There is a wealth of information contained in this issue of the Newsletter. Reference, Discovery and Collection (RDC) Coordinator Nara Newcomer (University of Missouri–Kansas City) provides an update on the work of the RDC Committee, in particular their initiative to document troublesome issues in WorldCat Discovery that inhibit access to music resources. Continuing Education Coordinator Rahni Kennedy (Southern Methodist University) offers a glimpse at the developing program for our 2019 meeting in St. Louis. The call for applicants for the Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant to attend the annual meeting appears in these pages as well. If you are a student or paraprofessional, or a professional librarian in the first five years of your career, I encourage you to review the application requirements and apply for a grant. Of course, the latest news from OCLC and the always popular questions and answers with Jay Weitz are also contained herein.

Another item in this issue that deserves your attention is the MOUG-OLAC Collaboration Task Force’s Roadmap for Further Collaboration Between Our Organizations, which the Task Force presented to the MOUG and OLAC Executive Boards in June. Both Boards have accepted and endorsed the report and its recommendations (spoiler alert: the first recommendation is to create a screencast or webinar that will be of interest to members of both organizations). With the delivery of the report, the task force completed its charge and has been disbanded. The two Boards will jointly monitor progress on the recommendations and appoint any task forces that may be needed to implement them. Sincere thanks to all the members of the task force for the time, thought, and enthusiasm that they dedicated to this work.

Online balloting for the MOUG election has begun. I urge you to vote in this election, because there are several matters on this year’s ballot on which your input is needed:

**Election of officers:** We must fill three offices on the Executive Board: Vice Chair/Chair-Elect; Treasurer-Elect; and Reference, Discovery and Collection Coordinator. I thank the Nominating Committee—Beth Isenminger (independent contract cataloger), Chair; Anne Adams (Harvard University); and Casey Mullin (Western Washington University and MOUG Past Chair)—for assembling a strong slate of qualified candidates.

**Dues revision proposal:** This proposal will eliminate the categories
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for personal and institutional members located outside North America, and it will raise dues for the remaining categories by $10. As I have noted elsewhere, dues were last raised in 2008, and since that time MOUG has incurred new expenses by migrating to a new web hosting service that offers features we did not have previously (searchable online member directory, automated membership renewal process) and adding two positions to the Board. Inflation and a steady decline in institutional subscriptions have also taken their toll on MOUG’s budget. Please be assured that the Board continually monitors expenses and strives to keep costs as low as reasonably possible. Nevertheless, we believe a dues increase at this time is in MOUG’s best interest financially.

Bylaws amendment: The current text of Article IV, Section 4 of the Bylaws contains a discrepancy, highlighted in bold text below:

. . . a call for the nomination and election of two of the four offices (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Secretary/Newsletter Editor, Treasurer-Elect, Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator, and Continuing Education Coordinator) shall occur each year, with the remaining two offices to be nominated and elected on the alternate years.

The parenthetical in the passage above lists five offices, not four as stated. The amendment will correct this, and further specify that three offices are to be elected in one year and two offices in the remaining year. Additionally, the final sentence of Section 4 (not quoted here; please see the website) will be revised to indicate that election results will be publicized in advance of the annual meeting. This change will ease transitions between outgoing and incoming Board members, and it will allow non-winning candidates to pursue other service opportunities in a more timely manner.

MOUG logo: The current MOUG logo first appeared in the November 1988 issue of the Newsletter. While it may have been a bold and high-tech design back then, thirty years later it is looking rather dated. The logo contest that the Board held last fall did not yield any viable submissions, so we have turned to a third party to create designs for consideration. Please see the ballot and cast a vote for your favorite.

Balloting will remain open through Tuesday, September 25. If you have already submitted your completed ballot, thank you. If you have yet to do so, please find your ballot invitation in your inbox, follow the link to the ballot, and mark your selections today.

And now, I leave you to proceed to the good stuff. Happy reading!

MOUG Board Visits OCLC Headquarters

MOUG BOARD AT OCLC HQ
(from top row, left): Alan Ringwood, Rahni Kennedy, Ann Shaffer, Casey Mullin, Jake Schaub, Jay Weitz, Tomoko Shibuya, Nara Newcomer.

Also pictured: Plaque commemorating the millionth OCLC record (above); the last catalog cards produced at OCLC, dated 2015 (below). (Photos by Ann Shaffer)
The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is now accepting applications for the Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant. The grant supports attendance at the annual MOUG meeting and, in recognition of Ralph's mentoring role in music librarianship, is especially intended to support newer members of the profession in both public and technical services.

The award offers free conference registration for the MOUG annual meeting (February 19-20, 2019 in St. Louis, Missouri); reimbursement of up to $200 in associated expenses (lodging, meals, etc.); and one year's free membership in MOUG, including three issues of the MOUG Newsletter.

Eligibility: Students, paraprofessionals, or professionals in the first five years of their professional careers who are likely to benefit from MOUG's educational opportunities are eligible to apply. This includes everyone who works with music materials in libraries or library systems, whether they are music specialists or generalists. Professional and workplace need, financial need, past training and experience, demonstration of initiative, likely further contributions to the profession, and comments from reference letters are also considered. Applicants need not be current members of MOUG. Preference will be given to applicants who will be attending the MOUG annual meeting for the first time, but anyone who meets the preceding conditions and who has attended a previous MOUG annual meeting is eligible to apply. Preference will also be given to applicants who have not previously been awarded a Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant.

