FROM THE CHAIR

This issue of the MOUG Newsletter includes summaries (prepared by Pamela Juengling, Dean Corwin, Linda Barnhart, Nancy Mosley, Ann McCollough, Shirlene Ward, Sheridan Stormes, Anne McGregor and Candice Feldt) of the plenary sessions and discussion groups at our 1985 annual meeting. Together with the minutes of the annual business meeting, this constitutes the report of the Louisville Conference. This is my opportunity to publicly thank all of you who helped make our meeting the success that it was. Special thanks go to Don Hixon, MOUG Continuing Education Coordinator, who did a splendid job pulling the program together; to Bob Hays of the Louisville Free Public Library who coordinated Seelbach Hotel arrangements; and to Nancy Mosley who handled on-site registration. The success of this meeting is a true indication of their hard work.

I would also like to acknowledge the contributions of our speakers: Ann Armbrister, Dawn Lamade, Catherine Garland, Glenn Patton, Jay Weitz and Kate Nevins, and our discussion group leaders: Ivy Anderson, Garrett Bowles, John Hein, Penny Mattern, Ralph Papakhian, Tim Robson and Joan Schuitema.

My last words of appreciation go to Richard Smiraglia who is retiring from the Board after five years as Treasurer, Chair and Past-Chair. In Richard, the Group has had a most effective spokesperson and leader and his dedication has been an obvious display of his support for MOUG.

My closing words are to report some good news. OCLC has announced its next group of Enhance libraries. For scores they have chosen the Eastman School of Music, Florida State University, Northern Michigan University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Louisville, University of Texas at Austin, University of Wisconsin at Madison and for recordings they have chosen New England Conservatory of Music.

--Joan Swane kamp
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Balance end of 1983: 1382.84

Income:
- Memberships 5700.00
  Annual meeting 2295.00
  Interest 190.04
  Back issues 79.50
  Total income 1984: 8264.54

Expenditures:
- Annual meeting 721.30
  Board meetings 2914.30
  Newsletter (No. 21-23) 1306.37
  Back issues 177.16
  REMUS 382.00
  General 370.82
  Total expenditures 1984: 5871.95

Balance end of 1984: 3775.43

--Judy Weidow
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SUMMARY OF THE 1985 ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Music OCLC Users Group took place on March 3rd and 4th at the Seelbach Hotel in Louisville, Ky.

PLENARY SESSION I

Don Hixon, MOUG Continuing Education Coordinator, opened the meeting with a welcome and general announcements.

Glenn Patton, Manager, System Support and Training Section, OCLC, offered an overview of activities at OCLC, many of which were described in handouts included in registration packets. Handouts included were: What's new at OCLC, information on the Machine-readable data files format and the revised Archives and manuscripts control format, Direct transmission service, new Serials Control 350, ILL micro enhancer, Cataloging micro enhancer, microcomputer program exchange, micro software submittal program, a list of members of Subsystem advisory committees, Online union catalog statistics, a report from Rowland Brown, President, OCLC, Inc., titled "OCLC: Present issues, future directions," and of particular interest to music users, Technical Bulletin 153: Music publisher number index.
Mr. Patton also mentioned forthcoming documentation: a revised edition of Bibliographic Input Standards, and revision pages for Scores and Sound recordings formats. Also discussed were: 1) Linked Systems Project, a national effort at computer to computer links between the Library of Congress and several bibliographic networks; OCLC is committed to participation in the first phase (i.e. the authorities phase), which is expected to be up and running in Fall 1985. 2) Oxford Project, a project to totally redesign OCLC online systems. 3) Searching enhancements, including the addition of a date qualifier which will facilitate retrieval of items with no date or uncertain dates; an additional search qualifier to limit by form of reproduction, e.g. microform vs. non-microform; enhancement of the Sudocs numbers search; several changes in the truncated display: indication of microformat, "0" level record, and statement of publisher/record manufacturer rather than place of publication. 4) ILL enhancements, including transfer of fields 130 and 240, and the GMD, to the ILL request form. 5) Within the next several months, users at the cataloging "full" authorization will be able to upgrade Level K, O, and 7 records (a future Technical Bulletin will explain this more fully). He also updated information concerning two future projects at OCLC: 1) OCLC has not yet begun to load MARC music tapes, and there still are no resources for development of software necessary for loading the tapes; 2) Search enhancement in the Name Authority File which would allow searching by author/title combination has run into scheduling problems which conflict with the Oxford Project.

Catherine Garland, Music Cataloger at the Library of Congress, gave a progress report on LC Music Online which began full production on March 19, 1984. As of February 7, 1985 the music file contained almost 7400 records, of which 1100 were non-music sound recordings, and the remaining 6300 records were almost evenly divided between scores and musical sound recordings. The online system has allowed for observation of two particularly interesting statistics about music: 1) music records have almost twice the number of tagged fields as do book records, and 2) music records have almost twice the number of text characters as do book records. A report on the REMUS Project, which will allow contributions from selected institutions to the Library of Congress Name Authority File, projected that LC will expect to receive approximately 300 records per month from REMUS participants, once they have undergone the appropriate training. Ms. Garland also commented on the proposed rule changes for the physical description of compact discs, as proposed in the Music Cataloging Bulletin. The proposal was presented to the JSC in November 1984, and met with no opposition. The proposal will thus be the recommended rule addition for AACR2 description of compact discs.

Kate Nevins, Manager, Network and Library Services Department at OCLC, gave a presentation on the pricing structure at OCLC. A project has been underway for four years to evaluate OCLC's pricing structure. It has become clear that the OCLC system has gone from providing one service to multiple services, that libraries have new needs, and that new technologies have altered the ways in which libraries accomplish their work. She also acknowledged several myths regarding changes in pricing structure: new pricing means more revenue for OCLC, new pricing means greater costs to all OCLC users, and new pricing means system use will be more restrictive. Long term pricing goals are for a pricing structure that is flexible, manageable, equitable, affordable, and transitional. Ms. Nevins displayed a number of graphs describing the search/produce ratio, subsystem use by various sizes and types of libraries, which demonstrated that there is a great variety in the use of the OCLC subsystems among the membership. Ms. Nevins outlined four structural changes: institution of a search charge, with credits being offered for input of original cataloging, upgrading of minimum level records, and ILL lending. The specifics of these changes, effective January 1, 1986, include: 1) a search charge of 6¢ above and beyond a threshold of four searches per produce activity (the charge applies only to searching the OLUC, not the LCNAF) 2) a credit of 50¢ for input of original cataloging 3) waiver of the FTU charge for the upgrade of a minimum level record 4) a 20¢ credit for each ILL lending activity. Several documents are scheduled for distribution in April 1985, which offer further explanations of the OCLC pricing structure, including the Users Council Pricing Paper, and Pricing Questions and Answers. Also to be distributed to library directors are individual library use data and a financial impact.
analysis. Lastly, Ms. Nevins reported that in January 1985 AT&T petitioned the FCC for a new tariff. Unless the request is denied, on March 19, 1985, OCLC expects a 22% telecommunications price increase. Due to the short time period between AT&T's request and the date it would take effect, there has been little time to counter the request, however OCLC is working with the American Library Association office in lobbying the FCC.

