FROM THE CHAIR

From the many persons with whom I've spoken since then, the 1989 MOUG meeting, held in Cleveland March 19-20, was a great success, if not a bit grueling. We all owe a debt of gratitude to Laura Snyder, our Continuing Education Coordinator, and her Program Committee (Keiko Cho, Karen Little, and Patrick Maxfield) for providing us with such imaginative and provocative speakers and issues. Those who were unable to attend may find of interest the summaries contained in this issue.

The MOUG Board would like to ask for volunteers on a number of important fronts. As we all know, MOUG is now more than ten years old and during that time, a rather substantial archive has accumulated. This archive has been passed from officer to officer in a rather informal manner, sometimes methodically organized and sometimes not. The time has now come to make decisions as to what needs to be retained in order to preserve MOUG's historical perspective, how such materials should be stored, and where they should be housed. If anyone is interested in helping, or at least in sharing ideas, please let me know.

Also, we feel that an organization of our age and size ought to have a membership directory. A membership list is currently maintained by the Treasurer, but this is not a public document readily available to the entire membership. We are interested in producing a high-quality product utilizing good design, layout, and typography. I urge anyone who would like to work on such a directory to please drop me a line or give me a call.

Finally, the Board feels that we need to do more aggressive advertising, both in general to alert the library community about MOUG's existence and, more specifically, to announce details of our annual meetings. In this regard, we are considering appointing a Publicity Officer on an ad hoc basis. That person would elaborate some of the things mentioned above, as well as coordinate with Chris Olson (MLA Publicity Officer) about displaying MOUG materials with MLA at ALA, ARLIS, etc. Initial emphasis would be given to our next meeting, to be held next February in Tucson, although experience gained would be applicable to later situations. If you are interested in pursuing plans for a MOUG Publicity Officer, or if you would like to be considered for such a position, you should contact Laura Snyder as soon as possible.

This is your organization and there are many ways to become actively involved for the benefit of all members. I've mentioned some above. Now, let us hear from you!

-- Don Hixon
University of California, Irvine
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MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
MISSION STATEMENT

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

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue of the Newsletter. The Newsletter is an occasional publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. Editor: Linda Barnhart, Catalog Department C-075-K, Central University Library, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0175. Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be typed (double-spaced) or submitted on floppy disk using WordPerfect 4.2 or 5.0, and should be consistent in length and style with other items published in the Newsletter. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged. Correspondence on subscription or membership should be forwarded to Candice Feldt, University Library, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155. (Dues: $5.00 for individual members, $10.00 for institutional members, $15.00 outside the U.S.; back issues nos. 21-38 are available from the Treasurer for $4.00 per copy).
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

1988 FINANCIAL REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance in checking account at end of 1987</td>
<td>$6,802.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships (1988)</td>
<td>$5,155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Registration</td>
<td>$2,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$366.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Issues</td>
<td>$198.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing List Sale</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>$853.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 1988 Income</strong></td>
<td>$8,812.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Telephone</td>
<td>$389.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting AV Equipment</td>
<td>$236.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter No. 37</td>
<td>$659.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter Postage</td>
<td>$227.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter No. 34</td>
<td>$253.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Meeting – Minneapolis</td>
<td>$1,611.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Meeting – Summer 1988</td>
<td>$1,179.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$215.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing – Best of MOUG</td>
<td>$207.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$708.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$160.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$57.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Table ALA</td>
<td>$323.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$392.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACO-Music</td>
<td>$1,421.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 1988 Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$8,369.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in checking account at end of 1988</td>
<td>$7,245.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 Net Gain</td>
<td>$443.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Balance in Checking Account at end of 4th quarter 1988 $7,245.83

INCOME

Memberships $835.00
Meeting Registration $2,530.00
Interest $98.27
Back Issues $20.00
Best of MOUG $30.00

Total 1st quarter income $3,513.27

EXPENSES

Annual Meeting Board Expenses $1,106.62
Newsletter $363.80
Newsletter Postage $176.62
Printing - General $67.41
Miscellaneous - Returned Check Charge $3.25

Total 1st quarter expenses $1,717.70

Transfer to Certificate of Deposit $2,000.00

Balance in checking account at end of 1st quarter 1989 $7,041.40

MOUG Certificate of Deposit $2,000.00

TOTAL CASH $9,041.40
FROM THE EDITOR

This issue begins the coverage of the 1989 annual meeting in Cleveland. I would like to sincerely thank the many people who graciously agreed to prepare summaries and reports for the Newsletter. More will be forthcoming in issue no. 40.

As I'm sure all of you have noticed, the Newsletter has undergone some changes in format and style. We introduced a new masthead/logo in issue no. 37. The use of folded 11 x 17 inch paper was begun with issue no. 38, largely to save on printing costs. This issue brings some minor changes in font and style, due to MOUG's purchase of WordPerfect 5.0. I hope that these areas are now somewhat settled, and that the MOUG Newsletter can once again be consistent in style from issue to issue. I welcome any comments or suggestions on the form and content of the Newsletter; please let me know how it can better meet your needs.

At the MOUG Board meetings in Cleveland, the Board approved several new proposals for the Newsletter. First, we agreed to include a regular statement in the prefatory matter allowing materials in the Newsletter to be copied or reprinted, providing that the source was acknowledged. Second, we thought that we might try, on an experimental basis, an "Action Exchange" column, modelled on the column of the same name in American Libraries, where members could write in with questions (automation, music cataloging, OCLC, etc.) which would then be turned over to the membership and/or appropriate sources. Answers or additional information would then be published in a subsequent issue. You may direct queries to me, at the address listed elsewhere in this issue. Third, Jay Weitz has agreed to include in his column the written questions that he regularly receives at OCLC, usually regarding specific tagging problems, along with his response. He starts this feature with this issue. So be warned that your questions to Jay might be relayed to a much wider audience!

The MOUG Executive Board will be meeting in San Diego on Saturday, July 29, 1989. Any agenda items members wish to submit should be sent to Don Hixon at the address given elsewhere in this issue.

Three recent articles have come to my attention that might be of interest to MOUG members:


As a result of a new agreement between MOUG and MLA whereby the secretaries of each organization will share minutes and other relevant documentation to better communicate and cooperate, I have learned of two MCB-related publications that have been approved by the MLA Board: (1) the Index-Supplement 16-20 to the MCB, and (2) a compilation of music-related rule interpretations and music cataloging decisions, to correspond to AACR2rev. No publication dates have been announced.

Finally, members who are attending the American Library Association annual conference in Dallas from June 24-29, 1989, might be interested in the following music, automation, and cataloging-related sessions, culled largely from the preliminary program:

"More Technology, Less Access?" LITA Technology and Access Committee program, Saturday, June 24, 9-11 a.m.

OLAC Business Meeting, Saturday, June 24, 8-10 p.m.

"Costs and New Technologies: Libraries, Network, Utilities" RTSD Technical Services Costs Committee program, Sunday, June 25, 9-12:30 p.m.
"How to Keep Abreast of Library and Information Technology" LITA Education Committee panel discussion, Sunday, June 25, 9-12:30 p.m.

"Spotlight OCLC" OCLC User's Council, Sunday, June 25, 12-1:30 p.m.

LITA/RTSD Authority Control Interest Group (includes Joan Swanekamp, past MOUG chair, speaking on music uniform titles), Sunday, June 25, 2-3:30 p.m.

"Networks for Cooperation in the Arts" ACRL Arts Section program, Sunday, June 25, 2-5 p.m.

"Subject Analysis Tools Online--The Challenge Ahead" RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section program, Monday, June 26, 9:30-12:30 p.m.

"The Future of Technical Services: New Roles for Acquisitions and Catalog Librarians" RTSD Resources Section program, Monday, June 26, 2-5:30 p.m.

"Music in the Public Library" PLA Cataloging Needs of Public Libraries Committee, Tuesday, June 27, 9-11 a.m.

"Format Integration: Implementation Plans" RTSD, LITA, RASD (MARBI) program, Tuesday, June 27, 2-5:30 p.m.

As you can see, many very interesting and relevant sessions are planned. I would be interested in hearing from any MOUG members who might be willing to write brief summaries of any of these (or other) sessions for the Newsletter. And, as always, other prepared articles and announcements are most welcome!

-- Linda Barnhart
University of California,
San Diego

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, since 1985, Joan Schuitema has served as official liaison from the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) to the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG), as well as from March 1984 to June 1985 in the capacity of Vice Chair/Chair Elect; and

WHEREAS, during her service she has reported regularly and in detail to the membership of MOUG on activities, projects, new developments and all matters at OCLC potentially affecting music; and

WHEREAS, she has worked tirelessly on behalf of MOUG to bring about improvements in accessing musical materials in the Online Union Catalog and related files and systems, conscientiously articulating, voicing, and responding to concerns of the membership; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Executive Board of MOUG express to Joan Schuitema its sincere thanks for her service, not only to music users of OCLC but also to those untold end-users of music materials who will benefit directly from her efforts and accomplishments; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this resolution be printed in the MOUG Newsletter and that a copy of it be forwarded to Joan Schuitema.

