenges of adopting WorldCat Discovery Services (WDS) in place of FirstSearch, with terminology used for search functions being one of the biggest challenges for music resource discovery. According to Dougan, the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) used a FirstSearch-like search environment that was locally built (“Easy Search”) with subject modules for music specific search. The present challenge then is to continue to create a search environment using OCLC WDS when functions and tools for customization have changed their role.

According to Dougan, one of these new changes is that the formerly-free WorldCat.org service is no longer free with WDS, and the platform is configured to search journal articles in addition to books and scores. While the latter may be a welcoming change for some libraries, it is bound to create clutter for music resources. Dougan showed screenshots of a keyword search for “music” on both FirstSearch and WDS, and surprisingly the results did not match, one speculation being the addition of journal articles to the results pool. Additional indexes are bundled in for discovery using WDS, but they are contingent upon level of subscription. The OCLC WorldShare Service Configuration is accessible by limited personnel at UIUC, therefore customizing WDS to meet the needs of all library units may become a trial-and-error approach. Also, WDS needs to be further customized to add services such as Alexander Street Press Classical Music Library and other digital services.

One of the main issues that impact music resource discovery on WDS is the lack of faceted search option from initial interface; the keyword search function leads to another “click”. Using an example, Dougan pointed out that looking for a two-piano edition of a certain work led to all editions and formats of the work, as a result of failing to implement FRBR into the search and retrieval process. Additionally, the new interface has no option to look at search history, saving a search, returning to a search, modifying a search, thus each search is a start-over, which becomes a time-consuming endeavor for public service librarians assisting patrons during a research consultation.

WDS search results do not show publisher information nor cluster results by region/state. One is able to narrow search results by zip code, but this is problematic for institutions like UIUC that are part of a statewide consortium, as institutions from the same state may be preceded by adjacent state institutions. Dougan’s presentation was a direct response to the dissatisfaction voiced by other public services librarians in the music community, which overlapped with Belford’s presentation of recommendations to improve OCLC WDS as a response from the music library community.

Belford’s presentation’s title summed up the main goal of her presentation: response from the music library community and MOUG, and how members can be involved to continue the conversation in improving WDS to facilitate efficient music resource discovery. With a specific example, Belford discussed how the WDS public interface currently shows only MARC field 382 $a: Medium of Performance. This leaves out information related to soloists ($b), doubling instruments ($d), number of performers for medium ($n), notes ($v), etc. With large scale participation or “vetting” from the MOUG community, the proposed change of removing 048 field from public display end and display all 382 subfields in the order of appearance (a, b, d, p, v, n, e, s) can be implemented. Tying in with Dougan’s previous example about editions and formats, Belford pointed out that a recommendation to
display 7XX field information, more comprehensive advanced search function similar to FirstSearch, and the accommodation of complex Booleans, among others, may facilitate a better search experience for music users.

Belford also presented a summary of the MLA-MOUG OCLC Search and Discovery Task Force that has been working diligently since May 2015 to propose similar changes to OCLC. Belford encouraged the audience to participate in OCLC webinars such as Ready-Set-Go, WorldCat Discovery Configuration, WorldCat Discovery Services and FirstSearch: What’s next? hosted to offer more information to those interested in learning more about the changes from FirstSearch to WDS. Other items covered in Belford’s summary report include improving the searching universe for music materials, and refining recommendations based on search results, facets, examples of bibliographic records, and OCLC help documentation. Belford announced that the task force recommendations were in working draft status, and did not wish to publicize the details of the report at this time.

In summary, Dougan’s presentation covered the challenges faced by public service librarians assisting music users during the switch from FirstSearch to WDS. Belford’s presentation covered improving configurations and recommendations from the music community to facilitate better music resource discovery on WDS.

Reported by: Treshani Perera
(University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee)

LIGHTNING TALK
The Cataloging of Self-Published Items

Reed David (University of Alaska, Anchorage)
Nurhak Tuncer (City Colleges of Chicago, Malcolm X College)

On the Tuesday evening program, Nurhak Tuncer (Adjunct Librarian at Malcolm X College, City Colleges of Chicago) and Reed David (Cataloging Librarian at the University of Alaska Anchorage) co-presented a 30-minute session on the topic of cataloging self-published items in libraries. Opening by noting the growing prevalence of composers creating their own presses or record labels to publish their works (composer John Mackey: “My day job is publishing my own music”), Tuncer described a research project she developed in April 2015, in which she identified problems of cataloging self-published materials – lack of information, little cataloging research, and the need for a consensus on best practice – and constructed a methodology that included surveying catalogers and analyzing records contributed to OCLC by the survey respondents. She and David collaborated on the project’s implementation.

The survey, distributed nationally via listservs and Facebook groups over a period from September 14 to December 31, 2015, comprised twelve questions, all multiple-choice with text boxes to accommodate additional comments. 403 respondents completed the survey. The largest number were from academic libraries (45%), followed by public libraries (34%), with smaller numbers from other libraries. 38% of respondents were contributing cataloging of self-published titles beyond the local/consortial level, to cooperatives such as OCLC. All formats were being cataloged: 94% were books, 38% sound recordings, 36% videos, with smaller numbers of scores and other formats.

Three questions dealt with publication data. Regarding publisher name and place, the largest group of respondents (34%) indicated that they employed no single method for recording these elements; they used their “best judgment,” variously giving creator, firm, or both. Most, in the presenters’ words, “made an effort to put something meaningful” in cases where information was missing; only 10% reported resorting to the “[publisher not identified]” option. Regarding date of publication, a majority (55%) indicated that the date was usually clear from the item; however, text-box comments showed that many were inferring a publication date from copyright dates, printing dates, or outside sources such as Amazon.

Respondents were asked whether they ever added a note pertaining to an item’s self-published status. 68% replied that they had never done so.

Respondents were also queried on the amount of effort they put into cataloging self-published as opposed to traditionally published items. 59% said they expended the same effort on both; but, as one comment put it, “the same effort ends up requiring more time [for self-published ma-
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terials] because the information isn’t as available.” For a solid majority (63%), most of their cataloging of self-published items was original (“it is very rare for us to find existing records”); others mentioned also upgrading vendor copy.

Did catalogers ever question whether a self-published title should be added to their library’s collection? About half (51%) replied “no”; a quarter replied that they did report poor-quality items, and that at least some of the time these items were not added. Some commented that their position did not involve responsibility for selection; others that they did have some level of responsibility for collection-development decision-making. Still others cited local policy mandating cataloging of any works by members of their community, or of user-requested items.

David then showed us a few of the 357 OCLC records that were solicited from survey respondents as “representative examples of the records you create.” The purpose was to compare actual practice to survey responses. One point of variance concerned the publisher data: more than half as many records (212 to 92) gave the firm only than those that gave the creator only; about a third (29%) gave both; and about a quarter (24%) gave “[publisher not identified].”

The presenters offered a number of suggestions. Linked data could help with multiple expressions and manifestations. NACO catalogers could be encouraged to help reduce the burden on the many libraries currently creating local authority records. Also to be encouraged: the creation of lists of self-publishing firms for local use. Regarding publication data, the presenters favor acknowledging the creator as publisher in all relevant places in the MARC record (relationship designators as both creator and publisher in the 100 field; and a 264 field for the creator, in addition to one for the firm). Using copyright date (which is almost always present) to infer a publication date is supported in RDA (LC-PCC to 2.8.6.6). Regarding the question of creating notes indicating self-published status (should one do it? How?), the presenters’ response is: It depends on the item. In conclusion, the presenters noted that their work is intended to be descriptive, not prescriptive; to identify patterns in self-published items; to start a conversation about cataloging practice; to encourage the building of bridges between self-publishers and libraries; and to indicate directions for future research.

