FROM THE CHAIR

Inside this issue of the MOUG Newsletter are summaries (skillfully crafted by Don Green, Nancy Lawrence, Ann McCollough and Ralph Papakhian) of the program sessions at our recent annual meeting. Together with the minutes of the annual business meeting this constitutes the report of the Philadelphia conference. To all who took part in making our sixth annual meeting a success, our heartiest thanks! The 1984 Program Committee will be chaired by Tim Robson, MOUG Continuing Education Coordinator. Members of that committee are Dean Corwin, Nancy Lawrence and Dawn Thistle. Planning has commenced somewhat later than usual this year due to the bylaws revision, so please get any suggestions for program topics, etc. to Tim or one of the committee soon.

For those of you on the edge of your seats about the results of our bylaws revision referendum, the good news is that the revision package has passed by an overwhelming margin (209 to 7). Thanks to Joan Swaneckamp, Olga Buth and David Knapp for a fine job of updating our bylaws.

As usual, the OCLC system's performance for music users is a mixed bag. There is actually some good news about the system. According to recent announcements received from the Center, volume of system use is at an all-time high. This is good insofar as it portends increased availability of bibliographic records in the OLCU. Quality control activities have been stepped up in the Bibliographic Maintenance Section as well. Everyone is helped by improvements in response time, when they occur. And in the immediate future lies the conversion to a new operating system, designed to meet the challenges of a complex bibliographic cooperative.

This brings me to the problems with the NAF. By now most of you have discovered the consequences of the 256 record limit on name-authority searches. Jay Weitz's message (inside this issue) offers one approach to coping with the loss of authority information for Johann Sebastian Bach's works.

We are assured the problem is temporary. A recent (May 12) message in the ILLINET Information Bulletin (no. 136) suggests enhanced searching capabilities in the NAF have a high priority at OCLC, and that such enhancements as are currently on the drawing board will be provided "no later than August 1983, and earlier if at all possible." The enhancements will apparently follow the conversion to the CP-V operating system.
I suspect music users will have to wait for the overall enhancement of searching capability in the NAF for a solution to the "Bach" dilemma. Public statements from OCLC have mentioned only searching for uniform title fields (130 etc.). Searching for uniform title portions of name headings (subfield "t" in 100 etc.) may be more difficult to provide. Still, the time is right for all of us as members of MOUG and users of OCLC services to write to those who can make a difference. If you want to let OCLC know directly how you feel about this, write to Ken Harris, Vice President for Marketing and User Services. Write or phone your network coordinator. As brokers of OCLC services, the networks are largely responsible for seeing that the services we contract for are delivered. The absence of authority information for prolific composers will mean increased costs per title cataloged. It may eventually mean decreased accuracy of new member-input records. Let your networks know that this issue is important to you!

--Richard Smiraglia

---
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1982 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Balance end of 1981: 1255.93

Income:
Meeting 2870.00
Memberships 1803.00
Back issues 46.50
Interest 29.74
Total income 1982: 4749.24

Expenditures:
General 565.09
Newsletter 1211.75
Meeting 2027.45
Total expenditures 1982: 3804.29

Balance end of 1982: 2200.88

--Joseph W. Scott
Treasurer

---

CORRECTIONS TO TABLE FOR FIELD 033

The following corrections should be made to the table for coding field 033, subfields "b" and "c" which appeared in Newsletter no. 12 (September 1981) p. 14-16.

p. 15, 1st column: "Czechoslovakia" misspelled "Czechoslovakia"

p. 15, 2nd column: under "France," "5830" should read 5830/4"

p. 15, 2nd column: under "Ireland," "5780" should read 5780/4"

--Phil Youngholm
Connecticut College
CORRESPONDENCE FROM OCLC

Thanks to better system performance after the considerable problems we all encountered during the winter, the Bibliographic Maintenance Section at OCLC is pleased to report that, as of the beginning of April, turnaround time for current change requests is down to 7.5 weeks. Work continues on older (pre-7 million OCLC numbers) problem change requests. Major name changes resulting from AACR2 which, for various reasons (subsequent authority record changes by LC, lack of death dates in OLUC records, consistent errors in OLUC records, etc.) did not correctly convert in December 1980's conversion are expected to be at a maintenance level by the end of June 1983. March 1983 saw the largest number of records changed or deleted ever: 15,266; this helped to increase the number of records processed so far this fiscal year to 54 percent more than the same period last fiscal year. We all feel that this reflects our commitment to quality control in the data base. In conjunction with this, we are discussing ways to improve the change request system and the "error tally" process, about which more in the future.

Moving on to specifically musical concerns, I have begun to search out and correct changes which have appeared in Music Cataloging Bulletin (and subsequently in the Name Authority File) between the time that Robert Cunningham left OCLC for NELINET and the present. Starting with the January 1982 MCB (13:1), I have begun to work toward the latest issues; when these changes are relatively current, I will begin to work back from December 1981 to wherever Robert seems to have stopped.

In recent weeks it has been brought to our attention (a number of times, in fact) that the Name Authority File search key "[Bach, Joh, S]" now retrieves more than the allowed 256 entries, a regrettable occurrence. In progress, however, are a number of proposed enhancements to NAF search procedures which will eventually alleviate or eliminate this problem. In the meantime, the microfiche edition of LC Name Authorities (which at this writing covers changes only through June 1982) will yield the NAF record number, in the lower right hand corner of the record, in LCCN format but prefixed with an "n." Instructions for searching by this number (minus the hyphen) appear in Name-Authority: User Manual, 2nd edition (1983), p. 3:1 - 3:2. Unfortunately for the time being, that is the best that we can do.

Better news can be passed along concerning OCLC's progress in preparing for the arrival later in the year of the first LC MARC tapes for the music formats. Glenn Patton has been appointed Project Manager and the functional specifications are proceeding apace.

Following is a selected list of changes made in the OLUC resulting from the aforementioned MCB reports, change requests, NAF changes, and mere serendipity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AUTHORITY NUMBER</th>
<th>UNIFORM TITLE OR CHANGE</th>
<th>NAME AUTHORITY NUMBER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REFERENCES</th>
<th>MCB REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglebert, J. H.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>80146171</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12:3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Luca, Giuseppe.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>78095481</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13:6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Malcolm.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>79140955</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13:3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English dances, orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13:3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Luca, Giuseppe.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>78095481</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13:6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devienne, Francois.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>80166831</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13:3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duets...</td>
<td>81049204;82042541</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13:6:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartets...</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinfonies</td>
<td>82024086;81078143</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13:3:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trios...</td>
<td>82036514</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grieg, Edvard.</td>
<td>Works. #f 1977</td>
<td>78072761</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13:2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindemith, Paul.</td>
<td>Chansons...</td>
<td>81101074</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13:6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonatas, alto horn, piano</td>
<td>81086894</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13:3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hovhaness, Alan.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>79089446</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibert, Jacques.</td>
<td>Mouvements...</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symphonie concertante...</td>
<td>81035844</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13:5:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isidore, of Seville</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>80139470</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13:6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etymologiae...</td>
<td>81124421;8201867</td>
<td>82018685;82018686</td>
<td>82150635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelterborn, Rudolf.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>80144675</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Espansioni (from: Symphony, no. 3)</td>
<td>80143630</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13:1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kônûs, î.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>82139127</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concertos...</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacy, Steve.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>81140109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13:3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalande, M. R. de.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>80057151</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13:6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simphonies des Noëls</td>
<td>80057618</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasso, Orlando di.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>81037013</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chansons...</td>
<td>82064082;78040233</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11:5:2;13:5:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Frank.</td>
<td>Guitare</td>
<td>82026475</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13:5:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>80022788</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quintets, clarinet...</td>
<td>81128331</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quintets, horn...</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quintets, piano...</td>
<td>81133657</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quintets, violins...</td>
<td>81093429;81046828</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13:3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81129181;81024402</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City Opera...</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>81073616;81151806</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13:6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78018989;81151805</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79000299</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleyel, Ignaz.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>79107743</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12:7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonates progressives</td>
<td>80155666</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13:5:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampal, Jean Pierre.</td>
<td>(made open entry)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13:2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossetti, F. A.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>81058965</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(various uniform titles)</td>
<td>81059386</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3:9:3;supp.1-5, p. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryba, J. J.</td>
<td>Quartets, flute...</td>
<td>82032753</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13:4:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider, John</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>81021804</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13:5:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takács, Jenő.
- - -
(correct AACR2 form) 80020490 28 13:2:4
Trompeten-Studio 80021223 1 13:2:4

Telemann, G. P.
- - -
(correct AACR2 form) 79117028 34 14:2:2
Essercizii musici... 80101223;79130003 51 11:1:3;14:2:2
8027338;78087357

Tippett, Michael.
- - -
(correct AACR2 form) 50011869 194 12:3:6;13:5:2
Concertos... 82048943 13 13:11:2

Viotti, G. B.
- - -
Concertos... 78013794 71 - -
Duets... 78045362;78045363 21 - -

It must be noted that the above are not necessarily the correct AACR2 forms of either names or titles, but have been condensed for presentation purposes. In addition, not every NAF record or MCB reference cited contains a valid AACR2 heading; those which do not were used for identification purposes only. As always, any headings missed or converted incorrectly should be brought to OCLC's attention via the usual change request procedure.

