FROM THE CHAIR

This is a big issue, so I'm going to be brief! The response from my column in the previous issue was gratifying. I received expressions of interest in working on a MOUG membership directory and in tackling the problem of MOUG's always-increasing archives. Details will be given later.

I want to draw your attention to two important matters contained in this issue. Jay Weitz, OCLC's Quality Control Librarian, is the new OCLC liaison to MOUG, replacing Joan Schuitema. I hope you'll join me in welcoming Jay! Also, Tom Sanville, OCLC's Vice President, Marketing, has responded to my inquiry concerning possible changes in OCLC's pricing structure. Questions and comments should be directed to Mr. Sanville. If you do write, it would be helpful for you to send a copy to me so that MOUG can better ascertain member interest in this concern.

Don Hixon
University of California, Irvine
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FINANCIAL REPORT

Balance in checking account at 12/31/88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$1,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Registration</td>
<td>$2,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$151.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Issues</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable Expense</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6 Month Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,111.67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Telephone/Comm.</td>
<td>$42.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting AV Equipment</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Board Expense</td>
<td>$1,176.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$355.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>$1,362.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter Postage</td>
<td>$260.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Meeting - Summer 1989</td>
<td>$248.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing - Best of MOUG</td>
<td>$16.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing - General</td>
<td>$67.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$289.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6 Month Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,101.65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to CD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance in Checking Account at 6-30-89</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,255.85</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CASH</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,255.85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM THE EDITOR

This issue of the MOUG Newsletter contains information on a wide variety of topics. There is a fascinating exchange of letters concerning LC's recent proposal to discontinue coding the 045, 047 and 048 fields, and a survey undertaken by one of MOUG's members to assess the ramifications of such actions. I encourage all members to take the time to respond to this survey, as well as the survey promised in the previous issue concerning MOUG annual meetings. Also included here are letters regarding OCLC's move toward contribution pricing, the conclusion of the reports from the Cleveland meeting, and many, many cataloging and tagging questions and answers. I would like to thank the many contributors for their timely and very interesting articles.

MOUG has certainly found a friend in Mark Crook of the OCLC Office of Research! Mark has very generously provided data for music librarians in previous issues, and his work is also well represented here. We owe Mark a hearty round of thanks for his willingness to assemble and analyze OLCU data that is both relevant to and interesting for our everyday work.

In what is fast becoming tradition, the following articles have come to my attention over the past few months, and may be of interest to the MOUG membership:


Frost, Carolyn O. Media Access and Organization. Englewood, CO : Libraries Unlimited, 1989. [Includes one chapter on sound recordings]


Linda Barnhart
University of California, San Diego

NEWS FROM OCLC

For the first time, I write to you as the official OCLC liaison to MOUG, succeeding Joan Schuitema, now at Northwestern University, and Ron Gardner, the interim liaison since Joan's departure. Since you've known me as the Quality Control representative from OCLC since 1982, I figure that introductions are unnecessary. From now on, though, I'll be reporting on more general OCLC news as well as writing about my usual quality control issues.

New Online System

On May 24th, OCLC President K. Wayne Smith announced that Release 1 of the New Online System would be delayed slightly in order to modernize the OCLC telecommunications network. A vendor is expected to be selected this summer to design the New Network and convert the current one during 1990. Users will be migrated to the new network gradually during the next twelve to twenty months. Release 1 of the New Online System is expected to become available during the same period. The New Network should result in long-term telecommunications cost savings and allow such improvements as better inter-network links, facsimile transmission, eventual 24-hour availability, and improved response time.

Interlibrary Loan

The OCLC Interlibrary Loan Subsystem is ten years old in 1989. On March 31, 1989, ILL logged its 21 millionth interlibrary loan transaction.

Search CD450

Search CD450 Version 3.0 has been introduced, improving access to sixteen databases in agriculture, education, science/technology, and general reference. Among the enhancements are quicker searching, better multiple term searching from the index, browsable indexes and new entry formats for...
searching specific terms and phrases, and automatic saving of searches.

CAT CD450

CAT CD450 Version 1.1 has also been introduced. Of particular interest to MOUG members will be the availability of the Music Publisher Number search. Faster retrieval speed, VGA (Video Graphics Array) board support, display of extended produce status for bibliographic records, and automatic opening of the CD file description window when CD Searching and Editing is selected are among the other enhancements. Medical and law subsets were introduced at the Medical Library Association in May and the American Association of Law Libraries in June, respectively. A music subset is expected for February 1990. The Authorities Collection has been reorganized into two Name Authority CDs and one Subject Authority CD, to be updated quarterly rather than semiannually.

EPIC Service

In May, a field test of OCLC's EPIC Service, an online reference system that will feature access to a number of databases (including subject access to the Online Union Catalog), began in six libraries. The EPIC Service itself is expected to be available in January 1990.

Other News

Sources at the Library of Congress have informed us that they planned to begin using the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 1988 revision, beginning on June 19, 1989.

Quality Control News

The first phase of the Subject Heading Correction Project, wherein certain spelling, tagging, and subfielding errors were corrected, certain outdated headings were updated, and certain cancelled subdivisions were deleted, has been completed. Some 2.7 million records were processed, with 1.7 million records actually updated. A total of 2.1 million individual headings were modified. A machine-generated subfield $w at the end of a 650 or 651 field indicates such a correction. For more information about the Subject Heading Correction Project, see Technical Bulletin no. 185. For a fuller explanation of this use of subfield $w, see Technical Bulletin no. 187.

At the time of this writing, the Online Data Quality Control Section (ODQCS) is current with score and sound recording duplicate reports and member-reported Name Authority reports. There is a slight backlog of music change requests. We are also working regularly to whittle away at the long-standing store of LC score and sound recording updates, which has been reduced substantially over recent months.

Questions and Answers

Question: What should be done with numbers associated with untraced series such as "Schirmer's library of musical classics?"

Answer: Practices have varied so much over the years that people are justifiably confused about these things. Many phrases that once were considered series and placed in the series area of bibliographic records (such as "Edition Peters") are now considered Music Publisher Numbers. Now these are placed in notes and in 028 fields. Some such phrases are still considered as series, albeit untraced. I have encouraged people to input these numbers in 028 fields as well (coded so as not to generate additional notes), giving extra access to notoriously hard-to-search music records. Although they are not entirely consistent in the practice, the Library of Congress seems to be doing the same thing more often than not.

Question: How does one choose the LTxt fixed field codes when more than two could apply?

Answer: Both the list in the USMARC Format for Bibliographic Data and that in the OCLC Sound Recordings Format are in order of priority. If you cannot choose two codes on the basis of predominance on the recording, choose the two that come first in the priority list.

Question: In cataloging a volume of two different scores bound together, I noticed that AACR2, 1988 rev. 5.7B21 has an example with only the titles proper and statement of responsibility. Referring back to 2.7B21, the examples also have the publication information. Should I include the publication information in a score "with" note?

Answer: Remember that (as 0.14 in the introduction to AACR2, says) the examples "are illustrative and not prescriptive. That is, they illuminate the provisions of the rule to which they are attached, rather than extend those provisions. Do not take the examples or the form in which they
are presented as instructions unless specifically told
to do so by the accompanying text." Instead, go
back to 1.7B21, specifically to its Rule
Interpretation, which says, "For each item listed in a
"with" note, give the title proper (or uniform title if
one has been assigned), the statement of
responsibility, and the entire publication,
distribution, etc. area ... Use ISBD punctuation,
except omit the period-space-dash-space between
areas." The RI itself no longer says it explicitly, but
also add information that the works were bound
together subsequent to publication.

