FROM THE CHAIR

MOUG is expanding its horizons! From a group of a few music catalogers trying to find ways to influence the policies of OCLC, we have grown to become an organization of over 400 diverse institutional and personal members. Just as OCLC's products and services have evolved, so the needs of MOUG members are evolving. A few weeks ago the MOUG Executive Board met in Dublin, Ohio for our annual summer Board meeting. Prior to that meeting I made an "official visit" as MOUG Chair to OCLC headquarters to meet several of the people on the OCLC staff who have expressed interest in the new directions MOUG is taking. In particular, I would like to mention Mary Marshall, Marketing Manager for OCLC's Electronic Publishing and Information Delivery Division (EPID). One of the products of this new division is Search CD450, OCLC's CD-ROM reference tool. The first databases to be made available are ERIC and a subset of the OCLC database having to do with education. Ms. Marshall expressed great interest in having suggestions for other products which OCLC might market in CD-ROM format. Bear in mind that the CD-ROM technology can include sound and graphics, as well as text. Would there be a market for CD-ROM thematic catalogs or other music reference tools? If you have suggestions, please send them to Ms. Marshall at OCLC (with a copy to me for the information of the MOUG Board). There is a description.
of the CD-ROM products in the July/August 1987 OCLC Newsletter (with our own Jay Weitz as "coverman" for the issue!) It is in areas such as new product suggestions and field testing of new products and services and user education and awareness that MOUG has the opportunity to make a new and strong impact at OCLC.

These new directions prompted the single most important topic at our summer Board meeting--discussion of a draft mission statement for MOUG. The text of that draft, as discussed by the Board, appears elsewhere in this issue. Please examine it; your comments are welcome. The Board is scheduled to give final approval to the statement at our next annual meeting in Minneapolis, February 8-9, 1988. We also discussed a series of goals and objectives which would help us fulfill the mission statement. These goals, objectives, and possible "action items" to fulfill the goals will be presented during a plenary session in Minneapolis.

The Executive Board determined that more aggressive marketing of MOUG is necessary to attract new members (both personal and institutional, both music specialists and persons who only occasionally deal with music, both catalogers and non-catalogers), retain present members, and convince lapsed members to rejoin. Among the actions which will be taken are: supplying this Newsletter free of charge to all networks; more aggressive follow-up on former MOUG members who have not renewed (If they have dropped out on purpose, what was the reason? How could MOUG attract them back?); a printed flyer about MOUG with membership information, which could be distributed at various library meetings; the possibility of some informal MOUG meetings apart from our annual meeting (e.g. ALA midwinter), to provide the opportunity for non-music specialists to learn about MOUG.

Obviously, not all of these activities can begin at once. If you have other suggestions for marketing MOUG, please let me know. If your library would be interested in doing field testing for some prospective OCLC product, you should also make that interest known--sometimes products which work perfectly well for books are disastrous for scores and recordings. (It was news to me that there are sometimes products which are tested but never actually make it to market).

In other business, the MOUG Board decided to authorize our Treasurer to invest part of the MOUG treasury in a higher-interest account or certificate. At the same time, there was considerable discussion about making more effective use of our treasury. Several possibilities are currently under consideration.

I am pleased to announce that in response to a suggestions from MOUG and after a hiatus of several years, OCLC will again be exhibiting at the Music Library Association annual meeting and advertising in NOTES. Exhibiting at a convention requires a substantial expense to a company, and I am excited that OCLC is again showing this commitment to music libraries.

Finally, the Board also approved the wording for a by-laws amendment to revise the length of time required of an individual to serve as MOUG Chair. I encourage you to vote affirmatively on this issue. Later in the Fall you will receive your ballot for election of new officers.

Timothy Robson
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The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.
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February 9: Preconference workshop on archives and archival materials in music.

February 10-13: Sessions on music resources in special areas of the library, planning for library audio facilities, copyright, subject access for popular music, the state of music librarianship as a profession, and music of Minnesota.