During the question-and-answer period, several audience members stressed the importance of refraining from making value judgments on the self-published materials we catalog. It was observed that firms created to publish a single author’s works are legitimate, in the sense that they perform marketing and distribution; and that publishing patterns have always been changing. One attendee voiced reluctance to use the term “self-published” in a note, fearing that users might infer inferior quality or credentials; the presenters’ response stressed the importance of creating more access for local users, and teamwork with collection-management librarians. On the topic of recording publication data, an attendee cited cases where Amazon gave the name of a firm, but the cataloger had recorded only the composer as publisher. This prompted discussion exploring the establishment of a best practice to give both composer and firm as publishers. A couple of attendees reported receiving items with missing accompanying materials, and difficulties they encountered contacting composers to rectify the situation; the presenters responded that this was indeed an additional problem that they had observed with self-published materials.

Tuncer and Reed will soon publish an article comprehensively detailing their research.

Reported by: Leslie McCall
(Wake Forest University)
David Procházka began this session by introducing an investigation he has undertaken in recent years, the purpose of which is to determine the best way to identify the guitar preludes of Spanish composer Francisco Tárrega (1852-1909). Emphasizing that this endeavor is very much a work in progress rather than a completed, polished research project, Procházka provided the MOUG audience an eight-page handout that proved most useful as a guide to the knotty bibliographic problems he would go on to describe.

Following a brief account of Tárrega’s compositional output and musical style, Procházka moved to the root of this problem: Tárrega’s tendency to distribute multiple versions of his compositions, in manuscript and often untitled copies, among his students and friends, a practice that has since complicated the process of identifying his complete works. Procházka pointed out in this regard that no fewer than five editions of widely varying content claim to include Tárrega’s complete original works, and that identification of the preludes has proven especially problematic. These small-scale works have caused some large-scale confusion.

Procházka’s understanding of this confusion is informed by his work as Music and Special Materials Cataloger at the University of Akron, an institution known for its excellent program in guitar performance. Because it is common for guitar recitalists to include selections from Tárrega’s preludes in their recordings, Procházka has always striven to create access to each of these works by providing it a unique identifier, a priority that has inevitably drawn him to the publishing history of the preludes.

The story begins straightforwardly enough during Tárrega’s lifetime with the publication of nine works bearing the title of prelude, published at different times by different firms with no discrepancy in their numbering. Such clarity was not to last, however, as a wave of publication during this century and the last swept away the consistency of identification observable in the first published set of preludes.

Citing editions of Tárrega’s works that have appeared over the last sixty years or so, Procházka detailed a publication history that is almost baffling in its inconsistency. The Universal Editions Sämtliche Präludien of 1961 includes fifteen preludes, omitting without explanation several of the original nine. The four-volume “complete edition,” published by Ricordi of Buenos Aires in 1968, lists thirty preludes. This number rises to thirty-nine in Bèrben’s 1971-1978 edition, only to fall to thirty-five in the five-volume Soneto Ediciones Musicales edition of 1991-1993, and then to twenty-four in the Productions d’OZ single-volume edition of 2008. Beyond these editions, Procházka consulted Wolf Moser’s biography of Tárrega, a volume impressive for its extensive coverage of Tárrega’s compositions but less helpful than might be expected as a guide to identification of the preludes.

Procházka compared the thirty-seven preludes identified in Moser’s thematic catalog with the thirty-nine contained in the Bèrben edition and discovered that these publications had only twenty-seven works in common. Disagreement between these volumes includes works unique to each publication as well as compositions entitled prelude in one and etude in the other. A further problem that complicated Procházka’s investigation is the inconsistency in Moser’s thematic catalog from one edition to the next: the numbering of works in the Spanish editions of 2007 and 2009 differs from that of the original 1906 German edition.

Finally, Procházka’s has only recently come upon an additional thematic index of Tárrega’s preludes, studies, and exercises, edited by Mijndert Jape and included in Classical Guitar Music in Print, published by Musicdata, Inc. in 1989. Before discussing this source, he shifted attention briefly to the subject of authority control and the Tárrega preludes.

Following this rather bewildering survey of the source materials, audience expectations for the efficacy of the relevant authority work were hardly high—and
the three records Procházka provided little to raise them. The first of these records (no97082998) represents all of the preludes and cites a 1984 edition inclusive of twenty preludes, edited by Ruggero Chiesa; the second (n2010053913) is for an individual prelude and implies on shaky evidence the existence of a single work or set of works that includes all of the numbered preludes; and the third (n2015060086) is of little consequence to Procházka’s investigation, as it is for selections and was included in the presentation only to give a complete account of what the authority file has to offer on Tárrega’s preludes. Because the records provide an inadequate guide to the construction of access points, Procházka began developing an apparatus that would enable him to trace each of the preludes. As he put it, “I attempted to draw together every numbered work which at least one editor or author had identified.” What emerged from this endeavor was a substantive and detailed table that provided the audience a wealth of data pertaining to the preludes—incipits, keys, meters, variant titles, and of course a great many numbering schemes with their sources identified. If this is a work in progress, clearly it has progressed a very long way.

To conclude his presentation, Procházka returned to the subject of Mijndert Jape’s thematic index, a source he describes as the most promising he has encountered in his decade of work on this project. The index not only retains the original numbering of Tárrega’s preludes but also provides an unprecedented critical apparatus and is very widely held. Procházka noted the drawback that this work does not include all of Tárrega’s compositions; however, he does not find this a major stumbling block, given that most of the composer’s other works have distinctive titles and thus require no further qualification. Procházka also regrets that Jape does not explain his reasons for categorizing certain works as preludes, others as etudes, and still others as exercises, adding that further study will determine whether or not this is a significant problem.

A lively discussion followed. In addition to questions and observations from the audience, there were three questions submitted prior to this session by MOUG members Matt Ertz, Tomoko Hibuya, and Jean Hardin. Matt’s question stimulated a spirited exchange on the complexity and function of parallel titles in Beat Furrer’s La Bianca Notte. Tomoko sought advice on how to construct an authorized access point under RDA 6.28.1.10 for Esercizio di Pazzia II, by Francesco Fildei, a work calling for four performers in which the medium is paper. And Jean asked for opinions on the construction of an authorized access point for a John Harbison’s Three Occasional Pieces when the existing authority record gives Four Occasional Pieces as the only variant title.

Reported by: Mac Nelson
(The University of North Carolina at Greensboro)
works to provide guidance, consistency, and structure. The archival corollary to RDA is DACS (Describing Archives: A Content Standard). Instead of catalogs with bibliographic records in MARC21, finding aids guided by DACS and encoded in EAD (Encoded Archival Description) transmit data about collections.

Within an archive, each collection is organized hierarchically unto itself, requiring a more flexible, case-by-case approach in comparison to traditional cataloging methods. An archival collection and its creator(s) are inextricably linked, and the methods of describing these relationships between creators and created reach far beyond those prescribed by RDA. The DACS Statement of Principles outlines foundational archival tenets which include keeping items in a collection together, identifying groupings within the whole, reflecting a collection’s arrangement in its description, and viewing description as a dynamic, iterative process. Discoverability remains paramount, and a preliminary collection-level finding aid is better than no finding aid at all. In some cases, the answer to the question “How do I get this off my desk?” may be to provide an initial descriptive overview then add further detail as time permits.

DACS Part I focuses on describing archival materials and establishes the minimum requirements for a description. The highest-level grouping of materials is a series, followed hierarchically by a subseries, box, folder, and item. DACS Part II ventures beyond describing materials, focusing instead on archival authority records for persons, families, and corporate bodies. Some discipline-specific companion standards are provided in DACS Appendix B, but the guidelines for music remain under discussion. Appendix C contains crosswalks including DACS to RDA, DACS to MARC, DACS to EAD, and DACS to EAC-CPF (Encoded Archival Context – Corporate bodies, Persons, and Families).