Lastly, it was a double delight both to be back in Philadelphia, where I spent my University of Pennsylvania undergraduate years, and to meet many of you at the MOUG/MLA conferences. I hope the good spirits of these meetings will endure.

--Jay Weitz
Quality Control Librarian
Bibliographic Maintenance Section
Marketing & User Services Division
OCLC
6565 Frantz Road
Dublin, Ohio 43017

REPORT FROM THE INSTITUTE OF JAZZ STUDIES

The Institute of Jazz Studies has completed analytical cataloging for the jazz component of the New World Records bicentennial series "Recorded Anthology of American Music." For each jazz recording in this series the LC cataloging has been "enhanced," as needed, to include the composer(s) and performer(s) and/or performing group for each selection in the contents note, and added entries (to the extent the record length permits) for performer(s) and/or performing groups which apply to the disc as a whole. In addition each track is separately analyzed and cataloged, thus providing access to all the composers, lyricists, arrangers; titles, uniform titles, variant titles; performers, including sidemen; and performing groups on the jazz recordings in this series.

All the tracks are retrievable on OCLC by a title search on the title of the disc (for example, the OCLC title search key "jiv,at,fl,rec" retrieves eighteen truncated entries for New World Records NW 274 "Jive at Five") The cataloging for the disc as a whole is distinguished by the inclusion of the subtitle, if present, and the sigla "DLC." The tracks are distinguished by the inclusion of the name of the first-named composer after the title, or the title proper alone, when no 100 tag is present. Individual tracks may also be searched based on the information in the contents note.

The OCLC number, LC-card number, title, and number of tracks for these discs are as follows:

New World Records NW 201 "Cecil Taylor"
LC 78-750571/R OCLC no. 4555524 (3 tracks)
New World Records NW 204 "Loxodonta Africana"
LC 77-750895/R OCLC no. 371727 (6 tracks)

New World Records NW 216 "Mirage"
LC 77-750223
/R OCLC no. 3130501 (10 tracks)

New World Records NW 217 "Jammin' for the Jackpot"
LC 76-750910/R OCLC no. 2878582 (16 tracks)

New World Records NW 242 "Nic's Dream"
LC 77-750588/R OCLC no. 3490946 (7 tracks)

New World Records NW 246 "Sissle & Blake's 'Shuffle Along'"
LC 75-751056/R OCLC no. 2671873 (14 tracks)

New World Records NW 261 "Straighten Up and Fly Right"
LC 77-750592/R OCLC no. 3491212 (16 tracks)

New World Records NW 269 "Steppin' on the Gas"
LC 77-761267/R OCLC no. 2860915 (16 tracks)

New World Records NW 271 "Bebop"
LC 75-751058 OCLC no. 3078492 (14 tracks)

New World Records NW 274 "Jive at Five"
LC 76-750746 OCLC no. 2650873 (17 tracks)

New World Records NW 275 "Introspection"
LC 77-751193/R OCLC no. 3662654 (10 tracks)

New World Records NW 284 "Jazz in Revolution"
LC 77-750920/R OCLC no. 3130443 (14 tracks)

New World Records NW 285 "When Malindy Sings"
LC 77-751194/R OCLC no. 3662618 (15 tracks)

There are 192 jazz performances analyzed on these recordings. 208 catalog records can be identified on the OCLC data base; these are listed in the IJS Jazz Register and indexed in the indexes (Performer/Title, Performer/Performing Group, Performing Group, Title, Composer, Arranger, etc., and Label Name and Issue Number.) One set in the Time-Life "Giants of Jazz" series and one set in the Franklin Mint Record Society series, "The Greatest Jazz Recordings of All Time," have also been completely analyzed. These are:

Time-Life Records STL-J12 "The Guitarists"
LC 79-750440 OCLC no. 6779431 (40 tracks)

Franklin Mint Record Society 1; Jazz FM 001 A-1 (matrix)--FM 004 B3 (matrix) "Louis Armstrong, Jazz Masterpieces; Roy Eldridge, Jazz Masterpieces" OCLC no. 9052438 (48 tracks)

--Marie P. Griffin
Institute of Jazz Studies
Rutgers University

MINUTES OF THE MOUG BUSINESS MEETING,
1 March 1983 (Philadelphia, PA; 12:50 pm)

Board members present: R. Smiraglia, J. Swanekamp, J. Scott, T. Robson, S. Stancu

1) Opening remarks
Chairperson Richard Smiraglia welcomed the 93 members in attendance to the 6th annual meeting of MOUG. Smiraglia acknowledged the fine work of Tim Robson, Continuing education coordinator and program chair, and Anne Hudson (PALINET), local arrangements chair, in putting the meeting together, and thanked OCLC for their support. Members of the Executive Board were introduced.

2) Minutes of the 1982 Business meeting were approved

3) Executive Board reports
a.) Chairperson (Richard Smiraglia) MOUG has been very successful over the past several years in its continuing education programs, training people throughout the country to use the OCLC system for music materials, and has been branching out into areas of quality control. Part of
that effort resulted in MOUG representation at a meeting of the OCLC Users Council. Because libraries that are members of OCLC communicate their concerns primarily through the networks, the Board feels that it is important for MOUG as well, to be in closer contact with the networks.

The MOUG Network Advisory Council met on Monday evening (28 Feb.) for the first time in a number of years. Discussion centered on ways in which communication with the networks could be increased. MOUG members are encouraged to keep in touch with the persons who are their network representatives, and members whose networks did not send a representative should contact the network to request that a representative be sent to next year's meeting. Items about which MOUG will communicate with the Advisory Council: ENHANCE Project, REMUS, and the potential problem of LC MARC records bumping analyzed member records already in the database.

Smiraglia announced that Chris McCawley will chair the Nominations committee. People who have suggestions for next year's slate of officers should send them to McCawley.

b.) Vice-chairperson/Chairperson-elect (Joan Swanekamp)

MOUG was recently granted tax exempt status, so that MOUG would be able to apply for grants, particularly for the REMUS Project.

c.) Treasurer (Joe Scott)

Summary of the 1982 annual financial report: MOUG began the year with a balance of 1,255.93; total income: 4,749.24; total expenditures: 3,804.29; balance at the end of 1982: 2,200.88.

Membership is at an all-time high with 241 institutional and 219 personal members. Of these, 50 institutional and 54 personal memberships are delinquent at this time.

d.) Secretary/Newsletter editor (Stancu)

Thanked those who had made contributions to the Newsletter during the past year, and encouraged members to submit articles and make suggestions for things that they would like to see in future issues.

e.) Continuing education coordinator (Tim Robson)

Thanked members of the Program committee: Anne Hudson (PALINET), who handled all local arrangements; Susan Lundell (University of Cincinnati); Elizabeth Knowles (Bowling Green); Elly Johnson (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee).

Called for volunteers for next year's program and local arrangements committees. Members who have ideas for program topics for the next annual meeting should contact Robson.

The Board is considering the sale of tapes of the 1983 annual meeting, at a cost that would cover the price of tape plus a handling and mailing charge. Members who may be interested in obtaining tapes should contact Robson.

4) Meeting site for the next annual meeting

Smiraglia opened the floor for discussion: The suggestion was made to hold the next annual meeting at OCLC. Discussion followed concerning the requirement in MOUG's present bylaws to meet with MLA. In order for MOUG to meet in Dublin, the proposed bylaws revision would have to be approved. Several members felt that it would be better for the organization not to be tied to MLA's meeting plans. However, approval of the revised bylaws would not prevent MOUG from meeting with MLA in the future, but would allow us the choice of a meeting site. It was also pointed out that being able to attend both MOUG and MLA is easier financially than if the meetings were held in two different locations. Meeting at OCLC might attract new people who would otherwise not attend.

Smiraglia suggested that by meeting at OCLC, MOUG would be able to reduce the cost of the meeting. A sheet included in the registration packet showed an estimated budget for a 1984 meeting at OCLC with a savings of approximately 46 percent from the costs for the 1983 Philadelphia meeting.