For more information: contact:
Martin A. Silver
Music Library
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
(805) 961-3609
FINANCIAL REPORT
1st quarter 1987

Balance
end of 4th quarter 1986 3186.82

INCOME 1st quarter
Memberships 2030.00
Regis. and luncheon 3153.00
Best of MOUG 85.00
NOW interest 64.91
Back issues 8.00
Sale of mailing list 20.00
TOTAL INCOME 1st quarter 5360.91

EXPENDITURES 1st quarter
Meeting expenses 2040.94
Printing 51.65
Postage 3.20
Change 50.00
Returned check 53.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES 1st quarter 2198.79

BALANCE end of 1st quarter 6348.94

2nd quarter 1987

INCOME 2nd quarter
Memberships 785.00
Best of MOUG 130.00
NOW Interest 82.08
Back issues 21.00
Refund for telecommunications 56.21
TOTAL INCOME 2nd quarter 1074.29

EXPENDITURES 2nd quarter
Newsletter #32 258.00
Printing 54.63
Postage 46.40
Summer Board mtg. 298.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES 657.03

BALANCE end of 2nd quarter 6766.20

MARC NEWS

Changes to Field 007 for sound recordings

MARBI, the ALA LITA/RTSD/RASD committee responsible for making changes to the MARC formats, approved two MLA proposals at its meeting in June 1987. The changes bring Field 007 for sound recordings up to date with recent advances in digital sound technology.

Prior to the adoption of the proposals, Field 007 Byte 04 (Kind of Sound) had been used to record two types of information: the configuration (or number) of playback channels (such as monaural, stereophonic, or quadraphonic) and the technique used to record the sound (such as acoustic, electric, or digital). In 1985, the MLA Bibliographic Control Committee Subcommittee on MARC Formats (SMF) began working on an update of the 007/04 code values in order to provide better coverage of digital technology. The resulting list of codes was found to be too lengthy, so Sally McCallum (LC Network Development and MARC Standards) suggested that the proposal be rewritten with the two types of information carried in separate bytes. SMF sketched out the codes and descriptions for the two bytes (see MCB 17, no. 10 [October 1986]: 7) and completed final work on the proposals during the MLA annual meeting in February 1987.

The approved proposals redefine 007/04 to include only the information on configuration of playback channels and add a thirteenth byte to Field 007 to contain information on recording technique. Assigning separate bytes to these two types of information reduces the number of code values and makes it possible to code one type of information regardless of whether the other is known. The restructuring also paves the way for accommodating future developments in sound recording technology.

The approved code values for 007/04 and 007/13 are as follows:
007/04 CONFIGURATION OF PLAYBACK CHANNELS

WHEN 007/00 = SOUND RECORDING (S)

m Monaural
q Quadraphonic
s Stereophonic
u Unknown configuration of channels
z Other

(The following codes are now obsolete:)
a Acoustic [OBSOLETE]
f Monaural (digital) [OBSOLETE]
g Quadraphonic (digital) [OBSOLETE]
j Stereophonic (digital) [OBSOLETE]
k Other (digital) [OBSOLETE]
o Other (electric) [OBSOLETE]

007/13 CAPTURE AND STORAGE TECHNIQUE

WHEN 007/00 = SOUND RECORDING (S)

a Acoustical capture, direct storage
b Direct storage, not acoustical
d Digital storage
e Analog electrical storage
u Unknown
z Other

During discussion of the proposals, someone suggested that the name of 007/12 (Special Reproduction Characteristics) be changed to "Special Playback Characteristics." Provided no one finds a problem with this change, it will be made.

The full description for these elements will appear in MFBD Update #16. Copies are available in advance from Richard Griscom.

Proposed changes to 008/21 (Existence of Parts) and 008/20 (Format of Music Manuscript and Printed Music)

In 1985, SMF submitted a proposal to define exactly what constitute the "existence of parts" in Field 008 Byte 21 (Existence of Parts). The proposal recommended that the coding of this byte be associated with the content of Field 300 subfield a (Extent of item). During discussion by MARBI in summer 1986, a few observers pointed out that the presence of the words "part" or "parts" in Field 300 does not necessarily indicate that the cataloging institution holds parts. Some institutions describe the "ideal" copy regardless of whether they hold the complete item. Walt Crawford (RLG) recommended that the byte be made obsolete, and other members concurred. Richard Griscom offered to bring this suggestion before the MLA membership for their reaction.

Articles appeared in MCB (17, no. 10 [October 1986]: 17) and the MLA Newsletter (66 [September/October 1986]: 5). In Eugene, the Music OCLC Users Group, the RLG Music Cataloging Subcommittee, and the BCC Subcommittee on MARC Formats discussed the problems associated with 008/21, and each arrived at the conclusion that the byte is not useful. The question remained, however, of what should be done to revise 008/20 (Format of Music Manuscript or Printed Music), since the coding of this byte is dependent upon the content of 008/21. The matter was left unresolved. MARBI Discussion Paper no. 15, which was presented at the June 1987 meeting, summarized the discussions that took place in Eugene and was submitted with the hope that MARBI could offer some advice on how the 008/21 problem could be resolved.

