Well? We did it! I don't know what else to say.

As I looked through this past year of chair columns, it's impossible to believe what we've all been through. Shortly after our meeting in Norfolk, everything was shuttered; stores, restaurants, schools, libraries, and more closed their doors in the face of a global health crisis. Since then, nearly 3.5 million human beings have lost their lives to the COVID-19 coronavirus, almost 600,000 just in the United States. Our family, friends, and colleagues have lost their income.

And yet, thanks to our membership, MOUG still had a successful and fulfilling annual meeting in the midst of a fairly unique year (fingers crossed). The MOUG Executive Board worked it out to offer an entirely free event without a drastic impact on its finances. Kevin Kishimoto (Stanford University), our Continuing Education Coordinator, coordinated an entirely virtual event. Many thanks to the Program Committee that put together that fulfilling event—Enrique Caboverde (Florida International University), Reed David (Washington State University), Chelsea Hoover (Syracuse University), Nara Newcomer (University of Missouri Kansas City)—and the additional Tech Moderators that made it run smoothly—Clare Spitzer (Stanford University) and Elizabeth Uchimura (Florida State University). Know that this was a hugely successful meeting for us. We hope that it allowed folks to attend who otherwise would not have been able, and we hope that anyone who joined us for the first time are hooked!

Now we welcome those Executive Board members who took office at the MOUG Virtual 2021 meeting. That includes Mary Huismann (St. Olaf College) who is now Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Amy Strickland (University of Miami) who is Treasurer-Elect, and Suzanne Eggleson Lovejoy (Yale University) who is Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator. Additionally, Nancy Sack (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa) and Molly O'Brien (New York Public Library) have agreed to continue as MOUG-L Co-Owner and E-Ballots Manager, respectively.

So what's next?

(Continued on page 3)
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From the Chair
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In this column last year, I talked about Questions ohne Answers (QoA). I'm afraid we have those again, and some of them are the same questions. Here are the questions I posed last year about the meeting and their answers:

Q: Will we or won't we meet in person in 2021?
A: We didn't. We met virtually instead.

Q: Will we or won't we be able to afford the trip if we do?
A: Since we didn't meet in person, we didn't have to afford the trip. But, hopefully, offering free registration made many able to attend virtually regardless!

Those questions reappear for MOUG 2022. We do not yet know whether we will meet in person, even partially, in 2022. We may not yet know whether we will be able to afford the travel if we do. We also don't know yet what our registration rates will be. That will depend on several factors, but know that this time it is unlikely to be free in most situations. Also know, though, that we will keep you posted as we find those answers.

Outside of MOUG, those QoA last year included the following:

Q: Will we or won't we get to go back to work?
A: Many of us did continue to work but virtually. Many of us were eventually able to return to our workspaces. And many of us did neither.

Q: Will we or won't we be able to do the same work?
A: In many cases, the answer was "yes, we will." Tasks that were already completed online could often continue. Orders could still be placed, database clean-up could still go on, even describing digital resources still happened. Our priorities may have changed or the time we spent on tasks may have redistributed, but when we were able we adapted.

Q: Will we or won't we continue to be trusted to work remotely?
A: Yes and no. I personally take a pessimistic view of this question. For those who were, we continued to do our work remotely. Restrictions on taking library materials home for work purposes were eventually lifted and some became delivery drivers to free things from the building for their colleagues. But, just to be sure we could fill every moment of our time, we were given long lists of "professional development opportunities" to pursue, even if we didn't have the time to fill. However, it is possible that some decisions to reduce work time to "save money" were veiled beliefs that work wouldn't get done remotely anyway. Statistically speaking, I am at least 200% more productive at home myself!

The answers to these questions are different this year. For example, at Indiana University, the answer is "we will go back to work in person so we can do the same old work we did before and will not be trusted to work remotely" (so much for statistically elevated productivity). Thanks to my vaccinated status, I will get to keep this job, at least. Just as we got used to a "new normal" we are again facing an unknown "new normal." At the same time, many of our colleagues already went back to work in person, many do not know their future yet, and many are still unpaid.

That being said, I have been woefully absent in many regards beyond my job. I vow to pick back up on things I've promised. First on my list is the promise to move MOUG forward in updating our mission statement, adopting vision and value statements, developing our efforts toward better inclusion, diversity, equity, and accessibility, including our expectations for conduct when interacting in the organization. We will start with some work in the Executive Board, and there will be work in the future involving our membership.

I've got much to do.
2021 Business Meeting Minutes

MOUG 2021 Business Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, Feb. 23, 2020
Virtual Meeting
DRAFT

Call to Order at 3:16pm by MOUG Chair Michelle Hahn

I. Welcome
   A. Ancestral land acknowledgment.
   B. Meeting is designed to imitate the MOUG experience – no concurrent sessions and everyone under one roof. MOUG is not just catalogers. It is all OCLC product users whose work is related to music in every format.
   C. Adaptation of voting and motions for virtual format: So moved for motions; Second for seconded; Discussion on the motion enter “???” to discuss in chat. If need to make motion from the floor enter “Motion???” in chat.
   D. Only members of MOUG in good standing can make motions, second, and vote.

II. Adoption of agenda
   A. Motion to adopt the agenda: Moved by Faulkner; Seconded by LoPrete; No discussion; Two opposed; No abstentions; Motion carried.

III. Approval of minutes from 2020 business meeting in Norfolk, Virginia
   A. Member comment – Reference, Discovery, and Collections Committee members Emily Vickers not listed correctly and Nara Newcomer not listed; Minutes approved as corrected.

IV. A. Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant
   A. No awards given due to virtual meeting.

V. Recognition of first-time attendees
   A. 318 registered attendees. First time attendees encouraged to use a fun emoji to identify themselves.

VI. Board reports
   A. Chair (Michelle Hahn)
      i. Election results
         Vice Chair/Chair-Elect (Mary Huismann)
         Treasurer-Elect (Amy Strickland)
         Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator (Suzanne Eggleston Lovejoy)
      ii. Appointments
         E-Ballots Manager (Molly O’Brien)
         MOUG-L Co-owner (Nancy Sack)
         MOUG Oral Histories Coordinator (Autumn Faulkner)
         Web Editor (Anna LoPrete)
         Fundraising Coordinator (Currently unfilled)
         Program Committee
   B. Past Chair (Alan Ringwood)
      i. Last duty for Past Chair is thank you letters.
      ii. Worked with nominating committee on the DSA award;
      iii. Email discussions and board meetings.
      iv. Thanks to past and present Board members.
      v. No questions for Ringwood.
      vi. Ringwood thanked for his report.
   C. Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Heather Fisher)
      i. Produced the September and December 2020 newsletters (Issues 135 and 136)
      ii. Updated documentation for uploading the issues to EBSCO for indexing.
      iii. 2019 newsletter issues were sent to Anna LoPrete (Web Editor).
      iv. Issued reports to MLA in preparation for their Board meetings.
      v. Fisher thanked for her report.
D. Treasurer (Melissa Moll)
   i. MOUG is financially stable and has not taken a significant downturn in light of COVID economic issues.
      a. Renewals are on pace to match last year.
   ii. MOUG has a conservative break-even budget.
      a. Ending balance of MOUG accounts was $8,600.
      b. MOUG had a net profit of $2,500 from last year’s meeting in Virginia.
   iii. CDs were both withdrawn at maturation. Moll is in the process of transferring them to a higher interest rate account.
   iv. Operations income is 47% personal memberships and 42% institutional membership.
      a. 135 personal members
      b. 31 institutional members
         i. Institutional membership is higher, but is reflected only of those who do not use Ebsco.
   v. Donations were down in 2020, but that was expected with COVID.
   vi. The largest piece of operations costs is the newsletter. Moll notes the printer is doing a great job at keeping cost in check.
      a. Board meetings are usually more of the operations costs, but the Board has met virtually.
   vii. 2021 Budget
      a. Lower income expected due to COVID.
      b. Operations budget savings are from virtual meetings and no Papakhian awards.
      c. MOUG sent $3,000 to MLA to help offset the meeting penalty they incurred with the cancellation of the in-person meeting.
      d. The budget did account for video platforms, captioning, software, etc.
         i. There was a contingency budget also in place.
   viii. Attendees at this year’s meeting:
      a. 60% not members; 40% members in this year’s meeting
   ix. New email address for the treasurer (treasurer@musicoclcusers.org)
      a. Please email Treasurer for postal mail address.
   x. Question from membership: What was the response to the suggested donation option?
      a. Moll: Just under $1,000 (very good)
   xi. Moll thanked for her report.

E. Past Treasurer (Jacob Schaub)
   i. Served mainly in advisory role
   ii. Schaub thanked for his service.

F. Continuing Education Coordinator (Kevin Kishimoto)
   i. Spent most of the year planning due to COVID uncertainty.
      a. MOUG couldn’t make decisions until MLA announced their intentions.
   ii. Program Committee thanked for their work.
   iii. Kishimoto has spent time working with MLA/TLA Task force to help plan their virtual meeting.
   iv. Question from membership: What might stay from the virtual meetings when meetings are back in person?
      a. Kishimoto said it will depend on membership feedback. There might be a larger chance we meet in Salt Lake. If that does not happen, the meeting will look very similar. A member voiced support for the trivia game.
      b. Suggestions from the audience to use Kahoot for the trivia game.
         i. Kishimoto said Kahoot requires a year-long subscription and he did not think it a wise use of funds but will continue looking at possible platforms.
   v. Kishimoto thanked for his report.

G. Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator (Monica Figueroa)
   i. Thanks to the RDC members and OCLC liaisons
   ii. Fairly quiet over the past year as COVID and anti-Black racial violence interrupted everyone’s work
   iii. Two major updates in WorldCat Discovery, including subfield displays, are from MOUG’s work with OCLC.
   iv. Encourages participation in the OCLC Community Center.

(Continued on next page)
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VII. Other reports:
A. OLAC Liaison (Autumn Faulkner)
   i. Helped organize the OLAC conference, which was also held online.
   ii. The OLAC conference was recorded, with videos available for non-attendees six months after the conference.
   iii. OLAC is seeking a web developer and a liaison between OLAC and MLA Subject Access Committee.
   iv. The Cataloging and Policy Committee in OLAC is seeking members.
   v. Treasurer and Membership Coordinator roles are being split.
   vi. Potential to collaborate with German speaking libraries that are generating their own best practices for a/v materials.
   vii. Some consideration about whether the video game genre should be closed to new terms or not.
   viii. Scope and parameters for OLAC research grants are being reevaluated.
   ix. OLAC will also be having their summer meeting virtually.
B. Oral History Coordinator (Autumn Faulkner)
   i. Jay Weitz (OCLC) did an interview for it at MOUG 2020, but COVID has stopped work on this project.
   ii. Interested participants can submit a self-recorded oral interview https://goo.gl/znDkBB and https://goo.gl/uhfLCb
   iii. Expects to pick up efforts this summer
   iv. Faulkner thanked for both of her reports
C. Web Editor (Anna LoPrete)
   i. Continued to update docs, links, news posts, and banners.
   ii. Created new 2021 meeting page.
   iii. Posted 2019 newsletters.
D. OCLC report (Jay Weitz)
   i. EZ Proxy release 7.1 introduces new security features to guard libraries against unauthorized access.
E. LC report (Damian Iseminger)

VIII. Distinguished Service Award
A. Awarded to Casey Mullin.
IX. For the good of the order
A. Annual meeting acknowledgements
   i. Thanks to the MOUG executive board for the off-cycle Board meeting regarding finances to ensure this meeting was free.
   ii. Thanks to Kevin Kishimoto for the extra work required to prepare for a virtual meeting.
   iii. Thanks to Stanford University for letting us use their Zoom.
   iv. Thanks to outgoing officers Alan Ringwood, Jacob Schaub, and Monica Figueroa.
B. Board transitions
   i. Welcome Mary Huismann, Amy Strickland, and Suzanne Eggleston Lovejoy.
C. Other announcements & new business
   i. The Board is developing a vision and values statement.
   ii. The Board will update mission statement and DEI work going forward.
X. Adjournment
A. Those present at the 2017 meeting marked the fourth anniversary of Hahn’s accident.
B. Hahn encourages nonmembers who are at the meeting to join MOUG.
C. Motion to adjourn – Iseminger moves; Seconded by Jenkins; Motion carries.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:17pm.
Respectfully submitted,
Heather Fisher, Secretary/Newsletter Editor (2020-2022)
The Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is honored to name Casey Mullin (Western Washington University) as the seventeenth 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.

Casey Mullin has become a household name for folks involved with library cataloging. Beginning with a Master of Library Science degree specializing in music librarianship from Indiana University, Casey hit the ground running, working on the Variations3 Digital Music Library project to describe streaming media while studying under the tutelage of 2005 Distinguished Service Award recipient, A. Ralph Papakhian.

Casey began his career at Stanford University Libraries as Discovery Metadata Librarian, advancing to become Head of the Data Control Unit in the Metadata Department. While at Stanford, he began working as a Cataloger with Flourish Music Contract Cataloging. After moving on to the position of Music Cataloger with the New York Public Library, Casey became a Managing Partner of Flourish Music Metadata Solutions. Currently he is Head of Cataloging and Metadata Services for his alma mater, Western Washington University, from which he received a Bachelor of Music in Viola Performance. Throughout all of this, Casey has been and remains an avid and active violist!

In nominating Casey, Marguerite Iskenderian noted his “tireless leadership and contributions to technical services and music cataloging,” including his contributions to MOUG-L and reviews in the Music Library Association’s journal, Notes. His work with Gary Strawn, 2019 Distinguished Service Award winner, to develop the Music Toolkit has been noted by music catalogers throughout the field.

Casey’s professional activity is widespread. He has served on the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS) Cataloging and Metadata Management Section (CaMMS) Subject Analysis Committee to develop the Library of Congress’ faceted vocabularies, and as a participant and reviewer for the OCLC Member Merge Project. As Chair of the MLA Cataloging and Metadata Committee’s Vocabularies Subcommittee, he has been instrumental in developing the Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus (LCMPT) and the Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms (LCGFT) for music. He is now the Coordinator for the Program of Cooperative Cataloging’s (PCC) BIBCO Music Funnel. And, of course, we in MOUG know him for his record-setting eight years of continuous service on the MOUG Executive Board, first in the Treasurer cycle and then in the Chair cycle.

Casey is a co-recipient, with Beth Iseminger, Nancy Lorimer, and Hermine Vermeij, of MLA’s Richard S. Hill Award for their article, “Faceted Vocabularies for Music: A New Era in Resource Discovery,” which appeared in the March 2017 issue of Notes (v. 73, no. 3). He is also the 2019 recipient of the Esther J. Piercy Award from ALCTS.

In closing, consider how Casey is ALSO known on a personal level by our colleagues. Bruce Evans admires “his massive intellect and level of talent,” and has “come to appreciate his generous heart, friendliness, positivity, humility . . . and notable intellectual curiosity.” Hermine Vermeij is “amazed by how much Casey can do (and do well!) . . . wondering how the heck he finds the time to do that on top of everything else.” Please join us in admiration of Casey Mullin for his distinguished service to the profession and to all who have benefitted from that service.
A tribute to Marguerite Iskenderian

With sadness we mark the loss of Marguerite Iskenderian, who died on April 24, 2021. Marguerite served as the Music Cataloger at Brooklyn College since 1971 and was a dedicated member of MOUG for twenty-eight years. Jay Weitz remembers Marguerite as “a frequent source of insightful questions for the Q&A column” who was “always keen on improving the quality of WorldCat data.”

Honora Raphael, Marguerite’s friend and colleague at Brooklyn College for forty-five years, noted that “she was a woman of great knowledge, insatiable curiosity and persistence, qualities that made her a world-class cataloger and someone who was one-of-a-kind.” Marguerite was also an avid bird watcher and a cellist and pianist who played in several community orchestras. Honora added that Marguerite “was one of the most selfless and generous of colleagues, who worked tirelessly and joyfully doing what she did for the students and faculty of Brooklyn College and beyond that for anyone out there who, whether they know it or not, will encounter her lasting legacy.” She will be missed.

Brooklyn College Library is pleased to announce the creation of the new Marguerite J. Iskenderian Music Fund. In the aftermath of the tragic hit-and-run accident that took Marguerite’s life, Brooklyn College established this fund to honor Marguerite’s outstanding dedication and service to music and Brooklyn College Library. This memorial fund will support Brooklyn College Library’s distinguished music library collection—one of the three largest in CUNY.

The fund is accepting donations and we ask that you will honor Marguerite by making a gift in her memory. You may make contributions to the fund online at http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/support/foundation/donate.php. Please write in the comment box that this is a gift for the Marguerite J. Iskenderian Music Fund. If you’d like to contribute via check, please send donations to:
Brooklyn College Foundation
2900 Bedford Avenue
1122 Ingersoll Hall
Brooklyn, NY 11210

Call for Nominations for the 2022 Distinguished Service Award

Nominations are being accepted for the 2022 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 will be presented, and a lifetime complimentary membership to MOUG.

Past recipients of this award are Casey Mullin (2021; Western Washington University), Gary Strawn (2019; Northwestern University), Mark Scharff (2018; Washington University, St. Louis), 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” Herrold, 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 Mary Huismann via e-mail (huismann@stolaf.edu). Nominations and accompanying statements must be received no later than Thursday, July 15, 2021. The Executive Board will select an award recipient at its summer Board meeting.
Leonard Martin presented an overview of microgenres in music: looking at them in their cultural contexts and the challenges in acquiring, describing, and circulating these sound recordings. He began his presentation with some background information on the concept of microgenres in music, placing them in context with other small cultures in literature and fine arts while also identifying socioeconomic and cultural factors that shape these groups. Musical microgenres can be organized into three broad groups. The first category, “hyper-specific”, is exemplified by Chopped and Screwed music out of the Houston, Texas Hip-hop community. This “you know it when you hear it” microgenre is intimately connected to the culture that generates it and descriptions can refer to both the culture and the sound itself.

The second category, “flexible, provisional, and temporary”, is a microgenre with less clearly defined attributes. Martin offered Vaporwave as an example of this type of musical microgenre, noting that while it has its own culture, it is not identified with any specific geographic location, but rather it finds its home online. Self-identified vaporwave artists release their music directly on the web, and the actual musical characteristics can vary widely depending on a number of factors. The third category Martin describes is “specialized or niche”, using Ambient music as an example. Ambient music may combine elements of natural sound, human generated sound, machine-made, remixes, and algorithmically generated music to create repetitive soundscapes.

