Let me begin by expressing how extremely honored and excited I am to serve as MOUG Chair – MOUG is naturally close to my heart as a cataloger, but it is so much more! The June newsletter, traditionally devoted to coverage of the annual meeting, provides a view of the breadth of MOUG as an organization and of its members’ interests and creativity.

Speaking of the annual meeting, MOUG hosted its second virtual meeting this past February. Even with a modest registration fee, registration numbers exceeded expectations. Many thanks to Continuing Education Coordinator Kevin Kishimoto (Stanford University) and Secretary/Newsletter Editor Heather Fisher (Saginaw Valley State University). Many thanks for your service to MOUG! With that farewell, two new people join the Executive Board: Continuing Education Coordinator Margaret Corby (Kansas State University) and Secretary/Newsletter Editor Linda Bagley (Normandale Community College).

Welcome, Margaret and Linda!

If you are interested in serving MOUG, please watch for upcoming calls for a new Web Editor, Nominations Committee members, and candidates for our next election (Treasurer-Elect, Reference, Discovery, and Collection Coordinator, and Vice-Chair/Chair Elect).
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MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue. The Newsletter is a publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. It is published three times a year: June, September, and December. Editor: Linda Bagley, Normandale Community College Library, 9700 France Ave S, Bloomington, MN 55431.

Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be submitted electronically in Word. Articles should be consistent in length and style with other items published in the Newsletter. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged. Correspondence on subscription or membership (including change of address) should be forwarded to Jeff Lyon, MOUG Treasurer. Email or call the Treasurer for the physical mailing address if needed. (Dues are $40.00 for personal members, $50.00 for institutional subscriptions; back issues from the Treasurer for $5.00 per copy.) A copy of the quarterly financial report is available from the Treasurer on request. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.

The Music OCLC Users Group is a 501(c)(3) non-stock, nonprofit association organized for these purposes: (1) to establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC products, systems, and services and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users; (2) to encourage and facilitate the exchange of information between OCLC and members of MOUG; between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general between members of the Group and similar user organizations; (3) to promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards; and (4) to provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group. MOUG’s FEIN is 31-0951917.

MOUG-L: MOUG-L is an electronic discussion list for the dissemination of information and the discussion of issues and topics of interest to music library professionals and users of OCLC products and services. To subscribe to MOUG-L, send an e-mail to listserv@lsv.uky.edu with the subject line blank. In the body of the message type: SUBSCRIBE MOUG-L <your name>

MOUG Website: http://www.musicoclcusers.org
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From the Chair
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What is next for MOUG? The Executive Board will meet this summer to chart a course for the next year and I will provide an update on the Board’s work in the September issue.

Finally, MOUG is YOUR organization – please do not hesitate to contact me, or any of the Executive Board members with your comments, questions, and suggestions. I look forward to hearing from you!

Stay tuned!
MOUG needs a new Web Editor!
Wondering what the Web Editor does? Well, in brief, they are responsible for maintaining, editing, and managing the MOUG website.
Watch for more details about the Web Editor position, as well as a call for applications, which will be sent out on MOUG-L soon!

Call for Nominations for the 2023 Distinguished Service Award

Nominations are being accepted for the 2023 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 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 Michelle Hahn via e-mail (mkhahn@salisbury.edu). Nominations and accompanying statements must be received no later than Friday, July 15, 2022. The Executive Board will select an award recipient at its summer Board meeting.
I. Introductions from the Chair
   A. Explanation of MOUG’s identity.
   B. Considerations for time of the meeting.
      a. Reports are in print form to save time.
      b. Use Q and A to make opinions and to vote.
      c. Will only ask for negative votes and abstentions in the Q and A.
   C. Motion to adopt the agenda
      a. Motion made by Lynn Jaffe
      b. Seconded by Anne Adams
      c. No opposed or abstentions
      d. Motion carried
   D. Minutes approval motion:
      a. No corrections requested
      b. Motion made by Bruce Evans
      c. Seconded by Anne Adams
      d. No opposed or abstentions
      e. Motion carries

II. Ralph Papakhian Travel Grant
   A. Award includes free conference registration and one-year complimentary MOUG membership
   B. 2021 Annual Meeting
      a. No award due to no registration fee charged
   C. 2022 Annual
      a. Awarded to Amit Feldberg (Music Catalog Librarian, Felicja Blumental Music Center and Library, Tel Aviv, Israel)

III. Acknowledgment of first-time attendees

IV. Chair’s report
   A. Election results
      a. Linda Bagley – Secretary / Newsletter Editor
      b. Margaret Corby – Continuing Education Coordinator
      c. Chair thanks Jennifer Martin who stood for election

V. Treasurer’s Report
   A. Highlights:
      a. Financial stable over the last 2 years (pandemic)
      b. Lots of new members
      c. 2022 budget with a modest surplus
      d. Total assets for calendar year 2021 grew
   B. Bank transition.
      a. MOUG moving from Bank of America (BoA) to First Internet Bank (FIB).
      b. FIB has higher interest rates and an easier process for changing signatories.
         i. This was a recommendation from the 2014 Financial Planning Working Group paper.
      c. Opening two CDs ($15,000 each) on 12- and 18-month terms.
   C. Operations income
      a. Personal memberships – 50%
      b. Institutional subscriptions – 32%
         i. Showing an increasing reliance on personal memberships
      c. Papakhian and General Fund donations grew.
   D. 2021 operations expenses
      a. Newsletter – 58%
      b. Website – 25%

(Continued on next page)
c. Question from membership: What is the possibility of an e-newsletter?
   i. Has been under discussion for a few years
   ii. Dependent on servers and contracts with Ebsco
   iii. Concerns on how institutional members would have access

E. Membership
   a. Currently have 10 more memberships than this time last year (all personal).
   b. Two members passed away last year
      i. Marguerite J. Iskenderian (Brooklyn College)
      ii. Neil Hughes (Ret. University of Georgia)

F. Issues for future consideration
   a. Guest checkout options for registration
   b. Budgeting for hybrid meetings

G. Final comments
   a. Sent $1,000 courtesy payment to MLA
   b. Jeff Lyon begins term as Treasurer

H. Moll thanked for her report.

VI. Continuing Education Coordinator report
   A. Thanks to the Program Committee
      a. Members included: Sonia Archer-Capuzzo, Reed David, and Felicia Piscitelli
   B. Conference preparations
      a. Decided relatively early to go virtual
      b. Platforms were evaluated and Hopin was deemed best for MOUG’s needs
      c. Will send a post meeting survey.
         i. There will be a question about the Hopin platform.
      d. 126 registrants this year.
         i. Half of last year’s registrants but speaks to the dedication of the group (since there was a cost this year)

C. Question from membership: Is MOUG going to continually not be attached to MLA Conference?
   a. Answer: Under discussion as hybrids are more expensive.
   b. Acknowledge that it is easier for some to be able to submit MLA/MOUG as one PD/travel request.
   c. Also looking at the character of MOUG (the comradery that is formed in the in-person meetings) vs losing those who can’t afford/aren’t allowed to go to on-site.

D. Kishimoto thanked for his report.

VII. Library of Congress report
   A. Print report not available at time of meeting.
   B. Library of Congress Personnel Updates
      a. Carla Arton is now Head of the Recorded Sound Section of the National Audio-Visual Conservation Center, Library of Congress
      b. Amy Strickland is the new Head of the Processing Unit for Bibliographic Access for the Recorded Sound Division.
      c. Janice Young has left the Policy Office and is now a librarian in the US Anglo Division.
         i. Veronica Barrens is temporarily filling in at the Policy Office.
   C. Policy Office Updates
      a. Completed metadata guidance documentation for use with RDA in December 2021
         i. Intended for showing more detailed examples
   D. Music Division Updates
      a. New Bibframe editor introduced in summer 2021 (called AFMA)
      b. Library of Congress Demographic/Group Terms (LCDGT) entering new phase.
         i. Music library community can now start submitting terms.
      c. Boxed notated music copyright deposits from 1870-present (roughly 31,000 boxes) moved to climate-controlled facility
      d. The public can request and see them in the Performing Arts Reading Room.
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2022 Business Meeting Minutes

e. Catalogers dealt with over 300 records for music in the collection published before 1700.
f. The Processing Area dealt with over 500,000 records and 54 finding aids in the last year.
g. Digital projects launched 6 digital collections.
   i. A warning some of the musical theatre collections include minstrel collections that have negative stereotype language.