Mini-Lesson

Nowhere in AACR2 or its Rule Interpretations
is there much discussion about the correct
construction of formal contents notes, particularly
concerning punctuation. The newly published Notes
in the Catalog Record: Based on AACR2 and LC
Rule Interpretations, by Jerry D. Saye and Sherry L.
Vellucci (Chicago: American Library Association,
1989) deals with contents notes in admirable depth
and with numerous examples. Although there is a
wide range of possible combinations, including the
incorporation of statements of responsibility,
indications of sequence, and certain elements of
physical description, a few general types can be
distilled.

Individual titles either with or without statements
of responsibility are separated by a space-hyphen
space:

505 0 King Porter stomp -- New Orleans
joys -- Grandpa's spells -- Kansas City stomp --
- Wolverine blues -- The pearls -- Thirty-fifth
Street blues / Charles Levy -- Mamanita --
Frog-i-more rag -- London blues -- Tia Juana
/ Gene Rodenrich -- Shreveport stomp --
Mamanita -- Jelly Roll blues -- Big foot ham --
- Bucktown blues / Boyd Senter -- Tom cat
blues -- Stratford hunch -- Perfect rag.

505 0  G-Dur op. 6 Nr. 1 / Georg Friedrich
Handel -- G-Dur Nr. XXI : Propitia sydera /
Georg Muffat -- d-Moll op. 3/11 / Antonio
Vivaldi -- g-Moll : fatto per la Notte di Natale
/ Arcangelo Corelli.

505 0  Sonata for cello and piano / Benjamin
Lees (28:00) -- Elegy / Gabriel Faure (6:12) --
Fantasiestucke, op. 73 / Robert Schumann
(10:18).

Titles sharing the same statement of responsibility
are separated by a space-semicolon-space:

505 0  Variazioni su un'aria nazionale di Moore :
in re maggiore / F. Chopin -- Danze spagnole :
op. 12 ; Danze polacche : op. 55 / M.
Moszkowski.

505 0  Suite no. 1 in E-flat, op. 28, no. 1 /
Gustav Holst -- English folk song suite ; Toccata
marziale : for military band / Ralph Vaughan
Williams -- Suite no. 2 in F, op. 28, no. 2 ;
Hammersmith : Prelude and scherzo, op. 52 /
Gustav Holst.

For multipart works, separate the larger designation
(collective title, title of an opera, volume, etc.)
from the individual titles with a period-space:

505 0  6 concerti per l'organo, opus 7. No. 1 in B
flat major, HWV 306 (18:50) ; No. 2 in A major,
HWV 307 (13:09) ; No. 3 in B flat major, HWV
308 (14:47) ; No. 4 in D minor, HWV 309 (15:55)
; No. 5 in G minor, HWV 310 (12:06) ; No. 6 in B
flat major, HWV 311 (7:55) -- in F major,
without op. no., HWV 295 (13:06) -- in D minor,
without op. no., HWV 304 (11:51).

505 0  Nabucco. Sinfonia -- Luisa Miller.
Sinfonia -- La traviata. Preludio Atto I ; Preludio
Atto III -- I vespri siciliani. Sinfonia -- Un ballo
in maschera. Preludio Atto I ; Preludio Atto II --
La forza del destino. Sinfonia.

For multivolume items, set apart volumes with
space-hyphen-hyphen space:

505 0  [1] Nos. 1, 3, 5, and 7 -- [2] Nos. 2, 4, 6,
and 8.

505 0  [v. 1] Sonata in G minor, for oboe &
continuo, op. 1, no. 6; Trio sonata no. 2 in D
minor, for 2 oboes & continuo ; Sonata in C
minor, for oboe & continuo, op. 1, no. 8 ; Trio
sonata no. 3 in E-flat, for 2 oboes & continuo --
v. 2. Trio sonata no. 1 in B flat ; Trio sonata no.
4 in F major ; Trio sonata no. 5 in G major ;
Trio sonata no. 6 in D major.

Obviously, only a few examples are noted here,
though many more complex situations can be dealt
with by combinations of these practices.

Jay Weitz
Quality Control Librarian
Online Data Quality Control Section
OCLC
FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR

Elsewhere in this issue you will find a survey on MOUG annual meetings. Here is your chance to express your preferences in meeting scheduling, format, and content. Please take the time to fill it out and return it to me, by November 1st if possible.

In Newsletter No. 39 a Call for Papers was announced for the Tucson meeting. If you have not yet responded but are interested in giving a presentation for that meeting, please let me know right away.

Laura Snyder
Oberlin College

SUMMARY OF THE MOUG ANNUAL MEETING, MARCH 19-20, 1989, CLEVELAND, OHIO (CONTINUED)

LOCAL DATABASE CLEANUP PROJECTS

The session on local database cleanup projects was conducted by Linda Barnhart, University of California, San Diego. In her opening remarks, Barnhart provided background and definitions for the discussion to follow. The topic of the session is of importance, as the loading of archival tapes into a local database creates a high level of visibility for all bibliographic records, including their inconsistencies, problems, and errors.

Local cleanup projects approach a wide variety of problems, ranging from broad-scale heading changes to correction of isolated typographical errors. These projects may involve catalog or maintenance personnel, or both. Broadly defined, local database cleanup includes anything done to correct, improve, or make consistent the local database. Factors creating the need for such projects include simple inputting errors, local practices, changes in cataloging standards, and those unforeseen results of bulk processing of archival tapes by the various vendors.

In order to accomplish a database cleanup, the following are necessary: (1) identification of projects, in a format that allows for updating and revision, and (2) documentation; information needed for each project includes priority, proposed level of staffing, estimated time involved, cost of implementing, and ramifications if the project is not implemented (the last item is of particular importance in terms of convincing library administrators of the necessity for such projects). A hands-on knowledge of the local system and consultation with colleagues (especially those in public service areas) are also of value in preparing the documentation.

Throughout the discussion, there was a sharing of various problems encountered by the participants relating to their local databases. It soon became apparent that the time available in this session allowed for little more than an introduction to the topic. Several participants thought that it would be of value, at least for the immediate future, to conduct an on-going series of sessions on database cleanup.

Grace A. Fitzgerald
University of Iowa

PROBLEM SHARING SESSION

Laura Snyder of Oberlin College convened the session and Jay Weitz of OCLC answered questions. We decided that we all must be experts at cataloging on OCLC because there weren't many of the usual questions about tagging, etc. This gave us an opportunity for sharing information and ideas related to OCLC quality control and product development. We had a lively discussion and we all came away with useful information.

Question: How do you record dates for a CD with several works when the "p" dates for the works are from 1972-1976, for example, and the CD itself was issued in 1988?

Answer: FF Dates: 1988, 1972
260 [1988]
500 Reissue of ...

Question: When cataloging a CD does one need to add a note for a previous release if the item does not state it explicitly?

Answer: You don't have to search for evidence and use date type "r" if there is no evidence printed on the package.

Question: Does permanent ink used in labeling damage compact discs?

Answer: There is no current evidence that permanent ink damages compact discs. CDs have
not been in general use long enough to make
definite decisions now.

Question: Can Enhance libraries add 045 and 048 fields to LC records which lack these fields?

Answer: Not now. Certain types of authorizations may be allowed to do this sort of enhancement in the future. The usefulness of the 045 and 048 fields is diminishing with full text searching capabilities.

Question: Do the tapeload records with 028 subfield $b in the first position index correctly in OCLC? Will they be flipped at some time in the future?

Answer: They do index correctly. They probably will not be flipped because it's an aesthetic problem that doesn't affect indexing.

Question: Some tapeloaded records have very little punctuation. Is this a problem with the loading process or with the library's editing?