-- Adopted at the Annual Meeting of the Music OCLC Users Group in Cleveland, Ohio, on March 19, 1989
CALL FOR PAPERS  
for the  
MOUG ANNUAL MEETING  
FEBRUARY 19-20, 1990  
TUCSON, ARIZONA

The Program Committee of the Music OCLC Users Group invites the submission of proposals for plenary session presentations on the following:

I. PREPARING LIBRARY USERS FOR AUTOMATION

Including topics such as:

- Bibliographic Instruction for online catalogs.
- Design of "Help" screens, menus, etc. for online catalogs.
- Preparation and use of printed guides to the online catalog.
- Studies on the acceptance (or non-acceptance) of online catalogs by library patrons.
- Training of library staff for automation.
- Public access to OCLC -- How is it used by library patrons?
  - How much staff assistance, written information, etc. is required?
- Patron use of CD-ROM products.

II. SUBJECT ACCESS TO MUSIC MATERIALS

Including topics such as:

- Studies of patron use of music subject terms.
- Use of classification systems for online subject retrieval.
- Library of Congress Subject Headings: Focus on special music topics, problem areas, etc.
- Use of CD-ROM products for music and related subjects.
- Use of online databases such as Dialog, BRS, etc. for music and related subjects.
- Music information in Government Documents.

Presentation length may range from 20-50 minutes. Proposals should be 1-3 typed, double-spaced pages. Please include the following information with your proposal: Name, Address, Phone number (specify work or home, or list hours you are generally at that number), Institutional affiliation, estimated length of your proposed presentation. Send proposals by August 1, 1989 to:

Laura M. Snyder  
MOUG Continuing Education Coordinator  
Conservatory Library  
Oberlin College  
Oberlin, OH  44074

The Program Committee will need to consider the overall balance of the program as well as the quality and interest of each proposal when making the final selection.

MOUG regrets that it will not be able to provide funding to potential speakers.
FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR

Planning is underway for next year's meeting, scheduled for February 19-20, 1990, in Tucson, Arizona. Assisting me on the Program Committee for this meeting will be Paul Cors, University of Wyoming; Lynn Gullickson, University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee; and Stephen Wright, Northern Illinois University. Elsewhere in this issue, you will find a "Call for Papers" for two of the topics we hope to feature at next year's MOUG meeting. This appeal is something of an experiment, through which we hope to encourage the involvement of music librarians and prospective librarians in research. I hope that you will take some time to study the "Call" and consider preparing a presentation on one of these topics. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

-- Laura M. Snyder
Oberlin College

NEWS FROM OCLC

Collection Analysis

A new compact disc-based collection analysis tool developed by OCLC was introduced at the Association of College and Research Libraries' conference in April 1989.

Collection Analysis CD allows OCLC-member academic libraries to compare their collection-development activity against representative holdings of predetermined institutions, based on bibliographic and holdings data derived from the OCLC Online Union Catalog.

An interactive microcomputer format enables libraries to conduct analyses locally. The results describe user and peer group holdings within subject categories based on Library of Congress classification and the National Shelflist Count.

The initial version features a database of two million titles published between 1977 and 1987. Collection Analysis CD is now in field test and will be available for delivery in early summer.

This product is the newest of a coordinated group of collection analysis products now offered by OCLC/AMIGOS Collection Analysis systems, a collaborative venture of OCLC and AMIGOS Bibliographic Council.

Dewey Decimal Classification

DDC 20, the twentieth edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification is now available from the Forest Press Division of OCLC. New features of DDC 20 include:

* A manual - to guide the classifier by providing sound advice in difficult and ambiguous areas.
* More summaries - to make your use of the lengthy schedule more efficient.
* More notes - to make the schedules and the tables clearer and easier to use.
* Revised index - making it easier to pinpoint the subject matter you want.

The abridged edition and foreign translations are being revised.

Interlibrary Loan

The OCLC ILL Cost Directory is now available and has been distributed by OCLC to ILL participants. This document identifies lenders charging more than postage and copying costs for loans. It details the charges and provides additional information required to initiate interlibrary loans with any participating institution.

United States Newspaper Project

The third edition of the National Union List for U.S. newspapers with approximately 100,000 records will be available in June. Of course, OCLC libraries may search Union Listing holdings online.

Major Microforms Project (MMP)

The British publisher Chadwyck-Healy Ltd. recently became the first international participant with the announcement of its intention to use MMP to catalog its 19th century imprints.
Cataloging Statistics (as of January 1989)

* The percentage of records by type in the Online Union Catalog:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>85.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Recordings</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual Media</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Files</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The language distribution of those records:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>68.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M310 Workstation

The M310 Workstation Package A is now discontinued, and the price of Package B has been reduced. To make it even easier to purchase an M310 Workstation, a three-year, three-payment plan is available.

LS Connect

A software package called LS Connect is now available to allow librarians, staff, and patrons to log on to and search the OCLC Online Union Catalog from their local systems terminals.

Linked Systems Project (LSP)

Nine institutions are now active as OCLC NACO/LSP participants: Eastman School of Music, Indiana University, Indiana University Music Library, LC Serial Record Division, Minnesota Historical Society, GPO, UCLA, University of Illinois, and the Online Data Quality Control Section of OCLC.

-- Ron Gardner
OCLC Liaison

NEWS FROM ODQCS

MOUG's 1989 annual meeting in Cleveland is now history, and a productive meeting it was, despite post-MLA burnout.

Because of the rather informal structures of the problem sharing and Enhance sessions in which I was involved, no formal reports are possible. Instead, I present a few tidbits of news and some questions and answers that may have wider interest.

The Online Data Quality Control Section (ODQCS) joins the Eastman School of Music and Indiana University as well as the other OCLC-member National Coordinated Cataloging Operations/Linked Systems Project (NACO/LSP) participants in contributing new and changed records to the LC authority file. In its first year of contribution, ODQCS created 139 new records and changed 652 records. NACO/LSP makes for a more accurate shared authority file, allowing errors to be corrected online much more quickly than used to be the case.

OCLC's Enhance project has added and dropped a few libraries since the Newsletter last published the list of music participants. Here is the current list; those marked with asterisks (*) have Enhance authorizations in more than one format.

SCORES
Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh (CPL) *
Eastman School of Music (RES/RER)
Florida State University (FDA) *
Indiana University (IUL/IUG) *
Michigan State University (EEM) *
New England Conservatory (ENG) *
Oberlin College (OBE) *
University of California, San Diego (CUS) *
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIU)
University of Oregon (ORU) *
University of Texas at Austin (IXA) *
University of Wisconsin--Madison (GZM) *
University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee (GZN) *
University of Wyoming (WYU) *

SOUND RECORDINGS
Bowling Green State University (BGU)
Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh (CPL) *
One topic of discussion in Cleveland was the fact that so few of us had received our copies of the AACR2 1988 Revision. Since then, mine has arrived, and I trust most of yours have as well. The 1988 Revision resulted in few substantive changes beyond what was already known through rule interpretations and revisions. An important exception must be noted, especially to anyone who uses Chapter 6 to catalog sound track film. Rule 6.5C2 no longer allows the name of the unique recording system, (e.g. Phillips-Miller) to be recorded in the physical description field (corresponding to the 300 field of a MARC record). When this information is deemed necessary, it is now placed in a general 500 note (6.7B10). Corresponding changes in the placement of trade names and comparable technical designations have taken effect in Chapters 7 (motion pictures and videorecordings), 8 (certain types of graphic materials), and 9 (computer files). These changes should be implemented immediately.

Two suggestions were made to me in Cleveland about my MOUG Newsletter column, one that I include a question and answer section, and the other that I resume my mini-lessons on cataloging and tagging problems. The first sounded like a fine idea; regarding the second, I never really thought I'd abandoned the mini-lessons, though they occasionally shrank to micro size. So, in response, some Q & A.

Question: An entire session and much discussion at MLA were devoted to the Dewey Decimal Classification 20th Edition's 780 phoenix schedule. How can we tell, or let others know, which edition has been used to assign the classification number?

Answer: Both the 082 field (for LC-assigned Dewey numbers) and the 092 field (for locally-assigned Dewey numbers) have the required (if applicable) subfield $2$ that explicitly identifies the DDC edition from which the number was derived. If you are using the 20th edition, just input "20" into subfield $2$ (without the quotation marks, of course). When using subfield 2, also remember to code the first indicator according to the version and edition used. An example:

\[
\text{092 0 786.219366 2 20}
\]

Question: For a recording I'm cataloging, I've found LC cataloging copy in the Music NUC. It's got three physical description fields, each for a different recording format, and each prefaced with the publisher's number for that format. What do I do about these? Can I code it as LC copy?