MARBI encouraged LC to prepare a proposal to make 008/21 obsolete and to set up some guidelines for the coding of 008/20 that will in effect maintain the current coding practice for that byte. In August 1987 the LC Network Development and MARC Standards Office issued a revision of MLA's original proposal that recommends the following action:

PROPOSED CHANGES

The following is presented for consideration:

1. Make byte 21 (Existence of Parts) obsolete in field 008 for Music. It will henceforth be left blank.
2. Add the following to the description of byte 20 (Format of Music Manuscript or Printed Music) in field 008 for Music:

The existence or presence of music parts in the item being cataloged should not be considered in coding this character position.

Under this proposal, a score with parts would still be coded "a - Full score" and not "m - Multiple formats." A set of parts would receive "z - Music in other than score form" as it always has.

The proposal will be sent out to MARBI members in early October. MLA can certainly make recommendations to revise the proposal if a better solution to the 008/21 problem can be found. Readers should submit comments by December 15, since the proposal will be considered at the January 1988 MARBI meeting.

A complete report of the June 1987 MARBI meeting is available from Richard Griscom, Northwestern University Music Library, 1935 Sheridan Rd., Evanston, IL 60208 (BITNET: GRISCOM@NUACC).

Richard Griscom
Northwestern University

COOPERATIVE RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION PROJECT

A cooperative project undertaken by the music libraries of the Eastman School of Music, Indiana University, and the University of California at Berkeley, under the auspices of the Associated Music Libraries Group and funded by a Title II-C grant from the U.S. Department of Education, has resulted in the retrospective conversion of 29,454 bibliographic records for music scores and books. Of these records, 7,370 input at Eastman and Indiana were new to the OCLC data base, and 7,774 of those input at Berkeley were new to the RLIN data base. Tapes from the respective institutions are in the process of being cross-loaded into RLIN and OCLC for the widest possible use by member libraries.

Adherence to standards as described in the National Plan for Retrospective Conversion in Music (MLA Newsletter no. 60, March-April 1985) was strict. Eastman and Indiana used the Enhance capability to significantly improve a total of 7,354 records in OCLC. At Berkeley 1,232 upgraded or improved records were added to RLIN. This included the addition of access points such as the unique music publisher's numbers, subject headings, and the upgrading of name and uniform title headings to AACR2 specifications. In most instances pre-AACR2 description was left unmodified, but all codes for fixed fields and indicators were supplied or corrected during enhancement. Only 20 percent of the records converted were simply updated; that is, the record was sufficiently complete that only local information was needed.

To avoid duplication of effort a full matrix of music books and scores was used, with each library concentrating on different areas of their collection. There is some overlap, however, between MUS 9 and MUS 16.5. In these areas it must not be assumed the total represents a total of unique titles; at least 20 percent are probably shared records between the institutions. Also, the matrix here is not complete, but includes all conspectus areas covered by this project.

By far the most time-consuming aspect of the project was in the areas of AACR2 authority work and local authority control. The Library of Congress Name Authority File contained about half of the name headings used, and less than 15 percent of the uniform titles used. Thus, out of the total name and name/title headings established for the records, 74 percent involved a cataloger decision based on AACR2. Indiana found that an average of 1.22 unique headings were required per item; Eastman was somewhat higher at 1.27 headings, because of the nature of items converted (M200s generally requiring uniform titles, whereas MTs would not).

Problems with the records largely
involved inadequate or erroneous information on the shelf list cards. One advantage of an in-house recon project is that the item to be converted can be pulled from the shelf if necessary. Although this slows the initial effort of "getting the record in," it can save much time in post-conversion clean-up and catalog maintenance.

Other problems centered around the difficulty of personnel recruitment and retention for work that is temporary. Despite some employee turnover and loss toward the end of the project, the original goal of 30,000 converted records was very nearly met.

Monthly progress reports were distributed to participants by the project coordinator. Sample records were also distributed for perusal and comment to aid in quality control. Hopefully the combined efforts to produce high-quality machine-readable records and particularly the authority work contributed to those records, will be of great benefit to libraries involved in or planning for retrospective conversion in the field of music.

Vivian Olsen
Indiana University

PLENARY SESSION II

The NJALN, New Jersey Academic Library Network, until 1982, was a standing committee of the Council of State Colleges known as the Committee on Inter-Institutional Cooperation. The NJALN whose membership consists of the Directors of eight state colleges (Glassboro, Jersey City, Kean, Montclair, Ramapo, Stockton, Trenton, William Paterson) plus the New Jersey Institute of Technology and the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey. One of the main purposes of the members is to pursue common interests and concerns with regard to inter-institutional cooperation. Among these interests is an automated circulation system and public access catalog.