Although DACS remains container-neutral, EAD is recommended as an encoding standard since it facilitates interoperability and offers linked data possibilities. As with HTML documents, EAD documents consist of nested elements. The EAD structure divides the various elements into three segments: the EAD header, front matter, and archival description. Numerous best practices documents for EAD are available online, especially from regional consortia. Using existing crosswalk mappings, finding aids in EAD may also be imported via MARC records into an OPAC.

Maristella highlighted several initiatives and websites that explore the potentials of archival description and archival-provided context. For supplemental documentation and explanations of EAD, consult the website eadiva.com, self-described as a “plain-talking EAD tag library.” Housed at the University of Virginia, SNAC (Social Networks and Archival Context) is a research and development cooperative program focused on describing persons, families, and organizations and linking these creators to collections held by archives and libraries throughout the world. Finally, the OCLC product ArchiveGrid crawls and aggregates EAD records from over 1,000 archival institutions.

In conclusion, Maristella noted the ongoing challenge of enabling our various systems to talk to each other. For instance, how will BIBFRAME interact with EAD and EAC? But amid our current day-to-day questions of What is this?, Why is it on my desk?, How do I get it off my desk?, we should not be afraid to bust historical silos and venture into bibliographic borderlands. For collections resisting a cataloging approach, archival description may just provide an answer.

Reported by: Melissa Moll
(University of Iowa)
Kathy Glennan shared the results of an experimental RDA visualization of the Jim Henson Collection, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries. The collection was donated to the University, Jim Henson’s alma mater, in 2005 by the Jane Henson Foundation and The Jim Henson Legacy. The collection includes 75 digital videos spanning 35 years of his innovative work in television and film were given. The full-length videos are available for use on campus. The collection is discoverable via the catalog record, webpage (http://digital.lib.umd.edu/henson/henson_um), and now – by “r-ball.”

An “r-ball” is a collection (or “ball”) of linked data related to a particular entity. Data is described with RDA and the r-ball is created with RIMMF (“RDA in Many Metadata Formats”), a visualization tool. Few r-balls tackle music or audiovisual materials.

RIMMF has been the focus of recent workshops such as the popular “Jane-a-thons” (Jane Austen) to explore use of RDA beyond the current MARC limitations. RIMMF can ingest both MARC bibliographic and authority records, breaking them into entity records. The resulting entity records are linked to show relationships. Currently, RIMMF is only a visualization tool, not a production tool. When the record for the video “Time Piece” was put into RIMMF, the results included five different relationships for Henson – in contrast to the MARC workarounds we are used to (e.g., a single access point with relationship designators in multiple instances of subfield e).

The Jim Henson r-ball created from the 75 video records resulted in 798 entity records, including records for 99 works, 93 expressions, 103 manifestations, 437 persons, and 66 corporate bodies. There are more work than expression records because records were not created for individual talk show clips, etc.

Other visualizations of linked data, such as linked data graphs, are available but are problematic. There are not many free tools available and to get a meaningful display, data often needs to be massaged. Since bibliographic data has detailed relationships, any visualization gets large very quickly. When audiovisual materials are involved, the results grow exponentially – when the Henson data was fed into a tool, the over 14,000 RDF triples produced resulted in an illegible visualization! (By way of contrast, a graph of four entity records for Jane Austen’s Emma produced a detailed, but manageable visualization.)

Glennan outlined several data challenges using the RIMMF tool. Sometimes it can be difficult identifying which element to where. While RIMMF allows for pure RDA without compromises for MARC and local systems, it’s difficult to get away from these ways of thinking. Glennan also noted that there are not relationship designators for everything – case in point, “puppet builders.” Using RIMMF offers data opportunities such as greater granularity in records. Relationships and roles can be described with greater specificity, and one can determine exactly what to display in an authorized access point (for example, dates are displayed here where they do not appear in the Library of Congress Name Authority File).

Turning to music, Glennan shared results of a base r-ball created for George F. Root songbooks in The Polly H. Carder Collection on George F. Root at the University of Maryland (view the r-ball at http://rballs.info/topics/p/gfroot). This r-ball resulted in 232 records. Challenges encountered including dealing with print resources most of which were digitized, representing editions/reproductions in a meaningful way and describing electronic reproductions. One example of a worst case scenario in this collection: The Shawm, which included a singing book plus a collection of songs plus the cantata, Daniel. Trying to determine which WEMI level should hold those relationships was quite messy!

Reported by: Mary Huismann (University of Minnesota)
This year the traditional MOUG sessions “Ask OCLC (Ask Jay),” “Ask MOUG,” “MOUG Hot Topics,” and the NMP/Enhance expert community sessions were combined to form “Ask Everything!” In her introduction to the session, Michelle Hahn explained that “Ask Everything!” would be based around pre-submitted questions, with time allowed for new questions from the attendees.

 Appropriately, the first question was about MOUG 2016’s program proposal process. Michelle stated that this year, ideas for the program were generated not by the Program Committee, but by the MOUG membership. Members could submit proposals for their own presentations, could propose sessions to be presented by others, or could pose questions for lightning talks and question/answer sessions. The program committee reviewed all of the submissions to develop themes around suitable content.

 A variety of topics were raised during the session. Casey Mullin and Kathy Glennan addressed the question of the use of “(expression)” in relationship designators (e.g. “composer (expression”). Casey suggested using it for the composer of a cadenza included in a previously-composed work, or for someone who completes a previously unfinished work. Kathy noted that she has used it for a composer who wrote music that was used in a video recording, but who was not the primary creator of the recording.

 In response to a question about when and how to input non-Roman alphabet parallel title fields, Mark Scharff advised contacting the individual language funnel to get their input and assistance. The group discussed the pros and cons of using Windows scripts and keyboards, while several attendees recommended the OCLC script macros, such as those for Cyrillic and Greek.

 A member asked how libraries are handling born-digital content, including workflows, standards, and platforms. A show of hands indicated that few of those present were currently working with born-digital content, although attendees suggested institutional concert recordings and institutional or library imprints as sources of such content. Consensus seemed to be that there is no consensus on how to handle the files—some are housed in an archival server, while others are stored in a scholarly repository—but the content generally ends up described in the traditional catalog.

 Another question involved whether library research services staff should be offering assistance with resumes, cover letters, and CVs. It was noted that such a service seems to be more common, and that there was going to be a session at MLA about helping students with career preparation.

 An attendee asked about how to deal with a physical resource that includes the same ISBN as the previously published electronic version, and how ISBNs are assigned for self-published resources. Jay Weitz responded that ISBNs must be assigned by the publisher: self-published items won’t have one unless the publisher/author applies for one. He also said that in the case of an ISBN used for both electronic and physical versions of a resource, the duplicate ISBN should be placed in subfield z for the second resource.

 There were a few questions about OCLC records. One person said that their institution had added several thousand records to OCLC for resources that turned out to be illegally produced and thus couldn’t be circulated. They wanted to know if these records could be deleted from OCLC. Jay responded that a file of OCLC numbers could be sent to OCLC. Jay responded that a file of OCLC numbers could be sent to OCLC with an explanation of the situation, and as long as there were no holdings OCLC could delete them.

 Another person asked about searching OCLC records with the “Display using GLIMIR clustering” box checked. She said that she had searched for a record by OCLC record number, and that it had not been found when the box was checked. Jay replied that there are a lot of records in OCLC that do not yet have GLIMIR identifiers assigned; these records will not show up in a search if the GLIMIR clustering box is checked. He added that OCLC is looking into adding the identifiers to every record, but this is a work in process.

 A third question was about OCLC’s use of schema.org for linked data: is there a way to see the “behind the scenes” use of this data? Jay responded that information about schema.org data and its applications can be found on the OCLC website in the “Research” area (http://www.oclc.org/research.html). Any questions about this and other research can be addressed to the researchers via this page.