There will be a mail ballot in the near future for members to vote on the proposed bylaws revision.

5) Committee reports

a.) REMUS (Ruth Henderson, chair)

REMUS is a cooperative project for the upgrading of the OCLC database for music. Participants will be assigned special authorization numbers, and will edit records already in the database. A tape of edited records and new records contributed by the members will then be extracted and sold. It will consist of pre-MARC LC cataloging and non-LC cataloging, and will complement LC MARC music tapes.

The means through which REMUS will operate is the OCLC ENHANCE project. ENHANCE has been postponed twice since last
year's REMUS committee report, but we now anticipate that it will be starting this fall.

The committee has proposed to LC that authority work be coordinated through NACO (the Name Authority Cooperative project at LC). LC continues to express interest in REMUS, but because of Music Online and the implementation of TOSCA, LC has asked that the committee resubmit its proposal this August.

We have a group of sixteen libraries that have expressed interest in participating. OCLC is restricting the number of initial participants to ten. The Committee has begun discussion of selection criteria which will be based primarily on size. If all goes well, additional participants may be added later.

A preliminary small grant proposal will probably be prepared later this spring for equipment for some of the participants and possibly other details of the project.

The other committee members are: Robert Cunningham, Marie Griffin, Kitty Skrobela, and two ex officio members, Catherine Garland (LC) and Glenn Patton (OCLC).

b.) OMRAC (Richard Jones, chair)

About 4 1/2 years ago, six music catalogers formed the group informally; 2 years ago it was named; and, this year OMRAC has been made an official committee of MOUG. Membership in OMRAC is personal, although a certain degree of institutional support is expected.

At the present time there are eight people involved: Ann McCollough (Eastman School of Music), Jack Knapp (Oberlin), Richard Smiraglia (University of Illinois), Nancy Lawrence (University of North Carolina, Charlotte), Sue Stancu (Indiana University), Barbara Strauss (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Richard Jones (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), and Deborah Pierce (University of Washington).

During 1982, the group analyzed 421 records. (59.4 percent were updates to existing records; 40.6 percent were new records.)

Annual cumulations will continue to be printed in the Newsletter.

c.) Bylaws review committee (Joan Swaneckamp, chair)

Last year the committee was appointed to look over the bylaws and reflect on the current operating status of the organization, specifically to consider structural changes which might be required by the IRS to acquire status as a tax-exempt organization, to look at the organization's relation to MLA, and to consider the completeness of the bylaws regarding procedural matters. The Revision proposed by the committee was printed in Newsletter No. 17.

Changes were made in the objectives: Some were consolidated. Particularly considered was MOUG's relation to the music library profession in general rather than just to MLA, and our relation to other users groups. The wordings in Article II have been changed to reflect this. Article IV: officers' formal relationships with MLA were dropped. The idea of a Past-chair as a one year advisory position was introduced. Article XI on dissolution was changed. Article VIII (Annual meeting): the revision has removed the requirement that MOUG must meet with MLA. However, this does not preclude a meeting with MLA. Article IV, section 3: More time will be allowed for the election procedure. The Network Advisory Council has been better defined.

Some additional changes in the wording of the proposed revision will be printed with the ballot for a mail vote.

6) New business

a.) Smiraglia called attention to the NELINET Vivaldi project. Phil Youngholm gave a brief summary: The purpose of the project is to change uniform titles for all Vivaldi entries in the database to their AACR2 forms. Participants cooperatively search the database for all instances of Vivaldi uniform titles, report them, change them to AACR2 form using Ryom numbers where necessary and the LC approved form when available. Changes are then sent to the Bibliographic Maintenance Section at OCLC. A pilot project has been planned and tested and volunteers for participation in the project are being sought from the MOUG membership. Individuals interested in participating should contact Phil Youngholm at Connecticut College.

b.) The membership called for the Executive Board to investigate possibilities for a union list of music serials.

Meeting adjourned 1:35 pm

--Sue Ellen Stancu
Secretary
SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

The Annual Meeting of the Music OCLC Users Group took place February 28 and March 1, 1983, at the Hilton Hotel of Philadelphia. Ninety-three members registered for the meeting.

Session I.

Glenn Patton, Instructional Coordinator for Cataloging, OCLC, reported on new developments at OCLC.

In the past year, emphasis was placed on the stabilization of the online system rather than on the development of new enhancements. From March to December 1982, there was an improvement in overall response time as reported by eight OCLC users in various parts of the OCLC telecommunications network who have manually been measuring response time. Soon, these libraries will have response-time monitors installed to facilitate the gathering of statistics.

Communication between OCLC and its users has greatly improved over the past year through the daily log-on messages, the weekly online reports, and the written system condition reports distributed through the networks. There has been an increased awareness on the part of the OCLC staff of the impact on users when the system performs poorly. The problem reporting process has been formalized, allowing a better means of defining problems and monitoring the progress in solving these problems. This process also provides the necessary information for better arranging priorities at OCLC.

OCLC's major goal for the next year is the conversion of the general operating system, OBM (Ohio Batch Monitor). This system, designed for the early Ohio College Library Center system, is no longer adequate because of its limited memory space and its inability to adequately isolate online users. Conversion to a new, tested system, CP-V, is in its final stages. This system, compatible with the system's Sigma 9 computers, will mark the first application of fiber optics to the online system. The new system will allow for additional CPU's and the present upper limit of 6,000 terminals will be extended to as many as 19,000.

Since the system conversion has been assigned the highest priority, the installation of certain enhancements has been delayed. The "merge holdings" enhancement, designed to enable quality control librarians to merge the holdings information from duplicate records, is now in the test phase, with a target date for implementation of summer 1983. The "enhance" feature, which will allow selected users to make changes to the master data base record, is ready for the test phase and is tentatively scheduled to be ready in the fall of 1983. Other functions being delayed are duplicate detection, the next phase of the interlibrary loan subsystem, and serials automatic claiming. OCLC is preparing for the Library of Congress's Music Online project: the analysis work has been done and specifications have begun to be drawn up.

Several changes to the scores and sound recordings formats were announced: 1) The fixed field default values will be changed to make more sense. 2) In the fixed field area, source and date type will be fill characters. 3) There will be a prompt for the 028 field. 4) The prompt for the 047 field will be eliminated. 5) There will be prompts for the non-filing characters in the 240 and 245 fields.

As a result of changes in the requirements for participation, a library may now supply its cataloging in machine-readable form. In December 1982, the University of Minnesota (an RLIN member) became the first institution to participate in this program. The institution's holdings were added to the database: records were matched through OCLC number, LCCN, and ISBN. Unresolved matches and records with no matches are being held for future processing. Plans are being made to develop an extended matching algorithm and a means to add a record when no match is found.

Mr. Patton then introduced Jay Wetz, Quality Control Librarian, Bibliographic Maintenance Dept. (OCLC), who reported that as of January 1983, there were 410,000 music records in the database, marking an increase of 25 percent in fifteen months.

There were several questions from the audience. 1) With regard to future indexing of the 028 field: this may become necessary as a matching point for LC MARC records. 2) Moving the old 260 field information in the sound recordings format to the 028 is under consideration. The bibliographic maintenance staff now does this when changing old records. 3) OCLC will try to formulate a check procedure so that LC MARC records will not bump more complete non-LC records. 4) A project is underway to increase access to the name authority file. Recently, access to uniform title headings was added (documentation forthcoming). 5) Another conversion of the OLCU using the name authority file will
probably not be done, since the authority file has greatly increased in size since the last conversion.

Catherine Garland, Music Cataloger, Library of Congress, reported on the Music Online project at LC, now tentatively scheduled to be implemented in July 1983. The programming is largely finished and testing is presently underway, with user testing about to begin.

Before the Music Online system can become a reality, LC must implement TOSCA (Total Online Searching for Cataloging Activities). This system is designed to provide a "universe" against which catalogers at LC will compare entries and search access points, since the card catalogs at LC effectively will be closed. It is not yet known how music will fit into this universe since the only online records which exist for music are authority records. Progress with Music Online has been further delayed by poor response time of the LC in-house system.

Ms. Garland then elaborated on what is causing the delay with Music Online. In the early stages of the project, the complexity of the system was not fully appreciated. Not only did a new format have to be implemented, but it had to be implemented in a completely new way. The system is designed to allow catalogers to input online directly, a departure from current practice. The new system also had to be compatible with existing systems and fit into the Library of Congress's standard framework for machine readable data. The early implementation dates represented an unrealistic point of view of the amount of work involved and a lack of understanding of the differences between music and other formats.