In 1977, the NJALN (still called the Committee on Inter-Institutional Cooperation) showed a keen interest in automating its collections. The Executive Committee, after an investigation of existing systems in Illinois and New Jersey and a thorough review of the literature, recommended that the members of the Committee develop an automated circulation system. This recommendation was then forwarded to the Select Committee of the Council of State Colleges.

A request for proposal for an automated system was released in early May of 1978 with a bid opening at the end of June. The bidding process was managed by the Division of Purchase and Property for the Department of Higher Education of the State of New Jersey. Each college serves under the auspices of the Department of Higher Education, the coordinating body which provides oversite of certain New Jersey state institutions.

The RFP was carefully developed to assure a system response to the needs of the member institutions. It was decided by the group that a turnkey system would best serve the purposes of the libraries since at that time most of the computer centers of the member institutions relied heavily upon the NJECN, New Jersey Educational Computer Network, for providing needed data and services. As a consequence programming support on each campus was sharply limited and creating a system from scratch would require the full time services of a computer programmer and support staff for at least one year.

At the bid opening over 50 vendors were present, but only four responded to the RFP. The two leading contenders were DataPhase and CLSI, the latter was finally chosen since their proposal most closely met the specifications established by the Executive Committee.

A system was originally configured with a storage capability for over 2.5 million items, utilizing 29 terminals and 10 printers. The system would run on one Digital PDP 11/34 processor and four 300 megabyte drives.
The central site was originally located in the computer center at Montclair State College. Since the NJALN is not legally established as a separate entity, all funds, staff salaries, etc. were handled by Montclair. Each member contributed equal amounts to the project.

A target date of July 15, 1981 was set by the NJALN for the system to be fully operational with terminals at all ten sites. This target was never met as the hardware was not delivered until July 1982 and the software delivered later that year.

Database: Prior to 1984 CLSI’s system would not accept a MARC record. NJALN had hired a programmer to both merge all duplicate OCLC records with appropriate holding statements and reformat the archival MARC tapes of each library into a 30 field CLSI format. Each library was responsible for the retrospective conversion of its collection and the barcoding of all items for which labels had been assigned.

The patron and item databases were loaded into the CLSI system over a period of seven months. Patron records are created by each campus computer center using its enrollment records and a special program written by one of the computer center programmers. Those libraries which do not have access to a program-generated patron tape must input each patron manually.

In October 1983 Montclair State and William Paterson State Colleges started to use the CLSI system for circulation. As of January 1985 all ten colleges were online.

In 1984, with the acceptance of a MARC tape product by CLSI, the NJALN started loading all new material into the database through a weekly OCLC tape which contained the merged holdings of all ten institutions. In order for ten colleges to share one database the parameters had to be set up in such a way that incoming records would overlay existing records which had identical OCLC control numbers. All appropriate holding statements would be attached to that one bibliographic record.

Music materials are input the same as monographs, through OCLC MARC tapes. One major problem plaguing all materials input occurs when the item is multivolume or has a number of parts. There is no simple mechanism on the CLSI system which will automatically set up a volume structure. Each title has to be manipulated manually to create a hierarchical structure of volume pointers, and parts within these pointers before items can be attached. CLSI is well aware that this is a major stumbling block in their system and they have asked the NJALN to submit suggestions for improving its methods.

Upgrades: The original system has undergone three hardware and four software upgrades in a continuing effort to support additional terminals and an ever expanding bibliographic database. In August of 1984 the NJALN moved from Montclair State College to the NJECN which was well equipped in terms of space and staff support to meet the increasing needs of the Network. NJECN not only maintains the NJALN operation but other time-sharing operations throughout the state. With this move hours of operation were expanded to seven days a week with an average of 16 hours uptime per day.

The current configuration reflects four processors which will support approximately 180 terminals; six 800mb Winchester drives which will allow for growth beyond the current holdings of 1.6 million items, over 900,000 titles and 202,000 patrons.

Another upgrade is expected this summer in anticipation of a public access catalog with keyword and boolean retrievability.