After the University of Houston Libraries migrated to Alma in 2019, they took on several metadata remediation and enhancement projects. One of these projects was reviewing resource description and subject headings through a diversity, equity, and inclusion lens. The LC genre form term “Chopped and screwed (Music)” was created after the initial DJ Screw donation was received and processed into the Houston Hip Hop Research Collection, so it was an ideal opportunity to enhance these records to current standards and increase their discoverability. Martin enhanced the records in batch in MarcEdit using a series of task lists and then replaced the master records in OCLC using the OCLC API integration in MarcEdit. Tasks included adding 007s where missing, adding relator term “remix artist”, adding 344/347 fields, adding 382 “rapper”, enhancing 505s, adding 655 “Chopped and screwed (Music) $2lcgft”, and adding a 710 added entry for the collection. Other microgenre music cataloging challenges include a lack of sufficient coverage and specificity of established LCSHs and LCGFTs and also artists using multiple alternate identities. Description of pseudonyms become even more complicated when an individual is credited as creator under one name and performer as another on the same recording, or when their identity evolves over time.

Martin recommended Bandcamp Tags, Every Noise at Once, Musicbrainz, and Discogs as additional resources for catalogers to use in their descriptive work, as genre tags and other descriptive terms already exist in these communities and suggested developing controlled vocabularies based on internet-derived genre-tags. He also discussed the challenges of acquiring and circulating microgenre recordings. Production is often limited and may not be available for long or through traditional vendors. Streaming platforms like Spotify, Soundcloud, YouTube, and DatPiff do not lend themselves well to the library collection model and even those recordings available in physical media tend toward formats, such as cassettes and VHS tapes, with less frequently available functioning players. In navigating these challenges, libraries are not only good stewards of their collections, but also doing their part to document and preserve their cultural contexts.

Submitted by
Kristi Bergland (University of Minnesota)
While working from home during quarantine, the University of Colorado, Boulder, music library staff worked on a project to identify and improve sound recording records with inappropriate or overly broad usage of subject headings for “World music” or “Indians of North America—Music.” Their goal was to make their catalog more inclusive and more useful by reflecting the specific places, cultures, and genres of the recordings held and thus enhance access to music of underrepresented communities. As their library supports an ethnomusicology program, it is especially important to provide robust access to these materials.

CU Boulder staff began by defining the specific cases when “World music” would be appropriately used in a sound recording record. The heading correctly refers to music resulting from the fusion of folk or popular music from different cultures, and also can be used for compilations containing music from too many different places, cultures, or genres to be reflected in separate subject headings. It is not appropriate for sound recordings that contain music from a specific place, or as a way of grouping together everything that is non-Western.

Staff made a list of 65 CD records with subject headings for “World music” and divided them into categories. Those containing 5 or fewer types of music should get more specific subject headings in place of “World music,” whereas those with 6 or more would retain the “World music” heading. In some cases, staff members need to look at the physical items in order to update the records, which will have to wait until they return to the library. Overall, about one-third of the records used “World music” inappropriately. In addition to updating their local records, catalogers also updated OCLC records with more specific subject headings but left in the “World music” heading, which may be useful for some libraries.

CU Boulder staff also looked for sound recordings with the subject heading “Indians of North America—Music,” finding 78 hits, of which 24 had only that broader heading without anything more specific. When there were 5 or fewer Indigenous groups represented, catalogers added subject headings for the specific groups in order to add granularity in subject retrieval. The speakers discussed the problematic nature of the LCSH vocabulary for Indigenous peoples of North America and pointed out that there are other thesauri that can be used instead of or in addition to LCSH. At CU Boulder, they are retaining the LCSH terms because using an agreed-upon controlled vocabulary is important in a cooperative cataloging environment, and because these subject headings can be updated en masse when the Library of Congress eventually (we hope) updates the terminology used in LCSH. For the moment, CU Boulder is also adding a local subject heading for “Indigenous peoples—North America—Music” in order to include inclusive language in addition to the problematic language of LCSH. Again, they updated OCLC records with the more specific headings.

Possible next steps for this project include looking for scores whose catalog records could be updated in the same way (though they don’t expect to find many); using additional vocabularies outside of LCSH; and expanding to further subject headings such as “Folk music” and “Popular music” that may also conceal non-Western music needing more robust subject access. The speakers pointed out that many older records in particular tend to have these problems and can use updates.

Submitted by
Michelle Cronquist
(University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)
Reference, Discovery, and Collections Committee (RDCC) and OCLC Discovery Services Update

Monica Figueroa (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)
Jay Halloway (OCLC)

Jay Halloway of OCLC provided an update on OCLC’s WorldCat Discovery, OCLC’s discovery layer. Basic WorldCat Discovery is available to any member library that has a FirstSearch subscription. (You can contact support@oclc.org for the URL for your institution.) WorldCat Discovery Premium is available as a subscription, or if you institution uses WorldShare Management System (WMS). WorldCat Discovery Premium includes additional information, such as item availability and access to remote databases.

WorldCat Discovery is undergoing a “modernization.” Halloway highlighted four areas of focus: data-informed decisions, global perspective, inclusive and accessible design, and modern design standards. The modernization is expected to continue through late fall 2021. If you have a FirstSearch subscription, you can view new user interface at https://[libraryname].on.worldcat.org/v2.

Another development on the new WorldCat Discovery will be the new search module. The central index list can be found at: www.oclc/indexDiscovery.

The results from the new search module will focus on local holdings and editions.

After Halloway’s update, outgoing RDCC Chair, Monica Figueroa, discussed the display of subfields related to the 7xx fields. After a proposal from MOUG, WorldCat Discovery now displays subfield d in the 1xx/7xx fields. A frequent problematic example is John Adams. 100 1_ Adams, John, $d1735-1826 refers to the second President of the United States. 100 1_ Adams, John, $d1847- refers to the legendary composer.

Another display update that was courtesy of a MOUG suggestion was to display all title-related subfields in the 7xx fields. Each full 7xx field is also fully hyperlinked and searchable.

If any member of MOUG is interesting in continuing this work, please contact Suzanne Eggleston Lovejoy, Coordinator of the RDCC, at suzanne.lovejoy@yale.edu.

 Submitted by
Heather Fisher (Saginaw Valley State University)

Expanding Catalog Access to Electronic Resources with WorldShare Collection Manager

Keith Knop (University of Georgia)
Simon Hunt (University of Georgia)

Keith Knop and Simon Hunt of the University of Georgia presented a pilot project tackling the behemoth problem of adding records for Alexander Street holdings to their catalog. MARC records from Alexander Street come with an array of issues rendering them relatively unusable, but the team devised an approach to improve them and create new records. This work was facilitated by WorldShare Collection Manager, an ILS-neutral collections management tool available to institutions with an OCLC cataloging subscription.

Not only are the Alexander Street records generally filled with unreliable metadata, but only a fraction of the collection is represented in OCLC. Due to the largely born-analog nature of Alexander Street resources and thus presuming that the physical corollaries of many items would have records, Knop and Hunt proceeded to design a pilot project to derive electronic records. They began with the Music Online: Popular Music Library collection, which had only 0.2% of its holdings in WorldCat at the time.

The basic process of the pilot began with downloading the collection data from Collection Manager, removing items with existing OCLC records, and formatting the remaining data to track work and to prepare OCLC number correction reports. Because the Alexander Street collec-
On the Road to Easier Digital Score Acquisition

Kristi Bergland (University of Minnesota)

This session, presented by Kristi Bergland of the University of Minnesota, provided an overview of the process by which that school practices acquisitions of digital scores. The presentation didn’t touch on those scores that are available through larger, more established publishers—just on one-off material.

Bergland started by noting that the University of Minnesota doesn’t have a good way of circulating born digital material that did not originate at the University of Minnesota. One awkward work around that they’d tried at UM is to treat PDFs as part of the ILL workflow; however that workflow doesn’t work well for this material—digital scores. Bergland described how they are similar (and different) from material that already has existing acquisitions workflows: They are different from ebooks because they are hosted and in general they are very cheap. They are also different from physical scores because there are no slips to order from, no order records to use in the catalog, acquisitions staff need to create a basic record from the (often) small amount of information provided and, when received, the file often has nothing (or very little) to do with the small amount of information provided upon purchase. They are also different from digital score platforms because they are single scores, rather than a platform that provides a package of scores.

Bergland then followed this by providing a comprehensive discussion of some of the issues facing digital scores acquisitions. She said that one crucial thing to keep in mind when considering these issues is that “every party in this...
Focusing on the vendor/producer part of this, Bergland mentioned some of the issues that her institution has encountered. She pointed out that the most common business model for those selling digital scores is those who are trying to sell multiple copies or licenses to schools or ensembles. Therefore, most licensing language that these companies will already have relates to performance rights. Sometimes the file is sent to the library with the acquisitions librarian’s name embedded into the watermark on the PDF (acquisitions staff are often the main point of contact with a vendor). Additionally, the file names for these files are often quite difficult to parse—they’re not structured with metadata use in mind. Bergland gave examples of a zip folder simply titled “2 songs-piazzolla” containing two PDFs which simply were named with the titles of the original pieces—difficult to keep in that format! When contending with file naming that’s fairly vague or unclear, the problem can be compounded by the fact that there is sometimes no title page for these scores, and in some cases no text at all in the score—just music with no words. This complicates things for acquisitions staff who might be trying to find the order record in their local system, or work out which purchase order this PDF relates to.

