FROM THE CHAIR

It was good to see many of you at the annual meeting in Baltimore. Stephen Wright and the Program Committee (Michelle Koth, Judy MacLeod, and Sarah Long) put together a fine meeting. You'll want to read the session summaries in this Newsletter, especially if you were unable to be with us there. Another important event of the Baltimore experience was the MOUG/MLA joint session on OCLC's EPIC Service. Our thanks to Robert Acker and Leslie Troutman for their hard work in organizing and presenting this event.

The annual meeting is a time for thanking retiring Board members and welcoming new ones. We thank Stephen Wright for the exciting annual meetings he has organized in his position as Continuing Education Coordinator, and Karen Little for the excellent Newsletters and Membership Directory that she has produced as Secretary/Newsletter editor. Both of these positions require a lot of work and dedication, and are vital to the success of MOUG. We will miss their valuable contributions on the Board, but welcome Tim Cherubini as the new Continuing Education Coordinator, and Sue Weiland as the new Secretary/Newsletter editor.

Thanks are also due to the Nominating Committee: Linda Barnhart (Chair), David Knapp, and Karen Little, for the excellent slate of candidates they found for these two positions. One hundred five eligible ballots were received, out of a possible 250, for an encouraging 42% return. Thank you for voting. We need everyone's participation. It is not too soon to begin thinking about next year's elections for the positions of Vice Chair/Chair Elect and Treasurer. I will be appointing a nominating committee in the next few months. If you would be interested in serving on this committee, or would like to be considered as a possible candidate for one of these offices, please let me know.

In these hard times of budget cuts, staff layoffs, and hiring freezes, it occurs to me that we need, more than ever, to work together through organizations such as MOUG. Our collective efforts to build a high-quality bibliographic database, through contributed cataloging, enhancement of records, and support of the NACO-Music project, and to share our resources through use of this database, are important to the success of each of our libraries in providing service to our users. In my term as MOUG Chair, I hope to serve as a catalyst, to keep us all working together toward our common goals.

Laura Snyder
MOUG Chair

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.
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## MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
### 1991
#### FINANCIAL REPORT

**Balance in checking account on December 31, 1990**

$9,109.46

**INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$6,409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting registration</td>
<td>$3,790.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$409.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back issues</td>
<td>$163.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>$3,004.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 1991 Income**

$13,775.44

**EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting reception</td>
<td>$704.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting Board expense</td>
<td>$1,139.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting miscellaneous</td>
<td>$160.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>$2,883.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter postage</td>
<td>$618.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board meeting--Summer 1991</td>
<td>$1,310.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$350.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>$2,528.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACO Music</td>
<td>$46.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$103.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$154.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$476.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 1991 expenses**

$10,567.09

**Balance in checking account at end of 1991**

$2,996.00

**Balance in savings account at end of 1991**

$9,321.81

**Total balance at end of 1991**

$12,317.81

**Net Gain 1991**

$3,208.35
Balance in checking account at end of 3rd quarter 1991 $837.64
Balance in savings account at end of 3rd quarter 1991 $9,216.34
Total cash available at end of 3rd quarter 1991 $10,053.98

INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$4,570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$105.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Issues</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>$1,057.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 4th Quarter Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,737.21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>$1,331.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter Postage</td>
<td>$200.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage--General</td>
<td>$223.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>$1,233.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing--General</td>
<td>$13.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$470.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 4th Quarter Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,473.38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance in checking account at end of 4th quarter 1991 $2,996.00
Balance in savings account at end of 4th quarter 1991 $9,321.81
Total balance at end of 4th quarter 1991 $12,317.81

Net gain 4th quarter 1991 $2,263.83
FROM THE EDITOR

It is with some trepidation that I take over the editorship of the MOUG Newsletter; its previous editors leave me with a high standard to live up to! I take comfort, however, in the belief that an organization as interesting, relevant, and useful as MOUG is to music librarians will generate material for a newsletter with those same characteristics. I welcome all suggestions for the Newsletter, whether it's a completed article or report, or something that's still in the idea or proposal stage. (Give me a call or send an e-mail message, and let's talk about it!) The next issue of the Newsletter is planned for August 1992, with a deadline of July 15, 1992. Guidelines for submission are given on page 2 of this issue.

This issue begins coverage of the annual MOUG meeting held in Baltimore, Maryland on February 17-18, 1992. I wish to thank all the contributors for their articles and summaries. They volunteered their time to write (and sometimes also present) these reports; their efforts are VERY much appreciated. Coverage of the meeting will be concluded in the next issue.

Mark Crook of OCLC has worked his magic again to provide the information found in the article entitled "Top 150 Performers in the OCLC Database." Besides the general interest of such a list, many MOUG readers in the past have used Mark's work as a handy list of "prolific authors" that may need cleanup in their own catalogs.

Copies are still available of The Best of MOUG, 4th edition. (Try it out at a reference desk.) An order form is on the back page of this issue. Another edition of the MOUG Membership Directory is also being planned for later this year.

The Executive Board of MOUG will be meeting for their summer meeting on August 15 in Rochester, New York. Any agenda items or topics for discussion from the membership should be forwarded to Laura Snyder at the address given on page 2 of this issue.

Sue Weiland
Secretary/Newsletter Editor

NEWS FROM OCLC

Installation of OCLC's New Network was completed on November 26, 1991, a month ahead of plan, with 3,367 modems connected to over 10,000 workstations. Message traffic currently averages 3 million per day. New Network availability has been 99.7%, slightly above that of the old network. OCLC is currently installing an alternate fiber-optic cable route between the Dublin center and the New Network to provide physically diverse telecommunication routes and so reduce the possibility of major outages.

Migration to the PRISM Service is now at 92%. Because the functions of certain specialized users such as CJK and the Online Data Quality Control Section (ODQCS) are not yet supported in PRISM, migration will not be total for some time. However, it is expected to be completed for most other users in April 1992.

The DLC qualifier, enabling users to limit searches to LC, LC-member input, and cooperative (CONSER, NCCP) cataloging, was installed in October 1991.

Seventeen H.W. Wilson indexes will be added to FirstSearch and Epic by the end of 1992, including Art Index, Bibliographic Index, Biography Index, Book Review Digest, Education Index, and Library Literature. Among those already added are Readers' Guide Abstracts, Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Business Periodicals Index, Wilson Business Abstracts, and Humanities Index. FirstSearch, introduced on October 1, 1991, offers an end-user interface to a wide range of databases including OCLC's Online Union Catalog, here known as WorldCat. EPIC, OCLC's reference database, provides keyword and Boolean searching and subject access to an equal variety of databases, including the OLUC.

Primary Journals Online is a joint project of OCLC and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) to publish online electronic journals. Online Journal of Current Clinical Trials, which will publish findings recently reviewed by medical experts, will be available in April 1992.

The 25 millionth bibliographic record was input to the OLUC on December 19, 1991 by Brandeis University: Oscar Sonneck's Was Richard Wagner a Jew?. Less than six months had passed since the 24 millionth record was input on June 27, 1991.
The 35 millionth ILL transaction took place on December 5, 1991, only 55 days after the 34 millionth ILL request.

Recent documentation revision packets have included Serials #5 (January 1992); Books #6 (November 1991); PRISM Searching Guide #2 and PRISM Cataloging User Guide #1 (September 1991); Maps #3, AMC #3, and Computer Files #2 (August 1991); and Bib Input Standards #2 (July 1991). Revisions to the AV format are in the works.

**News from the OLUC Product Management Division**

In October 1991, the OLUC Product Management Division reorganized into two departments. The first is the OLUC Core Services Department, which has responsibility for product management of online services and their associated offline and micro-based products (including PRISM, Cataloging, ILL, Union Listing, and NAD). It is in turn divided into two sections: the Online Resource Sharing Services Section and the Cataloging Services Section (which includes Glenn Patton and Barbara Strauss, among others). The second is the OLUC Database Services Department, which is responsible for creation and maintenance of the OLUC (tapeloading, database quality control, GOVDOC, and Major Microforms). It also comprises two sections: the Tapeloading and Database Services Section (where I now reside) and the Online Database Quality Control Section (my former home, with which I retain close ties).

ODQCS has three LC MUMS terminals on which we make additions and corrections directly in LC's database. Since my first work on the LC/OCLC Music Recon Project in early 1990, I have input 282 pre-MARC AACR2 score and sound recording records. In addition, tens of thousands of records have been changed or otherwise corrected in most of the bibliographic formats.

The Fiction Project consists of eight libraries adding subject headings to bibliographic records for works of fiction, running until July 1992.

Currently, there are about 100 Enhance institutions (depending upon how you count them), enhancing some 6,000 records per month (not including minimal-level upgrades and other database enrichment credits). The list that appeared in the November 1991 *MOUG Newsletter* is still current. Please remember that the application process remains open at all times.

The most recent phase of the Subject Heading Correction Project began in November 1991 and finished the week of the MOUG/MLA meeting in Baltimore. About 1 million occurrences of headings were fixed in this phase, including corrections of style (punctuation, diacritics, etc.), coding, certain typographical errors, inversions of direct/indirect order, abbreviations, and some manual corrections of invalid or outdated forms of headings.

Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) software began running for Books only on June 10, 1991. DDR collects potential Books duplicates and, through an algorithm of weighted elements, merges matching records and transfers certain information. As of mid-March, DDR had performed over 430,000 merges and was about 78% of the way through the Extended Title Index (ETI), in the letter "R." We expect this run through the OLUC to finish in Spring 1992. A matching algorithm for the Serials format is now under investigation; other formats will be looked at in the future.

The PRISM Service Authority Search Enhancement Project will supplement current derived search key capabilities with the ability to browse lists of authority headings and references, making ALL Authority File headings retrievable. Two new numeric indexes will be added for ISSN and ISBN. These enhancements are scheduled for installation with PRISM Release 1.2 in May 1992.

OCLC has been addressing widespread OLUC problems on a more coordinated basis, via machine rather than human intervention when possible, through single-run or periodic database scans. Some of these are intended to implement the various USMARC Updates (Update #3 changes were installed September 1991), while others are intended to address known validation problems. Among the recent scans of interest to the music community are:

* 048 1st indicators converted to blank: 70,194
* Call numbers "x" and "In Process" deleted: 40,977
* Accomp Mat in Scores and Recordings cleaned up: 46,041
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OCLC wanted input especially from users of the non-book format documents on the future disposition of the current eight documents. Format Integration, now scheduled for December 1993, will make the individual formats more redundant than they are at present. Because different elements of different types of materials (archival, serial, multi-media) will be able to be integrated into the same record, a single format document may be more logical in the future. Considering as well the time, effort, and expense involved in maintaining eight separate documents, a single document makes more sense from both the user's vantage point and from OCLC's. The size of a consolidated document would likely be about 630 pages (37% larger than the current Serials format), probably in two volumes. Remember that, because of MARC format integration, individual formats would be close to the same size. Among the advantages for users:

1. All changes could be made at the same time, allowing the format to be more current and changes to be more timely;

2. A single document may allow more format-specific examples rather than the present boilerplate;

3. Users would always have coding information for all formats at hand, not just the one or two most frequently referred to.

It is expected that the Bib Input Standards would remain a separate document, though its character would likely change somewhat. Obviously, distribution algorithms for all documentation would need to be reconsidered in light of these changes.

Questions & Answers

Question: In the uniform title "Quintets, Sm violins, violas, violoncello", why are there no arabic numerals after "violins" and "violas" showing how many of each there are?

Answer: AACR2R 25.30B1 says, "If there is more than one part for a particular instrument or voice, add the appropriate arabic numeral in parentheses after the name of that instrument or voice unless the number is otherwise implicit in the uniform title" (emphasis mine). In this case, the only possible combination adding up to 5 (quintet) in which both "violin" and "viola" would be pluralized is two of each. Hence, the numerals are implied by the construction of the uniform title and are not to be explicitly included. Of course, where various combinations would be possible, the numerals must be included: "Octet, Sm trumpets (2), horns (3), trombones (2), tuba." When the number of instruments is not implied by the title, the numbers must be included where appropriate.

Question: I see lots of inconsistency in the abbreviations used in place names in field 260. Should we be using the forms found in Appendix B of AACR2R or the standard two-character Postal Service abbreviations?

Answer: According to Rule Interpretation B.14, the Postal Service abbreviations are used only if they appear on the piece (and in exactly the form on the piece, regarding capitalization and punctuation). In all other cases (when supplying the name of the state or when abbreviating it from the full form that appears on the piece), use the form in Appendix B.14.

Question: How would you search Bo Diddley in the OCLC authority file? I tried "bo,did,", "bo,,", "bo d,,", "bod,," without success.

Answer: Mr. Diddley's name can be searched in a number of ways especially if you happen to know his real name(s). But knowing only "Bo Diddley" and not knowing if the name is entered directly or in inverted form, I'd try "didd,bo," first; that search would access no91015859. The other key would be "bodi,", which considers the name in direct order as a "forename only" name to be searched as a single word. See the middle of page 43 in the PRISM Authorities User Guide for further details.

Question: Is it possible to tell from any particular field or fixed field code if a score is in modern or original medieval notation?

Answer: The "Format" fixed field may occasionally be a hint of out-of-the-ordinary notation, but not usually. The only place where such information may be found is in a 500 note formulated according to AACR2R 5.7B8. Most of the time, one can assume modern notation unless...
otherwise noted or if the item is a facsimile, but aside from an explicit note, there is no other surefire way to tell.

Question: Does a record in the PRISM Cataloging Save File get automatically updated if the corresponding OLUC record is changed?

Answer: No. The version of the record that you save is the version that remains in your save file. However, note that keeping a locked record in your save file can prevent other users and OLUC processes such as DDR or national record tape loading from locking and replacing that record. Please don't keep locked records in your save file longer than necessary.

Question: Sometimes I find a sound recordings record online that appears to match what I have except for a different music publisher number. Should I input a new record?

Answer: Real differences in music publisher numbers (that is, not typos or simple differences of choice among multiple numbers) have always justified inputting a new record, as Bib Input Standards (p. 122) makes clear. When the difference appears to be minor, you might submit a change request and we will attempt to find out if the difference is actually a typo. In other cases, you might look carefully at different parts of the item for different numbers: the label, the container, the insert, etc. Again you may want to submit a change request to have the alternate number added. A recent LC Music Cataloging Decision 6.7B19 (MCB 22:12 (December 1991) p. 2) reveals that LC has ceased noting such "minor" differences in numbering on the same item. I feel this is a disservice and would encourage OCLC users to continue making such helpful notes and 028 fields. In any case, you always have the option of using an existing record edited for local use if you feel the difference does not warrant a new record.

Question: Why does it sometimes happen that, in PRISM validation, correcting a single error will cause others to go away as well?

Answer: PRISM validation checks and cross-checks literally thousands of elements in a record, both in themselves and in relation to other elements in the record. A single error could trigger validation flags in any number of directions. For example, an incorrect code in a field 007 subfield could be invalid itself as well as inconsistent with other subfields in the same 007; fixing this single error could eliminate a number of validation checks. Remember that PRISM currently updates the list of error messages only when you revalidate the record. Even if you've corrected an error, the message alerting you to it will remain on the screen until you perform another action that will trigger revalidation.

Question: Please differentiate among Database Enrichment, Minimal-Level Upgrade, and Enhance credits.

Answer: The actual value of any credit may be altered by your regional network, so I won't attach a monetary value to any of them. Database Enrichment credits result from adding call numbers and/or subject headings to bibliographic records, subject to the conditions outlined in the PRISM Cataloging User Guide (p. 68-69). Minimal-Level Upgrade credit is awarded when an Encoding Level K, M, 2, 5, or 7 record is upgraded beyond the addition of call numbers and/or subject headings, subject to the conditions in the PRISM Cataloging User Guide (p. 69-71). Only an authorized Enhance library can receive Enhance credits, subject to the conditions found in the PRISM Cataloging User Guide (p. 71-72). Please note that all three of these operations require locking and replacing records. Note also that adding a 300 field to a CIP record does not generate any credit.

Question: What is the official policy for when to input a new record in this case? There is an OLUC record for a score published in 1954 by G. Schirmer with a plate number ascribed to Schirmer. I have in hand a piece clearly produced from the same plates as the 1954 version; however, the plate numbers are absent, the back cover states that it is now distributed by Hal Leonard, and there is instead a Leonard catalog number. Should a new record be input with the Hal Leonard 028 and the 260 changed to include the new publisher/distributor information?

Answer: A new record is certainly justified with the new publisher information and the new publisher's number, plus whatever new (explicit or inferred) publication date you may find or come up with. You may also want to include a note indicating that the Schirmer plates were used for this new publication.
Question: This is a question about possible duplicate records. There's a bib record for an LP as a whole as well as multiple records for each work on the LP or for each side. Should we report the bib records for the "sides" or the individual pieces as duplicates of the record for the LP as a whole? In a related question, if we have an LP and the only bib records in the OLUC are for the sides, can we rightfully make a new bib record for the item as a whole, or is that a duplicate record?

Answer: In answer to both questions, records for the item cataloged as a unit and for the item cataloged as individual sides or works are allowed in the OLUC and are not considered duplicates. AACR2 allows either cataloging option and libraries are free to do it either way. In pre-AACR2 days, cataloging each work was common practice, but now most libraries choose the unit entry. See Bib Input Standards, "When to input a new record" under "Analytical vs. comprehensive entry" (p. 118).

Jay Weitz
OCLC Liaison

SUMMARY OF THE MOUG ANNUAL MEETING: FebruARy 17-18, 1992, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

This issue covers Plenary Session I (News from OCLC and LC), the first set of small group sessions, and Ralph Papakhian's paper from Plenary Session III. Summaries of the other two presented papers and the second set of small group sessions will be in the next issue of the Newsletter.

PLENARY SESSION I

NEWS FROM OCLC

See Jay Weitz's column above.

NEWS FROM LC

This report will cover all activities related to processing music and sound recording materials at LC. I hope to give attendees a sense of the growth of resources devoted to these activities and possibilities for the future.

From a single centralized source from which virtually all music and sound recording cataloging at LC emanated, the Music Section, resources have expanded dramatically in the past few years. There are now four units engaged in music and sound recording processing and cataloging activities, with approximately 75 staff members. These units' activities will be discussed in turn.

1. MUSIC SECTION

The Music Section of the Special Materials Cataloging Division is primarily engaged in producing full and less-than-full cataloging records for published music materials. Principal activities this year have included:

* Electronic and computer music subject changes

An MLA working group, chaired by June Gifford, worked on these changes. They were approved at LC and about one-half the specific changes have been made in LCSH. One category of heading, the "with-and" headings, are undergoing further consideration in the Office for Subject Cataloging Policy.