Networking: One impact of automation has been the development of increased cooperation and communication among the libraries. Sharing a database as large as the NJALN has led to the creation of protocols for circulation, reciprocal borrowing and inter-library loan, as well as specific policies and procedures regarding bibliographic input. Libraries’ individuality in kept intact as much as
Reciprocal borrowing privileges have been extended to all students (undergraduate and graduate), faculty, and staff at each institution. The Interlibrary Loan Committee is currently investigating the possibility of using telefacsimile in a cooperative venture.

Public Access Catalog: NJALN is currently awaiting an upgrade for the second phase of a public access catalog (scheduled for June 1987). The version used now is quite primitive with a basic author, title, or subject access which is derived from the CLSI 30 field record. The new public access catalog will be created from indexes of the MARC fields and subfields in each OCLC format. CLSI has given NJALN carte blanche in the choices made as far as indexing is concerned, with the caveat that the amount of information indexed for retrieval takes up a proportional amount of space.

Author, title, subject, author/title, and call number searches will be possible using both keyword and boolean logic. For the first time, searches may be qualified by publication year, language and format, greatly assisting those looking for music materials and scores.

All persons responsible for cataloging music materials were involved with the parameterization discussions. All music formats, fields, and subfields unique to music have been included.

The target date for availability of the public access catalog in the member libraries is January 1988. It will take the NJALN at least five months to reload the original MARC records for which 30 field title records were created and another six months to create the indexes necessary for PAC.

The software will also include "See" and "See also" references and authority control. CLSI will also have the capability to make global changes to the database within the next 18 months.

One hinderance to a shared database is the fact that the software is structured in such a way so that a search will retrieve all titles for a specific search. When a patron searches Haydn's Symphony no. 45, he is liable to retrieve not only the piece located at his library, but 13 different versions and formats of that title. With the new public access system there will be the capability to limit the format (score, sound recording, video of a performance of the piece, etc.), but the patron will still have to look at each title until he finds either the one at his location or a specific version. The system, at the moment, is not capable of limiting the retrieval to those titles located at a particular location. The patron has to sequentially call up each title until he finds his specific search. When dealing with a database the size of the NJALN this can become quite time consuming. This problem has been discussed with CLSI and they are willing to investigate alternative solutions.

The emphasis on terminal location has thus far been concentrated on the needs of the circulation and cataloging areas. As equipment for adding additional terminals becomes available these will be used for the public access, reserve collections, and other purposes. Two libraries have automated their audio visual collections and Glassboro State College is hoping to automate one branch library and its music library within the next calendar year.

Presented by Dean Corwin
Trenton State College

PLENARY SESSION II

Timothy Robson described the barcoding project at Case Western Reserve University, where he is presently Head of Bibliographic Services and the former Music Librarian.

Planning for the project began in March 1986 when he was appointed coordinator of the project which ran from May 12-August 22, 1986. Implementing the project was a full time job from late March through August. The result of the
project was that 244,746 volumes were barcoded from the LC-classed circulating collection. Approximately 150,000 volumes were not barcoded. These included reference, non-circulating, and older Dewey materials. During that time more than 100,000 barcodes were linked to bibliographic records. Another 18,000 items have been linked since August, using a reduced staff and moving at a slower pace.

Robson stressed that the options discussed in this talk should not be considered the only ones since these options may not be valid everywhere. His experiences and decisions were based on CWRU’s choice of Geac as its vendor, however, similar questions apply to all online systems.

Robson found three good references when beginning planning:


A special issue of the OCLC LS-2000 Newsletter provided a concise description of issues.

Robson gave an overview of his speech, stating that he would discuss the preliminary options of what goals such a project should achieve, the decisions that have to be made before beginning the project, a very important and time-consuming part, staffing of the project, a description of Case Western Reserve University’s project, including procedures for training staff and communication about the project to staff, administrators, etc, and finally, some special music considerations in barcoding.

In any major project, such as barcoding a large library collection, library administrators must wholeheartedly commit the time and funds to support the project. Otherwise, it is doomed to only moderate success, or worse, disastrous failure. Several questions must be asked before the project begins and administrators must support the answers. First, what is the library trying to achieve, an online catalog or a circulation system? These options have completely different implications. If an online catalog is the objective, a project should probably focus on information that the public will see, such as correct holdings information. In this situation, barcodes are often not necessary. If, however, a circulation system is to be brought up first with an online catalog perhaps following at a later date, a project should focus on materials which will circulate. If the library decides on implementing a circulation system, it must then make the decision whether to inventory the collection before barcoding, a very expensive proposition particularly in an older library that has probably not had an inventory in many years. The alternative is to work directly from the shelf. The ideal situation would be to inventory the collection either before or as it is being barcoded. This is very labor intensive and therefore expensive. Robson recommended taking a pragmatic view: if an item is not on the shelf, it is either circulating and will be barcoded and linked when it is returned, or it is missing and can’t circulate. This pragmatism doesn’t answer database cleanup problems that occur when there is useless or misleading information in the database.