Applications are due October 1, 2018 and shall consist of a letter that includes a rationale for attending the MOUG annual meeting, an explanation of financial need, a brief vita, and the name of at least one person who will submit a letter (also due October 1) in support of the application.

All application materials shall be sent by e-mail, either as in-text messages or as attachments in .pdf, .doc, or .docx format, to the MOUG Past Chair, Casey Mullin (casey@mullingroup.com). Letters of support should be sent directly by their authors, not by the applicants. Applicants will be notified of the outcome by e-mail no later than November 1, 2018.

For more information about MOUG, please visit the MOUG website. MOUG has helped train and mentor numerous music library professionals, and has helped shape the OCLC products and services we use every day.

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

Past Award Recipients

2018: Enrique Caboverde, III, Florida International University
Ryan Johnson, Indiana University
Dustin Ludeman, New York Public Library
Treshani Perera, University of Kentucky
Dan Ray, University of Virginia
Wanda Rosinski, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Katherine Willeford, University of North Texas

2017:
Jen Bort, Central New York Library Resources Council
Clara Burns, University of Colorado Boulder
Synae Yoon, Southern Methodist University

2016:
Alyssa Hislop, Project Sound Recording Cataloger, Stanford University
Laura Thompson, Reference/Music Librarian, Central Michigan University
Rahni Kennedy, Temporary Music Cataloging/Metadata Specialist, Southern Methodist University

2015:
Anna Alfeld LoPrete, Music Cataloger, Indiana Univer-
Papakhian Travel Grant
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Colin Bitter, Graduate Library Assistant, Music Library, University of North Texas
Sophie Rondeau, Sound Recordings Cataloger, Syracuse University

2014:
Elizabeth Hille Cribbs, Cataloging (Music) Librarian, Northern Illinois University
Chris Diamond, Library Information Specialist IV, Baylor University
Keith Knop, Associate Music Cataloger, Florida State University
Jennifer L. Vaughn, Technical Specialist, Syracuse University Libraries
Elin Williams, Music Librarian, Victoria Conservatory of Music (British Columbia)

Mark Zelesky, Music Circulation and Stacks Manager, Rowan University

2013:
Claire Marsh, Senior Librarian for Library Systems and Projects, Jazz Archivist, Leeds College of Music
Christina Linklater, Project Music Cataloger, Harvard University
Jacey Kepich, Digital Imaging Technician, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Karla Jurgemeyer, Cataloging and Acquisitions Associate, St. Olaf College
Kristen Heider, Music and Digital Resources Cataloging/Metadata Specialist, Southern Methodist University

MORE HIGHLIGHTS FROM OCLC HQ:

OCLC Library Manager and Corporate Archivist Kem Lang shows off the “Screwy Dewey” board game, created in 1980 by the Canadian Library Association to teach Canadian children how to use the Dewey Decimal System.

(Photo by Ann Shaffer)
This summer, Reference, Discovery, and Collection efforts focused on top WorldCat Discovery (WCD) priorities from the 2016 MLA-MOUG Search and Discovery Task Force report, available at http://musicoclcusers.org/resources/discovery-reference-collections/

You may have seen our weekly posts to MOUG-L (along with MLA-L and OLAC-L) highlighting the problems caused by the highest priority outstanding issues, and asking for examples. Thank you to everyone who submitted examples to the WCD Community Center. It is never too late to add an example to the enhancement requests linked from http://musicoclcusers.org/add-your-voice-to-improve-worldcat-discovery-for-music/. Your details from specific situations help OCLC diagnose and fix problems.

The MOUG Board spent an hour of our summer meeting with OCLC’s Binaebi Akah, Danielle Bromelia, Kristin Ewig, and Jay Holloway. Topics included FirstSearch, the WCD enhancement process, and MOUG’s top WCD recommendations.

Kristin Ewig showed us the restyled FirstSearch, now live in your institution’s FirstSearch subscription (automatically applied July 14). The restyled FirstSearch modernizes the interface “look and feel” without sacrificing functionality or subverting core user tasks. Sign up for the new FirstSearch Community Center (https://www.oclc.org/community/firstsearch.en.html). Special thanks to Darwin Scott and Rebecca Belford who serve on the FirstSearch Advisory Board, advocating for music needs.

OCLC Community Center users may have noted that some enhancement requests in the Community Center state they are “not on the roadmap.” OCLC’s WCD public roadmap (https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/community/Roadmaps/Roadmap%20-%20DISCOVERY.pdf) outlines major enhancements for the upcoming year. Enhancements “not on the roadmap” may be tabled to a later time, or they may be considered minor enhancements that will be implemented without ever being listed on the roadmap. MOUG’s enhancement requests often (not always) fall into the minor enhancements category because they affect a smaller user community.