Bergland mentioned some of the discussions that the University of Minnesota had in order to come to some basic decisions about how to deal with these scores. They determined that what they needed was a streamlined, consistent process. As a result, they decided that they would need to print these scores. Then followed some additional considerations and questions: How would they be able to print everything? Would they be able to lend? Lend over ILL? How would they name these scores? Some vendors include language that makes it seem as though the library can’t even change the file name. Mend them? Would the library add a title page if one didn’t exist or there wasn’t any language on the score? Bergland discussed that this process was a great opportunity for libraries to educate vendors about the needs and desires of academic libraries—selling to these customers was not within their normal business model. Along with libraries, composers, publishers and vendors are on a learning curve here—thus this is a great opportunity to do outreach and advocacy on behalf of libraries.

The library started to use a fairly vague copyright statement that states that the library is not giving up its right to do things, but it doesn’t specify what the library will do with the score. Bergland pointed out that copyright, licensing and performance rights can easily get blurred together in these discussions even though they are very different things.

There was a robust Q&A session in which a variety of topics were covered. Bergland talked about what steps they’ve taken to talk to users who recommend these digital scores—speaking to them about the options in purchasing. This program has been operating for two years (one of which was COVID) so thus far it’s been fairly minimal. Scores are printed and bound—the library would reconsider this process if they had a way of lending/circulating PDFs, which they do not currently have. The library currently keeps their digital files in a Google Drive—this isn’t ideal. When asked about whether they would use digital lending if they had that option, Bergland said that she was unsure—many composers are uncomfortable with having their work manipulated, while that is something that many users will want; on the other hand, there are some scores that haven’t translated well to printing on the paper sizes that the library has available—in those cases, digital lending would offer benefits. Asked if there were instances where access to a score has been password protected, Bergland said that there have been two instances in which the publisher wouldn’t agree to the library’s terms, and so in those cases they didn’t purchase the items.

Submitted by

Joshua Hutchinson (University of California, Irvine)
Matt Ertz introduced the session, said that he would start with the submitted questions, and explained other protocol. He then introduced panelists:

Jay Weitz (JW) (OCLC)
Damian Iseminger (DI) (Library of Congress)
Kathy Glennan (KG) (University of Maryland and RDA representative)

**Q:** When cataloging CDs, people put in 300 $b CD Audio. Is that a valid change, or is that incorrect? (The questioner clarified that she was a public librarian, and music cataloging was not her main focus.)

**A:** (DI): 300 $b has been used in the past to load up other recording information. With RDA, since CD Audio is a format you can select that helps in the physical description, a lot of catalogers have been putting it there; there’s nothing wrong with doing that. But it also can be added in other parts of the MARC record. It depends on your local systems limitations, in terms of whether or not doing so is useful. There are places in the 34x area this can go in. It is neither wrong with including it in the 300 $b, nor choosing not to include it there. Some folks put it in the 300 $b to understand what that audio disc is (i.e. it’s a CD, not an LP, etc.), so it will be there right in the description.

Follow up: (KG): It’s useful to remember that they are different data elements, so just because you see them together in a string doesn’t mean that the machine is going to understand them the same way. Machines may not read info the same way.

Follow up (JW): Local systems have different capabilities. Some don’t do anything with the 34x fields and some do. So local system capabilities factor in as well.

**Q:** Can we abandon some of the redundant fields to RDA, like 048 field?

**A:** (DI): I’ll chime in by saying that the 048 is a MARC field, and therefore a coded way of entering Medium of Performance (MoP) information. New RDA allows for the MoP to be recorded in a coded manner. If you don’t know what’s going on, call it a score. That said, if you know it’s always been done a particular way, and now it’s been arranged for guitar, you could call it a vocal score. But my preference would be for just score.

**Q:** With regards to the new/revised RDA, will there be a completely separate section for music materials? I think this was mentioned at some point.

**A:** (KG): They are still looking at how to generate a view of RDA specific to a user community. How that will play out is still to be determined.

Follow up (DI): The new RDA is much different, more of a data dictionary of elements. Application profiles (APs) are in development that could be plugged into the Toolkit. You could have a recorded sound output AP, which basically means that someone could use these elements and then RDA could return search results that only search those elements, or that you only have access to those. In the development phase, the pandemic has slowed things down. APs will become essential in using the Toolkit, since there are 3000+ elements.
Cataloging managers could make decisions about which elements to use.

Follow up (KG): The easier it is to implement without spending development funds, the sooner you’ll see it. So it depends on what kind of solution we can get through the content management system without spending a great deal more development monies.

Q: What’s actually been happening in music cataloging at LC during the pandemic?

A: (DI): LC shut down in mid-March. The first problem was that not all staff were telework-enabled. In the context of the federal government, you just can’t use your own computer to telework, you are required to use a government approved laptop that meets certain security protocols. So it took the first month-and-a-half of the shutdown for everyone to get approved equipment. For those that weren’t able to do this right away, this necessitated coming up with projects that could be done at home. One such project, and one that continues to this day, is performing bibliographic file maintenance. This project is connected to BIBFAME. We have been cleaning up, by hand, old catalog headings. Thus far, we have cleaned up 13,000 of 56,000 music headings that have the category “Old Catalog.” As people have returned to the physical workplace, those who work on site a couple days a week work on materials that they can’t take home because of security-related concerns (this includes manuscripts, rare books, rare copyright deposit, etc.) Damian serves as a “go for” for many work-at-home staff, such as photographing parts of resources (title pages, etc.) to share. Ingest of new materials has slowed considerably; we have way less to work on. That’s what’s going on at the music division.

Q: I just cataloged the 2020 edition of Dukas’ L’apprenti sorcier (OCLC#1200523944). The logo of Eulenberg is displayed on the title page next to that of Breitkopf & Härtel, and on page 1 of the score we find both:

© 2014 Ernst Eulenberg & Co. GmbH, Mainz
© 2020 by Breitkopf & Härtel

I added to 264 _4 fields with the copyright dates, but one is advised to not use $a or $b when using indicator 4. So where, if anywhere, should I put that publisher's name and place? Should I also repeat the 264 _1? Can the two publishers co-exist in a single 264 _1? Also, is the © date for the publisher is now divorced from said publisher name. Is this okay?

A (DI): Start with issue of copyright. Statements at bottom of title page essentially say that Eulenberg and Breitkopf hold the copyright to some portion of the item; Eulenberg from 2014, and Breitkopf from 2020. In other words, these are rights statements. In RDA, we have studiously avoided talking about rights management, and that’s for some very good legal reasons. The catalog record should not be the arbiter of determining rights information. We don’t want to have elements in RDA about holder of copyright. But if you are concerned about the date of copyright divorced from that publisher’s name and place of publication, you could enter it in 500 quoted note, and say for instance, “Bottom of page 1, copyright 2014 Ernst Eulenberg and Company, GmbH, Mainz” and enter the same type of statement for Breitkopf. New RDA accommodates this: Manifestation Statement/Manifestation Copyright Statement, it’s a way of showing that this is a statement on how the item represents itself. We do have a place for this in RDA, but no place in MARC for this info yet (currently under development). In the meantime, use a 500 note if you want to keep all parts of that statement together.

Q: When cataloging a score that includes lyrics in the original language and one or more translations, do you need to provide analytical authorized access points for the original expression and at least one translation, as well as a preferred title for the original expression (240 and 7xx fields), or can you omit the preferred title since you have already included an analytical authorized access point (AAPs) for that expression (7xx fields only)? An example of this is OCLC# 13923144, Schneefried = Snöfrid by Jean Sibelius, which includes the original Swedish text as well as German and Finnish translations. Thank you!

A (DI): There is a policy statement in the authorized access point area in the classic Toolkit. If you have an original language expression and a translated language expression, you create an analytical added entry for the original language expression, which according to the way PCC catalogs now would be the AAP for the work with no language added, and then another analytical added entry for the translation, this time with the language appended. Your 100 would be for the composer, and you do not need a 240, which is where the preferred title would be. I did review the record being referenced, and what you’re seeing is the AACR2 treatment, with the uniform title followed by Polyglot, used when there were more than two languages present. So if you were to convert this record to RDA, I would remove the 240 and then add analytics in the 700s for original and translations. The policy statement says to do the original language expression and at least one of the translations, but if you’re this far in, you might as well do the second translation.
Ask Everything, cont.

Q: For Kathy—Can you explain what the relationship between 100 and 245 is in RDA? Or how many different relationships might be going on there?

A: (KG): RDA does not care about MARC coding, but I get the point. You have an author and a preferred title, and so what’s the relationship? If there’s no 240, that’s an author/title access point really; the author and the preferred title, which has to be encoded in MARC. This is about naming the work, not the author. We’ve always made MARC do heavy lifting in this regard, which is how we get into our less than clean modeling. And we all know about the issues surrounding indexing 100/240s; we’d like to see this indexed the way you see 700 $s indexed. We’re making the MARC tagging do double duty. But the relationship between a 100 and a 245 would be naming the manifestation. Once you get to the preferred title through naming the work or expression, you only add the 240 if you need to identify it more than that.