Jay Weitz, Quality Control Librarian, OCLC, described the OCLC Enhance project. The purpose of Enhance is to allow selected libraries to "enhance" records in the OLUC. To date, some 30,000 records have been enhanced, and the efforts of the Enhance libraries have resulted in substantial reductions in the number of Change Request forms which would otherwise be handled by OCLC's Quality Control Department. Mr. Weitz described the procedure by which Enhance libraries are selected, which involves a rigorous process of application and evaluation. The initial selection produced 20 Enhance libraries, to which four have since been added. Very recently, a second round of applicants were evaluated, which will yield one new sound recordings and six new score Enhance libraries. Presently, the music Enhance libraries (for scores and/or sound recordings) are: Indiana University, New England Conservatory, Oberlin College, University of Texas at Austin, University of Utah, and University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

--Pamela Juengling
University of Massachusetts
at Amherst

ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPTS CONTROL FORMAT

During one of the small group sessions on March 4, Penny Mattern, a specialist in serials, maps, and authority formats with OCLC's Marketing and User Services Division, introduced a packed room to the Archives and Manuscripts Control Format (AMC). "Special needs, special fields" is Ms. Mattern's motto for the AMC format, which is substantially revised from the old Manuscripts format. While traditional cataloging creates records for individual bibliographic items, the materials in archives and special collections are commonly described at the "collection" level, where a single record stands for a group of related items, such as a family's personal papers or the records of a single organization. Appropriate links among related archival materials are important, since much of their value derives from their use together, as a collection.

Since no existing cataloging rules or format had adequately met the archivists' descriptive needs in the past, the field set about to develop some. First prepared was a data dictionary, as yet unpublished, defining concepts and the vocabulary to represent them. Following this, work began on a new cataloging manual, based on AACR2, but more nearly meeting the special needs of the archival community. This manual is Steven L. Hensen's, Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts: A Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories, Historical Societies, and Manuscript Libraries (Washington, D.C.: Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, 1983). Finally the AMC format was prepared to designate the new fields and subfields for the information specified in the new rules. The AMC format still supports all the fields needed for traditional AACR2 Chapter 4 cataloging, and libraries may continue to choose this descriptive option. However, OCLC encourages the use of Hensen as the standard for description, with the stipulation that access points be as always in AACR2 or AACR2-compatible form.

An examination of the AMC format with Hensen in hand reveals the special fields provided. Perhaps most important are the linking fields that enable the description of an individual item or of a "collection" in a single record to be linked to a larger collection of which they form a part. The 580 Linking Entry Complexity Note and its companion 773 Host Item Entry, the same fields used for In-Analytics on much the same principle, make this possible along with a new Bib level code (Bib lvl: d). Another feature of the format allows a record for a collection to include descriptions applicable to only part of the collection through the use of a subfield "3" with a repeatable 300 field. Some of the more straightforward special fields include: 506 Restrictions on Access (Hensen rule 4.7B9); 520 Summary, Abstract, Annotation, Scope, etc. Note (4.7B4; this note is the heart of the description of the archival material); 540 Terms Governing Use (4.7B10); 555 Finding Aids (4.7B11); 561 Provenance (4.7B7); 561 Immediate Source of Acquisition (e.g., gift or purchase); and 583 Actions
(to assist in-process control). The last two of these fields, 541 and 583, are also masked, so that they display on OCLC only to someone at the inputting library logged on in full mode.

The AMC format may be used for music materials, when the special fields are desired, under the circumstances outlined in the format manual introduction. AMC is flexible and useful for special materials control. Network representatives can assist with further training in the use of the AMC format.

--Shirlene Ward
Wichita State University

THE OCLC ACQUISITIONS SUBSYSTEM: PROBLEM SHARING

Tim Robson (Case Western Reserve University) opened the problem sharing discussion of the OCLC Acquisitions Subsystem by reporting that there are 240 libraries currently using the system, 46% of which are academic/research libraries. Also, Tim stated that OCLC is not planning any major enhancements to the subsystem. Tim felt that OCLC would be turning its attentions to the development of a new micro-based, hard disk technology acquisitions system.

Since only a few of those present in the discussion group had actually used the system, Tim gave a brief description of how it works. He then opened the discussion to specific questions and problems. The most common concern raised about the system was the fact that the publisher's number (028 field) does not transfer to the acquisition record and does not appear on the Action Form which the vendor receives. Suggested solutions to this problem included: (1) calling the vendor, (2) inputting the manufacturer's number in the order subfield "b," (3) inputting the manufacturer's number in the source field, and (4) inputting the manufacturer's number in subfield "d" of the order field. The question was posed, "How exhaustively should you search the OLCU before you can enter an O-level record?" Answer: "Search as far as it is possible with the information you have." Another participant asked if the O-level records are being purged. The reply was that they are being purged about six months after the last symbol has been removed.

Most people agreed that the online accounting aspect of the subsystem works very well. However, some concern was voiced about the Funding Activity Report print-outs. Many felt that they are unduly complicated. Others expressed a need for the manufacturer's serial number and the uniform title to be included on the report. Still other concerns were verbalized regarding the fact that no piece of paper is associated with each order and, as a result, it is difficult for patrons to learn whether or not certain titles are on order.

Glenn Patton confirmed that OCLC was not planning any enhancements to the present ACQ System and added that there will not be a micro-enhancer. Special interest groups who would like to have input into the planning of the new system should address their concerns to the Acquisitions Advisory Committee of OCLC.

--Sheridan Stormes
Butler University

CONSUMER ACTIVISM (OR, THE SQUEAKING WHEEL GETS THE GREASE)

Consumer activism for online users was Joan Schuitema's topic for a small group discussion on March 4th. She delivered a most interesting paper on this timely subject.

Although political activism and lobbying are certainly not new concepts to librarians, what is perhaps new is the context in which we are now required to consider them. Lobbying for changes in the OCLC system may be different because we are dealing with a business as opposed to an institution, a government body, or another organization. It is our responsibility as users of the OCLC system to lobby for new developments in the system, thereby improving the product we purchase.

In order to lobby successfully, we need to understand the company's structure and mode of operation. OCLC has two identities. The first is that of a pro bono organization devoted to societal service objectives, relying heavily upon the cooperative drive of its users. The second identity is that of a private sector firm, utilizing the marketplace to connect to the customers, and using its revenue generating capacities, and its ability to generate a surplus of revenue over costs, as a means to secure capital for continuing expansion. Tension is inherent in maintaining a balance
between these two identities, and this should be kept in mind when addressing our concerns. Some feel that OCLC is leaning too heavily in the direction of money-making and forgetting its role as a service organization. The membership must then insist on its changing that direction or suffer the consequences.

MOUG's strength as an organization lies in our ability to exert pressure on OCLC by enabling us as individual members to lobby effectively. MOUG has no official channel as an organization within the OCLC governing structure, nor does it generate any money for OCLC. We are dealing with a business, therefore, individual letters from 250 bill-paying OCLC members will exert much more pressure than one letter signed by MOUG's Board on behalf of its membership. "Consensus as the preferred way to change things isn't as successful except at certain times when cohesiveness is believed to have an equal or higher value to the substantive issue itself." Lots of paper translates into lots of unhappy bill payers. Other possibilities might include MOUG's joining forces with other user groups, enabling both memberships to send letters addressing certain problems, or using MOUG's Network Advisory Council as a channel for lobbying. In order to actually lobby for change, we must use official channels within OCLC's governing structure.

OCLC's governing body is the Board of Trustees, where all long range goals, decisions and directions are determined. Its membership is comprised of eight Board-elected members and six elected from the Users Council. There are also special advisory committees, such as the Cataloging Advisory Committee. Each of us should know who our representatives are on these committees as well as on the Users Council. Through these channels we establish communication with OCLC. These are the people whose job it is to apply pressure on OCLC to meet the needs of the membership and to remind OCLC of its pro bono identity. We can also work through OCLC management where day-to-day decisions are made and priorities are set in order to meet the goals of the organization. We generally need to go through Marketing and User Services Division, headed by Tom Sanville. This is also where our official liaison, Glenn Patton, works. He and Jay Weitz can lobby internally for us, but not without ammunition: letters from us, the users.

The activity of lobbying may represent one way in which our professional duties as librarians have changed with the advent of library automation. Our work is directly affected by the results of successful lobbying for improvements in the tools we use and the services we purchase.