 Two major themes emerged from the submitted questions. The first was about supplying appropriate dates for resources. Someone asked, “When the date listed in the 26X
is very obviously the date that an item was received and not a date of publication/production, can we change it?” The example given was a resource with 2014 printed on it, but which has been cataloged with “[2015]” in the 26X field. Jay advised to be careful when considering changing a date in an OCLC record. Catalogers should try to find out if the date in the record was supplied with a good reason, and only change it if they are certain it is incorrect.

This and another question about dating print-on-demand/custom print scores led to a lively discussion about determining dates for various types of custom printed resources, or resources printed later or earlier than their “publication” date. After some debate about whether or not the OCLC record should be considered a record of a “universal manifestation” or of an individual item (e.g., when you catalog a PDF printout, are you cataloging the printout or the original PDF?), it was noted that the LCC Policy Statement for 1.11: Facsimiles and Reproductions advises to supply the publication or production date of the original resource, not the date the resource was printed out. An attendee suggested using local bibliographic data to avoid creating multiple records in OCLC that only differ in the date. Jay reminded the group that, traditionally, a different date of printing has not justified creating a new bibliographic record, unless there is evidence that something else has changed.

A related question asked about how to determine dates or ranges of dates for different types of materials: are there guides to dating resources such as scores from particular publishers, e.g. G. Schirmer, Peters, or Breitkopf & Härtel? The attendees had many good suggestions, including Dichter & Shapiro’s Handbook of Early American Sheet Music, Hoffmeister XIX, Devriès’s Dictionnaire des éditeurs de musique français, and the IAML guide to dating music. It was suggested that MOUG could create a master list of these kinds of resources for the MOUG website.

The second major theme of the session, which followed from the discussion of supplying appropriate dates for resources, was the classic cataloger’s conundrum of when to create a new record. Tracey Snyder asked about the pros and cons of adding item-specific notes to the OCLC master record for a resource. This question sparked a debate on how to handle local 500 notes in a shared catalog. Some attendees who use WorldCat Discovery requested that catalogers not add local notes to the records, since those notes would be displayed to their users, who may think that information applies to their library’s copy of the resource. Someone else remarked that since one of the most common uses of WorldCat is to aid in interlibrary loan, having notes that don’t apply to all versions of an item could cause confusion. Tracey explained her situation more fully: Cornell has DJ Afrika Bambaataa’s collection of LPs, which he covered with electrical tape and various annotations to help him in DJ-ing. Cornell wants to make these unique items discoverable to the world. What is the best way to do that, if local 500 notes in OCLC is not recommended?

The most popular suggestion from the group was to create new records for these items. DCRM allows catalogers to create separate records for unique resources that have significance as “artifacts,” and from Tracey’s description, the LPs seem to qualify as such. One attendee advised supplying new titles for the LPs, such as “[Afrika Bambaataa’s copy of…]” to highlight their status as unique artifacts.

Tracey’s situation and the resulting conversation served as a preface to the final portion of the session. Jay Weitz gave a presentation entitled “Cataloging Sound Recordings Defensively: When to input a new record in the age of DDR.” The purpose of his presentation was to remind music catalogers of how best to use MARC and AACR2/RDA to differentiate records in OCLC so that they won’t be handled incorrectly by OCLC’s Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) software. He presented a list of fields that DDR uses to determine whether or not a record is unique, and suggested ways catalogers could use those fields to their advantage. Jay’s PowerPoint presentation is available at https://www.oclc.org/events/2016/cataloging-sound-recordings-defensively.en.html.

Reported by: Amy Strickland
(University of Miami)
The meeting was called to order by Chair Bruce Evans at: 10:32 a.m.
1. Adoption of Agenda
   a. The agenda was adopted without change.
2. Approval of Minutes from the 2015 Denver business meeting
   a. Minutes were distributed electronically in advance of the meeting, and were also published in the June 2015 issues of the MOUG Newsletter.
   b. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes; the motion passed.
3. Board Reports
   a. Chair (Bruce Evans)
      i. Appointments:
         1. 2016 Program committee: Colin Bitter, Matt Ertz, Christopher Holden, Sophie Rondeau, Daryll Stevens, Amy Strickland, Rebecca Belford (ex officio), Bruce Evans (ex officio)
         2. Nominating committee: Catherine Busselen (chair), Damian Iseminger, Casey Mullin
         3. Temporary website admins: Autumn Faulkner, Molly O’Brien
         4. Temporary website admin asst: Tomoko Shibuya
         5. Web editor (formerly Web Keeper): Anna Alfeld LoPrete
         6. Fundraising Chair: Steve Luttmann
         7. MLA-MOUG joint WorldCat Discovery Task Force appointments: Rebecca Belford, Marty Jenkins, Her-mine Vermeij, Brad Young
         8. All appointees, committee and task force members were thanked for their service
      ii. Election results
         1. Bylaws election was held in November 2015: all amendments passed
            a. Next steps: Reference, Discovery and Collection Coordinator and Committee
               i. Rebecca Belford will serve as acting RDC Coordinator until the 2017 election
               ii. Draft a charge for the committee
               iii. Call for committee members
         2. Elections for the positions of Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Continuing Education Coordinator were held in November 2015
         3. Candidates for Secretary/Newsletter Editor: Jacob Schaub, Jennifer Vaughn
         4. Candidates for Continuing Education Coordinator: Jaroslaw Szurek, Molly O’Brien
         5. Results: Jennifer Vaughn was elected Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Molly O’Brien was elected Continu-ing Education Coordinator
            a. Thanks to all four candidates for their willingness to put their names forward in service of the organization
            b. Outgoing Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Continuing Education Coordinator Michelle Hahn were rec-ognized for their service
            c. Outgoing Treasurer Nara Newcomer was thanked for her service as she transitions to her new role as past treasurer
         6. The 2016 Nominating Committee was appointed: Bruce Evans (Board representative), Beth Iseminger, Karla Jurgemeyer (chair)
      iii. Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant
         1. Three awards were made this year: Alyssa Hislop, Laura Thompson, Rahni Kennedy
         2. The awardees were recognized, and thanks given to all applicants
      iv. Other activity
         1. NMP to CMC transition
            a. The transition was completed in summer 2016
b. NMPAC chair Alan Ringwood and NMP coordinator Mark Scharff were thanked for their service and assistance with the transition

2. Future of MOUG-L
   a. In response to report from Kerri Baunach (MOUG-L listowner) solicited discussion about use of another platform for the list
   b. In response to membership feedback the decision was made to move the list to a new host (OCLC)
      i. Jay Weitz and Nancy Sack will be co-listowners
   c. Kerri Baunach was recognized for her service as listowner since 2008

3. Transition to Past Chair
   a. Bruce Evans expressed his thanks for being able serve as MOUG Chair and related how enriching and enjoyable this experience has been to him