E. Impact of Music Modernization Act
   a. A patron wrote a request on January 7, 2022 for a 1915 recording.
   b. Without the Music Modernization Act, the recording would have entered the public domain in 2067. Patron can now access it.

F. Question from membership: Will LC update online access to things like sheet music as the copyright barrier advances?
   a. Answer: No.

VIII. Other business:
   A. Announcements
      a. Anna LoPrete is stepping down as web editor.
      b. A posting for the position will be forthcoming.
   B. No other new business.

IX. Thanks
   A. The Chair thanked the MOUG Executive Board, especially Kevin Kishimoto (outgoing CEC) and Melissa Moll (transition to Past Treasurer).
   B. Thanks to Fisher (outgoing Secretary/Newsletter Editor) who completes her term.

X. Moment of silence in memoriam for Marguerite Iskenderian and Neil Hughes.

XI. Adjournment
   A. Motion made by Bruce Evans
   B. Seconded by Reed David
   C. No opposed or abstentions
   D. Motion carries

Meeting is adjourned at 12:58pm by the Chair.
Thanks to headline-making stories of families finding relatives unknown to them, most people think of DNA when thinking of the genealogy website Ancestry.com.

However, the site can also help catalogers and authority record editors to establish identities. Cawelti set out to show how to use the site for this purpose.

Ancestry.com requires a subscription for its two editions - the personal edition or the library edition. The Library edition is a bit more simplified than the personal edition, which offers more robust collections.

Cawelti recommends starting with “New Collections.” One asset of searching a specific record collection is that the user can search it separately from the general search. This allows the user to find out if the person being researched is contained in the collection. On the specific record collection’s homepage, examine the “About” section that provides specific details about the records, which will give clues as to if the person is contained in the collection. Use the keyword search in the new collections search. Location, date, and type filters are further down on the screen to help narrow down results. She recommends users clear the filters when moving from one search to another.

Transcription errors can appear. They often happen at the initial data intake (usually by a third party), or when transcribers are reading unfamiliar handwriting.

Cawelti demonstrated how she used Ancestry.com with Mary P. Bartlett, who compiled a bound volume of sheet music with several Boston sellers’ stamps. Cawelti searched for birth records with a date limiter of born +/- 10 years from 1815 (Cawelti was estimating what Bartlett’s age would be). She then checked to make sure three other records confirm the information in the original record, which she recommends for establishing birth and death dates. Cawelti believed she found a record showing Bartlett being born in 1823. She tried the same search used before but changed the birth year to 1823. She then added Bartlett’s middle initial. This brought Cawelti’s results list down to seven results. Cawelti mentioned that users may run into some verification difficulties due to women using different last names once married.

When working in the general search, Cawelti suggests checking which name limiter would be best. Ancestry.com uses name limiters “exact,” “exact and sounds like,” and soudex, among others. Wildcards are accepted in the search boxes, but users must use at least three letters when searching.

The Learning Center in the Library Edition provides searching guides to popular topics. Cawelti recommends reading through the guides for African American and German searches.

Cawelti mentioned she also found the International African American Museum Center for Family History helpful with her research.

An audience member commented that users should also keep in mind some common issues, such as there will be content excluded if dates are in search results. Also, some records will show that the person might have given an incorrect age (for example, when enlisting for wartime military service.)

When adding the Ancestry.com information to authority records, Cawelti uses the Ancestry.com information citation as a 670 field in the authority record. (For example, 670 |a 1850 US Federal Census |b Minnesota, Hennepin, Minneapolis, District 4). Cawelti does not include |u with the URL since Ancestry.com information is proprietary. Users were reminded to not use addresses for authority record subjects still living.

Cawelti has compiled a document with helpful Ancestry.com tips that is available at the following URL: https://bit.ly/MOUG_Ancestry_tips

If members would like to contribute tips to the document, they are encouraged to contact Cawelti at cawelti@fas.harvard.edu.

Submitted by
Heather Fisher
(Saginaw Valley State University)
Sharing the Joy of Music: A Music Cataloger’s Guide to Training Library Staff with Limited Music Expertise

Wanda Rosinski (University of Tennessee, Knoxville)

As music specialists, we’re familiar with concepts such as vocal scores, critical editions, and ISMNs. However, often library staff who don’t have music expertise are called upon to work with music materials as part of their jobs, and their unfamiliarity with music concepts can lead to confusion and errors. Wanda Rosinski developed a training for her colleagues in acquisitions, cataloging, processing, interlibrary lending, and systems to familiarize them with the music concepts they need to understand so they can do their jobs effectively and avoid costly and time-consuming errors.

Without training, acquisitions staff may order the wrong materials or even duplicates of what the library already owns. Money is wasted and time is lost in getting users the items they want. Staff in acquisitions who aren’t familiar with music may not be aware that a given piece of music can be available in many manifestations or arrangements that are not interchangeable. Staff may order the wrong manifestation that seems sufficiently similar to what was requested but will actually not meet the user’s needs.

Wanda’s training sought to help staff read catalog records more effectively when searching OCLC. She talked about the music concepts that can be confusing to staff who do not have a music background: different formats of notated music such as scores, parts, and vocal scores; different editions such as critical editions or those edited by a particular musician; and generic titles that are difficult to search for. In addition, there are potential language barriers with titles and other terminology that may appear in unfamiliar foreign languages. Since preferred titles for music can be nonintuitive, she also taught search strategies for finding musical works with generic titles, and explained that even works with distinctive titles such as Stravinsky’s Rite of Spring can be hard to find because their titles may appear in one of multiple different languages. The many different types of standard numbers that appear on publishers’ websites are also a source of confusion for staff, and Wanda taught her colleagues how to search on the correct indexes to get results.

Wanda shared her slides that were used for a recent staff training. She defined different score formats and their purposes; explained the various types of publisher’s numbers and other identifiers recorded in catalog records; showed the types of edition statements that may appear in music records; displayed a table showing the types of formats frequently requested and how they will appear in a 300 field; and finally displayed several examples of scores and catalog records together with explanations of the relevant fields.

Many of Wanda’s examples related to acquisitions and ILL obtaining a different item than the user requested, but she also talked about how a lack of understanding of music concepts hinders the ability of systems staff to serve our patrons, such as a lack of granularity available in filtering search results to limit by different score formats. Processing staff also need to be aware of how music materials are used so that they won’t, for instance, bind a set of parts together into one volume.

Wanda reported that after doing this training in 2019, the library saw an improvement in workflow efficiency and accuracy. She did the training again in 2022 for newly hired employees. She also created a training guide for staff to consult. Wanda emphasized the benefits of all staff who work with music materials getting this kind of training to help our library workflows work more efficiently. Even within the detail-oriented realm of library work, music materials require staff to be particularly detail-oriented.

Submitted by
Michelle Cronquist
(University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)
This year’s Ask Everything session was a lively discussion, facilitated by Ricky Caboverde. Some relevant and substantive contributions from the audience/chat have been included here to reflect the full conversation.

**Question:** Kathy - re the RDA log-in change, does that also apply to log-in to the toolkit via Connexion?

**KG:** This came from ALA Publishing, so I’m not sure. If you’re looking for the original toolkit, you will need to navigate there from the landing page.

**(Chat):** The instruction is to click "log in" without filling in username and password. This is really difficult to do, since it autofills every time. I haven't been able to get it to work yet. (And local IT is trying to help too.)

**Q:** Jay—is there a fix to the macro for generating authority records in sight?

**JW:** It’s on our to-do list.

**Q:** Jay—What is the timeline of Connexion? Wondering when we should upgrade to 3.0.

**JW:** You’re welcome and encouraged to upgrade any time. I believe most of the problems we’ve encountered have been solved; the ones I know of, anyway. We’ve been encouraging people who use the browser to move over to Record Manager.

**(Chat):** The macro issue is the only problem I'm having with CNX 3.0. Everything else works fine with it.

**(Chat):** If you're talking about the one created by Gary Strawn, he's put a note in his downloads that he hasn't been able to figure out the issue, and it's better than the OCLC supplied macro so it would be great if it would be fixed.

**Q:** Some of this has been already said on the listserv and some I already know, but it would be good to have some more clarity on what we should be doing with the new 348 $c Form of musical notation. It is preferred that we use the 348 field, but can 546 $b still be used with it? What will OCLC be doing with records retroactively, if anything?

**JW:** This is an issue for those who are working on the MLA Best Practices and MLA policy statements. For now, I think it would be wise for catalogers to use both 348 $c and 546 $b. Some systems may not accommodate or display both.