The following are some guidelines for effective letter writing. Form letters of any kind are not desirable—they express only one bill-paying member's thoughts and do not make a favorable impression. Be accurate, clear and brief. Try to focus each letter on one major problem, tying in with others when possible. Here is a general outline which may be adapted to allow you to express yourself comfortably:

1) Paragraph 1 should contain a concise statement of your concern. Try to keep this in perspective, indicating an awareness of the total problem. You could also commend OCLC for their efforts, when appropriate.
2) In paragraph 2, briefly describe the problem by giving concrete examples. Since OCLC is a business and not a library, they do not use the system, and they become aware of the problems users experience only by receiving real-life examples. It is best to stick to usable facts and examples rather than emphasizing your opinion, and to try not to become defensive.
3) Paragraph 3 might contain discussion of what all this could mean to the database per se, emphasizing costs for the company, if possible. It might help to remind OCLC that it would be more cost effective for them to try to prevent a problem rather than to have to clean up the results. Problems which result in a decline in the quality of the database affect all users.
4) Paragraph 4 is the "bottom line" paragraph. That is, that as music users, we are not receiving the services we are purchasing. This might be a good opportunity to relate some other concerns to the main focus of the letter.
5) Finally, we come to a brief closing. We might thank OCLC for the attention given to previous requests and to express our expectation of similar action in this case. Or, one could simply state what is expected from OCLC, possibly reminding them of their existence as a pro bono organization.

Where these letters should be sent varies slightly depending upon the nature of the problem. One copy should go to management level (in our case this is often Tom Sanville, assuring that Glenn Patton also receives a copy). An additional copy should
always be sent to your network, since they need to be informed. A third copy should be sent to the appropriate Users Council or committee representative, whichever seems most directly involved. In this way, we have covered all three channels: management, network, and governance. It would also be very helpful to find someone else in your library to write a similar letter, possibly an administrator (even if all they do is endorse your letter). The more letters received, the more OCLC considers it worth their while to respond to the requests made. As musicians, we have a reputation to uphold, namely, that of being loud and persistent.

--Candice Feldt
Tufts University

"IN" ANALYTICS

This discussion group session was conducted by Glenn Patton, OCLC. Before the days of indexing services there were many "in" analytics, especially of literary items. Interest in them has waned with the improvement of indexing services. In doing retrospective conversion, one may have to handle some of these, which include: a) separately titled volumes of multi-volume sets, b) items from a contents note, and c) name/title added entries. Now a new type of analytic is available: a separate bibliographic record for one part of a larger piece, such as one band of a sound disc. This only applies to things which are physically part of the "host" item. Technical Bulletin 147 describes the format changes necessary to accommodate this technique.

Some uses a music library could make of this "In" analytic technique include separate cataloging for one band of a disc (allowing subject analysis and performer entries to match the composition); cataloging a score which is issued in a serial; and, cataloging an article by a local faculty member.

--Nancy Mosley
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

PROBLEM SHARING--GENERAL DISCUSSION

Ralph Papakhian led this discussion group. Among those present were Jay Weitz and Glenn Patton of OCLC.

Several categories of problems were covered. Due to the large number of participants with questions or problems it was not possible to cover most of them at length in the time allotted. The topics which generated the most discussion were the following:

1) Productivity vs. quality of cataloging. This is particularly a dilemma for music catalogers. Some work under pressure of a quota system, yet score and sound recording cataloging take more time than monographic cataloging because of the greater length of music records. It was suggested that the LC Music Section publish its statistics demonstrating longer record length for music. Some music catalogers are finding now that the many name changes being generated because of LC's TOSCA procedures are having an impact on cataloging workflow, even though the number of names found in the LCNAF has increased.

2) Name-title indexing of the LCNAF in OCLC. The question of availability of name-title searching of the LCNAF was raised. Glenn Patton reported that this is in development, but there is no projected time frame yet, largely due to the fact that the entire OCLC system is in the process of change. There was agreement in the room that this type of indexing is needed. Patton asked that we write individually to OCLC if we are concerned that this be given a high priority.

3) Loading of LC MARC music tapes into the OCLC database. Many people present wanted to know when this will take place. Patton reported a shortage of staff devoted to the software development needed for the music tape loading. There is the anticipated problem of the great number of duplicate records which will occur when the tapes are loaded (this could be as high as 40%). The software that would be necessary to match and weed duplicate records from the database is currently not available. The suggestion was made by a participant that if this programming problem is what is delaying the tape loading, duplicates could instead be weeded manually, as is done now with member libraries submitting duplicate record reports to OCLC.
Searching the 028 field. With OCLC's announcement of the forthcoming enhancement for searching by the 028 field for music records came some discussion of search keys and potential problems. If a plate number or publisher's number has been entered with "no." in the "a" subfield, it would not be retrieved by the prescribed search key which uses only the number, or a prefix and number.

Other topics of interest to participants were: OCLC's new pricing system (announced at Plenary Session I), uses of the M300 workstation other than for word processing (i.e., batch searching), and problems with using student searchers for music materials.

--Anne McGreer
Indiana University

MELVYL: THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S ONLINE CATALOG

Garrett Bowles, Music Librarian at the University of California, San Diego, spoke to a large audience on Monday afternoon about "MELVYL: The University of California's On-line Catalog." He began with a brief description of the system, emphasizing the fact that it is a union catalog for the nine UC campuses, assembled at the UC system-wide level from OCLC, RLIN, and locally-produced archival tapes. There are two files available: monographs and serials (CALLS, the California Academic Libraries List of Serials). As of early April 1985, the MELVYL Online Catalog contains 1,634,693 bibliographic records for the nine campuses. The scores and sound recordings files have not yet been loaded into the catalog, but are expected in the not-too-distant future. A few scores, however, entered in Books format, can be found in the catalog.

Dr. Bowles continued with an overview of the two search modes: look-up mode (the user-friendly method of accessing the database, which requires no knowledge of the command language), and command mode (the preferred search method with more powerful capabilities). The MELVYL catalog is a very easy system to learn, and has a substantial number of well-written help screens available for explanation and information.

Index construction was then highlighted. The primary indexes include personal author, corporate author, title, uniform title, series, subject, keyword, exact key (title, subject, and corporate author), and control number (LCCN, ISBN, ISSN, OCLC, RLIN, local system). Using Ernst Krenek as an example, Bowles showed the results of various index searches. Users can ask the system to display the results of their searches in a variety of formats, from a short one-line description to the fully-tagged MARC record. These formats are: 1) review (one line: author, title, date); 2) brief (short paragraph: author, title, publication information, pagination, call number, library locations); 3) long (tabular format: contains all the information shown on a catalog card); and 4) MARC (fully-tagged record, sometimes a composite if held by more than one library).

The presentation concluded with a brief description of search strategies and how to limit them, including the use of Boolean operators. Bowles also described some of the secondary indexes that the MELVYL catalog has which allow a search to be further refined, such as qualifiers by date, specific campus, or particular libraries. Other secondary indexes are planned, including language and country of publication. Some discussion followed, particularly about the catalog's authority structure, which is integrated with the bibliographic files and is transparent to the user.

--Linda Barnhart
University of California, San Diego

CLSI AS A MARC-BASED SYSTEM

The small-group session on CLSI was chaired by John Hein, Head of Technical Services at the University of North Florida. Mr. Hein was generally critical of CLSI's software, but he said that it is gradually improving. Circulation librarians had the most influence on the design of the system in its early stages of development. More recently, catalogers have been increasingly influential. CLSI is now developing PAC-II, which will give the system the capability of being used as a MARC-based public access catalog.

For the cataloger, the major problems with the CLSI system concern the lack of flexibility in using MARC records: MARC
records can be retrieved online but cannot
be edited online or off-loaded to another
system.