It is essential to know as much as possible about the capabilities of one's online system before beginning a project. Robson recommended getting friendly with the library systems office staff, sitting on implementation planning committees, talking with librarians (not just music librarians) at other institutions who use the same system, keeping in mind that all systems have options which are locally
controlled to a certain degree. Music librarians need to look out for their own interests since no one else will. Make it known to others in your library that music materials need special consideration. You should know as much about the quality of the database as possible since this affects linking and barcoding. Questions to ask include: Were corrections consistently made to archival records? Have tapes been "deduped"? Were holdings from consecutive uses of the same OCLC record merged or were they strung together in one holdings field? If a bibliographic record has been used more than once, which version was retained on the tape? Once you know about tapes, you need to know the consequences of loading them. Know about your tape loading program. The Case Western Reserve University loader program created thousands of erroneous holdings that needed to be cleaned up. Linkers have to be trained to recognize and distinguish between legitimate and erroneous holdings. Robson noted that these erroneous holdings might have been avoided by a more sophisticated tape-loading program.

Before starting there are many decisions to be made. First, what sorts of time constraints are you working under? How long do you have to complete the project? When does the director want to "bring the system up"? Will the library be open or closed during the project? If open, will regular services continue uninterrupted? How will the workflow affect regular technical and public services staff? Projecting how long the project would take was not as difficult as Robson had suspected. Using Music Library students as guinea pigs, Robson did some time studies then devised a simple worksheet on Multiplan in which variables could be changed to play "what if." For example, how many weeks will the project take if people barcode 200 volumes per day as opposed to 250? Variables included the number of employees working on the project, number of days worked, number of hours per day worked, etc. The projections from this experiment turned out to be fairly accurate, and in some cases not optimistic enough. The application phase took a shorter length of time than projected, but linking took longer, mainly because of the system.

Finally, you need to determine who will staff the project. Will all staff be involved, will a special staff be hired, or will there be a combination of the two?

Robson then described CWRU's project. He began by stating the the directive he received from his library director was to prepare for a circulation system. Ultimately, it was decided to bring up the online catalog first. Because of this change, some of Robson's decisions would have been different. Since he knew the project would not be particularly interesting, he devised ways to make the project seem exciting and to get all staff members interested and involved. Ten full-time special employees were hired for the project. These were student temporaries hired for 15 weeks, working 35 hours per week at $4.50 per hour. This meant approximately $23,625.00 for extra help. All permanent library staff worked part time on the project. Robson strongly recommended divorcing any special barcoding project as much as possible from regular supervisory and workflow patterns. People's regular supervisors shouldn't be their barcoding supervisors. The project must have the full support of library and university administration. The library director should make numerous public statements to staff about the importance of the project, and acknowledge that some work probably will not be accomplished as usual and that short-term backlogs may be generated by the project. In CWRU's case, the library director and associate director were members of teams (described below) and worked, at least part of the time, on the project along with other staff members. This was extremely important, at least from a symbolic standpoint, since it demonstrated the commitment of the library administration to the project. Employees should not be made to feel that they are being penalized either actually or symbolically for working on the special
Permanent staff was organized into "teams" of 7-8 members. Teams had members from various departments; not all members were from one department and team captains were not necessarily regular supervisors of team members. For the purposes of the project, the team captains were the supervisors of their team members, and were responsible for any disciplinary actions that might have been needed during the project. This was clearly understood by all staff at the outset of the project. Team captains were both librarians and non-librarians. They answered day to day questions, solved easy problems, assigned work to team members, and kept statistics, which were passed on to the project coordinator. Robson was team captain for the temporary employees.

Training began with a preliminary all-staff meeting in April to introduce and explain the project. This consisted of a pep talk by the director and a presentation by Robson. A separate training session was held for the special temporary employees, most of whom had had some previous library experience as student employees. Special training sessions were held for team captains. In a half hour training meeting for the permanent staff, Robson went over documentation and demonstrated application of the labels. Then the group broke up into teams to answer more specific questions and to have a practice barcoding session.