**DI:** From a technical perspective, there's no way to identify the source term of 546 $b. The advantage of using 348 $c is that the vocabulary can be specified, so that can be converted to linked data.

**JW:** What we do with records retroactively will depend on what the Best Practices become.

**(Chat):** The current draft BPs say to use 348 $c if a controlled vocabulary term is available. If no controlled vocabulary term is available, we left it open as to whether 348 $c or 546 $b is chosen. That's not set in stone, though.

**Q (follow-up):** In regard to the 348/546 question, if your library is not showing the 300 fields to the patron (except for the first one), would it be better to leave the information in the 546 even if it is redundant?

**Kevin Kishimoto:** Yes.

**(Chat):** 34[8]/546—"Staff notation" is generally not useful to users, but other sorts of notation are. So display does matter.

**Q:** I came across my first set of concert programs. Are these considered a serial even though they're not published on a regular basis?

**DI:** Something doesn’t have to be regular to be a serial. You could treat concert programs as a serial. Or as a multipart item if it’s a series of concerts for a festival.

**(Chat):** Ooh, I have a lot of answers to that question about programs! Get in touch: michellekhahn@gmail.com

**Q:** This may be more of a NACO question, but are we allowed to edit Name Authority Records with 024 7 URIs? (I think I remember there was a moratorium on changing some of these). What if we need to change fields that have URIs in them?


**Q:** How do we deal with machine harvested digital repository items that come from a different schema and do not map correctly to MARC fields?
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**KK:** My non-expert advice – I think if you’re going to import it into your catalog, you’re going to have to edit them locally.

**JW:** Well, if you can edit the record, we’d be happy to have you edit with the resource in front of you. Harvesting is miraculous when it works – I guess even a mess when it works. A lot of those [repository items] are on the mixed materials format, so if you are able to, change that to the correct format and then edit the record as you see fit. If you are not able to change the type code, you can email us and we will change the type, and you can edit the record.

**Q:** Are they ever planning on updating the harvesting software so it does a better job?

**JW:** That would be nice, wouldn’t it? I’m not sure to what extent that would be possible. As I understand it, it has more to do with the capabilities of the originating schema, usually Dublin Core. The trouble comes from trying to convert something as general from Dublin Core to something as specific as MARC21.

**Q:** Kathy—what are the latest developments with "representative expressions"?

**KG:** RDA has it defined. [...] I found my notes on MARC Proposal 2022-04: It was approved as written with the addition of "characteristics" to the name of the 387 field. It now has to go through a long process of various organizations and systems approving it and making changes, and it could take 6-12 months from when MAC approves a change to when OCLC implements it.

**JW:** In recent years, we’ve been doing updates 2-3 months after approval.

**Q:** The only thing I use Connexion browser for is to attach Local Holding Records, and my understanding is that I can’t do it in client. Do you know how I will be able to handle this?

**JW:** The browser isn’t going away any time soon. If you’re only using it occasionally, you can continue to use it, probably for years. My understanding is that Record Manager does handle LHRs and also Local Bibliographic Data.

**Q:** How are things going with arrearages at LC?

**DI:** Because people are limited with on-site work, our copyright arrearage has grown. In January, we started cataloging nothing but monographs just to catch up. In the Music Division, we’re not backed up very badly. Things have been coming to the Copyright Office more slowly, and then going to the selectors more slowly.

Another note: we won’t add graded band or orchestra below a certain grade, and we won’t add children’s methods books. If there’s a huge number of parts, we’ll just keep the score. When we surplus stuff, there are band organizations in the DC area that will come and take surplus to use.

**Q:** When I save a new record in Connexion browser, the 386 fields disappear. Why?

**JW:** I have no idea! The next time that happens, you should report that to the OCLC global helpdesk/customer service, and they’ll pass it on, probably to us. I know that the browser cannot handle non-Latin characters, but other than that, offhand I don’t know what the problem is.

**Q:** With the new DCRMR, many of us haven’t yet adopted the new RDA toolkit. What is the advice for use until the new toolkit is approved locally (not to mention by the PCC)?

**KG:** I have not had a chance to look at DCRMR. I assume the people who are writing DCRMR know that people are not using the new toolkit yet, so that may be a question for them.

(Chats): The DCRMR preface says the old versions will not be deprecated and can continue to be used with the original Toolkit and/or AACR2.

**Q:** My library is developing a discovery layer that, at the moment, lacks a lot of the functionality necessary for music discovery. I believe it converts MARC to BIBFRAME. It doesn’t display analytical entries, for example. Any advice for advocating for music discovery in general?

(Chats): To the last question asked: the MLA Music Discovery Requirements is a great resource to cite for advocacy purposes. See: https://musicolcusers.org/resources/discovery-reference-collections/
https://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/BlankCustom.asp?page=mdr_es
http://doi.org/10.1353/not.2013.0017

**Q:** LC-PCC PS for preferred titles of aggregates of musical works in the new Toolkit seems to be basically the same as the Music Division policy announced in the May 2020 edition of MCB. Does that mean the Music Division policy (reducing use of CCTs [conventional collective titles] in favor of aggregate titles) is essentially being expanded to cover all music in LC/BIBCO records?

**DI:** Truthfully, it’s been so long since I wrote those LC policy statements, it may be that I incorporated what LC...
David Reed, Cataloging Librarian at Washington State University (WSU), began the first round of lightning talks by giving an overview of a database maintenance project he worked on remotely. Having always worked with physical materials, March 2020 was the first time he had needed to find something to work on at home. With the help of his supervisor he was able to land on a project revising enumeration and chronology information in item records for the WSU Music Library.

To explain this project he began by describing Alma, WSU’s current ILS, which is web-based. There are 4 tabs in item records: General, ENUM/CHRON (enumeration and chronology), Notes, and History. Within General, there is a field for description that is intended to be human readable information for enumeration and chronology. This information would also appear on the spine call number label as, for example, volume and number for a serial. The General tab has space for 2 levels each of enumeration and chronology information that is intended to be machine readable, entered as numbers only. More complex information can be added in the ENUM/CHRON tab, which has 8 levels of enumeration information and 5 levels of chronology. The Notes tab contains a public note that is visible to patrons and a fulfillment note for circulation staff members.

WSU migrated from Millennium to Alma in 2013. Because there are no holdings records in Millennium, all enumeration and chronology item information was exclusively stored in the item record’s description field, which remains the case for many items following the migration.

In 2019, another cataloging librarian identified these item records and compiled spreadsheets that were assigned to everyone in the department so that these items could be corrected. Because more urgent tasks had been prioritized, by mid-March David had reviewed just over 400 of 4912 items in the music library. While working remotely, however, this became one of the projects that he’d work on every day.

Reed sometimes found information in the description field that actually belonged in public or fulfillment notes. There were also some series whose volumes are cataloged separately that had volume numbers in the description field when it should have been in the call number in the holdings record. Some problems were unresolvable without the item in hand and some items needed to be pulled and re-cataloged. Collected editions best illustrated the benefits of this process, and an image was shown of WSU’s OPAC for the collected editions of Telemann’s works before—where users would need to click through several pages, and after—where a user can see all editions at a glance.

Since returning to work in-person last July, the project has continued. Now that issues can be resolved with the item in hand, anything that needs to be re-cataloged has been sent to the main library. Reed feels that he’s gained a deeper understanding of WSU’s Music Library’s collections and how they’ve been cataloged, as well as ideas for future cataloging projects.

Submitted by
Clare Spitzer
(Stanford University)
In this presentation, Felicia Piscitelli discussed issues in cataloging bound-withs after Texas A&M Libraries migrated from Voyager to FOLIO. She clarified that bound-withs are multiple publications that were most likely issued unbound or maybe with a paper wrapper, and that the owner took them all to a book binder so that they would be bound in a single volume. Regardless of the system being used, description of these items can always be troublesome. When Texas A&M migrated from Voyager to FOLIO, which is still in development and had only just gone live a month before this presentation, the issue they ran into was the public display in VuFind. Piscitelli showed 2 diagrams comparing the bound-with models of both systems. In Voyager, the titles are connected at the item level while FOLIO has parent and child records so that titles are connected with a collective record. FOLIO’s model will be changing in the next release, although the parent record will remain.