Answer: The problem is in the editing and inputting at the library end.

Question: What sorts of wholesale cleanups will be done prior to implementation of the New Online System?

Answer: Subject headings; maybe some fixed field cleanups; maybe some work on the integrated format.

Question: Will the first release of the New Online System come up before the music Cat CD450 is released?

Answer: Music CAT CD450 production has been delayed due to intensive internal testing and problem solving. OCLC found in testing other CAT CD products that field tests yielded fewer problems when internal testing was performed first. OCLC wants to follow the same pattern of extensive internal tests with the New Online System, so the New Online System field test set for Fall may be later than originally planned.

Jay asked us some questions related to quality control and product development.

Question: Are there any suggestions for outside databases to be added to the Search CD?

Answer: Music Index, Song Index, Duckles, RISM, Phonolog, RILM, various manuscript indexes, Baker's Biographical Dictionary, some subsets of Grove, especially composers' works lists.

Question: There is a possibility of publishing dirty subsets from the OCLC database in CAT and SEARCH CD products. Would dirty subsets be a deterrent? Would publication of a dirty database stimulate cleanup of records?

Answer: The general consensus was that dirty subsets would not be a major obstacle in using the tools. One librarian said that he would be upset if the special products databases provided at an extra cost were cleaner than the regular database. Jay replied that OCLC was trying to produce a cost-saving cataloging tool and a more flexible searching tool, not a higher class database. Jay also mentioned that the quality of records in the database has improved greatly, due mainly to Enhance activity.

Question: We know that duplicate records are a problem in the OCLC database. Are there any other problems that OCLC should be addressing?

Answer: Someone responded that some K level recon records are so scanty that it is almost impossible to make a positive identification when searching for cataloging copy.

Jay replied that it would be appropriate to ask OCLC for verification depending on what the problem was and that Enhance libraries should go ahead and enhance these records when possible. Jay said that he preferred the enhance option to contacting OCLC when enhancing a record was appropriate.

Anna Sylvester
University of Missouri, Kansas City

MUSIC ACQUISITIONS AND AUTOMATION

The participants in this session briefly discussed automated acquisition systems in use at their institutions. Music materials are acquired using each of the four systems: INNOVACQ, GEAC, NOTIS, and PALS.

David Knapp from the Oberlin Conservatory of Music opened the discussion with a brief presentation on the INNOVACQ system. This system is used as a stand alone system at Oberlin. Through the use of menus, the user is allowed to move to and from subsystems such as Data Retrieval
and Ordering and Receiving. Records are indexed by author, title, series, call number, old order number, title key, OCLC number, ISBN, and record number.

INNOVACQ does not support diacritical marking. Character sets, such as Cyrillic and Hebrew are also not supported by Innovacq. Individual records are input manually rather than being transferred directly from OCLC or another database system. There is a limit to the number of records in INNOVACQ at one time and there is no easy way to delete records once they are no longer needed but Oberlin seldom reaches the limit and doesn't see this as a problem.

Next, Patrick McCafferty, Acting Head of Serials at Case Western Reserve University, spoke on the GEAC Acquisitions System. Currently the system is used as a stand alone system at Case Western, but plans are underway to link their online catalog and acquisitions system. Menus are also used to access this system with a variety of user security levels available. The appearance of several screens was distributed. One query results in the Purchase Order screen on which the requisition number, ISN, author, title, imprint, series, edition, call number, source, process, language, and status lines were available. The Vendor Query screen provides information including the vendor’s name, address, phone number, claim status, and mail code. The Purchase Order Maintenance screen details the date, invoice number, status, vendor, and amount. A MARC record display is also available.

Jeannette Thompson, from Tulane University, continued the discussion by outlining her experience with the NOTIS Acquisition System. Part of an integrated system, the NOTIS Acquisition System builds its order records from a Provisional Record input at the point of ordering. This record typically provides very brief bibliographic information. Attached to this record are the Order/Pay/Receipt Record and the Copy Holdings Record. This record controls what the public sees as a location or status for the item. A Vendor Address Record is also available. The purchase order is printed by the system. And, as with the other systems discussed, no designated field is available for plate numbers and they are accommodated only by sticking them in wherever there is room.

The last system was discussed by Kiyo Suyematsu of Mankato State University. PALS, which stands for Project for Automated Library Systems, is a system developed by the Minnesota State University System. Fields indexed include author, title, series, ISBN, ISSN, LC card number, OCLC number, reference number, vendor number, department ID number, purchase order number, and requestor name. The search by department ID number, for example, provides a list, in alphabetical order by title, of the items ordered by that department and their status. In the order record, two helpful fields for music materials are entitled parts per copy and parts received.

Karen Little
University of Louisville

OCLC SENDS OUT RFP FOR NEW TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK

At the May 24-26 OCLC Users Council meeting in Dublin, Ohio, OCLC President and CEO Dr. K. Wayne Smith announced that OCLC has sent to seven vendors requests for proposals (RFPs) for modernization of the OCLC telecommunications network.

"By midsummer we will select a vendor and move with all deliberate speed to install a modern, state-of-the-art packet-switched network," said Dr. Smith. "The new network that we are going to construct will provide a much more flexible telecommunications environment for OCLC. It will significantly enhance our capabilities and see us through the 1990s and beyond."

The present OCLC telecommunications network is closed, modem-based, and operates with a unique telecommunications protocol that does not readily lend itself to linking with other networks.

The new OCLC network will use packet-switched technology to do the following:

- Increase network capacity to support the New Online System
- Accommodate increased growth in message traffic
- Enable OCLC to link more easily with other networks
- Manage the network in terms of operation, maintenance, analysis, trouble-shooting, and planning
- Allow OCLC to extend hours of operation, gradually moving toward 24-hour-a-day availability
- Enable OCLC to react to the ups and downs of tariffs more rapidly than it can now and with
more options
- Provide OCLC with a faster telecommunications network which could result in improvements in user response time, which is currently very favorable
- Enable OCLC to incorporate facsimile transmission in its services to libraries

According to Dr. Smith, the new network will result in a modest delay in Release 1 of the New Online System. However, he noted: "It also means that Release 1 and all subsequent New System Releases will be available over a more capable network that uses the latest and best telecommunications technology."

OCLC will select a vendor this summer and will begin converting the telecommunications network in 1990. While operating its current network, OCLC will migrate all users to the new network as quickly as possible during the next 12 to 20 months.

Release 1 of the New Online System and subsequent New System releases will follow the successful implementation of the new telecommunications network. Some users will probably get Release 1 sooner than others because OCLC will bring up the telecommunications network in stages. A library will have to have the new network to be able to use Release 1 of the New System.

Dr. Smith said that although a precise timetable could not be released until OCLC receives responses to its RFP, Release 1 of the New System should be available in some libraries during the twelve to twenty months required to modernize the telecommunications network.

Dr. Smith noted that the delay in implementation of Release 1, which was scheduled for 1989, while disappointing, is more than offset by the technical and economic benefits of modernizing the network. Among the advantages he cited are long-term savings in telecommunications costs for members, substantial improvements in capabilities, including facsimile transmission, and additional planning time for libraries to adapt to changes related to the New Network/New System.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Editor:

A show of hands at Cleveland revealed that almost all of us are maintaining our card catalogs until OPACs work better for music. The question, however, was posed in an either/or frame of reference. I would think that discussions of various middle-of-the-road solutions might be useful.

So--I have two, for which I would like to see some public response. (I realize that different systems and the size of a collection may affect the usefulness of these proposals--Appalachian State University has an LS/2000 system and a collection of 10,000 scores and 8,000 recordings.)