OCLC works directly with MOUG to discuss our specific enhancement requests, learn more about music user needs, and communicate their work on these requests back to us. This summer’s in-person discussion of specific enhancements focused on four recommendations:

- Display subfields $b, $c, $d, $k and $q in name headings, to allow for identification and differentiation of names.
- Infamously known as the “John Adams” problem, this hampers distinguishing between the composer John Adams and the U.S. presidents of the same name, especially when clicking on a hyperlinked names. This is not a music-specific problem; anyone searching for not-the-president John Adams, or any common name, will encounter it and we recommended any fix be implemented for all bibliographic formats.
- When fields 700, 710, or 711 contain subfield $t, display all title-related subfields (currently $t, $k, $l, $m, $n, $o, $p, $r, $s), together with the name (all name-related subfields).
- WCD only displays the name portion of 7xx name-title headings, forcing users to rely on other bibliographic fields, often a transcribed contents note (MARC 505), for title information. Though not unique to music, this problem is especially pervasive in music, given the frequency of aggregates like score anthologies and sound recordings with multiple pieces.
- Display 245 subfields together; alternatively, identify 245 subfield $c as responsibility instead of names from 1xx/7xx (feature present in FirstSearch).
- Like the 7xx titles problem above, the frequency of aggregates (especially sound recordings without collective titles) makes this especially problematic for music, though the WCD Community Center details difficulties beyond music, including rare books and films. Several Reference, Discovery, and Collection Committee members also met virtually with OCLC employees to discuss the problem last spring. OCLC plans to
display 245 $c soon, and asked MOUG for help formulating a display label. Thank you to everyone who responded to the survey distributed via MOUG-L. Based on your input, we recommend the display label “More author/title information.”

- Change the facet option for “music” to “music recording.”
- MOUG made this recommendation because many musicians asking for “music” for a piece want notated music, not a recording. (WCD’s notated music facet is usefully labeled “Musical score.”) Unfortunately, the display text “music” is inter-

woven with the configuration for several OCLC systems, not just WCD, so a change would be rather involved at this time. It may be feasible “eventually” and is on OCLC’s radar for the future.

Please keep your examples, comments, and suggestions related to OCLC’s Reference, Discovery, and Collection-related products and services coming! It is MOUG’s responsibility and privilege to work with OCLC to optimize its products and services for all music users and those who serve them.

---

**Sign up for OCLC Community Centers for FirstSearch, WCD, WorldShare, ILL, and more:**

Use your existing credentials for other OCLC Community Centers—such as WorldCat Discovery or WorldShare Interlibrary Loan—to access the new FirstSearch Community Center. If you do not have credentials, you can request them by submitting this form: https://www.oclc.org/forms/community-fs.en.html

Within 5 – 7 business days, you will receive an email with instructions for how to update your OCLC Services account password and log in to the FirstSearch Community Center. You can also use your existing OCLC authorization (for example, to Connexion) to create your own account at https://www.oclc.org/community/home.en.html. Please contact orders@oclc.org with questions about credentials for access to OCLC Community Centers.
**MOUG-OLAC Collaboration Task Force:**
*Roadmap For Further Collaboration Between Our Organizations*

Submitted to the MOUG and OLAC Boards, June 20, 2018

**Pre-task-force merger efforts:**

At the 2014 MOUG-OLAC Joint Meeting in Kansas City, the organizations’ two boards met to discuss how they could better collaborate. Jay Weitz proposed merging our two organizations, because, as Glenn Patton noted a while back, “Everything is A/V now.” Eventually, the OLAC and MOUG Boards commissioned the creation of a survey in 2016 to gauge each respective organization’s receptiveness to this idea, such as potential benefits of and concerns of a merger. The release of the survey results was followed by a formal presentation of the chief findings, together with an open discussion of the same, at the OLAC Membership Meeting at the 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting, and then at the 2017 MOUG annual meeting a month later. This culminated in the creation of a white paper to review this entire process.

Following each organization’s board’s review of the white paper, the main next step was as follows:

- “[Hold] a joint conference call of selected members of both Boards (at least 3 from each Board; consider also adding the current or former MOUG-OLAC liaison) [to discuss] the report and recommend a course of action including:
  - “Proceed with merger investigations. Appoint a task force for this work.
  - “Proceed with selected collaboration initiatives. Appoint a task force for this work.
  - “Do not proceed at this time with a merger.”

The joint conference call took place on November 9, 2017. The discussion began by assessing whether we should recommend proceeding with merger investigations. Those assembled quickly concluded that, given the strong reservations expressed by participants in the open discussion at MOUG 2017, the organizations should not pursue this course of action. We then discussed the prospect of proceeding with selected collaboration initiatives, which we decided to pursue. This led to the creation of a list of possible collaboration initiatives, and our recommendation that each board appoint a task force to consider what we brainstormed. Thus our present group, the MOUG-OLAC Collaboration Task Force, arose from this recommendation.

The group was formed in February, 2018 with the following charge and membership:

**Charge:**

The MOUG-OLAC Collaboration Task Force will review the notes from the joint MOUG-OLAC meeting held on November 11, 2017 in order to consider the possibilities for collaboration between the two organizations. This task force will determine which of the proposed initiatives are feasible and rank them according to priority. The task force will develop a roadmap for how and when each of the proposed collaborations should be implemented. The task force will not be responsible for implementing the initiatives, but are encouraged to suggest membership for additional task forces to handle the implementation of each initiative.

Note: new task forces to implement the solutions should be approved by both the MOUG and OLAC Executive Boards.

**Membership:**

- Bruce J. Evans (OLAC)
- Autumn Faulkner (OLAC, MOUG)
- Mary Huismann (OLAC)
- Allison Lyttle (OLAC)
- Hayley Moreno (OLAC)
- Nara Newcomer (MOUG)
- Molly O’Brien (MOUG)
- Treshani Perera (MOUG)
- Alan Ringwood (MOUG)
- Jay Weitz (OLAC, MOUG)

**Deliverables:**

Roadmap for implementing proposed initiatives, including suggestions for the creation of new task forces to implement each solution.

The group appointed Bruce J. Evans as the chair, and our work commenced.
Short review of our process:

The task force came up with the following outline for its work (using our charge as the blueprint):

• (Preamble to First Task): The MOUG-OLAC Collaboration Task Force will review the notes from the joint MOUG-OLAC meeting held on November 11, 2017 in order to consider the possibilities for collaboration between the two organizations.