Follow up Q: When training people I had gotten the impression that with the RDA relationship, you were trying to reduce the number of multiple relationships you have going on between two elements, and so I’ve kind of thought about it as being the relationship between that name up there and this thing that you’ve cataloged, the resource itself. When you said manifestation relationship, that’s the way I’ve been thinking about it. But something I’ve read made me wonder if I should be actually be thinking about it that way.

Follow up A: (KG): It’s really one of the problems that we have because we’re happy to slap on a relationship designation onto a 100 field, such as composer, but for that same author/title relationship in a 700 field, we would not add that relationship designator (RDs). But these things are really doing the same thing, so we’re putting extra weight on the 100 so we don’t repeat things, and if any of you played with RIMMF in its earlier version prior to its version back to MARC, we like to string on multiple RDs on a single person. So with Bernstein being the composer and the conductor, I don’t enter multiple 700s to separate out those different RDs. But strictly speaking, you’d be better off if they were in separate 700 fields, that is, in looking forward to the future. For the short term, stringing them together makes sense for our users. From a Linked Data perspective, not so much.

Follow up: (DI): Another major related issue is that we’ve attached so much semantic heft to a lot of these MARC fields where their original intention, and the intention in AACR2 for example, was to provide guidance on where to put this card in the catalog. The whole idea of Main Entry was based on way to organize the process concerning where to put card in catalog; we’ll do it by author, and we’ll stick the card here. But now with RDA, you’re starting to think of it semantically, and it starts to break down how MARC was designed, that is, for print catalog cards.

Q: Could someone give the rationale behind using inches to measure an audio disc vs. centimeters in measuring size of printed scores?

A: (KG): CD is 12 cm, and LP is 12 inches, so in deference to catalogers’ practice of taking a quick glance at the full record, the idea was not to have identical numbers for different formats. This is a U.S. implementation decision. If you want it changed, bring it up with the CMC.

Q: If I don’t know for certain what the instrumentation of a piece is, will a first indicator 1 in the 382 cover my lack of information? This scenario happens often with popular music.

A: (DI): I’ve used it on several occasions for “quick and dirty” cataloging. LC has a lot of sheet music for which we have simple database entry records. We all know it from the LC class that it’s a pop song, so I’ll just add 382 11 singer, and not worry if there’s guitar tab, ukulele tab, or piano. I think it’s perfectly fine.

Q: LCSH question regarding concerti grossi. The scope note for this heading of it being used for collections of concerti grossi does not appear to be applied all that often. It seems it’s more commonly applied for single concerti grossi. Why is this the case?

A: (DI): Iseminger began by reading a portion of the heading’s LCSH scope note: “An individual concerto grosso is entered under the heading Concertos, followed by medium of performance.” LC wanted to retain that heading for collections calling themselves Concerti grossi, but individually they are concertos. However, concerti grossi is established on its own in LCGFT—we would encourage you to use that. We realize everyone has legacy data, but at least in LCGFT there is a consistent application. The questioner lamented the fact that they still haven’t implemented LCGFT in their shop, so this may not be applicable at where they work.
Ask Everything (Session 2)

Jay Weitz (OCLC)
Damian Iseminger (Library of Congress)
Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland; RDA Steering Committee)

Matt Ertz began the session with pre-submitted questions, but invited everyone to ask questions throughout the program. Matt reintroduced the panelists:

Jay Weitz (JW) (OCLC)
Damian Iseminger (DI) (Library of Congress)
Kathy Glennan (KG) (University of Maryland and RDA representative)

Q: A participant asked a question focused on the history of RDA and the history of BIBFRAME, more specifically, concerning the documentation of the development of each. Will previous versions of the tools will be archived? Is the development of these resources being documented? The history of RDA is getting hard to nail down. Wayback Machine is a possibility, but not sure about the efficacy of that. Will there be archiving of the Original Toolkit and BIBFRAME development?

A: (KG): Anything ever posted on the JSC/RSC website should still be available and will be archived on the Archive JSC site. Materials archived go back to 1999. Kathy encouraged the participant to contact her offline if there’s anything in particular that she’s looking for. Anything that’s in dynamic development is going to harder to maintain and archive.

Follow up (DI): BIBFRAME: He can’t speak specifically of BIBFRAME. LC is exempt from Freedom of Information Act requests, which means that LC is not obligated to publish the development of BIBFRAME. Now LC is governed by federal regulations that set forth parameters to make these requests. That said, Damian has been trying to go through old documentation (such as MCB) and find decisions connected to development, but that’s hard because most of it is in print resources.

Q: For statements such as "Manufactured and distributed by Angel Records" should we split the statement into a 264 _2 and 264 _3, or use a single 264? If a single 264, which 2nd indicator?

A (JW): Recording a statement beyond the publication statement in a 264 is optional. But if you do, record it as it appears and do not split it up. Use 264 _2 for distribution with "Manufactured and distributed by Angel Records". Iseminger followed up by asking Weitz if you can just use 260 in that situation? Weitz answered that the cataloger could, to which Glennan noted that method isn’t RDA compliant. Weitz said that this presents an opportunity for proposal to MLA to clarify this, that is, how to transcribe and encode it. Kathy noted that the New Toolkit includes manifestation statements that help with this so you can transcribe it as it appears. A participant asked Weitz to include rationale for recommendation when it comes through. Glennan noted the original RDA has clear hierarchy a numeric reading. Glennan endorses Weitz’s recommendation to take higher level info (distribution) and record it all in distribution (264 _2). This goes off of the assumption that users care more about distribution than manufacture information. Iseminger added that we also need to think about why we are using this information. Is it just to show that it exists on the item, or is there a value added for the user? If the latter, then do you want to have an access point for these entities? And lastly, Weitz observed that catalogers could also use a 500 note.

Q: Why don’t we create unique identifiers for compilations?

A: (DI): I don’t think there’s much utility with assigning conventional collective titles, because you’re obscuring the title of the compilation anyway. I would hate to take a conventional collective title with selections after it; I’d try to differentiate it from all other titles with selections. How are you going to differentiate that from all other headings with selections? At LC Music Section, we lean toward title as it appears on the item, but that’s just our approach, not an LC policy. PCC has a different approach.

Follow-up (KG): Giving a conventional collective title a unique identifier would require an extraordinary effort over time to make it unique. We are still rooted in card environments. The more we add to these access points, the less they seem useful to users, and what our users would expect to see.

Q: When cataloging vendor record scores, I often find that they already have the ISMN in the form M####, though this is nowhere to be seen on the item; the one on the item is usually identical (when displayed) to the EAN.

I have been in the habit of putting in the EAN as an 024 30, and the ISMN as an 024 20, even though the two numbers appear identical. But I revisited one of my old originals and someone had removed the second 024.

So how do they get that M-form of the number, and am I doing it correctly?

A: (DI): The ISMN has not started with M since 2008, so that number is inaccurate to begin with. They probably have a process in place to change the 9790 to an M. So it’s acceptable to put a 9790 in an 024, and also have it as an
Ask Everything, cont.

EAN. A member chimed in by saying that this is similar to 028s, where we transcribe what’s there, and vendors will then put in info that’s useful to them. Another side of coin about what to do with those numbers. Weitz continued by noting that with the ISBN in Connexion, the system creates the old and new form regardless of how many digits the resource has, for indexing purposes. They are pretty sure that doesn’t happen with ISMNs. The formula for translating an ISMN with M or numeric is that numeric always begins with 9790, which is stated in OCLC Bib Formats. Iseminger observed that ISMN numeric values do not indicate country, 9790 numbers are commonly referred to as “music land barcodes”, and Glennan added that it’s pretty easy to convert because check digit is always the same. The member noted that a subtext of this is that you should make the record look like you want it to, but don’t take out info that might be useful to someone else. Glennan agreed: Just because info looks duplicative to you, it may not be for the machine. An ISMN is different than an EAN, even if the numbers are the same. Please don’t take out duplicate info unnecessarily.

Weitz transitioned slightly by noting that the OCLC master record is now called WorldCat Record, to eliminate possible offensiveness. (Iseminger said that it’s also on RDA’s plate to try to get away from terms like this, such as master recording, slave, etc. Kathy added that RDA is continuing to strive to become more inclusive by eliminating offensive language. There may be terminology that’s offensive that the organizations are not aware of. Wetz noted a potential complicating factor: this gets to the issue of if we are distorting the historical record by renaming fields, such as the 079 master record number. Glennan noted that a participant put in the chat that “master” recordings can be re-framed as “preservation recordings”, which is commonly done in the archives world.

Q: I’m new to music cataloging, what are some good resources to consult when cataloging collected works M1-M3 and thematic catalogs?

A: (DI): I am not aware of any specific resources to do so. The big decision is whether you’re going to decide to catalog each volume in the set (analytical description in old terminology), the whole set, or a mixture. For LC, we describe each volume and class it together, but we don’t do a comprehensive record. For collected works, the practices are more varied. We used to create set record, and if there were one or two works contained within the analyzable part, we would do separate records. We will now accept analyzed record for any individual volume. It’s your choice as to what works best.

Q: (DI): It will be proposed within the next few days. It will likely get into April and May update. Go ahead and use it now because it will get in there no matter what.

Q: In RDA: Why have the various "Writers of..." phrases been replaced with "Contributor agent of text"? I think more specificity is preferable over a general (and essentially meaningless) phrase.