The reference librarian has different
problems using CLSI. The first is that an
author search does not sort by title, but
rather by a system-generated, seven-character
author-title key. The second problem relates
to retrieval of records from the bibliographic
record file (distinct from the MARC record
file). A record in the bibliographic record
file can contain a maximum of 30 fields. The
distribution of these 30 fields is determined
in advance by the library. For example, a
library might decide to allocate 4 of the 30
fields to name added entries (MARC tags 700-
715). If a record being loaded from an
archive tape into the bibliographic record
file contained 15 name added entry fields,
the last 11 such fields would not be stored
in the file. The disadvantages for music
records are obvious; however, PAC-II, storing
full MARC records, will not have this problem.

--Dean W. Corwin
Trenton State College

PLENARY SESSION II

Speakers for the second plenary session
were Dawn Lamade, Member Services Manager,
SOLINET, and Ann Armbrister of the AMIGOS
Bibliographic Council.

The session began with Ms. Lamade
describing archival tapes. An archival tape
is a chronological record of each transaction
done on the OCLC system. The records appear
on the tape in the same order in which they
were created, not in numerical order, by
bibliographic level, or record type. Every
produce, update, replace, or cancel done
in cataloging or retrospective conversion
authorization results in an entry on the
archive tape. The various networks collect
the archive tapes which subsequently can be
used for a number of different purposes.

The tape itself is a 1/2 inch strip of
magnetic tape which is a storage medium.
Particles of iron oxide are magnetized on
this strip and represent data. This data
must be stored in a meaningful way so that
libraries can get from the tape information
that they need.

The data on the tapes is organized in
logical units of information. The smallest
logical unit on the tape is a bit. It has
two states: on (0) or off (1). Bits are
combined in groups of eight to form bytes.
The two standards for combining bits into
bytes are ASCII (American Standard Code for
Information Interchange) and EBCDIC (Extended
Binary Coded Decimal Interchange Code).
Groups of bytes form the fixed and variable
fields, and the combination of fields is a
record.

A logical record is one bibliographic
item with a unique OCLC number. It has a
maximum length of 4096 bytes. On the tape,
the record is blocked; a physical record is
2048 bytes, while a logical record is 4096
bytes. The tape, which has nine tracks, is
fed through the computer. Eight of the tracks
represent bytes, with the ninth being a
check digit. Between each logical record
is an inter-record gap which tells the
computer where one record ends and the next
begins.

A logical record is made up of groups
of fields. The first part of the record, the
leader, is 24 characters long and con­
tains various pieces of information from
the fixed field and supplies the length of
the logical record. The second grouping
of information on the tape is the record
directory. This defines the position of
each field in the record. The tag number
is first, followed by the length of the
field and the starting character position of
the data on the tape. The control fields,
containing additional information from the
fixed fields, make up the third grouping
on the tape. The fourth group contains all
of the variable fields and the information
in each. It is important to remember that
what appears on the tape is different from
what we see on an OCLC screen. OCLC
and other vendors can format the data from
the tape in a different way to make it more
readable to users.

Several records together comprise a
file. Most libraries have institution
files—their archival tapes. Groups of
related files form a database. For example,
the OCLC database is a combination of biblio-
graphic files, the name address directory,
the serials control subsystem, etc.

Every time a subsequent use is made of
a bibliographic record, that use appears on
the tape with every other produce, cancel,
update, or replace command. Subsequent
uses don't replace what is already there.
The tapes are strictly transactional,
giving a chronological sequence of records.
reflecting every use of a record. The tapes are not "cleaned up" until a library requests that service from a vendor, and there is generally a charge associated with it.

All of the information in a bibliographic record is usually what goes on a tape. Each library has a profile for its off-line products (cards, COM) which strips out the information to be used on that particular product. For example, a library may specify which call number the vendor is to strip off the archive tape for use on its products. This does not actually remove other call numbers from the tape, but selects which particular elements should appear. All of the information remains on the tape for possible future use. In response to a question from the audience, Ms. Lamade recommended that all call numbers be retained on the archive tape. Very little storage space is taken up by these fields and there may be a future use for them. The advantage of having that information may far outweigh the storage space saved. Although an institution may choose to remove certain information from its bibliographic records as they are loaded into a local system, it should try to retain as much as possible on the archive tapes. This information may be useful to other parts of a large institution.

It is important to realize that there is certain information which is not on the archive tapes. Input stamps appear on the tapes, but automatic stamps do not. Most vendors can provide automatic stamps based on information in the $49 field (the four-letter codes) in the same way that OCLC does. For this reason, it is important to use these codes correctly and consistently. An institution's profile should be both written and used correctly. Other elements which do not appear on the tapes are automatic oversize designations, print constants (e.g., 505: CONTENTS:), ISBD punctuation, and brackets around uniform titles. Most of these items can be supplied by the vendor or tape processor.

Ms. Lamade then recommended that OCLC's quarterly Marketing and User Trends Reports be consulted. These document the number of uses and subsequent uses that an institution makes of a record. Although the reports are not broken down by type, they do provide detailed information on the use of the system.

"Cancel" commands also appear on archive tapes, along with previous uses of the same record. This is important to remember when having tapes processed. Most libraries would want to have the cancel transaction eliminate all other uses, and this must be specified to the processor.

Ann Armbrister discussed the maintenance of archive tapes. Most OCLC users are familiar with maintenance in terms of editing a record for card production, but may not be aware of the ramifications and importance of maintaining one's archive tapes. The two areas of maintenance are the correct record of holdings data and the accurate maintenance of bibliographic data. Since changes made in a bibliographic record aren't retained online, maintenance involves constructing and re-constructing a record. Ms. Armbrister cautioned the audience to avoid certain expediencies that may be tempting to follow. Try to be consistent with OCLC practice and in observing the MARC format. This affects not only your own use of the record, but has implications with regards to resource sharing. Each library should carefully document decisions about cataloging policy, maintenance, card production, and tape maintenance policy. By documenting these practices, a library will be better able to explain the inevitable inconsistencies which will occur in the future. A vendor can usually cope with these inconsistencies if it knows what has been done, when it was done, what significant changes have been made, and where they can be expected to show up on the archive tape. The audience was urged to begin this documentation immediately if it had not already been done so; don't rely on someone's memory.

The physical maintenance of tapes is also important. They should be preserved and handled carefully. It is desirable to review tapes when they are received to make sure they contain good, readable data. The holdings statement on the tape should be compared to the actual number of records on the tape and records should be examined to be sure each is complete. The tapes should be stored in the correct atmospheric conditions and should be refreshed periodically. Certain networks offer storage service for their members.

A question and answer period followed. Glenn Patton of OCLC announced that OCLC was offering several tape-related services. For libraries which did not subscribe to their archive tapes, OCLC is now able to go back through its archive tape and select
every transaction with a certain holdings symbol and provide this information in tape form. Through the use of the AACR2 conversion software, tapes can also be run against the current Library of Congress name authority tapes to provide current name forms. OCLC is also offering a service whereby multiple occurrences of the same bibliographic record are consolidated.

The audience was reminded that changes in the MARC format are not reflected on archive tapes. The OCLC MARC tape subscription document contains an appendix which enumerates the changes in the MARC format. This can be very helpful when attempting to reconstruct tape history for a vendor.

When choosing a vendor, it is important to remember that some systems don't retain the MARC format or the OCLC MARC format for internal processing. This has serious implications for editing records directly in a local system. If the maintenance function in the systems is not MARC-based it may be difficult or impossible to get the information out in MARC format, or if the information is retrievable, it may be of limited use.

Ms. Lamade then discussed tape processing as done by SOLINET and reminded the audience that most of the other networks and vendors offer similar services. The most familiar tape by-product is the catalog card. Some libraries purchase their tapes in order to produce COM catalogs. Some use tapes to load into local systems. Special listings, such as serials lists are available in paper and microform by accessing certain keys (e.g., bib level) within the bibliographic record. It is advisable to use your tapes in a manner that already has been developed. Innovative and unusual uses of tapes can be very costly to program.