The analysis and design of the system was underway last year. In May, the first draft of the Music Online input manual was completed and copies were circulated for comments. In addition, requirements for printed cards were sent to the Cataloging Distribution Service. In June, the detailed requirements of the system were sent from Processing Services to the Automated Systems Office. The final draft of this document took six months to complete. All requirements had to be checked and rechecked; once the document receives a final "inspection" no further changes can be made.

The specifications of the system were prepared by the Automated Systems Office from August to October and the second edition of the test plan of Music Online was completed in December. A set of approximately 200 tests, developed from the requirements for inputting and updating records were described in this document, along with the tests' expected results. Following a review and inspection, these tests were approved on February 17, 1983. When the unit testing is completed in the Automated Systems Office, user testing on dummy records will begin. For approximately four weeks, editing and validation tests will be performed on these dummy records. When major errors are found, re-programming and corrections will be made. There are no predictions on how long this last major step toward implementation of Music Online will take.

Work is continuing on the input manual which will be in two parts: a section on how to input data, and a section on the use of the LC online system. Records continue to be transferred from the Automated Systems Office to the Cataloging Distribution Service. Only when this transfer is complete will records be distributed outside of the Library of Congress.

Following her remarks on Music Online, Ms. Garland made several further announcements and emphasized that this is a period of great change at the Library of Congress. A tentative decision has been made not to file cards in the LC public catalogs, reflecting a shift away from the card catalog to greater reliance on the online system.

A joint LC-RLG project is currently underway to input online through RLIN, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean bibliographical records in the vernacular. This project will also include sound recordings, although it is not yet known exactly how this will be handled.

LC plans a retrospective conversion of all AACR2 records. As yet, there are no details on when and how this will be accomplished.

In response to some questions from the audience, Ms. Garland reported that: 1) Input manuals will be available for purchase, but no date or method of distribution has been formalized. 2) The old and new catalogs at LC will not be linked in any way. In the course of cataloging an item, catalogers will search the online catalog. If they find an AACR2 heading, they will use it. If not, they will search the online bibliographical records and determine the heading from bibliographic records and the piece in hand.
Hence, the official name-title catalog will become a giant reference tool. 3) Projected workflow at LC when Music Online is implemented: As scores come in, they will be given to catalogers and searched online for duplicates and for name and series authority. Cataloging will be directly online. Following a review of the cataloging, the records will be sent to the MARC Editorial Division for further review to be sure that the book and music content designation is the same. It is expected that this second review will be discontinued after the system has been operable for awhile. The final verification, or approval, of the record will trigger a transfer of the record to the Cataloging Distribution Service. There it will be converted to the MARC communications format, the final step before the printed products are made. Information will be input and updated only in the bibliographic files at this point. Worksheets will be sent to the MARC Editorial Division for input into the Name Authority File. Once ZOSCA is operable, there will be a MARC editor in each cataloging area who will take temporary authority records (form of name only, without cross-references) and input them immediately. The rest of the record will take from four to six weeks to complete. 4) CIP (Cataloging in publication) for music and sound recordings: Officially, music is out of the scope of the CIP program, but a few publishers have been, and will continue to contribute records. There are no CIP records for sound recordings, although a survey revealed that users want these.

Union Listing with OCLC, presented by Ellen Rappaport (SUNY/OCLC)

Ms. Rappaport presented the OCLC Union List Component: what it is, how it works, how to use it, and how to create it. OCLC union listing allows storage and retrieval of volume-by-volume holdings statements for serials and periodicals in a very broad definition. It displays these holdings for a group of libraries (group being defined in this case as from one to hundreds) It allows holdings information to be displayed for non-OCLC libraries. It is displayed in a public services type format, that is, no tags. It is currently an online list, although offline products are expected to begin later this year.

Holdings may be input by a central inputting "agent," or by the individual participating libraries, or both. All individual holdings have volume-by-volume and year-by-year information.

There are 26 union lists plus 7 regional lists in New York State which are included in the New York state list. In all, there are about 1,283 libraries participating in the various union lists. Each union list is assigned a 4-letter code participating libraries, or both. All individual holdings have volume-by-volume and year-by-year information.

The 4-letter codes for the union lists are available in the NAD. This may be accessed by using the NAD guest authorization number, "000-00-0000gss." The list of union lists is then retrieved by inputting "ser." Remember that all commands in the NAD must be preceded by a colon. Individual members of a union list are found by inputting "ser," where the blanks are filled in with the union list code. This will give access to the information on the individual libraries. There is currently no charge for searching in the NAD.

Offline products will become available sometime in 1983. They will be available as camera-ready paper printouts, as fiche (in single or multiple copies), or as machine readable tapes. These will contain short bibliographic records taken from the database. They will be available for a union listing group, a subset of that group, or a single library code. They will probably be made available twice a year.

Union lists are begun by creating a union listing group. These may be OCLC libraries,
non-OCLC libraries, departmental libraries, etc. The group may be added to at any time. An agent acts for the group and most often inputs all the information into the system. Many alternatives are available though. The group and OCLC then create the group profile, a much simpler process than the normal library profile. Within a few weeks, the group can begin processing their holdings, and the list is created.

Costs may be estimated from the following general example: The fictional group has 35 members, 20 of which are OCLC participants, 15 of which are non-OCLC members. The cost for profiling the group will be about $750. OCLC will charge an annual maintenance fee of about $780 dollars. Local data record creation is charged at the rate of 32 cents per title per library. Maintenance charges for the LDR's are 6 cents apiece.

Informational brochures for the Union List Component are available from OCLC or your local network office. Try union listing. You'll like it!

MOUG Open Forum. The Forum panel consisted of Glenn Patton (OCLC), Jay Weitz (OCLC), Catherine Garland (LC), Ellen Rappaport (CUNY/OCLC), and Timothy Robson (Case Western Reserve), moderator. (Questions and responses are paraphrased for conciseness and clarity)

Q: I am involved in a retrocon project at my library. We are down to the "horribles," i.e., binder's collections of sheet music from the turn of the century. Should I input these made-up binder's collections into the OCLC system?

OP: Yes, you certainly can. Past practice has allowed for this situation. I might add that an analytics format is coming, probably later on this year. This will allow for a record for the "host" item and records for a bunch of "attached" records, that is, full "in" analytics. There is no limit on the number of allowable analytics, because each is a separate bibliographic record.

Q: I recently read that one of the problems that was confronting Music Online at LC had to do with finding a place in the record for a cataloger's initials. I was stunned that this would be a problem that would delay implementation of the system. Can you explain the purpose of the initials?

CG: It is not so much of a problem as it is the new use of a field. Since music catalogers will be inputting online, it was felt that it would be important to know who worked on a particular record. Field 908 will be used for this information. It will be used in LC displays, but will not be distributed.

Q: I'm curious to know why LC decided that each cataloger should input his own record online, rather than having a team of typists do the inputting.

CG: I thought from the beginning that it was ridiculous that catalogers were not allowed to be responsible for the content designation of their own work. At LC, we still type up manual cards which are sent to the MARC Editorial Division. Verifiers there, who are not catalogers, do all the content designation and input these records. This can become very difficult when, for example, the MARC editor has to make up an O48 field. Since catalogers were accustomed to typing anyway, and since it seemed like the time was right for LC to try this experiment again for utilizing this totally online concept, we are the "guinea pigs" for the process.

Audience comment: In my experience, it is actually easier for someone who doesn't type very well to type on a terminal and correct mistakes as you see them than it is to try to type a flawless hard copy for someone else to input.

Audience comment: Has anyone done any studies comparing the time needed for the cataloger to input the record directly and the time needed for the clerical inputting process?

Audience comment: It would be more expensive if the cataloger, whose time is very expensive, is inputting into a system whose response time is slow. By typing a workform, proof reading it the next day, having it input by a typist, and then proof reading it again, a high degree of accuracy may be achieved. Has LC considered this type of process, especially in light of slow response times?

CG: No, never. Because of continuing printer's errors in GPO, music is one of two units, the other being Arabic, who routinely proof read our own galleys before they are released for printing.

Audience comment: We had to let go a data entry operator because of funding. We have found that it is faster to have the cataloger input his/her own work. Worksheets are used only for the catalogers information.

Audience comment: By inputting directly, it may psychologically help to encourage the
cataloger to become more interactive with the online authority and bibliographic records.

Q: LC is planning to load all the AACR2 records for music since 1981. Are these going to be full level records or sublevel 1 records? Will there be complete data for all these things with complete tagging?

CG: We hope to have as complete data as possible, but they will be level 1. We are required to do that since we won't have the item in hand.

Q: Does LC expect a lower level of cataloging when Music Online is running?