4. Peter Lisius’s project to digitize newsletters
   a. The project is now complete and the newsletters are available at the MOUG website
   v. Evans was recognized for his service and was thanked for his report

b. Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (Casey Mullin)
   i. Main responsibilities have been shadowing the Chair and serving as main publicity officer; watch NOTES for a special Papakhian Travel Grant announcement!
   ii. Served on the Nominating Committee
   iii. Spearheaded the handbook revision process
   iv. Coordinated the selection process for the Papakhian Travel Grant selection process
   v. Mullin was thanked for his service and for his report

c. Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Mary Huismann)
   i. Distributed draft Board and business meeting minutes
   1. Worked with the Web Keeper to get minutes posted to the public and board webpages
   ii. Produced three issues of the MOUG Newsletter
      1. Sent the previous year’s issues of the MOUG Newsletter (2014) to the Web Keeper for posting
      2. Sent current issues of the MOUG Newsletter to EBSCO for inclusion in their library product
   iii. Submitted MOUG Handbook and newsletter publication manual revisions to the Vice Chair/Chair Elect
   iv. As liaison to Music Library Association submitted Board roster to the MLA President and regular reports to MLA Board
   v. Huismann thanked everyone for opportunity to serve in this role
   vi. Huismann was recognized for her service and was thanked for her report

d. Treasurer (Nara Newcomer)
   i. The treasurer’s report was distributed in the meeting folder
   ii. MOUG remains fiscally healthy
   iii. Some funds spent this year for website expenses/implementation
   iv. Great results from Membee implementation – renewals are up and on-time!
      1. This renewal cycle was the first with PayPal/Membee fully implemented
      2. Members encouraged to add donations on to their renewal or at anytime
      3. Institutional subscriptions continue a downward trend
      4. Will be investigating receipt of EBSCO royalties
   v. Newcomer thanked everyone for opportunity to serve in this role
   vi. Newcomer was recognized for her service as Treasurer and was thanked for her report

e. Treasurer-Elect (Tomoko Shibuya)
   i. Served as web assistant
   ii. Completed treasurer training with Newcomer via Skype, which worked well
   iii. Shibuya recognized Newcomer for her assistance and training

f. Continuing Education Coordinator (Michelle Hahn)
   i. Final registration numbers: 113 attendees (of which 8 are first timers)
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1. Attendees were reminded to complete the online meeting evaluation
2. Hahn revealed OCLC-related presentations to be given at MLA
3. Hahn thanked everyone for opportunity to serve in this role
4. Hahn was recognized for her service and was thanked for her report

4. Other reports
a. Reference and Collection Services Coordinator (Rebecca Belford)
   i. Performed the usual activities: tracking OCLC activity, webinars, etc.
   ii. Pursued direct advocacy with OCLC
   iii. Participated on the MLA-MOUG joint Discovery Task Force
   1. Task force work is wrapping up soon
   iv. Belford looks forward to serving as acting Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator
   v. Belford was thanked for her report
b. OLAC Liaison (Karen Peters)
   i. Peters gave a brief explanation of OLAC
   ii. Current OLAC president is Stacie Traill
   iii. Reported that OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) has issued several RDA best practice guides
   (most recently, video games)
   iv. The 2016 OLAC biennial conference will be postponed to 2017
   v. The recipient of the 2015 Nancy B. Olson Award was Mary Huismann
   vi. Peters was thanked for her report
c. OCLC report (Jay Weitz)
   i. The OCLC report was distributed in the meeting folders
   ii. Weitz is developing and presenting a series of “Cataloging defensively” webinars/presentations
d. LC Report
   i. The LC report was distributed in advance of the meeting in electronic format
e. First 100K Effort (Steve Luttmann)
   i. Upcoming campaigns will include a “40 for 40” campaign (in honor of MOUG’s upcoming 40th anniversary)
   1. Other campaigns are in the works, with details to come
   ii. Proposed capital campaign with some matching from a group of MOUG elders and alums to launch later this year with funds to support the Papakhian Travel Grant
   iii. Luttmann was thanked for his report

5. Tribute to Sue Stancu (Michelle Hahn)
   a. Sue Stancu, a charter member of MOUG, retired from Indiana University in December 2014 after 25 years of service

6. Distinguished Service Award (Bruce Evans)
   a. The Distinguished Service Award was awarded to Neil Hughes
   b. Hughes expressed his thanks to the membership and Board

7. Announcements and questions from the membership
   a. Announcement: MLA registration opens at noon

8. Comments to the Good of the Order?
   a. None given

9. Adjournment
   a. The gavel was passed to incoming Chair, Casey Mullin
      i. Mullin remarked that MOUG is turning a new chapter – MOUG “XL” (noting the record meeting attendance, new services, and announced the launch of a new oral history project commemorating MOUG’s 40th anniversary)
      ii. Mullin paid tribute to outgoing Chair, Bruce Evans, thanking him for his service to MOUG
   b. A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and passed unanimously
   c. The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Huismann
Secretary/Newsletter Editor
FirstSearch will Continue to be Offered as a Separate Service

A new version of FirstSearch will deliver the full-featured searching of WorldCat valued by FirstSearch users today. WorldCat Discovery will continue to provide single-search discovery of electronic, digital, and physical materials in local library collections and in libraries worldwide. In addition to the single search box preferred by many searchers, the future WorldCat Discovery will provide the full-featured search experience of FirstSearch for library staff and other expert searchers. WorldCat Discovery will remain the user-facing interface to WorldShare® Management Services. Both WorldCat Discovery and the new version of FirstSearch will include a modern, mobile-ready interface. Collections of libraries represented in WorldCat will remain visible on the websites where many people begin their research, no matter which option a library uses in the future. As OCLC works to deliver essential functionality required by both services, access to the current version of FirstSearch will extend beyond the 2016 calendar year into 2017. OCLC has modified the plan to transfer all FirstSearch and WorldCat Local users to WorldCat Discovery because we understand libraries need to deliver search experiences that meet different user needs:

- Power searching of the WorldCat database, often used by library staff and expert searchers.
- Single-search-box discovery of electronic, digital, and physical library collections for a broader user community.

Many libraries also already have a discovery service but still want to provide detailed searching of WorldCat to support research and a variety of library workflows. A current subscription enables libraries to select either FirstSearch or WorldCat Discovery, implementing the service that best meets the needs of their staff and users. OCLC will share additional details about plans to enhance WorldCat Discovery and release the new version of FirstSearch in the coming months. Next steps for your library:

- If you have completed your transition to WorldCat Discovery, continue to use the service and new features as they are added.
- If you have not yet tried WorldCat Discovery, request your library’s unique WorldCat Discovery URL (http://registration.oclc.org/reg/?pc=worldcatdiscovery) and take a look at the service. This will help you plan whether to use FirstSearch or WorldCat Discovery in the future.
- Watch for additional information from OCLC about plans for both services, along with a schedule for service changes.
- See Upcoming Events (http://www.oclc.org/en-US/worldcat-discovery/news.html) for a list of informational webinars to learn more about plans for FirstSearch and WorldCat Discovery.

WorldCat Discovery Expands Personal Lists, Shares User Feedback to Library Staff

WorldCat Discovery has added more flexibility in personal lists:

Notes: Users can now add notes records included in personal lists, to provide personal thoughts or descriptions of the content in an item. These notes can also be edited following their initial addition to a list.

Use of temporary lists: An entire temporary list or individual items in a temporary list can now be added to a personal list, to save time in assembling useful lists of records from WorldCat Discovery search results.

Edit lists: Users may move records among personal lists, delete items from lists and edit the name or description of a list.

Library staff may now configure a WorldCat Discovery site to send user feedback to an email address of their choice. This feedback will inform staff decisions in areas such as refinements to a site’s design and user instruction about WorldCat Discovery use. Additional details about these enhancements, along with information about new databases recently added to the WorldCat Discovery central index, are provided in WorldCat Discovery Release Notes (http://www.oclc.org/support/services/discovery/release-notes.en.html).
OCLC Research: 2015 Activity Report

OCLC Research supports the work of the Membership and Research Division by forging breakthroughs in library practice and benefits OCLC Members with evidence, insight, and thought-leadership for an increasingly complex and changing network environment. We have collaborated with partner librarians and information experts to move our research agenda forward and have shared our knowledge with the library community. OCLC Research: 2015 Activity Report (http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2016/oclcresearch-2015-activity-report.pdf) highlights significant accomplishments of OCLC Research in five thematic areas:

Understanding the System-wide Library. Learn about:
- Our work in supporting stewardship of the evolving scholarly record.
- Our evidence confirming the continued use of interlibrary loan.

