Spring greetings from the Great Northwest! After another long, wet winter, fairer weather has returned to our region, as I hope it has to yours. Bear in mind, we rarely experience in Washington State the kind of balmy temperatures that MOUG/MLA Annual Meeting attendees enjoyed in Orlando this past February, but perhaps that’s for the best! In this issue you will find summaries of our jam-packed meeting, ably planned and executed by Continuing Education Coordinator Molly O’Brien and the MOUG Program Committee. Along with the usual suspects (lightning talks and all that), we engaged in a thoughtful discussion about the future of our organization vis-à-vis the idea of pursuing a merger with OLAC. And we were joined by not one but TWO individuals from OCLC named Jay: our inimitable Jay Weitz (affectionately renamed “Jay-Dub” by some on the Board) and his colleague Jay Holloway, Product Analyst, End User Services, who joined us during the Ask Everything session. We are delighted to have a new public services liaison from OCLC (who also happens to be a cellist) during this time of rapid development of OCLC’s public-facing products and services.

Speaking of that, our Reference, Discovery and Collection Committee has finally been formed, after the MOUG membership voted to change the bylaws to accommodate this expansion of our administrative structure a few years ago. Members of this committee include: Matt Ertz (University of Louisville), Monica Figueroa (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill), Heather Fisher (Saginaw Valley State University, also serving ex officio on the Program Committee), Marty Jenkins (Wright State University), Karla Jurgemeyer (St. Olaf College), Jennifer Olson (University of Hartford), and Nurhak Tuncer (City Colleges of Chicago, Malcolm X College). This intrepid crew is led by our RDC Coordinator Nara Newcomer, whose column in this issue contains updates on their work.

As is the case every February/March, the MOUG Board welcomes new members and bids farewell to
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those who have completed their terms. As it happens, this year our “new” officers aren’t new to the MOUG Board at all, but are stepping into new roles. Nara Newcomer (University of Missouri-Kansas City) just finished a (quite successful) four-year stint as Treasurer-Elect/Treasurer/Past Treasurer, and is now serving as RDC Coordinator for the next two years. Alan Ringwood (University of Texas) is our new Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, having served as Secretary/Newsletter Editor from 2008-2010. Please join me in welcoming our colleagues (back)! We have had to say heartfelt goodbyes to Rebecca Belford, outgoing RDC Coordinator and Bruce Evans, Past Chair extraordinaire. Space limitations prevent me from giving a full account of everything these two have done for MOUG, for which I am eternally grateful. Rest assured, their innumerable accomplishments on the Board will be enjoyed by their successors for years to come. In Rebecca’s case, her main legacy is the reimagined RDC Coordinator Board position and the reinstated RDC Committee. As for Bruce, we have him to thank for the new website, our recent focus on fundraising efforts, the joint MOUG/MLA OCLC Search and Discovery Task Force and their seminal report, the new Social Media Coordinator position, and so much more. Oh, and let’s not forget he was also CEC for two consecutive terms (four years) back in the aughts! He’s earned himself quite the respite after all that, but something tells me we haven’t seen the last of him!

Regarding the new Social Media Coordinator position, we were delighted to appoint Michelle Hahn (Indiana University Bloomington, and past CEC) to this critical role. In the few short weeks leading up to and including at our Annual Meeting, she hit the ground running, enhancing our social media presence on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and YouTube, and laying the groundwork for our #MOUGat40 initiative (more on that below). As most of you are aware, the day after our meeting ended Michelle was struck by a reckless motorist while crossing the street in front of the conference hotel, and spent several weeks recuperating in an Orlando area hospital. I am pleased to report that her recovery has gone miraculously well, and she has returned to her beloved Bloomington digs to continue her healing process. Treshani Perera (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee) has agreed to step up and serve as Acting SMC until Michelle is back in the saddle (which, something tells me, will happen sooner than we think). From the bottom of our hearts, thank you Treshani and WE LOVE YOU MICHELLE!!!

In case you haven’t heard, MOUG is turning 40! Plans are underway for quite the anniversary bash at our 2018 Annual Meeting in Portland, Oregon. The #MOUGat40 initiative includes three main components: the “40 for 40” fundraising campaign, a contest to design a new logo for MOUG, and an oral history project. We have begun collecting member stories through a variety of media: video testimonials, written memories and social media channels, and will continue to do so over the coming months. Watch this space and MOUG-L for further updates on this initiative. Better yet, subscribe to our social media channels to stay updated there! A special thanks to the #MOUGat40 project team: Mark Scharff (Washington University in St. Louis), Autumn Faulkner (Michigan State University), Michelle Hahn, Treshani Perera and Anna Alfeld LoPrete (MOUG Web Editor) and to all of you who have and will participate in these exciting projects.

With best wishes for a safe and enjoyable summer,
Casey
The Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is honored to name Robert Cunningham (Boston Public Library) as the fourteenth 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 Robert at the MOUG Business Meeting in Orlando, Florida, on February 21, 2017. The Board wishes to thank Robert’s colleagues Beth Iseminger and Anne Adams for the words that follow.

Robert’s contributions to the profession of music cataloging are important and long-standing. He has brought his knowledge of music bibliographic needs, as well as his wit and humor, to his many music cataloging positions, and his contributions are greatly appreciated by all who have had the pleasure of working with him.

Robert Cunningham was the first music specialist hired by OCLC in 1979. While at OCLC, Robert helped plan annual MOUG meetings, inviting speakers, providing programs, and participating in music cataloging workshops at several MOUG meetings, in the days when MARC was new and music catalogers were figuring out how best to encode musical works in MARC. Robert encouraged Glenn Patton, then of Illinois Wesleyan University, to apply to be the second music specialist at OCLC, which Glenn did. When Robert left OCLC, his position was filled by the inimitable Jay Weitz.

Prior to OCLC, Robert was a music cataloger at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts. During that time, he helped organize and present music cataloging workshops for the New England Chapter of the Music Library Association.

After working at OCLC, Robert returned to New England to become the music specialist at NELINET, the library cooperative for academic, public, school, and special libraries across New England. In this role, Robert gave music encoding workshops on scores and sound recordings to librarians from the Northeast region. To honor Robert’s contributions to the profession, NELINET renamed their annual bibliographic services conference in Robert’s name, presenting five Robert L. Cunningham Annual Bibliographic Services Conferences which continued until the company’s final conference in 2009.

In true demonstration of his dedication to and interest in the craft of music cataloging, Robert continued to catalog music after his retirement from NELINET. In the past several years, Robert has been a cataloger for the Boston Conservatory, M.I.T., and the Loeb Music Library of Harvard University. Robert is currently Music Cataloger at the Boston Public Library, where he carries on his unique devotion to the practice of music bibliographic description. Robert is also an active participant in MOUG, MLA, the New England chapter of MLA, and the New England Technical Services Librarians association.

Robert’s love of the field and his interest in current practices and future developments for music bibliographic control are exceptional and admirable, and Robert continues to be an inspiration to his colleagues.

Thanks to Anne Adams and Robert Cunningham for photos
The MOUG Nominating Committee seeks nominations for the offices of Secretary/Newsletter Editor (a 2-year commitment) and Continuing Education Coordinator (a 2-year commitment). We will assemble a slate of candidates this spring 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 Portland, Oregon, in January 2018. Below are brief descriptions of each office, paraphrased from the MOUG Bylaws and MOUG Handbook.

**Secretary/Newsletter Editor**

The person in this position serves for 2 years. The Secretary/Newsletter Editor serves as a member of the Executive Board and participates in general supervision of the organization’s affairs. He/she records the minutes of the annual business meeting and the sessions of the Executive Board, and carries out other administrative duties. Additionally, the Secretary/Newsletter Editor is responsible for publication and distribution of the organization’s tri-annual newsletter.

**Continuing Education Coordinator**

The person in this position serves for 2 years. The Continuing Education Coordinator serves as a member of the Executive Board and participates in general supervision of the organization’s affairs. He/she chairs the Program committee for the annual meeting, and oversees local arrangements and program planning/implementation for the annual meeting.

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 2, 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.musicoclusers.org/](http://www.musicoclusers.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!

Thank you,

The MOUG Nominating Committee

William ("Mac") Nelson, Committee Chair
Cello Music Cataloger
Jackson Library
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
P.O. Box 26170
Greensboro, NC 27402-6170
wmnelson@uncg.edu
336.334.5781

Alan Ringwood
Vice Chair, Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG)
Coordinator, Music & Multimedia Resources Cataloging
University of Texas Libraries
The University of Texas at Austin
P.O. Box P
Austin, TX 78713-8916
Phone: (512) 495-4191 | Fax: (512) 495-4296
a.ringwood@austin.utexas.edu

Colin Bitter
Systems/Web Services Librarian
Camden County College Library
P.O. Box 200
College Drive
Blackwood, NJ 08012-0200
cbitter@camdencc.edu
856-227-7200 x4233
Nominations are now being accepted for the 2018 Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) Distinguished Service Award. This award recognizes and honors someone who has made significant professional contributions to music users of OCLC. The MOUG Executive Board selects a recipient based on nominations received from the MOUG membership.

Eligibility for nomination is as follows:

- Nominees must have made professional contributions that significantly address the needs and concerns of music-oriented users of OCLC’s products and services.
- Nominees may be MOUG members, but membership in the organization is not a requirement.
- The nomination must be accompanied by a statement that provides supporting evidence of the nominee’s qualifications.

The award recipient will receive an engraved plaque containing an inscription recognizing his or her special contribution to the field, complimentary registration for the MOUG meeting at which the award is being presented, and a lifetime complimentary membership to MOUG.

Past recipients of this award are Robert Cunningham (2017; Boston Public Library), Neil Hughes (2016; University of Georgia), Paul Cauthen (2014; University of Cincinnati), Matt Montgomery (2013; OCLC, Inc.), Phyllis Jones (2012; Oberlin College), Alice LaSota (2011; University of Maryland–College Park), Michelle “Mickey” Koth (2009; Yale University), Charles M. “Chuck” Herold, Jr. (2007; Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh), Jean Harden (2006; University of North Texas), Ralph Papakhian and Sue Stancu (joint recipients, 2005; Indiana University), Jay Weitz (2004; OCLC, Inc.), Judy Weidow (2003; University of Texas), and Kathryn E. (Kay) Burnett (2002; Smith College).

Nominations should be sent to Alan Ringwood at the address below by e-mail or U.S. mail. Nominations and accompanying statements must be received via email or postmarked no later than June 9, 2017. The Executive Board will select an award recipient at its summer Board meeting.

For more information about MOUG, please visit [http://www.musicoclcusers.org/](http://www.musicoclcusers.org/).
FROM THE REFERENCE, DISCOVERY AND COLLECTION COORDINATOR

Nara Newcomer
University of Missouri-Kansas City

OCLC’s Reference, Discovery, and Collection front has been active in recent months! First, thank you to outgoing RDC Coordinator Rebecca Belford for all her work to get so much underway. Thank you also to OCLC for sending Jay Holloway, Product Analyst, Discovery Services to the 2017 MOUG Annual Meeting, where Jay presented Discovery Updates with Rebecca Belford (slides at http://musicoclcusers.org/meetings/2017-presentations/) and led a productive brainstorming session with a smaller group of MOUG members. Jay continues to work with MOUG as our OCLC discovery/public services liaison. Jay’s education includes a bachelor’s degree in music from Ohio University (he’s a cellist).

Jay Holloway and OCLC’s Bridget Dauer are working towards implementing the 2015 WorldCat Discovery Display Preferences for Medium of Performance and sought MOUG’s input on the 382 subfields defined since 2015 (S - Total number of ensembles of the same type; Sr - Total number of individuals performing alongside ensembles; St - Total number of ensembles). Thank you to everyone who participated in the survey this March. Results have been shared with OCLC and posted on the Discovery, Reference, and Collections page of MOUG’s website (http://musicoclcusers.org/resources/discovery-reference-collections/).

MOUG’s newly reinstated Reference, Discovery, and Collection Committee (formerly the Reference Services Committee) is now up and running. The RDC Committee’s work centers on OCLC’s public-facing discovery, reference, and collections-related products and services and will include investigating issues as well as compiling and advocating for suggestions and improvements. The RDC Committee also develops content on the Discovery, Reference, and Collections section of the MOUG website and provides input to MOUG’s Program Committee.

Thank you in advance to members Matt Ertz, Monica Figueroa, Heather Fisher, Marty Jenkins, Karla Jurgemeyer, Jennifer Olson, and Nurhak Tuncer!

Finally, I encourage everyone to sign on to OCLC’s Community Center. OCLC is now using the Community Center as an important place to gather input and share information. Visit https://www.oclc.org/community/home.en.html to set up your login. All you need is an OCLC authorization (100-xxx-xxx) and password.