• (First Task): Determine which of the proposed initiatives are feasible and rank them according to priority.

• (Second Task): Develop a roadmap for how and when each of the proposed collaborations should be implemented.

The so-called First Task was where the task force spent the majority of its time and energy, and we used the MOUG-OLAC Merger wiki (PBWorks) as the place to have that discussion. This work took place March-May.

Here is a simple list of the options for collaboration without merging that we discussed during the First Task work:

1. Collaborating more at conferences
2. Joint MOUG-OLAC Conferences
3. Live streaming of programming
4. Promoting each other’s organizations more effectively
5. Offering a MOUG-OLAC webinar
6. Advocate/educate administrators on importance of audiovisual cataloging
7. Discovery of music or A/V resources

Additionally, at the request of the OLAC Board, we discussed OLAC’s idea to create a Conference/Continuing Education Coordinator position, similar to MOUG’s position. This came about because this proposed position would have a tie-in with most of the initiatives under discussing. On the First Task portion of the wiki, we gave this topic a Roman numeral 8 (VIII) to denote the fact that while it forms part of our discussion, it did not spring from the November 11, 2017 conference call.

As noted a little earlier, the First Task generated copious discussion. The discussions on items 1 and 2 were especially involved, as we were careful to examine past experiences with joint meetings and other matters related to joint efforts surrounding conferences to help inspire us to come up with new, creative ideas. Similarly, the discussion concerning live-streaming (item 3) also engendered a great deal of discussion, most notably because other library organizations’ experiences suggest that considerations involving expense and conference hotel contracts will figure very prevalently into any exploration of providing live streaming of conference presentations.

Thanks to our copious, thorough, thoughtful discussion of the seven options for further collaboration, we were sufficiently equipped to both assess their feasibility, and then prioritize those identified as most feasible. We shall now present our recommended roadmap for moving forward with enhancing and expanding collaboration between OLAC and MOUG.

The Roadmap is roughly divided between 1) the top three initiatives to pursue first, presented in priority order, and 2) initiatives for future consideration (or, Secondary Roadmap, if you will), not presented in any order of importance or priority. For the top three initiatives, we recommend pursuing and completing each initiative prior to moving onto the next one.

(Continued on page 10)
**MOUG-OLAC Collaboration Roadmap**

(Continued from page 9)

**Recommended Roadmap:**

**First step: Offering/creating a MOUG-OLAC webinar:**

The task force identified this as the first priority and an easily achievable goal for OLAC and MOUG. This would help to raise our respective organizational profiles and create awareness of collaborative efforts made between OLAC and MOUG. The task force has not identified a specific topic at this point. Important procedural matter: Whatever group is charged with devising webinar topics, they need to make sure that the topics do not duplicate content from webinars offered by other organizations, such as ALA-MLA, ALA ALCTS, and so forth.

A potential topic that may be of interest to both groups is how the new RDA Toolkit would affect audiovisual cataloging, and best practices for cataloging audiovisual content (DVDs, Blu-ray Discs, Streaming media, Video games, etc.) using the new Toolkit and MARC21. Task force members may identify potential webinar presenters and submit their recommendation to the OLAC Board. And as a way to get this initiative off to a solid start, perhaps we should explore making the first webinar free? We would need to figure out how to pay for it if so.

Another way to approach this first step would be to test the waters with a single webinar, focused on the two organizations. This would be a way to reach out to folks who can’t attend conferences like ALA or MLA. Potential presenters could include the outreach/membership coordinators (or board members).

Yet another way to proceed would be not to do a webinar, but a series of screencasts. The Music Library Association’s Cataloging and Metadata Committee (MLA-CMC) just used Screencast-o-Matic to record screencasts that are subsequently uploaded to the CMC’s YouTube channel.

**Second step: Determine more (meaningful?) ways to collaborate at conferences:**

Before delving into our ideas for additional ways to collaborate at conferences, we wish to first address our musings concerning joint MOUG-OLAC Conferences, since that was one of the original seven ideas for further collaboration.

The task force agreed that joint MOUG-OLAC conferences are always welcomed and that we should continue to pursue opportunities to have them. During the discussion, the task force entertained the idea of having a joint conference at a time other than the fall, and perhaps even in lieu of an annual or biennial meeting. To this we add a word of caution: the 2016 survey suggested that changes in conference scheduling that increased costs to attendees could have a negative effect on attendance. In fact, upon review of attendance at past joint conferences scheduled at non-traditional times (i.e. not in the fall), attendance by members from the organization most inconvenienced by the difference in scheduling greatly suffers. If we were to pursue having a joint-conference that either takes place at a non-traditional time, or is in lieu of a respective organization’s usual meeting, we highly recommend performing another survey before doing so. We also feel that from this point forward, MOUG and OLAC should share logistical (e.g., site location, program planning, etc.) and financial responsibility for joint meetings, rather than one organization or the other shouldering the burden. (To review, the last joint conference was held in October 2014 in Kansas City, MO, with a total attendance of 159.) Now onto our new ideas for conference-related collaboration.

A less complicated way to collaborate at conferences is by creating programmatic content that would be of interest to members of both organizations, such as workshops for widely used tools like OpenRefine, MARCEdit, etc. Offering member rates at each other’s conferences would also promote attendance and participation from both organizations.