CG: I have to say, "Oh, no! We are expecting it to go up!" Initially, there will undoubtedly be a drop. Hopefully, with TOSCA, it will gradually climb back to present levels, but expect an initial drop.

Q: When LC begins cataloging recordings for MARC tapes, will they be giving a classification number for these recordings?

CG: We'll be giving them the same classification we do now, a suggested class number.

Q: I understand that the 026 field does not print as part of the OCLC acquisitions system. Are there plans to add that as a printing field?

GP: I don't know. That is a whole different development process.

ER: It has certainly been talked about and is on a list for the future.

At this point, Tim Robson asked Glenn Patton and Jay Weitz to address the questions that had been submitted with the registrations.

GP: The first person asked about the use of the subfield 5. This is a new (about a year ago) subfield, defined for fields 500 and 7XX. It is designed to be used with the cataloging of rare and/or special materials. It can allow an inputting library to include in the master data record copy-specific or institution-specific information. This would be basically in the form of a note or added entry that may result from that note. The subfield 5 contains the NUC symbol (not the OCLC symbol) of the institution that created the record. When the subfield was initially implemented, there was a good deal of uncertainty at OCLC as to exactly how the subfield fit into the OCLC concept of the master data base record versus the local copy. OCLC has always been pretty firm in saying that local, copy-specific information did not belong in the master data base record, but rather belonged in the local copy of that record. The proposal for the subfield came from the rare books community, specifically the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of ACRL. Guidelines for the use of subfield 5 were worked out at OCLC in association with representatives from those groups this past December. These guidelines are included in Technical Bulletin 124. We (OCLC) can now say that the use of subfield 5 with manuscript material is by definition unique. We are also trying to stress restriction of use of the subfield 5 to rare and special materials. Use careful judgment to determine what would be in the master data record and what should be in the local data record only. Do not put local holdings information into this subfield, as some libraries have been doing.

The next person asked what could be done about the vast number of duplicate records for sound recordings and the inaccuracy of the information contained in those records. This is one of the places where I would strongly encourage you to work through your network. Most of the networks have quality control groups that are concerned with these types of issues. I would advise you to search the OLCU carefully, and search it again before you add the record to the system. Many times there is a question about whether these are true duplicates or only appear to be duplicates. Check the records carefully. If you are indeed finding a lot of problems, tell us about them through your networks. Audience comment: I wonder what sorts of repercussions these problems will have with enhance, in that some of these supposed duplicates actually are not duplicates.

Change requests have been returned to our library for items where the title pages read exactly the same, but the plate numbers on our copy were different from the copy of the reporting library. By the time the form got to us, the online record had already been changed to reflect what the other library had reported as an error. I think that some definite guidelines need to be developed for what is to be considered a duplicate record. JW: That happens very often, thanks to the vagary of music and recordings publishing. That is one reason why we send the change requests back to the inputting library. When things like that do happen and you feel that the change has been made incorrectly, please send it back to us with the complete information that you have. We try to resolve any problems like this that may arise. If the record involves either scores or sound
recordings, send the information through your network, but to my attention.

GP: One of the things that I try to emphasize at the workshops that I do for OCLC users is to try to encourage users to make judicious decisions to edit the existing record, as opposed to creating a new one, if the differences seem to be so minor that they are totally insignificant.

Q: Does OCLC have a recommendation or a requirement that we search for other people's mistakes, particularly in the area of initial recordings, send the information through cassettes. There is other ongoing research which aims to provide better access and decrease the number of entries retrieved in an initial hit.

JW: We also encourage you to qualify all your searches.

Q: You can qualify a search by date. Can you qualify a search by "no date"?

GP: That is one of the things that we are looking into at this point. Serials catalogers have this same unknown date problem. At this point, items in the no date category get "lost" in the group display process.

Q: Is there any thought of linking OCLC searches with OCLC searches so that the date of recording could be used to qualify a search?

GP: That is an awfully specialized type of indexing. Remember that when we design something, we have to be able to justify its use, its cost, and all that sort of thing. It is very difficult to do that for a lot of specialized kinds of things. Every user's group goes its own want list of things that "have to be indexed immediately."

Q: Has any thought been given to having the terminal give you a prompt for where in a group (truncated, collective) display you might be as you are searching?

GP: That has been discussed, but I don't think it has been practical up to this point because of hardware limitations. One of the things under development for the future is what is referred to as a "smart terminal." This will be able to receive a massive amount of data and maintain it for you in the terminal memory. It would also allow for full record edit with a single transmission to OCLC computers, rather than transmission of each individual field.

Q: Has there been any thought of allowing qualification of a search to LC records only?

GP: Yes, there has been discussion along those lines. It is difficult because of the limits on the size of the index key.

Q: I read about this TOSCA business with much fear. Any idea about what it will mean for music catalogers?

CG: This is one of those things that is supposed to be great for books. Music was not
really considered in the concept or development. There will be a group of LC music people who will write a position paper explaining what the music "universe" for music cataloging should be.

TR: If you have other questions that didn't get addressed, tell any member of the Board, Glenn, Jay, or your network, and we will publish them in the Newsletter.

--Ann McCollough
Don Green
Eastman School of Music

Session II: Public Access to Online Catalogs

The first speaker at this session was Charles Hildreth, of the OCLC Office of Research. He stated some reasons why libraries decide to move to online catalogs: the desire to provide faster and easier access to the collection, the enhancement of Boolean searching, and linking one library's collection with others. Presently there are more than 50 OPACs (Online Public Access Catalogs) in operation. Many of these are turnkey systems, others are developed inhouse. Some of these, unfortunately, are designed so that their owners may, in the words of Seymour Lubetzky, be in danger of "marching boldly backwards into the future."

Hildreth's original project involved the study of 10 OPACs; the project has now expanded to 30. While the systems involved have many similarities, they also have many differences. The difference between an OPAC and a card catalog is not in bibliographic description, but rather in the interaction between the user and the system. This is a dynamic interaction demanding skills and activities not required with card catalogs. The system designers have a strong influence on the form of interaction. Now, librarians and users are also having an effect on system design.

There are significant differences among the OPACs, and sometimes within a given system, in search command syntax and structure. Hildreth showed examples of several of these. The user needs to know how to search a particular system in order to use it properly. Some systems search any part of the record for the desired access point, and some search only indexed fields. Some other areas of differences are search types (author, title, etc.); access points (indexed data elements, e.g. call number, government documents number, etc.); access methods (keyword searching, sequential character string searching, word or phrase truncation, etc.).

There are also many variations on the theme of types of display formats. There are full MARC displays, full bibliographic displays without MARC tagging, brief displays (of various types), and truncated entries. There is usually a default format (that which displays when no other is specified).

The online system can help the user through the search. Most designers provide "preventive medicine" through the use of "help screens." Some of these help displays are rather complicated. This area is one of the most varied among the OPACs. Most systems are not very good at user cordiality.

There is a common universality of understanding of the card catalog, but this understanding does not yet exist for the Online Public Access Catalog. The user must know what types of searches are available, and must know how to do them. Some types of searches available are: direct entry search (as in the card catalog); thesaurus browsing (subject headings); keyword searching; sets creation and manipulation (find this and that); and limiting results set (find this but not that). Users must know the difference between phrase searching (the whole phrase or a truncation thereof) and keyword searching (in which the system will find keywords and ignore stop words). One of the dangers of keyword searching is that it can be overwhelming. The user must know if the system is searching all fields or just indexed fields. Searching for "Music" in a subject index will yield a very different result than will searching "Music" as a keyword in all portions of the bibliographic record. Some systems can also limit the search by year (imprint date) or by language. Fewer can limit a search by type of format. In a music library this format limitation of a search would be much more useful than in other types of libraries.

Hildreth distributed an "OPAC Interface Adequacy Assessment Guide" which is reprinted on page 16 of this Newsletter.

Jaye Bausser of Duke University was the second speaker at the session. She spoke about music librarians' needs from an online catalog. She stressed that we must become lobbyists for these needs. Steps to take when planning an online catalog include: 1) Formulate a definition of the expected product. First define the acceptable minimum, then state your ideal. 2) Expand
1. Test for self-service usability. Is the OPAC self-explanatory with regard to its basic operation? Can an untrained user begin to use the system and successfully complete some searches without direct assistance from another person or printed aid?

2. If a command/argument dialogue approach is used,
   a. Are the commands selected from familiar natural language words, or reduced to their self-evident abbreviations or other mnemonic form?
   b. Is the function of each command or subcommand clearly conveyed by the word chosen to name the command? Are the commands easily remembered and recalled?