I look forward to serving the MOUG membership as Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator and invite your suggestions and input at any time! My email address is newcomer@umkc.edu.
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Cataloging Scores in an Age of Print on Demand

Anne Adams (Harvard University)
Morris Levy (Northwestern University)

In this session, Anne Adams (Harvard University) and Morris Levy (Northwestern University) discussed cataloging issues arising from print on demand and custom printing models in the music publishing world. Following the conversation started at a MOUG 2016 Hot Topics session, Adams and Levy noted that a very large percentage of materials are now being published in a way that presents challenges to catalogers. For the remaining 45 minutes, Adams and Levy presented an array of examples, from questionable publication dates to locations and everything else in between, and their approach to cataloging these items. The bulk of the presentation took place using MARC records as examples, showing varying opinion between the two cataloger-presenters when it comes to recording publishers, places of publication, and dates for on-demand or custom sheet music printing. In presenting these examples, Adams and Levy discussed best practices for cataloging these materials in an efficient and less ambiguous manner.

Adams began the presentational component of the session by going back to the basics: definitions of publisher and publishing, how distributors (and corresponding dates) fit into the picture, and a basic introduction of the current print-on-demand/custom printing model. According to Adams, a copyright date or manufacturing date may be a good substitute for a publication date since most print-on-demand scores provide the former types of dates. However, other details may be not as clear; for example, determining place of publication when a location isn’t specified, or determining the date of publication for print-on-demand scores. Adams reminded the audience that guidelines do exist to guide the cataloger through difficult decision making; when in doubt, consult OCLC Guidelines on When to Input a New Record, RDA 2.8.6.6., and LC-PCC PS 2.8.6.6. However, Adams also pointed out that none of these guidelines take into account customizable electronic publications, which is mainly the issue at hand. Next came an overview of types of material typically encountered by a cataloger: publisher/distributor combinations, rental scores, self-published scores, reprints, multi-national publications, and customizable print scores. The issues here are quite obvious: multiple dates are involved regardless of whether they count as revision dates, scores with no date (or copyright date) information, and conflicting information for place of publication. Adams suggested that the cataloger use whatever date available on the item if no other reliable date was supplied with the item, and to document these decisions in a 5xx note.

Levy took over the session by providing some examples of commonly-noted publishers and publications with confusing or conflicting publication information. The remainder of the presentation was constructed in the format of presenting an item and its bibliographic content, and provide an example of a MARC record highlighting how publication information (264 _1, 264 _4), extent (300), and notes (500) were captured for each item. The examples can be found in the session slides now available through the MOUG website (http://musicoclcusers.org/wp-content/uploads/AdamsLevy.pdf). For many of these examples, especially when the copyright date and manufacturing (printing) date differed, both dates were recorded in the bibliographic record, and a 500 note was added to justify cataloger’s judgment in adding different/multiple dates. For items with no copyright date, date on cover was quoted as both publication and [copyright date]. In some cases, as seen in the Edition Peters example with conflicting publication information, Levy recommended recording all applicable publishers and their respective locations and dates in the MARC record for clarity. Again, an accompanying 500 note is recommended to avoid confusion during search and retrieval.

(Continued)
The Q&A session proved to be engaging and thought-provoking as audience members inquired about the best practice to recording dates for publications issued less than 2 years apart for the same score (i.e. without revisions). While the presenters agreed that a new OCLC record may not be necessary, it may be helpful to update the local MARC record for each additional holding. As a general rule of thumb, Levy advised that catalogers should get in the habit of supporting assumptions with a 500 note, especially if publication information is not explicitly stated on the item. In the case of self-publishing composers, composer should be indicated as publisher, in square brackets, in MARC field 264. For composers and publishers offering custom print options, such as changing print dimensions to meet local needs, the presenters recommended always describing the item “in hand” to avoid confusion over future reprints or iterations of the composition.

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

The Cataloging of Self-published Scores and Recordings: A Preliminary Report

Reed David (University of California, Berkeley)
Nurhak Tuncer (City Colleges of Chicago, Malcom X College)

The research project underway by Tuncer and David studies self-published materials. Their previous work looked at self-published materials in all formats; this new endeavor continues the effort, narrowing the focus to just music formats.

There are three objectives: to examine the cataloging problems that accompany self-published works; to analyze the catalog records that libraries create for them; and to gather information about the composers who produced the works. It is hoped that this undertaking will foster a much-needed conversation on the topic, thus leading to further research. Rather than imposing any restrictions on the policies and practices that are developing around self-published music, the project simply describes the state of affairs as exposed by the investigation.

They pointed out that composers have been self-publishing for centuries. Today, composers are involved in the process to varying degrees, including any or all steps from editing to advertising to distribution. In some cases, composers may be able to put more time and energy into marketing their own works than a publisher would be willing or able to do.

Scores are produced as printed music or supplied as PDFs. Recordings are self-published as CDs and/or digital downloads. Cataloging of these materials will need to change in order to make the newer formats accessible by patrons. There are challenges: self-published music needs original cataloging; research and information about the works is limited; and there are no established cataloging practices in place.

The researchers described the data collection process, the beginning point of which was the list of about 700 self-publishing composers compiled by Kent Underwood, New York University (“Scores, Libraries, and Web-based Self-publishing composers,” Notes 73, no. 2 (December 2016): 205-240). Elements of the list were searched in WorldCat, and the results entered into a spreadsheet. Comparisons were made with composers’ websites. They were curious to know how many composers and their works had made it into OCLC.

Although fewer than one third of the listed composers and their websites have been analyzed, some preliminary observations are beginning to emerge. A search of the authority file shows that most composers are represented...
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there; however, few of their works have been cataloged. An inspection of composer websites reveals that many make their works available online, whether scores or sound recordings, and that they may also use the services of music distributors. This has implications for collection development librarians searching for the most useful sources of the music, as well as for cataloging librarians who might need to choose between differing publication statements.

In conclusion, Tuncer and David emphasized that now is the time for a conversation about the cataloging of self-published scores and sound recordings. Libraries will want to include the composers in that conversation.

Reported by: Chuck Peters  
(Indiana University)

Useful Tools Lightning Talks

Tomoko Shibuya (Northwestern University)  
Jean Harden (University of North Texas)  
Colin Bitter (Camden County College)  
Treshani Perera (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee)

The MOUG 2017 “Useful Tools” lightning talks were jam-packed with useful updates related to Connexion, MarcEdit and OpenRefine batch processing, enhancing and unenhancing 505s, and OHMS (Oral History Metadata Synchronizer). See the following for a brief summary of each -- for details and to view the presentations, visit http://musicoclcusers.org/recent-meetings/2017-presentations/.

Connexion® Toolkit

In this lightning talk, Tomoko Shibuya (Northwestern University) provided us with highlights and recent updates to the Connexion Toolkit, including a new, experimental feature in the Authority Toolkit which generates new 046, 370, 380, 385, 386 and 388 fields from 650s when creating authority records; the process to convert an access point for a related work in a bib record to a 500 field in a new AR; and the step-by-step batch correction process to update associated name/title ARs when the name has been changed.

Batch Processing with MarcEdit and OpenRefine

Jean Harden (University of North Texas) used the Progressive Series Studies publications as the sample set for this lightning talk on batch processing with MarcEdit and OpenRefine, which, as she states, expedites the cataloging of similar items. For details regarding the batch processing procedure, visit the link for presentations provided above.

Enhancing and Unenhancing the 505 with Macros

Colin Bitter (Camden County College) presented a lightning talk centered around the use of macros to enhance and unenhance 505 fields. The presentation started with discussion around whether you’re coding the field at the basic vs. enhanced level and then goes on to discuss macros such as Enhance505, developed by Joel Hahn, that can help greatly speed up the processes. Bitter also provides several examples to help demonstrate different use cases. It is also noted that although the unenhancer macro should work without issues, the enhancer macro has some room for improvement.

(Continued)
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Oral History Metadata Synchronizer (OHMS) for Audio-Visual Digital Collections

Treshani Perera (University of Wisconsin Milwaukee) gave a lightning talk on a specific tool, the web-based Oral History Metadata Synchronizer (OHMS), and demonstrated how it can be used not only with oral history digital collections but also with audio or video digital collections with streaming content in general. Some of Perera’s takeaways included that there is not a one-size-fits-all method for incorporating OHMS into digital collections and that it works best for small-scale projects that don’t have a great deal of metadata.

Please note that a fifth lightning talk – “A Metadata ‘Connexion’ from Sharepoint to Worldcat®” -- was listed in the program, but was canceled.

Reported by: Jen Bort
(Syracuse University)

Ask Everything!

MOUG/OLAC Merger Survey Discussion
Nara Newcomer (University of Missouri-Kansas City)
Bruce Evans (Baylor University)

OCLC Q&A
Jay Holloway (OCLC)
Jay Weitz (OCLC)

The “Ask Everything” session, moderated by Matt Ertz, was divided into two parts. Nara Newcomer presented the results of a recent survey on MOUG/OLAC collaboration, with discussion facilitated by Bruce Evans. The remainder of the meeting featured questions for OCLC representatives Jay Holloway and Jay Weitz.

The MOUG/OLAC collaboration survey was a joint effort of both boards. An online survey was distributed via each organization’s electronic discussion list in late 2016. There were 150 total responses to the survey, about evenly split between the two organizations. OLAC members discussed the survey results at their recent membership meeting at ALA Midwinter.

The survey results revealed a similar results spread for each organization. MOUG members rated learning and discussing music cataloging most highly; OLAC members rated learning and discussing AV cataloging most highly. Both organizations valued an influential role, either with OCLC products (MOUG) or through cataloging documentation/development (OLAC).

Several concerns about a possible merge of the two organizations were voiced in the survey results. There was a feeling that each group would lose their uniqueness. Some responses called out financial issues and governance logistics. There was also concern that MOUG public services involvement would be dropped. Concerns about moving away from the traditional meeting structure/schedule were expressed—according to the survey results, moving the MOUG meeting away from the MLA meeting would negatively impact the meeting attendance of current MOUG members (26.3% would not attend, and 62.5% answered “maybe.”)

The two organizations have different relationships within the larger cataloging community. OLAC is an ALA affiliate and the Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) represents the concerns of AV catalogers in the development, interpretation and implementation of national and international cataloging standards. MOUG is closely tied to OCLC and MLA (who serves as the official representative of music cataloging within the larger community). Despite these differences, there are ways for both organizations to collaborate: joint conferences/meetings, organizing and collaborating in formation of cataloging best practices, joint newsletters or discussion lists, or joint cataloging policy committees.

(Continued)
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Evans led the audience in a discussion centered around four questions. The first question was “What overlap do you see between OLAC and MOUG?”. There is some overlap in membership, approximately 40-50 people. Both groups work with audiovisual resources and issues, and are known for documentation and training. The second question asked “What excites you most about a possible OLAC-MOUG merger?”. Responses to this question were centered around building a consistent approach to cataloging audiovisual materials—which would be nice for music video, for example.

The third question was “What concerns you most about a possible OLAC-MOUG merger?”. Not surprisingly this question generated more lively discussion. There would be many organizational challenges to conquer if the two organizations were to merge. Several concerns were voiced about one organization becoming dominant and the impact of different meeting/conference arrangements. There would need to be careful work to allay fears and all expectations would need to clearly articulated. Each organization has a different basis—MOUG is subject based, while OLAC is format based. Would one organization’s members be interested enough in the other organization’s work to remain members? Collaborating on cataloging standards and best practices would be difficult as MLA CMC is the official liaison for development of music cataloging standards. Great concern was also voiced about financial matters, conference costs, and potential loss of our relationship with OCLC.

The final question up for discussion was “In what ways might OLAC and MOUG collaborate more without merging?”. Regular joint meetings were suggested as was exchanging educational programming. Reciprocal conference attendance, perhaps with a discounted rate, was another suggestion.

The next portion of the meeting was devoted to questions and answers for OCLC’s Jay Holloway and Jay Weitz. Some of the questions were submitted in advance (and some have been abridged to fit space requirements).

Q: Any update on the OCLC response to the MOUG recommendations for WorldCat Discovery Display Preferences for Medium of Performance document?
A (JH): Recommendations are targeted for implementation in June 2017.

Q: WorldCat does not display relationship designators, nor the full string of elements in the uniform title. OCLC #957559843 is an example of a record that contains relationship designators for the music editors, but the WorldCat display makes it look like these editors co-composed the Serenade with Mozart… Also, only the first element of the uniform title displayed. Boo.

A (JH): I’ll defer to my forthcoming presentation, but note that relationship designators will be displayed in an array of fields starting in June. Uniform title elements are still under consideration.

Q: Is there a desire to maintain and update FirstSearch?
A (JH): FirstSearch is here to stay; FirstSearch and WorldCat Discovery each have a distinct use.

Q: How is the OCLC Community Center working out?
A (JH): The OCLC Community Center is a vital part of the process to prioritize what goes into development. It also provides a place for all staff to participate in conversations about products and services.