* Cataloging simplification

A proposal was made two years ago that fields 045, 047, and 048 no longer be included in full-level records. Only a few formal responses were sent to the Library; these mostly regretted the change but there was little substantial negative response. Nonetheless, the matter languished unresolved until last summer when, with the intensification of efforts toward cataloging simplification, the decision was finally made that these fields would be dropped. This was effective in October 1991.

Other simplification efforts for music and sound recordings have been directed at simplifying the description and reducing redundancy in the record. Examples are information about the medium of performance and language: if a uniform title gives the medium or the language, this information is not repeated in a note. This has recently been codified in a Rule Interpretation.

Less-than-full cataloging has continued to grow in importance. For music and sound recordings, this kind of cataloging is now called Production Level rather than Minimal-Level; it still is encoded "7." The Music Section thought that there should be a clearer distinction even in name between the less-than-full cataloging done in the Music Section and that done for books, because they are significantly different, principally that music cataloging has subject headings and call numbers. The name change also gave the section an opportunity to refine the guidelines somewhat; for sound recordings, analytical
added entries are now allowed and there has been some loosening of the restriction on subject headings. These records all have a note which says “Production-level cataloging.”

* Arrearage control

Pressure to reduce arrearages continues to increase and there are a number of efforts underway to deal with the arrearages. Among them are these:

- In partnership with the Music Division, the Music Section has been refining selection guidelines for printed music.

- Experiments have begun with a kind of copy cataloging. Records are being pulled from OCLC to serve as the basis for the cataloging record created by the music cataloger.

- The backlog of Chinese music is being worked on jointly by music catalogers and Chinese-speaking catalogers. Romanized records are created in the Music file; no vernacular record is created.

* Cooperative projects

The NACO Music project continues to be very successful. At the end of fiscal 1991, 4,231 authority records had been created since the project began, 1,526 in FY91. This year’s totals will be even more impressive because the rate of monthly contributions has been growing steadily.

* The National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP) may be expanded this year to include more participants who are already NACO participants. This offers the opportunity to consider a cooperative program for music bibliographic records which would be advantageous for all of us. The idea is being explored at LC.

A new cooperative project more along the lines of the NCCP is of particular interest now. Contributed records for Music, Books on Music, and Sound Recordings have fallen off dramatically in the past few years. At the same time, the responsibility for these contributed records, along with a position to do the work, has been transferred to the Music Section. However, we have not been allowed to fill the position. Currently, new records are not being added. We would be interested in any comments any of the contributors might have on this.

2. MOTION PICTURE, BROADCASTING AND RECORDED SOUND DIVISION

Sound recordings are housed in the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division. M/B/RS has had a Processing Section for a number of years with most of its resources devoted to processing archival moving image materials. A single sound recordings cataloger was hired in 1988 to work on archival and rare sound recordings, and that staff is now expanding. Four catalogers are on board, three of them now in training under the tutelage of the Music Section. It is intended that once their training is complete, they will primarily work on processing the Library’s vast collections of rare and archival sound recordings. The rules and procedures by which this processing will be done are to be worked out during the next year. Such collections as the General Curtis LeMay audio archives and the Velburn Duke Ellington collections, which the Library recently acquired through gift and purchase, will be among the first to be processed. Also under development are procedures for dealing with broadcast materials which are serial in nature but which may require item-level control and which may be held in both video and audio versions.

3. ENHANCED CATALOGING DIVISION

Last year you heard about plans to reduce the arrearages of sound recordings by searching OCLC for copy, enhancing the records through updating of headings, and re-keying the records into LC’s database. This project began in May 1991 and thus far nearly 7,000 records have been completed.

All the information found in OCLC’s records is retained when the record is added at LC. Additionally, name, uniform title, and series headings are searched and brought up-to-date, with authority records made if needed. Subject headings are brought into the current form but the applicability of the subject headings to the content of the item is not checked. Contents notes are added if they are not present.

This project has been limited to popular music, both older LPs and newer CDs. The hit rate has been terrific and we are very grateful to you all for the records. It is hoped that these catalogers will soon begin original cataloging for the recordings which they do not find on OCLC.

LC appreciates very much the cooperation. OCLC has been very supportive in subsidizing this project by not charging LC for its searching time.
Concern has been expressed over LC's need to re-key the records it finds on OCLC. This year efforts have finally gotten underway which will allow us to electronically transfer records. We are hopeful that we will be able to reach agreement with OCLC to be able to do this.

4. MUSIC DIVISION

The Music Division has had the most substantial growth. When it reaches full strength, there will be 31 staff members devoted to the processing of the Library's archival music collections: papers, manuscripts, etc. Already many of the smaller collections have completed their physical processing. The division plans to create collection-level records for about 600 collections. Finding aids are being created using PC software like Notebook, WordPerfect, and ProCite to provide item-level access. Some of these may be published; all will be available in the reading room.

Smaller collections which have been completed include those of Hans Kindler, Richard Rodgers, Nikolai Lopatnikoff, Diaghilev, Henry Cowell, Edward and Marian MacDowell, and the Amateur Hour. Larger collections, whose physical processing is still in process, include those of Artur Rubinstein, Aaron Copland, Irving Berlin, and A.P. Schmidt.

Catherine Garland
Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division

SMALL GROUP ACTIVITIES I

PROBLEM SHARING: PUBLIC SERVICES

OCLC now offers a wide variety of products and services to assist the public service librarian. EPIC, PRISM, and the First system may be used to access the Online Union Catalog (OLUC). This activity is most often a librarian-mediated task; however, end-user access is potentially available through PRISM and the First System to those knowing the command language. Since only a small part of the end-user population knows command language, FirstSearch, a menu-driven, end-user service, was developed. FirstSearch provides access to the OLUC, called WorldCat, as well as to a variety of other databases, many of which have utility in the Music Library setting, such as ERIC, Readers' Guide, and Humanities Index. Finally, Search CD450, Music Library: Musical Sound Recordings is a CD-ROM product now produced by SilverPlatter that provides access to over 400,000 records taken from the OLUC.

This wealth of resources brings with it a certain feeling of bafflement. It is easy to be overwhelmed by the sheer variety of products and services from which to choose. Use of these resources has implications for staff training and bibliographic instruction.

The fifteen librarians present during the Public Services Problem Sharing session took the opportunity to hear what choices their colleagues had made with regard to OCLC products and services. Some of those present reported using or intending to learn to use the EPIC service to search the OLUC. Leslie Troutman, University of Illinois at Urbana (UIUC) reported that she was using EPIC to search the OLUC about five times a week, often searching the contents notes of recordings. This type of search was probably the most frequently reported use for EPIC. The costs of ready reference searches are absorbed by the UIUC Library; however, more extensive searches are charged to the patron. No one present at the session reported using EPIC to search other available databases as yet. The UIUC Music Library will soon be the site of *Search CD450, Music Library: Musical Sound Recordings* and Leslie anticipates that searching the OLUC through EPIC will decline.

When the added searching power of EPIC was not required or not available for public service functions, nearly everyone present searched the OLUC through PRISM, although at least two librarians were still using the First system. At Illinois State University, Kim Lloyd reported that there was a public terminal in the General Information and Reference area with access to the OLUC. The clientele are primarily faculty members trained in command searching.

Two institutions were currently offering FirstSearch as a trial service. Tim Cherubini, Duke University, described an extremely enthusiastic response on the part of the users. Use of this service brought to light an interesting problem in terminology that is symptomatic of a wider confusion in the area of commercial databases. Tim reported that a patron might search the WorldCat, not find what was sought and then come and ask him to search EPIC thinking it was a completely different database and search. Both Sheila Madden, Texas Christian University, and Tim felt that their institutions would continue to offer FirstSearch after the trial period was over.
The session was instructive and gave those attending an understanding of what was happening in other music libraries. Possible topics for future discussion during the Public Services Problem Sharing session include bibliographic instruction, staff training, and updates on the services discussed during this year's session.

Leslie Troutman
University of Illinois at Urbana

RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION OF MUSIC MATERIALS

Approximately 20 people attended the small group session on retrospective conversion of music materials; most were currently undergoing retrospective conversion projects. Few had completed any conversion projects and were most concerned with staffing and workflow. Several brochures from OCLC and SOLINET were distributed that outlined options available. After a brief introduction, there was a good deal of discussion of experiences individuals have had with each of the options available from OCLC, including RETROCON, MICROCON, and online retrospective conversion.

Specific issues and problems raised included lack of information on shelflist, staffing, workflow, and training. It was the general consensus that quite often staffing levels are inadequate for retrospective conversion of music materials. In addition, training of technical assistants, especially those with no musical background, can be quite time consuming. Music materials often represent only a small percentage of the overall total of records that a library has needing retrospective conversion. The decisions made in a given situation may not always take into full consideration the special needs of music.