(1) Composer-Title Catalog. It is a fact that our OPAC offers access as good as or better than our AACR0/AACR1/AACR2 card catalogs, to everything besides the works of "prolific" composers (i.e., those whose names appear in more than twenty bibliographic records). For that reason we are considering maintaining a card catalog that includes only main entries and composer-title added entries. We would than tell our patrons: If you want a logical listing of composers and their works, go to the card catalog. If you are looking for anything else, use the OPAC terminal.

(2) Authority File as Composer-Title Index to OPAC. Because a title search on an exact uniform title will bring up all bibliographic records that include that title in either a 240 or a 700 field, we are also considering having a card authority file next to our OPAC terminal(s). This file would include one card for each composer-uniform title that appears in our database, plus appropriate cross references from variant titles. Our message to patrons: This index provides a logical listing by composer and title of the musical works in our computer database. To find a score or recording, do a title search at the computer on the exact uniform title (the title in brackets) listed in this file.

Final note: I'm looking forward to the day when I can get rid of the card catalogs completely--but I'm not holding my breath. So what do we do in the meantime?

Please share your comments with everyone.
Thanks.

Karl Van Ausdal
Music Library
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Again, the Library of Congress leads the way into the past!!! The recent announcement that they are discontinuing the coding of fields 045 through 048 demonstrates a short-sightedness unworthy of an institution which purports to be a national leader! These fields were put into the MARC format with considerable discussion, much of which is reflected in Don Siebert's documentation on the development of the format (MLA Technical Reports no. 13: The MARC music format, from inception to publication). They are intended to provide access to specific musical characteristics which are either inaccessible because of our cataloging practices or difficult to access.

The argument that few, if any, computer catalogs have implemented search routines using these fields is short-sighted and ill-informed. All of our on-line catalogs have been developed for "monographs," that is books; none have been designed specifically for music. Why? Because the development of on-line catalogs is an expensive process directed by those with little regard for anything but the most common and easily represented materials. We are only now beginning to get to a point where on-line catalogs can begin to accommodate special materials, and music, because we have been coding the fields like 048 (no matter how imperfectly), is in an excellent position to begin to reap the rewards of those efforts.

Those of you who attended the [1989] pre-conference workshop on the on-line catalog should reflect on the comments by Walt Crawford. His excellent discussion on screen design and the representation of music showed the problems of trying to provide access with bibliographic records designed for card catalogs. Important information for the user is buried. Using fixed fields, some of the problems which he discussed could be easily overcome.

The current policy by the Library of Congress reflects their disregard for the needs of music. In the long run, it is a continuation of their disregard for the needs of special materials which was demonstrated by their long delay in issuing the Music MARC format. Certainly, the priorities of the Library of Congress are changing to greater insularity and a lesser regard for the needs of the nation. This is an attitude reflective of the library profession as a whole which may allow the benefits of automation to slip from its grasp. Instead of worrying about whether one codes specific fields, we should be worrying about providing QUALITY access to our collections. We need to get our backlog collections cataloged and made available. A few librarians in the 1960's looked toward automation as a solution to this problem, but they also realized that any successful effort would require cooperation. And that is the area in which librarians have been most deficient. Worrying about the coding of specific fields instead of the over-riding issue of cooperative cataloging only continues the stereotype of the librarian incapable of seeing the library for the books!

I've always been proud to be a music librarian because we seemed to be able to cooperate better than any other sub-set of librarians, and with excellent results. The Library of Congress again wants to shrug off any responsibility for leadership in developing cooperative cataloging. They have consistently thrown road-blocks in our way as reflective of their long delay in issuing the MARC Music format and in their leadership in developing "minimal" standards which are no standards at all. It is time for us to set them free; they neither desire to be national leaders nor are they capable of it. I consider their abhorrent policy proposal to discontinue coding the fixed fields for music the final straw in their blockade against the needs of those who use music catalogs.

I suggest you all write to the Library of Congress and express your strong objection to their policy change. I was amazed when I heard that not one voice was raised against the policy when it was presented to MLA's Bibliographic Control Committee. I assume that they, as I, were dumbfounded at the stupidity of the suggestion.

Garrett Bowles
University of California, San Diego

Editor:

Power to the librarians.

Let's talk about a little self empowerment.

LC does not make us follow their policies; we choose to because it is easier, cheaper, and less
MOUG ANNUAL MEETING SURVEY  
1989

I. General background:
1. Length of membership in MOUG (approx.) _________
2. Current areas of job responsibility. Mark primary areas with P, secondary areas with S.
   ___ Music cataloging
   ___ General cataloging
   ___ Music acquisitions/collection development
   ___ Music reference
   ___ General reference
   ___ Music library administration
   ___ Bibliographic instruction (Music)
   ___ Bibliographic instruction (General)
   ___ Other public services for music collection
   ___ Other public services for general collection
   ___ Other (Please indicate) ____________________________________

Type of music collection, type of library:
Check the choices which best describes your situation.
___ Separate music library
___ Separate department within a library
___ Separate music archive collection
___ General library collection which includes music materials
___ Other (Please describe): _______________________________________

___ Public library
___ College library
___ University library
___ Other (Describe) ____________________________________________

II. MOUG meeting attendance:
I attend MOUG meetings:
___ Every year or almost every year since joining MOUG
___ Every 2-3 years
___ Occasionally
___ Never

The last meeting I attended was: (Give year and/or place) _________________________________

III. Meeting schedule preferences:
I would most likely attend a meeting scheduled:
(Check any that apply, rank preferences 1, 2, 3, etc.)
___ Before MLA & Pre-conference
___ During Pre-conference
___ During Pre-conference, but only if I wasn't interested in the Pre-conference topic.
___ During MLA
___ After MLA
___ During ALA
___ Completely separate from MLA or ALA
   ___ At OCLC
   ___ At another location
___ I would try to attend a MOUG meeting regardless of time & location.
___ I would probably NOT attend a MOUG meeting regardless of time & location.

IV. Meeting length:
Our MOUG meetings in the recent past have lasted about 1 1/2
days. This length seems:
___ About right; keep up the tradition.
___ Too long, would prefer 1 day 1/2 day (circle one)
___ Too short, should be 2 days
___ About right, but alternate with occasional shorter meetings
___ About right, but alternate with occasional longer meetings

V. Meeting content:
In addition to the business meeting (required by the Bylaws) I would consider the following types of sessions very important to include at annual meetings: (Give number ranking: 1 = very important; 3 = moderately important; 5 = not very important; blank = completely expendable)
___ News from OCLC
___ News from LC
___ Other special reports (e.g. cooperative projects)
___ Demonstrations of new OCLC products & services
___ Plenary sessions on special topics
___ Small group sessions (special topics, up to 1 hour in length)
___ Workshops (Small groups, special topics, 2-3 hours or longer)
___ Other suggestions: ______________________________________

In general, I have found MOUG meetings to be:
___ Useful, interesting sessions, with topics or approaches not found at other meetings.
___ Useful, interesting sessions, but overlapping in content with meetings of other organizations.
___ Interesting but not useful.
___ Useful but boring.
___ Too variable to generalize. Comments:

Comments on past meeting content:

Suggestions for future meeting content:

Other comments:

Thank you for completing this survey. Please send to:
Laura M. Snyder
Conservatory Library
Oberlin College
Oberlin, OH 44074   RETURN BY NOV. 1, 1989
SURVEY ON LC'S PROPOSAL
REGARDING 045, 047 and 048 CODING