Q: What kind of programming languages do you need to know, and what’s the most challenging part of your job?
A (JH): I work closely with designers who have that language knowledge--my job is to meaningfully convey the user needs to developers. The most challenging part of my job is the huge volume of problems and sorting it all out – this also makes the job more interesting!

Q: Having recently upgraded to Connexion Client version 2.63, I noticed that you now have to insert a space between subfields before the delimiters in 6xx and 7xx fields or you will be unable to control the heading… Has this been added to the list of known problems for version 2.63, and will it be corrected (if so, when)?
A (JW): This is actually an unintended consequence of the wider Unicode implementation—a delimiter is now treated by Connexion like any other character, as it’s a Unicode character. A workaround is to just reformat the record before controlling headings (the system will install
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A (JW): Yes; OCLC has been working on a smaller scale performing those types of changes to “rda-ize” records as preparation for a linked data future. Note that the OCLC hybrid record guidelines still apply.

Q: Does OCLC have a Unicode conversion plan for existing characters?
A (JW): It’s complicated; both trying to figure out to the extent possible how to standardize what is seen in WorldCat (e.g., pre-composed characters versus uncomposed characters) and deciding what to standardize on input.

Q: If I am deriving a record with FAST headings, and they apply to the resource, should I leave them in?
A (JW): When changes are made to any LCSH in record, delete all FAST headings relating to the LCSH. FAST headings will be regenerated within a week.

Q: What is Record Manager’s official name?
A (JW): To my knowledge, its official name is “WorldShare Record Manager.”

---

Q: If I’m working on a vocal score cataloged with Description “a”, AACR2, should I change the FMus: Format of Music from “c” to “k”? “c” was correct until “k” was an option. A follow-up question, if “k” is appropriate for all vocal scores, regardless of Description “blank” or “a,” will OCLC systematically flip from all “c” coding to “k”?
A (JW): The Format of Music has been an ongoing source of confusion. Some codes have a one-to-one correspondence but others (like “z”) don’t, or definitions that overlap or have been split (with no programmatic way to flip). If it is possible to flip programmatically that will be done; in meantime, with item in hand, please correct/update.

Q: Should we use FMus “l” or “a” for a score?
A (JW): In general, use the newer definitions.

Q: If my score has identical plate and publisher’s numbers, should we add one 028 field, or two? If it is appropriate to only add one field, is there a preference on plate number vs publisher number (028 22) vs (028 32)?
A (JW): My inclination is to prefer plate number over publication number. One could add both, but it may not be worth the time since they will index the same. Don’t agonize!

Q: When will 028 first indicator 6 be implemented?
A (JW): OCLC is working on an upcoming MARC update, sometime in next few months (3rd quarter, calendar year 2017).

Q: Is there any update on the retirement of the Connexion client?
A (JW): No death date has been announced for the Connexion client. Plenty of advance notice will be given!

Q: In our current age of hybrid records, is it a “bad” thing to use new description elements in an older Desc “a” record? For example, if I have a score for solo piano, the 300 field will most likely have xx p. of music. Can I edit the score to reflect 1 score (xx pages) and change the FMus to “l”?

---
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A (JW): Yes; OCLC has been working on a smaller scale performing those types of changes to “rda-ize” records as preparation for a linked data future. Note that the OCLC hybrid record guidelines still apply.

Q: Does OCLC have a Unicode conversion plan for existing characters?
A (JW): It’s complicated; both trying to figure out to the extent possible how to standardize what is seen in WorldCat (e.g., pre-composed characters versus uncomposed characters) and deciding what to standardize on input.

Q: If I am deriving a record with FAST headings, and they apply to the resource, should I leave them in?
A (JW): When changes are made to any LCSH in record, delete all FAST headings relating to the LCSH. FAST headings will be regenerated within a week.

Q: What is Record Manager’s official name?
A (JW): To my knowledge, its official name is “WorldShare Record Manager.”

**Reported by:** Mary Huismann  
(St. Olaf College)

---
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As a member of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), Indiana University submits yearly statistics detailing the library’s holdings, staffing, and expenditures. Although the IU library system encompasses more than two dozen libraries, each with a different focus, all of them report the same statistical categories as defined and required by ARL. This forced standardization leads to statistics which can perhaps be more easily compared between ARL libraries but offers little help when analyzing an individual library’s operations and collections. For staff at IU’s Cook Music Library, knowing how many titles and volumes were added or withdrawn campus-wide could not tell them how many books, scores, and recordings passed through their own technical services department.

Prior to 2015, Cook Music Library technical services staff reported statistics each month via tally marks on paper forms. At year’s end, Anna LoPrete and Chuck Peters transferred the many tally marks into a spreadsheet calculating totals for general categories like titles/volumes copy cataloged, added copies, withdrawals, and shelf-ready books. The paper form for sound recordings stats was more complex and included format. For acquisitions, the library tracked funds and ran reports, but the acquisitions data available did not always match the acquisitions data desired. Shifting statistics collection from handwritten tally marks to a Microsoft Access database offered the possibility of more accurate, more detailed, and more timely information.

Anna offered several tips for designing a statistics database tailored to your own collection and workflows. First, consider which categories of materials or functions you need to track; each of these will become a separate table within your database. IU set up five tables for books, scores, shelf-ready books, sound recordings, and acquisitions, and Anna recommended drafting each table in a spreadsheet before transferring the design into a database platform. Record each data point you want to collect in a separate row of the spreadsheet, with columns for field name, data type (usually a number, short text, or yes/no), and description. For example, one row of the IU scores spreadsheet lists field name “Enhanced bib record,” data type “Yes/No,” and description “Did you enhance the bibliographic record in OCLC?”

Anna’s second tip: use forms to enter statistics into the database and thus reduce data-entry errors. Each table has its own form, so the five IU tables became five separate forms for books, scores, shelf-ready books, sound recordings, and acquisitions. Although a database platform like Access includes a wizard for creating forms, you may also design them yourself. If you choose the DIY route, Anna recommended sketching the form out on paper or in Excel before migrating it to the database software. As part of their workflow, IU staff use the forms to input a title control number or their initials into text fields, click on a check box to indicate what type of cataloging or authority work they performed, or select a format or the name of a donor from a drop-down menu. Some fields – especially those like date which are necessary to pull statistics – should be mandatory on the form to prevent accidental omissions. If you are using Microsoft Access, the field descriptions you wrote when designing your tables become user prompts in the forms. If anyone at IU forgets what “Mono STF” means, they need only look at the bottom of the screen for the reminder “single-piece scores with only one signature that can be sewn through a fold.” Although the database captures much more granular data than the previous tally-mark-on-paper stats, in IU’s experience this new tool did not slow down productivity, especially when used together with macros. For cataloging statistics, staff fill out a form for each title cataloged. For acquisitions, they input data once for each invoice or batch of gifts or shelf-ready books.

Once your database is up and running, use queries to gather the data into useful statistics. Queries do not have to be intimidating and overly complex; most of the queries
that Anna uses are relatively simple and involve only a single table. Match your queries to your stats questions: How many scores were cataloged in January? Of those, how many required binding?

Anna summarized the database design process with these tips:
- Plan your database out in advance, including mock-ups of the forms
- Write field definitions (which become prompts in the forms)
- Keep related data together so that staff won’t need to switch between forms. (For example, if both acquisitions and cataloging staff process gifts, include it on both forms.)
- Be flexible
- Listen to your staff who use the forms and study their workflows
- Plan for the most common scenarios, and don’t worry about every contingency
- Back up the database frequently
- Keep an eye on the data, and watch for anomalies which may pinpoint needed database design edits

Moving to a database collection method greatly expanded the depth and breadth of the Cook Music Library’s technical services statistics. Now they can answer questions such as: Of the items acquired or cataloged this year, how many were recent purchases vs. frontlog/backlog vs. gifts, and how much time was spent cataloging each category? How many original bibliographic or authority records were contributed to OCLC? Of the bib records, how many were PCC records, dissertations, or M2/M3s? What were the binding needs of the scores cataloged or received, and how do those stats inform future binding budgets? Of the shelf-ready books, how many required adjustments to the call number? What was the end-to-end processing time for a particular item?

Chuck noted that the statistics database also provides hard data and leverage when planning budgets, staffing, and future projects. For instance, their library administration charged a task force with outlining options to deplete the frontlog of music scores. The task force utilized the database stats to definitively compare in-house cataloging costs per item with outsourcing. In-house work proved far less expensive, providing solid justification for additional staff and student hires. Moving from a once-a-year tally to real-time analysis also allowed them to track departmental progress and celebrate significant milestones as they occurred.

Michelle Hahn highlighted methods for adapting the database to your own needs and workflows. For example, an LP recataloging project meant entering the same basic stats into the sound recordings form for each title completed. Using MacroExpress combined with the Access form, Michelle reduced eighteen keystrokes and a couple of clicks into just one macro. The database also proved useful for monitoring gift items weeded as duplicates – collection management work that requires staff time but is often difficult to track and report. If database design proves too daunting, stats collection via spreadsheet remains a helpful alternative for recording everything from “big picture” music cataloging efforts to progress on a particular project.

As a gift to budding statistics database designers, Anna provided demo versions of the IU acquisitions and cataloging statistics databases as well as a PDF of their statistics manual at the address below. You are welcome to download the files, experiment with queries, and adapt them to your own local setting.
https://www.dropbox.com/sh/hl5zd57c1k0r1v5/AABjVgtGejFh5tBEstml3Lta?dl=0

Reported by: Melissa Moll
(University of Iowa)
As the OCLC bibliographic database has grown, one of the great challenges in database maintenance has been the reduction of duplicate records, that is, multiple records which represent the same bibliographic manifestation. In the late 1980s OCLC began developing an automated process for addressing many of these records. The software is called Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR), and the initial version, designed to look only at records for book, was launched in 1991 and ran through 2005, eliminating nearly 1.6 million duplicate book records.

In 2005, a project was begun to revamp DDR and to expand its operation to cover records for other formats. The new version was put into production in 2010, running two parallel processes. The first looks at each day’s new and updated records. This process continues daily, and has merged over 18 million duplicates. The second process was a “walkthrough” of the complete OCLC database from record #1, which was completed in September of 2010, examining over 166 million records and merging 5.1 million duplicates.

Of course, there are many instances when there are subtle differences between items which will have records that are nearly identical, but that do, in fact, justify separate bibliographic records. This is where the idea of “cataloging defensively” comes in. In short, it means making sure that these distinctions are brought out in fields that DDR examines when looking for potential duplicates.

The first step is simply to keep in mind that “cataloging defensively” means cataloging carefully. Make sure to search OCLC thoroughly before deciding to enter a new master record. When deriving a new record from an existing one, be sure to change all the elements that need changing to match the new item. When editing an existing record, never change the essential identity of the existing record. Be sure that coding and tagging are correct and complete.

One area that can be particularly useful in bringing out distinctions between similar, even nearly identical, items, is the edition statement (MARC 250 field). Obvious examples are statements such as “Pew edition” versus “Organ edition” for hymnals, or “Student’s edition” and “Teacher’s edition.” But this field can also be used to record many other phrases that appear on scores and that differentiate manifestations of a work, phrases that indicate differences in content, geographic coverage, language, audience, physical format, dates of content, voice range, or format of musical notation. Examples include a “Southern” and a “Western” edition of a collegiate songbook; “Score” versus “Piano reduction”; “Corrected reissue, 1990”; “High voice” versus “Low voice.”

A cataloger may also use the 250 field to supply such differentiating information, even if it is not expressly stated on the item. To quote RDA 2.5.1.4: “If a resource lacks an edition statement but is known to contain significant changes from other editions, supply an edition statement, if considered important for identification or access.” An example presented was the record for a proof copy of a score, compared with the record for the published version. In the former, a 250 of “[Proof copy]” was added to differentiate this from the final version. Another example showed cataloger-supplied edition statements for “Treble-clef version” and “Bass-clef version” for two manifestations of a choral piece that would otherwise have been bibliographically identical. This distinction could be stated in a note (field 500), but placing it in a 250 ensures that DDR will not incorrectly merge these records.

(Continued)
There are, of course, many other areas of the bibliographic record that DDR examines in considering whether records might be duplicates. Among these are the physical description; title, subtitle, and statement of responsibility; publisher numbers; and subject headings that reflect medium of performance or genre. DDR tries both to differentiate legitimately separate records as well as to bring duplicates together. Catalogers can assist this process by careful, accurate, and thorough cataloging.

Slides from this presentation and much more information on cataloging defensively can be found on the OCLC Cataloging Defensively page at http://www.oclc.org/events/cataloging-defensively.html.

Reported by: Marty Jenkins
(Wright State University)

---

UPDATES

Bruce Evans (Baylor University)
Casey Mullin (Western Washington University)
Rebecca Belford (University at Buffalo)
Nara Newcomer (University of Missouri-Kansas City)

This session was a combination of short presentations on updates from the following groups: ALA ALCTS Creation of Cataloging Competencies Task Force (by Bruce Evans), LCDGT (by Casey Mullin), the Search and Discovery Task Force (by Rebecca Belford and Jay Holloway), and Music Discovery Requirements (Nara Newcomer).