A: (D): If I write the intro to a book, I am the author of that content. It’s hard to keep track of all these various accompanying material writers, so we collapse them into “Contributor agent or text” and their agent sub-elements. Glennan added that you shouldn’t describe something in terms of its physical location within a resource. Iseminger continued: In classic RDA, these agents are sub-elements of the agent creator. In new RDA, the various categories under creator now stand on their own. We brought them over because we didn’t want people to be upset when their favorite relationship designator was missing, such as composer. We could have collapsed them all down to creator and allow the work and its characteristics define what’s going on, like for example, “Beethoven is the creator, what did he do? He composed the music.” Maybe it’s worth considering getting away from relationship designators. Glennan mentioned that RDA does not prevent you from putting in a note that a person wrote the preface.

Q: As relationship designators are changed, how will the legacy relationship designators be handled?

A: (KG): Vis-à-vis Iseminger’s answer, we carried over most of them. In new RDA we are talking about element names and it’s not necessary nor really recommended that you display them out to your users. Element names are designed to be specific and be useable by machines to uniquely identify the more than 3000 entities in RDA.

Follow-up comment from attendee: Relationship designators are helpful when they are the only tool to tell roles of particular entities (such as who is the composer, and who is the editor).

A: (KG): RDs are not going away, they are still there for your use.

Submitted by

Bruce Evans (Baylor University)
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Lightning Talks (Session 1)

Chris Holden (Library of Congress)
Phyllis Jones (Oberlin College and Conservatory)
Amanda L. Scott (Middle Tennessee State University)
Marty Jenkins (Wright State University)

A brief update on music cataloging and the new RDA by Chris Holden (Library of Congress)

Chris Holden began the first round of lightning talks with an overview of the state of music cataloging and the RDA Toolkit as of February 2021. The official “switchover” of the Toolkit from original to new RDA occurred on December 15, 2020. Holden stressed that this was just the kick-off to the transition process, as we are not cataloging yet using the new RDA. During a gradual rollout, cataloging communities will have time to develop training materials and application profiles. The PCC does not plan to implement new RDA any sooner than July 2022. The original RDA will remain available in the meantime, and we will have at least a one-year warning before it disappears from the Toolkit.

Updated LC-PCC policy statements are scheduled to be released during spring 2021. In the new Toolkit, the LC-PCC PS policy statements appear in a column to the right of the RDA text. The MLA Best Practices—unchanged since the Toolkit was “frozen” in 2017—will also need updating to reflect both the new RDA and the new LC-PCC policy statements. The MLA CMC Content Standards Subcommittee has been working on revisions to the MLA BPs.

Holden offered four tips to prepare the new RDA: First, be patient. Second, familiarize yourself with the new Toolkit’s layout. Third, explore the updated LCC-PCC policy statements and MLA BPs as they are posted. And finally, follow listservs and professional organizations for news on training opportunities.

1968 Revisited: Cataloging Nono’s Musica-manifesto n. 1 by Phyllis Jones (Oberlin College and Conservatory)

Phyllis Jones provided a case study of cataloging with an active, creative approach to subject analysis that highlights connections between music, art, history, and other liberal arts disciplines.

In May of 1968, tens of thousands of university students protested in the streets of Paris. They were joined by millions of workers in sympathy strikes throughout France. The protests inspired many works of art, including Luigi Nono’s Musica-Manifesto No. 1. The piece is divided in two parts: the first for soprano, reader, and tape using a text by Italian anti-fascist poet Cesare Pavese; and the second incorporating words scrawled on the walls of Paris during the 1968 uprising plus field recordings from the Venice Biennale held during June of that year.

The CD at hand was a 2018 reissue of a disc originally released in 1969. In addition to providing access points for medium of performance and to highlight Pavese’s text, Jones sought to include headings for the two historical events referenced in Nono’s work (the 1968 Paris protests and Venice Biennale). In this way, the subject access linked the musical work to the historical events it commented on or described—blurring disciplinary boundaries and “illuminat[ing] linkages between the arts.” While the heading for the Biennale was straightforward, one for the 1968 Paris protests was not. After examining subject headings assigned to monographs on the topic, Jones settled on the most common form used: 650 ǂa Riots ǂz France ǂz Paris ǂv Songs and music.

This heading, however, remains unsatisfactory. It lacks specificity to the event known in France simply as “May ‘68” or “May 1968.” The heading also uses a loaded term—riots—that focuses on the property-damaging aspects of the protests. Jones noted, “as we know, a name is almost never neutral and the act of naming is done from a position of power.” LCSH terms applied to similar historical events range from riot to massacre to uprising. Some LCSH have been modified, as with the heading for the Tulsa massacre of 1921. Cataloging materials linked to such historical events thus become opportunities to reexamine how we name them.
Cataloging Transcriptions of Jazz Performances by Amanda L. Scott (Middle Tennessee State University)

Middle Tennessee State University recently acquired transcriptions of Clifford Brown’s trumpet solos. Transcribed by Erik Veldkamp, each volume corresponds to one album of Brown’s music. Although such notated transcriptions of jazz performances have sold since the 1920s, current cataloging standards do not address these transcriptions directly. Three problematic areas center on persons, genre/form, and source recordings.

Concerning persons, should the performer of the transcribed work such as Clifford Brown be considered a creator under RDA? Scott decided yes, based on RDA 6.28.1.5 (containing instructions on adaptations of musical works). Although the pieces were composed by others, Brown’s added improvisations constituted creative output. However, none of the available RDA relationship designators satisfactorily described Brown’s role, and Scott elected to omit the element. The access points for Brown and Veldkamp were thus:
100 1_ǂa Brown, Clifford.
700 1_ǂa Veldkamp, Erik, ǂd 1969- ǂe transcriber.

Scott applied the genre/form terms Jazz and Scores, although she wondered if it would be more appropriate to call these materials parts.

Information on the original source recording went in an unstructured field 500 note plus an 046 for the date(s) of recording. An alternative is to use the combination of fields 033 (structured date/time and place of recording), 046 (dates), 500 (unstructured note on the original release), 518 (note on date and place of recording), and 787 (relating to the album). Although the alternative is more linked-data friendly, Scott chose to use the 500 + 046 since the item at hand was a transcription of a recording, not the recording itself.

Scott concluded by outlining her wish list for transcription cataloging: First, add the RDA relationship designator “Transcription of:”. Second, add a genre/form term “Transcriptions (Music)” along with a scope note to distinguish it from transcriptions that are arrangements for other mediums of performance and to clarify whether it includes transcriptions from one notation system to another.

Using the Music Toolkit to Add Genre, Instrumentation, and More Access Points to Score and Recording Records by Marty Jenkins (Wright State University)

Marty Jenkins provided a brief introduction to using the Music Toolkit, a program that takes existing information in a bibliographic records for scores and recordings and generates data for faceted fields including 382 (medium of performance) and 655 (genre/form). The Music Toolkit works within OCLC Connexion Client and consists of a macro written in OCLC macro language. The Music Toolkit runs on one bibliographic record at a time, and users are expected to review the generated data and edit further as needed.

Find the Music Toolkit at https://files.library.northwestern.edu/public/Music382/ or access through the MLA Cataloging and Metadata Committee site (http://cmc.blog.musiclibraryassoc.org/ > Cataloging & Metadata Resources > Genre, Medium, and Subjects > Music Toolkit).

All Lightning Session 1 Summaries submitted by Melissa Moll (University of Iowa)
This session featured background about librettos, discussed them as both text and objects, and then got into the meat of cataloging them. This was an excellent presentation that truly benefitted by being on Zoom rather than in-person. Along with the presentation, which was well-illustrated with photos and images of example librettos, the webinar software allowed chat to happen in the sidebar, which enabled questions, clarifications and links to appear alongside the main presentation.

Levy first considered a libretto as a text. A libretto is defined by Grove Music Online as the verbal text of an opera; it is typically written before the music (ie, the composer sets the libretto) and the composer may modify the text through musical repetition. Historically, many early librettos were based on mythical themes. Levy presented a brief overview of some of the most important librettists, such as Pietro Metastasio (1698-1782) who wrote 27 librettos and had texts set by over 400 composers. He also named numerous composer/librettist teams, including Lorenzo Da Ponte & Mozart, Felice Romani & Donizetti, as well as Gilbert & Sullivan. There were also a number of composers who wrote their own librettos—prominent among them Berlioz, Wagner and Mussorgsky.

The next section of Levy’s presentation concerned librettos as objects. In this sense, they’re defined by Grove Music Online as a “Printed or manuscript book giving the literary text, both sung and spoken, of an opera or other musical work”. Early librettos were meant in sort of the same way that we would consider a playbill today, so they’re interesting as objects in their own right. Some mention all people involved (composer, librettist, set designer, singers at a specific performance), while others have much less information. Some have text in both original and translation. Levy showed an example of a libretto that even has a list of refreshments served in the theater! This was an excellent example that garnered much comment in the chat (and memories of attending live theater events).