Next, we saw an example of a record in Voyager. The example was chosen because they have three copies in three different bound-withs. She pointed out the MARC fields with bound-with notes and the three holdings on the left side of the record. She then showed a record of the same example in FOLIO, where the three holdings could be seen at the top of the display, and three dummy records were visible on the right. She explained that while it looks OK in FOLIO, the call number and location are not being properly displayed in VuFind in a title search. This information is, however, displayed for another copy of that title that is not part of a bound-with volume. If a user looks at the larger item description, the bound-with note is displayed, but it is displayed with all other notes. The location and call number can be found in the staff view, but it is unlikely that users would go that far for that information.

One solution to take care of this would be to have separate records for each title with bound-with notes, with holdings and items added to each bib record. The advantage would be complete bibliographic information for each title, the disadvantage being how laborious this could be, especially when a bound-with has many titles. Another solution that’s often done is to have a single record with a very long contents note and maybe 7XXs. While it’s a quick and easy way of doing it, you lose a lot of bibliographic information of the individual pieces. Piscitelli feels that neither are great solutions.

Submitted by
Clare Spitzer
(Stanford University)

The Great American Songbook Foundation is a non-profit organization concentrating on pop, jazz, Broadway, and other popular music styles. The Foundation includes a songbook library, archives, hall of fame, and a number of programming opportunities that aim to provide an interactive, educational, immersive experience for all. The library and archives are housed away from the exhibit space in an office building in Carmel, Indiana.

The library and archives had one staff member until 2021 when they applied for an IMLS grant to hire a project librarian, Anna LoPrete, to start processing the Bethards-Massey collection. This mega-collection incorporates numerous smaller collections from the 75,000 titles collected by Jack Bethards, the 13,000 titles collected by Curt Massey, and several other smaller collections. These are collections from NBC radio studios in multiple cities from when these stations used to house live orchestras. These radio station collections were combined with the Paramount Theatre’s collection of popular music in Oakland, California. The collection covers Hollywood, popular music, as well as standards played between 1890-1950 either live or over the radio.

Almost five hundred crates came from the Paramount Theatre to the Great American Songbook Foundation in 2019. The pilot project started by Anna began with one part of the collection (KQW, the oldest and in the worst...
physical shape of the collections) with three goals in mind: (1) to catalog 1,900 items, (2) complete two finding aids, and (3) deaccession duplicates. Anna started with only a 150,000-line spreadsheet and was living 90 minutes away and working from home part time. She continued her presentation with describing some fun finds, issues from processing this collection, and her takeaways.

Anna started the pilot project by considering what the goals for the collection were, how the music was created and used, and how she hoped the arrangements would be played. She wanted to locate all the arrangements of a single song but this proved difficult. The Indiana University performance library call number system, based on LC, was used so that the collection could be shelved together. The items are housed in typic envelopes and labeled with the call number, arranger, composer and any other identifiable information. Before starting at the foundation, Anna worked at the William and Gayle Cook Music Library at Indiana University, and when parts would come back to the circulation desk marked by performers, they would be erased. For this collection she decided to keep any parts with significant markings as well as a clean set. She would sometimes find additional manuscript items in the published envelopes and decided to keep significant items together. When finding arrangements in multiple keys, the foundation decided to keep a full set in all keys. Duplicate parts are set aside and Anna has created a detailed spreadsheet to keep track of everything not cataloged.

Anna gave an example of a reference question where she was able to locate the arrangement a user had requested starting from the Paramount Theatre, so user needs are able to be met by her hard work. Scope is difficult in a collection like this where the line between popular and art music is hazy, and if questions arise, those items are set aside for review. Seventy five percent of the collection required original cataloging and next steps for Anna include working on a processing guide. More information on the Great American Songbook Foundation can be found at: https://thesongbook.org/

Submitted by Victoria Peters (DePauw University)

Treshani Perera (University of Kentucky)

Treshani began by explaining the purpose of the presentation, which is as follows: Inherited projects require a different approach to manage, compared to managing projects you initiated. Inheriting projects can happen due to reorganizations, retirements, someone leaving, or when an employee accepts a new job. Treshani emphasized that she hopes to share how this has worked for her through presenting on two specific projects she had to manage.

Treshani gave the following caveat: This is not a project management workshop, and she is not a certified project manager. There are folks in this community that are much more qualified to talk about project management standards and principles. The purpose of this presentation is to give tips and practical strategies for managing inherited projects. Treshani recommended the Project Management Institute website for those who wish to learn more about project management in depth. She included the website in her list of resources. Treshani then transitioned to cover the four stages of project management.

The first stage is starting, initiating, or pre-planning the project; the second stage is planning the project, which is the stage where you create the project plan and form a project team; the third stage is implementing or executing the project according to the project plan; and the final stage is assessment and completing the project.

Treshani noted that most project management literature assumes that a single project manager will be involved from start to finish. In general, project management best practice recommendations focus on what you should do during the four stages. Treshani has found that these best practices don’t always apply directly to inherited projects. For example, what if you inherited a project with no project plan? You may then need to retroactively create a project plan to use going forward. This also applies to the ab-

Continued on next page}
presence of workflow documentation; you may need to re-create that as well. Due to these complications, you may not be able to hit the ground running on day one, even if your employer would like you to do so. It may take weeks or months to restart an in-progress project.

Treshani spent the rest of the presentation covering the strategies she has taken to manage two large scale projects that she inherited upon arrival at the University of Kentucky four years ago. Both projects are nearly completed.

The projects that she inherited in the Fine Arts Cataloging Unit at UK Libraries are as follows: 1) Lair Sheet Music Collection, and 2) School of Music Recording Collection. She managed the arrangement and description aspects of these projects.

Treshani then covered specific information about each project. The Lair Sheet Music Collection is a large donation from John C. Lair covering popular music and songs from the late 19th century through the early 20th century. Collection processing and metadata work is completed. The collection consists of nearly 10,000 pieces of vocal and instrumental sheet music. The project team was made up of one staff member and one student, in addition to Treshani (the project manager). Most of the work to be done is at her level, which is reviewing subject heading notation form that time they’re retaining going forward. The second speaker, Nara Newcomer (University of Missouri, Kansas City), will focus on discovery and ILL, and interesting correlations between the two from the pandemic. The third speaker, Jay Holloway (OCLC) will talk about WorldCat-related end-user solutions; OCLC’s efforts with equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility; and OCLC’s library-on-demand roadmap. A side note of interest: Kevin noted that Nara is heavily involved in a migration from Sierra to FOLIO at UMKC.

(Continued on page 17)
Suzanne stated that when the pandemic began and the students were sent home during Spring Break (March 2020), Yale scrambled to make as much available online as possible, primarily through adjusting search parameters on Quicksearch (Yale’s local Blacklight iteration) to prioritize online resources, such as locally digitized resources, Hathi Trust, and Internet Archive. They will preserve access to Hathi Trust and Internet Archive when Hathi Trust’s Emergency Library goes away. They have also maintained preferences for purchasing online ebooks and online course reserves over print.

Also at the pandemic’s outset, they implemented contact-free pickup, and in June 2020, a mail to home address service. The mail to home service was really popular, so they’re preserving it as a pilot for this year, and will keep track of costs. They also tried a mail to campus address service, but because of the vicissitudes of campus mail, most people preferred to come to the libraries to pick up their books if they were on campus already. This service was subsequently discontinued.

Suzanne then jumped forward to the fall of 2021, and noted that their Quicksearch Team was able to resume its work on what they had to abandon in January of 2020. They proposed a two-part project. 1) To incorporate finding aids into their discovery layer, and 2) redesign their results landing page.

To incorporate finding aids, they are going to have a new link in faceted browse that will say archives and manuscripts, not to be confused with Yale’s Manuscripts and Archives department, thus the difference in wording. Finding aids search results will be found in this limit. The plan is to eventually have collection level records come from the finding aids database, but they are currently still displaying the catalog, which will require them to dedupe the catalog records for the collection.

Some features of their redesigned results page include different fonts and colors, an index to the boxes or quilt pages below, and format levels at the top levels of resources. Cornell’s discovery layer’s design figured a lot into their redesign.

In preparation for the redesign, they have been doing some user studies, accomplished through the use of heat maps, which Suzanne demonstrated. During the study, they recorded 11,927 clicks on their results page. Some key findings:

- Of the 5000 clicks in the search box, almost half of them immediately change their search.
- Very few people clicked on view and filter books, and full text in articles results, and there were no clicks in the digital collections area. More clicked on the title links.
- A heat map of scrolling behaviors demonstrated how far down people scroll through a results list screen, which unsurprisingly decreases further and further down.
- They recorded 1688 clicks on the advanced search screen. Half of those go back to the basic search box, and only 36 press enter on the advanced search screen, which means very few people are revising their searches in the search boxes on the advanced search screen.
- Some people click on parts of the record that aren’t linked, which Suzanne attributed to “rage-clicking.”