1. Does your library currently code fields:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Orig. Cat.</th>
<th>Recon</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If the Library of Congress stops coding 04x fields for music, will your library continue coding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Orig. Cat.</th>
<th>Recon</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Undecided only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If the Library of Congress stops coding 04x fields for music, will your library discontinue coding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Orig. Cat.</th>
<th>Recon</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Does your library have a local online catalog?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If you have an online catalog, does the system currently index:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If you have an online catalog and the fields are not indexed, are there current plans for indexing or is the vendor contracted to index fields:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If you have no plans to index and will continue to code, state why you will continue coding for

a) 045

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>comply with cataloging standards</th>
<th>possible future use</th>
<th>because we've always done it</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
<th>other. Please expand:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) 047

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>comply with cataloging standards</th>
<th>possible future use</th>
<th>because we've always done it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) 048
___ comply with cataloging standards
___ possible future use
___ because we’ve always done it
___ not applicable
___ other. Please expand:

Now some information about you and your library is needed.
8. In what type of library do you work?
   ___ Public
   ___ University
   ___ College
   ___ Special Collection
   ___ Other. Specify ____________________________

9. Is there a separate music library or music section of the library?
   ___ yes  ___ no

10. What is the size of the music score and recordings holdings combined?
    ___ 0-10,000 vols.
    ___ 10,000-25,000 vols.
    ___ 25,000-50,000 vols.
    ___ 50,000-100,000 vols.
    ___ 100,000- vols.

11. Are scores cataloged by
    ___ a music cataloger
    ___ the music librarian
    ___ a general cataloging department
    ___ other. Specify ____________________________

12. Are recordings cataloged by
    ___ a music cataloger
    ___ the music librarian
    ___ the general cataloging department
    ___ other. Specify ____________________________

13. What is your position? Are you primarily responsible for:
    ___ Cataloging
    ___ Reference and Public Services
    ___ Both of the above
    ___ Other. Specify ____________________________

14. Name ___________________________________________
    Address _________________________________________
    Phone _________________________________________

Please give institutional address and phone.

SEND COMPLETED FORM TO: Jerry McBride, Music Librarian, Johnson Building, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont 05753
intellectually taxing. LC is not the national library and probably never will be. It is just a very large library with its own agendas and a lot of clout. Isn't it about time we stopped giving power to an organization that is not legally responsible to or for us and then complain about the results? Don't get me wrong, I'm as guilty of LC bashing as the next person. But, it hasn't gotten us anywhere and won't until we decide to collectively disengage our profession from the cult of LC and try to determine our own destinies.

Perhaps it is true that most libraries are relatively free of LC's influence in matters such as the 045-048 controversy. In other areas of cataloging, however, this is not true. Our dependence on LC rule interpretations sometimes verges on the pathological, and we have accepted for years a subject heading system that has little basis in reality or utility.

In reference to Garrett Bowles' original points. The fields in question were included in the MARC format because of real needs for access in music catalogs, needs which were not and still are not being met by traditional cataloging methods, especially the LC subject headings. It is easy to forget this fact in our dissatisfaction over the artificial nature of the coding of the fields and the concomitant bars to access. Such blind spots, however, when coupled with our easy acceptance of LC's unwilling and unable leadership prevent us from accomplishing what is possible and desirable. Taking control of our profession would allow us, among other things, to improve the MARC format and help it keep pace with the revolution in computing. The MARC format was and still is a response to the state of computer design in the 1970s. Fields like 045-048 were designed in coded form so that those early computer systems could accommodate the information represented by them. That they are inadequate now is not the fault of their designers or an indication that the information in them is not needed. Their inadequacy is a patent example of the library profession's unwillingness to change with the times and to take responsibility for things that intimately affect it. By allowing LC to control the development of the MARC format we have accepted an outmoded data storage system. We should have been improving the MARC format in significant ways through the years, not haggling over individual bytes and the coding of fields. Computer systems can or very shortly will be able to accommodate information such as we put in 047 and 048 in natural language. We should change the formats to reflect this and write programs to translate the codes into understandable terms within our bibliographic records. Far reaching changes could also be made in other portions of the format. Such action could and should also be extended to other areas of cataloging and librarianship such as the active involvement of more librarians in the creation and revision of cataloging codes and the revival of the lamented Music Thesaurus project. The time seems right now for music librarians to take the lead in changing our profession in these important ways. Can we do it? If the dialogue in this forum is any indication, the answer is yes.

Jeffrey Earnest  
Stanford University

Editor:

I've been reluctant to join this fray but maybe I can offer some useful information.

At the recent RTSD workshop on AACR2 1/2 Ben Tucker announced a number of very minor policy changes that LC catalogers are undertaking. For instance, they will no longer apply 2.5C2 except to give the abbreviation "ill.", and they will no longer make index notes, and they will describe all bibliographies as "Includes bibliographic references."

These changes are in response to internal criticism at LC about the cost of cataloging (this has been going on since 1941--see Martha Yee's article in Library Quarterly about "The Crisis in Cataloging"). It seems they are very afraid that if they don't get their own house in order someone else will do it for them.

I'm not at all certain that they've chosen the right intellectual approach to "reconsideration of the catalog" but at least I think this might be connected to the music section's various announcements of late about cost saving measures such as discontinuation of class numbers for recordings, and now the 048 etc. mess.

Garrett is correct that LC has not been a leading force in music cataloging for decades. They don't catalog much, what they do catalog they either over-catalog (if it's western European) or under-catalog (if it's anything else). And they gave up their chance to play a major role in shared music cataloging when they failed to implement the music format in a timely way.

I think it's true that the current record
configuration of 04x fields might yield irrelevant responses in machine searching. But that doesn't mean we should cease coding the data. To do so is to give up the hope that someday we might think of a better way to configure the data. I KNOW it would be very expensive to convert millions of bibliographic records but that doesn't mean it can't be done (despite what the networks tell us--they always scream that it's too expensive and can't be done, like LC, until they're forced to do it then they come through). On the other hand we might devise some sort of coded music access field, that would include data now coded in both 047 and 048, and that would use intrarecord links to relate each occurrence of the field to the musical work it identifies in the descriptive portion of the record. (This is sort of like a faceted classification.) Should we devise such a thing, we could use conversion programs to change existing records. But not if the data aren't there already.

On the other hand we shouldn't over-code things. For instance, it's silly to waste time entering 10 048 fields to cover every possible permutation of instrumentation for chamber works that identify more than one set of possibilities.

Richard Smiraglia  
Columbia University

[Editor's Note: At the Cleveland meeting, the MOUG Board was asked to investigate some members' concerns regarding proposed changes in the OCLC pricing structure and its implication for music. The result was the following exchange of letters between Don Hixon, MOUG Chair, and Tom Sanville, Vice President for Marketing at OCLC.]

Dear Don Hixon:

In response to your letter, let me offer these summary comments about contribution pricing. A full description is an hour-long presentation or ten-page document -- the best I have done so far at summarizing the rationale, the mechanics, the impact, etc.

The future pricing structure should be based directly on charges for access to the data (searching of bibliographic and holdings information) with rewards (credits or exemptions) for contribution (original cataloging, adding holdings, creating or updating Union List LDRs, ILL lending and requesting, and deleting holdings) that enhance the value and usefulness of the OLUC for all OCLC members. Relative to our current prices, this would result in increased charges for those users who only access data while benefitting those that also
contribute. For equivalent searching activity, it would result in the least cost to the library that also contributes their holdings information and fully participates in the Online Union Catalog.

Such a new pricing structure must also recognize that libraries need a varying amount of search activity to accomplish their online cataloging and resource sharing activities. Within a wide range of search-to-produce activity, libraries should not need to change behavior to react to the economies of a new pricing structure. Within a "cradle" of full bibliographic and holdings contribution behavior, the cost for equivalent amounts of usage should be the same.