Another idea that sprung from this discussion is to offer audio recordings of MOUG sessions that can be purchased by both MOUG and OLAC members post-conference. Due to the nature of OLAC conferences containing hands-on sessions, this may not be a practical suggestion for OLAC conference sessions. The task force discussed in detail how recorded sessions can be made available, including waivers or release forms be signed as part of session acceptance protocol, and reading a statement at the beginning of the meeting so that attendees are aware of sessions that are being recorded. Dissemination of recordings,
whether these are available to purchase as a package or as individual sessions, will need to be discussed further in detail.

A much more cost effective method of sharing session content is currently in effect with session summaries that are being reported in the post-conference newsletter issue for each organization. MOUG’s session summaries are currently open to members only via the MOUG Newsletter; the taskforce would like to encourage MOUG to make reviews of conference-related content from the post-conference newsletter issue (not the entire newsletter), alongside corresponding slide deck, available freely via MOUG’s website so that members and non-members may benefit from learning about topics and content presented. OLAC’s newsletters are open, therefore this is not a concern at this time.

Third step: Explore live streaming of programming:

As stated earlier, this is a tricky issue that requires some careful navigation. Please see below for our recommended approach.

Task #1: Navigate technical and release/rights issues

Technical options:

- Contract with an outside vendor, such as VCube. This is expensive (see below).
- Streaming requires a good hard wired connection or strong wifi. Preliminary consultations with an MLA Convention Manager suggest there is a hard-wired connection in MOUG’s meeting room in St. Louis, but this should be confirmed.
- DIY streaming options include YouTube or Go-To-Meeting. Other than any internet costs, this could be run by a member volunteer. One option is a DIY trial of sessions (or selected sessions) in St. Louis as a trial to gauge interest.

Conference hotel permissions:

- Preliminary consultations with an MLA Convention Manager suggest the hotel contract would allow live streaming, both DIY and via a vendor. Generally, the hotel contract simply requires MLA to notify (but not be approved by) the hotel of using outside vendors, which has already been done for MOUG-MLA since MLA is already streaming sessions (by contracting with an outside vendor, VCube).

Rights/release issues:

- Place a sign at meeting room entrances notifying attendees that sessions are recorded/live-streamed.

Task #2. Conduct a cost-benefit analysis

If we pursue streaming, we recommend:

- consulting with key MLA people (past and present Convention Managers and Administrative Officers) for advice.
- including, specifically, confirming all details of permissions and technical feasibility with the relevant convention managers (MLA Convention Manager, and the person who does hotel contracts for OLAC).
- conducting a thorough cost-benefit analysis before incurring any costs. This could include forecasting when (if ever) OLAC or MOUG is likely to break even or make money from the endeavor.

Preliminary discussions with several MLA’ers involved in streaming suggest the following information:

- MLA pays VCube ca. $7,000 to stream MLA sessions
- In a recent year, MLA had about 20 people pay the $45 fee for live streaming, i.e. netting less than $1,000. Streaming is also provided to those who register for in-person attendance.
- MLA makes the recordings free on their Vimeo channel 6 months after the conference. It seems that people not attending in person tend to wait until then to watch the recordings.

For future consideration (Secondary Roadmap):

These are in no strict priority order.

Discovery of music or A/V resources:

The fall 2016 survey indicated both OLAC and MOUG members are interested in discovery issues. This task force considers discovery a priority, but the way forward is not clear. For now, we recommend wading in incrementally and seeing if anything builds. This summer, MOUG’s RDC Committee has dipped in a toe by cross-posting weekly messages about specific discovery issues to OLAC-L in addition to MOUG-L and MLA-L.

(Continued on page 12)
If we want to go further, a possible next step is involving OLAC’ers in the work of MOUG’s Reference, Discovery, and Collection Committee. In recent years, MOUG’s RDC Committee and Coordinator have worked actively and productively with OCLC on public interfaces to WorldCat. It could be useful for OLAC members to serve on the RDC Committee. Currently, the RDC Committee works electronically with no in-person meetings. RDC Committee members are encouraged, but not required, to attend discovery-related sessions at the MOUG Annual Meeting. OLAC members could be easily incorporated into this asynchronous work and the perspective of music + AV would likely strengthen and broaden MOUG’s input with OCLC.

As a logistical matter, Article VII. Section 3 of MOUG’s bylaws currently require RDC Committee members to be MOUG members in good standing. As a scope matter, MOUG’s RDC Committee focuses on OCLC products and services, so OLAC would need to discuss participating in vendor-specific work.

Advocate/educate administrators on importance of audiovisual cataloging:

The extra layer of complexity inherent in description of audiovisual materials is well-known to catalogers who work with these resources; we understand that extra time, additional expertise or training, and ancillary authority work are often required, and we are able to plan accordingly. But library administrators are often unaware of both the added challenges of AV descriptive work, and the added benefit to users when the proper resources are dedicated to that work.

MOUG and OLAC members, and the AV metadata field in general, should therefore find it useful to have something to share with administrators that concisely breaks down and advocates for the particular needs and outcomes surrounding AV cataloging.

This could be an online document, a resource toolkit, or an advocacy position white paper, endorsed by both groups and carrying the weight of our combined authority and experience.

Promoting each other’s organizations more effectively:

Members of OLAC and MOUG have similar professional interests and it would make sense to have both organizations collaborate on promoting their content which can help reach a bigger audience. With both organizations having an officer responsible for social media it would be worthwhile to have these two officers cooperate more on advertising their organizations’ content. The officers can work on strategizing a social media campaign that can better target content for its users.