ALA ALCTS Creation of Cataloging Competencies Task Force

Bruce Evans (Baylor University) started the session by providing an update on the ALA ALCTS Creation of Cataloging Competencies Task Force. The charge of this task force was to ensure the documentation is relevant to practitioners, to enumerate skills and knowledge required for cataloging, to define these competencies broadly, and to acknowledge career long development.

Evans proceeded to discuss the outline of the document this Task Force created. While discussing the introduction, he pointed out that this document does not overlap info found in ALA’s Core Competencies of Librarianship. He outlined different types of core competencies found in the document:

Knowledge Competencies (practical or theoretical understanding of a subject: foundation of cataloging and metadata principles, systems and technologies, and trends in the cataloging profession)

Skill & Ability Competencies (a natural or learned capacity to perform an act: formulating consistent data, analyzing resources, application of universal standards within a local context, and integration and mapping between standards)

Behavioral Competencies (a pattern of actions or conduct: soft skills, interpersonal communication, public service orientation, initiative and adaptability, professional curiosity, and problem solving)

After outlining the approval timeline for the document, Evans stated that he is expecting a broad announcement in the “very near future.” He would be happy to email a current copy of the document to anyone interested.

(Continued)
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LCDGT (Library of Congress Demographic Terms)

Casey Mullin (Western Washington University) gave a presentation entitled “Demographic Group Terms: Or, the ‘Who’ of Cataloging.” In his presentation, Mullin discussed reasoning behind creating the thesaurus, its structure, and where to use thesaurus terms in both bibliographic and authority records.

Mullin discussed the structure of LCDGT. Each term in the thesaurus describes only one demographic group, and there are no compound terms in this thesaurus. Broader terms are used sparingly, and instead the terms are sorted into broad categories such as age and religion. One example of the need to stay away from broader terms is that not all Benedictines are Catholics.

Mullin asked the audience how many were using LCDGT in their cataloging. Although only a few hands were raised, he was glad that some have started. For reference, he pointed to a manual for using LCDGT from the Library of Congress. This manual can be found at the following website: www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCDGT/freelcdgt.html.

Two new MARC fields have been created for using LCDGT in bibliographic records. The field 385 is used for Audience Characteristics. The field 386 is used for Creator/Contributor Characteristics.

While discussing when to use creator and audience terms, Mullin referenced the common idiom, “when in doubt, leave it out!” Examples included that it would not be helpful to use the term “Pianists” to describe the audience for every single bibliographic record for a piano sonata. The same is true for using the term “Composers” to describe the creator in the bibliographic record of every composition. One example of when to use it, is to use the term “Band directors” when cataloging The Band Director’s Handbook. He also recommended that if it was something that a cataloger would normally bring out in a subject heading, then it would be appropriate to use a term from LCDGT in the new fields.

LCDGT terms can also be used in authority records. The 385 and 386 fields are the same in authority records. There is also a possibility to use LCDGT terms in the 375 field (Gender), but it is not yet settled whether or not this thesaurus will be used here.

Mullin briefly discussed retrospective implementation of LCDGT terms. There is a group that is a part of the Cataloging and Metadata Committee, Vocabularies Subcommittee that is creating an algorithm to derive faceted data from LCSH headings. This process is currently underway.

LCDGT is still new and is in Phase 3 of production and implementation. This means that the terms that are in LCDGT can be used in bibliographic and authority records, and terms that are lacking can be proposed. Occupation terms are especially in need of proposals. Terms can be proposed through the SACO Music Funnel.

At the end of his presentation, an audience member asked for guidance on what to do when the same term is available in LCSH and LCDGT. Mullin’s response was to use LCDGT when the term is available. He iterated that the thesaurus is still incomplete, and to propose a new term if it does not yet exist.

Search and Discovery Task Force

Rebecca Belford (University at Buffalo) and Jay Holloway (OCLC) gave a presentation entitled “Discovery Updates: MOUG/OCLC.” In their presentation, both First Search and Medium of Performance Requirements were discussed.

The first update was that First Search is not going away and that it will be separate from WorldCat Discovery. OCLC is planning to not only keep both, but to continue to make both better. These products are serving different users (First Search is for expert searchers/library staff, and WorldCat Discovery is more for library patrons). Generally, First Search provides more detail, and WorldCat Discovery has a more simplified interface.

A First Search advisory board has been formed by 16 expert users to help OCLC learn what is most important (Continued)
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to be improved. Of this group, two are music librarians, so music will not be overlooked. Their first meeting was in January of 2017.

Recommendations for the Medium of Performance statement display include the following: the recommended label for the 382 field is “Instrumentation,” and subfields should be listed in order of occurrence. Semicolons should be used in display to separate instruments. The number of instruments should be displayed when it greater than one. “Or” should be displayed for alternative medium of performance (Sp). A backslash (“\”) should be used between doubling instruments (Sd). Square brackets should be used around notes content (Sv). If more than one instrument of the same medium occurs in a statement, the number should follows the instrument name in parentheses (“a cello Sn 2” would display as “cello (2)”). An audience member suggested that subfield “s” should be displayed (for total number of performers), but no definite plans have yet been made for display. It was also mentioned that Cornell’s Blacklight uses a very similar display for medium of performance.

The next section provided information on how relator terms used in MARC will be displayed for the public. Names will be un-inverted (first name first, followed by last name), which will be followed by a comma, then the relator term if one exists in the bibliographic record.

The relevance algorithm pilot and course reserves data migration will be coming to WorldCat Discovery at a later date. The MLA-MOUG Search and Discovery Task Force document was distributed on the listserv in June or July 2016.

A few ways to keep up to date with other related happenings include the following: Look into the MLA WMS Interest Group. Work with the OCLC Community Center. Participate in OCLC webinars. Look into the MOUG RDC Committee.

Music Discovery Requirements

Nara Newcomer (University of Missouri-Kansas City) concluded this session with a presentation entitled “Music Discovery Requirements: An Update.”

The previous Music Discovery Requirements (MDR) document from 2012 is on the MLA website: www.musiclibraryassoc.org/default.asp?page=mdr. Many changes have happened since then: RDA has been implemented, there is a move towards IFLA-LRM, LCMPT has been released, BIBFRAME is being worked on, and linked data is more of a real thing.

The charge of this group was to update the MDR with all of the changes in the landscape in addition to other updates. The plan is to have the final draft complete by August 2017.

The approach to the document remains the same, but the systems and standards will be updated. The document will be organized according to FRBR. It will also include a 5th section for Metadata Schemas.

Newcomer recommended the following to stay current with updates on MDR: Watch MLA-L for drafts and feedback solicitations, or contact Newcomer or any committee member with suggestions as well as to share real-life experiences that would be beneficial to the documentation.

Reported by: Jeff Lyon
(Brigham Young University)
The meeting was called to order by Chair Casey Mullin at 4:02 p.m.

1. Adoption of Agenda
   a. The agenda was adopted without change

2. Approval of Minutes from the 2016 Cincinnati business meeting
   a. Minutes were distributed electronically in advance of the meeting, and were also published in the June 2016 issue of the MOUG Newsletter
   b. Suggestion was made to reduce number of bullets and sub-bullets in minutes
   c. A correction had been made previously to correct a typo on page 4, item e, number ii: “acapital” corrected to “capital”
   d. Another suggestion was made to change the word “explanation” to “description” on page 4, item b, number i
   e. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as corrected; the motion passed

3. Board reports
   a. Chair (Mullin)
      i. Election Results
         1. Elections for the positions of Vice Chair/Chair-Elect; Treasurer-Elect/Treasurer; and Reference, Discovery and Collections Coordinator (RDCC) were held in October-November 2016
         2. Candidates for Vice Chair/Chair-Elect: Mac Nelson, Alan Ringwood
         3. Candidates for Treasurer-Elect/Treasurer: Reed David, Jacob Schaub
         4. Candidates for RDCC: Chris Holden, Nara Newcomer
         5. Results: Alan Ringwood was elected Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Jacob Schaub was elected Treasurer-Elect/Treasurer, and Nara Newcomer was elected RDCC
         6. Thanks to all candidates for their willingness to stand for election
         7. Thanks to 2016 Nominating Committee (Karla Jurgemeyer, Beth Iseminger, Bruce Evans)
      ii. Appointments
         1. Program Committee
            a. Appointment letters sent out
         2. 2017 Nominating Committee
            a. Mac Nelson, Chair; Colin Bitter, Alan Ringwood (who is also e-ballots manager, but board discussion determined there was no conflict to have him serve in both roles)
         3. Social Media Coordinator
            a. After call for applications, Michelle Hahn was appointed as first SMC
         4. Others
            a. Anna LoPrete has been web editor for nearly a year
            b. With the MOUG listserv move, Nancy Sack appointed Listserv co-owner, Jay Weitz is OCLC representative
      iii. Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant winners
         1. Three winners this year: Jen Bort, Clara Burns, and Synae Yoon were recognized
      iv. Recognition of first-time attendees
      v. Other activity
         1. Submitted joint MLA/MOUG OCLC Search and Discovery Task Force report, with cover letter co-signed with MLA President Michael Rogan, to OCLC senior management (mid-2016)
         2. Web site developments and updates (Cataloging resource page, continuing efforts)
         3. MOUG at 40 efforts
         4. MLA Admin. Officer to extend MOUG registration to MLA Diversity Fellows
         5. MOUG-L migration in 2016, smooth operation
         6. Joint MOUG-MLA WMS interest group will be formally introduced
      vi. Acknowledgments and thanks to outgoing board members
         1. Rebecca Belford, Reference, Discovery and Collections Coordinator, and in previous title as Reference and Collection Services Coordinator, laid groundwork to make RDCC a formal member of the board
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a. Changes to handbook and documentation
   b. Wrote article that was basis of Search and Discovery Task Force (http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/lrts.58n1.49)

2. Nara Newcomer (Past Treasurer) is transitioning to a new role as RDCC after four years as Treasurer-Elect/Treasurer/Past Treasurer
   a. Expanded PayPal on web site for membership and subscription renewals
   b. PayPal transaction fee was reduced for 501c3
   c. Migration of website and membership database

3. Bruce Evans (Past Chair) was thanked for his 8 total years of board service (4 years as Chair-Elect/Chair/Past Chair, and CEC from 2006-2010)

b. Past Chair (Evans)
   i. Received nominations for DSA, Board representative on Nominating Committee
   ii. Sent out call for Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant, forwarded names in September and October for Board approval
   iii. Sent brochures for MLA booth at ALA, and for display at other ALA conferences
   iv. Handbook updates (still in progress)
   v. MOUG-L hosting change
      1. Worked with Nancy Sack, Jay Weitz, and Kerri Baunach to complete migration by August 1, 2016
   vi. MOUG-OLAC collaboration on survey this fall
      1. Partnered on survey
      2. Both organizations studied results and have held or will hold discussions in their respective organizations’ meetings
   vii. Social Media Coordinator draft job description created for summer board meeting
      1. Call in October for candidates
   viii. Evans thanked MOUG for the honor of serving
   xi. Evans thanked for his report

c. Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Vaughn)
   i. Distributed draft Board and business meeting minutes
   ii. Produced three issues of the MOUG Newsletter
      1. Switched printers to save money and to receive better customer service
   iii. As liaison to Music Library Association, submitted Board roster to the MLA President and regular reports to MLA Board
   iv. Vaughn thanked for her report

d. Treasurer (Shibuya)
   i. 2016 Financial Report distributed to members in registration packet
   ii. MOUG is fiscally healthy, has consistent annual budget surpluses and reserves
   iii. Slight decrease in membership from retirements and job description changes
      1. Some renewals were late because of an issue with Membee’s renewal feature
      2. Dedicated MOUG email account hopefully will be established to avoid this problem in the future
      3. Please update your email and physical mailing address on the MOUG website to ensure prompt receipt of invoices and newsletters
   iv. Shibuya thanked membership for donations added to the renewal
   v. Shibuya thanked Newcomer for training as treasurer, and thanked MOUG for opportunity to serve
   vi. Shibuya thanked for her report

e. Past-Treasurer (Newcomer)
   i. Worked with Jeremy Myntti from OLAC and Bruce Evans on OLAC MOUG merger survey
   ii. Investigated financial options to open Certificates of Deposit
   iii. Worked on 40 for 40 campaign
   iv. Newcomer thanked for her report

f. Continuing Education Coordinator (O’Brien)
   i. Thanks to the Board, Program Committee, past CECs for wisdom, web editor, SMC, presenters
   ii. Please submit a proposal for the program next year
   iii. Call for 2018 program committee
      1. Please consider joining
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iv. Please fill out online evaluation
   1. URL is on meeting folder, there will also be a call on the listserv
v. Final count of attendees was 88
vi. O’Brien thanked for her report
g. Reference, Discovery and Collections Coordinator (Belford)
   i. Succession planning
   ii. Handbook updated
   iii. Documents transferred to Board’s internal wiki
   iv. Call for RDC committee members
      1. Deadline March 6, please consider applying
v. WMS interest group planning, with Michael Rogan and MLA
vi. Search and Discovery Task Force
vii. Met with MOUG Board over summer and OCLC; First Search Advisory Group wouldn’t have come about without summer meeting at OCLC
viii. Thanks to Jay Holloway, OCLC Discovery Liaison, for coming.
ix. Belford thanked MOUG: she joined Reference Services Committee in 2008!
x. Belford thanked for her report