In response to your request concerning the impact of contribution pricing on music libraries, I collected the following information based on the model used in our presentations to members at Users Council and many regional network meetings this spring. These contribution price estimates are based on FY87/88 OCLC activity. This model is only an example to illustrate the general impact of a change to contribution pricing.

1. Twelve libraries were identified as separate music libraries. Seven of these 12 libraries had a cost decrease with the contribution pricing model. The remaining five libraries had an annual cost increase ranging from $5.00 to $81.00. The model applied to 4,000 general members results in 64% with price decreases and 21% with a 0% - 5% increase.

2. Many music libraries are often billed under a three-character institution symbol which includes the activity of other libraries on a campus. For these libraries, one can assess the impact of contribution pricing on the entire institution.

Apart from the 12 libraries described above, 231 institutions were identified as having their holding symbol attached to at least 1,000 music score records. When these libraries were analyzed, 140 (60%) were found to have a cost decrease with contribution pricing. Fifty-one (22%) of the libraries had an increase of 0% - 5% over their current costs. The contribution pricing costs of the remaining 40 libraries (17%) increased by more than 5%.

Typically, the libraries with a search-to-produce ratio greater than 12:1 would expect a cost increase with contribution pricing. A high search-to-produce ratio coupled with excessive display holdings activity and little original cataloging also leads to higher costs under contribution pricing.

Overall, there is no significant difference in the results for music libraries versus the general population. The checks and balances of contribution pricing which provide for credits from original cataloging, copy cataloging, and other contributing activity while charging for access (searching and display holdings) are designed to protect most of our members at their current activities levels.

The specific nature and mechanics of the price structure are not final and more suitable for presentation and discussion. As I said, the only attempt at a written description of the structure took me 10 pages.

Tom Sanville
Vice President
Marketing
OCLC

THE TOP 25 COMPOSERS IN THE OCLC DATABASE

1. Johann Sebastian Bach
2. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart
3. Ludwig van Beethoven
4. Johannes Brahms
5. Joseph Haydn
6. Franz Schubert
7. George Frideric Handel
8. Peter Tchaikovsky
9. Robert Schumann
10. Richard Wagner
11. Giuseppe Verdi
12. Frederic Chopin
13. Franz Liszt
14. Felix Mendelssohn
15. Claude Debussy
16. Antonio Vivaldi
17. Antonin Dvorak
18. Sergei Prokofiev
19. Richard Strauss
20. Maurice Ravel
21. Igor Stravinsky
22. Bela Bartok
23. Gioacchino Rossini
24. Giacomo Puccini
25. Sergei Rachmaninoff

"Bach scored highest, with 17,640 published or recorded works. Mozart occupied second chair,
with 17,150. Beethoven’s third was heroic—13,622. Brahms was a distant fourth with 8,133. Sorry, there were no rock composers who even came close."

Phil Schieber
Reprinted from the OCLC Newsletter, no. 173, May/June 1988, p. 9

THE TOP 100 SCORES IN THE OCLC DATABASE

The following list was compiled by Mark Crook from the OCLC Office of Research. It lists in order the scores held by the largest number of holding libraries. No score exceeded 11,000 holdings. Holdings are given in brackets following each entry, and OCLC numbers are included should further information be desired.

1. The folk songs of North America, in the English language by Alan Lomax [993] (#190825)
2. Best loved songs of the American people by Denes Agay [925] (#1296340)
3. The American songbag by Carl Sandburg [914] (#5354945)
5. A treasury of Stephen Foster by Stephen Collins Foster [850] (#398063)
6. Traditional American folk songs from the Anne & Frank Warner collection by Anne Warner [821] (#11189155)
7. Masterpieces of music before 1750 by Carl Parrish [820] (#517590)
10. Anthology of medieval music by Richard H. Hoppin [792] (#3979963)
11. American hymns old and new by Albert Christ-Janer, Charles W. Hughes, Carleton Sprague Smith [790] (#7203431)
14. Favorite songs of the nineties by Robert A. Fremont [725] (#690068)
15. The fireside book of favorite American songs by Margaret Bradford Boni [720] (#404006)
17. Historical anthology of music by Archibald T. Davison [689] (#364904)
19. American ballads and folk songs by John Avery Lomax [635] (#999512)
20. Here’s to the women by Hilda E. Wenner [632] (#15518334)
21. Go in and out the window by Dan Fox [632] (#17249753)
23. Medieval music by W. Thomas Marocco [597] (#3350062)
25. He was singin’ this song by Jim Bob Tinsley [584] (#8293958)
27. Folk songs of the world, gathered from more than 100 countries by Charles Haywood [552] (#3543712)
28. The Lullaby songbook by Jane Yolen [552] (#12916790)
31. The New York Times great songs of the 70’s by Milton Okun [545] (#441385)
33. Choral music by Ray Robinson [532] (#3996629)
34. The symphony, 1800–1900 by Paul Henry Lang [525] (#30272)
35. A Texas–Mexican cancionero by Americo Paredes [523] (#2140179)
36. America sings by Carl Lamson Carmer [522] (#5255530)
37. Historical anthology of music by women by James R. Briscoe [522] (#13945768)
38. I’m going to sing by Ashley Bryan [516] (#8968417)
39. Carry it on! by Pete Seeger, Bob Reiser [516] (#12913052)
40. Do your ears hang low? by Tom Glazer [514] (#6017351)
41. Music for ones and twos by Tom Glazer [514] (#9931902)
42. Tomie dePaola’s book of Christmas carols by Tomie dePaola [513] (#14964725)
43. Classic piano rags by Rudi Blesh [512] (#844955)
44. Wake up dead man by Bruce Jackson [509] (#479362)
45. A new approach to sight singing by Sol Berkowitz [508] (#479367)
46. Petrushka by Igor Stravinsky [507] (#299753)
47. Songs of the Chitt War by Irwin Silber [504] (#594364)
49. Folk song: U.S.A. by John Avery Lomax [504] (#594697)
50. The little drummer boy by Katherine Davis [501] (#1260237)
51. The world of Rod McKuen by Rod McKuen [493] (#4339166)
52. The American heritage songbook by Ruth Lloyd [489] (#2321462)
53. Symphony in G minor, K. 550 by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart [486] (#620569)
54. Eye Winker, Tom Tinker, Chin Chopper by Tom Glazer [485] (#912412)
55. The international book of Christmas carols by Walter Ehret [483] (#229777)
56. The solo song, 1580-1730 by Carol MacClintock [478] (#592476)
57. What a morning! by John Langstaff [478] (#15281372)
58. Cantata no. 4; Christ lag in Todesbanden by Johann Sebastian Bach [477] (#2869218)
60. Songs of man by Norman Luboff [467] (#1034972)
61. The hell-bound train by Glenn Ohrlin [467] (#3171934)
63. Songs of '76 by Oscar Brand [464] (#740722)
64. Omnibus by William J. Starr [463] (#306925)
66. Maurice Sendak's Really Rosie by Carole King [458] (#3632751)
67. Hispanic folk music of New Mexico and the Southwest by John Donald Robb [457] (#6446181)
68. 100 best songs of the 20's and 30's by Richard Rodgers [456] (#781890)
70. American folk songs for Christmas by Ruth Crawford Seeger [454] (#3045167)
71. A treasury of American song by Olin Downes [452] (#985936)
72. Songs of work and protest by Edith Fowke, Joe Glazer [451] (#743019)
73. A treasury of early music by Carl Parrish [450] (#583365)
74. Ballads and folk songs of the Southwest by Ethel Moore [449] (#947019)
75. Songs of the great American West by Irwin Silber [446] (#1268417)
76. Le nozze de Figaro by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart [443] (#293323)
77. The Laura Ingalls Wilder songbook by Eugenia Garson [442] (#802549)
78. Music in opera by Elaine Brody [442] (#1232239)
79. Hard hitting songs for hard-hit people by Alan Lomax [436] (#190819)
80. Jim along, Josie by Nancy Langstaff [436] (#252753)
81. Dichterliebe by Robert Schumann [434] (#324540)
82. Music of the Bach family by Karl Geiringer [434] (#775880)
84. Symphony no. 5 in c minor by Ludwig van Beethoven [429] (#1710736)
85. Fantastic symphony by Hector Berlioz [428] (#273785)
86. The concerto 1800-1900 by Paul Henry Lang [427] (#263691)
87. Variations on a theme of Haydn by Johannes Brahms [425] (#3003614)
88. The Norton scores by Roger Kamien [424] (#82294)
89. The great music of Duke Ellington by Duke Ellington [424] (#813961)
90. The singing sixties by Willard Allison Heaps [423] (#1021189)
91. Father Fox's feast of songs by Clyde Watson [423] (#9961250)
92. Prelude to the afternoon of a faun by Claude Debussy [422] (#697573)
94. Piano concerto in C major, K. 503 by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart [420] (#234851)
95. The Holiday song book by Robert M. Quackenbush [419] (#3290130)
96. The Raffi singable songbook by Raffi [418] (#15281538)
97. The early American songbook by Lee Vinson [414] (#1141330)
98. Too many songs by Tom Lehrer [414] (#7899245)
99. Lullabies and night songs by Alec Wilder [412] (#222788)