In attendance was Morgan Cundiff, library customer services analyst from the Cataloging Distribution Service at the Library of Congress. He introduced the idea of a training program for those who are beginning retrospective conversion projects. Searching old bibliographic records for music materials can be difficult, to say the least, especially for those who have little background in music. The Library of Congress developed an in-house training program for those working in retrospective conversion. The training program was a great success, and the Library of Congress is considering developing this program for other libraries. A lively discussion took place on the format that such a training program might take to serve the larger library community. A written training manual or workbook that could be acquired from the Library of Congress seemed to be a popular idea. Other suggestions included a VCR tape, a training workshop at the Library of Congress that people could attend, and interactive video. It was generally agreed that any help available in training staff for retrospective conversion projects would be quite welcome. Music librarianship would greatly benefit through such a training program to make materials more accessible both locally and nationally.

A short bibliography was then distributed. An online database search yielded relatively few articles dealing specifically with retrospective conversion of music materials. However, those available provide a good basis for anyone considering a retrospective conversion project.

Cheryl Taranto
University of Alabama

WORKFLOW, STAFFING, AND STRESS IN TECHNICAL SERVICES

I. A case-study in stress and staffing

I begin by using our recent experiences at the Sibley Music Library as a case study of budget cuts, staff reductions, and the effects on technical services operations. Last May, two of our librarians, one in Reference and one in Acquisitions, were laid off. Beyond the initial shock, this has had some long-term effects on cataloging operations. Even though we did not lose staff directly, the rest of us have expanded our duties and spread ourselves a little thinner. In June, four members of the cataloging staff, two librarians and two library assistants, were trained in reference work and began working regular hours at the reference desk. Everyone has made the transition well, but it was not easy for those with little or no prior experience in this area. It has also added up to quite a bit of time away from cataloging duties. During the fall semester, three librarians from the department worked with the library director to team-teach a required graduate bibliography course, taught in three sections to about 75 students. Since we did this on relatively short notice, and in some cases without much prior teaching experience, this took up a considerable amount of our time. In November, the head of our department left for another position, and her duties were divided between the two remaining librarians in the department. We have a relatively large staff, but find that much of our time is now diverted to other activities. In addition to the reference and teaching
responsibilities, we find that with fewer people, the rest of us must spend more time in meetings and planning activities.

We are also at a point in our automation process where we need to spend lots of time on local system clean-up and maintenance. This is complicated by a shortage of equipment and an abundance of down time.

A high priority is our ongoing AMLG retrospective conversion project. Although it is grant-funded and carried out primarily by a separate staff, it also takes its toll on the time of the current cataloging staff. About 3 1/2 hours per day of my time is spent supervising the project and assisting in the revision of huge piles of new records being added to OCLC. The project also generates a tremendous amount of authority work, all typed on cards and filed in our manual authority file. A project like this naturally ties up OCLC terminals and adds to the general confusion level of the department as a whole.

As for current cataloging, items with good copy on OCLC flow through the department readily. The librarians, however, have almost no time left for actual cataloging, so much less original cataloging is getting done. This has been one of our biggest sources of frustration.

Lack of planning time is also a problem. We need to fight the temptation to give up looking at the big picture in favor of getting a little more done now. For example, we switched over to PRISM fairly quickly in late August, just as the fall semester was getting underway, but did not have time to incorporate all of the new features into our workflow as well as we could have. Our clever student assistants managed to fill in the gaps, but this was far from ideal.

Our staff has gone through three stages in our response to loss of staff.

1. Shock and denial. The meaning of this is obvious!
2. The Workhorse/Martyr Phase: We put in lots of extra time, trying to do as much as possible and cut back services as little as possible.
3. The Reality Phase: We finally realize that we can't keep up the pace forever without serious consequences to health and sanity. We've tested our limits and know that we have to cut back our expectations. Our next step is to get patrons to accept the situation. (This will be difficult indeed. We tried cutting back hours last fall, and there was a big furor.)

4. I keep hoping that there will be a fourth phase, in which we discover the true secret of efficiency and are able to get everything done, with time and energy left over for evenings and weekends. There are probably numerous ways to improve efficiency, but this takes planning time, which we don't have in abundance.

II. Our Strategies for Coping

A. Set priorities for the department

In November, Jennifer Bowen began compiling a list of our ongoing work activities and possible future projects, attaching individual names where appropriate, and assigning numbers for categories of priority (0 = must do right away when called for, 1 = high priority, 2 = moderate priority, etc.) in consultation with the rest of the department staff. This had an immediate psychological benefit as it communicated to the staff acceptance of the fact that we can't do everything right away. When there's too much to do, time can be wasted in wringing our hands and trying to figure out what to do first. A list of priorities helps to alleviate this problem. It can also improve communications with the rest of the library staff. It's easier for others to accept that we can't do something right away if they at least see it on our list as a future project. It is important to get the whole staff to accept the plan, and to realize that if something gets moved up to top priority, something else must be dropped to a lower priority. Our next step may be to communicate our priorities to library patrons.

B. Work more in batch mode

Our staff has always worked on all formats and materials rather freely, and values this variety in their jobs. We wanted to keep this flexibility, but also realized that constantly shifting from one thing to another may not be efficient. Now, we tend to concentrate on one area at a time, making that a sort of "project of the month," then move on to another area. I call this the "brush-fire" approach to cataloging, but it seems to help us focus our attention, and lessens the guilt of not being able to do everything at once.

C. Minimal-level cataloging

We have an "In-process collection" of lower-priority scores that are kept in storage and cataloged primarily by patron request. Access was formerly provided through a
paper file in the public catalog area. Now, brief records are being added directly into our local system (Geac) by a student assistant, with just the basic access points (author, title, publisher's number or plate number) and non-AACR2 description. We are now considering expansion of this to other groups of materials, such as gift books.

III. Implications for the future

As noted before, we have had to cut back on the amount of current original cataloging we do, though we have managed to make participation in the NACO-Music project a high priority. In these hard times, the concept of a shared database like OCLC, built through the cooperative cataloging efforts of all of us, is more important than ever. We need to fight the tendency to cut the quality and quantity of new input, and find ways to convince our administrators of the importance of our cooperative efforts.

IV. Workflow

Every library is unique in this respect, and I have no magic formulas. Our workflow is rather old-fashioned, due to the limitations of our local system and the lack of individual computer workstations at our desks. Thanks to PRISM's improved editing capabilities, we have recently experimented with creating new records directly on OCLC rather than typing workforms, but this depends on getting at one of our busy terminals. PRISM's improvements seem to be geared to the individual workstation--a direction we'd like to be taking but can't afford at the moment.

V. Discussion

The notion that automation will reduce the amount of work and the number of people needed to do it seems to be a myth, but automation can help to provide better service to users. Having acquisitions records available in the online catalog means that cataloging is more likely to be driven by patron request. One advantage of this is the satisfaction of knowing that someone will actually use the item that is being cataloged. It helps to ask for time frames when taking requests so that materials can still be processed in batches. Not every request really needs to be handled on a "rush" basis. It also helps to anticipate demand by looking at course schedules.

Recent changes in the OCLC system, especially through the introduction of PRISM, are having a positive effect on workflow, but it is sometimes difficult to keep up with these changes. We also need to keep abreast of new technologies as they develop. A lot of this information is available in the library literature, but it takes time to wade through all of it. Forums such as MLA-L, the MOUG Newsletter, and OCLC Micro are good sources of practical suggestions and information about new products.

Some concern was expressed that if minimal-level records are used as a temporary measure, can administrators be convinced of the need to upgrade them to full cataloging later? One argument that has been used for less catalog access is that the reference staff can solve the problem. This is not true, however, for off-site catalog users or in places where reference services have been cut back. This argument could also be used to gain support for online authority control.

Laura M. Snyder
Eastman School of Music

NACO-MUSIC PROJECT HISTORY AND UPDATE

In 1987, the MOUG Executive Board renamed the REMUS (REtrospective MUSic) Project as the NACO-Music Project (NMP). The new name underscored the project's principal continuing goal, the cooperative contribution of music name and name/uniform title authority records to the Library of Congress Name Authority File as part of the national NACO project. By 1987, two of the original REMUS Project goals had largely been achieved: the cooperative "enhancement" of OCLC master records for music materials, under OCLC's ENHANCE program; and a major retrospective conversion project under the auspices of the Associated Music Libraries Group (AMLG). The REMUS Project's third goal, to enlarge the LC Name Authority File by means of a cooperative project, had not yet been accomplished. Rick Jones was the key person in REMUS. His work and the REMUS project had forced the issue on retrospective conversion and ENHANCE activities. His design for cooperative authority work also became the basis for the NACO-Music Project.

Fortunately for MOUG and NMP, we had some music librarian moles at OCLC. Joan Schuitema (currently at Northwestern University Music Library) was at OCLC in 1987 working on the Linked Systems Project (LSP) and was the OCLC liaison to MOUG. She was also in contact with the LC NACO office because of her LSP work. She was instrumental in keeping the topic alive by presenting proposals to OCLC management on behalf of
MOUG. She even managed to get OCLC to contribute a couple of hundred dollars to fund our initial training. The other mole was Glenn Patton who has been keeping an eye on all music related projects at OCLC for many years now. For those of you who might not know, Glenn was music librarian at Illinois Wesleyan University before going to work at OCLC. Their efforts really laid the groundwork for NMP.

In December of 1987, Tim Robson, then Chair of MOUG, appointed me as coordinator of NMP (just about that time, Tim had also left music librarianship to become the Associate Director for Technical Services at Case Western Reserve University). In January of 1988, Tim also prepared and submitted to LC and OCLC a detailed proposal to implement the NACO-Music Project by taking advantage of OCLC's imminent participation in LSP. This was essentially a proposal for a pilot project to see if the NMP could be organized in an effective way. Suzanne Liggett, the Library of Congress' Coordinator of National Cooperative Cataloging Projects, responded favorably. And OCLC responded favorably. While NMP was initiated by MOUG, it was in fact a joint endeavor with LC and OCLC and all of the participating institutions.