Following these introductory sections, Levy moved on to talk about issues relating to cataloging, starting with some of the complexities inherent in cataloging librettos. He talked about cataloging, classifying, identifying main entries, and creating authorized access points. To start, Levy briefly mentioned two early catalogers of librettos: Oscar Sonneck (the head of the music division at the Library of Congress from 1902-1917) and Claudio Sartori (musicologist and librarian in Milan, who lived 1913-1994). Sonneck cataloged the Albert Schatz collection of librettos (over 12,000 librettos, the purchase of which he arranged for the Library of Congress) and Sartori’s analytic catalog of Italian librettos published before 1800 comprise two major works in the history of cataloging librettos.

Broadly speaking, Levy said, when cataloging librettos one should follow the basic rules for cataloging books. In fact, it is fairly similar to cataloging plays—they should have Lit form ‘d’ (Dramas) and subject analysis should use the form subdivision ‘Dramas’ (as in Daphne (Nymph) – Dramas and Tuberculosis—Dramas). It is also mandatory to have a 650 -0 Operas $v Librettos (do not subdivide this heading by century) and optionally records should include a 380 Librettos $2 lcgt and 655 -7 Librettos $2 lcgt. Levy also provided an overview of classifying librettos using LCSH. He discussed varying policies across the classification numbers (what they’re cuttered and subarranged by) and also how local practice may vary based on institutional needs.

Levy then discussed some of the history of determining the main entry for librettos. Prior to 1941, the main entry was the librettist. The ALA cataloging rules of 1941 changed this to using the composer as main entry if the composer is named, or a particular performance is named and the composer can be determined. Otherwise, the 1941 rules advised to continue to use the librettist as the main entry. The LCRI for AACR2 reverted back to having the librettist as the main entry. There has thus been varying practices over time, and Levy gave many excellent examples with images as well as screenshots of MARC example records. Under RDA, there are a variety of additional access points which may be assigned to records for librettos. Levy again showed excellent examples of these access points in practice, and talked about some areas which lack clarity or precision. Levy finished by talking briefly about title authority records for librettos that make use of relationship designators in the 500 field, such as “Libretto for (work)”.

Levy finished his excellent presentation by advising catalogers that when cataloging librettos it’s important to think about them both as text and as objects.

Submitted by
Joshua Hutchinson (University of California, Irvine)
A shot in the Arm: Injecting Local Catalog Data into OCLC Master Records Using a Connexion Macro-Assisted Workflow by Jim Soe Nyun (University of California, San Diego)

In this presentation, Jim Soe Nyun followed up on a project he had co-presented on at MOUG two years ago with UC San Diego Libraries colleague Kurt Hanselman about improving online resource titles from Alexander Street Press using Connexion macros with locally injected data. Jim discovered recently that many of those same records he and Kurt had worked on were becoming icky records again. While they could have imported those records into the local catalog, Jim decided to hold off on importing the records. This was because their institutional catalog still had good Alexander Street Press records that Jim and Kurt had improved, many of which had had extensive authority work done on the 100 and 700 fields, and Jim didn’t want to risk losing any of that work.

Therefore, Jim came up with an authority salvage project using a pair of Connexion macros. This authority salvage project involved outputting the local authority-controlled data from the 100 and 700 fields of his and Kurt’s records into the master OCLC records. The information that they output from the local catalog included the following elements: the OCLC number, the local ILS catalog, the source catalog, and local data in the 100 and 700 fields that they wanted to replace in the OCLC master records.

In addition to the local data from the 100 and 700 fields of these records, Backstage LibraryWorks had also done some authority processing that provided $0 IRIs for the identifiers in the authority fields. If Jim had tried to inject this information from Backstage into the OCLC master records, however, the Backstage authority processing work would have disappeared because the $0 would have canceled it as soon as he had attempted to control the headings. Therefore, Jim morphed the identifiers into $1 real-world objects by doing “surgery” on the stem of each identifier. Jim and Kurt would then append the identifiers into the 100 and 700 strings and morph them into real world object identifiers. In fixing the records, Jim said “a line of the macro food” would include the following elements: the OCLC number, the home catalog number, and the 100 field with the subfield modifications. Some macro food lines also included 700s that would be stacked in tab format and separated with carets. Jim made a disclaimer that as a non-programmer, incorporating characters such as diacritics was a challenge. A solution Jim employed to address this was to use output from UC San Diego’s local catalog that used a curly bracket notation and come up with a diacritic based on how the diacritics should look through the macro. He then fed the data into the macro, with a file of about 500 records at one time. Another macro would check authority control, and if that macro did not work perfectly, Jim could manually fix the data. From then Jim was able to replace the master records in OCLC and bring the fixed records back into the catalog. Jim and Kurt fixed over 6,900 records last year using this Connexion macro method, as well as over 1,500 additional records earlier this year.
Universally Remote: Cataloging Digital Collections with the Help of Student Employees by Clare Spitzer (Stanford University)

In this presentation, Clare Spitzer, the Sound Archives Metadata Librarian at Stanford University, discussed a remote cataloging project for collections of digitized sound recordings that she has had her student employees work on since the onset of the pandemic. She noted that this project has been especially engaging for her student employees because they have been able to work on digital collections from genres of music in which they are interested. One of her student employees, who has shown great interest in classical music, has worked on the Judith Rosen Collection, which consists of 226 digitized recordings of performances, lectures, and radio programs that have a particular focus on 20th century music and music of female composers. This employee has also worked on the Kirsten Flagstad Collection, which consists of 87 digitized recordings of the Wagnerian opera singer’s interviews, recording sessions, and performances. Another student employee has shown keen interest in jazz music and has worked on the Reese Erlich Jazz Programs and Interviews Collection, which consists of 184 digitized recordings of public radio feature jazz perspectives that profile Latin, jazz, and blues musicians. This student employee has also worked on the Art Vincent Jazz Collection, which consists of 159 digitized recordings, mostly of radio program interviews of artists such as Count Basie, Ray Charles, Frank Sinatra, and Stan Getz.

Clare briefly described the workflow process for this project. First, the student employees were sent home with Excel spreadsheets that contained links to recordings from their assigned collections, as well as columns for recording entities such as names, name authority URIs, roles, and dates. The students would listen to the recordings and look at any accompanying images to ensure that they included every composer, performer, ensemble, and conductor in the spreadsheet. She said they would sometimes add up to 20-30 names in the spreadsheet depending on the collection and recording. After checking their work, Clare would use OpenRefine to merge their spreadsheet with the complete collection MODS spreadsheet. In the collection MODS spreadsheet, Clare would create a new column based on the shared id in each spreadsheet, using the GREL cell cross function to bring in their work. Once all the columns were merged, Clare would add in subject and genre headings and do a bulk update of the collection metadata in the digital repository. Finally, she would release the collections to Stanford University’s online catalog. Clare noted that to date three large digital collections the student employees have worked on have been released, totaling 446 digitized recordings. She anticipates that two more collections will be released in the next month.

Clare concluded that this project has been extremely rewarding for her student employees once they have been able to see the final outcomes of their work.

Julia A. Perry Collection Goes Digital! By Stephanie Sussmeier (Westminster Choir College of Rider University)

In this presentation, Stephanie Sussmeier, the Special Collections and Archives Librarian at Rider University’s Westminster Choir College, discussed the digital collection of prolific African American composer Julia A. Perry, which she noted is her library’s most popular collection. Stephanie opened her presentation with a brief biography of Perry, detailing how Perry had endured many race, gender, and health-related obstacles throughout her lifetime. One particularly trying struggle Perry endured was a stroke that paralyzed her entire right side, which included her then dominant right hand. But instead of letting this stroke discourage her from composing, Stephanie noted that Perry learned to write with her left hand.

Stephanie continued her presentation by discussing her process for selecting objects to be digitized from the Perry collection. Stephanie ultimately decided to choose objects that reflected Perry as a person and composer, focusing on Perry’s music, writing, personal struggles, and accomplishments. Stephanie divided the Perry Digital Collection into the following categories: correspondence, photographs, music compositions, biographical information, programs, and written works.

Next Stephanie briefly described the process for creating this digital collection via ContentDM, the digital collections platform that her institution uses. First Stephanie looked at digitized content and decided which metadata elements she wanted to include, recording the elements in an Excel spreadsheet. After she created the new collection on the server side of ContentDM, she went into the fields section and arranged the desired fields, making sure that the arrangement of metadata was searchable and mapped accordingly. Once she uploaded the digitized content onto ContentDM, she copied and pasted metadata from Excel.
Stephanie recommended shortcuts for inputting this data, such as right clicking the mouse to automatically fill information in, or inputting information via collection or item level. Finally, after all content was filled in, she uploaded the finished content onto the server.

Yo Ho, a Trader’s Life for Me!, or, The Terrible Tales of Traded Tapes in our Special Collections by Thomas Pease (Library of Congress) and Michelle Hahn (Indiana University, Bloomington)

In this presentation Tom Pease of the Library of Congress and Michelle Hahn of Indiana University addressed questions from their abstract about who tape traders are and what their tapes entail.

Michelle: What do traders put on tapes?

Thom: Well I should note that I’m not speaking for the Library of Congress, but I’d say almost anything. Since we’re at a music library conference, the obvious one would be live conferences. But it can be anything off the radio. If you have a reel-to-reel, you’re usually dealing with serious traders, who will put one big thing on a tape and fill it in with whatever else they are interested in (i.e. arias, speeches, interviews) by the same composer or performer.