Usually a vendor will profile a library in much the same way that OCLC does card profiles. This involves deciding what types of information should be taken from the archive tapes. Again, the importance of maintaining the tapes and documenting past practices cannot be overstressed. This is especially important in large institutions which may have smaller branches or departmental libraries with varying practices and procedures.

Tape processing can involve several different processes. A library may wish to have all transactions on the tape: every record every time it has been used, arranged in OCLC control number order. Another option is to retain the last or latest transaction. This may be desirable for a library that has been careful about maintaining its records online. All previous uses are removed in this type of processing, unless the last use is a "cancel" and all uses are removed. A third type of processing is Ø49 consolidation. This is useful when a library has used a record more than once for different holding libraries, for instance, a public library with branch locations. All of the Ø49 information would be pulled together into one record. A fourth type of processing, Ø19 resolution, involves replacing member input cataloging with Library of Congress cataloging which may have "bumped" the member input at a later date. The OCLC control number of the older member input is put into the Ø19 field of the LC record and the old record is removed from the database. There are approximately 150,000 LC records which have replaced member input. SOLINET, and several other networks have the OCLC AACR2 tapes from the "flip" of several years ago. A library could have its tapes processed through these tapes in order to upgrade a great many of its older headings to AACR2 form. The last type of processing described was the "item record build." Libraries with local systems may find this process useful. It involves building records with barcode numbers in them; a specific barcode is matched to a specific bibliographic record in the database.

Questions were then taken from the audience.

Q: When a library deletes holdings, is this reflected in the Ø49 merge process?
A: Not necessarily. This would be the case if a library left out one particular holding symbol as it works with a record. Otherwise it might be better to also specify latest use when processing tapes.

Q: Is it possible to use indicators in the Ø49 field to indicate changes made in a record?
A: Yes, but be sure to document your practice.

Q: Will two sets of call numbers and subject headings be recorded on an archive tape? For example, a library may have an item both in its adult and juvenile collection.
A: Yes, both will appear because the
indicators in the respective fields are different.

Q: When complicated holdings are recorded in the $49 field over a period of time (e.g., a multi-volume set which is still being published) does the system retain the previous uses when volumes are added, or does the $49 have to be completely reconstructed each time?

A: There is the potential for an $49 merge here, but the library should have careful documentation in order to inform the vendor of its practices. In this instance, it may be desirable to specify latest use for the bibliographic information and first transaction and merge for the $49 information. It would probably be best to get a print-out of all uses of the record to determine which use is best and fullest. It is cheaper for the library to do this itself than to have the vendor write programming to do it.

The audience was reminded that not all systems and vendors can handle all formats.

The next section of the program featured Ann Armbristter discussing tape processing for local systems. The implementation of an online system is where all of the above-mentioned factors come into play. Archive tapes are critical to the start-up success of an online system; a library's archival records must support all of the functions of the system.

There are many decisions to be made in implementing an online system. The parameters governing these decisions may include the features of the system, its capabilities, the characteristics of the library's file, and online storage. Since the procurement of an online system is not static, a library must be certain it can retrieve its records in MARC format when it decides to migrate to another system.

Before the bibliographic data is loaded and indexed for retrieval and display, a library should attempt to anticipate the data's use. When doing retrospective conversion, it should also plan for search-ability. A library should also investigate a system's handling of local data, particularly holdings information which can get very complex. An important part of the start-up is the creation of the link between the item and the corresponding bibliographic information. Automated processing can be used to facilitate this. As part of tape processing, the vendor may be able to manipulate the information in the $49 and call number fields and convert this information into a field that the local system accepts. Some systems use a $49, $49, or $59 field and others have customized processing. Item information is also generated by matching the $49 information with copies and locations. The alternative to this automated processing is manual inputting of holdings and item information.

The barcoding/OCR function for circulation can be streamlined by having the vendor create a special tape as a spin-off of the archival tape processing. The vendor will produce barcodes from this special tape. The labels will correspond to the data in the now-manipulated archival tape. A set of labels in shelf list order will match with materials on the shelf, and the barcode information will automatically be linked to the bibliographic database. Although this process can be rather expensive, it is much less labor-intensive than doing it manually and reduces the chances of errors.

When planning for an online system, music librarians should make their needs known since music and other special materials may be overlooked in large institutions.

The initial tape load is probably the most important. Since this occurs when the library is the least experienced with the system, it is essential to have accurate and adequate testing. A library should work with a sample database before loading a great many records. With the test database, the library should exercise the software to its fullest and test all of the functions of the system.

The session concluded with a discussion period. There were several questions about maintenance of records online. Some systems have local MARC maintenance functions and can retain changes without having to go back through OCLC. Since we are only beginning to see some of the applications of archival tapes, libraries should build durable databases, but have enough flexibility in them to move to other systems and applications.

Glenn Patton announced that the ANSI (American National Standards Institute) standard for recording holdings of non-srollar items was in draft form. He alerted the audience to several problems libraries are likely to encounter while recording holdings information for music materials.
The first involves recording holdings for multiple part items that circulate as one unit (scores and parts). Since circulation staff needs to keep track of this type of information, libraries should check with vendors to see whether they can handle this situation. The second problem is the converse of the first. Frequently, a single physical item may be represented by multiple bibliographic records, for instance, sound recordings cataloged under the old rules. A single item number or barcode must somehow be linked to multiple bibliographic records.

The session ended with a discussion of the use of the 099 call number field. Since this field is usually used to format a call number in a particular way for card production, it does not always load, display or index properly in a local system. Again, the importance of documenting the use of the field was stressed.

--Ann McCollough
Eastman School of Music.

MINUTES OF THE MOUG BUSINESS MEETING,
4 March 1985 (Louisville, Ky.; 1:20 pm)

Board members present: J. Swanekamp, J. Schuitema, D. Hixon, J. Weidow, S. Stancu

1) Opening remarks
   Joan Swanekamp, Chairperson, welcomed members in attendance to the annual meeting of MOUG and introduced members of the Executive Board. Richard Smiraglia's term as past-Chair of the group expires with this meeting.

2) Minutes of the 1984 Business meeting were approved.

3) Executive Board reports
   a.) Chairperson (Joan Swanekamp)
   Swanekamp announced that a Nominations Committee will be formed this spring to prepare a slate of nominees for the Executive Board elections in the fall. Volunteers are also being sought for several MOUG committees. Interested persons should contact Swanekamp.

   The Music Library Association will be meeting next year in Milwaukee and they have set aside the dates February 8th-16th. Swanekamp asked for a show of hands of those members who would be willing to meet during that time. Approximately half of the members indicated their approval of holding the next annual MOUG meeting in Milwaukee either directly before or after MLA. The Board may explore the possibility of having some sessions overlap with MLA. Discussion followed on how the meeting should be scheduled. Members should contact Don Hixon, Continuing Education Coordinator, with their ideas concerning the meeting schedule.

   Swanekamp suggested that those members who have had experience with implementing online systems in their libraries contribute articles for the MOUG Newsletter.

   Joan Schuitema, Vice-Chairperson, is continuing work on the MOUG officer's handbook.

   Members were encouraged to fill out and return the meeting evaluation form included in their registration packets in order to assist the Board in planning for next year's meeting.

   b.) Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Sue Stancu)

   Thanked the members who contributed to the Newsletter last year, as well as those who volunteered to write summary reports of the 1985 meeting. The next issue is planned for May.

   c.) Treasurer (Judy Weidow)

   Membership report: total membership is 525, with 232 personal and 293 institutional members.

   Summary of the 1984 financial report:
   income: 6429.54; expenditures: 5226.14; budget surplus at the end of 1984: 1586.24.