As part of Tim's proposal, two MOUG members, The Sibley Music Library of the Eastman School of Music and the Indiana University Music Library, were selected as the project's first-year participants. The NMP relies on a novel "funneling" procedure to ensure quality control and to enable the participation of smaller cataloging units such as those found in music libraries to participate in NACO. The "funneling" idea also made the project feasible administratively for the Library of Congress-NACO Office and the Music Section. The NMP Coordinator serves as the project's sole contact person with LC in terms of this project, and is responsible for quality control. Name authority records created by participants are "funneled" through the coordinator. From LC's viewpoint, NMP is regarded as "one" NACO contributor. All procedural rules that apply to any one NACO institution apply to the NMP as a whole. (For example, NACO recently established minimum quantitative requirements for participation--I believe it was 400 records per year. This requirement applies to NMP as a whole and not to any one NMP participant).

During the first few months of 1988, NMP contributed new name authority records on worksheets. I received basic training in NACO procedures from Marty Joachim, then head of the Cataloging Dept. at Indiana University (Marty's help in getting the project off the ground cannot be over emphasized--not only because of his expertise in authority work, but because of the high degree of trust the LC NACO Office has in him). These paper workforms would shuffle from the Music Library over to our Main Library for local review, then to Richard Hunter for LC Music Section review. Records that were OK were then keyed into the LC system by staff at the LC MARC Editorial Division. Fortunately, in the spring of 1988 (when OCLC's LSP implementation was under way), I was invited to participate in OCLC-LSP training. Glenn Patton showed up to do the training at Indiana, and let me sit in on the sessions. With OCLC's cooperation, we soon began contributing authority records via LSP. On June 1, 1988, six months after Tim had submitted the MOUG proposal, the first NMP records were successfully transferred from OCLC to LC via the LSP link.

Staff members from each participating institution had received OCLC training in OCLC/LSP procedures, and LC instruction in music authorities by August, 1988. We managed to convince all parties involved that one week of training at LC was sufficient (instead of the two weeks they had been insisting on prior to that). MOUG's proposal for implementing NMP had recommended training for staff from both Sibley Music Library and Indiana University with funding from MOUG, OCLC, and the home institutions. I went for a week in May and Joan Swanekamp went in August. Karen Calhoun of OCLC then trained Joan on the LSP system. Karen also became our chief contact at OCLC for LSP-related matters--NMP would not have worked without her enthusiastic assistance in getting technical details solved on the OCLC side. LC, of course, provided its staff resources for training and orientation.

The process for contributing records is now routine. Staff at the participating libraries create authority records in the OCLC LSP database (which is currently on a machine different from the cataloging database) and notify me when the records are ready for review. The correspondence for all of this is conducted by electronic mail (originally via OCLC's LSP e-mail, which is very cumbersome, and now BITNET). I review the record for content and coding. Until the project received "independent status," I would then notify LC when I thought records were ready for contribution. Then LC staff from the Music Section and from the MARC Editorial Division would further review the records from their own terminals, using the LSP inquiry mode. This means that the people at LC can issue a command on their internal system (limited to record number only) and
search for records in the OCLC/LSP machine. Once the records were approved at LC, they would let me know, and I would go back to the record on OCLC and flag it so that the data would be automatically transferred from OCLC to LC. When the transfer is complete, the records are distributed by the LC mainframe to all LSP nodes within a day or two. They are also included in LC's Name Authority File tapes. This quality control process is obviously quite elaborate, especially during training, based on the premise that records in an authority file should by definition be fairly authoritative. Not everyone in the cataloging community holds this view, but I think it is the operating principle behind the NACO project. Review, by the way, refers to adherence to cataloging standards, format for authority records, and MARC coding. These are detailed in various LC documents.

In August 1988 NMP received "independent" status for coding from the MARC Editorial Division. By December 1988 NMP also received "independent status" for content. In order to achieve independent status, we had to undergo a "test" whereby 80 records were reviewed in detail. (The 80 "test" records are essentially self-selected to demonstrate that the participant knows when a record is "perfect"). Our grade for content was 97.5% and about 99% for coding. This means that NMP can contribute records without prior review from LC. However, our records are sampled monthly (16 per month) and checked carefully both by the Music Section and MARC Editorial. Should the accuracy rate decrease below a certain threshold for three months in a row, we would be subject to full review once again. This constant review also compels a bit of peer pressure among the participants, since no one participant would want to be responsible for having the NMP as a whole returned to full review status. But we continue to maintain a regular correspondence with the Music Section and will request that specific records be reviewed in advance whenever we have any doubts. This might be the appropriate time to mention all of our colleagues at the Music Section who have served as reviewers (NACO reviewing is a 6-month rotating assignment): Richard Hunter, Dean Strohmeyer, Jerry Emmanaul, David Sommerfield, Ken Valdes, Deta Davis, June Gifford, Steve Yusko, and Harry Price. The project really appreciates all of the help we have received from the LC Music Section. I should also mention the other music librarian mole planted in the Library of Congress office now known as Network Development and MARC Standards--he is Larry Dixson, who used to be a music cataloger at LC (and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, before that). He has been extremely helpful there, getting technical details resolved for us on the LC side of the linked systems.

After the "pilot" year was over, in the middle of 1989, I encountered a new problem, which was how to go about declaring the pilot project a success. Everyone and all of the offices involved were supposed to somehow agree or disagree about whether the project would continue. Since we were continuing to produce NACO headings, I assumed there had been no significant opposition. I took the initiative and sent out a brief letter declaring the project a success unless someone objected. So far no one has objected. But I am not sure anyone has really agreed, either.

After becoming "independent," the problems about how to expand the project immediately surfaced. How would individuals be trained? What kind of funding could be sought? What limitations exist on the OCLC and LC systems? How many participants can the coordinator handle? My inclination was to gradually add some additional catalogers who were either already familiar with NACO or were at institutions already utilizing LSP and NACO in their general catalog departments so as to minimize training, particularly onsite training. Joan Schuitema seemed to fit the bill since she had moved from OCLC to the Northwestern University Music Library (Northwestern had by that time become an OCLC library). We started getting that organized at the beginning of 1990 (that means getting NUC symbols established and entered into the various computers).

Later that year, I talked with the former MOUG Secretary, Linda Barnhart, about participating since she was serving as the local NACO coordinator at UC San Diego. She was reluctant to participate fully since she was not located in a music library, but came up with the idea of the "Prokofiev" project. Let me try to explain the logic of that project. Under LC guidelines (these are "internal" guidelines documented in the LC Descriptive Cataloging Manual), authority records are not made for music titles for which no references are required. These guidelines make some sense in a local, fully-AACR2 catalog, and were obviously designed to limit the number of records that have to be created at LC. They do not make a whole lot of sense for the rest of us who have to work on OCLC, where the bibliographic and authority files are separate and where it is very difficult to find certain kinds of name/title headings in the bibliographic file. Linda proposed working from the LC bibliographic file for a given composer and creating authority records for all titles from those bibliographic records. This way she could be making a contribution to the NMP without
having to be near a music reference collection. Approvals for this exceptional practice were sought and granted. Prokofiev's file was increased a bit. Reaction to that project was favorable. We have now started working on Beethoven, beginning mysteriously with the Q's, and have gotten through the sonatas so far.

Then last year I got in a bit of trouble. A couple of people who had worked at Indiana doing a large number of NACO headings had moved on to other jobs. Since they were essentially trained in how to do "NACO work" I didn't see why they should stop just because they moved on to another institution. When the current MOUG Treasurer, Ann Churukian, moved from working on a grant project at Indiana to Vassar, which was also an OCLC library, I suggested she do some headings using my authorization and NUC symbol. That was a bad move on my part. When OCLC found out they made it clear that I was not going to share my authorization again.

Mickey Koth, who had created large numbers of NACO records in connection with the recon project at Indiana, had moved on to Yale. She was interested in continuing the NACO work as well, but this was a new problem since Yale is an RLIN library. Jeffrey Earnest at Stanford, another RLIN library, also volunteered to work on the project. Yale and Stanford seemed like reasonable choices since both were institutions already engaged in general NACO work, with main catalog departments that could help in the initial training. The problem was technical, since I have no production-level access to RLIN. Either someone would have to pay for me to have an RLIN terminal or we would have to organize RLIN participants in a different way. There was also the non-technical problem of expanding what was a MOUG project to non-OCLC libraries. I discovered that our campus was making RLIN accessible to faculty via the Internet. This was not production level access (meaning I couldn't see diacritical markings), but I could view records on the RLIN name authority file. I checked with Ed Glazier at RLG, and apparently RLG did not have any problem with authorizing the Yale and Stanford music libraries to work on LSP. We devised a system whereby when an RLIN library submits a list of record numbers to me they also specify which diacritics have been used and where. It's a bit cumbersome, but it turned out to work OK. Otherwise it operates the same way. The RLIN library enters a record into what is called a "pending file," and reports it to me. I review the record and report back if it is OK to contribute or not.