3. Are the error messages displayed by the system specific, comprehensible, constructive, and positive in tone?

4. Is context-specific help available at the point of need, in response to a simple (unqualified) help request?
   (Can the online help answer these questions: "How do I do it correctly?", "What do I do next?", "What else might I try?")

5. Is the system forgiving of minor inaccuracies or variations in command language spelling or syntax?

6. Are the bibliographic displays
   a. consistently formatted and
   b. are their components clearly labeled, free of jargon and unfamiliar or unnecessary punctuation?

7. Can the user go backwards, sequentially or selectively, through a list or group of retrieved records, and otherwise review the status of the search?

8. Is there authority management for the name, series, and subject headings used to permit access to records in which they occur?
   a. Does a search on a variant name retrieve works entered under the authoritative, accepted form of the name and all other variant forms?
   b. Does the user have to search more than once to gather all the entries under various forms of a heading?
   c. Are related ("see also") terms/headings from a controlled vocabulary displayed online during a search?

9. Does the system display "suggestive prompts" or messages to guide the user with the formulation or refinement of a search? For example, when a search results in no "hits" or an excessive number of records, does the system suggest ways to broaden or narrow the search, recommend alternate search/browse approaches, display or direct the user to related terms or class numbers, etc.?

10. Is the indexing for online access "in depth" and consistent across material formats and similar search types (Author, Author/Title)? Are all authors/performers entered in the record indexed? Are title added entries indexed? Are subject subfields other than "a" indexed? Are call numbers indexed? Are notes indexed?

   **TIEBREAKERS** (If any two OPACs seem equally adequate, try these)
   - Will the system compensate for common spelling errors in names or title and subject heading words, and retrieve the closest matches?
   - In keyword searching, will the system automatically search on both the singular and plural forms of the term?
   - Will the system ignore stopwords (words not indexed) when they are included in the user's search argument and process the search on the significant word(s)?
this definition by specifics, such as, How to create the database; What will be in it? What priorities should be applied in retrospective conversion? What forms of display should be provided? What do the patrons need? 3) Decide searching capabilities. Will you provide those access points provided by the card catalog, or more? Will you want to be able to limit searches by language, date, format? 4) Determine what types of help will be available for the user. 5) Decide what type of holdings information is needed, considering need for information on sets, series, multiple copies, multiple locations, etc. 6) Determine what type of circulation information is needed, and in what form this is to be stored and manipulated 7) Decide if special types of materials will need special treatment. 8) Determine if special copy-specific information needs to be added to the bibliographic record. 9) Examine the training needs, both for staff and for the users. 10) Consider needs for authority control and determine how these needs will be met in an online environment. 11) Decide how to provide for the changes which will be inevitable.

These processes for planning and implementing an online system may take several years. Music librarians frequently are not involved in the planning process. Special materials and users may not be planned for in the general system, so it is up to the music librarian to let the planners know what is needed.

How does one lobby for music needs? Other people must be educated to the special interests of music libraries. User studies must be done. The eleven step planning process outlined above should be used, bearing in mind the special situations which are unique to music. There might be a very different type of retrospective conversion priority for music materials than for the sciences, for example. In planning for circulation, consider whether special treatment is needed for scores and parts. Are there special authority control needs for music?

Communicate with the designers and planners of the system. This will involve becoming familiar with their terminology. Read LITA, RTSD, etc. Make your concerns known to the whole library field through journals. Finally, lobby close to home. Take coffee breaks with your online catalog planners. But, don't intimidate!

Lois Schultz, music cataloger at Duke University, spoke next. She identified three areas which need to be studied by music librarians. These are: 1) how do patrons try to find scores and sound recordings? 2) is the present card catalog system really adequate, and 3) what are the best ways to find scores and sound recordings?

Patrons have various access needs, depending on the use to be made of the material. A student wanting to follow a score while listening to a sound recording needs one type of access (a known item search), but a performer or group of performers looking for music to play or perform needs subject as well as known item access. There needs to be access to classed together series and sets as well as to collections of one type, and individual pieces. The Library of Congress subject heading structure for music makes this difficult. For example, someone wanting to find flute and oboe duets must look under Flute and oboe music, Suites (Flute and oboe), etc. In any online environment this situation becomes even more critical.

The language of the title proper (title page title) is much less important for scores and music sound recordings than for most other types of material. However, cross references become crucial in helping patrons find desired materials. All of these considerations need to be brought to the attention of the designers and planners of online catalogs.

Schultz has developed a list of desired standards of access for music. She would like to see MOUG publish this list, and to include field and subfield locations. This list includes composer, uniform title, title proper and other titles, series, publisher, editors, translators, and other names, performers, plate and publisher's number, instrumentation, contents, and subjects.

Schultz closed her talk with three requests. Administrators should solicit input from music librarians for information on types of access desired and needed for music patrons. Music librarians are requested not to wait, but rather to determine what is important in the way of access and to publish a list. This list should be published where systems designers, and not just music librarians, would see it. Administrators and catalogers should make copious access and quality cataloging top priorities. Full analytics should be made for all individual pieces in a bibliographic record and full contents notes should be provided. Unfortunately it
appears that this full access is even more important in online catalogs, and must be provided.

Donna Mendro, Music Librarian at Dallas Public Library, related how not to do it. The Dallas Public Library shares a computer with other city agencies, and is assigned a rather low priority. The system was designed in-house, and works (sort of) for monographs, but is terrible for music materials. Down time is frequent, response time is slow, and librarians can’t find materials in an efficient manner. There is no way to cross reference, so music uniform titles cause a great deal of trouble. The major ingredient needed is patience!

During the discussion period which followed the formal presentations, Hildreth commented that an excellent way to avoid down time is to build in redundancy. This can be done with dual processors. Hildreth also stated that experiments with derived search keys have resulted in a tendency to lengthen the keys, thereby producing better results. In response to a question as to which existing systems are capable of handling music formats, Hildreth mentioned Melvil (University of California), Mankato State (Minnesota), and the National Library of Medicine system.

Hildreth pointed out that the MARC record was developed to print cards. He described some aspects of a new type of format which will eventually be developed to better serve an online environment. One major difference is that there will be no need for multiple access; if information is in one location in the bibliographic record, that will be enough. An authority system can link variant forms of a name. The system designer needs merely to know the indexing requirements.

There were additional questions from the audience about authority control in presently available systems, about TRIN (Triangle Research Libraries Network, consisting of Duke University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and North Carolina State University), about turnkey systems which use microprocessors, and about tape processing.

Session III.

Meeting attendees chose between a basic music tagging workshop conducted by Robert Cunningham (NELINET), and a workshop in tagging microforms and manuscripts presented by Glenn Patton (OCLC). Also, throughout the afternoon, Anne Hudson (PALINET) gave hands-on demonstrations of the various OCLC subsystems.

Workshop on Tagging Manuscripts and Microforms (Reproductions)

Glenn Patton led the session on MARC coding of bibliographic records which describe music manuscripts and reproductions (microforms and photocopies) of manuscript and printed music. His presentation concentrated on the codes that are problematic or unique to these materials. The following summarizes the detailed information covered during the workshop.

MANUSCRIPTS:
As with other materials, many coding problems are resolved if the item is completely cataloged prior to tagging. Also, cataloging music manuscripts requires reference to AACR2, chapter 4 for several areas of the bibliographic description. Since music manuscripts are cataloged on the OCLC score format, those codes relating to music are normally the same for both printed and manuscript music. In the Fixed field, the Type code will be "d" for manuscripts either in the hand of the composer (holograph) or by someone else. The Type code will also be "d" for on-demand reproductions or copies of manuscripts. On the other hand, published facsimiles of music manuscripts should have Type code "c." Theses which are manuscript scores (or copies) should have Type code "c" (this is analogous to the LC treatment of textual theses, which are coded as printed monographs--Type code "a"--instead of as manuscripts) The OCLC workform defaults to code "c." This should be changed to "d" when necessary.

For the code in Bib lvl, the default "m" is appropriate to single manuscripts (code "c" would be appropriate if an institution has assembled a collection of materials which are to be cataloged as a unit) The Ctry code for manuscripts is "xxW" (however this would not be the case for reproductions) The Comp code would be supplied as with printed music--sketches should be coded for the completed work if possible. For the Format and Parts codes, supply codes as if
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at Charlotte
the item were published (sketches might be in "other than score" format)

The variable field 260 will include, at most, a date. Therefore, the first indicator should be "1" (no publisher present) and the "a" and "b" subfields are omitted ("s.l." and "s.n." would not be used for cataloging manuscripts) It is possible not to have date information when the date appears in the title area. In this case the 260 field will contain no information, although the online system will not allow the field to be deleted (the field is retained with a prompt for subfield "c") Examples 1-5 show various features of manuscript cataloging and coding.