Robson wrote most of the extensive project documentation. He produced it on his Macintosh, printed it on a Laserwriter and incorporated graphics. This polished appearance gave it veracity. He devised an extensive communication mechanism. This included all-staff meetings, both in the preliminary and training stages of the project. There were informal team meetings, called by the team captains to reinforce training and follow up on comments, questions, and complaints. He issued an all-staff barcoding project update newsletter once or twice per week during the project. This gave project statistics cumulations, updates on training instructions, and pep talks. In addition, he placed articles in the University Libraries newsletter, which is distributed to a wider constituency.

Incentives for participation and good work were very successful. He stressed that the incentives be for a team effort, not individual effort. This encouraged cooperation among the staff members: the work of all team members is important. This is tied in with having team membership be mixed from various departments, so that the project doesn't become a competition between, for example, the circulation department and the cataloging department. A byproduct of the cooperation was that staff members who normally did not work together got to know each other, which could be beneficial to the library in the long run.

Incentives were figured on average daily output to compensate for team members being absent because of illness or vacation. If a staff member was present on any given day, he or she was expected to participate in the project. Non-participation hurt the team as a whole, unless that non-participation was made up by the other teams members. The incentives were one extra personal day (i.e., an extra day of vacation) for each member of the winning team at the end of the summer, a catered barbeque for all staff and temporaries at the end of the project and imprinted barcode mugs for all staff members.

The actual procedure consisted of 20 hours per week being spent barcoding for about 4 weeks. In addition, the temporary staff linked for 15 hours per week. Staff worked from the books on the shelf to the shelf list drawer. Cards with no books were ignored. Each person had a "daily goal" of 225 volumes to barcode. If a person reached the daily goal within the required four hours, he or she could stop for the day, or optionally could ask for more labels and go beyond the required number. This was to the team's advantage, because it raised the number of barcodes applied by the team, in the
competition for team incentive. Problems were flagged for later problem solving. Only in rare cases were books removed from the shelf for immediate problem solving. These problems were solved by the team captains or passed on to the appropriate department.

Phase II of the project was linking. This took place for eleven weeks (the remainder of the summer) for 5 hours per week. In this phase it was much more difficult to place a quota or goal on people because of the problems encountered. A goal of linking 20 barcodes per hour was set, but this was optimistic because of how cumbersome Geac is. Linkers worked from the barcoded shelf list drawers and only looked at cards with duplicate barcode labels. Books returned to circulation with no barcodes were barcoded and linked. Holdings were corrected, location and call numbers checked and corrected if necessary, erroneous holdings were deleted when possible and retrocon titles were identified.

When choosing barcodes one needs to make several decisions. Vendors of systems usually supply specifications barcodes must meet. Whether to use smart or dumb barcodes usually depends on the accuracy of the data base. Where and how many barcodes to affix to an item must be decided.

Some of the special music problems encountered in barcoding include "bound withs" (e.g. "With" notes on sound recordings). CWRU applied one barcode per physical volume then linked the barcode to the bibliographic record for the first work on side one of the disc. This is not a satisfactory solution. One barcode was applied to scores with parts in the same folder. This decision may be reconsidered. Parts bound separately were assigned one barcode per separate part. Barcodes were placed in the upper left hand corner of the album cover for LPs, on the box for cassettes, and on the upper left corner of the "jewel box" for CDs.

Timothy Robson
Case Western Reserve University

NEWS FROM OCLC

I would like to take this opportunity to update the MOUG membership on the status of the New Online System. When I last wrote about this topic, I reported that OCLC was in the midst of reviewing the project in order to assure that both users' needs and technological advances were adequately represented in the planning done up to that point. The review was completed this spring resulting in the development of new schedules, resource requirements and milestones for the project.

None of the user requirements have been changed, however, some technical issues have changed. Therefore, OCLC will be building the New Online System beside the current system in order for a smooth, low risk transition.

What does this mean? First of all, it means that there will be multiple releases of the New Online System. Release 1, which is currently scheduled for late 1989, will include new editing capabilities and the implementation of the cataloging and authorities services. There will also be enhanced searching capabilities such as the use of new qualifiers, expansion of derived keys, and browsable indexes. Release 2 will be comprised of the implementation of the holdings format, name-address directly, and intersystem services. Interlibrary loan, union listing, and the materials ordering system (MOS) will be included in Release 3.

Secondly, OCLC will be building a new, search-only database drawn from the Online Union Catalog which will offer keyword and boolean searching. Its scheduled availability is set to coincide with Release 1 of the New Online System. This database represents the structure required to complete the New Online System and will ultimately be integrated with the capabilities listed in Releases 1-3 above. In this manner, OCLC will be able to deliver the promised functionality of the new system in a number of deliberate, measurable steps while minimizing risk to ensure continuity of service.