Answer: Back in the early and mid-1970s before they were creating MARC records for recordings, LC experimented with these multi-carrier collation records; they are briefly explained in the 1976 text of AACR Chapter 14, revised. (A brief history of the practice can be gleaned through reference to the following Music Cataloging Bulletin: 2:7 (July 1971) p. 4; 2:11 (November 1971) p. 3; 3:11 (November 1972) p. 3; 7:2 (February 1976) p. 3; and 9:4 (April 1978) p. 2. Cessation of the practice was announced in the Spring 1978 Cataloging Service, bulletin 125, p. 9. If you leaf through the 1973-1977 Music NUC cumulation, you're bound to find a few examples). If you intend to use this LC cataloging as the basis for your own, transcribe only the physical description for the item you have in hand and ignore the others. Transcribe the appropriate publisher's number(s) in the correct place for the cataloging rules that are being used; of course, create an 028 field. If your physical format is the first one in the LC record, consider the cataloging LC and code it as such (Source code: blank; LCCN in 010 subfield $a$; DLC in 040 subfield $a$). Otherwise consider it original cataloging, and put the LCCN in a subfield $z$ of the 040 field. Further guidelines for the transcription of retrospective copy can be found in Bibliographic Input Standards, 3rd ed.
Question: Compact discs sometimes carry only a date that is clearly too early to be the publication date of the CD. What should we do?

Answer: CDs became commercially available in Japan in October 1982, in Europe in February 1983, and in the U.S. in March 1983. If you suspect that the date on a CD does not correspond to the actual date of issue, formulate a more accurate set of dates by applying AACR2 1.4F2, 1.4F5, 1.4F6, 1.4F7, and their respective LC Rule Interpretations.

If the response to this question and answer feature of my column is positive, we'll continue. As fodder, I'll use questions you call or send in to me at OCLC and any questions forwarded to me by Linda Barnhart.

Finally, with the redefinition of certain values in the 007 subfield $e$ and the addition of subfield $n$ in Sound Recordings, it seems a propitious time to devote our mini-lesson to these two aspects of the 007 field.

Anyone who followed the protracted debate about splitting the 007/04 position (Configuration of playback channels) in the MARC format into two elements will be relieved to learn that the result means much simpler coding of subfield $e$. No more reference need be made to the number of channels originally recorded, nor to the means (electrical, acoustical, or digital) by which the sounds were initially captured. Now the codes are:

- m Monaural
- q Quadraphonic
- s Stereophonic
  Use this value also for reprocessed recordings that have been "enhanced" to simulate stereo.
- u Unknown
  Use this value when the playback configuration is not mentioned on the recording and is not recorded in the 300 field.
- z Other configuration of playback channels
  Use for playback configurations known to be other than mono, stereo, or quad.

That information concerning how the sound was originally captured is now coded in the 007/13 element of the MARC format, 007 subfield n (Capture and storage technique). All recording enhancements made after the sound was first captured are ignored for the coding of this element.

- a Acoustic
  Live sounds were captured using an acoustical horn that directed vibrations to a diaphragm connected to a stylus. Most of these predate the 1927/1929 period when electrical recording was evolving.
- b Direct storage, not acoustical
  Microphones and other electrical equipment were used to store sounds directly on a disc surface. Until magnetic recording developed in the late 1940s, all electrical recordings employed direct storage. Nowadays, so-called "direct-to-disc" recordings use much the same method.
- d Digital storage
  Sound signals are samples at small intervals and encoded in binary form on a recording medium. "Digital recording" or an equivalent phrase often identifies such recordings; neither digital remastering, digital mixing, nor digital playback implies digital storage of the original sound.
- e Analog electrical storage
  Electrical capture and storage of the sound as pulses and modulations on a magnetic surface such as tape or wire was used for most recordings from the late 1940s until the arrival of digital technology in the early 1980s.
- f Unknown
  The original capture and storage technique cannot be determined.
- z Other capture and storage technique
  Any technique not listed previously. Use this code for piano and organ rolls plus any modern recording that originated as a piano or organ roll.

-- Jay Weitz
OCLC/ODQCS
REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE USMARC ADVISORY GROUP

Washington, D.C., January 7-10, 1989

MARBI, and other members of the USMARC Advisory Group, convened for four sessions at the American Library Association Midwinter meeting in Washington, D.C. Kathy Bales (RLG/RTSD) served as chair.

Report Summary

I. General Announcements

At the annual meeting of the American Library Association in Dallas, Texas, MARBI will present a program sponsored by the Library and Information Technology Association (LITA). Entitled "Format integration: implementation planning," this session is scheduled from 2:00-4:00 PM, Tuesday, June 27, 1989.

Format integration is to be implemented in 1993 following the completion of a new computer system at the Library of Congress. The national bibliographic services (RLIN, OCLC, WLN, etc.) have agreed to follow LC's implementation schedule, providing format integration within months of LC's implementation date.

Implementation of the MARC Holdings Format is scheduled for 1990.

The Library of Congress has issued a new publication, Format Integration and its Effects on the USMARC Bibliographic Format, which includes all fields and subfields that will appear in the integrated bibliographic format. It is available through the Cataloging Distribution Service of the Library of Congress.

II. Proposals Affecting the Bibliographic Format

Proposal 89-2: Changes to Bibliographic Field 850 (Tabled)

This proposal, left over from Proposal 88-1 (Format integration), pertains to narrowing the scope of Field 850 for Holding Institution and validating it for archival and manuscripts control. Discussion centered on the need for subfield $6 (Linkage) and its meaning within bibliographic and holdings records. This proposal was tabled for discussion with the Holdings Format this summer.

Proposal 89-3: Make Bibliographic Field 851 Obsolete; Additions/Changes to Holdings/Bibliographic Field 852 (Tabled)

Also left over from format integration Proposal 88-1, this proposal pertains to making Field 851 (Location) obsolete and making changes to Field 852 (Location/Call number) to accommodate data currently recorded in Field 851. Again, discussion centered on the use of subfield $6 which was defined only for the bibliographic format and not for holdings in this proposal. Further discussion was on the proper use of subfield $a (Institution/Location) and subfield $d (Name of Individual Collector) in Field 852. This proposal was also tabled for discussion with Holdings this summer.

Proposal 89-5: Changes in the Coding Practices of 008/07-14 (Approved)

This proposal makes changes in the coding of information that is unknown or not given in character positions 07-10 (Date 1) and 11-14 (Date 2) of the 008 field to bring about more consistency in the way such information is handled for serial and non-serial items. Three options were proposed. After some discussion, Option 3 with some amending was approved as the best method for encoding this information. With this option, "u" will be used instead of "blank" in all cases in 008/07-14, except with "b" and "s" date types. The use of "9999" with "c" type dates will be retained.

Proposal 89-6: Make Eight Codes Obsolete in 008/20 for Serials (Approved)
This proposal made obsolete codes for the United Kingdom, Australia, Moscow Regional Centre, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Argentina and "u" for Unknown used in character position 20 (ISDS Center) of the 008 for serials.

Proposal 89-7: Make Field 440 in the Bibliographic Format Obsolete (Not Approved)

This proposal, originally generated by the LITA Authority Control Interest Group (ACIG), was to make Field 440 (Series Statement/Added Entry--Title) obsolete in the bibliographic format, as well as making a name change to Field 490 first indicator value "1" from "Series traced differently" to "Series traced." Driving this proposal is the issue of authority control on 4xx fields in some local systems. The Library of Congress reported that 80% of 4xx fields would have to be copied into 8xx fields, and that LC would not implement this due to the amount of re-keying needed. Further discussion centered on the redundancy of the information and the additional amount of online storage space needed. Although rejected, the consensus of the group was to see this proposal again in a re-worked version.

Proposal 89-9: Changes Needed to Fields 033 and 518 (Approved)

This proposal was originally approved as amended at the July 1988 MARBI meeting. Clarification was sought by the Library of Congress as to whether information following character position 12 in subfield $a for broadcast data should be recorded using a three-character time zone code for events in the U.S. and using a time differential factor for events outside the U.S. or using the time differential factor in all situations. After some discussion, the amendment to use the time differential factor in all cases was approved.

III. Proposals Affecting the Authority Format

Proposal 89-4: Addition of a Subfield in Field 040 in the Authority Format (Approved)

This proposal approves the use of subfield $f (Subject Heading/Thesaurus Conventions) in Field 040 of the authority format to identify, where appropriate, the subject heading system/thesaurus building rules used to formulate the 1xx heading. This subfield would be used whenever code "z" (Other) has been used in 008/11 of Field 008.