Note in Example 1 the use of brackets in which exist, in effect, only as microform will contain no information, although the 260 field can be the code appropriate to the original. It is possible not to have date information when the date appears in the title area. In this case the 260 field will contain no information, although the online system will not allow the field to be deleted (the field is retained with a prompt for subfield "c") Examples 1-5 show various features of manuscript cataloging and coding.

MICROFORMS AND REPRODUCTIONS:

Follow LC practice as stated in the Cataloging Service Bulletin no. 14 (p. 56-58) Describe the original with the reproduction information in a note. (This would not apply to "original microform" publications, which exist, in effect, only as microform editions) Sections 5.2 and 5.3 for OCLC's Bibliographic Input Standards, 2nd ed., describe these policies in detail.

In the fixed fields, the Type code should be the code appropriate to the original (e.g. "d" for a music manuscript, "c" for printed music) Code the Bib lvl also for the original. The Repr code should be filled in as appropriate, remembering that photocopies are coded "x." The Ctry code should be provided for the country of the publisher of the reproduction (not for the country of the publisher of the original) In Dat tp, code "r" will be most frequent, with the date of the reproduction given as the first fixed field date and the date of the original as the second (note that code "q" takes precedence over "r" and if the date of the original is multiple or uncertain, give the earliest possible date as the second date) The codes for Comp, Format and Parts would be those for the original.

In the OCLC formats, instructions for coding 007 will be revised to conform to LC's latest version as given in update no. 7 to the MARC format. Subfield "a" is obvious as the general material designation. Subfield "b" is equivalent to the specific material designation given in the reproduction notes, while subfield "c" will most often be coded "r" (original refers to masters, and the use of facsimiles is unclear) The polarity code "d" is obvious as is the code for dimensions (this is the code for the dimensions of the film itself, not the images on the film) The code for reproduction ratio has four characters and should be provided when known (when the ratio is unknown use "u---") The color subfield "g" is most often monochrome (black & white) Subfields h-j are archival and can be omitted. Subfield "h" for the film emulsion is most often silver halide (which is black & white: diazo may be violet or green, and vesicular is blue or beige) For subfield "i," the "subsequent generation" is now renamed "service copy" which will be the most frequent code. First generation means the camera master, and printing master is the copy used to make the service copies. Subfield "j" can be coded if the information is provided on the item. Safety base film is non-flammable.

When cataloging microforms, use the appropriate GMD in the 245 field. Microforms may often be reproductions of rare materials in which case the description may cite other references. These can be provided in field 510 in coded form (some standard citation forms that might be used for music materials are given on page 27 of this Newsletter. With the recent change in the card printing program (Technical Bulletin 122), use separate 510 fields for each citation if more than one is used. These will be combined and printed in a single note.

The reproduction note should be in field 533, which is also subfielded. It will follow all notes pertaining to the original. Notes related to the reproduction can follow the 533. Examples 6-12 include cataloging for reproductions and microforms.

--Ralph Papakhian
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EXAMPLE 1

Type: d Bib lvl: m Lang: ger Source: d Accomp mat:
Repr: Enc lvl: I Ctry: xx Dat tp: s MEBE: 0
Mod rec: Comp: cn Format: z Prts: n
Desc: a Int lvl: LTxt: n Dates: 1826, %
> 1 010 %
> 2 040 XXX +c XXX %
> 3 045 0 +d d182609 %
> 4 048 wn05 %
> 5 090 ML96 +b .B415 WoO 197 %
> 6 049 OCLC %
> 7 100 10 Beethoven, Ludwig van, +d 1770-1827. %
> 8 245 00 [Da ist das Werk]
> 9 260 1 +c [September 1826] %
>10 300 1 ms. leaf of music ; +c 24 x 32 cm. %
>11 500 Holograph. %
>12 500 5-part canon. %
>13 650 0 Music +x Manuscripts. %
>14 650 0 Glee, catches, rounds, etc. %
>15 740 01 Da ist das Werk. %

EXAMPLE 2

Type: d Bib lvl: m Lang: N/A Source: d Accomp mat:
Repr: Enc lvl: I Ctry: xx Dat tp: s MEBE: 1
Mod rec: Comp: zz Format: a Prts:
Desc: a Int lvl: LTxt: n Dates: 1973, %
> 1 010 %
> 2 040 XXX +c XXX %
> 3 045 0 +d d197301 %
> 4 048 wb01 +a wc01 +a wd01 +a wd01 %
> 5 090 M2.S494 +b P6 %
> 6 049 OCLC %
> 7 100 10 Seyfrit, Michael. %
> 8 245 10 Portal : +b for oboe, clarinet, English horn, bassoon /
+c Michael Seyfrit. %
> 9 260 1 +c 1973. %
>10 300 1 ms. score (i, 42 p.) ; +c 35 cm. %
>11 500 Holograph. %
>12 500 Duration: ca. 15:30. %
>13 650 0 Woodwind quartets (Bassoon, clarinet, English horn, oboe)
+x Scores. %
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EXAMPLE 3

Screen 1 of 2

> Type: d Bib lvl: m Lang: N/A Source: d Accomp mat: 
  Repr: Enc lvl: I Ctry: xx Dat tp: q MEBE: 1 
  Mod rec: Comp: co Format: z Prts: n 
> 1 010 ¶ 
> 2 040 XXX +c XXX ¶ 
> 3 048 +b sb01 +a 0a ¶ 
> 4 090 ML96.S473 +b C6 ¶ 
> 5 049 OCLC ¶ 
> 6 100 10 Serly, Tibor. ¶ 
> 7 240 10 Concertos, +m viola, orchestra 
> 8 245 00 Concerto for viola and orchestra / +c Tibor Serly. ¶ 
> 9 260 1 +c [193-?] ¶ 
>10 300 1 ms. part (14 p.); +c 35 cm. ¶ 
>11 500 Holograph signed of viola part. ¶ 
>12 500 Caption title. ¶ 
>13 500 Gift of Milton Katims. ¶ 
>14 500 Viola and piano arrangement published: New York: Sprague-Coleman, 1943. ¶ 

Screen 2 of 2

>15 500 Accompanied by cadenza (1 leaf, holograph signed) ¶ 
>16 650 0 Concertos (Viola) +x Parts (Solo) ¶ 
>17 600 10 Serly, Tibor +x Manuscripts. ¶ 

EXAMPLE 4

> Type: d Bib lvl: m Lang: N/A Source: d Accomp mat: 
  Repr: Enc lvl: I Ctry: xx Dat tp: s MEBE: 1 
  Mod rec: Comp: co Format: z Prts: n 
> 1 010 ¶ 
> 2 040 XXX +c XXX ¶ 
> 3 045 0 +b d1973 ¶ 
> 4 048 kb01 +a oz ¶ 
> 5 090 ML96.H289 +b C6 ¶ 
> 6 049 OCLC ¶ 
> 7 100 10 Harrison, Lou, +d 1917- ¶ 
> 8 240 10 Concertos, +m organ, percussion ensemble (Sketches) ¶ 
> 9 245 00 [Complete sketches for Concerto for organ with percussion orchestra / +c Lou Harrison] ¶ 
>10 260 1 +c [1973?] ¶ 
>11 300 [88] leaves of music in case; +c 27 x 31 cm. ¶ 
>12 500 Holograph (some photocopies); some leaves blank. ¶ 
>13 500 Gift of the composer. ¶ 
>14 650 0 Musical sketches. ¶ 
>15 650 0 Concertos (Organ with percussion ensemble) ¶ 
>16 600 10 Harrison, Lou, +d 1917- +x Manuscripts. ¶
EXAMPLE 5

Screen 1 of 2


> 1 010 ¶
> 2 040 XXX +c XXX ¶
> 3 045 0 +b d1923 ¶
> 4 048 va01 +a wa01 +a wc01 ¶
> 5 090 ML96.C795 +b A7 ¶
> 6 049 OCLC ¶
> 7 100 10 Copland, Aaron, +d 1900- ¶
> 8 245 10 As it fell upon a day: +b song for soprano with accompaniment of flute and clarinet / +c by Aaron Copland; words from Richard Barnefield. ¶
> 9 260 1 +c 1923. ¶
>10 300 1 ms. score (8 p.) ; +c 35 cm. ¶
>11 500 Holograph. ¶
>12 500 Gift of Archibald MacLeish, 1978. ¶
>13 500 At end: Vienna, Summer of 1923. ¶
>14 500 On t.p.: For darling Ada, apres trente ans, with love, A.C. ¶
>15 500 Published: San Francisco : New Music, 1929. ¶

Screen 2 of 2

>16 650 0 Songs (High voice) with instrumental ensemble +x Scores. ¶
>17 600 10 Barnfield, Richard, +d 1574-1627 +x Musical settings. ¶
>18 700 10 Barnfield, Richard, +d 1574-1627. ¶
EXAMPLE 6

Screen 1 of 2


> 1 010 %
> 2 040 XXX +c XXX %
> 3 007 h +b d +c r +d b +e f +f u--- +g b %
> 4 045 0 +b d1827 %
> 5 048 va02 +a vb01 +a vc01 %
> 6 090 +b %
> 7 049 OCLC %
> 8 100 10 Beethoven, Ludwig van, +d 1770-1827. %
> 9 240 10 Quartets, +m strings, +n no. 13, op. 130, +r Bb major.