4. Other reports
   a. OLAC Liaison (Karen Peters)
      i. There has been a lot of discussion about possible merger with MOUG
      ii. New website (OLACINC.ORG), new logo, and a Wikipedia entry
      iii. 2016 election results:
         1. New Vice President/President Elect: Jeremy Myntti, University of Utah
         2. Secretary: Jeanette Ho, Texas A&M University
         3. CAPC Chair: Bruce Evans, Baylor
      iv. Best practices for Blu-Rays and DVDs out, BPs for Playaways in process, spoken word in audio and other formats is being considered for the future
v. Master unified mega best practices guide being discussed
      1. Instructions integrated in RDA Toolkit, listing everything that applies to all formats
   vi. Reminder: Deadline for 2017 OLAC research grant is soon
      1. $2,000 grant for research in the field of AV cataloging or expenses to attend OLAC Conference
      2. 2016 OLAC research grant went to Ralph Hartsock and Peter Lisius
vii. Next OLAC meeting in Richmond, VA, October 27-29 at Omni Hotel
     viii. Peters thanked for her report

5. LC report
   a. The LC report was distributed in advance of the meeting on the MOUG-L and MLA-L listservs
6. OCLC report (Weitz)
   a. OCLC report was distributed in the meeting folders
      i. Of special note: article (page 4 – 15) on libraries chosen for Small Libraries Create Smart Spaces program
         (partnership with Association for Rural and Small Libraries)
         1. Of 106 applicants, selected libraries represent 12 states, and serve rural communities between 1,000 and 21,000 people
      b. Weitz thanked for his report
7. Fundraising Czar (Luttmann)
   a. Fundraising task force chaired by Neil Hughes
      i. Report suggested that MOUG should look to OCLC for funding, but OCLC unable to make such a commitment
      ii. Other vendors (from MLA) also approached, not much interest in funding MOUG
   b. MOUG “elders,” including Steven Luttmann, Laura Gayle Green, Neil Hughes, Ruthann McTyre, Jay Weitz, and Mark Scharff will match donations to MOUG at a rate of 2:1 with a cap of $15,000
      i. Donors can pay off over 3 years if more than $150 is pledged
      ii. More details (and solicitations) to follow
   c. Papakhian Travel Grant fundraising drive
   d. Luttmann thanked for his report
8. Web Editor (LoPrete)
   a. Last year’s annual meeting presentations were posted
2017 Business Meeting Minutes

b. Additions made to MOUG website:
   i. History of MOUG from Jay Weitz, plus timeline and history of Executive Board
   ii. Implemented a way to deal with spam comments
   iii. Conference page for 2017
      1. Soon will be updated with this year’s presentations

c. Coming soon:
   i. Video content will be added to expanded Community tab
   ii. More interactive timeline features, 40th anniversary content, improvements to make donating easier

d. LoPrete thanked for her report

9. Social Media Coordinator (Hahn)
   a. Hashtags have been created (#MOUG2017, #ASKMOUG2017, #MOUGat40, #MOUGFORME)
   b. New social media accounts created (Instagram, YouTube)
   c. Content highlighting member projects sought, MOUG will follow your library’s social media account if your institution follows MOUG (follow for follow) (institutions with OCLC interfaces will be highlighted)
   d. If you have ideas, let SMC know
   e. Experimenting with different approaches to see what works and what does not
   f. Hahn thanked MOUG for opportunity to serve
   g. Hahn thanked for her report

10. Distinguished Service Award (Mullin)
    a. The 2017 DSA was awarded to Robert Cunningham of Boston Public Library
    b. Citation letter read out loud
    c. Cunningham expressed his thanks to membership and Board

11. Announcements and questions from the membership
    a. Question: any possibility that R. Papakhian Grant could be opened up to non-first time attendees?
       Freeman grant has different criteria
       Board discussed this matter over summer, and will decide in time for next award cycle
    b. Announcement: the more money we have, the more awards we can hand out. Please donate!
    c. Announcement: Project to record video is ongoing during day 2 of MOUG
       i. Please participate after sessions
       ii. If there is someone who is a good videographer, please stand for Mark Scharff tomorrow afternoon, as he is attending pre-conference
       iii. Thanks to Mark Scharff and Autumn Falkner for help with MOUG@40
    d. Announcement: Tomoko’s email address printed incorrectly in program
       i. t-shibuya instead of t_shibuya
    e. Announcement: Anyone interested in RDCC meet in main salon right after meeting concludes
    f. Announcement: Thanks to 1-day attendees
       i. Thanks to MOUG and the program committee for their flexibility in allowing folks to participate in RIMMF pre-conference

12. Comments to the good of the order?
    a. None made

13. Adjournment
    a. A motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and passed unanimously
    b. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer Vaughn
Secretary/Newsletter Editor
LAC to Move Catalogue to WorldCat, Use OCLC WMS as Its Platform

Library and Archives Canada (LAC) has entered into an agreement with OCLC to use OCLC WorldShare Management Services as its library services platform and move its National Union Catalogue to WorldCat. These moves are designed to make Canada's documentary heritage more widely accessible and available to library users in Canada and around the world. OCLC was awarded the contract following a Government of Canada public procurement process. OCLC was determined to be the only organization that was able to meet all of LAC’s requirements. Under this agreement, current union catalogue data will be loaded and maintained in WorldCat, the most comprehensive union catalogue that currently represents the collections of hundreds of Canadian libraries and thousands of libraries around the world. A subset of WorldCat will be created to produce a Canadian view of the catalogue, and a link to this subset will be available on the LAC website. There are currently more than 122 million holdings from Canadian libraries represented in WorldCat, and as many as 10 million unique items are held by Canadian libraries. More Canadian libraries will be able to join OCLC to take full advantage of services offered. Many Canadian libraries already subscribe to OCLC interlibrary loan and copy cataloging services. LAC's transition to OCLC will not affect these libraries. As a provision of the agreement, LAC will support small public libraries and small libraries at post-secondary institutions. As part of the unique features OCLC will offer to LAC, OCLC will continue maintaining the LAC French-language name authority file using WMS. Once these authority records are migrated to the WMS platform and WorldCat, LAC will use WorldShare metadata management applications to create and update French name authorities. LAC French-language authority data will be integrated into OCLC’s cataloging services and continue to be freely accessible through the Virtual International Authority File (https://viaf.org/). More about this agreement, services offered and the transition schedule is on the LAC website at http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/services/library-system-renewal/Pages/introduction.aspx.

Fachhochschule Muenster Migrates to OCLC WorldShare Management Services

OCLC and the library of Münster University of Applied Sciences announced that FH Münster (https://en.fh-muenster.de/index.php) is now live with OCLC’s cloud-based WorldShare Management Services (WMS). FH Münster's decision in March 2016 to adopt WMS as its library management system was followed by a period of preparation and training. The migration from SISIS-SunRise (http://www.oclc.org/en/sunrise-stub.html) to the new system began in mid-December, and the library was able to begin operations with WMS on schedule in January 2017. WMS is a comprehensive, cloud-based library services platform that integrates all workflows including cataloging, acquisitions, licensing, and circulation through a single staff user interface. Each application shares common data routines, making it possible to access user data, loan, title/item data, acquisition data, and license information quickly and easily without re-keying information common across all modules. Connecting WMS to the university's LDAP authentication system was critical to the success of the FH Münster implementation. APIs available through the WorldShare technology platform make it possible for WMS to be easily integrated with the student registry, ensuring that the principle of "one identifier for everything" could be achieved and extended with the inclusion of the student's library account and self-issue system.

Since the introduction of WMS five years ago, more than 500 libraries spanning six continents have selected WorldShare Management Services. WMS makes it possible for libraries to share bibliographic records, publisher and knowledge base data, and more. With WorldCat at its foundation, WMS enables libraries to draw on the collaborative data and work of libraries worldwide for more efficient workflows. WMS also provides libraries with the unique opportunity to share innovation, applications, infrastructure, vision, and success in serving their users. More about WorldShare Management Services is on the OCLC website at http://www.oclc.org/en/worldshare-management-services.html.
Seattle Public Library Uses Google Analytics to Shape CONTENTdm Collections

With OCLC’s CONTENTdm, libraries can increase the visibility of their digital collections and allow them to be more discoverable. CONTENTdm enables the storage, editing, and display of digital collections, making them accessible on any type of device for searchers worldwide. The Seattle Public Library has used CONTENTdm to showcase its digital collections since 2008, and has been using Google Analytics to track data about its collections since 2014. CONTENTdm’s integration with Google Analytics (http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/training/CONTENTdm/pdf/Tutorials/Getting%20Started/Getting%20Started%20with%20Google%20Analytics%20in%20CONTENTdm.pdf) enables users to construct detailed reports to do an in-depth analysis of collection usage. The library staff started with Google Analytics because they wanted to make data-informed decisions about their collections, and they wanted to learn how their patrons were using the collections in a number of different ways. They now send the main report of Google Analytics data for their CONTENTdm collections to the library’s administration so they can see what is most impactful.

Jade D’Addario, Digital Projects Librarian, Special Collections for The Seattle Public Library monitors Google Analytics year-round. She looks at the statistics for newly released collections and when collections are highlighted through different avenues of publicity. Jade tracks the number of users who view digital items and if they are new or returning users. She also follows page views and how long patrons spend looking at the collections. Google Analytics allows Jade to track what kind of devices are used to view the collections and how people are referred to the digital collections. Patrons may be directed to the library’s CONTENTdm collections from the library’s website, social media posts, a Google search, or through links on other libraries or archives websites. By using Google Analytics to track CONTENTdm collection data, The Seattle Public Library maximizes collection usage by viewing a full picture of how patrons interact with their collections. The library can see trends about how people are finding and using their collections and what types of collections are most popular with users. Each year, the library staff analyzes the collections and uses Google Analytics collection data to help determine changes they want to make to collection discoverability and outreach with users. They explore how well searching is working for patrons and if they can make any improvements to make collection navigation easier. Google Analytics also helps the library determine which social media sites, such as Twitter, Facebook, or Instagram, have been the most successful for collection promotion.

Monika Sengul-Jones Joins OCLC as Wikipedian-in-Residence

OCLC has appointed Monika Sengul-Jones as Wikipedian-in-Residence for Wikipedia + Libraries: Better Together (http://www.webjunction.org/explore-topics/wikipedia-libraries.html), a project led by OCLC’s WebJunction program. Sengul-Jones will work with WebJunction to design and deliver an online training program that will introduce U.S. public librarians to the inner-workings of Wikipedia this fall. The training will enable librarians to edit Wikipedia, guide patrons in its use, and lead local Wikipedia-based community engagement programs with confidence. In her role, Sengul-Jones will also foster connections between public librarians and Wikipedia’s volunteer editor community.

Sengul-Jones is a communication and media studies scholar, educator, organizer, web developer, and Wikipedian. Her passion for media literacy and community engagement guides her work with Wikipedia. Sengul-Jones has a master’s degree in gender studies from the Central European University in Budapest, Hungary, and in communication from UC San Diego, where she is currently completing her doctorate. She has five years of experience as a Wikipedia editor and outreach organizer (user: Shameran81; https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/User:Shameran81). And she has volunteered with the Cascadia Wikimedia User Group since 2014. In 2015-16, her work on systemic bias and Wikipedia’s gendered content gaps was funded by the Wikimedia Foundation’s INSPIRE grant campaign on gender diversity. The Wikipedia + Libraries: Better Together project is a winner of the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation 2016 News Challenge, for which OCLC received $250,000 in funding. In October 2016, the Wikimedia Foundation awarded OCLC a $70,000 project grant toward the Wikipedian-in-Residence position.
Guide for Collaboration Between Archivists and IT Professionals

OCLC has released *Demystifying IT: A Framework for Shared Understanding between Archivists and IT Professionals* (http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/2017/oclcresearch-demystifying-it-shared-understanding.html), a follow-on report in the popular *Demystifying Born Digital* series designed to help archivists achieve a better understanding of how information technology professionals work so that they can be effective collaborators. The report by Seth Shaw, Clayton State University; Richard C. Adler, University of Michigan Library; and Jackie Dooley, OCLC Research, describes types of IT providers and the services they typically offer, offers insights on the software development process, provides guidance toward building partnerships, and emphasizes the centrality of resource constraints. Many of the issues described are relevant to librarians and archivists who work with IT colleagues on issues other than born-digital management. Today's digital archivist needs tools and platforms to ingest, manage, and provide access to electronic records and digital content of all types. The complexity of digital systems makes the participation of IT professionals essential. Archivists have sophisticated domain knowledge, while IT staff have advanced technology skills. Working together effectively requires a desire to understand each other's expertise, priorities, and constraints. It requires developing a culture of collaboration.