This expansion of activity in 1990/91 also made it difficult to coordinate and discuss many of these issues, so I created a private LISTSERV list for the participants. For example, Larry Dixson has been sending out monthly statistical reports showing what the project is accomplishing, and I use the list to relay information I receive from LC that is of importance to all participants. Basically, it is an administrative tool to coordinate activities related to NMP.

In early 1991, Karen Little from the University of Louisville, and then MOUG Secretary, also expressed interest in participation. Karen had worked at the Indiana University Music Library and knew about authority work, and since Louisville is a short drive from Bloomington, her participation also seemed feasible and well within MOUG's budget allocation.

I believe this flurry of adding new participants (including non-OCLC participants) resulted in the MOUG Board getting a little peeved with me. OCLC was also a bit concerned because of certain limitations on the number of simultaneous users on the current OCLC LSP machine. As a result, Jennifer Bowen created and appointed a MOUG NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee, which began to function last year after the Indianapolis meeting. The committee has four members: the NMP coordinator (who is not chair), a member of the MOUG Board, one OCLC participant and one RLIN participant. Its charge is: 1) to supervise the internal activities of NMP (excluding the actual review of records), 2) to monitor broader aspects of NMP (such as selecting a coordinator and future expansion), 3) to maintain channels of communication with other appropriate groups, 4) to publicize NMP, and 5) to maintain a file of committee working documents. Joan Swanekamp was the first chair of the committee, and the current chair is Jeffrey Earnest. Obviously this committee will have great influence on any future developments in NMP. There is considerable interest in creating some kind of formal application process for adding new participants. But besides creating the Advisory Committee, the MOUG Board approved the addition of Yale, Stanford, and Louisville just before the Indianapolis meeting and Vassar just after it. Once approvals arrived, all of the details about symbols, authorizations and so forth at OCLC, LC and RLIN, were taken care of relatively quickly.

One interesting question came up in all of this which probably remains unanswered: Who owns NMP? I still regard it as an essentially MOUG-sponsored project, even though RLIN libraries are involved. But there has been discussion on this question and it will probably continue to be discussed in the Advisory Committee.
There are a couple of other developments related to NMP that I would like to describe.

First, I would like to mention the fact that I received a sabbatical leave for the fall of 1991 to work essentially full-time as coordinator of NMP. Of course I submitted the application for the leave a year before and before we had the increase in the number of participants. And I intended to use the leave time to work with participants instead of having to spend it on the administrative details of selecting participants and arranging for the authorizations and so forth. This is another reason why I raised the issue of NMP expansion in 1990. I would also like to describe the sabbatical, both as an encouragement to other librarians and as an indication that sabbatical leaves can be received for projects other than research leading to publication. In this case, I was simply allowed to do the part of my job which I enjoyed doing but which normally seemed to have low priority compared to my other responsibilities. Also, it was interesting to me that computer networking had indeed evolved to the point where I was able to conduct business from my living room with a PC and modem. All of the correspondence regarding the project was done via e-mail; I could search OCLC, RLIN, MUMS and my local catalog; and I could do production work on the LSP machine with dial-up access using PASSPORT software.

My leave was also supported by an allocation of $750 from an Indiana University Libraries research grant fund and a $750 allocation for the NMP in the MOUG budget (I haven't used the MOUG allocation yet). This enabled me to spend three full days at the Eastman School where we contributed about a hundred records in that time (I was working with Joan Swanekamp, Jennifer Bowen, Laura Snyder and Ann Snyder). I was also able to spend several days at Northwestern working with Joan Schuitema. One common problem associated with NACO work is that it simply has to be done in sufficient quantity so that you can keep a lot of the details in mind. I thought this kind of "intense" NACO work for a few days would help get those libraries on the road to independent status. I certainly had a good time visiting these other music libraries and think that much was accomplished. Besides these visits, I was also able to review records and reply to inquiries very quickly. That too should have been helpful to all of the participants. My daily focus for five months was on getting authority records done.

My sabbatical leave was also related to a second significant development for the NMP. During 1991, the Associated Music Libraries Group received a grant from the US Department of Education, Title II-C program to continue its retrospective conversion project in 1990-91. This grant, for the first time, included modest funding to support NACO work stemming from the recon work. The NACO work is handled centrally at Indiana. AMLG participating music libraries have been forwarding headings to the "NACO Central" office, where the headings are reviewed, carefully edited, and when possible contributed to the LCNAF. The idea behind this organization of the project was to avoid interrupting the recon work as much as possible so that a minimum amount of additional "new work" would be added to the recon libraries. I felt that the most efficient process would be to do the NACO work centrally. Of course, we return the headings we receive, and the recon library can either deal with them as it chooses or leave that final process for future generations of catalogers. The authority records will get into the LCNAF and frequently we will report conflicts in the OCLC database to the OCLC Quality Control Section. For 1991 we had sufficient funding to hire a librarian to work exclusively on the NMP for 8 1/2 months (the target for that grant was to contribute about 2,700 authority records). AMLG also received funding from the Department of Education to continue both recon and NACO work for 1991-92. The funding for the NACO component will provide for two librarians to contribute about 10,000 name authority records. The 1991-92 funding is for about $97,000 to support staff, student assistants, and equipment. The librarians are on board—Mark Scharff and Marlena Frackowski. I figured out one day that they have to produce an authority record every eighteen minutes to meet that goal of 10,000.

In order to put that 10,000 or 12,700 number for which we have received federal funding in perspective, I would like to conclude with a recitation of some other numbers. These numbers also help to explain why we need cooperative cataloging and cooperative authority work if we are ever going to make a dent in the bibliographic control of music.

By the end of January 1992, and since March of 1988, NMP had contributed 5,625 new authority records and updated 615 previously existing records. That is, the NMP has been involved with about 6,240 records.

According to information I received from Larry Dixon, at the end of the last federal fiscal year (9/30/91), the Library of Congress NAF had 2.7 million name authority records, and of that amount about 497,000 (or 18%) were from NACO libraries. Last year, NACO participants were responsible for 61,020 (or 31%) of the
194,637 total records added to the NAF. For 1992, I am going to predict that the NMP contribution will be around 10% of the total contribution from NACO libraries. We can also compare NMP's output with that of the LC Music Section. Last year the Music Section added 2,780 authority records to the NAF, and 3,186 the year before. Excluding the specially funded projects, it seems to me that NMP participants will contribute authority records at a rate similar to the LC Music Section.

Another interesting figure reported by Larry is that the LC Music File (which contains bibliographic records in the score and recordings format) contained only 61,520 records. These are what most of us know as DLC/DLC records for music and sound recordings in the OCLC database, including minimal level records. These 61,000 music records compare to 3.2 million records in the LC books file. Last year 12,148 records were added to the Music File, and 6,729 records the year before. In 1991, the Music Section (of the Special Materials Cataloging Division) cataloged 4,715 scores and sound recordings (including minimal level cataloging) so the remainder must have come from other agencies at LC--probably the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division or the Music Division (both of which also do music cataloging).

I think the 61,000 number is interesting when you compare it with OCLC’s figures. As of January 4, 1992 OCLC reports that the Online Union Catalog includes 719,020 bibliographic records for sound recordings and 606,156 records for scores. That’s a total of about 1.3 million music format records. Now we all know the terrible problems in OCLC associated with duplicate records, but even assuming that every legitimate record in the database is duplicated, then we still have over 650,000 bibliographic records--fully 10 times more than the number available in the LC file alone. The people attending this meeting can take a certain amount of credit for this accomplishment which might very well be the single largest cooperative music bibliographic endeavor to date. But the accomplishment in the creation of the cooperative authority file is of a different order of magnitude. The total number of bibliographic records in the Online Union Catalog is now over 24,121,789. The ratio of 24 million bibliographic records to 2.7 million authority records is simply not adequate. It is this inadequacy that NACO, including NMP, is trying to address. Parenthetically I can add that OCLC might be addressing this as well. Apparently work is proceeding at OCLC to develop a cooperative authority file which would work much like the bibliographic file. If that actually happens, I think the structure of NACO and therefore of NMP will have to be re-evaluated. An OCLC authority file which potentially could include thousands of libraries would easily and quickly make the LC file fairly secondary, provided that reasonable quality control was maintained.

We can take the problem of bibliographic control of music one step further. While our 1.3 million records (or 650,000, whichever number you prefer) represents significant accomplishment, it certainly begs the question of what it is we might expect if we had truly "universal" bibliographic control of musical materials. The only person I know who spends time worrying about stuff like that is Professor Don Krummel at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. When asked how much music there is, his answer came quickly: 10 million titles give or take a million. If Don is anywhere in the right vicinity, this would mean that the OLUC is now covering only about 10% of what is potentially collectable by libraries.

I can’t think of a punch line, but I do think comparing our 6000 NACO records to the potential music bibliographic universe of 10 million creates at least some kind of perspective.

Ralph Papakhian
Indiana University

Minutes of the MOUG BUSINESS MEETING
Music OCLC Users Group
Tuesday, February 18, 1992
1:15 p.m.–2:00 p.m.
Baltimore, Maryland

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:20 p.m. by Chair Jennifer Bowen with the introduction of members of the Executive Board. There were no changes to the agenda, which was then adopted as printed.

2. The minutes from 1991 Business Meeting held in Indianapolis, Indiana, printed in MOUG Newsletter, no. 47 (April 1991) were approved.