Proposal 89-1: Additions/Changes to the Authorities Format to Provide for Classification Data (Tabled)

This proposal provides additions and changes needed in the authority format to accommodate data from classification schedules such as the Library of Congress Classification and Dewey Decimal Classification. Driving this proposal seems to be the online printing of class schedules. Other, more beneficial, uses are being investigated. If this proposal passes, the Library of Congress plans to eventually distribute the product. Classification data is authority-like data, and if not put in this format, another format would have to be developed. Since this proposal was quite lengthy, work was accomplished only on the Leader, 008, and new fields 074 (Classification Table) and 153 (Classification Number). Discussion of the remainder of the proposal will take place this summer.

IV. Discussion Papers

Discussion Paper No. 9: 008 Byte 38 (Modified Record)

This paper was an attempt to clarify what 008/38 is supposed to be conveying. It raised the question as to whether the element should be maintained, and if so, whether definitions of specific codes should be changed. At this time, only LC is using all the codes. It was suggested that the Linked Systems Project (LSP) people discuss if this information is needed or useful. RLG is not using the byte at this time, but sees potential in using it, with some modifications, vis-a-vis "roman" vs. "non-roman" records. Other suggestions were that value "s" could be maintained to show machine or local system shortening of records. Alternately, a new set of codes may be necessary for new uses of the byte. The Library of Congress will continue to investigate uses of this byte until sorted out, but will not assign it a high priority.
Discussion Paper No. 22: Cross Reference Problems in Authority Records

This paper outlined the problems of cross references that contain like elements or are subsets of an authorized heading in local systems that support keyword/boolean searching. These fields, when displayed, cause indexing problems. A new code value for subfield $w$ in the authorities format, which would be system-supplied, was proposed to suppress this type of see reference from public display. The USMARC Advisory Group, after discussion, voted not to see a proposal concerning this issue.

Discussion Paper No. 24: Guidelines for Note Fields in the Authority Format

This paper is concerned with the principles of defining notes in the authority format. Currently defined notes and changed or new notes were listed and labeled as either "public" or "non-public." The label "non-public" means the note is primarily intended to guide catalogers and is usually not written in a form adequate for public user display. "Public" means the note is intended for public display in addition to guiding catalogers, and is thus written in a suitable form.

Discussion Paper No. 25: Handling Multiple Version Linkage Needs

This was a joint MARBI and CC:DA discussion which centered mostly on issues and the definition of a "version." Multiple versions implies not just a linking method, but display conventions as well. Other groups are also addressing multiple versions and may have approaches to linkage needs other than those proposed by LC. The CONSER Policy Committee is moving ahead with a discussion forum on multiple versions. This forum, which will be funded under the auspices of the Council on Library Resources (CLR), will hopefully provide the mechanism for decision-making vis-a-vis multiple versions.

Issues that surfaced were that the intellectual content is hard to identify when defining what is a "version;" for example, stereo vs. mono, analog vs. digital, and colorized vs. black and white. Local solutions to this definition may not match solutions used by the national bibliographic services.

Specifically, most people preferred Option A in Discussion Paper No. 25 which uses existing linking fields so that no additional fields would have to be defined. Implications of multiple versions linkage for the holding format will need to be addressed.

A consensus was reached that multiple versions should not be a way of creating minimal records as the associated record. LC concurred and added that while some records used might be brief (e.g., PREMARC), no intentionally minimal records would be created.

This joint meeting was also to address problems and concerns over Fields 246 and 740 for other title information, but this did not occur.

Discussion Paper No. 26: Leader/06 Considerations

This paper discussed problems in coding Leader/06 (Type of Record) brought about because archival and manuscripts control and type of material is mixed together in one character position. It proposes the leader be revised to indicate a record is under archival control. Consideration is also given to types of control other than bibliographic and archival, such as provenancial and associational.

Comments and questions about the MARC Formats should be addressed to the MLA liaison to MARBI, James P. Cassaro, Cornell University, Music Library, 225 Lincoln Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853-4101; BITNET: jj5y@cornellc.

-- Jim Cassaro
Cornell University
SUMMARY OF THE MOUG ANNUAL MEETING, MARCH 19-20, 1989, CLEVELAND, OHIO

LS/2000 INTEREST GROUP

The LS/2000 Interest Group met on March 19, during the MOUG Annual Meeting in Cleveland. Because the Music Library Association had scheduled time for user group meetings during its conference which preceded MOUG, this was the second LS/2000 meeting for most of the users who attended on March 19. Pat Stevens, OCLC Local Systems, had planned to meet with the interest group, but due to a cancelled flight which delayed her arrival in Cleveland, she graciously agreed to a dinner meeting with the interest group instead. Thus, there were actually three opportunities during the Cleveland meetings for LS/2000 users to meet, and our time was used very effectively. Geri Laudati (East Carolina University) reported on a four-day training session provided by LS/2000 personnel on site, which offered not only assistance in use of the system, but help with re-profiling decisions. Also cited were the articles on music automation specifications which appeared in Notes (September 1986), and those on using music in LS/2000 by Tim Gmeiner (Breve Notes, May 1988) and Geri Laudati (Breve Notes, September 1988). Music users will exchange passwords so that we may have access to other LS/2000 installations, and view music displays and explore search protocol, etc. Also to be shared are copies of search group documents and card image display formats for scores and sound recordings. The interest group is open to anyone concerned with music in LS/2000. For further information, please contact:

Pamela Juengling
University of Massachusetts/Amherst
Music Library  FAC 149
Amherst, MA  01003
(413) 545-2870 (after 6-15-89)
(413) 367-9278 (prior to 6-15-89)

-- Pamela Juengling
University of Massachusetts/Amherst

PLENARY SESSION I: AUTHORITY CONTROL IN THE ONLINE ENVIRONMENT

DESIGNING AUTHORITY SYSTEMS FOR OPTIMAL MAINTENANCE AND RETRIEVAL

Pat Stevens, a Senior Systems Analyst in OCLC's Local Systems office, gave the first presentation. Ms. Stevens proposed that the strength of an online authority structure is determined by the usefulness of the system. She discussed both the advantages and disadvantages of the two basic types of system development. While product development spreads the cost over many institutions and allows one to know system strengths and weaknesses before purchase, traditional system development allows one to meet the needs of individual institutions by designing tailor-made systems. As music poses special problems for bibliographic data in online catalogs, music also presents unique difficulties in creating an online authority structure for names and, in particular, uniform titles. No system is ever perfect and each system will possess various flaws.

Ms. Stevens identified two basic functions of online authority systems: (1) to improve retrieval by pulling items together; and (2) to provide management and control of collections. Authority structures should be evaluated according to a system's capability to fulfill these two requirements.

Ms. Stevens suggested viewing the authority record as a "family" consisting of complex relationships. The established heading may serve as the "parent," while all subsequent entries are linked, or "related," to the "parent" heading. The relationship of the authority record to the rest of the information system must also be established (i.e., the headings, the bibliographic records, the physical items, etc.) When authority records and bibliographic records are linked together, changes can be made to the authority record, and the system is able to identify the corresponding bibliographic records and automatically make those changes as well.

A system designed with authorities at the center of the structure provides for optimal retrieval and maintenance according to Ms.
Stevens. Phrase headings, keywords, full MARC authority records, the bibliographic record, and the physical item should all relate to the local authority record.

-- Lynn Gullickson  
University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee

AUTOMATED AUTHORITY WORK: MAKING THE TRANSITION

The second speaker was Amey Kirkbride, Authority/Online Catalog Maintenance Librarian at Kent State University, whose topic was "Automated Authority Work: Making the Transition," to which she added the informal subtitle "in ten easy steps." Perhaps "easy" is a bit too optimistic, but libraries making the change from a manual to an online authority record system can certainly benefit from her experience.

The first step is to become familiar with online authority records. Learn the MARC format, become familiar with those fields that are most likely to be changed locally, and learn how to record local decisions in a note. Learn how to code subfield $w in the 4xx and 5xx fields to create the correct displays in your public catalog.

Step two is deciding how to create the file, i.e., to use a vendor or build it locally. For most libraries, contracting with a vendor is more practicable. The third step is to become familiar with the tools you will use to determine the form and content of your authority records. Make and record local policy decisions, and design workflows.

The fourth step is to check very carefully the tape you have received from the vendor. Expect to find typographical errors, even in Library of Congress records, and be prepared to make corrections. This will require a considerable investment in staff time, and combines logically with the fifth step, increasing the staff's familiarity with the file and giving them a sense of ownership of the database.

The sixth step is catching up with all the authority work that went on while the tape was being produced by the vendor, since the library did not stop cataloging new materials while the file was being prepared. The seventh step is related, catching up with all the changes in headings that have been made since the vendor's cutoff date. For Library of Congress subject headings this is relatively simple, using the weekly lists. For names and series no similar tool exists, so keeping current is more difficult. Be prepared to discover some major changes.

The eighth step is to keep up with your ongoing authority work. Design a workflow for new records, and a procedure for using it. Decide how to resolve conflicts. Watch the 667 field in the Library of Congress records for indications of forthcoming changes.

The ninth step is to keep up with future developments. Know where you're going, as well as where you are. Think about products and services that you would like to have available someday.