A shared calendar would allow both officers to work together more efficiently in creating social media content, as well as creating goals and tracking progress in promoting our organizations. Both officers can also be more engaged in the social media post placed by the other organization. OLAC can report or comment on MOUG social media content and vice versa. This shows how both organizations are truly close colleagues in this field cataloging. The organizations can also collaborate on creating social media content that spotlights how its members collaborate on webinars, articles, or events that will be of interest to both OLAC and MOUG. For example, perhaps OLAC and MOUG could consider a spotlight series similar to ALCTS Career Profiles?

OLAC and MOUG should also learn how to promote stories from their organizations, better brand themselves in the library industry, and interact more with its users. The officers can work together in finding creative and new ways on showing how OLAC and MOUG are vital to the field of cataloging. One possible and immediate way both organizations may interact with its members is having monthly chats where we discuss pertinent topics in the audio/visual/music cataloging world.
**Conclusion:**

We hope we have provided you, the MOUG and OLAC Boards, with a clear and effective roadmap for seeking out further initiatives for collaboration between our two organizations. While we did not provide specific recommendations for task force membership to pursue and plan out these initiatives, we will be happy to offer ourselves as consultants, as it were, to recommend people, pending the response to our roadmap from the MOUG and OLAC Board.

Alluding back to Glenn Patton’s statement “Everything is A/V now,” MOUG and OLAC have so much in common, and have benefited from a long history of cross-pollination through members, projects, task forces, and conferences which further the cause of both organizations. These are all exciting opportunities to greatly enrich our organizations’ working relationships. We will both emerge stronger and more energized as a result.

**Special Addendum for the OLAC Executive Board:**

**Prospective OLAC Conference/Continuing Education Coordinator:**

The task force realized at the outset that given many of the items on the list of original seven initiatives would require an OLAC CEC’s involvement. In addition to having a part in any developments surrounding MOUG-OLAC webinars, joint MOUG-OLAC conferences, collaborating more at conferences, live-streaming of programming, and advertising for OLAC at MOUG and vice-versa, the task force also suggested that an OLAC CEC be a member of the MOUG Program Committee. And regarding membership considerations: Since OLAC does not require the MOUG CEC to be a member of their program planning committee, then MOUG should not require an OLAC CEC to be a member of MOUG.

We hope our reflections have helped provide guidance in your decision concerning both the need to create an OLAC CEC position, and what that person’s duties would be.

Respectfully submitted by the MOUG-OLAC Collaboration Task Force:

Bruce J. Evans (OLAC)
Autumn Faulkner (OLAC, MOUG)
Mary Huismann (OLAC)
Allison Lyttle (OLAC)
Hayley Moreno (OLAC)
Nara Newcomer (MOUG)
Molly O’Brien (MOUG)
Treshani Perera (MOUG)
Alan Ringwood (MOUG)
Jay Weitz (OLAC, MOUG)
**From the Continuing Education Coordinator**

Rahni Kennedy  
Southern Methodist University

First, thank you for electing me to the position of Continuing Education Coordinator. I am honored to serve MOUG in this capacity. Second, save the dates for the 2019 MOUG Annual Meeting: February 19-20, 2019, St. Louis Union Station Hotel.

The program committee has been hard at work putting together a program that will be enticing for everyone. The program committee members for the 2019 meeting are: Colin Bitter (Rutgers University), Enrique Caboverde (Florida International University), Matthew Ertz (University of Louisville), Leonard Martin (New England Conservatory), Anna Alfeld LoPrete (Indiana University), Treshani Perera, (University of Kentucky), Alan Ringwood (University of Texas-Austin), and Daryll Stevens (Colorado College.) Already confirmed are topics on improving records for licensed digital resources, classification systems for media items, and insight into the WorldCat databases. Also, we will have a leading expert present on the RDA Toolkit 3R Project and how it will affect your work. Of course, there will be the Discovery Services Update and the popular Ask Everything session so please bring your best questions!

The program will continue to be a full day on Tuesday and half a day on Wednesday. Look for registration and program details on MOUG-L in the upcoming months. In the meantime if you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at rbkennedy@smu.edu.

We look forward to seeing everybody in St. Louis!

**News from OCLC**  
Compiled by Jay Weitz

**OCLC-MARC Update 2018**

The 2018 OCLC-MARC Update will implement MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings format changes announced in MARC 21 Updates No. 25 (December 2017) and No. 26 (April 2018) including:

- In the Bibliographic and Holdings field 007 for Maps, a new code “x” (Not Applicable) is defined in subfield $e (007/04, Physical Medium) for remote digital resources. Documentation-only changes have also been made in subfields $b (007/01, Specific Material Designation) and $g (007/06, Production/Reproduction Details).
- Bibliographic field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) has had its scope broadened to include areas not legally recognized as countries.
- Bibliographic field 382 (Medium of Performance) has had its subfield $r (Total Number of Individuals Performing Alongside Ensembles) redescribed.
- Bibliographic field 730 (Added Entry – Uniform Title) has had subfield $4 (Relationship) added.
- New Bibliographic field 758 (Resource Identifier) has been defined.
- New subfields $t (Report Number), $u (Standard Technical Report Number), and $z (ISBN) have been added to the Bibliographic field 777 (Issued With Entry).
- Subfield $d (Date of Meeting or Treaty Signing) has been made Repeatable in all Bibliographic Meeting Name fields.
- Subfield $s (Version) has been made Repeatable in 31 Bibliographic fields.
- Bibliographic subfield $0 (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number) has been slightly redefined.
Subfield $1 (Real World Object URI) has been defined in over 90 Bibliographic fields and four Holdings fields.