Going forward, they will investigate why people click in areas they didn’t intend for them to click, and how they can steer them towards clicking on different parts of the catalog record or the various facets.

Nara began her presentation by giving a preamble that through the process of changing their discovery layer settings several times over the past two years, they acquired a lot of data demonstrating how discovery layer settings impact ILL usage for musicians and general library patrons alike. She stressed that this whole experience was serendipitous; they did not set out beforehand to collect this type of data. She finished her opening statements by thanking Jen Salvo (Head of Resource Sharing, UMKC) and Buddy Pennington (Head of Systems and Technology, UMKC) for their assistance, including the data that Nara will be presenting to us today.

Nara covered some quick facts about UMKC: 16,000 students (5,000 grad/professional; 1,400 international students), and 94% of undergrads live off-campus. UMKC has 600 students in music, theatre, and dance (UMKC Conservatory). They had no major COVID-related expansions to online subscriptions, although they did have some free trials in spring of 2020.

Nara noted that UMKC’s ILL practices evolved over the course of the pandemic. ILL for emailed items never stopped. Once things opened back up, they had consortial borrowing for physical materials within their state, but ILL
for physical materials everywhere else didn’t resume until April 21st of 2021. This changing availability of various materials led them to make several repeated changes to the default search options in their discovery layer.

In retrospect, they see a strong correlation between discovery layer settings and ILL request volume. Nara examined the correlations via two data points: 1) UMKC’s ILLIAD link-out statistics from their discovery layer, and 2) all ILL requests submitted by their users.

Their discovery layer is EBSCO discovery service from EDS, which she showed is the library homepage search, overlaying their Sierra ILS. Nara showed a search-results screen where the patron is shown various options for fulfillment, getting the item depending on what’s available. Clicking the request button for the one that says “request this item through ILL”, takes you to ILLIAD and populates a request. Each time a user clicks on the link, it will be counted as a link out to ILL regardless of whether or not the user actually completes and submits an ILL request.

Nara then brought up a slide which shows their statistics on those ILLIAD link-outs. And as she noted, throughout COVID they changed that default search several times based on availability of physical and online materials at UMKC and beyond. Nara showed everyone a chart that demonstrated this. To begin, from Fall 2019 through March of 2020, their search defaulted to include all materials, ILL link-outs accounted for 9% of the link-outs from EDS. During COVID’s initial phase – April 2020-Summer 2020 – their holdings were limited to just online materials from UMKC. When folks returned to campus in Fall 2020, only UMKC holdings and physical materials beyond UMKC through their state consortium were available. Because of that, they decided to default the search to UMKC holdings only, both online and physical. During this time, only 0.22 percent of their EDS link-outs were to ILL: 1/40th of the 9% pre-pandemic. During Summer 2021 to December 2021, they had physical ILL back, and so decided to restore the default to include everything. ILL link-outs increased to 11%, back to pre-pandemic levels more or less. The increase is due not only to the resumption of ILL for physical materials, but also to major journal cuts in Summer 2021, which necessitated relying on ILL for materials in discontinued subscriptions.

The second data point Nara presented concerned looking at all ILL requests submitted by their users. The chart demonstrated a natural fluctuation of borrowing, with peaks in March and April, and drop-offs during the summer. The 2020 line follows 2019 until it hits March, and then it plummets, and stays low for the rest of the year. The first part of 2021 is low, but in the summer, when they turn back on the ILLIAD link-outs to include everything. Not much happens in the summer, but by Fall 2021 tracks pre-pandemic 2019.

While it’s not surprising that patrons are going to use the materials that are most readily available to them, these two data-points strongly demonstrate that correlation. Other factors likely influenced ILL usage, such as their journal cancellations, increasing online courses, and that some faculty adjusted research expectations for use of library materials, likely affecting faculties’ teaching methods going forward.

Nara closed with some thoughts and conclusions, making the disclaimer that she’s not suggesting one approach to discovery layer settings over the other, but wanted to take advantage of sharing data that would be challenging to gather without these external constraints that led them to change their search defaults regularly and repeatedly. Here are the conclusions:

- Focusing search on immediately available items helps researchers who need “something” and pushes users to items the library already has access to.
- Focusing search on immediately available items hides relevant content which often can be accessed on a short timeframe (95% of email delivery requests are filled within 72 hours).
- Search settings impact what patrons find and use.

Jay gave a multi-faceted review of WorldCat Discovery developments, beginning with Suite of End User Solutions available through one’s WorldCat Discovery or FirstSearch subscription. Through FirstSearch, you also have access to WorldCat Discovery and Visibility, the latter makes your WorldCat holdings visible on the web through WorldCat.org. The WorldCat Knowledge Base and the Central Index to all of your licensed subscriptions are also accessible through WorldCat Discovery. In summary, these three main services (FirstSearch, WorldCat Discovery, and Visibility) are available through your FirstSearch WorldCat Discovery subscription.

In terms content differences between the platforms, with FirstSearch you search the WorldCat and FirstSearch licensed databases. With worldcat.org, you get access to several more million articles via primarily full-text provid-
one without a project plan, take the time to create one. Using a checklist in tandem with creating the project plan is essential.

3. Project Team: If you don’t have one, get one!
When Treshani inherited the Lare Sheet Music Project, she had one staff member dedicated to it. This person announced their retirement several months later, and so Treshani needed to hire new personnel. Treshani was also hiring a project student assistant at the same time. This was a good time for Treshani to rethink what skills should be present in team members. She prioritized hiring a student member with a music background, which proved to be a good decision, as the staff member did not have a formal music background. In the end, Treshani had one full-time staff member with 30% of their time dedicated to project, along with one part-time graduate music student worker. The collection processing and metadata entry were completed in about three years. If you find yourself in a situation where you don’t have any dedicated staff or students for the project, she recommends advocating for a project team.

This step is tied to the project plan. If you decide to implement a project without a project plan, she recommends at the very least coming up with goals, deliverables, and a possible timeline. This will help you and the rest of the project team stay on track and meet milestones you’ve set. This is especially important for ongoing and large-scale projects, although timelines may be difficult to determine for large-scale projects. The goal of her sheet music collection project was to process the collection, performing metadata entry using modified Dublin Core, with a searchable publicly accessible spreadsheet as the deliverable. Treshani had hoped to finish the project by December 2020, but the timeline was inevitably extended due to the pandemic. Despite COVID-related delays, the work was completed in April 2021.

For the School of Music Recording Collection, Treshani had similar processing goals for collection processing and metadata entry with the deliverable of a searchable collection inventory spreadsheet. The timeline established was only for processing the backlog of unprocessed recordings. Since it’s an ongoing collection, the timeline will be ongoing as well.

5. Changes to project directions (clear communication)
Treshani emphasized that one should be willing to clearly communicate any needed changes to project directions. In her case, she did not make any scope or project direction changes to the sheet music collection, other than responsibilities at the team member level. Previously, the work was done at the staff level, with the project manager reviewing the work, so it was only a two-person project team. When she took over, she changed responsibilities at the various levels. For example, the student was responsible for processing the collection from folders, and transcribing metadata from items. The previously-mentioned new staff member was hired with 30% time dedicated to project. The staff member was responsible for reviewing student work and adding subjects. Treshani created a list of terms appropriate for subject analysis of local music and popular sheet music collections. She reviewed overall staff work and metadata decisions. Delegating responsibilities has helped her focus on higher level responsibilities.

When Treshani took over responsibilities for project management of the School of Music Recording Collection she made several changes, which she felt empowered to do because the project was still in an exploratory stage when she inherited it. So she was able to approach the project as if it were new. The main change was to abandon item level catalog records and go with a modified Dublin Core schema for metadata entry in a spreadsheet format. As a deliverable she prioritized comprehensive collection inventory to assist public services folks with reference requests. Her responsibilities as project manager were limited to physical processing and metadata entry, which also meant that she could keep the scope of the project fairly narrow. She kept her colleagues informed of project progress, as well as scheduling meetings to discuss changes and get their input. As long as you are clearly communicating changes, people will not oppose your professional judgment as the project manager.