Last, but not least, stay realistic about what automation can and cannot do. Cleanup is never finished.

Ms. Kirkbride concluded her presentation with a series of overheads showing cautionary examples of some of the things libraries can expect to encounter during the transition from a manual to an online authority file. The following bibliography was part of a packet of materials Ms. Kirkbride distributed.

Tools Used for the Form and Content of Automated Authority Work

**Form:** Names


Form: Subjects


Form: Series


Content


Library of Congress' online authority file is accessible through OCLC (updated daily), on CD-ROM, or by purchase of magnetic tapes.

-- Paul B. Cors
University of Wyoming, Laramie

AUTHORITY CONTROL FOR MUSIC MATERIALS

Jerry McBride demonstrated the MIDCAT system used at Middlebury College. MIDCAT's generic name is DRA, for Data Research Associates; it is an integrated system using DEC hardware. There are 102 installations, mostly public and small academic libraries. Author, title, subject, call number, and keyword searches are supported.

Some of DRA's positive aspects are as follows: (1) The beginning screen is clear and concise; (2) The display of bibliographic records in the public mode has captions (AUTHOR:, TITLE:, NOTE:, etc.) with TYPE OF MATERIAL: at the top, making the sometimes arcane world of bibliographic description a little more intelligible to the user; (3) It is easy to browse back and forth and to redirect a search; (4) Lists of new headings can be generated, along with an indication of whether or not they match a record in your authority file.

Problems with DRA seem to be mostly the result of the well known and bemoaned literalness of the computer, especially with regard to authority control. For example, a subject heading with a free-floating subdivision in the bibliographic file will appear as an unauthorized form in index displays if there is not an accompanying authority record for that heading with the free floating subdivision attached. Similarly, a uniform title with, for example, a subfield $s Vocal score will appear as an unauthorized heading if the authority record for the uniform title does not include that $s. Global search and replace is possible but unforgiving, as
punctuation and upper- and lower-case letters must match. All cross references in all authority records display as index entries whether or not there are any headings in the bibliographic file which match the cross references, resulting in long lists of useless cross references; these unwanted references can be deleted, but only by going through them one by one. And a subject search will display name title entries in the index, showing zero hits because although the entry is an authorized one, it is not authorized as a subject heading. DRA seems to have solved the bibliographic problems well, but the interface with the authority file still needs improvement.

--- Sue Weiland  
Wichita State University

Lowell Ashley, leader of the Humanities Cataloging Group at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, described the VTLS system. VTLS began at VPI as a circulation system, and has been expanded to handle cataloging and an online catalog. In 1983, an authority module with global change capability for authors and subjects became available. VPI catalogs about 30,000 titles per year and enters about 1,000 authority records per month. Verification of headings is done at the time of cataloging, with all corporate and personal names with cross references getting an authority record. For LC copy, only problematic-appearing headings are checked. While most authority work is for personal and corporate authors, geographic names and subject personal and corporate names are also being worked on. No topical subject authority work is being done at present.

The OPAC works well and is easy for patrons to use. The display is arranged in alphabetical order by bibliographic title. Items are not sorted by uniform title (240) fields or by related 700 $t$ fields. The system does not give an automatic display in an incorrect heading is input. Instead, it refers the user to the correct form. The authority file is available to the user to help determine the correct forms to search.

--- Dena Janson  
Rhode Island College

MINUTES FROM THE MOUG BUSINESS MEETING  
March 19, 1989  
7:00 p.m.  
Cleveland, Ohio

1. It was moved, seconded, and carried to adopt the agenda for the meeting.

2. The minutes of the 1988 Business meeting held in Minneapolis (as printed in the May 1988 MOUG Newsletter) were approved.

3. Opening remarks and introduction of officers.

   Chair Don Hixon announced the results of the recent election and introduced Jennifer Bowen of the Sibley Music Library as the new Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect. He thanked Jerry McBride for agreeing to run for office. Hixon then introduced the other members of the Executive Board: Laura Snyder (Continuing Education Coordinator), Candice Feldt (Treasurer), and Linda Barnhart (Secretary/Newsletter Editor). He then read a resolution passed by the Board at its earlier meeting officially thanking Joan Schuitema on behalf of the membership; Schuitema was warmly applauded. [The resolution is printed on p. 6--Ed.] She has been replaced by interim liaison Ron Gardner, who was unable to attend the meeting.

4. Board reports.

   a. Chair. The above report constituted the report of the Chair.

   b. Secretary. Linda Barnhart reported primarily on activities of the past year as newsletter editor. She announced that four issues were published this past year, and thanked those people who contributed articles, especially the regular contributors. She also thanked those people who volunteered to summarize the activities of this meeting. Barnhart strongly encouraged the members to submit articles and make suggestions about what should be done in future issues. She solicited for feedback on the recent logo and format changes. Finally, she announced that an index to the MOUG Newsletter is in preparation, and will probably be published in the Fall.

---
c. Treasurer. Candice Feldt reported on the income and expenses incurred by the organization over the past year. [The full financial report is printed on p. 3--Ed.] MOUG has a membership of 544, split approximately evenly between personal and institutional members. A second billing for those members who have not renewed will go out in April. Feldt thanked Kenneth Pristash for his help in preparing the first renewal mailing.

d. Continuing Education Coordinator. Laura Snyder announced that 72 people had registered for the Cleveland meeting (including speakers). She thanked everyone for coming, particularly given that the meeting began on Palm Sunday. She also thanked the Program Committee--Karen Little, Patrick Maxfield, and Keiko Cho; OCLC staff--Joan Schuitema, Jay Weitz, Sonya Thelin, Daviss Menafee, Dawn Puglisi, and Ron Gardner; and the membership for its ideas for the program.

5. NACO-Music report.
Ralph Papakhian reported on the current status of the NACO-Music Project. His remarks were based substantially on the report printed in MOUG Newsletter No. 37, p. 13-14, but were amplified and updated. Further details will be published in the next issue.

6. OLAC report.
See the following article for a full report.

Don Hixon called for members to express their interest to him in working on a Reference Task Force to work with OCLC in developing CD-ROM products for music. He then introduced Deb Bendig from OCLC, who described the immediate tasks and challenges for the Task Force.

The goal is to produce one or more music subsets, or "libraries," for the OCLC Search CD450 system during OCLC's fiscal year 1989-1990. OCLC would like to see at least one music disc produced before the MLA/MOUG meeting in Tucson in February 1990.

Short-term tasks:

(1) Advise on the scope of the subset(s). For example, which of the following should be included, and as separate databases, or merged into one or two large databases? Sound recordings (both musical and non-musical); scores; other material classed in M's/780's; other class areas/subject areas (such as other performing arts, the business of music, use of music in other areas e.g., teaching, therapy, religions); include theses?

(2) Advise on the indexing of subset(s). Evaluate standard Search CD450 indexing as it would apply to music records. Suggest special indexing for music (such as uniform title as separate index, contents notes, other notes, fixed field indexing (including 007 field), special restrictors (including both formats and medium)).

(3) Advise on the displays of music records, within the context of the Search CD450 system. Advise on the contents of a single-line, truncated hit list. Evaluate standard Search CD450 record displays for use with music records.

Long-term tasks:

(1) Advise on marketing. For example, how should OCLC describe these subsets to music librarians?

(2) Advise on modifications to subset discs once they've been produced.

(3) Advise on additional, non-OCLC databases for OCLC to put on CD-ROM.

8. Tradition of annual meetings.
Laura Snyder led the membership in a lively discussion about MOUG meetings in general and specifically about the upcoming Tucson conference. There seemed to be a number of problems expressed with meeting after MLA, plus the Board needs some feedback from the membership about the need for and timing of annual meetings. Snyder took a "straw poll" of the members present, and mentioned that a more formal survey would be forthcoming in the
newsletter [This will be published in the next issue--Ed.]. She encouraged everyone to please respond to the survey. The results of the poll of the members present were:

- How many would attend if the meeting were held on Sunday and Monday (with Tuesday off as a break before the MLA preconference? [No support]
- How many would attend if the meeting were Monday to Tuesday night? [About 1/3 of the audience]
- How many would attend if the meeting were held concurrently with the MLA preconference? [About 1/3 of the audience]
- How many would prefer no meeting next year? [No support]

Snyder mentioned that next year MOUG must meet before MLA; there is no hotel space available after MLA. It was mentioned that a Monday–Tuesday meeting might be a problem for those people who only attend MOUG, because one needs to stay over a Saturday night to take advantage of the lowest airfares. Only 2–5 people in the audience indicated they came just for MOUG. It was also announced that the conference hotel rates in Tucson will be available ahead of the meeting but not after, for those members who might want to vacation in the area.