4) Committee reports
   a.) Union List of Serials Committee (Ellen Rappaport)

   The committee was charged to conduct a feasibility study to determine if a music union list of serials is 1) theoretically possible, and 2) a worthwhile project. Rappaport explained some of the options that might be available for participants in the union list group. It is possible for the group to be made up of OCLC libraries as well as non-OCLC libraries. If a library is already participating in an OCLC union list group, its holdings data would not have to be keyed again. OCLC libraries which are not now part of a union listing group could key in their own holdings information. One of the OCLC libraries would have to take responsibility for acting as agent for the group.
The advantages of creating such a union list group would be to consolidate all music holdings into one list. Problems would be mainly organizational, since the group would cover such a large geographic area.

Rappaport also gave a brief review of the costs involved, and questioned the members present about whether or not they thought the project would be worthwhile. Approximately twelve members indicated that their libraries are currently part of a union list and about twenty members expressed interest in having access to a music union list. A survey seeking opinions on creating a music union listing group may be published in the next issue of the MOUG Newsletter.

b.) Committee on Academic Library Needs
(Ralph Papakhian)

The committee was charged with evaluating the usefulness of several fixed field elements and OXX fields, as well as whether the Required/Mandatory/Optional status as listed in Bibliographic Input Standards is appropriate.

The committee has put together a questionnaire which appeared in MOUG Newsletter No. 25, and so far six responses have been received.

c.) OMRAC (Ann McCollough)

Currently there are nine members: Kathryn Burnett (Smith College), Dean Corwin (Trenton State College), Elly Johnson & Rick Jones (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), Ann McCollough (Eastman School of Music), Nancy Mosley (University of North Carolina-Charlotte), Richard Smiraglia (University of Illinois), Barbara Strauss (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Eric Western (University of Utah).

During the past year the group lost three members: Jack Knapp (Oberlin College) and Sue Stancu (Indiana University) (who gained Enhance authorization), and Margaret Welk (University of Maryland) (who is now working at LC), and added one new member, Dean Corwin (Trenton State College).

Last year the group analyzed 488 records: 34 (7%) were scores and 454 (93%) were sound recordings, an increase of 52% over 1983.

d.) REMUS/NACO (Richard Jones)

REMUS membership consists of twelve libraries: University of California, San Diego, University of New Mexico, University of Texas at Austin, University of Virginia, University of Louisville, New England Conservatory, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, University of Illinois, Indiana University, Oberlin College and Eastman School of Music.

Jones reported that the first part of the REMUS project, retrospective conversion, has not progressed because external funding is needed. Also, REMUS is involved with the joint committee on retrospective conversion standards whose work is still in progress.

The second part of the project involved OCLC’s Enhance. Five of the twelve member libraries have received Enhance authorizations. The three libraries that have reported their statistics to Jones are enhancing an average of 486 records per month.

NACO participation, the third phase of REMUS, has made progress during the past year. Jones has been trained in NACO procedures and will be responsible for training the remainder of the members, probably this summer.

5) New business

a.) No new business issues were introduced.

b.) The members present at the business meeting joined Swanekamp in thanking Phil Youngholm and Jay Weitz for their work on the Vivaldi Project.

Meeting adjourned 1:50 pm

--Sue Ellen Stancu
Secretary
CORRESPONDENCE FROM OCLC

For those of you who were in Louisville for the MOUG meeting in early March and had their curiosity quickened by the impending announcement of the second batch of Enhance institutions, wait no more. Nineteen new institutions have been chosen to receive Enhance authorizations, one of those in two formats; in addition, two other libraries already authorized for one format have been authorized for one or two other formats.

Newly authorized for the Scores format are: Eastman School of Music (RES), Florida State University (FDA), Northern Michigan University (EZN), University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIU), University of Louisville, School of Music (KLM), University of Texas at Austin (IXA) (already authorized for Sound recordings), and University of Wisconsin at Madison (GZN).

The single new Sound Recordings format authorization is the New England Conservatory of Music (ENG), previously authorized for the Scores format. So there are now an even dozen institutions with sixteen authorizations in the two Music formats.

To refresh your memories, the libraries previously authorized in the Music formats during the first round of Enhance were: Scores format: Indiana University (IUL), New England Conservatory of Music (ENG), Oberlin College (OBE), University of Utah (UUM), University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee (GZN). Sound recordings format: Indiana University (IUL), Oberlin College (OBE), University of Texas at Austin (IXA).

Between the implementation of Enhance in June 1984 and the end of March 1985, these and the other authorized libraries have Enhanced 35,170 records in the OCLC. Of these, approximately 6300 were in the Scores and Sound Recordings format. This number can only be approximate because the statistics gathering mechanism for Enhance does not break things out by format. As a result, this figure includes some Books format Enhances done by Indiana University and in the future will also include Books Enhanced by the University of Texas at Austin, so far the only two libraries authorized in one of the Music formats as well as in Books.

Training for the second round libraries is in the process of being scheduled. One session for the new Score libraries and some of the Books libraries will be held at OCLC at the end of April. A session for the five Audiovisual format libraries will be in mid-to-late May in Richmond, Virginia, while a West coast session for the remaining Books libraries will be scheduled later in the spring. More details and a complete list of the new Enhance institutions will be in the next OCLC Newsletter. Also forthcoming after the training and monitoring of this group will be the third round of Enhance, open to all types of libraries in all formats, later this spring.

By the time you read this, we expect that the Music Publisher Index will be available. Since it became clear that this index would be coming up soon, we in Online Data Quality Control Section have been busy adding and correcting 028 fields. We encourage users to submit change requests for the addition of 028 fields to records lacking them, especially where Music publisher number information appears in such unindexed areas as 4XX fields, 500 notes, and 260 _c (for pre-AACR2 Scores), as well as for cases where pre-AACR2 forms of entry would result in incorrect indexing (particularly ranges of numbers in 262 _c, pre-AACR2 Sound recordings).

It was suggested to me in Louisville that I could devote a portion of my regular column to special problems I encounter in cataloging. Considering the advent of this new index, the considerable trouble many people seem to have with 028's, and the new importance of the 028 as an access point for music, this seemed an especially appropriate topic for the first of these mini-lessons.

Remember that the 028 field was designed to satisfy multiple, and often incompatible, purposes and so deals with neither of them satisfactorily: as an indexable access point and as a generator of a note and/or an added entry. Because we can circumvent the problems with generating notes and added entries by explicitly inputting them, the indexing aspect has taken higher priority.

For correct indexing, the 028 _a should contain only numerics, word, abbreviations, or alphabetic devices which indicate numbering. Abbreviations for the terms "number", "catalog number", or the like ("No.", "Nr.", "Cat. no.", etc.) should not be input in 028 _a; the terms "Publisher's number", "Plate number" and their abbreviations should not be input in 028 _a.
Ranges of numbers must be separated by double hyphens, the second number must be greater than the first, any initial alphabets must be identical, and any parentheses must be correct and consistent for accurate indexing.

on record label: Columbia Special Products
BM 10020

on score cover: Wilhelm Hansen Edition No. 3452

at bottom of each page of musical score:
E.E. 1120

Following these guidelines and the further detail in the format documents should help to make the new Music Publisher Index more efficient and complete.

By this time users should have received the third edition of Bibliographic Input Standards; new revision pages to the Scores and Sound Recordings formats should be on their way as well. The latter contain expanded information on 007 and 028 and content designators for "In" analytics, among other changes. This fiscal year through the end of March has seen the deletion of 23,920 records via 19,900 merge holdings commands. Recently, ODQCS received printouts from a database scan of all records with "DO NOT USE" notes in the 043 field, a total of some 16,000 records. While most of these are serials, quite a few hundred are Scores and Sound Recordings. Processing these duplicates has begun, but is not expected to be completed until sometime in 1986.