#p Finale (Sketches)

>10 245 00 [Musical sketches for the finale of Quartet, op. 130]

#h microform / +c [Ludwig van Beethoven] %

>11 260 1 +c [1827?] %
>12 300 [4] p. ; +c 22 x 30 cm. %

Screen 2 of 2

>13 500 On cover: Original-Handschrift von Ludwig van Beethoven (Skizzen) und Entwürfen zu seiner Streich-Quartett) ... %
>14 533 Microfilm. +b Paris : +c Bibliothèque Nationale, Service Photographique, +d 1980. +e 1 microfilm reel : negative ; 35 mm. %
>15 500 Reproduced from the original in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. (Ms. 35). %
>16 600 10 Beethoven, Ludwig van, +d 1770-1827. %
>17 650 0 String quartets +x Scores. %

EXAMPLE 7


> 1 010 %
> 2 040 XXX +c XXX %
> 3 048 +b tb01 +a oa %
> 4 090 M1037.4.G8 +b C56 %
> 5 049 OCLC %
> 6 100 10 Chobanian, Loris O. %
> 7 240 10 Concerto, +m guitar, orchestra %
> 8 245 00 Concerto for guitar & orchestra / +c by Loris Ohaness Chobanian. %
> 9 260 1 +c 1980. %
>10 300 1 ms. score (v, 78 leaves) %
>11 502 Thesis (Ph. D.)--Michigan State University, 1970. %
>12 533 Photocopy of holograph. +b Ann Arbor, Mich. : +c University Microfilms International, +d 1980. +e 21 cm. %
>13 650 0 Concertos (Guitar) +x Scores. %
EXAMPLE 8

Screen 1 of 2

Type: c Bib lvl: m Lang: N/A Source: d Accomp mat:
Repr: a Enc lvl: I Ctry: gw Dat tp: r MEBE: 0
Mod rec: Comp: zz Format: z Prts:
Desc: a Int lvl: LTxt: n Dates: 1969,1583 %
> 1 010 %
> 2 040 XXX +c XXX %
> 3 007 h +b d +c r +d b +e f +f u--- +g b %
> 4 090 M12 +b .T32 %
> 5 049 OCLC %
> 6 245 00 Tabulaturbuch auff Orgeln und Instrument. +n Die erste Theil
+h microform : +b darinne ... liebliche und K"unftliche Moteten ... 
geordnet ... im gesang ohne Coloraturen ... / +c mit sonderlichen fleiss
auserlesen, in eine richtige Ordenung bracht, abgesetzt, und in Druck
vorfertiget durch Johannem R"uhling ... %

Screen 2 of 2

> 7 260 0 Gedruckt zu Leipzig : +b Bey Johan[nem] Beyer, +c 1583. %
> 8 300 [v], 138 leaves. %
> 9 500 For keyboard instrument in German keyboard tabulature. %
>10 500 No more published. %
>11 510 4 Brown, H.M. Instrumental music printed before 1600 +c 1583 6 %
>12 510 4 RISM +c 1583 24 %
>13 533 Microfilm. +b Wolfenb"uttel : +c Herzog-August-Bibliothek,
+d [1969?] +e 1 microfilm reel : negative ; 35 mm. %
>14 650 0 Organ music, Arranged. %
>15 700 10 R"uhling, Johannes, +d 1550-1615. %
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EXAMPLE 9

*Microfilm :t:a No. 1462

Title from bassus part.

Microform:

Microfilm reel : negative ; 35 mm.

Bassus part only.

Microfilm:

Bologna:

Biblioteca Musicale G.B. Martini,

1 microfilm reel : negative ; 35 mm.

Microfilm:

Bassus part only.

Microfilm:

Bologna:

Biblioteca Musicale G.B. Martini,

1 microfilm reel : negative ; 35 mm.

Microfilm:

Bassus part only.

Microfilm:

Bologna:

Biblioteca Musicale G.B. Martini,

1 microfilm reel : negative ; 35 mm.

Microfilm:

Bassus part only.

Microfilm:

Bologna:

Biblioteca Musicale G.B. Martini,

1 microfilm reel : negative ; 35 mm.

Microfilm:

Bassus part only.

Microfilm:

Bologna:

Biblioteca Musicale G.B. Martini,

1 microfilm reel : negative ; 35 mm.

Microfilm:

Bassus part only.
Screen 1 of 2

Type: d Bib lvl: m Lang: eng Source: d Accomp mat: abehi
Repr: a Enc lvl: I Ctry: nyu Dat tp: s MEBE: 1
Mod rec: Comp: mu Format: m Prts:

Desc: a Int lvl: LTxt: n Dates: 1975, %
> 1 010 %
> 2 040 XXX â€‹ XXX %
> 3 007 h â€‹ d +c r â€‹ d a â€‹ f +f vâ€‹---- +g b %
> 4 045 w9x5 %
> 5 047 sp â€‹ a sg â€‹ a su â€‹ a sn â€‹ a sy â€‹ a cr â€‹ a an â€‹ a ft %
> 6 090 M3 +b .F37 %
> 7 049 OCLC %
> 8 100 10 Farwell, Arthur, â€‹ d 1872-1952. %
> 9 240 10 Works %
>10 245 14 The microfilm collection of the music of Arthur Farwell
+h microform / â€‹ c prepared by his children ; Brice Farwell, editor ... [et al.] %
>11 260 0 Briarcliff Manor, N. Y. : â€‹ b B. Farwell, â€‹ c 1975. %
>12 300 13 microfilm reels : â€‹ b chiefly music ; â€‹ c 35 mm. %
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13 500 Microfilm of mss. and published works. %
14 500 "Reel 1-5 and A-G originally filmed by Brice Farwell, 1966,
Reel 6 by the New York Public Library, 1975. %
15 500 "Chronologically indexed and with writings & materials by & about
the composer & his life ... " %
16 650 0 Music â€‹ x Collected works. %
17 600 10 Farwell, Arthur, â€‹ d 1872-1952. %
18 700 10 Farwell, Brice. %

EXAMPLE 11

Screen 1 of 2

Type: d Bib lvl: c Lang: ger Source: d Accomp mat:
Repr: b Enc lvl: I Ctry: nyu Dat tp: r MEBE: 1
Mod rec: Comp: zz Format: m Prts:

Desc: a Int lvl: LTxt: n Dates: 1976,1752 %
> 1 010 %
> 2 040 XXX â€‹ c XXX %
> 3 007 h +b e +c r +d a +e m +f b025 +g b %
> 4 090 +b %
> 5 049 OCLC %
> 6 245 04 The Johannes Herbst Collection, c. 1752-1812 #h microform %
> 7 260 1 +c %
> 8 300 ca. 500 items. %
> 9 500 Described in: Catalog of the Johannes Herbst Collection / edited
by Marilyn Gombosi. Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina, 1970. %

Screen 2 of 2

10 533 Microfiche. â€‹ b New York, N.Y. : â€‹ c University Music Editions,
+d 1976. +e 258 microfiches ; 11 x 15 cm. %
11 500 "A complete and unaltered facsimile of the manuscripts of the ... Collection as found in the archives of the [Moravian Music] Foundation." %
12 500 In 2 binders. %
13 650 0 Music â€‹ x Collected works. %
14 700 10 Herbst, Johannes, â€‹ d 1735-1812. %
15 710 20 Moravian Music Foundation. %
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Standard Citation Forms for Music-Related Items

The following citation forms for use in 510 fields are extracted from:


CITE AS: BUCEM


CITE AS: Dichter & Shapiro

International inventory of musical sources = Repertoire international des sources musicales. Munchen, etc.: G. Henle, etc., 1960-

CITE AS: RISM


CITE AS: Lowens, I. Songsters


CITE AS: Sonneck-Upton


CITE AS: Gregory


CITE AS: Sonneck, O.G.T. Librettos


CITE AS: Wolfe, R.J. Secular music
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