Treshani closed by remarking that she hoped that we had learned something new and would think about steps to consider for inherited projects. She hopes it’s helpful for those currently managing projects, and that she has provided helpful information for handling staff retirements or other changes that affect project membership. She then shared her list of resources consulted for her presentation, which can be seen at the end of her presentation slides: https://musicoclcusers.org/wp-content/uploads/Perera_Project_Management_MOUG_2022.pdf

Kevin noted that there were a lot of good suggestions in the chat regarding the use of student workers, including having the students write the documentation. Kevin closed the session by once again thanking Treshani for her presentation.

Submitted by
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ers. And then with WorldCat Discovery you get an additional set of collections for licensed content that require subscriptions to even search. If interested, the full central index list is available at oc.lc/indexDiscovery.

With regards to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Accessibility efforts at OCLC, they have a few key efforts that are impacting WorldCat Discovery in positive ways.

The first is Reimagining Descriptive Workflows (oc.lc/discovery-edi), which provides context and direction for infrastructure enhancements to support inclusive language and practices. This provided a broad framework to WorldCat Discovery community discussions in November-January. These will help guide a multi-phased effort focused on implementing surface-level changes, and later deeper (and more impactful) cataloging practice changes. Surface level changes are due by July, whose main aim will be to enable remapping LCSHs to an alternative heading only in the user interface. This will be available to all WorldCat Discovery users regardless of subscription level.

The second component to this involves continuing WorldCat updates. For example, on November 30th OCLC received updated LCSH vocab and implemented changes to ~41,000 WorldCat records by December 9th. Primary changes include mapping aliens to noncitizens and illegal aliens to noncitizens and illegal immigration. This will be available for global use and local catalogs, not just WMS customers.

The third and final component surrounds accessibility. OCLC believes A is a socially just experience. Therefore, as A standards grow more inclusive OCLC needed to take a look at their technical stack and make changes to support the latest standards. This is a primary driver for WorldCat Discovery modernization. One outgrowth is maximizing displays on mobile devices and tablets. OCLC is also assisting institutions with making inclusive choices through their Accessibility Insights for Web service. Jay demonstrated the service, which suggests improvements to your WorldCat Discovery display to make it more accessible. Accessibility Insights for the Web is supported on all of their modernized pages today. While it’s not legal conformance, it’s a good starting point for understanding accessibility issues, including educational components within it to learn more.

Looking forward, what drives us within the end-user space is the Library On Demand, an effort to bring library services to users on demand, wherever the user is and in whatever way they need it. We know users spend the vast majority of their time outside of library resources, and so we are focusing on making the library-oriented tools like the ones they use outside of the library. The strategy’s three pillars are 1) Intuitive discovery, which means providing predictable search results and experiences through any channel that you might need them, 2) Smart fulfillment according to the user’s preference, and 3) Personalized experiences, that is, providing personalized experiences for specific types of users for their specific needs at a particular time.

One specific outgrowth of Smart Fulfillment is Search Indicators. One example was to take a search results screen where it’s unclear why the specific results came up, and to change it so specific metadata would be promoted to appear in the search results that matched the search terms. This is important because users’ perception of the search results’ relevance is largely based on their understanding of their search results. So the more connections provided between the search terms and the search results the more relevant the experience should feel.

The next Smart Fulfillment feature is Best Access Options. So when there are multiple fulfillment options, such as local or ILL, we want to help users understand when one option might be better than the other, such as when all local copies are checked out it’s best to go with an ILL or group option.

And the third Smart Fulfillment feature is Personalized Experiences. They added more configuration options to suit individual needs, such as search result display order and search filter options.

Other enhancements to WorldCat Discovery include adding support for search history by logging our session searches for quick reference later. This can include search alerts so that if you’re interested in a topic for a long period of time you can create an alert on that topic either through email or RSS, and bringing the user’s items into their account.

Jay then moved onto some highlights of directions OCLC is heading with Intuitive Design.

2021 Search Engine Assessment Pilot. The 80 responses revealed that both relevance and performance need additional optimization. So that means that the time is not right for a new platform just yet, they need a more significant investment to meet user expectations. This has transitioned into a two-phased deliver method. Phase 1 will focus on performance improvements, meaning additional pilots and successfully meeting real world use case scenarios through librarian and user-testing before going live. Phase 2 will focus on significant gains in relevance. OCLC will deliver on that iteratively following Phase 1. So after they get users over to the new platform, they will iteratively introduce new features to improve the platform more rapidly.

Back to smart fulfillment: OCLC wants to continue to optimize Best Access Options. OCLC knows that user preference drives their decision, and delivery time might be an interesting way to help a user make an informed choice.
Optimizations will help users assess how long request would take for a given type of material from a given lender.

And finally, back to personalized experiences. OCLC is looking at how to support diverging needs for the types of users you support. WorldCat has long been optimized for undergrad students that are trying to find known items, but OCLC knows expert searchers need additional functionality. This includes more search results than the current default allows, and some additional precision search tools within the advanced search page. So for novice and expert researchers, they are looking at new ways to meet each group’s specific needs, while also keeping it easy to manage one system with different types of users in mind.

Jay closed with announcing that they launched a new suite of APIs last summer. So for those that are a WorldCat Discovery premium subscribers or WMS users, you get this new suite of APIs to extend your services with WorldCat. One example is creating a bento box search experience, showing you everything that is or isn’t in your local library, embedding new titles lists on your website through new holdings, and creating a citation action through a partnership they have with citation services.

Nara Newcomer closed the session by announcing that if anyone is interested in serving on RDCC, there are openings. If your library has a WorldCat subscription, figure out who the person is at your institution that sets preferences/settings, become friends with them, and then advocate for your needs. A lot of things can be changed.

Submitted by
Bruce Evans
(Baylor University)

Britt Burns, Metadata and Cataloging Librarian at University of Memphis and former music Metadata Specialist at UCLA, discussed how he approached cataloging the large amount of score submissions from Kaleidoscope’s 2020 composition competition, sponsored that year by UCLA. Kaleidoscope is an orchestra that performs without a conductor, and they perform chamber works as well as orchestral works. Composers were given the option to submit up to three works and because the competition was sponsored by UCLA, the normal submission fee of about thirty dollars was waived. Over five thousand score submissions were received.

Around 550 scores were cataloged and those that were not fully cataloged still remain accessible. Of these, one hundred and ten were finalists selected by Kaleidoscope. The remaining cataloged scores were selected mainly by Burns, who tried to select the work that seemed to have the most potential to be played which he figured would have the most value to newer composers.

The goal of the university was to offer as much access to these composers as possible, and to include at least one composition by each composer when possible. Composers were given the option to make their scores open access, although if the work were already owned by a publisher that would not be possible. Some opted not to, and in a few cases, some requested to have their works withdrawn. Because UCLA was publishing these scores, UCLA was used as the publisher in the 264 field. Any other publication information found on the score was included in a 500 note.

While working on these scores, Burns discovered that many had unusual instrumentation which made for a fun challenge in assigning subject headings, with some examples being a work for electronically modified trumpet and electronics, a work for dizi and cello, and a work for horn and video. He also enjoyed working with electronic scores and providing open access for the first time. Overall, Burns enjoyed working on this project and making many of these scores accessible for those who wish to explore and possibly perform them.

Submitted by
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In this presentation, Leonard Martin briefly described the origin of G-funk and its influence on hip-hop in Houston, followed by a discussion of how a lacquer disc test pressing and cassette of a G-funk album were cataloged at the University of Houston Libraries. Gangsta rap music had gained mainstream popularity by the 1990s, influencing television, film, and fashion. G-funk fused gangsta rap music and funk music, featuring both samples or live instruments playing funk, as well as soul and disco samples like other hip-hop works of the time. G-funk started on the west coast, but by the mid-90s musicians and record labels outside of California were also producing G-funk works with regional influences. One label, Houston-based Rap-A-Lot Records, released the works of local and regional gangsta rap music artists with occasional guest features by west coast artists. For example, Houston-based group The Ghetto Boys’ member Willie D released “Play Witcha Mama” featuring west coast rapper Ice Cube in 1994 on Rap-A-Lot Records, which Martin played a clip of.

MC Wickett Crickett (Darrell Veal) was born in Houston in 1959, where he returned after spending his teenage years in New York, and met Willie D in high school. He released his only known official album, “Where U From/ Can I Hit It,” in 1996 on vinyl and cassette. “Where U From,” a G-funk anthem for Houston, features a Parliament Funkadelic inspired bassline by studio bass guitarist and producer Dirtt (Derwinn Parish). The University of Houston’s DJ Screw Sound Recordings Collection contains a lacquer disc test pressing of side A and a cassette of the album.