Assuming that MOUG will hold a meeting every year, the membership was then asked whether they would prefer a 1/2 day, 1 day, or 1 1/2 day meeting. The one-day meeting was the most strongly supported. The possibility was raised that we could meet every other year, with "off" years having only a business meeting held during MLA. One opinion was expressed that one of the most informative sessions of the MOUG meeting is the news from OCLC and LC which gives the opportunity to raise questions and have them answered; this should also be included yearly. There was no support from the group for a separate meeting in conjunction with OLAC or another interest group.

Some of the comments from the membership included: (1) There are new products becoming available and other things for us to talk about, such as the CD-ROM products and the New Online System; (2) If we meet closer to MLA, we might draw in more public service people; maybe we could structure one session just for them and/or establish a half-day registration; (3) On the years where there is no MLA Preconference, we should meet just before MLA; (4) We should not eliminate the possibility of meeting concurrently with the preconference; at MLA we have to make choices now anyway--you can't go to everything--so we shouldn't be afraid of conflicts; (5) The educational aspects are one of the strengths of this group and should not be disregarded in favor of just business meetings.


Hixon led a discussion about the proposal of the Executive Board to raise personal dues to $10.00 per year. He pointed out that since 1983, the dues have been $5.00 per year, a mere pittance by current standards. Costs are rising everywhere, for postage, printing, transportation, telecommunications, etc., plus the organization is expanding its services (e.g. NACO-Music, the index to the Newsletter, The Best of MOUG, etc.) At the Board meeting in Dublin in August 1988, the Board agreed that in order to support these increased and very valuable activities of the group, we would propose an increase in personal dues, but that institutional dues should remain the same at $10.00 per year so that this organization did not contribute toward the spiraling increase in serial prices to library budgets. At that time, the Board saw little rationale for raising institutional prices as well.

There was a great deal of discussion on this topic. Many members seemed to support the increase, feeling that the higher rate still was not out of line for the benefits received from the organization. Several members questioned the "exemption" for institutional members, feeling that they also received the benefits and should be charged a commensurate rate. More details about the proposed 1989 budget were given, showing that the Board projected a deficit (due to the increased costs mentioned above) if dues were not raised. The motion was made that beginning in 1990, personal dues be increased to $10.00 per year. It was seconded and passed by voice vote with no abstentions.

Hixon announced that at a meeting held earlier in the week, MOUG and MLA agreed to work together more closely and cooperatively, particularly regarding planning for annual meetings. To that end, the secretaries of both organizations will begin to exchange minutes, policies, calendars, rosters, meeting-related information, and anything else that would be of interest to each organization.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

-- Linda Barnhart
MOUG Secretary

REPORT OF THE OLAC MEETINGS,
JANUARY 1989, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) of Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. met on Friday, January 6. There was some discussion about various details related to the recently published Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., revised. One topic was the second footnote to rule 1.1C1 which seems to imply that a set of activity cards usually would be cataloged as a kit, a presumption which was at variance with the opinion of many audiovisual catalogers present. Another matter of interest involved the change in the physical description of audiovisual items which precludes such trade names as VHS and Beta or other technical specifications from being used in the physical description area. Most audiovisual catalogers were not happy about having this information in the third or fourth, etc. note, and proposals have been made to consider this information as a system requirement which would make it the first or second note on the bibliographic record, following the practice for the system requirement note for computer files in chapter 9. The manual for locally produced materials is still undergoing work and revision.

Dick Thaxter, head of the Audiovisual Section of the Special Materials Cataloging Division at the Library of Congress, will be OLAC's new MARBI liaison. The OLAC conference in Los Angeles last November, "Decision-Making for AV Catalogers," was a great success with a total of 149 persons in attendance.

OLAC has been invited to meet in Rochester, New York in 1990, probably in October.

-- Lowell Ashley
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

AMLG COOPERATIVE RECON PROJECT UPDATE

As reported in the November 1988 MOUG Newsletter, the music libraries of Indiana University and the Eastman School of Music (OCLC users), and those of the University of California at Berkeley, and Harvard, Stanford, and Yale Universities (RLIN users), all members of the Associated Music Libraries Group (AMLG), have been working since October 1987 on a cooperative retrospective conversion project funded by the U.S. Dept. of Education under a Title IIC grant. The areas of conversion, agreed upon by all six institutions in order to maximize the collection strengths of each library and to minimize duplicate effort, cut across all LC score classification numbers. (The conversion of books has not been allowed under the 1987-1988 and 1988/1989 grants, although the 1985/1986 pilot project included MT's.)

The 1987/1988 project was scheduled to end on 31 December 1988, however, the Dept. of Education granted an extension to 31 March 1989; late notification of funding and difficulties in hiring project staff resulted in late start-up for almost all of the project participants. However, by 31 March, a total of 48,543 records had been converted. Of these, 13,837 records were updated, 15,504 records were enhanced or upgraded, and 19,344 records were new to the database into which they were first input. Sample records were sent to Linda Barnhart and Jay Weitz for critical review; their comments have been incorporated into our ongoing effort to maintain quality in our work.

One of the central features of this cooperative project is the crossloading of tapes between OCLC and RLIN. At this point, almost all of the records converted during this past year are available in both databases. (Yale provided copies of the tapes prepared for their NOTIS
installation, so the AMLG recon records are just a portion of a much larger group of Yale records now available to us in OCLC.) As the project continues, tapes will continue to be exchanged periodically. The OCLC institution symbols assigned to the recon project follow:

- RER: Eastman
- IUG: Indiana
- HMU: Harvard
- STF: Stanford (not STU as previously listed)
- YUU: Yale
- CUY: Berkeley (snapshot tape)
- RQK: Berkeley (OCLC converted)

The goal for the 1988/1989 project, now underway, is the conversion of 59,174 records, of which it is estimated that 25,682 records will be updates, 11,006 records will be upgraded or enhanced, and 22,486 records will be new to the database into which they are first entered. With the end of this grant year, Stanford and Berkeley will be seeing the end of their score recon.

For the 1989/1990 grant year, Indiana, Eastman, Harvard, and Yale have been joined by the music library at Cornell University (RLIN user) in seeking funding for the conversion of 51,387 score records. Of these, it is estimated that 22,303 records will be updates, 9,906 records will be upgraded or enhanced, and 19,178 records will be new to the database into which they are first entered. Indiana expects to be finished with score recon by the end of 1990, and Yale expects to be nearly finished.

Eastman, Harvard, and Cornell will continue to seek funding for score recon for 1990/1991. As part of that proposal, Stanford, Berkeley, Indiana, and Yale, with the addition of new AMLG members, will be seeking funding for the conversion of sound recordings. Because the conversion of sound recordings is so expensive, AMLG would like to ensure that there will be no duplication of work. In order to achieve this, AMLG members have been sending photocopies of their manufacturer files to Indiana, where a database of brief records is being compiled. The database will be merged to determine the extent of overlap between the participants, and decisions about the distribution of work will be made on the basis of those results.

This ongoing AMLG project is much more than an means for AMLG libraries to convert their catalogs at minimal institutional expense. At the heart of the project is the intent to increase the quantity and upgrade the quality of music records in the logical national database. We want and need your responses to the project. That response can be very specific: (1) Letting us know about specific problems and/or errors in AMLG records (see OCLC library identifiers above), and (2) Letting us know, for any chosen month, how many records you use which are results of this project (if you can bear to keep track of those statistics!)

General comments and questions are also welcome. Please address those to Michelle Koth, the current project coordinator. Her address:

- Michelle Koth
  - Music Library
  - Indiana University
  - Bloomington, IN 47401
  - BITNET: koth@iubacs

Those who were not at the Cleveland meeting can receive a copy of the AMLG matrix, which lists the areas of conversion completed so far, in progress, and proposed for next year, by sending your request to:

- Jane Nowakowski
  - Sibley Music Library
  - Eastman School of Music
  - 26 Gibbs Street
  - Rochester, NY 14604
  - BITNET: smjn@uorvm

-- Jane Nowakowski
1987/1988 Project Coordinator

**LC REPORT**

This year has been characterized by a great deal of self-examination throughout the Library. If you've been reading library literature, particularly the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, then you're already aware that the Librarian of Congress undertook a year-long
review of the Library's organization and functions. He used a three-pronged approach: he established the Management and Planning Committee (known as MAP), a group of twenty-seven library staff members; he engaged the consultants Arthur Young and Co. to advise him on various matters; and he established a national advisory committee to reflect the various constituencies of the Library.

This review having been completed in January, progress is now being made towards implementation of some of the recommendations. A heavy emphasis is being placed on service—to constituents and to collections—and functions are being re-aligned around service units. The actual work to go from theory to reality has just begun, but the Librarian's performance up to now has shown everyone that the changes he thinks good for the Library will happen sooner rather than later. Since we don't yet know any specifics of how this reorganization will affect the music reference and cataloging operations, there's not much more to be said on that topic.