Subfield $3 (Materials Specified) has been added to Bibliographic fields 377 (Associated Language), 380 (Form of Work), 381 (Other Distinguishing Characteristics of Work or Expression), 383 (Numeric Designation of Musical Work), and 384 (Key).

OCLC will also validate MARC codes announced in nine Library of Congress Technical Notices (http://www.loc.gov/marc/marcinf.html#naa) issued since November 2017. This OCLC-MARC Update will also:

- Invalidate the OCLC-defined Encoding Level (Leader/17) value “L”.
- More strongly enforce the mandatory input standard for the presence of field 040 subfield $b for Language of Cataloging in most bibliographic records.
- Invalidate First Indicator values 7, 8, and 9 in Bibliographic field 243 (Collective Uniform Title).
- Invalidate the OCLC-defined Second Indicator value “8” (Sears List of Subject Headings) in all applicable 6XX fields.

All details will be available in an upcoming OCLC Technical Bulletin. We plan to install the OCLC-MARC Update 2018 during the second half of calendar year 2018 and will make announcements widely through the usual discussion lists and Connexion logon greetings. Elements from the MARC 21 Authority Format Updates No. 25 and No. 26 will be implemented not at this time but instead at a future date in coordination with the Library of Congress and the Name Authority Cooperative (NACO) of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). LC, NACO, and OCLC will make announcements at that future date.

OCLC Member Merge Project Update

There are currently a total of eight libraries participating in the OCLC Member Merge Project, through which specially trained institutions are given the ability to de-duplicate master bibliographic records in WorldCat. The four libraries that constitute the current second cohort -- Brigham Young University (UBY); University of Maryland (UMC); Western Washington University (XFF); and University of California, Berkeley (CUY) -- are now all independently merging books format records, with some moving on to other formats.

We are planning for a third cohort to begin later in 2018, and will be reaching out in the next month to those who have already expressed interest, gathering more information to help us in the selection process. We are also in the planning stages for an OCLC Community Center for the Member Merge Project, which we hope to have in the place for the third cohort.

During Fiscal year 2017, participants in the project performed 4,883 merges; as of the end of May 2018, 6,347 merges were done during Fiscal Year 2018. Any library interested in applying for a future forth cohort should contact us at AskQC@oclc.org.

OCLC and Ovid Partner to Automate E-book and E-journal Workflows

OCLC and Ovid, a leading provider of scientific, medical, and healthcare information, have partnered to automate e-resource management workflows, eliminating the need for manual intervention by library staff. This means that (with your permission) Ovid will provide monthly updates to OCLC with your library-specific holdings data so that OCLC can automatically:

- Keep your WorldCat holdings up-to-date for Ovid e-journals and e-books (including subscribed and individually purchased).
- Provide full-text links to ensure seamless access.
- Deliver customizable MARC records with ongoing updates as collections change over time.

To learn how to make your Ovid collections easier to find, access, and manage, please visit http://oc.1c/Ovid.
OCLC and Casalini Libri Expand Partnership

OCLC and Casalini Libri (http://www.casalini.it/), a leading international library service provider based in Italy, have signed an agreement to expand their partnership to provide libraries with high quality bibliographic records that improve library users' access to authoritative content. Under terms of the expanded agreement, Casalini Libri will provide bibliographic records for titles from over 4,000 publishers in Europe, in Spanish, Portuguese, French, and Greek languages, in addition to Italian. By supplying this data to OCLC, member libraries save time in processing the print and electronic content represented by those records, and can quickly make that content available to their users and researchers.

OCLC and Casalini Libri have been working together for 23 years. Under the new agreement, OCLC will be adding 12,000 Core Level records annually to WorldCat. In addition, 40,000 brief records, which are new title announcements and e-book records, will also be added annually. OCLC works with publishers and other content providers from around the world to add metadata for high-quality books, e-books, journals, databases, and other materials that will make content discoverable through libraries. By providing metadata and other descriptive content, these partnerships help libraries represent their electronic and physical collections more completely and efficiently.

Tyrrell Historical Library, CONTENTdm, and Hurricane Harvey

In 2011, staff at the Tyrrell Historical Library in Beaumont, Texas, began managing their digital collections with the hosted version of CONTENTdm because they liked the technical support offered by OCLC. The staff started by digitizing two large collections: the General Photographic Archives (http://cdm16058.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p15627coll11), which consist of 3,677 photographs that pertain to the history of the greater Beaumont area, and the John H. Walker Papers (http://cdm16058.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p16058coll17), which focus on the history and people of Beaumont and the outlying rural area situated in Jefferson and Orange counties.

The library currently has 80 digitized collections with more than 49,000 items. In 2014, the library was awarded a TexTreasures grant, which allowed the staff to digitize and provide historical background information related to the Melody Maids Collection (http://cdm16058.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p16058coll33). The group was a girls’ choir that traveled to perform for military personnel from 1942 to 1972.

After Hurricane Harvey in 2017, the library had to close temporarily because of mold that formed in the main reading room after the building lost electricity during a storm. While none of the physical collections were damaged, the reading room needed to be thoroughly cleaned.

Bill Grace, Branch Manager, said that CONTENTdm has enabled the library to continue to provide access to approximately one-third of its collections during this period. He also explained that CONTENTdm has proven to be a valuable tool for preserving history, as it has shown local citizens the importance of their own personal collections and led to donations of materials to the library, which has aided in collection development.