Collective Wisdom: An Exploration of Library, Archives, and Museum Cultures

*Collective Wisdom: An Exploration of Library, Archives, and Museum Cultures* (http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2017/collective-wisdom-white-paper.pdf) was written by the participants in the Library, Archives, and Museum Conference Exchange project, in which 18 librarians, archivists and museum professionals explored cross-sector practices and culture, and potential for interdisciplinary collaboration and continuing education. This project was part of the grant-funded and OCLC-managed Coalition to Advance Learning (http://www.coalitiontoadvancelearning.org/).

The cohort was charged to 1) Build stronger cross-sector relationships; 2) Increase understanding of sector cultures; and 3) Identify opportunities for collaborative continuing education or professional development. The white paper summarizes their in-depth efforts in each of these three areas. Among the highlights:

- Participants identified concerns that cut across all three professions, which include preservation and conservation; diversity, equity and inclusion; employment and workplace practices; sustainability (financial and environmental); and the need to become better advocates for ourselves as individuals, institutions, sectors, and collectively across these sectors in order to secure needed resources and articulate our public value.

- Participants examined opportunities for cross-sector collaboration, including graduate programs in library and information science and museum studies and smaller shared interest groups organized regionally across sectors.

- Recommendations, ideas, and actions for LAM cross-sector connection are provided in Appendix A, in a format inspired by Nexus LAB’s recent “Layers of Leadership” framework.
The primary goal of the Music Division in FY 2016 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 2017 there are 66 staff members in the Music Division in six sections: Administrative (6), Acquisition & Processing (18), Reader Services (15), Bibliographic Access (17), Concert Office (6), and Digital Projects (4).

New staff or reassignments: Robin Rausch, Head of Reader Services, Damian Iseminger, Head of Bibliographic Access Section, Benjamin Barba, Christopher Holden, and Kyle Shockey, Bibliographic Access Section Specialists.

**Acquisition highlights**

- Unknown George and Ira Gershwin Correspondence. (61 items including 54 letters, 6 related documents, and working manuscript of part of the Crap Game scene in Act I of ‘Porgy and Bess,’) These documents present an unprecedented acquisition for their unique combination of their great informational substance, the extraordinary number of these letters, and the fact that these materials are completely unknown to the scholarly world. Of primary importance for research is the enormous content of the letters to Gershwin biographer Isaac Goldberg. They are rich in both musical and biographical explanatory content, and they chronicle in considerable detail the last nine years of George’s life, 1929-1937.
- George Gershwin holograph music manuscript sketchbook (1929-1931). The 84-page sketchbook contains material from the beginning of the last and richest part of George Gershwin’s career, with entries dated from January 10, 1929 to April 8, 1931. Perhaps the most unexpected and significant entry is the earliest known sketch for any material that would be used in “Porgy and Bess” – in this case, an early version of “I Loves You, Porgy,” which appears in the early (1929) portion of the sketchbook. One of the most exciting features of this sketchbook is the presence of music for three songs for which the lyrics are preserved in LC’s Gershwin Collection but for which the music was previously thought lost.

**Creating, Managing, and Distributing National Collection Metadata**

The Music Division’s Bibliographic Access Section (BAS) created bibliographic metadata for music materials in the ILS. (Voyager).

**Cataloging statistics for FY 2016**

- New general collections items inventoried: 22,315
- Original and copy cataloged additions to collection: 5,586
- Unpublished materials cataloged: 112
- Bibliographic and Authority change: 5,158
- Name and subject authorities created: 2,415
- Class numbers proposed and modified: 27
- Materials receiving subject analysis: 874
- Materials receiving LC classification: 5,855

In addition to keeping current with incoming receipts of music materials to be cataloged, BAS played a key role in creating cataloging records for digital projects, including music manuscripts, Renaissance music, and liturgical music. These projects provide unprecedented access to bibliographic metadata for onsite collections. Most of the large digital projects cataloged during the previous fiscal year--the Schatz librettos, pre-1801 music...
books, pre-1820 sheet music, and other instrumental music collections—are currently awaiting processing by another section. Once cleared, the records will be made available to the public.

Preparing for future cataloging, the section specialists have continued to take an active role in reviewing, testing, and participating in the development of the new cataloging standards. Specialists attended the Digital Future lecture series as well as Bibliographic Framework Initiative, BIBFRAME presentations, and will continue to prepare for the next generation of bibliographic control.

International Standard Music Number (ISMN) news

The Library successfully launched the U.S. ISMN Public Archive, making available, world-wide, catalog records created for scores issued with ISMNs in the United States. This database is updated monthly (currently 4,927 items) to include newly registered scores and to reflect changes that publishers have made to already existing scores. [https://memory.loc.gov/diglib/ijhas/html/ismn/ismn-home.html](https://memory.loc.gov/diglib/ijhas/html/ismn/ismn-home.html) The multi-page website conforms to Project 1 standards. It features standard database search parameters and 5 different, useful displays of the data retrieved for each ISMN issued: eye-readable, MARC record, XMLMARC, METS, and MODS. This was achieved by the goal date of June 30, 2016. We created a tri-fold brochure – designed, printed, and ready for distribution. The U.S. ISMN Public Archive displays records for nearly 5,000 scores issued by American music publishers. This project’s importance lies in its fostering U.S. music publication world-wide, and it is smart resource leveraging—it provides LC with catalog records created without LC labor.

Production of Metadata for use outside the Library

Four Music Division Bibliographic Access specialists participated as testers from August 2015 to March 31, 2016 in the “BIBFRAME” pilot project, intended to provide a foundation for the future of bibliographic description both on the web, and in the broader networked world.

Contribution to Metadata Standards

One BAS specialist contributed significantly to the development of cataloging standards and documentation as an LC representative to the RDA Steering Committee’s (RSC) Music Working Group, the RSC Aggregate Working Group and the Performed Music Ontology section of the grant-funded project, LD4P (Linked Data for Production), which is charged with developing a new standard for cataloging structures based on the Resource Description Framework (RDF) and has representatives from six institutions. The RSC Music Working Group produced several important cataloging documents, some of which have already been incorporated into the RDA instructions.

Sharing the National Collection: Master Special Collections List

The following link: [http://www.loc.gov/rr/perform/special/special-collections.html](http://www.loc.gov/rr/perform/special/special-collections.html) is a draft page of our new public master special collections list. This will replace the current finding aids page to inform researchers about collections we hold that are not fully processed. This effort brings together collections that have been processed whose finding aids are online, with collections that are unprocessed or partially processed, and are described by brief collection level records, making a first-ever comprehensive listing of our special collections available to the general public. This will go a long way towards making our collections known and helping us prioritize processing.

The Music Division has begun serious planning for the renovation of the Performing Arts Reading Room and adjacent staff and processing areas. We worked with the Space Utilization Planning and Design Division and Contracts Division to award a design contract to Lukmire architectural firm. We also worked with Recorded Sound and Moving Image to identify efficiencies in merging reading room and office functions.
Building the National Collection

A joint Library Services and Copyright Office working group for the eDeposit of sound recordings began weekly meetings in April 2016. Five Recorded Sound Section staff joined other Library Services staff and members of the Copyright Acquisitions Division to develop plans for a 2017 startup program for the mandatory deposit of sound recordings that are only distributed as digital files. Three major groups of audio content have been identified as potential targets for the program: music, recorded books, and podcasts. In addition to planning internal workflows and processes, the group has developed lists of producers, investigated accompanying metadata standards and content, and identified various external stakeholders that might be consulted as part of the planning process.

Recorded Sound Acquisitions

Recorded Sound Section acquisitions emphasized quality, condition and uniqueness over quantity. By targeting gaps in our holdings of pre-1972 popular music on original 78rpm and cylinder formats, and with a focused collection of a unique form of popular piano music, the following were acquired during the year:

- WTON Collection: The 78rpm record library of a Staunton, VA radio station founded in 1946. The collection includes over 3,400 78rpm discs from 1946-1952, the majority of which are “promo” discs – high quality pressings provided to radio stations by record labels.
- Alex Hassan Syncopated Piano Collection: Approximately 1,700 78 rpm recording from the US, UK and Europe of the jazz and classically influenced syncopated piano stylings popular on both sides of the Atlantic in the 1920s and 1930s.
- Marty Stuart Country Music Collection: Over 3,300 78s, 45s, and LPs, many quite rare, from the personal collection of noted country and bluegrass musician Marty Stuart.
- David Jones Acoustic Era Recording Collection: Over 300 cylinders and 78rpm discs of rare opera and classical recordings.

By the end of FY2016, the entire Packard Campus Data Center – combining both the Digital Archive and the Embargo Space – held a total of 7.384 PB (petabytes) and 1,790,422 files.

The total number of items preserved during the fiscal year was 84,757.

Recorded Sound Preservation

The Recorded Sound section rehoused 11,057 audio carriers in FY16, including over 4,000 commercial celluloid cylinder recordings that were re-housed in a newly designed Archival Cylinder Box and placed in media cabinets specifically configured for maximum storage capacity. The new cylinder box is the product of a collaborative design and development project between NAVCC and the Association for Recorded Sound Collections to produce an affordable archival container for these early and fragile recordings.

In collaboration with the American Folklife Center, the Audio Laboratory used state of the art digital audio restoration technology to enhance the sound of 31 wax cylinders that were recorded by Jesse Walter Fewkes in 1890. The cylinders were digitized last year by the Audio Lab. The recordings are of Passamaquoddy Indians from Maine, and are considered the first field recordings ever produced. The restored recordings were presented to the living descendants at an event attended by AFC staff as part of the Ancestral Voices project.

American Archive of Public Broadcasting

The Library of Congress and the WGBH Educational Foundation in Boston moved forward in FY2016 with achieving the goals of the American Archive of Public Broadcasting (AAPB), a collaborative project administered by the two institutions to preserve the most significant public television and radio programs of the past 60 years and to coordinate a national effort to save at-risk public media before its content is lost to posterity. While the Library is responsible for the long term preservation of the digital files and WGBH is responsible for access and outreach to stations and con-
Building the National Collection
The Library of Congress American Folklife Center (AFC), created by an Act of Congress in 1976 to "preserve and present American folklife," collects, safeguards, and provides access to the unparalleled collections of the Archive of Folk Culture. The collections in the Archive contain one-of-a-kind documentation of traditional cultural expressions that date from the end of the nineteenth century through the present. These collections preserve for future researchers a record of the folklife, cultural expressions, traditional arts, and oral histories of Americans and of our global neighbors.

During fiscal 2016, the AFC Acquisitions Program accessioned 102 new collections and collection accruals documenting expressive culture in the United States and around the world, totaling 259,654 items including 170,136 non-purchase items by gift and 89,518 purchases or additions to collections already purchased. The AFC Reference Program acquired 722 additional serials (only 10 by purchase and the rest by gift) and 600 items of ephemera (all by gift) for AFC’s subject files. This is a total of 171,448 items by gift, 89,528 purchases, and a grand total of 260,976 items, not including the VHP collections.

Stewardship of the National Collection
AFC has made stewardship of its audiovisual collections a particular priority in FY16. Staff worked closely with engineers at NAVCC to prioritize the digitization of AFC wax cylinders. In addition, several steps were taken to help prepare for an assessment of audiovisual holdings in late FY17 with an eye toward a comprehensive plan.

Creating, Managing, and Distributing National Collection Metadata
Throughout FY2016 the Recorded Sound Processing Unit created brief inventories for various collections, either to facilitate processing or to better help section staff find items which would not be processed in the near future. Section staff also created acquisition and inventory records in MAVIS to track each incoming collection that was counted-in.

At the request of Music Division, Recorded Sound staff consulted on the development of training documents and procedures intended to allow Music Division staff to start creating MAVIS records. This was intended to provide Music Division a manner in which to better track all unpublished sound recordings they transfer to the Recorded Sound Section at the item-level, and at the same time, increase potential patron discovery through Reference staff-mediated searching within MAVIS. Starting in June, and continuing for a few months, one Recorded Sound cataloger spent one day a week onsite in Music Division, training staff in MAVIS, reviewing their work, and answering questions.

Contribute to Metadata Standards
Recorded Sound Section catalogers provided feedback on various RDA proposals. One cataloger also continues to serve on the RSC Music Working Group.