Martin showed images of the test pressing sleeve with a handwritten note and the disc. The source for the title and contents note were the handwritten disc labels, where publication information could be found, as well. Performers were listed on a handwritten note that was confirmed when compared with the cassette of the full-length album. Martin made a name authority record for Dirrt and updated Wickett Crickett’s record. He went over MARC fields and values used for the test pressing and highlighted that the content note included a censored radio version and uncensored street version with explicit lyrics, common for the era. He also added a local note for provenance, as is done for all items in the DJ Screw Sound Recordings Collection. A partial 382 for rapper was entered, as well as subject headings for Rap (Music) $z Texas $z Houston, Gangsta rap (Music), Funk (Music), and Remixes with their reciprocal genre headings that were identical except for LCSH Remixes and LCGFT Remixes (Music), and the addition of LCGFT Test pressings (Sound recordings).

Martin then showed an image of the J-card insert for the full-length album released on cassette. The lacquer test pressing has the first four tracks featured on side one of the cassette, and side 2 of the cassette includes the screwed version, and so DJ Screw is also added as an additional entry to this record with a relationship designator of remix artist. To conclude, Martin played excerpts of the radio version of “Where U From” from the official album, the Dirrt radio version, and DJ Screw’s chopped and screwed version.

Submitted by Clare Spitzer
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A Tribute to Peter Lisius

MOUG member Peter Lisius (Kent State University) passed away unexpectedly on April 5, 2022. Peter was the music and media catalog librarian at Kent State University, having started there in 2007. Before that, he was a music cataloger for the New York Public Library. Many have had the opportunity to work with Peter or have benefited from his research over the years. He was active in NACO (music and AV), BIBCO, MLA, MOUG, and OLAC, having served as coordinator of OLAC’s NACO-AV Funnel since 2013. Peter was a kind, gentle soul, always with a smile despite life’s challenges.

The family is recommending donations in his memory to either muscular dystrophy or Ukraine Relief.

Rest in peace, Peter.

To read Peter’s full obituary, please visit: https://www.cliffordshoemaker.com/obituaries/peter-lisius-1

Flowers by Mati Carrizales from NounProject.com

A Tribute to Neil Hughes

Neil Hughes (University of Georgia, retired) passed away Thursday, December 30, 2021 after from a stage IV brain tumor. Neil’s contributions to MOUG were many, and he received the MOUG Distinguished Service Award in 2016. Neil served on the Board twice, as Continuing Education Chair and as MOUG Chair. Neil spearheaded several financial initiatives during his term: making several budgetary and treasurer improvements, leading the effort to have MOUG become a 501(c)3 tax-exempt, charitable educational organization, and serving as chair of the Financial Planning Working Group. Outside of MOUG, Neil was an accomplished violist, and active in several professional organizations, including the NACO-Music Project, MLA, and SEMLA. Memories shared by colleagues and friends remembered his witty humor, eloquence, warmth, and generous nature.

The family suggests memorials to Chamber Music Athens, or to the University of Georgia Foundation (include “Neil R. Hughes Memorial Fund” in the memo field).

Rest in peace, Neil.

To read Neil’s full obituary, please visit: https://www.lordandstephens.com/obituary/Neil-Hughes
Failure (to Include) Is an Option

Question: Recently, I've been seeing more and more OCLC records with added 007 fields for scores:
007  q $b u
in addition to the record type already being "score" (Type = c). Is this considered a best practice now, and something that should be more widely adopted? If so, what does this add to the record? I'd appreciate any guidance.

Answer: The Notated Music field 007 is marked as “optional” in both the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data: National Level Full and Minimal Requirements (https://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/nlr/nlr00x.html) and OCLC’s Bibliographic Formats and Standards (https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/007notmus.html). In MLA’s Supplements to Best Practices for Music Cataloging Using RDA and MARC21: Supplement 3: Complete MARC Record Examples, Version 1.81, 31 December 2019 (http://cmc.blog.musiclibraryassoc.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2020/02/Supp_RDA_Best_Practices3.pdf), none of the full record examples for scores alone or for scores cataloged with other materials include a Notated Music field 007. Considering all of this, it is reasonable to conclude that you may, in good conscience, omit the Notated Music field 007 from bibliographic records. For some reason, MARC 21 Bibliographic doesn’t say when the Notated Music field 007 (https://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd007q.html) was added to the format, and because I’m not working in my office, I can’t do the more detailed research I would have done in the past. I can, however, work from my memory and some MARC evidence, including Relationship of Fields 006, 007, and 008 (https://www.loc.gov/marc/ formatintegration.html). The roster of fields 007 was rounded out to include all of the categories of materials as they existed at the time – even those for which field 007 does not add much if any information (Kit, Notated Music, Text, and Unspecified) – as part of the 1980s discussions and 1990s implementations of Format Integration. At OCLC, we considered those four fields 007 to be so useless that we waited until the OCLC-MARC Update 2011, documented in Technical Bulletin 260 (https://files.mtstatic.com/site_10606/4201/0?Expires=163708096&Signature=feC5AJJExCjQPU-nILea4niQ1yw6o8-d78Op0-FZMFINjlwdD43wV17uRJMXDZn88Li-91SyRvOU-WI7ojfcVc8BdIZsBtg9YywV273JqziQb-Zqz-6d33Dm4XsdPdOQ5vZqNqx7ZVQEZi9MBauMotrZNq10E0TETYX7zA_&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJ5Y6AV4GI7A55SNA), to implement them in OCLC-MARC. That was one of the ongoing moves to bring OCLC-MARC into closer alignment with MARC 21 as we approached the eras of RDA and linked data. For a little perspective on such redundancies as 007, 300, 34X, 538, and other fields built into MARC, you may want to look at the MOUG Newsletter Number 136 (December 2020, page 14, not yet posted online) “Questions and Answers” that touch on the subject. MARC 21 was built over the past fifty-plus years to accommodate AACR2, with the accommodation of RDA being added only within the past two decades. Technology, cataloging, metadata, and everything related to them have taken numerous twists during that time. If we were starting over (as BIBFRAME has tried to do) with a new encoding standard, we’d do things much differently.

Impermanent Press

Question: I was reading the Q & A in the most recent (December 2021) MOUG Newsletter. It’s the one called “Tough Assignment.” The questioner was wondering what date to use when the following appeared at the bottom of the caption:


I have a different question. How is it that Oxford University Press, which holds the copyright, can transfer that copyright to … Oxford University Press? In other words, to itself. What is being “transferred” when the two parties involved are in fact just one company? I have seen this formulation a number of times over the years and have always puzzled over it. It’s been around a long time; I remember seeing it in a 1920s piece of sheet music where the copyright had been transferred from Francis, Day & Hunter to Francis, Day & Hunter.

(Continued on next page)


**Questions & Answers**

*(Continued from previous page)*

**Answer:** Perhaps even more so this time than usual, I haven’t the slightest idea. I’m just a stupid cataloger, not a copyright lawyer. Such “assignments” and “transfers” have always puzzled me, also. Not wanting to leave your question completely unanswered, however, I took a look at the Oxford University Press website to see if I could find anything resembling a clue. Because the copyright assignment took place in 2010, I started with the press’s 2009/2010 annual report, which yielded nothing. But much to my surprise, the OUP Annual Report for 2010/2011 (https://fdslive.oup.com/www.oup.com/pdf/OUP_Annual_Report_2010-11.pdf) included the following in its “Music” chapter.

After a major re-structure last year which saw US sheet music transferred to the UK, the Music Department has had a successful 12 months in its new form. This success is all the more pertinent given the trading conditions in its key markets. Economic conditions and the effect of digitization have had a negative impact on sales in both the US and the UK, which represents the majority of OUP’s music sales. In spite of these challenges, a concerted effort to build links in the UK, grow our range of publishing, and some significant rights deals, have been rewarded with impressive sales and renowned awards.

It appears that in 2010, Oxford’s US sheet music copyrights (?) were transferred to the UK Music Department. I have no idea what that may mean in reality, but it could give us a small insight into why the dates of copyright assignments, transfers, renewals, and the like are disregarded for bibliographic purposes. Maybe they aren’t about the resource per se, but instead are about revenue, taxation, or other matters of financial significance. My first thought on reading your question was that an OUP to OUP “assignment” must have been something internal, such as a geographical or departmental change. No one is more shocked than I that this is apparently what it turned out to be.