In Library-wide cataloging news, plans are well underway for what is being called Whole Book Cataloging—it's what LC music catalogers and most other catalogers everywhere have always done. About fifty descriptive and subject catalogers will form into three "teams" to explore various new ways of cataloging for two years. One experiment will test a team cataloging concept. One experiment will test an individual concept. The project is innovative for the Library in that one of its major attractions is that the teams will be given a lot of leeway to determine their own procedures. This project has caught the Librarian's interest, and it is expected that it will be extended to the rest of the catalogers in due course.

Another self-examining activity which occupied a lot of time was strategic planning. Last year it was extended to all staff members at their section levels. This was a good opportunity for the Music Section to discuss operations and a forum in which they could propose changes which would result in streamlining activities. Many of these have been implemented; some improved internal functioning—for example, regular rotation of assignments among catalogers. Some have done away with time-consuming and/or no-longer-needed activities, and these are things which you may notice. The pre-assigned card number program has been abandoned. The assignment of suggested class numbers to sound recordings ceased effective March 9; the request for comments resulted in a single letter, so it was felt that this could cease. Some suggestions were innovative ideas; one of the best is the establishment of an internship for library school students in the Music Section.

One effect of this extensive self-examination is the renewed attention being given to the bibliographic control of materials in the Library's collections. The extent to which uncataloged arrearages exist, particularly in the special collections areas, has been made clear and steps are being taken to address this critical situation. Emphasis is being put on making the collections of the Library available. Along with that, figuring out ways to make the cataloging operations more efficient is a continuing concern. So there are a number of developments which follow from all this self-examination. They will affect the "products" which you receive from the Library, and this is why I've gone into a certain amount of detail on internal Library activities which are not directly related to music cataloging.

At last year's meeting, you heard that the Music Section had begun a project of minimal-level cataloging for printed music. Shortly after the meeting, we decided to extend this program to sound recordings. Each cataloger will spend one full day each week doing MLC cataloging. Minimal-level cataloging for music materials is much fuller than those you might have seen for MLC books; they include subject headings, full classification, and contents notes.

Further, to improve the quality of cataloging being done and to streamline activities, the section has recently forwarded a proposal to Lucia Rather, Director for Cataloging, to stop including fields 045, 047, and 048 in music records. This proposal is making its way through LC and comments will be solicited nationally, so you should not take this as a statement of fact but rather of intent. The section's feeling is that these coded data fields, developed to be retrieval tools, are not performing that function. In order
for the 045 field to be useful, it would be necessary to do research to determine the date of a work. Catalogers at LC do not routinely research dates; they rely on information which appears in the item, and this may result in different dates for the same composition. None of these coded fields can be linked to the works they represent in a multi-composition item, and further, none of them can be linked to each other. This means that, even if the fields were searchable, the potential for false hits would be enormous. This topic has been discussed many times before, most recently last year at MOUG, without a definite conclusion being reached. We hope that this proposal will, through the comments received, stimulate music libraries to follow suit and that, in turn, will spur us all to work towards developing a more workable alternative to 047 and 048, in order to replace the current music subject headings, which are not really geared to efficient online searching and retrieval. 

The particular spur for this proposal is that coding the fields takes a lot of cataloger time, both in the coding and in the review of cataloging records. This is exacerbated by confusion and disagreement in their application, and this fact has been dramatically reinforced by their not being used in MLC records. We invite your comments, addressed to Fred Bindman, Special Materials Cataloging Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540. 

One outcome of the increased emphasis on cataloging for the Library’s collections will begin to be evident to you over the next few months as you notice a change in the kinds of sound recordings being cataloged. To give you some background on this, here are some statistics: In Fiscal Year 1988 the Copyright Office received and cleared through copyright approximately 23,000 sound recordings. During the same period 5,946 titles were purchased. The Recordings Lab produced 800 reels of preservation tape and 338 recordings of events. 530 titles were received through Exchange and Gift. This comes to about 45,000 sound recordings received in a single year. Of these, the music and audiovisual catalogers created bibliographic records for fewer than 4,000. The selection of which sound recordings were to be cataloged has been delegated to the Music Section for a number of years. Recently, however, it was decided that the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound reference librarians will take over the selection. Their intent is to increase access to the recordings in the Library by decreasing the number of duplicates in the Library’s two online systems. One of these systems is the Copyright Office file (COHM), the principle purpose of which is to preserve legal details; the other is the file of MARC records created by Processing Services catalogers. What does this mean to you?

(1) Fewer recordings of music from the standard repertoire will be cataloged. In order to increase the breadth of materials cataloged by the Library, the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division intends to be very selective in recommending cataloging of recordings of music from the standard repertoire. (Standard repertoire is defined as those works generally listed in "basic music library guides," such as Beethoven symphonies and Mozart string quartets.)

(2) There will be an increase in minimal-level cataloging of sound recordings. The catalogers and reference librarians have been working together to identify the types of recordings which could be given minimal-level cataloging without serious loss of access.

(3) Many genres of recordings which previously were not cataloged at all--such as non-U.S. popular music, recordings from our field offices, and generic (not composer-centered) vocal and instrumental recitals--will now be given at least minimal-level cataloging.

Ralph has reported to you on the NACO-Music program, and from the Library’s point of view, it has been a tremendous success. Ralph Papakhian and Joan Swanekamp achieved "independence" in what appears to have been record time and have really impressed people at LC, thus providing more ammunition for our continuing argument that music catalogers really are very special people.

-- Reported by David Sommerfield; Prepared by Catherine Garland and Sam Brylawski Library of Congress
MBMSR IS CHANGING!

Music, Books on Music, and Sound Recordings (MBMSR) is changing! The 1989 subscription year closes out the old title and book format, and 1990 marks the beginning of the use of the microfiche format. The new, 48x microfiche product will be published in the register/index format and will feature indexes to the most important access points, including names, titles, subjects, and series.

To ease the transition from print to microfiche, only one publication will be issued in 1990, The Music Catalog: 1981-1990. With it, you will have in one, convenient package, a major source of music cataloging information at your fingertips. This ten-year cumulation will include MARC records from both the Library of Congress and the National Union Catalog-Books database, and it will include new data for 1990 never published in its predecessor, Music, Books on Music, and Sound Recordings.

Beginning in 1991, there will be a new subscription service. This new microfiche version of MBMSR will contain cataloging records for music, scores, and sound recordings, as well as books and serials on music created by the Library of Congress itself or by selected contributing music libraries. Bibliographic records for books on music created by libraries participating in the National Union Catalog program will also be included.

Presently, the Library is working cooperatively with nine libraries who contribute their current cataloging on music to this publication. While we realize there is a need to expand even further the amount of cataloging data in the new fiche catalog, the Library does not plan on expanding the number of contributing libraries immediately. However, the number may well be increased as we gain experience in using the new online cataloging system for music.

Questions, comments and concerns regarding our new publication plans are welcomed. Please direct them to: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, Customer Services Section, Washington, D.C. 20541 ((202) 707-1309)

"MOST POPULAR" MUSIC LITERATURE IN THE OLUC

Mark A. Crook, Consulting Analyst in the OCLC Office of Research, recently provided the following list of those items classed in "ML" that have more than 1,000 holdings in the OLUC. (OCLC numbers are included here should more information be desired.) He notes that no score had over 1,000 holdings, but plans to do a similar listing later this year.

1. The New Grove dictionary of American music (#13184437)
2. The New Harvard dictionary of music (#13333674)
3. The New Grove dictionary of music and musicians (#5676891)
4. Rock music in America (#15017264)
5. Baker's biographical dictionary of musicians (#10574930)
6. The great song thesaurus by Roger Lax (#10207289)
7. The New Oxford companion to music (#10096883)
8. Bernstein, a biography by Joan Peyser (#15107068)
9. Baker's biographical dictionary of musicians (#4426869)
10. All American music by John Rockwell (#8930001)
11. Copland by Aaron Copland (#10876473)
12. Louis Armstrong, an American genius by James Lincoln Collier (#9576221)
13. American musicians by Whitney Balliett (#13642503)
14. Musicians since 1900 by David Ewen (#4194793)
15. All the years of American popular music by David Ewen (#2929339)
16. American musical theatre by Gerald Martin Bordman (#3543506)
17. The joy of music by Leonard Bernstein (#371984)
18. Music in western civilization by Paul Henry Lang (#384807)
19. Horowitz by Glenn Plaskin (#8763305)
20. Music in the new world by Charles Hamm (#8409981)
21. Black popular music in America by Arnold Shaw (#12808463)
INDIANA UNIVERSITY'S MUSIC LIBRARY RECEIVES GRANTS

The Indiana University (IU) Libraries' Music Library has received two substantial grants from the U.S. Department of Education Title II-C program. The grants are effective through 1989.

A multi-institution grant, sponsored jointly by IU and the Associated Music Libraries Group (AMLG), will convert nearly 60,000 cataloged titles in the music libraries of the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford University, IU, University of Rochester Eastman School of Music, Harvard University and Yale University into machine-readable form. [See the AMLG report elsewhere in this issue for further details—Ed.]