Regarding BIBFRAME and linked data, three Recorded Sound catalogers participated in the initial BIBFRAME pilot, describing CDs containing one work and providing feedback on the tool, which led to improvements. Both of the Recorded Sound and Moving Image processing unit heads provided feedback to NDMSO on various BIBFRAME documents and ideas, particularly in regard to the concept of “event.” The RS Processing Unit Head is involved in the LD4P-performed music project, which is evaluating BIBFRAME in light of specific needs for performed music content and formats.

The Recorded Sound Processing Unit Head continues to serve on an ISO task force to revise the ISRC (International Standard Recording Code) and serves as co-chair of the ARSC Cataloging Committee, which is performing tasks to support the LD4P-performed music project.

News from the Library of Congress
for preservation digitization. First, AFC staff worked with a contractor to develop a tool to batch transfer digitized AV materials to NAVCC. The tool not only enables AV to be delivered in the reading room via PCWA, it also allows the division to combine its management of analog and digitized AV as well as build capacity to ingest vendor digitization in the future to NAVCC servers. Also, AFC worked with Marlan Green in Conservation to pilot a processing transfer workflow for AFC’s film holdings on Capitol Hill. The Pete Seeger film collection is being processed and will transfer to NAVCC in FY17. This new workflow provides a path so that AFC can tackle its film arrearage on Capitol Hill.

- AFC inventoried 77,847 new and 357,516 legacy collection items.
- AFC rehoused 132,225 collection items.
- AFC reformatted 3,240 audiovisual items.

Creating, Managing, and Distributing National Collection Metadata

- AFC compiled 9,547 catalog records.
- AFC compiled 115 name and subject authority records.

AFC’s Ancestral Voices project continued to enable tribally-centered contextualization and description of historic recordings in the Library collections by developing community-based Traditional knowledge labels, a form of metadata which is a key component of the Mukurtu content management system developed at Washington State University. The project partners traveled to Maine twice to return digital copies of the recordings and to launch the metadata development process in collaboration with Passamaquoddy people.

Sharing the National Collection: Providing access to the collection

AFC’s Ancestral Voices project continued to digitize AFC’s vast collection of wax cylinders containing recordings of Native American voices and music. This involved greenlighting the cylinder move to NAVCC and establishing a partnership with a third party (Local Contexts, NYU) to work with the Passamaquoddy Indian community of Maine to facilitate development of a collaborative cataloging project.

AFC’s online presentation The Alan Lomax Collection was launched on October 15, 2015. The Alan Lomax Collection includes ethnographic field documentation, materials from Lomax’s various projects, and cross-cultural research created and collected by Alan Lomax and others on traditional song, music, dance, and body movement from around the world. Lomax conducted fieldwork in the Bahamas, the Caribbean, England, France, Georgia (Republic), Haiti, Ireland, Italy, Morocco, Romania, Russia, Scotland, Spain, the United States, and Wales from the 1930s to the 1990s. The collection contains approximately 650 linear feet of manuscripts, 6,400 sound recordings, 5,500 graphic images, and 6,000 moving images. This presentation includes the first 25,000 pages of Alan Lomax’s personal papers and office files from his time at the Library of Congress (1932-1942) and from his post-Library career through the 1990s. Featured are Lomax’s writing projects such as Land Where the Blues Began (1993), the unpublished Big Ballad Book, as well as documentation of his extensive work in radio for the CBS and BBC networks. Also included are thousands of pages of field notes and correspondence associated with his field projects beginning in the 1930s.

https://www.loc.gov/collections/alan-lomax-manuscripts/about-this-collection/

AFC celebrated its 40th anniversary in 2016 with a series of events that shared knowledge of our collections with ever larger audiences. During fiscal 2016, for example, AFC held a special reception in the Great Hall, participated in the National Book Festival, where we staffed a table and provided an introduction and orientation to AFC collections in the Library of Congress Pavilion, and produced or collaborated on 28 public programs.
Correction, Courtesy of Kathy Glennan

In MOUG Newsletter No. 124 (December 2016) Page 13, in the Q&A entitled “Still Ambisonic After All These Years,” I stated in part:

If my analysis from 2009 still rings true, however, Ambisonic would be accounted for under RDA 3.16.9.3, “Recording Special Playback Characteristics, not as one of the controlled terms listed but under the paragraph: “If none of the terms in the list is appropriate or sufficiently specific, use another concise term or terms to indicate the special playback characteristics.” The MLA Best Practice for 3.16.9 recommends: “If feasible, record special playback characteristic for all audio carriers,” and guides us via example to field 344 subfield $h; hence:

344 digital $b optical $g stereo $h Ambisonic UHJ encoded $2 rda

Although the terms in subfields $a, $b, $and $g are from RDA controlled lists (RDA 3.16.2.3, RDA 3.16.3.3, and RDA 3.16.8.3, respectively), “Ambisonic UHJ encoded” is not on the RDA 3.16.9.3 controlled list. Because it conforms to the paragraph quoted earlier from the same instruction, though, I guess the subfield $2 coded “rda” may still be appropriate. Maybe the Best Practices folks can rule on that one, as I’m not sure about any decision so far regarding that question.

Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland), the American Library Association Representative to the RDA Steering Committee, offered the following correction:

I was just reading your Q&A column in the most recent MOUG Newsletter & thought I should weigh in with my opinion on the use of "$2 rda" in MARC when following the RDA instruction to "use another concise term or terms" if the list supplied in RDA doesn't have a term that is appropriate or sufficiently specific. I believe the intention of $2 is to identify the source of terms from a controlled vocabulary. When a cataloger uses a term that's not actually in RDA, even though it is supported by RDA instructions, I don't think that term has come from a controlled list -- and thus $2 is not appropriate in this situation.

Kathy further suggests the use of multiple fields in such cases, one with the controlled terms plus the subfield $2 representing the source, and the other with the uncontrolled terms and no subfield $2. In this case, the preferred solution would be the following pair of 344 fields:

344 digital $b optical $g stereo $2 rda
344 $h Ambisonic UHJ encoded

In a Linked Data world, as Kathy points out, “this allows mapping the vocabulary terms with their sources when applicable.” Thanks to Kathy both for the correction and for permission to share it.

Disproportional Font

Question: I have a new computer with Windows 10, which no longer has the Arial Unicode MS font. Has anybody found a way to make the flat sign display properly on Connexion 2.63 in Windows 10? With the font set to “System,” the flat sign sometimes shows as a rectangle (standing on its narrow end) and sometimes as a teeny-tiny flat sign with a bunch of space after it. There is probably a better font for this, but I haven’t discovered it yet.

Answer: My font (Tools/Options/Fonts/Records and Lists) is set to Arial Unicode MS, which I am not aware of ever having changed. The flat sign displays normally, but I’m not working in Windows 10 yet. My colleague (and former music cataloger) Anna Sylvester notes: “There is a charge now for using Arial Unicode MS. If their institution does not want to use Arial for that reason, then they may be able to find a font that displays the flat sign with a Web search. There are fonts that are available at no charge. They would have to look around to see what they can find. We don’t keep a list of fonts here to suggest to users.” If anyone has found an acceptable font freely available to Windows 10 that correctly displays the flat sign, please share that information.
Inundated by Languages

Question: I have a vocal work by Claus-Steffen Mahnkopf “Esė apie vandenis” for baritone solo, unaccompanied. The title is in Lithuanian. In the preface, the words printed as text are German (original, by Anja Kampmann) with English translation by Wieland Hoban. However, in the score, the German and English words are intertwined (first page, measures 1-5: “Versuch about the sea über das Meer The horizon is the concern here Es soll um den Horizont gehen”). In other words, text fragments appear alternately, English first, except the very first word “Versuch.” In addition, the word “water” is spoken in 50 different languages, which are interspersed with the song text. All the words with IPA in the score. Performance notes are included in German and English. First, I was leaning toward using Lang (008/35-37) coded “mul” and

041 1 mul $e ger $e eng $n ger $g ger $g eng”

Then, I started to think German and English are predominant languages:

041 1 ger $a eng $h ger $e ger $e eng $n ger $g ger $g eng

with the fixed field Lang coded “ger.” In this case, subfield $h coded “ger” looks a bit odd to me. I don’t know which one to choose, or if there’s a better solution to this. My 546 looks something like: “Principally German and English words; German text printed separately with English translation. The word ‘water’ in 50 different languages interspersed with text.” Perhaps I’m making this more difficult than it really is?

Answer: The presence of a single word in a particular language, although significant in its way, would not seem to justify MARC coding in field 041 for each of those fifty represented languages, not even in the form of the “mul” code. Concentrating on the two predominant languages of German and English would be the way to go. Given that Anja Kampmann (no2014095361) is German and appears to write in German, as well as your explanation of the languages of the musical text (“the words printed as text are German (original, by Anja Kampmann) with English translation by Wieland Hoban”), the subfields $h and $n coded “ger” following the subfields $a and $e, respectively, also make sense. Hence, your second suggested 041 field strikes me as MARC, so to speak. Because of the unusual situation here, you may want to incorporate some of the additional details of the languages involved in your 546 note: the interleaving of the German and English phrases and the presence of International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) pronunciations, in particular. As clearly and succinctly as possible, as always.

Double Dating

Question: I’m cataloging a CD that’s been reissued a few times (Biograph, Bob Dylan). I know it was originally released in 1985, but the best I can do for my particular manifestation is “[between 2002 and 2016].” (Long story.) So, I want to use DtSt code “r”. Date 2 is 1985, but what goes in Date 1, 2002 or 2016? Obviously, DtSt cannot account for all the complexities of dates -- in this case, the date of previous issue and a range of dates for the current issue -- and perhaps it does not matter much, but thought I’d check to see if there was a preference.

Answer: In DtSt (008/06), you would use code “r”, as you suggest because it is higher in the DtSt hierarchy than DtSt “q”. For Types of Date that involve ranges of dates, the earlier date has always gone first, in Date 1. If “[between 2002 and 2016]” is as narrow a range as you can legitimately estimate, Date 1 (008/07-10) would be 2002, reflecting the earlier of your conjectural dates of publication. Date 2 (008/11-14) would be 1985, reflecting the date of the original release. As you note, DtSt and Dates cannot always convey the myriad details of a sound recording released in numerous media over a period of years. Depending upon your audience, your notion of the importance of the information, and your patience, you can try to express some of the important details in a note, as might be appropriate. Optionally, you may code for your “[between 2002 and 2016]” range in field 046, coding the Type of Date “q” in subfield $a and the presumed range of 2002 in subfield $k and 2016 in subfield $l.
Performance Enhancing Coding

**Question:** I have an enhanced CD, my first one in RDA, and I’m trying to figure out how to code it. I see an enhanced CD as a little different as to 006, 007, and 33X, when all aspects are on a single physical thing, instead of separate aspects on separate physical things. It’s mostly Billy Joel performing his songs, with two music videos embedded in the CD. Type in the 008 is “j” for the main audio content. Field 006 for the electronic aspect of the music videos: Type “m” for computer file, Form “q” for direct electronic, and File “m” for mixed, since I have both “c” for representational and “h” for sounds. The second 006 for the video aspect of the videos: Type “g” for projected medium, Time is three hyphens, TMat “v” for videorecording, Tech “l” for live action. What about File? Is that “q” for direct electronic, or would that go only in the previous 006, for the electronic aspect? I’m getting hung up on content vs carrier in 006. Moving on to the 007, I’ve got two, one for the music. A second one for the electronic aspect that seems straightforward (subfield $a$ is “c” for electronic resource, subfield $b$ is “o” for optical disc, subfield $d$ is “c” for multicolored, subfield $e$ is “g” for 4 3/4 in., subfield $f$ is “a” for sound included). Do I need one for the video aspect? I’ve never done it before in AACR2; and looking at the codes, none seem to fit for subfield $b$, specific material designation (it’s not a videodisc) or subfield $e$, videorecording format (it’s not a DVD), or subfield $g$, medium for sound (not a videodisc). I’d wind up with “z” for all those. For the 33X fields, audio aspect is 336 of performed music, 337 of audio, 338 of audio disc—or at least most of it is. Computer file aspect is 336 of computer program – is it really? – 337 of computer, 338 of computer disc; you do have to have a computer to access the music videos. Video aspect, 336 of two-dimensional moving image, 337 of video, 338 of what? It’s still not a videodisc. I guess the big question is if you have to have the whole set of 33X for each aspect in this situation. You really have only two kinds of content, but both kinds are carried on a computer disc.

What would be cool is to have only:

336 performed music  
336 two-dimensional moving image  
337 audio  
337 video  
337 (and computer?)  
338 computer disc  

(plus ‘audio disc’ for the stuff you don’t need a computer to access?)

When I have a score with a huge amount background info, texts printed separately and in translation, pages of endnotes, etc., I do put in two 336s, for notated music and for text. But since both are unmediated and in volume form, there is need for only one 337 and 338. Is an enhanced CD different?