**Both Sides Now**

**Question:** We’re in the middle of doing some cataloging of rare 78 rpm recordings. One that I’m working on has two pieces. On one side is an aria sung in German, the original language, while the piece on the other side of the disc is sung in German but was originally in Italian. I was thinking of doing this:

```
041 1 ǂd ger ǂh ita ǂd ger ǂh ita
```

So that it’s clear that one is a translation. But this is also a possibility:

```
041 0 ǂd ger ǂh ger
041 1 ǂd ger ǂh ita
```

Or should I just do this:

```
041 1 ǂd ger ǂh ita
```

Although in this case it doesn’t seem to be clear that there is also a piece in the original German. What do you think?

**Answer:** Arguments can be made for each of your three approaches, but I’m leaning toward your second option of coding a separate field 041 for each side of the 78 disc. That clarifies the coding of each language situation, just as I expect that your verbal description of the situation (in field 546) will be equally clear and distinct. The 2012 OLAC/CAPC Video Language Coding: Best Practices (http://olacinc.org/sites/default/files/Video-Lang-Coding-2012-09.pdf), in its section on “Multiple Works with Different Language Information” (pages 5-6), endorses this option: “Since 041 is a repeatable field, use separate 041 fields when needed for different works on one record.” The more recent OLAC Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs Using RDA and MARC21 (http://olacinc.org/sites/default/files/DVD_Blu-ray-RDA-Guide-Version-1-1-final-aug2018-rev-1.pdf) reiterates this recommendation, both explicitly on page 53 and by reference back to the 2012 document. Those documents are for moving images, but I see no reason why the same logic could not apply to audio recordings, too. When field 041 was made repeatable back in 2001, in conjunction with the definition of Second Indicator for “Source of Code,” the intention was to be able to accommodate more than simply the MARC Language Codes, of course. But the repeatability comes in handy under other circumstances as well. If we think about the atomization of data that both linked data and RDA promote, multiple fields 041 in this case make a good deal of sense, at least in a theoretical ideal linked data world (which is surely right around the corner). The subfield $h$ isn’t strictly necessary when no translation is involved. But as I read the second and third sentences of the first paragraph of the MARC description for field 041 subfield $h$, it’s permissible (although “not required”) to include: “Language code(s) for original language. Origin—(Continued on next page)
Sins of Omission

**Question:** I'm working on some items from our rather substantial CD backlog and have encountered a couple of bibliographic records containing 024 fields that don't validate. They include only the central 10 digits of the UPC. The full 12-digit UPC appears in a separate 024 field, which of course does validate. My question to you - - and I feel pretty sure you've previously addressed this -- is should I delete the non-validating 024, or should I leave it in the record and overlook the fact that the record fails the validation test? I must confess that I deleted the field in the first instance I encountered, but having come across a second case, it seemed prudent to inquire.

**Answer:** From your description, it sounds as though these may be among the really old bibliographic records that were cataloged decades ago back in the days when MARC instructions explicitly said to omit the characters that appear beyond the edges of the bar code (typically the first and final characters), a long-abandoned practice. If that is your guess, and if the complete valid number appears elsewhere in a field 024, you may feel justified in deleting the invalid field. If you happen to have the resource in hand and can verify that the seemingly truncated number does not appear otherwise on it, that’s even better. If you feel uncomfortable deleting such data in fear that it may somehow be meaningful, you may instead leave the field 024 in the record and put the offending number in subfield $z$ or change the First Indicator to value “8.” Either of those changes will allow the record to validate yet still give access to the questionable number.

Everybody Wants to Control the Real World

**Question:** Are there any restrictions on adding field 100 subfield $1$ values for real world object URIs to WorldCat bibliographic records? Our ILS will be making use of this subfield for public display later this year. Instead of adding these to our local system only, we wonder whether there is any value of doing this work at the WorldCat level.

**Answer:** We recommend following the guidelines in the Program for Cooperative Cataloging Task Group on URIs in MARC document “Formulating and Obtaining URIs: A Guide to Commonly Used Vocabularies and Reference Sources” (https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibframe/TaskGroups/formulate_obtain_URI_guide.pdf). It contains instructions for transforming 28 “Linked Data Resources” and twelve “Data Sources Without Linked Data” into URIs for uses that include the MARC subfield $1$. Bibliographic Formats and Standards Chapter 5.2, “Member Capabilities” (https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality.html#membercapabilities), outlines how you may edit existing bibliographic records depending upon the authorization level with which you are logged into WorldCat and whether the record is coded or not coded as PCC. If you encounter records you are unable to edit, you may submit a change request to bibchange@oclc.org and we can take care of it. Do remember that to edit a field that has been controlled, you will need to uncontrol that heading, add your subfield $1$, and recontrol the heading. WorldCat controlling is intended to allow correctly formulated subfields $1$ to remain intact. If you happen to encounter a problem with this, please let us know so that we may investigate. Thanks to my colleagues Cynthia Whitacre and Bryan Baldus for their assistance with this answer.
OCLC has released millions of authoritative WorldCat Entity management infrastructure that supports linked data initiatives in the library community. As a result of this effort, OCLC has released millions of authoritative WorldCat Entities through a publicly searchable website and will continue to partner with libraries to develop the tools needed to fully incorporate linked data into library workflows and improve resource discovery through connections. Working closely with an advisory group of leading libraries from around the world, OCLC has completed a project, funded in part by a grant from the Mellon Foundation, to develop a shared entity management infrastructure that supports linked data initiatives in the library community. As a result of this effort, OCLC has released millions of authoritative WorldCat Entities as the foundation of a linked data infrastructure.
News from OCLC
(Continued from previous page)

world, OCLC has created and released more than 150 million WorldCat Entities containing descriptions of creative works and persons. These entities are freely available through a look-up website for anyone to explore at entities.oclc.org. Library metadata specialists can begin to look up entity URIs and see how they can make new connections that empower discovery and research—a significant step toward making linked data work for libraries. As part of the grant, OCLC also created a linked data management tool—OCLC Meridian—and APIs to be released following a development partner phase. OCLC is now collaborating with key libraries as development partners to explore how these tools can best be integrated into library workflows. This development partnership will help OCLC refine and enhance these new entity services so libraries can better manage, edit, and create entities. Members of the advisory group worked closely with OCLC over two years to assess and enhance WorldCat Entities, test APIs and user interface prototypes, and provide feedback on the value of linked data in libraries. Their thoughtful insights and commitment to the future of linked data have been essential to helping OCLC reach this major milestone on the journey toward practical library linked data. Libraries are always seeking opportunities to make scholarly materials and other collections more discoverable on the web. They also want to expand opportunities to connect their collections to other relevant collections. The creation of this centralized infrastructure that provides linked data entities that are discoverable, reliable, and sustainable will provide a critical foundation for libraries working to achieve those objectives. Anyone can begin exploring this infrastructure by visiting entities.oclc.org.

WorldCat Validation Installation, May 26, 2022

The May 26, 2022, installation of changes to WorldCat Validation involves the following new features, enhancements, and bug fixes.

- OCLC-MARC Validations of New MARC Codes
  Announced February-April 2022

- Correction of Validation for Bibliographic and Authority Fields 043

Full details are available in the WorldCat Validation Release Notes, May 2022.

WorldShare Record Manager Installation, May 21, 2022

The May 21, 2022, release of WorldShare Record Manager introduces a new permissions level for simplified cataloging. This role enables staff to set and delete WorldCat holdings, export bibliographic records, and print labels, but it limits other activities. The release provides two new enhancements and three previously released bug fixes.

- Shared institution-wide bibliographic export lists
- With the new simplified cataloging role:
  - Access a focused Record Manager actions panel and read-only view of bibliographic records
  - Perform limited actions on a record: Set/delete WorldCat holdings, export bibliographic records, and print labels
  - Set holdings and export in one action
  - Edit a limited set of fields for export only

- Bug fixes (released earlier in May 2022):
  - Incorrect French translations for field 008
  - Extra field 090 displayed in the bibliographic record after TCP/IP export
  - Saving a Saved - In Progress record did not reset the lock timer

Full details are available in the WorldShare Record Manager Release Notes, May 2022.

Find the OCLC Annual Report at:

Find the 2022 News from the Library of Congress report at:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1VzA4aZkhadHlsNoMgDJBRKtwZMm5_ok8/view
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