David Fenske, Head of the Music Library (IUB), is project director for the overall grant and for the IU portion of the project. Ralph Papakhian, Librarian for Music Technical Services, is the project manager for the IU portion of the grant. The multi-year project begun in 1985 is hosted this year by IU. Other member institutions not listed previously include Cornell University, UCLA, University of Illinois, and the University of Michigan.

The Music Library also has received a second grant concurrent with the preceding one to continue to catalog its distinguished collection of operatic and vocal sound recordings.

This year's grant will focus upon the collection of Alvin M. Ehret given to IU. His collection of 24,000 long-playing sound recording records, primarily of operas, opera excerpts and vocal recitals, has significantly contributed to IU's distinguished operatic collection. David Fenske is the project director for this grant and Sue Stancu is the project manager.

ACQUISITIONS SUBSYSTEM TO BE DISCONTINUED IN TWO YEARS

On October 17, 1988, OCLC sent a letter to all users of the Acquisitions Subsystem, notifying them that the online Acquisitions Subsystem will be discontinued on December 31, 1990, and that OCLC does not intend to develop the Materials Ordering System (MOS) that it had been considering as a replacement for the Online Acquisitions Subsystem.

OCLC cited these reasons for its decision: the increasing prevalence of local systems, acquisitions services from book vendors and microcomputer-based systems and the need to remove current Online System hardware as soon as possible.

OCLC will continue to maintain and develop the DX (Direct Transmission) Service, as a link between local acquisitions systems (such as ACQ350) and vendors.

To ease the transition to other automated acquisitions systems, OCLC offers each current Acquisitions user a free tape of its online acquisitions data. In addition, OCLC Local Systems offers a fifty percent discount on ACQ350 software to online Acquisitions users, if they order before January 31, 1990.

MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Music Library Association announced the recipients of its annual awards for publications in the field of music and music bibliography at its 1989 convention in Cleveland, Ohio. The Vincent H. Duckles Award, given for the best book-length bibliography or music reference work, was presented to Arthur B. Wenk for his Analyses of Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Music, 1940–1985 (Boston: Music Library Association, 1987). This "outstanding compendium" includes 5,664 entries from 225 sources and enables library users to find analytical writings on particular pieces of Western art music.

Carl B. Schmidt was the recipient of the award for the best article-length bibliography or article on music librarianship for his "exhaustive" and "admirably organized" bibliography, "Newly identified manuscript sources of the music of Jean-Baptiste Lully" (Notes, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 7-32). For his review of the complete miniature score of Alban Berg’s Lulu, edited by Friedrich Cerha, (Notes, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 915-918), George Perle received the award for best review in Notes.

In addition, a citation was awarded to the late Thor E. Wood in recognition of distinguished service to music librarianship. Wood was Chief of the New York Public Library Performing Arts

OCLC POLICIES ON CHANGE REQUESTS

The Online Data Quality Control Section of OCLC has been reviewing their current policies and procedures, and have made some initial decisions regarding Bibliographic Change Requests. Their concern is for the amount of staff time presently spent in processing changes that have very little or no effect on the usability of the records, at the expense of other areas (i.e. access points, subjects, etc.).

To summarize:

(1) Change Requests will not be processed if they involve disagreements in areas of judgement between cataloging institutions (includes: disagreements over the finer points of classification, rule interpretations, etc.).

(2) Change Requests involving minor typographical errors/changes to non-indexed fields will not be processed (includes: terminal punctuation and capitalization).

(3) Change Requests not accompanied by printouts and/or copies of the OCLC record will not be processed. If you are sending in a Change Request form, OCLC is asking that you include "proof" as well.
Research Center, Past President of the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres, first Chair of the U.S. RILM Governing Committee, "active participant in international music librarianship, devoted librarian, indefatigable traveler, and good friend."

Nominations for awards for publications appearing in 1988 in the above categories should be sent to Thomas Heck, Ohio State University, Music Library, 1813 N. High Street, Columbus, OH 43210.

Joan Redding of Chapel Hill, NC, became the fourth recipient of the Walter Gerboth Award. Established in memory of Walter Gerboth, the esteemed past president of the Music Library Association and professor of music at Brooklyn College, the award is intended to support research by a member of the Association in the first five years of his or her career as a librarian. It was presented to Redding in support of her work toward a descriptive catalogue of the manuscript scores and musical sketches of Lennox Berkeley.

Applications for the Gerboth Award may be submitted by November 15, 1989 to Gerboth Award, c/o Linda Blotner, 203 Deercliff Road, Avon, CT 06001. All applications should be accompanied by two letters of support, one for the person and one for the project, a vita and names of further references. They should describe the project and its significance and show the total budget, specifying the amount (up to $1000) requested from the Association, sources of other funds if any, and the purpose of the funds requested.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION: What is the correct form for including performers in a 505 contents note for a sound recording? Most OCLC member copy records list them in this way:

Title / Performer -- Title / Performer -- Title / Performer.

Library of Congress copy puts the performers in parenthesis like this:

Title (Performer) -- Title (Performer) -- Title (Performer).

ANSWER: Member copy which uses the slash to separate the title from the performer is incorrect. In ISBD punctuation the slash separates the title area from the area of responsibility. In AACR2rev. the third example under 6.7B18 illustrates this. It shows a title followed by its composer and then in parenthesis the performer. The second example under 6.7B18 may cause some confusion. It shows a title to composer relationship correctly separated with a slash. Catalogers may be extrapolating from this transcription of title and composer and applying it to title performer relationship.

-- Verna Urbanski
Reprinted from the OLAC Newsletter, Vol. 9, No. 1, March 1989, pp. 27-28
**OLUC STATISTICS BY FORMAT -- AS OF 881009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Material</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Location of Items Cataloged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>15,442,818</td>
<td>85.14%</td>
<td>287,013,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>1,053,107</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>11,228,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>433,484</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>1,753,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>209,716</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>403,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>83,949</td>
<td>.46%</td>
<td>108,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Recordings</td>
<td>517,168</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>4,547,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>377,257</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>2,860,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRDF</td>
<td>20,995</td>
<td>.12%</td>
<td>66,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,138,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.01%</strong></td>
<td><strong>307,979,472</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total of percentages may be slightly more or less than 100 because of rounding.

**AVERAGE LENGTH OF OLUC RECORDS -- AS OF 881009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Material</th>
<th>Average Length (in characters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Recordings</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRDF</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Formats</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Compiled from Cataloging File Statistics, Analysis of Online Bibliographic Records, distributed by Rich Greene, OCLC CDSG)

---

From OCLC Pacific's News Update, No. 37, February 1989
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### BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS IN THE ONLINE UNION CATALOG

**BY SOURCE OF CATALOGING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Total LC-created</th>
<th>Total Participating Libraries</th>
<th>Total Member-input LC copy</th>
<th>Total Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>2,591,189</td>
<td>10,661,174</td>
<td>2,190,455</td>
<td>15,442,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>121,767</td>
<td>883,562</td>
<td>47,778</td>
<td>1,053,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Media</td>
<td>78,928</td>
<td>329,207</td>
<td>25,349</td>
<td>433,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>112,190</td>
<td>94,984</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>209,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83,579</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>83,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Recordings</td>
<td>14,390</td>
<td>455,814</td>
<td>46,964</td>
<td>517,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>11,977</td>
<td>319,394</td>
<td>45,886</td>
<td>377,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRDF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,951</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,930,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,848,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,359,358</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,138,494</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ONLINE UNION CATALOG MEMBER-INPUT RECORDS BY ENCODING LEVEL

**OCTOBER 1988**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>I-Level</th>
<th>K-Level</th>
<th>O-Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>9,394,618</td>
<td>1,695,992</td>
<td>48,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>507,026</td>
<td>86,877</td>
<td>6,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>284,543</td>
<td>65,332</td>
<td>2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>85,057</td>
<td>9,292</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>57,465</td>
<td>25,799</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Recordings</td>
<td>374,980</td>
<td>115,579</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>275,994</td>
<td>48,053</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRDF</td>
<td>18,231</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,997,914</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,049,147</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,239</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal membership is $5.00; institutional membership is $10.00 ($15.00 outside the U.S.). Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members receive all Newsletters for the year, and any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed on receipt of dues payment). Personal members, please prefer home address. Institutional members, please note four line, twenty-four character per line limit. We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor (Faxon, etc.).

NAME: ________________________________________________

ADDRESS: ______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

Check for membership dues payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP must accompany application:

[ ] $5.00 Personal (U.S.) [ ] $10.00 Institutional (U.S.)
[ ] $15.00 Personal and Institutional (Outside U.S.)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Candice Feldt, Treasurer, Music OCLC Users Group, University Library, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155

Linda Barnhart
MOUG Newsletter Editor
Music OCLC Users Group
13135 Bavarian Drive
San Diego, CA 92129-2367