Mark Crook
Office of Research
OCLC
INSTITUTIONS HOLDING THE MOST SCORES

Also forwarded on to the Editor by Mark Crook of the OCLC Office of Research was the following list of the institutions holding the most scores (record type "c") in the OCLC database. The range of holdings was approximately 22,000-38,000. The institutions in order are:

1. Arizona State University
2. Indiana University
3. Eastman School of Music
4. Yale University
5. University of Texas, Austin
7. Florida State University
8. University of Cincinnati
9. New York Public Library - Research
10. Oberlin College
11. University of New Mexico
12. Free Library of Philadelphia
13. University of California, Los Angeles
14. University of Illinois
15. University of Georgia
16. University of California, San Diego

MLA SEEKS NOMINATIONS FOR FIFTH WALTER GERBOTH AWARD

The Music Library Association is soliciting applications for the fifth annual Walter Gerboth Award, established in memory of the esteemed member of the Association, professor of music at Brooklyn College, and former head of the music library there.

The award is given to a member of the Music Library Association who is in the first five years of his or her library career, and who is seeking assistance for a research project in progress in music librarianship or music bibliography. It is desirable that the research lead to publication.

An application should be accompanied by two letters of support, one for the person and one for the project, and should include vita as well as names of further references. It should describe the project and its significance and show the total budget, specifying the amount requested from the Association (up to $1000), sources of other funds if any, and the purpose of the funds requested. No funds will be awarded for capital purchases.

Applications should be submitted by November 15, 1989, to Gerboth Award, c/o Linda Solow, Allen Memorial Library, University of Hartford, West Hartford, CT 06117.

MLA SEEKS NOMINATIONS FOR 1988 PUBLICATIONS AWARDS

The Music Library Association is now inviting nominations for awards for 1988 publications in the fields of music and music bibliography. One prize will be awarded in each of three categories:

1. The Vincent H. Duckles Award for the best book-length bibliography or other research tool in music published in 1988
2. The Richard S. Hill Award for the best article-length bibliography or article on music librarianship appearing in 1988
3. The Eva Judd O'Meara Award for the best review of a book or music score appearing in the 1988 issue of Notes, the quarterly journal of the Music Library Association.

The MLA Publications Awards Committee this year (for the awarding of the 1988 prizes) consists of Thomas Heck (ts7091@ohstvma), Chair, Harold Diamond (Lehman College, CUNY), and John Howard (howard@harvarda). MLA colleagues are encouraged to send nominations for any of these awards for work published in 1988 to any member of the committee.

Thomas Heck
Chair, MLA Publications Awards Committee
Ohio State University Music Library
Sullivant Hall
1813 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1307

MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT

Music Library Association
59th Annual Conference
February 20-24, 1990
Holiday Inn Broadway
Tucson, Arizona


February 21-24, 1990: Session include bibliographic instruction revisited, Southwest native
American music, preservation of sound recordings, antiquarian music collecting, and music therapy and medical aspects of the performing arts.

For more information, contact:

Martin A. Silver
Music Library
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
(805) 961-3609

MUSIC LIBRARIANSHIP IN AMERICA

A symposium, "Music Librarianship in America," will be held at Harvard University October 5-7, 1989. The symposium aims at stimulating music librarians to reflect on the larger aspects of their calling, in part by looking at their profession through the eyes of those in neighboring disciplines. Distinguished representatives from the fields of musicology, ethnomusicology, history, publishing, arts administration, performance, composition, criticism, librarianship, and library education will explore the role of music librarians as custodians of cultural history, their relationships with scholarship, performance, and compositions, and their role in the world of American music.

Among those scheduled to take part in the program are Richard Crawford, Richard F. French, Charles Hamm, H. Colin Slim, Christoph Wolff, Bruno Nettl, Oscar Handlin, Leo Balk, Stephen Graubard, Gunther Schuller, Steven Ledbetter, David P. Hamilton, Sidney Verba, James B. Coover, Dena J. Epstein, James Pruett, Don Roberts, Harold Samuel, Susan T. Sommer, and Donald W. Krummel. Also included will be three concerts: an evening of Black gospel music, a performance by the Boston Camerata, and an organ recital by Ewald Kooiman.

The symposium honors the establishment at Harvard of the Richard F. French librarianship, the first music library chair at a major university. It is sponsored by the Harvard College Library and Department of Music, with the aid of a grant from the Council on Library Resources.

For further information, contact Michael Ochs, Harvard University.

NEW MLA RESEARCH ROUNDTABLE FORMED

A new round table on Research in Music Librarianship has been formed to provide a vehicle for information exchange among MLA members pursuing research topics in music librarianship. The round table hopes to: (1) act as a clearinghouse on empirical research methods and methodological problems inherent in music library research; (2) assist in identifying a research agenda for the music library profession; (3) identify appropriate vehicles for the dissemination of research results; and (4) encourage more research into the administrative problems of music librarianship.

In preparation for the 1990 annual conference the round table is considering several discussion topics, including a proposal for a workshop on empirical and historical research methods, and a proposal to conduct studies that would help identify components of a research agenda for the profession.

Anyone interested in taking part in the work of the round table is encouraged to contact the coordinator to be added to the mailing list. Write to Richard Smiraglia, School of Library Service, Columbia University, 516 Butler Library, New York, NY 10027 (Bitnet: smiragli@cunixc.cc.columbia.edu).

CARD NUMBERS ON SOUND RECORDINGS AT LC

As of January 1989, the Library of Congress has discontinued preassigning catalog card numbers to sound recordings. This program has been terminated primarily because participation has declined precipitously as recording companies have adopted the compact disc format. Of course, the Library of Congress will continue to catalog sound recordings and make the cataloging data available through the Music MARC Distribution Service and Music, Books on Music, and Sound Recordings.