**Answer:** What I did first was to look at the current MLA Best Practices Supplement 1: Guidelines for Describing and Encoding Attributes of Audio Recording Carriers (http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.musiclibraryassoc.org/resource/resmgr/BCC_RDA/Supp_RDA_Best_Practices.pdf#%5B%7B%22num%22%3A31%2C%22gen%22%3A0%7D%2C%7B%22name%22%3A%22%3A%22%xyz%22%7D%2C%33%2C%543%2C%0%5D), where I compared the recommended treatment of the Dual-Disc (which is a single physical thing combining audio and video) with that of the CD/DVD Combo (which is two separate physical things). As I suspected, the recommendations are identical, so it doesn’t seem to matter in this regard whether the various aspects are on a single entity or on separate entities. With that in mind, we can use the recommendations for either of those carriers as the basis for how to treat the audio and video aspects of an Enhanced CD. Because the audio recording aspect is dominant, the main Type Code would be “j”, as you say, and there would be a Sound Recording 007. Does your disc specifically identify itself as an “Enhanced CD”? You’ve said that the video aspect is not in DVD format, but can you tell what format the video files are? It seems that in any case, an Electronic Resource 006 would be appropriate: Type “m”, Form “q”, and File “m”. So would an Electronic Resource 007, as you’ve outlined; a Visual Materials 006 with TMat “v,” as you’ve outlined; and a Videorecording 007, with subfield $b$ “d” (it’s still a disc with videos on it, even if it’s not a DVD – not every videodisc is a DVD, by any means), subfield $e$ either “z” if you know the video file extensions or “u” if not. As for the 33X fields, here’s what I’d suggest:

(Continued)
Questions & Answers

This seems like overkill, especially as we have one physical entity represented by three RDA carrier types. On the other hand, both MARC and RDA define “carrier type” as reflecting both the format of the storage medium and the housing of the carrier, so this tripartite carrier description makes at least some sense.

Noting Rights

Question: I have a CD originally issued as a quadraphonic LP by Deutsche Grammophon in 1973 and reissued as a hybrid SACD by Pentatone in 2014. The container shows this text: "Licensed from Deutsche Grammophon ...." If this information on licensing is included in a 264 field, what second indicator should I use? I’m guessing it’s publication information and therefore calls for 2nd indicator “1”, but before I plunge ahead I thought I’d check.

Answer: The designation “licensed from” seems not to fit the RDA definitions of production, publication, distribution, or manufacture, and so also seems not to be a candidate for inclusion in field 264. It strikes me more as rights information, possibly copyright related. That might make it more appropriate for field 542, Information Relating to Copyright Status. Or you could simply add the information as a quoted 500 note if you deem it to be important.

Consider the Implications

Question: I just ran across something in the OLAC Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs Using RDA and MARC21 (http://olacinc.org/drupal/capc_files/DVD_RDA_Guide.pdf) that requires further clarification. There are many examples of English language videos (please see the example for 1001 Classic Commercials on page 207) for English language titles that have the following field:

041 01 $a eng $h eng

Is it necessary to add field 041 to records lacking subtitles/captions that are solely in English? I don’t know why I did not notice this scenario in the past and I want to make sure we are using this field correctly. We have been omitting the 041 unless there are other languages and/or subtitles present. Should we be using field 041 more often and across formats?

Answer: Longstanding practice has been to omit field 041 when a single Language Code (in the Language fixed field, 008/35-37) covers all the language aspects of a resource. As we have moved toward a Linked Data future, however, we have increasingly recognized that some elements that have been omitted because they are implied by other data result in a loss of information. The trend has been moving toward explicitly coding elements that had previously been merely implied. This is at least part of the idea behind the OLAC Best Practice recommendation (page 49): “Always include the original language in MARC 041 subfield h when that information is present.” Aside from the obvious insistence on the consistent use of subfield $a, the document also suggests the routine use of field 041 subfield $j when it applies. The notion of spelling out what had been previously omitted or relegated to only coded form (most often in fields 007) is also behind some of the elements in 34X fields. This applies especially to elements that have historically been left out of bibliographic records because they were considered the standard for a particular kind of resource. Think of the several AACR2 instructions in 6.5 that included such text as “Do not give the playing speed if it is standard for the type of item (e.g., 1⅞ inches per second for an analog tape cassette; 1.4 metres per second for a digital disc)” (AACR2 6.5C3) or “Do not give the projection speed if it is standard for the item (24 fps for a sound film; 16 fps for a silent film)” (AACR2 7.5C5). The official positions of the OLAC and MLA best practices documents (Continued)
generally continue to consider many of these elements to be optional, but they may be explicitly expressed in field 344 subfield $c$ (Playing Speed) and in field 345 subfield $b$, respectively. In theory, each element has its own potential value in a Linked Data world, where explicit presence is much more useful than simply implied presence. How broadly to use field 041 beyond videos and audio recordings under appropriate circumstances is a question I’ll have to leave up to your judgment. LC-PCC PS 7.12.1.3 says: “In addition to recording the language of the primary content, also supply the languages of other content (summaries, tables of contents, etc.) if it will assist identification and selection.” That translates to 041 subfields $a$, $b$, and $f$, at least. MLA BP 7.12 boils down to suggesting routine use of field 041 subfields $a$, $d$, $e$, $g$, $h$, $j$, and $m$, when appropriate and ascertainable; and MLA BP 7.12.1.3 says to follow the PS. Coding all of the applicable subfields with the same Language Code for everything begins to look a bit obsessive. In some instances, it may be useful and in others, less so, so I’d opt for using judgment.

**Flipping the Switch**

**Question:** When you upgrade a Name Authority Record in the authority file, will the relevant access points “flip” on controlled fields on OCLC bibliographic records, automatically or do you additionally have to make sure you have a 4XX with the old form (coded “$w nne” or “$w nnea”, as the case may be)? I’m trying to figure out what triggers the flip.

**Answer:** My colleague Robert Bremer responds: “The old form does not have to be present as a reference. It only matters that an existing bib heading was controlled to an authority record. The text string in controlled bib headings will automatically change. You can usually watch it happen by changing a heading and then a few minutes later searching to see that the bib record headings have been updated. So, it’s just that the authority 1XX is different from what it was that triggers the updating of the bibliographic records.”

**Persistence of Bibliographic Memory**

**Question:** Did the definition of code “c” (catalogs) in BKS 008/24-27 (Cont) in the input standards once say that exhibition catalogs are included? I could swear it did. Or was that just my imagination?

**Answer:** In 1987, the MARC 21 definition of Books 008/24-27 (Nature of Contents; OCLC Fixed Field “Cont”) code “c” for “catalogs” grew in length, reading:

This code is used when the work is or contains a list of items in a collection, such as a collection of books, a collection of art objects, etc. It also includes lists of collectable objects, such as stamp catalogs, coin catalogs, trade catalogs, etc. Code c is used whenever the subdivision “Catalogs” or “Catalogs and collections” is used as a form subdivision under a subject heading. It is also used for catalogs of exhibitions for which the subdivision “Exhibitions” alone is used. For catalogs of books, sound recordings, or films, code for both Catalogs (code c) and Bibliographies (code b), Discographies (or other bibliographies or recorded sound) (code k), or Filmographies (code q), as appropriate.

The next year, though the definition shrunk, and would subsequently simplify further until it currently reads in its entirety: “Also includes lists of collectible objects, such as stamps and coins, or trade catalogs, etc. For catalogs of books, sound recordings, or motion pictures, code b (Bibliographies), code k (Discographies), or code q (Filmographies), are given with code c” (http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd008b.html). The definition in Bibliographic Formats and Standards and its predecessor documents grew and shrunk similarly over the years. Through at least the early 1980s, the old Books Format document, at least, contained a definition similar to the expanded 1987 version above. Since then, it has also grown shorter and simpler. It was not your imagination, just the persistence of memory. As far as I can tell, the intention of actual practice never changed, just that the definition fluctuated in detail and redundancy. You’re safe to consider an exhibition catalog as a code “c”.
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Deep Symbolism

Question: Can the treble and bass clef symbols in music be added to a record? I could not find any information on that, so I thought I would check if that’s permitted or if they need to be spelled out instead.

Answer: Because of OCLC’s implementation of Unicode, both the treble clef (Unicode 1D120) and bass clef (Unicode 1D122) symbols can technically be entered into bibliographic records in WorldCat. Here’s part of my colleague Anna Sylvester’s announcement from July 2016 about Connexion client 2.63 and the support of Unicode:

This release of Connexion client 2.63 is part of a group of changes that OCLC is making to expand WorldCat support for full Unicode characters and scripts to better represent your international collections. When complete, WorldCat will expand support from 15 scripts to all scripts that are represented in Unicode.

This means that by the end of 2016, WorldCat users will have the ability to:

• Catalog using full Unicode (available now in Connexion client 2.63)
• Upload records with full Unicode
• Search across full Unicode

As you catalog using Connexion client 2.63 please be aware that:

• WorldCat now supports all Unicode characters. OCLC has removed all limitations on MARC-8 and selected non-MARC-8 scripts. If you rely on validation to block unsupported characters, you may need to update impacted workflows.
• Connexion client 2.63 supports all Unicode characters through version 8.0.0 of Unicode.
• You can use previously unsupported characters to add new bibliographic records to WorldCat, replace records in WorldCat, import records into the client, and export records from the client. All other functions for bibliographic records support these characters as well.

• You will not be able to use the newly supported characters to search WorldCat until later in 2016. OCLC will announce when searching for the new characters in WorldCat is ready to use.
• Authority records continue to be limited to the MARC-8 character set.
• You have a choice to export bibliographic records in MARC-8 (the default) or in UTF-8. If non-MARC-8 scripts are exported in MARC-8 data format, the non-MARC-8 characters are saved in Numeric Character Reference (NCR) format.
• Valid Unicode characters can appear as empty boxes if they are not supported in your default font.
• The Arial Unicode MS font that OCLC recommends will not support all scripts. You will have to search for fonts to cover some of the new scripts OCLC supports. Fonts that support these scripts vary in their ability to display characters outside of the script they were designed to support. You may have to experiment to see which font works best for your needs for a particular script. The font selected as the default in the client is applied to the entire record. You may have to move between two fonts to see all of the characters in a record.

Under RDA LC-PCC PS 1.4, “Characters That Cannot Be Reproduced by the Facilities Available,” however, “… ‘facilities available’ means the totality of characters that can be represented in machine-readable form and displayed/printed using the ‘MARC-8 character set’…. In that context, and knowing that not all local systems are fully Unicode-ready, it probably remains prudent to follow the longstanding practices that are restated in LC-PCC PS 1.7.5, including this: “Substitute in the language of the context the word, phrase, etc., that is the obvious spoken/written equivalent (if unknown in the language of the context, use English); bracket the interpolated equivalent.” If you’re asking specifically about the transcription of a title in field 245, you could offer both the exact symbol, say, in field 245 and the textual equivalent in field 246, or vice versa. At least that’s my recommendation.
Unreliable Product Code

**Question:** We are cataloging a CD bearing a UPC that the same label (although under a different form of name) used for another CD several years ago. If the number was an internationally recognized number such as an ISBN or an ISMN, I would consider the number as application invalid and would record it in field 024 subfield $z$. Should UPCs be treated in the same manner? The information I read about UPCs stresses the fact that these numbers should be unique, so I'm inclined to say yes but I wanted to be sure.

**Answer:** If you know a UPC to have been incorrectly associated with a resource, coding it as subfield $z$ would be the correct thing to do.

Small but Voluminous

**Question:** This question pertains to music scores. If you have a single musical work, in study score format, but it is split into four physical volumes, what field(s) do you need to use for describing the set? For example, a set that has pagination for every volume.

300 1 miniature score (654, 756, 740, 738 p.) …

or

300 1 miniature score, 4 volumes (654, 756, 740, 738 p.) …

**Answer:** Thank you for any help and/or reference to a cataloging standard.

**Answer:** According to RDA 3.4.5.18 and its corresponding Music Library Association Best Practice, I believe that the description would be as follows:

300 1 study score (4 volumes (654, 756; 740; 738 pages)) : $b …

What used to be called a “miniature score” is now under RDA 7.20.1.3 designated a “study score.”

More Evidence That Size Doesn't Matter

**Question:** In Connexion, will a 10-inch 33 1/3 rpm recording be picked up in a search limited by mt:lps? The underlying question is whether LPs are considered just by the speed or also by diameter. I can't find in the documentation online any explanation that would clarify this.

**Answer:** The criteria for each Material Type are spelled out in *Searching WorldCat Indexes* under "Material Type Names and Codes" ([http://www.oclc.org/support/help/SearchingWorldCatIndexes/Default.htm#07 Material Type Names Codes/ Material Type Names Codes.htm%3FTocPath%25Material%2520type%2520names%2520and%2520codes%7C_____0]). The "lps" Material Type, which is on the "Sound Recordings" page, takes into consideration the speed of the disc but not the disc diameter. We did that because there were both 12-inch and 10-inch LPs.
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