Michelle: I’ve heard that trader tapes can include recordings of opera rehearsals, unauthorized recordings of orchestra concerts, old school mixed tapes when the trader would hold up the microphone to the radio, or even the sounds of traders snoring at concerts. But how do we get them?

Thom: So these tapes are often times ancillary to collections we actually want—they are the point of the collections. At the Library of Congress, we have the Dana Krummel collection, which consists of reels of musicals recorded in theaters. This collection includes a compilation of television and radio recordings that went along with it as well.

Michelle: Sometimes knowing that the donor was wealthy meant that libraries often accepted the donors’ tape collections regardless because that goodwill was said to follow up with a monetary donation (although this often didn’t happen), or the donor made accepting the tapes from a trader a contingency of their monetary donation.

Thom: Michelle, what would you say are the pros and cons of keeping such collections?

Michelle: Well the tapes can be fairly unique expressions of content. But spending the time describing tapes that the library cannot keep for legal reasons can seem wasteful.

Thom: It takes time to figure out and identify content, and it often takes a master ear to identify the tunes. Ironically this kind of work ends up falling on students or volunteers instead of librarians, who are often the experts on the subject matter.

Michelle: Who all is involved, and what can we do?

Thom: I want to talk about two people: engineers, who often spend large amounts of time figuring out tape configurations, and curators, who appraise the uniqueness of collections. If they can say no to parts of the collection, that would often be ideal.

Michelle: Really everyone is involved and should be involved from the start. Collection developers are looking to build in areas of interest. Administrators and development officers are looking for wealthy donors who will follow up with money. But reference, collection, and circulation personnel field and access requests about tapes, and catalogers must dedicate production time to tapes. Including everyone right away will help them all understand the broader financial implications like paid time of affected staff. If everyone is not included right away, it can have a severe negative impact on morale that will lead to even larger financial issues.

Thom: From a preservation point of view, you really have to decide what is most important to preserve and consider the conservation techniques materials from these collections might entail, such as winding reels, preparing splices, and keeping inserts with original boxes. When cataloging material, MARC may not be the quickest way to get it done. Inventories and finding aids would be helpful, and we should encourage donors to provide inventories.

Michelle: Is that even legal?

Michelle then noted that she and Thom would be compiling a longer video shortly to address the last question and other questions from their abstract in greater detail.

All Second Session Lightning Talk Summaries
Submitted by
Chelsea Hoover (Syracuse University)
**Interest Bearing Notes**

**Question:** Many scores are published with accompanying compact discs or, more recently, with access codes for online audio demos or backing tracks. Would a note for accompanying CD belong in field 500 or 501? Would a note such as “Includes demonstration and backing tracks online” belong in field 500, 501, or 530?

**Answer:** If your institution’s choice is to catalog the score and CD together, the accompanying CD would properly be accounted for in field 300 subfield $e, with appropriate 006, 007, and 33X fields. Depending upon the situation, any additional information about the CD could be included in a field 500 (if the information is of a general nature, as exemplified in #1096233832: “Accompanying audio disc contains performances of the songs”); field 520 (if the information is part of a more involved summary of the resource, such as found in #1057373142: “Method teaching saxophone students in employing contemporary techniques in their playing … The accompanying CD contains two versions of each piece …”); and/or field 505 (if noting the specific contents of the CD is deemed important, as in #975001554: “$g CD contents: …”). In some instances, other fields could also be involved, for example, if named performers are to be identified in field 511, “On accompanying CD: Claudia Benacchiutti, guitar” (#954466108). If your institution chooses to catalog the score and CD separately, generally I’d suggest using field 500 in each record to indicate the relationship between the individual resources. This is especially the case if both the score and CD may truly stand alone bibliographically. If appropriate, consider also the use of linking field 777 (Issued With Entry). Accompanying online access codes would best be accounted for in field 500. A typical example would be a 500 note such as found in #1200835485, “Includes code to access online audio files,” or something along those lines. Again, depending upon the situation, field 856 with the URL may also make sense.

**Punctuation MARC**

**Question:** When inputting the 383 field with a subfield $a and subfield $b, BFAS and MARC 21 have a comma between the subfields.

383 no. 2, $b op. 7

RDA MLA BP has it as follows without the comma:

383 no. 2 $b op. 7

Which is correct/preferred way?

**Answer:** Toward the bottom of the BFAS 383 page (https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/3xx/383.html), we explain OCLC’s suggestions regarding punctuation specifically in field 383. But for context, there is also the more general policy in BFAS 2.8 (https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/onlinecataloging.html#punctuation). You may choose to omit punctuation at the ends of subfields (Leader/18, Desc value “c” for ISBD Punctuation Omitted) or include punctuation (Leader/18 Desc value “i” for ISBD). See BFAS “Desc: Descriptive Cataloging Form” (https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/fixedfield/desc.html) for those details. This is in accord with the PCC Guidelines for Minimally Punctuated MARC Records (https://www.loc.gov/aba/pec/documents/PCC-Guidelines-Minimally-Punctuated-MARC-Data.docx). That’s a long way of saying either practice is correct depending upon your choice of policy and Desc coding. As we say in BFAS 2.8, the omission of ISBD punctuation appears to be the direction in which things are headed, but you may follow either practice.
Questions and Answers, cont.

Disconcerting Duration Discrepancy Dilemma Discussed

Question: I have come across a timely piece of music, Bolcom’s Fanfare for a New President, with conflicting durations printed on the resource itself. While the WorldCat record has the 1:15 duration recorded in the 306/500 fields per the caption on the resource, the title page of the score displays “Duration ca 3’.” I feel that this discrepancy should certainly be pointed out in the bibliographic record, but which of these durations should be recorded in the 306/500 fields: the pre-existing 1:15 already recorded in the WorldCat record taken from the caption, or the 3’ found on the resource’s title page?

Answer: How timely can you get? And if there was ever an occasion for a fanfare ….. Although there doesn’t appear to be any direct guidance in RDA or anywhere else obvious, RDA 7.22.1.5 includes an example that might hint at something:

Running time given as 155 min. on container
Duration stated on manifestation that has an actual duration of 113 min.

Not much to go on, but the discrepancy certainly seems to be worth accounting for in a 500 note. How you word it is up to you and possibly how the durations are stated on the resource itself, perhaps:

Duration given as 1:15 on the caption, but as ca. 3’ on title page.

If both duration statements are in a quotable form, that’s another option. Bolcom’s website (https://www.williambolcom.com) refers to the Keiser Southern Music site for information on his band music (https://keisersouthernmusic.com/composers/william-bolcom). Disconcertingly (pun intended, of course), the entry for the Fanfare says: “Duration (minutes): 2” (https://keisersouthernmusic.com/compositions/fanfare-new-president-band-fs). Because RDA 7.22.1.2 says that the duration may be taken from any source, you could even add this information into the mix, and to the note. Field 306 is optional, so you could choose to simply bypass the dilemma and omit it. If you want to include it and there’s some way you can determine which of those durations is more likely to be closest to reality, you may choose to code that in field 306. Or you could follow the MARC tradition when a duration is stated as a range by coding for the longer duration. At this point, the answer to your question is longer than the work itself. Strike up the band already.

On the Wrong Track

Question: I have a question about something I’m not finding in Bibliographic Formats and Standards or in the RDA Toolkit. What is the correct terminology in field 347 subfield $b$ for an audio recording on LP? I want to guess “LP audio” since “CD audio” is used for CDs, but I don't want to add this incorrectly.

For Music Scholars, Librarians, Performers, Faculty Members

Notes
Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association

Your Indispensable Companion For:
• Scholarly Articles
• Music Reviews
• Book Reviews
• Music Reviews
• Digital Media Reviews
• Lists of New Publications
• Advertisements for Books, Recordings, Scores, Journals, and Other Services

SUBSCRIBE NOW
Notes is available through membership in the Music Library Association. Annual membership begins at $140 for individuals, with special rates available for paraprofessionals, students, retirees and early career librarians. Institutional memberships begin at $175.

For more information on joining MLA, visit our website:
https://www.musiclibraryassoc.org

Information on memberships is also available from the MLA Business Office:
1600 Aspen Commons, Suite 100
Middleton, WI 53562
mla@aredinate.com

Contact the Business Office for information on back issues of Notes.

OLAC
Catalogers Network

Founded in 1990, OLAC is an organization for catalogers concerned with all types of nonprint materials, including a wide range of digital and physical resources like video and sound recordings, websites, maps, multimedia, streaming media, graphic materials, and realia.

Through conferences, workshops, publications (including OLAC’s notable best practices guides), and the electronic discussion list, catalogers exchange information and enjoy expert and practical advice on cataloging nonprint resources.

For more information, visit
http://www.olacinc.org

Personal membership: $40
Institutional membership: $50
Contributing membership: $75

Visit http://olacinc.wildapricot.org
and click “Join/Renew”
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal Membership is $40.00; institutional membership is $50.00. Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members will also receive any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>____________________________________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREFERRED ADDRESS</td>
<td>____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK PHONE ( )</td>
<td>FAX NUMBER ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION NAME</td>
<td>____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION TITLE</td>
<td>____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-MAIL ADDRESS</td>
<td>____________________________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A check payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP must accompany this application. Rates are as follows:

- $40.00 Personal Membership
- $50.00 Institutional Membership

Due to COVID, please contact Treasurer Melissa Moll for a mailing address at melissa-moll@uiowa.edu.