Research Collections and Support. Review:
- Our suggestions for reinforcing researcher and university reputation management.
- The improvements possible in the curation and management of special collections, research data, and born-digital library materials.
- Our first steps in exploring the discoverability and use of Web archives.

User Studies. Discover:
- What we’ve learned to date about how digital visitors and residents engage with technology and their expectations for library services and systems.
- How design thinking and ethnography clarify what users do outside of the library.
- Ways libraries can help researchers reuse data.

Data Science. Analyze:
- Our progress enriching the Virtual International Authority File (VIAF).
- Our leadership in extending Schema.org for library data.
- Our seminal linked data publications to understand challenges involved in publishing library linked data.

Scaling Learning. Examine:
- The expansion of our library learning resources.
- Our utilization of grant funding to empower libraries.
- Our support for strengthening and sustaining professional development to create innovative library service.

The report presents a story of achievement and contribution. It also represents the significant value that OCLC Research provides to the OCLC enterprise, OCLC members, and the larger community.

Addressing the Challenges with Organizational Identifiers and ISNI

Organizational affiliations of the creators of works are important to a variety of stakeholders, including academic administrators, funders, publishers, repository managers, software developers, rights agencies, and individual researchers. Identifying and tracking these affiliations can be challenging, as organizations may be known by a variety of names and may have schools or research centers well-known on their own.

An organizational identifier—a unique, persistent, and public URI associated with the organization that is resolvable globally over networks via specific protocols—provides the means to both find and identify an organization accurately and to define the relationships among its sub-units and with other organizations. Addressing the Challenges with Organizational Identifiers and ISNI, by Karen Smith-Yoshimura, Janifer Gatenby, Grace Agnew, Christopher Brown, Kate Byrne, Matt Carruthers, Peter Fletcher, Stephen Hearn, Xiaoli Li, Marina Muilwijk, Chew Chiat Naun, John Riemer, Roderick Sadler, Jing Wang, Glen Wiley, and Kayla Willey (http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2016/oclcresearch-organizational-identifiers-and-isni-2016.pdf), presents new modeling of organizations that others can adapt for their own uses.

This report focuses on organizational identifiers from the perspective of academic institutions. Their ranks and reputation often determine their success in obtaining funding and attracting or retaining faculty. Identifiers provide the “glue” for institutions and funder systems to support comparing and ranking the outputs of the research process; assessing the impact of grants between institutions and their funders; and tracking and collating publications between researchers and their publishers. The report outlines a number of scenarios where the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI) can be used to disambiguate organizations, including real-world examples.
The primary goal of the Music Division in FY 2015 was to make its holdings and services better known and more accessible to scholars, researchers and the general public. Efforts toward achieving this goal included processing collections and creating online finding aids; creating new and enhanced bibliographic records; digitizing collections; creating online presentations; publicizing the collections through concerts, lectures, films, orientations, and other public events; and developing an active online presence through social media.

As of February 2016 there are 64 staff members in the Music Division in six sections: Administrative (6), Acquisition & Processing (18), Reader Services (16), Bibliographic Access (14), Concert Office (6), and Digital Projects (4).

Hiring Plans: For the first time in years, we have been given approval to hire in the area of Bibliographic Access. Be on the watch for upcoming vacancy announcements for a Section Head (filling behind Joe Bartl) and two catalogers. We will also be posting a vacancy announcement for the Head of Reader Services. If you have questions, contact Jan Lauridsen, Assistant Chief, at jlau@loc.gov

New staff or reassignments: Robert Lipartito, Assistant Head of Reader Services, Elizabeth Smigel, Dance Archivist, Morgan Cundiff, Program Specialist, Lisa Shiota, Bibliographic Access Section Specialist (reassignment)

Recent retirements/resignations: Dan Boomhower, Head of Reader Services, Kevin LaVine, Reader Services Specialist, Steven Permut, Bibliographic Access Section Specialist.

The Collection Management Project, instituted just over a year ago, constitutes the most important contribution to the mission of the Music Division. Its purpose is to improve access, security, and the housing conditions of our collections. It has exerted a major positive influence on Division practices, operating procedures, and program implementation. One very significant result of this effort is the cataloging of 164 music manuscripts (ML96) heretofore never cataloged.

Sometime in the future we face a complete renovation of our reading room. The planning—design phase—for this will begin this year—2016. We will merge the reading rooms for Recorded Sound, Moving Image, and Music into one reading room. The renovation includes a complete redesign of all staff work areas as well. Construction should begin in 2017-2018.

This year the Music Division expanded the scope of its digitization by scanning opera, theater, and iconography collections in addition to its treasured manuscript scores and sketches from the collections. 2,290 items were digitized for public access. The Music Division greatly increased the number of items digitized for this fiscal year by using several different digitization streams, including outside digital vendors, the Digital Scan Lab, Duplication Services, and RIPM.

The Music Division’s ML50.2 classification contains about 1,350 very rare and valuable opera libretti from the 17th and 18th centuries; the majority of these materials were housed in old, acidic pamphlet binders or covers that were damaging the volumes. We were able to successfully rehouse about 1,300 rare items. In the process, we created an electronic inventory of the collection, identified cataloging needs, ordered proper trays to store the rehoused items, and enter about 40 items into the queue for full conservation treatments. The strategies and organization for this project could transfer to future rare book projects in the Division.

The MBAS Section embarked on a project to catalog virtually all pre-1825 American sheet music published in the United States (M1.A1) to support the online presentation for this digital resource (over 2,500 records). Full scores digitized will permit students and historians to study the emergence of music publishing in the United States and American history as presented in song. Eight interns and much of the cataloging staff worked on the
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project, which follows the model of last year’s high profile project—World War I Sheet Music. Once derivatives for the M1.A1 files are created the scores will be available online.

The MBAS Section also cataloged 164 holograph scores and sketches of noted composers, including Bach, Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart, and Wagner. This work is in preparation for the digitization of these valuable resources. In the process, a holograph of the entire Pagliacci by Leoncavallo was uncovered and cataloged.

The Music Division continued to administer the ground-breaking U.S. ISMN online registration system, which the publishers love and therefore are inclined to use. Other Library offices see the potential use to their operations; a paper on the Library’s development of the ISMN was presented at IAML pointing out philosophy and accomplishments.

Packard Campus for Audio-Visual Conservation, Recorded Sound Section

As of September 30, 2015, the total amount stored in the Digital Archive area of the Packard Campus Data Center was 5.81 PB (petabytes) of collections content comprised of 826,371 files. September 2015 was the peak month for production with 234,845 TB (terabytes) added to the archive. The previous highest amount of digitized content ingested into the Digital Archive had been 168,943 TB in September 2014. The high output in September 2015 was due largely to the ingesting of the born digital files received through the American Archive of Public Broadcasting project, which alone accounted for 205,000 files from 18,203 public broadcasting programs, ingested into the archive during the fiscal year.

The first brown wax cylinders from the American Folklife Center (AFC) collections were digitized in the NAVCC Audio Preservation Laboratory using the Archeophone cylinder reproducer. This new workflow digitizes Library cylinders for the first time at preservation quality (96kHz/24bit), while including comprehensive metadata. Completed during the year were the Passamaquoddy Indian cylinders recorded by Jesse Fewkes in 1892, the earliest known field recordings. The work has continued with later materials selected by AFC experts for both good physical condition and tribal permissions, and will be an ongoing workflow staffed by a rotating crew of NAVCC audio engineers in 2016.

The preservation of the Studs Terkel Collection reached the half-way milestone this year, as over 3,000 hours of content have been digitized from the analog tapes on loan from the Chicago History Museum. The collaboration to document and preserve this unique collection of Terkel’s WFMT Chicago radio programs, as well as the unpublished interviews he recorded for his books, got underway in 2011. A public website dedicated to Studs Terkel and featuring the recordings preserved at the Packard Campus was launched in 2014 and continues to add content received from the Library in periodic shipments.