3. Board reports
   A. Chair (Jennifer Bowen)

Bowen thanked the Nominating Committee for their work and announced the election results. Sue
Weiland is the incoming Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Tim Cherubini is the incoming Continuing Education Coordinator. Bowen thanked Paula Hickner for agreeing to run for Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Tom Zantow for agreeing to run for Continuing Education Coordinator.

Bowen reminded members that elections for Treasurer and Chair Elect were coming up in the Fall. If anyone had an interest in either serving on the Nominating Committee or running for office, they were encouraged to let any member of the Board know.

Bowen then thanked the continuing members of the Board. Karen Little was commended for her work on the three newsletters printed in 1991. Steve Wright was praised for his work on the very successful Baltimore meeting.

Bowen announced the membership of the NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee. They are Jeffery Earnest (chair and RLG representative), Karen Little (OCLC representative), Jennifer Bowen (MOUG representative), and Ralph Papakhian (NMP coordinator). No NACO report was given due to Papakhian's report to be given during the afternoon plenary session.

Bowen announced that the MOUG Archive has officially been established at the University of Maryland, College Park and that Peggy McMullen has sent approximately 4.5 cubic feet of MOUG materials there. Bowen presented the following resolution as a way of thanking McMullen:

"WHEREAS, the preservation of the written records of an organization is vital to the organization's efficient functioning as well as to future research about that organization; and

WHEREAS, for the first fourteen years of its existence, MOUG's archives existed as miscellaneous folders and piles of papers scattered throughout the country in the attics and extra file cabinets of former MOUG officers; and

WHEREAS, Peggy McMullen has succeeded in bringing this material together in one location, organized the material, and seen it safely to its final home at the University of Maryland, College Park, and has, in short, created order out of chaos;

THEREFORE, be it resolved, this 18th day of February, 1992, that the membership and Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group does hereby heartily thank Peggy McMullen for her exceptional dedication to this project and for her contribution to the future success of our organization!

The resolution was passed unanimously by the membership.

Bowen briefly summarized her experiences at the OCLC User's Council Meeting that she attended in the Fall. A full report appears in the November 1991 MOUG Newsletter.

Bowen summarized preliminary discussions regarding the possibility of suggesting to OCLC that both Music Index and RILM be considered for inclusion in FirstSearch. The members present indicated that the addition of these sources would be welcome and that the Board should pursue this.

Bowen asked that anyone interested in volunteering to sit at the MLA booth at ALA in San Francisco this summer as a representative of MOUG should contact Rick Jones, the MLA Publicity Officer.

B. Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Karen Little)

Little informed the membership that the organization published three issues of the MOUG Newsletter in 1991. She asked, on the incoming Secretary/Newsletter Editor's behalf, that members consider submitting articles for upcoming issues of the newsletter. Little also reported that both Music Index and Library Literature are considering indexing the MOUG Newsletter in their publications.

C. Treasurer (Ann Churukian)

Churukian highlighted budget activity for the past year and suggested that for full details, members consult their issues of the MOUG Newsletter.

D. Continuing Education Coordinator (Stephen Wright)

Wright thanked the members of this year's Program Committee: Sarah Long, Judy MacLeod, and Michelle Koth. He announced that Leslie Troutman would be replacing Sarah Long as the Public Services
Coordinator. Wright reminded those present that Leslie Troutman and Bob Acker would be presenting a joint MLA/MOUG session on EPIC later in the week.

Wright proposed to the membership, given a somewhat lower attendance at this meeting, increasingly limited funding for travel, and the long week that the current meeting schedule forces, that they might consider re-thinking the notion that the MOUG Annual Meeting not conflict with MLA's Pre-Conference. Potential problems with this might be available space at the chosen hotel for both a Pre-Conference and MOUG's meeting and a subject particularly relevant to MOUG's membership.

Another suggestion was to present the annual meeting in a shorter format, such as one day or one afternoon. It was noted that saving the cost of one night's lodging might not be considered substantial enough to make any changes to the meeting length. The suggestion was made to reduce overlap of material with MLA, such as the report from LC perhaps. The most recent survey run in the MOUG Newsletter asking why individuals did not attend MOUG yielded no conclusions.

Wright also suggested that the membership consider meeting with OLAC, perhaps in Dublin, Ohio, in 1994. The last time the two groups met together was in Dublin in 1984.

6. New business

Bowen publicly thanked Little and Wright for their contributions to MOUG over the past two years. Jay Weitz was also vigorously thanked with the exclamation that the organization wouldn't know what to do without him.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Little

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS

The OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) is preparing an AACR2R rule change proposal to submit to CC:DA concerning prescribed sources of information in Chapter 7, "Motion Pictures and Videorecordings." The proposal recommends that the container be added to the prescribed sources for the edition area, the publication, distribution, etc. area, and the series area. The container is a prescribed source in these areas for other audiovisual materials. Since the sole source of edition statements, publisher, and series is frequently the container of a videorecording, this information must now be bracketed in bibliographic records. The proposal, if adopted, would eliminate the need for brackets when the information is taken from the container.

Another topic of discussion at the Jan. 1992 CAPC meeting was the treatment of videorecordings of programs or episodes of television series. The variety of possibilities and opinions expressed on this issue serve to highlight the fact that the Library of Congress now catalogs very few published videorecordings, and consequently, there are no LC rule interpretations which could address such problems and promote uniform practice. This observation gave rise to further discussion about how this void might be filled.

The 1992 OLAC Conference will be held at the Holiday Inn Crown Plaza, Rockville, MD, on October 1-3. The theme is "Quantity vs. Quality: Are they Compatible,"
and keynote speakers will be Janet Swan Hill and Carol Mandel. The conference will include workshops on topics such as training AV catalogers, sound recordings cataloging, format integration, and graphic materials cataloging.

Verna Urbanski's cataloging manual for unpublished non-print materials is completed, and the expected publication date is March 1992. Karen Driessen and Sheila Smyth have sent draft chapters of their physical processing manual for audiovisual materials to the OLAC Editorial Committee for review.

Lowell Ashley, MOUG/OLAC Liaison
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

**TOP 150 PERFORMERS IN THE OCLC DATABASE**

This list was generated from a scan of the Online Union Catalog based on "prf" in subfield 4. Headings without subfield 4 or with more specific codes are not included. Thus the rank and number of postings might vary a little from actual. The first column is the rank, the second the total number of postings, and the third the heading itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Performer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>London Symphony Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berliner Philharmoniker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wiener Philharmoniker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New York Philharmonic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philharmonia Orchestra (London, England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Philadelphia Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>London Philharmonic Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Royal Philharmonic Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>English Chamber Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chicago Symphony Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ormandy, Eugene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bayerischer Rundfunk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Boston Symphony Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Concertgebouworchest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fischer-Dieskau, Dietrich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wiener Symphoniker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Academy of St. Martin-in-the-Fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>New Philharmonia Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cleveland Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Radiotelevisione italiana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Karajan, Herbert von.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bernstein, Leonard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Wiener Staatsoper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vsesoiuzme radio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Columbia Symphony Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Teatro alla Scala.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ceska filharmonie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Callas, Maria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Orchestre de la Suisse romande.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Boston Pops Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Konzertvereinigung Wiener Staatsopernchor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rampal, Jean Pierre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gedda, Nicolai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Domingo, Placido.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>NBC Symphony Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Szel, George.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dorati, Antal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Societe des concerts du Conservatoire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Bolshoi teatr SSSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Schreier, Peter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Armstrong, Louis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Richter, Sviatoslav.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fiedler, Arthur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Louisville Orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Previn, Andre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Accademia di Santa Cecilia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ashkenazy, Vladimir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Oistrakh, David Fedorovich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ellington, Duke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rubinstein, Artur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Basie, Count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Crosby, Bing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Bamberger Symphoniker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Staatskapelle Dresden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ansermet, Ernest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Stern, Isaac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Boult, Adrian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Prey, Hermann.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Brendel, Alfred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Schwarzkopf, Elisabeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Tebaldi, Renata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Barenboim, Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Concentus Musicus Wien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Berliner Rundfunk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Marriner, Neville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>National Philharmonic Orchestra (Great Britain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Merrill, Robert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Leonhardt, Gustav.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Goodman, Benny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sutherland, Joan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Heifetz, Jascha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ludwig, Christa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Menuhin, Yehudi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Leinsdorf, Erich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Baker, Janet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Serkin, Rudolf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Solti, Georg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 / MOUG Newsletter
Thanks to Mark Crook and Lisa Cox of OCLC for compiling this list.

UPCOMING PRISM ENHANCEMENTS

Authority Search Enhancements Project

The Authority Search Enhancements Project will supplement the current derived-key searching capabilities with the ability to scan pre-coordinated lists of headings, and is designed to blend into existing PRISM service functionality. Users will be able to search and scan headings and references in five new indexes for the Authority File. With the new searching capabilities, all headings in the Authority File will be retrievable. Two number indexes will also be available.

PRISM service users will be able to search and scan all headings and references as phrases using right truncation in separate indexes for personal names, corporate names, conference names, titles, and subjects. Each index will be searchable at two levels to provide access to the root portion of headings and the subheading portion of headings, such as the titles in author-title headings. Through these new searching capabilities, all the headings in the Authority File will be retrievable. Two new numeric searches, ISSN and ISBN, will be added for series authority records.