While the library is closed for cleanup, the library staff have worked on digitizing additional collections, including:

- The Neches River Festival Records (http://cdm16058.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p16058coll77)
- The Magnolia Garden Club Records (http://cdm16058.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p16058coll76), and others.

When the library reopens, it will be partnering with other genealogical research organizations in the area to conduct an outreach program, and the staff are very much looking forward to this program.
**Questions and Answers**  
Jay Weitz, OCLC

### Records Without Class

**Question:** We have been using Encoding Level “K” in our records for websites. Is this correct? Do the records need field 050 to be Encoding Level “I”?

**Answer:** Although it is in great need of updating (and is on our list), Chapter 2.3 of Bibliographic Formats and Standards (https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/onlinecataloging.html#section2.3) outlines the requirements for Full- and Minimal-Level cataloging under the heading “Comparison of cataloging level guidelines.” In theory, a classification number from a recognized scheme (050, 082, 086, etc.) is required for Full (if available), but we also recognize that there are categories of materials that institutions may choose not to classify, such as sound recordings and online resources. If your records for websites are Full in other respects, you can code them as such.

### When Subject Headings Were Without Form, and Void

**Question:** Can you point me to an authoritative source that describes when the 6XX subfield $v$ was first defined for form subdivisions, and subfield $x$ was thereby restricted to topical subdivisions? The LC MARC website and BFAS don’t seem to include this information. I want to say this happened in the 1990s, but I’d like an official citation.

**Answer:** Subfield $v$ for 6XX form subdivisions was first proposed in MARC Proposal No. 95-2 (http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/1995/95-02.html), which refers back to Discussion Papers DP79 (June 1994) and DP74 (February 1994), neither of which is available online. The proposal includes (under “Status/Comments”) an implementation plan for LCSH. This got folded into the larger Format Integration plans of the mid-1990s. USMARC Bibliographic Update No. 1 of March 1995 announced subfield $v$ in the various 6XX fields; this Update isn’t online and is not the MARC 21 Update No. 1 from October 2000 that appears on the MARC Standards page (http://www.loc.gov/marc/status.html).

OCLC implemented the subfield $v$ in ten 6XX fields in March 1996 as part of our Format Integration Phase 2 (Technical Bulletin 212, January 1996, which is not online, but I can scan and send you the relevant pages if you want).

The Subject Headings Manual H1075, Page 3 (June 2013) (https://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeSHM/H1075.pdf) says the following, in part: “Until 1999, form subdivisions were coded as $x$ subfields, the same subfield code used for topical subdivisions. In February 1999, the Library of Congress began to apply the new subfield code approved in MARC 21 to distinguish form subdivisions, the $v$ subfield, to newly cataloged materials. After that date, code a form subdivision for the function that the subdivision performs in the subject heading string. Code a form subdivision as a $v$ subfield when it represents what the item being cataloged is.”

As I recall, during the period between 1995 and 1999, existing Bibliographic and Authority records were converted and catalogers were encouraged to phase in the new practices.
Now That's What I Call Confusing

**Question:** I’m trying to decide what to do about an audio compact disc on my desk, the title of which is: *Now That’s What I Call Tailgate Anthems*. The subtitle, found only on the container (not the disc face) is: *18 Crowd Shakin’ Sports Anthems.*

There are three (almost) matching records in OCLC: #994241801, #1011864059, and #994640774. I’m pretty sure the second is a duplicate of the first. Both show the publisher (label name) as Legacy. The third is a vendor record (ELvl 3) so little of it can be believed, but for what it is worth it has a publisher of Sony Bmg.

My CD has a label name of Sony Music (with its own logo). The copyright and phonogram are held by “UMG [that’s Universal Music Group] Recordings, Inc. and Sony Music Entertainment” and Universal’s logo also appears on the disc face, a bit less prominently than the Sony Music logo. I would definitely say Sony Music is the label name, to be recorded as the publisher. No record in OCLC does that. All three OCLC records and my CD have the same issue number (028—in the third record it is embedded in the 938), the same UPC (024), the same date, and the same content (except for the vendor record which has none). “Legacy” appears nowhere on my item. Neither does Sony Bmg.

What is the best option here? I’m only sure I shouldn’t put in a new record. Should I choose the third record as my match since it at least does not say Legacy for the publisher, although ELvl 3 records often show only the distributor or a vendor. Or is it too a duplicate of the others due to all the identical information? Legacy and Sony Music are both sublabels of Sony Music Entertainment; is a better option to pick one of the Legacy records and add an additional publisher name of Sony Music? (AllMusic slashed them together in its Releases tab; but I don’t necessarily believe AllMusic either.)

I did figure out the odd title in the vendor record. CDs titled *Now That’s What I Call Music* come out at regular intervals and each is numbered; they’re up the mid-60s by now. Each gathers together the best of pop recordings of the current time, whatever that is at a given moment. In fine print my CD shows that that phrase is a trademark of Universal but otherwise it does not appear. My CD must be from the same shop but is not part of the numbered series, having a theme instead. There are a couple of other themed CDs in OCLC: *Now That’s What I Call Christmas* and *Now That’s What I Call Broadway*.

**Answer:** We know that Legacy is a division of Sony Music, so my suggestion would be to edit the record locally, adding a 264 field identifying Sony and a 500 note explaining that some copies identify Sony as the publisher rather than its Legacy subsidiary, or words to that effect. Thanks for reporting those duplicates, which have been merged.
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