Processing and preservation of the Les Paul Collection was a top priority preservation project this year, with a focus on the lacquer disc recordings Paul recorded in the 1940s and early 1950s. Over 2,000 discs were processed in MAVIS, and over 150 discs digitized.

Audio Laboratory staff sustained two rotational preservation streams this year, a high-throughput parallel transfer workflow for NBC Radio Collection tape reels and the Archeophone cylinder workflow for American Folklife Center Native American Cylinders.

The total number of bibliographic and inventory records created for recorded sound materials increased over last year’s totals. This is particularly noteworthy given that the unit lost another staff technician early in the year. Over the course of the fiscal year, a total of 30,766 individual sound recordings were processed (this figure includes second copies), which reflects an increase of more than 3,800 items process compared to the previous year. The number of records created in the ILS and in MAVIS, reported in the chart below, also significantly increased, as did the number of new and revised authority records. Administrative clearance / surplus statistics were approximately 20% higher than those reported for the previous fiscal year. The upward shift in numbers across the board reflects re-worked improvements made to workflows and a concentration on core activities in a period of significant staff shortages.

During the reporting period the number of records manually converted to MAVIS to facilitate listening and customer orders almost doubled, going from 432 in FY2014 to 715 in FY2015.

Three Recorded Sound Catalogers participated in the BIBFRAME pilot project and have started cataloging selected sound recordings in both the ILS and the BIBFRAME editing tool, per pilot and section parameters. Cataloging staff also continue to provide feedback
During FY2015, the AFC Acquisitions Program accessioned 65 new collections and collection accruals documenting expressive culture in the United States and around the world, totaling 301,349 items. Included in this are 271,339 non-purchase items by gift and 30,010 purchases or purchase accruals. (This total does not include items accessioned by the Veterans History Project, which is submitting a separate CS report.)

The new AFC materials consist of approximately 68,820 manuscripts, 8333 sound recordings, 222,925 photographs, and 1,171 moving images, 100 artifacts. Significantly, born digital accruals represent 96% of accessions, compared to 11% in FY14.

The online presentation The Alan Lomax Collection of Michigan and Wisconsin Recordings was launched on November 18, 2014. The Alan Lomax collection of Michigan and Wisconsin recordings (AFC 1939/007) documents Irish, Italian, Finnish, Serbian, Lithuanian, Polish, German, Croatian, French Canadian, Hungarian, Romanian, and Swedish songs and stories, as well as occupational folk life among loggers and lake sailors in Michigan and Wisconsin. Lomax's itinerary took him from Detroit through the Saginaw River valley to the northern counties of the Lower Peninsula, including Beaver Island. Crossing the Straits of Mackinac, he collected across the Upper Peninsula to the far northern Calumet area and then along the Lake Superior coast to easternmost Wisconsin. The collection includes 441 disc sides, many of which contain more than one song.
Questions and Answers
Jay Weitz, OCLC

Minding Your ©'s and ℗s

Question: I have a sound recording with a phonogram date and a copyright date. The CD has only ©1980. The container has ©1980, ℗1998. The original ©1980 was an analog recording, and the item in question is a digitally remastered CD. Should I use ℗1980 or ©1998 in field 264, second indicator 4?

Answer: First, remember that if the publisher has applied things correctly, a regular (©) copyright date properly applies only to the textual, artistic/package design, and other print aspects of an audio recording. Only the phonogram copyright date(s) (℗) legitimately apply to the audio recording itself. According to the MLA Best Practices for RDA 2.11: “For audio recordings, routinely record the latest phonogram copyright date in a separate 264 (2nd indicator 4) $c. If multiple phonogram copyright dates are present, record the latest date that can be determined to apply to the resource as a whole. Otherwise, do not record a phonogram copyright date. Optionally, record multiple phonogram copyright dates in a note. If it has been deemed useful for identification or access to also record the latest regular copyright date, record both dates in a single 264 (2nd indicator 4) field, in separate occurrences of $c.” As you’ve explained your case, if you choose to record both dates, they would go in a single 264 field in separate subfields $c:

264 4 $c ℗1980, $c ©1998

FMusing Confusing

Question: Codes for FMus seem redundant and sometimes contradictory and don’t seem to have a necessary relationship to how we describe notated music in the physical description. For instance, I came across two records (#17801676 and #29689391) for what looked like the same score yet they differed like this:

FMus:  g
300 1 score (32 pages) ; ¡c 28 cm
versus
FMus:  g
300 1 close score (32 pages) ; ¡c 28 cm
Can you explain this inconsistency?

Answer: The various codes in FMus (008/20) have been in flux for several years now, so there has long been a lot of confusion and inconsistency in how they are applied. Just to give you an idea, here is the “Content Designator History” for 008/20 from MARC 21:

008/20 - Format of music
a - Full score [REDESCRIBED, 2013]
c - Accompaniment reduced for keyboard [REDESCRIBED, 2012]
d - Voice score [RENAMED, 2012]
d - Voice score with accompaniment [REDESCRIBED, 2012]
h - Chorus score [NEW, 2009]
Prior to 2010 chorus scores were included in code c

(Accompaniment reduced for keyboard) and code d (Voice score).

h - Chorus score [REDESCRIBED, 2012]
i - Condensed score [NEW, 2009]
j - Performer-conductor part [NEW, 2009]
k - Vocal score [NEW, 2012]
l - Score [NEW, 2013]
z - Other [REDESCRIBED, 2013]

The Music Library Association has created a task group to try to rationalize some of this confusion, so the changes will continue, though things should be more understandable in the end. Or so we can hope. Related to this are changes between AACR2 and RDA regarding the description of musical scores. AACR2 5.5B1 included the phrase “close score” (defined in the Glossary as “A musical score giving all the parts on a minimum number of staves, normally two, as with hymns”) as one of the Specific Material Designations (SMDs) used to describe notated music. RDA 7.20.1.3 does not include “close score” among the formats of notated music, and the RDA Glossary refers from “close score” to “condensed score” (defined as “A score in which the number of staves is reduced to two or a few, generally organized by instrumental sections or vocal parts, and often with cues for individual parts”). Neither of the records in question is coded as RDA, but either 300 field would be acceptable. The coding of FMus is fine as it stands. The MLA Best Practices for RDA 7.20 allow 008/20 to be coded as appropriate.
Questions & Answers

Before and After

Question: When I was first learning to catalog AV, I had a rule of thumb drummed into me that one should never supply a publication date or use a copyright date as a publication date for a videorecording that is before the format in hand existed as a format. So no Blu-ray Disc should have a publication date before 2006, no DVD should have a publication date before 1993-1995, and no VHS cassette should have a publication date before 1976-1977. One should instead supply a date range for the publication date (at the broadest, a range between when the format was first released and when the item was received by the library) because it is impossible for that content to have been published in that format before that format existed. Is this actually a common practice among AV catalogers? If so, is it formally documented/recommended anywhere, and does it also apply to sound recordings (e.g., CDs "published" before 1982-1983 and standard cassettes "published" before 1962)?