OCLC is developing a computer-based training (CBT) course which will require the use of a DOS-based
personal computer with 640K RAM. The CBT is
directed towards the audience of knowledgeable PRISM
service users. Knowledge of the structure and function of
the Authority File is assumed, along with basic
knowledge of OCLC and the PRISM service.

--Edited from AMIGOS Agenda/OCLC Connection,
March 1992

OCLC Announces PRISM ILL Cutover Date

OCLC has announced the weekend of December 12-13, 1992, as the date for the cutover of the Interlibrary
Loan Subsystem from the First system to the PRISM
service.

Interlibrary loan activities will continue to be carried
out on the First system through Friday, December 11.
The ILL Subsystem will not be available on Saturday,
December 12. Current plans call for PRISM ILL to be
up and running on Monday, December 14.

Additional details will be provided by your network
office and OCLC.

--Edited from AMIGOS Agenda/OCLC Connection,
February 1992

Steady Stream of Enhancements Planned for PRISM

A steady stream of enhancements is planned for the
OCLC PRISM service, whose initial release was the
largest development in OCLC history. OCLC launched
PRISM in November 1990 and migration of cataloging
users to the New Online System will be completed in

By the end of April, 95 percent of cataloging libraries
will be using the PRISM service. The remaining five
percent are users of OCLC CJK350 system and CAT
CD450. These users need to be converted both at OCLC
and on the personal computer side; the process may take
up to a year. Users of local data records will also be
converted in a later phase.

With completion of the first phase of PRISM
implementation in sight, developers are turning their
attention to the next phase—the addition of
enhancements to increase the productivity of cataloging
staffs and reduce cataloging costs.

The first enhancements involve minor adjustments to
the system. Beginning with implementation of ASCII
terminal access to PRISM in April 1991, new features are
being added to PRISM every six months.

Release 1.1, which was implemented in September
1991, provides an LC qualifier for bibliographic
searching, changes the CODEN search prefix, allows the
capture of CAT ME Plus export data for statistics, and
corrects minor problems reported in the title phrase and
group displays.

Version 1.2, installed this spring, provides an
enhanced tag command for use with display holdings,
changes to PRISM help, title phrase enhancements, the
ability to delete holdings with local data records attached,
and adjustments to full record displays.

The content of release 1.3 is still being determined. It
is scheduled to be implemented this summer.

The first major enhancements will be in authority
searching. Planned for implementation this spring, this
enhancement will allow PRISM users to browse authority
indexes and to retrieve every record in the authority file.

The next major enhancement, a Gateway between
OCLC and local systems, will be available in fall 1992,
though implementation will be spread over many months.
The Gateway will facilitate local access to OCLC for
cataloging and interlibrary loan and provide electronic
file transfers between OCLC and local systems for
bibliographic and authority records and holdings. The
interface will make the Online Union Catalog more
readily available from the desktops of library staffs, and
integrate OCLC services, including EPIC, into a library's
existing terminals and local area networks. Since it will
be UNIX-based and be relatively easy to attach to
campus networks, it will be available to academic and
research libraries first. Non-campus local area network
environments will require additional hardware, and
possibly telecommunications and consulting fees.

Additional PRISM searching enhancements are being
investigated, including Boolean, keyword, and phrase
searching. These should increase the productivity of
library staffs, improve hit rates (and therefore perhaps
reduce the amount of original cataloging), and reduce
cataloging costs. They will also improve the quality of
the Online Union Catalog and enhance access for
resource sharing and reference services.
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Another possible enhancement is a new authority verification and record notification service. Automatic notification of changed authority records should reduce manual searching, editing, and exporting of bibliographic and authority records.

OCLC is excited about these enhancements. Users have asked for improved searching tools and better interoperability between OCLC and local systems. Both improvements are now on the horizon and should improve efficiency and ease of cataloging.

---Edited from OCLC Newsletter, January/February 1992

**FIRSTSEARCH NEWS**

Databases continue to be added to FirstSearch. By the end of 1992, thirty will be available. Of most interest to music librarians and musicians are those from the General and Arts/Humanities areas, as follows:

- WorldCat (OCLC Online Union Catalog)
- Biography Index
- Book Review Digest
- Consumers Index to Product Evaluations
- Cumulative Book Index
- GPO Monthly Catalog
- Newspaper Abstracts
- OCLC/Faxon Finder databases (ArticleFinder and ContentsFinder)
- Periodical Abstracts
- Reader's Guide Abstracts
- Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature

OCLC holdings data will be linked to most of these databases as they are loaded. This linking will allow users of a FirstSearch database to see which OCLC libraries subscribe to the title they are interested in. Three-character OCLC symbols are displayed first by state, then by region, then nationally. This feature will also be available on EPIC sometime this fall.

An upgrade to FirstSearch (Version 1.1) was installed last December. Several changes were made, including the following:

1. **Customizing access to databases.** All databases are available for searching when you receive a FirstSearch authorization. With this new customizing feature, a library can control which databases are searchable, blocking access to one or more databases. A blocked database cannot be selected for searching and will not appear on the Database Selection screen. For example, if your library has ERIC on a CD-ROM and you would like all patron access through the CD-ROM, FirstSearch can be adjusted so that ERIC is not available.

2. **Masking the BYE action.** The BYE action disconnects FirstSearch. With this feature, the library can control whether this action is displayed or masked. Masking reduces inadvertent use of BYE and may prevent accidental logoffs. Mask the BYE if you want FirstSearch to remain connected after one user finishes searching so that the next user can begin searching without logging on.

3. **Timed reset.** If Timed Reset is on and no message is received by FirstSearch for ten minutes, FirstSearch automatically resets, displaying the Welcome screen and removing any search limitations. If Timed Reset is off, users must use the Reset action to return to the Welcome screen. The library can turn Timed Reset on or off.

4. **Search command.** The system requires users to enter *s* or *search* before a term on all screens except the search screen. This helps prevent users from inadvertently using a search. Also, the search is not counted and an error message appears if the result of a search is no postings in the following cases: 1) a single keyword, 2) keywords with Boolean or proximity operators, and 3) a bound phrase.

4. **Topic area selection.** A general subject menu called the Topic Area Selection screen appears after the Welcome screen to help users select a database. If you select a topic area, FirstSearch lists all the databases for that topic. Users can also select the "All" topic to see a list of all available databases, and databases may appear in more than one area.

5. **Plurals.** For some searches, you can type "+" at the end of a word to search for that word and its plural and possessive forms. FirstSearch will search for the word and for the word with 's, and es added at the end.

6. **Default search operator.** This was changed from NEAR to AND, to diminish the number of searches with no hits.
7. Limit action. Users now can reissue a search with new limits without retyping the search and can decide if the search limits should apply to new searches.


NEW OCLC PUBLICATION

If the title OCLC Reference News is unfamiliar to you, this bimonthly publication is just over a year old and is sent to all subscribers of OCLC reference products, including EPIC, FirstSearch, and Search CD450. One copy is sent for each EPIC or FirstSearch authorization. If this publication is not crossing your desk and you would like to see it, find out who receives it at your library and see that it is routed to you.

RECENT MLA PUBLICATIONS

The Music Library Association has just announced two new publications:


This volume deals with the processes and considerations involved in the renovation, reorganization, and creation of music library facilities. The authors of the papers included in this report, which are based on MLA's 1990 Preconference on Space Utilization, attempt to address various broad issues as well as some more closely focused questions about space utilization. This book will be important to both the music specialist and the library generalist who has to consider these questions.

The report is available for $30.00 ($24.00 to MLA members) from the Music Library Association, P. O. Box 487, Canton, MA 02021.
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ORDER FORM

THE MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP PRESENTS

THE BEST OF MOUG, 4TH EDITION


*The Best of MOUG* is an excellent tool for catalogers and public service librarians because it can be kept at a desk, card catalog, or online terminal for quick access to uniform titles for the composers that are the most difficult to search online. The authority control numbers are given so that the authority record can be verified.

The cost is still $5.00 plus $1.50 for postage and handling, U.S. funds.

All orders must be prepaid, with checks made out to the Music OCLC Users Group.

***********************************************

NAME: __________________________________________
ADDRESS: _______________________________________
                                                  _______________________________________
                                                  _______________________________________
                                                  _______________________________________

Yes! I have enclosed a check made out to the Music OCLC Users Group for $6.50.

Send to:
Judy Weidow
Cataloging, PCL 2.300
The General Libraries
The University of Texas at Austin
P.O. Box P
Austin, TX 78713-7330
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal membership is $10.00; institutional membership is $15.00; international membership (outside of the U.S.) is $25.00. 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 upon receipt of dues payment). Personal members, please include home address. Institutional members, please note four line, 24 character per line limit. We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor (Faxon, etc.).

NAME:________________________________________

ADDRESS:____________________________________

HOME PHONE: (____)_________ WORK PHONE:(____)____________________________________

FAX NUMBER: (____)__________________________

INSTITUTION NAME:________________________________________

POSITION TITLE:________________________________________

INSTITUTION ADDRESS:____________________________________

ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS(ES):_____________________________

LOCAL SYSTEM(S) USED:____________________________________

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

  _____ $10.00 Personal (U.S.)
  _____ $15.00 Institutional (U.S.)
  _____ $25.00 Personal and institutional (outside U.S.)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Ann Churukian, Treasurer, Music OCLC Users Group, Music Library, Box 38, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Sue Weiland
MOUG Newsletter Editor
Music OCLC Users Group
1845 Fairmount
Wichita, KS 67208-1586