If you find this process complicated and confusing, you are not alone for the
project is indeed complex. New Systems Vice President Don Muccino often makes this point by saying that "the interdependencies and complexities involved in changing a system of the size of OCLC's make the task akin to changing a tire while the car is speeding down the highway."

OCLC is confident that our current plans will insure steady progress toward our goal: "to implement a replacement for the existing Online System while maintaining its growth, performance, and functionality with a new system environment that will support the same level of growth, performance, and functionality, as well as flexible foundation for new, broader information and information-related service offerings."

Joan E. Schuitema
System Support & Training Specialist

MORE NEWS FROM OCLC

The second major database-wide AACR2 conversion, which began running in late December 1986, was completed on July 17, 1987, with an overall conversion rate of 36% of the records in the database. Unlike the first conversion in 1980, availability of the online system was not interrupted although the conversion took considerably longer than had been expected. Because of the less-than-perfect cross reference structure in the Library of Congress Name Authority File, some conversion errors have occurred and are in the process of being fixed. Should you discover any headings that have been incorrectly converted, please report them.

One unfortunate result of this conversion was the deletion of the subfield 4 in many headings, an error which was not realized until rather late in the process. Once it was found, the conversion was halted and the software corrected. The deleted subfields will be restored to the fields which generated 87x fields containing the subfield 4. In fields which merely had the subfield w added, the subfield 4 is irretrievably lost.

However, we are trying to compensate for the loss of these subfield 4's by the addition of thousands of subfields 4's to fields that never had them before. During the month of August, OCLC modified over 2.5 million records to accommodate changes to the MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data Updates 12, 13, and 14, as outlined in Technical Bulletin 172. Each of the 120,062 conversions of tag 705 to 700 and the 42,903 conversions of tag 715 to 710, generated a new subfield 4, so we figured it probably all evened out in the end. We will of course accept change requests for the replacement of any subfield 4 in an appropriate field.

Other database scan changes of interest to the music community include the following:

Change of 840 tag to 830: 137,575
Change in Accompanying Material FF data element: 3,487
Change of Literary Text FF data element: 119,850
Change of Description FF data element: 248,103
Deletion of 039 data field: 699,714

More specific information on the nature of these changes can be found in Technical Bulletins 164 and 170, as well as 172.

The Online Data Quality Control Section is proud of its fiscal year 1986/1987 accomplishments, including changes and corrections to 189,683 records, only about one-seventh of which resulted from change requests. Some 56,412 duplicate records were merged or deleted, a 23% increase over the previous year. We encourage users to submit reports of duplicate records on the proper form. Also during FY 86/87, 2,448 records were updated from LC copy, a large portion of which helped account for the virtual elimination of the sound recordings update backlog and the vast reduction of the scores backlog.

Enhance libraries were also busy
during FY 86/87, increasing the number of Enhance replacements by 34% over the year before to a total of 87,671. As of the end of July 1987, the total number of records enhanced in the two music formats since the beginning of the Enhance project in mid-1984, was 50,506.

The following list of manual heading changes in the Online Union Catalog is again shorter than usual, mostly due to the AACR2 conversion. As always, should you happen upon any incorrectly converted headings, please report them through the change request route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>UT or Change</th>
<th>NAF Number</th>
<th>ARN</th>
<th>MCB Refs</th>
<th>Flds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avison, Charles, 1710-1770</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>82003133</td>
<td>700471</td>
<td>18:3:2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballif, Claude, 1924-</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>82025145</td>
<td>7222323</td>
<td>18:4:3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Böhm, Theobald, 1794-1881</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>81140264</td>
<td>685080</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrenc, Jean-Louise Dumont, 1804-1875</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>83005081</td>
<td>901023</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Strangways, A. H. (Arthur Henry), 1859-1948</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>85327595</td>
<td>1537711</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Haydn-Institut</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>85150014</td>
<td>1697738</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liubimov, Aleksei Borisovich, 1944-</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>84191352</td>
<td>1239220</td>
<td>18:3:3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Cathedral Choir</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>78089252</td>
<td>224403</td>
<td>18:3:3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman, Michael, 1957-</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>80097248</td>
<td>478235</td>
<td>18:3:3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Hap, 1942-</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>86010478</td>
<td>1793026</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Anthology of American Music, Inc.</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>85174272</td>
<td>1471282</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Cyril, 1879-1970</td>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td>84123365</td>
<td>1267525</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOW AVAILABLE:
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