Answer: This is a point that I’ve always made in my videorecording and sound recording cataloging workshops in a long-term attempt to spread the practice among catalogers. In Bibliographic Formats and Standards field 260 under subfield Sc (http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/2xx/260.html), the practice has been documented for quite some time regarding videorecordings, sound recordings, and computer files, along with the best dates of first availability that I was able to find through some research. We haven’t explicitly added the same information to field 260 (although there is an oblique reference and a link to 260 in the 264 field definition). Of course, it would also be useful to link to that information from other areas of BFAS (the fixed fields DtSt and Dates, for instance), but we haven’t done that yet. Here are the dates documented in BFAS:

Computer Files:
- 3 1/2 inch floppy disk: 1982
- 5 1/4 inch floppy disk: 1976
- 8 inch floppy disk: 1971
- CD-ROM: 1985
- DVD-ROM: 1996
- Electronic files remotely accessed via the World Wide Web: 1991

Sound Recordings:
- Audio cassette: 1965
- Audio CD: 1982
- DVD-Audio: 2000
- LP: 1948
- Playaway: 2005
- Reel-to-reel tape: 1949 [Thanks to Thom Pease for helping update this information]
- Streaming audio: 1999

Videorecordings:
- Beta cassettes: 1975
- Blu-ray disc: 2006
- CAV (Constant Angular Velocity) standard play laser optical discs: 1978
- CLV (Constant Linear Velocity) standard play laser optical discs: 1978
- CED (Capacitance Electronic Disc) video discs: 1981
- DVD-Video: 1996 (Japan); 1997 (USA)
- Streaming video: 1999
- U-matic/U-standard cassettes: 1971
- VHS cassettes: 1976

If you or anyone else have more accurate information about any of these dates, please share. Although Music Coding and Tagging, Second Edition (2001) is old, this is also documented there for sound recordings under field 260 on page 216.

An Unequal Distribution of Sizes

Question: A few years ago my library acquired a copy of Carlos Chavez’s 10 Preludes for Piano (published by G. Schirmer, distributed by Hal Leonard), which I copy-cataloged as #45082079. Yesterday I ordered a second copy of the same score, but looking in WorldCat I no longer see record #45082079. In fact, if I search for that record number, I instead get #1851000, which doesn’t appear to be quite the same item (it has Schirmer as the publisher, but lacks Hal Leonard as the distributor). Looking at #1851000, I see this in the 019 field:

245594 "a 17591966 "a 45082079 "a 156941758

I understand that these represent merged records, but I’m not sure why these particular records (#45082079 and #1851000) were merged, since only the former identified Hal Leonard as the distributor. Were they merged in error, or is there something going on here that I don’t understand? Is it perhaps no longer necessary to identify the distributor? Another difference between the two records: #1851000 (the original record) has 31 cm in 300 "c while #45082079 (the newer record, which has now disappeared) had 28 cm. The score in my collection measures 28 cm, yet another reason to mourn the passing of #45082079.

Answer: The earliest iteration of #1851000 that is available in our Journal History dates from 2010 July 29, by which time all four of the merges (#245594, #17591966, #45082079, #156941758) documented in field 019 had already taken place. So none of them are recoverable, nor can we any longer examine what those records looked like at the time of their merges. Duplicate Detection and Reso-
Questions & Answers

Tabling the Discussion

Question: In the Classification and Shelflisting Manual, is the “Music Translation Table” found in “G 800 Music Materials” used for any materials about music? It is used for books on the history of music, to books about music theory and even books that are a musical work? I have a book of Aaron Copland entitled Música y músicos contemporáneos. It is a Spanish translation of Copland’s book about the history of music of the nineteenth and twentieth century and contains a discography. Do I apply the translation table for music?

Answer: Linda Gabel provides the following response:

The reference is to http://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeCSM/G800.pdf, specifically Section 1.i, Translations (page 8). This is a variant practice from non-musical translations, which are documented at http://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeCSM/G150.pdf. It basically uses a different pattern to adapting a call number to reflect that the work is a translation (cutter for the original language, and add the translation suffix). So, I would say anything classed in M (including subclasses) should use G800. The last sentence of the G 800 “Background” (page 1) says: “This instruction sheet provides guidance in the shelflisting of music materials.” It certainly looks like one would use “x8” rather than the general “x18.”

Discs Jockeying for Attention

Question: I’m cataloging a piece of music that contains a score, two parts, an audio CD, and video data disc. After working on all my 300s, 33X, and 34X fields, I discovered this note on the video data disc: “Please note: This is not a DVD! For performance, copy files to computer and connect to a projector.” So I’m wondering what I need to use to describe this video data disc since “videodisc” no longer seems appropriate in my 300 or 338 field. Should I use “computer disc” under the computer carriers list or should it be something in the Projected image carriers list, like “other”? And while I’m asking, the audio CD contains soundtracks to be played with the performance. So is it described in 336 as “performed music” or is it something else? Nothing else seems to fit, but I keep thinking that the disc itself is like another performer, not really “performed music.” Or, maybe I’m overthinking this point.

Answer: From your description, it does sound as if what you had previously thought was a DVD is actually something else. How you choose to describe it depends upon what the disc is and what it contains. What are the extensions of the files that the disc instructs you to copy to a computer so that they may be projected, for instance? Are multiple types of files present? The OLAC Best Practices for Cataloging Streaming Media Using RDA and MARC21 (http://olacinc.org/drupal/capc_files/Streaming_Media_RDA.pdf) has a chart on Page 3 that lists at least some of the possible file extensions you might
Questions & Answers

Disqualified Punctuation

**Question:** Why in BFAS examples are multiple qualifiers in field 020 subfield $q$ now being separated by semicolons? In the past the separating punctuation was always a colon. Is this an error or was a change promulgated somewhere in a document that I am unaware of? Any information you can provide about this change would be much appreciated.

**Answer:** In the past, multiple qualifiers were, indeed, separated by colons. The current use of semicolons instead reflects an explicit change in the ISBD standard since the publication of the Consolidated Edition in 2011 (http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/isbd/isbd-cons_20110321.pdf). If you go the ISBD Area 8 on page 297, you will find the following:

Prescribed punctuation

A. For punctuation before areas of description, see A.3.2.

B. The key title is preceded by a space, equals sign, space (=).

C. Terms of availability are preceded by a space, colon, space (:).

D. A qualification added either to an identifier or to the terms of availability is enclosed in parentheses ( ( )). Multiple qualifiers are separated by a space, semicolon, space (;).

The new ISBD prescribed punctuation is in the italicized sentence.

Post Card Catalog and Post Catalog Card

**Question:** I have a really dumb question about the 245 first indicator, and I’m hoping you can help. Why do we always use “0” when there is no 1XX? Wouldn’t we actually want to do the opposite to get the only available version of the title into a title index? It’s tough to find a good example because no one actually seems to use the code in the First Indicator, or they don’t allow user access to indexes at all. But in theory users could be looking for the title of a pop album in a title index, even though it may not have a 100/110 and the cataloger may not have created a 130. I’m probably totally missing something here, but now I’ve thought about it too much to see the obvious.

**Answer:** Not a dumb question at all, simply one that reminds us not to believe everything we read. In this world that is not merely post-card catalog but also post-catalog card, we sometimes forget that MARC remains strewn with vestiges of those legacies. The formal definition of field 245 First Indicator “0” reads in part: “No title added entry is made, either because no title added entry is desired or because the title added entry is not traced the same as the title in field 245.” Although that specific wording has evolved somewhat over the decades, what it would have originally meant was that the “main entry” card could serve as the title entry card, so you didn’t have to print a separate title added entry card. Both MARC 21 and BFAS also spell out that “0” is used when there is no 1XX field in the record. In catalog card terms, that means no personal name, corporate name, meeting name, or uniform title gets in the way of the title statement in field 245. So when MARC says “No title added entry is made” with the assignment of First Indicator “0”, it doesn’t mean that the title is not indexed, it is instead telling us that no extra title added entry card needs to be printed. WorldCat (as well as probably every other bibliographic database) pays no attention to the 245 First Indicator in determining what gets into its title indexes. Everything gets indexed, within the parameters of those various title indexes (http://www.oclc.org/support/help/searchingworldcatindexes/Default.htm#04_Indexes/Indexes_by_data_type.htm#kanchor271), even such useful generic single-word titles as “Report” or “Journal” or “Sonata.” In WorldCat, I believe that our QC Macro makes sure that any 245 not preceded by a 1XX field has First Indicator “0” and that validation does the same.
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