Following is a list of OLUC changes derived from change requests, LC updates, the Music Cataloging Bulletin, and serendipity. Of course, the Name Authority File should always be consulted, as it is a dynamic, always-changing file and these names and uniform titles are not always the complete forms. Lists of NAF, ARN, or MCB references are not necessarily complete, nor does every reference contain a valid AACR2 form of the heading. Those that do not have been included for informational purposes only. Being only human, we in ODQCS have surely missed some headings or incorrectly converted others; should you come across any such errors, please let us know through the usual change request mechanism.

--Jay Weitz
Quality Control Librarian
Online Data Quality Control
Section
Marketing & User Services
Division
OCLC

"IN" ANALYTICS

Users have reported discrepancies between the list of valid subfields for field 773 in Books Format, 2nd ed. (p. 7:30) and Archives and Manuscript Control Format (p. 7:15) and those shown in Bibliographic Input Standards, 3rd ed. (p. 101). The format documents are incorrect. Subfields /c, /e, /f and /g are not valid in field 773 in any format. The format documents will be revised to alleviate the confusion.

--Glenn Patton
OCLC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>UT or Change</th>
<th>NAF Number</th>
<th>MCB Refs</th>
<th>Flds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrahamsen, Hans, 1952-</td>
<td></td>
<td>82102732</td>
<td>799290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR 2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:8:2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arensky, Anton Stepanovich, 1861-1906</td>
<td></td>
<td>79072720</td>
<td>305469</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR 2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:1:4;12:3:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750</td>
<td></td>
<td>79145908</td>
<td>377037</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ lag in Todesbanden (Cantata)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:6:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caccini, Giulio, ca. 1545-1618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuove musiche e nuova maniera di scriverle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond, David, 1915-</td>
<td></td>
<td>81146972</td>
<td>691738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR 2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dussek, Johann Ladislaus, 1760-1812</td>
<td></td>
<td>81120566</td>
<td>665538</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR 2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dussek, Johann Ladislaus, 1760-1812</td>
<td></td>
<td>83071596;78080121</td>
<td>953623;215450</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concertos...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:2:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dussek, Johann Ladislaus, 1760-1812</td>
<td></td>
<td>84040470</td>
<td>1242134</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elégie harmonique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dussek, Johann Ladislaus, 1760-1812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Concert (Musical group)</td>
<td></td>
<td>78096796</td>
<td>231839</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR 2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eybler, Joseph, Edler von, 1765-1846
(correct AACR2 form)
82101505
798066
15:6:1

Eybler, Joseph, Edler von, 1765-1846
Symphonies...
note in 82101505
note in 798066
15:6:1

Frescobaldi, Girolamo, 1583-1643
(correct AACR2 form)
79139212
370481
11:1:5

Frescobaldi, Girolamo, 1583-1643
Canzoni...
81054198;81053088;78025669;78025668
599687;598582;161987;161986
---

Frescobaldi, Girolamo, 1583-1643
Capriccios...
81134022;79036248
678882;269816
---

Frescobaldi, Girolamo, 1583-1643
Fiori musicali...
81151449;81151448
696192;696191
---

Frescobaldi, Girolamo, 1583-1643
Keyboard music...
81150163;81150164
694914;694915
---

Frescobaldi, Girolamo, 1583-1643
Recercari et canzoni franzese...
79137224
368551
12:7:1

Frescobaldi, Girolamo, 1583-1643
Toccate e partite d'intavolatura...
79150271;79150126;81146594;81133303;79150125;81133301
381313;381168;691361;678169;381167;678167
11:8:4;12:7:1;15:2:2

Gabrieli Quartet
(correct AACR2 form)
82040735
737764
---

Gade, Niels W. (Niels Wilhelm), 1817-1890
(correct AACR2 form)
81004075
550178
12:3:4

Gerhardt, Paul, 1607-1676
(correct AACR2 form)
81017339
563190
---
Hotteterre, Jacques, 1674-1763
(c correct AACR2 form)
50029237
64613
---

Krommer, Franz, 1759-1831
(c correct AACR2 form)
80040737
422802
---

Krommer, Franz, 1759-1831
Concertos...
83057577
942823
---

Krommer, Franz, 1759-1831
Harmonien...
78097088
232087
10:2:3

Krommer, Franz, 1759-1831
Sonatas...
80085521
466716
---

Krommer, Franz, 1759-1831
Variations...
80042899
424934
15:2:4

Lloyd, George, 1913-
Pervigilium Veneris
82042924
739927
15:9:1

Markevitch, Igor, 1912-1983
(c correct AACR2 form)
80158660
114234
15:9:1

Mravinsky, Yevgeny, 1903-
(c correct AACR2 form)
82246147
1075816
15:11:2

Opéra de Monte Carlo. Orchestre national
(c correct AACR2 form)
81015275
561151
16:4:3

Paderewski, Ignace Jan, 1860-1941
(c correct AACR2 form)
80019661
402045
11:6:4

Philipp, Isidore, 1863-1958
(c correct AACR2 form)
83121490
957554
---
Rotnwell, Evelyn
(correct AACR2 form)
81021927
567729
15:7:3

Syme, David, 1949 or 50-
(correct AACR2 form)
801688334
489115
15:4:1

Tabernacle (Salt Lake City, Utah). Choir
(correct AACR2 form)
84011590
1147096
---

Tůma, František Ignác Antonín, 1704-1774
(correct AACR2 form)
---

---
15:2:3

Valentine, Robert, 1674-ca. 1735
(correct AACR2 form)
82028133
725280
15:9:1

Visée, Robert de
(correct AACR2 form)
80167034
546166
---

Warlock, Peter, 1894-1930
(correct AACR2 form)
50038210
73443
12:3:5

Williams, John, 1932-
(correct AACR2 form)
80145169
525317
---

Yamashita, Kazuhito, 1961-
(correct AACR2 form)
81014988
560867
16:4:3

---
SEARCHING CORPORATE NAMES FOR MUSICAL GROUPS

A user recently reported problems in searching a sound recording titled *Leftoverture* performed by the rock group Kansas. The record could be retrieved by title search but name and name/title searches seemed not to work.

Several points need to be kept in mind. The parenthetical qualifier "Musical group" will frequently be added to headings for performing groups (see the LC rule interpretation for AACR2 rule 24.4B published in Cataloging Service Bulletin, no. 15 (Fall 1982)). Since these parenthetical qualifiers are not separately subfielded, they must be considered in the formulation of the search key. For example:

Heading: ABBA (Musical group)
Search key: =abba,mus,g

In addition, the corporate name stoplist must be considered in formulating the search key. A number of popular and rock groups have names which consist of state names or other words commonly associated with corporate names—e.g., Alabama, The Association, Kansas, etc. The user searching for *Leftoverture* had not realized that the word "Kansas" would be disregarded by the Online System.

Heading: Kansas (Musical group)
Search key: =musi,gro,

The name/title search key would also be influenced by the corporate name stoplist. The search key would be "musi,left" not "kans,left."

---Glenn Patton
OCLC

OCLC PRICING STRUCTURE CHANGES

At the March MOUG Meeting in Louisville I had the opportunity to describe OCLC's new pricing structure and its impact on the OCLC membership. Several MOUG attendees expressed interest in the specific impact on music libraries. While most music cataloging is performed as a subset of an entire institution's activity, OCLC staff were able to identify six music libraries online which catalog under a separate identifiable symbol. A summary of the pricing impact data for these six libraries is given below.

There are three primary pricing structure changes which will go into effect on January 1, 1986. They are:

1) Search charge (with a threshold of 4 non-billable searches per produce): .06 per search above threshold.
2) Credit for each original cataloging input: -.50 per item cataloged.
3) Credit for each item lent through the ILL Subsystem: -.20 per item lent.