From the Cataloging Service Bulletin, No. 44 (Spring 1989), p. 86

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question: In the Music Cataloging Bulletin, v. 18, no. 1, p. 8, I noticed a new subdivision "Film and video adaptations" to be added to the list of free-floating music subdivisions for music headings. In checking the NUC AV fiche for January 1983--
December 1987, I did not notice that this subdivision was in use for videorecordings of opera performances. For such videorecordings I have been using just the subject headings "Operas" with no subdivision. Since the aim of subject headings is to represent the subject matter of the item rather than the form, would it be appropriate to use the subdivision "Film and video adaptations" to describe a videorecording of an opera, oratorio, etc.? Or, if we desired a form qualifier would we need to use the form subdivision for the medium: Operas--Videorecordings?

Answer: In the online LCSH "Film and video adaptations" can be used "under individual literatures and under names of individual literary authors, e.g., English literature--Film and video adaptations; Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616--Film and video adaptations." The application of the phrase is very limited, according to LC's Dick Thaxter. It is intended to be used for works about the process of making a film or video, such as its application to the book on the making of the film version of La Traviata (85-215814). It should NOT be used for an adaptation of a novel, play, etc. such as the David Copperfield film with W.C. Fields (Dickens, Charles ... $x Film and video adaptations).

I am unfamiliar with the use of "--Videorecording" as a free-floating form subdivision. I understand the urge to organize files by form subdivisions. The addition of descriptive 007 information to cataloging records has for years been justified on the basis that materials can be retrieved by type using this coding. We must not forget that application. We need to focus on getting systems to implement the coding that is there rather than asking subject headings use to duplicate the form concept while distorting the function of subject headings. I think part of the interest in making subject headings perform this function originates from LC's discontinuing of the GMD in added entries. That was a handy way to give form access to materials via a consistent GMD.

Verna Urbanski
Reprinted from the OLAC Newsletter, Vol. 9, No. 1, March 1989, p. 27-28

The following questions and answers are from an OLAC workshop "Cataloging of Videorecordings" conducted by Glenn Patton.

Question: What is the chief source of information for a compact disc? In the report of the program on AACR2r at New Orleans ALA (OLAC Newsletter, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 16), it indicates that you take the information from the container.

Answer: (Patton): Take it from the label on the CD unless the container provides a collective title and the label doesn't.

(Intner): From the label on the CD. However, the label on a CD is smaller than the label on a vinyl record, so it may be necessary to resort to the container to get the fuller information.

Question: I am seeing more and more records for non-print items with the GMD at the end of the 245 field rather than after the chief title. These are DLC records in OCLC.

Answer: (Patton): Sound recordings are more likely to have multiple works by multiple composers. Rule 1.1G says what to do with multiple titles proper and multiple statements of responsibility. The GMD goes at the end. This conflicts somewhat with the concept of the GMD as an "early warning" device. The ISBDs are changing this so the GMD always comes after the first title.

(Fox): LC runs into the same problem in video cataloging when several titles or parts are involved, and the GMD is considerably further down.

(Intner): For user friendly cataloging, you should trace other titles as added entries and put the GMD at the end of each title.

(Urbanski): LC no longer uses GMDs in added entries.

Reprinted from the OLAC Newsletter, Vol. 9, No. 2, June 1989, p. 27-28

The following questions and answers are from an OLAC workshop "Cataloging of Videorecordings" conducted by Glenn Patton.

Question: Where should a cataloger put Dolby?

Answer: In sound recordings it means a system of noise reduction. If the item says Dolby stereo, code for stereo in the 007 and put Dolby in a note (7.7Bl0) if you think it is important enough to have in the permanent bibliographic record.

Question: Do you have to use subfield $i (kind of sound) in the 007?

Answer: If you have no stated information, you
can omit it. Do not assume an item is either mono. or stereo. if it doesn't say so.

Question: If a whole musical group during performance composes a piece of music, can you give them credit as the main entry?

Answer: AACR2r doesn't go as far as that, but it is the same as an "improvised performance." They are not working from printed music, and the group as a whole is responsible for the unique action. See 21.1B2E.

Question: Does the rule of three apply to added entries? Many sound recordings now seem to have lots more subjects and added entries than they used to.

Answer: The rule of three is usually not observed by music catalogers. The nature of the material just makes it impractical to place that kind of limitation on access points.

[Workshop leader's comment: Since presenting the workshops at which these questions were asked, several of those attending have called to my attention a LCRI for Rule 21.23C (published in the Cataloging Service Bulletin, no. 38 (Fall 1987), p. 36-39) which calls for the special entry rules for sound recordings to be applied to videorecordings that contain collections of music performed by one or more principal performers. Based on that LCRI, the answers to some of the questions reported below have been changed. I apologize for any confusion which resulted from my having forgotten about the existence of this LCRI.]

Question: If Horowitz had been playing a concert of one piece of his own composing, would you still enter it under title?

Answer: No. You'd probably enter it under his name as principal performer.

Reprinted from the OLAC Newsletter, Vol. 9, No. 2, June 1989, p. 5-7
TAG FREQUENCY OF SCORES RECORDS IN THE OCLC OLUC
TABLE OF TAGS BY CATALOGING INSTITUTION

Mark Crook of the OCLC Office of Research has graciously provided the following data for scores in the OCLC OLUC based on a program he ran on May 15, 1989. It counts the number of occurrences of a particular tag by cataloging institution; for example, the number of 048 fields found in LC-entered records is 12,709 (or 92.17% of their scores, Mark notes). The number of 048s found in member-input records is 252,680 (or 65.67% of the total number of member-input scores). In handwritten annotations, Mark also noted several interesting items: (1) 60% of the records have uniform titles (LC 53.9% and member-input 60.21%); (2) the average number of subject headings per record is 1.29 (LC 1.50 and member-input 1.28); and (3) the mean number of tags per record overall is 11.74 (with LC at 14.30 and member-input 11.65).

Total Number of Scores Records: 398,550
Number of LC-Cataloged Scores: 13,788 (3.45%)
Number of Member-Input Scores: 384,762 (96.55%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAG</th>
<th>LC Cataloging</th>
<th>Member Input</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3241</td>
<td>3242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>6881</td>
<td>8683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>3843</td>
<td>22766</td>
<td>26609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>10387</td>
<td>172352</td>
<td>182739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6570</td>
<td>6570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>8041</td>
<td>211509</td>
<td>219550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>2121</td>
<td>51692</td>
<td>53813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>5477</td>
<td>6506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>5448</td>
<td>128194</td>
<td>133642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>13725</td>
<td>14724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>12709</td>
<td>252680</td>
<td>265389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>13793</td>
<td>43550</td>
<td>57343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>224809</td>
<td>224811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26245</td>
<td>26281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>12070</td>
<td>346422</td>
<td>358492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3744</td>
<td>3821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>7433</td>
<td>231689</td>
<td>239122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>13788</td>
<td>384762</td>
<td>398550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>23473</td>
<td>24645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>6893</td>
<td>8591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>13788</td>
<td>384388</td>
<td>398176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>13788</td>
<td>383364</td>
<td>397152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>3383</td>
<td>5250</td>
<td>8633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>22829</td>
<td>24989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>89362</td>
<td>91201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>24213</td>
<td>512457</td>
<td>536670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>3508</td>
<td>4203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>2749</td>
<td>48950</td>
<td>51699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>4350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>16819</td>
<td>18696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3917</td>
<td>3995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>20752</td>
<td>495483</td>
<td>516235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>9126</td>
<td>179720</td>
<td>188846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>8116</td>
<td>8542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3362</td>
<td>3518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>3955</td>
<td>71296</td>
<td>75251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>4928</td>
<td>5698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27287</td>
<td>27299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30807</td>
<td>30808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</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