The intent of these changes is: 1) To provide diversity of online access, 2) To encourage growth of the Online Union Catalog, 3) To encourage resource sharing through OCLC.

The impact on the OCLC membership as a whole is detailed on the following chart. This includes both online and offline product charges, but does not include network or telecommunication charges. Impact data is provided both at current searching/original cataloging/ILL lending levels maintained by libraries and with some expected changes in searching levels as a result of the introduction of the search charge.

Every OCLC library will be receiving a report of its own online activity and impact data. This should be sent by networks to library directors in May.

OCLC feels that these pricing structure changes provide us with a more flexible, equitable way to address current and future system users. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me or your network office.

---Kate Nevins
Network & Library Services
Department
OCLC
### PRICE EFFECT - CURRENT VS. JANUARY 1, 1986
**ONLINE AND OFFLINE PRODUCTS COMBINED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARIES WITH:</th>
<th>NO CHANGE IN SEARCHING</th>
<th>&quot;EXPECTED&quot; CHANGE IN SEARCHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECREASED COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%–3% INCREASED COSTS</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%–5% INCREASED COSTS</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%–10% INCREASED COSTS</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%–30% INCREASED COSTS</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%–75% INCREASED COSTS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%–100% INCREASED COSTS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% PLUS</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below details the same information for music libraries only:

### PRICE EFFECT - CURRENT VS. JANUARY 1, 1986
**ONLINE AND OFFLINE PRODUCTS COMBINED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARIES WITH:</th>
<th>NO CHANGE IN SEARCHING</th>
<th>&quot;EXPECTED&quot; CHANGE IN SEARCHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECREASED COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%–10% INCREASED COSTS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%–30% INCREASED COSTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMUSIC UNION LIST OF SERIALS

The Music OCLC Users Group Ad-hoc Union List of Serials Committee has been charged to "conduct a feasibility study to determine if a music union list of serials is 1) theoretically possible and 2) a worthwhile project."

Please read the following, and reply by June 14 to Ellen C. Rappaport at SUNY/OCLC Network whether or not your library is interested in contributing to a MOUG union list of serials. So that this can be discussed at the summer meeting of the MOUG Board, please respond now!

Scope: A serials union list for music libraries could indicate holdings and music collections within larger collections. These could include periodicals, annuals, continuations, numbered monographic series, and other ongoing serials.

The holdings of libraries which are not members of OCLC could be included in the list, along with those of OCLC members. The holdings of a non-member library would be input by a member library. It is possible that some non-OCLC music libraries have already been included in a regional union list. If you know of any, please write its name into question number 22.

The holdings of any library which is already part of another OCLC union list would appear in the music union list as soon as it was established online. Those libraries would not need to input anything a second time; they would not incur additional charges for input or for storage. The holdings would make a music union list useful from the moment it was established.

Access: Any OCLC member could search the music serials list online from any OCLC terminal. You could search the union list even if your library had not contributed to it. Printed lists, on paper or fiche, could be produced. Then lists could be distributed or sold to any library. OCLC does not limit distribution or copying of machine-readable OCLC-produced serials lists. Tapes of the holdings and associated bibliographic records will be available, in July 1985, under a licensing agreement.

An OCLC library might search the list online, and any library might purchase a printed list, without contributing its own holdings. But obviously, the more holdings and libraries in the list, the more useful it will be.

Costs:

Online input:

To build holdings record:
25¢ per title per library

One ULS search, to identify correct record:
4 1/2¢ per title per library

Storage charge:
3¢ per title per library per year

OCLC would charge a one time profiling and start-up fee, based on the number of libraries in the group.

Online Searching:

4 1/2¢ per union list display (one per title, each time you search)

Printouts (optional):

Rough estimate of costs:
3 1/2¢ per title
1¢ per holdings statement (one per library)

For one copy of a printed list, which may be reproduced as needed.

Networks may charge their members a fee or a transaction charge, in addition to these charges. This fee would probably not be large; check with your network for details.

OCLC charges and network charges, if any, would be billed to each OCLC member library by its network. Non-OCLC libraries' charges would be billed to the responsible Agent, and in turn billed to those libraries.
SURVEY
MOUG Union List of Serials

Please answer as many questions as you can. If necessary, estimate numbers. Leave blank any questions you cannot answer. Above all return the questionnaire.

1. Name of Library:

2. OCLC Symbol:

3. Network:

4. Name of respondent:

5. Title of respondent:

6. Date:

7. Would your library be willing to contribute its serials holdings to a music union list? (This is not a firm commitment, just an expression of interest.)
   \(\square\) Yes. Our library could pay the OCLC and network charges involved.
   \(\square\) Yes, but our library could not be willing/able to pay the OCLC and network charges involved.
   \(\square\) No, we're not interested in/able to contribute information to a music union list of serials.
   \(\square\) Other:

8. Would you search a music union list of serials online on OCLC?
   \(\square\) Frequently
   \(\square\) Occasionally
   \(\square\) Not at all

9. Would you search a music union list of serials printed on paper?
   \(\square\) Frequently
   \(\square\) Occasionally
   \(\square\) Not at all

10. Would you search a music union list of serials printed on fiche?
    \(\square\) Frequently
    \(\square\) Occasionally
    \(\square\) Not at all
11. Do you search any OCLC based union list of serials, looking for music titles?

☐ Frequently
☐ Occasionally
☐ Not at all

12. Has your library input any music serials/periodicals into an OCLC union list of serials?

☐ Yes
☐ No (If not, skip to number 19)

13. How many titles have been input? (estimate, if necessary)

Periodicals: ____________________________
Annuals: _______________________________
Monographic Series: ____________________

14. What symbol(s) were they input under? ____________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

15. When were they input? __________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

16. Have the holdings statements been kept up-to-date?

☐ Yes
☐ Mostly
☐ Somewhat
☐ Not at all

17. Who input them?

☐ Your library staff
☐ A union list agent: _____________________________________________________________
☐ Other: _______________________________________________________________________

18. If kept up-to-date, who does that input?

☐ Your library staff
☐ A union list agent: _____________________________________________________________
☐ Other: _______________________________________________________________________

19. Do you have more titles to input?

☐ Yes
☐ No (If no, skip to number 22)

20. Number of periodical titles not input: ____________________________
Number of annuals not input: _________________________________
Number of numbered monographic series not input: ________________
21. Could you provide up-to-date information about your library's serial/periodical holdings (volumes and/or years) in list or card form?

☐ Yes
☐ No

22. If training were provided, could you or someone in your library key your serial holdings into OCLC?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Comment: ________________________________

23. Do you know of any non-OCLC music libraries whose serial/periodical holdings have been input to an OCLC union list of serials?

Name of Library(ies): ____________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

24. Comments about a music union list of serials: ________________________________

__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

Please return this survey to: Ellen Rappaport
SUNY/OCLC Network
State University Plaza
Albany, NY 12246

By June 14, 1985
Music OCLC Users Group

APPLICATION FOR NEW MEMBERS

Personal membership is $5.00; Institutional membership is $10.00. Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members receive Newsletter no. 25 and any mailings from date of joining through December, the end of the membership year (Issues are mailed on receipt of payment of dues). Personal members please prefer home address.

NAME: ____________________________________________

MAILING ADDRESS: _____________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

TELEPHONE: (_ _ _) - ___ - ___ ext. ___

NETWORK: ____________________________________________

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION: ________________________________

BILLING ADDRESS: _______________________________________

_____________________________________________________

Check one:

___ Enclosed is a check for membership dues: $5.00 individuals

___ $10.00 institutions

___ Please bill (Institutions only)

Are you presently a member of the Music Library Association?

___ yes

___ no

Please return complete form and check made payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP to:

Music OCLC Users Group
Judy Weidow, Treasurer
P.O. Box 8272
Austin, TX 78713-8272