FROM THE CHAIR
Ralph Papakhian

This is my first opportunity as incoming Chair of MOUG to welcome you to an issue of our Newsletter. And by way of welcome, I would like to remind us all of the MOUG mission statement which appears on p. 6 inside. Note that our goal has to do with OCLC products and services "concerned with music materials in any area of library services, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services." But we really have to place this lofty mission in context, which is simply that current OCLC databases, products and services now constitute the most expansive set of music bibliographic services available anywhere, anytime. All of us who have participated in OCLC work of one kind or another must proudly take credit for helping accomplish this great project. But as OCLC products and services have grown to include, among others, EPIC, FirstSearch, ArticleFirst, ContentsFirst, and various CD-ROMs, MOUG must similarly grow in terms of our educational and communicative activities if we are going to meet our stated goal "in pursuit of quality." With the good work done by our current Reference Services Coordinator (Ruthann McTyre) and previous MOUG officers, we have made significant progress in this regard. But we will have to do more. Readers with suggestions about how to expand MOUG "beyond cataloging" are invited to contact me or any of the officers.

That said, I am pleased to report that over 100 registrants participated in our annual meeting this past March in Kansas City (for workshop, meeting, or both). Our thanks to Tim Cherubini, Continuing Education Coordinator, and the Program Committee: Neil Hughes, Mickey Koth, Karen Little, and Jill Shires. Special thanks to Jay Weitz, our OCLC Liaison, for presenting the workshop on Cataloging Music Videos. (The workshop attracted at least 60 registrants—if you think this or other OCLC related workshops should be presented at annual meetings, let us know).

Annually we also want to recognize our outgoing and incoming officers. Retirees, who have done an outstanding job this year, are Sue Weiland, Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Tim Cherubini, Continuing Education Coordinator. Replacements are:

Judy Weidow as Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Laura Gayle Green as the CE Coordinator. The past election also included a bylaws revision which also passed. This bylaw stipulates that voting in MOUG elections will be restricted to Personal Members only. So if you are reading this Newsletter as a result of an Institutional Membership, you may want to consider also joining MOUG as a Personal Member in order to be able to participate in the organization more fully.

There will be an election this fall for Vice/Chair/Chair Elect and Treasurer. We have yet to form a Nominations Committee but it is not too early for members to suggest potential nominees. Please feel free to send your suggestions (including yourself if you are interested) to any Board member. Everyone suggested obviously will not appear on the final ballot, but the Nominations Committee will certainly be interested in receiving all of the input that is available. The formal call of nominations will be made later this summer.

Finally, remember that MOUG will be having a joint meeting with OLAC (Online Audiovisual Catalogers) this fall. Reserve October 5-8 on your calendars for what promises to be an exciting and informative conference in Oak Brook, IL. While a preliminary program was distributed in Kansas City, registration materials will be mailed to all MOUG members in June. This should be a wonderful opportunity for us to rub shoulders with our A-V colleagues. Our 1995 meeting will occur in conjunction with MLA in Atlanta, around Feb. 7-8. No decisions have been made regarding the content and structure of that meeting in light of the joint meeting in October. If you have opinions, please share them! Since the 1995 meeting will occur only four months after the October meeting, it is not clear whether we should consider another full meeting lasting a day and half (this would depend on how many MOUG members are likely to attend the joint meeting), or perhaps a much shorter meeting focusing on one topic. However the Program Committee and the Board will be discussing this during the summer in order to make a final decision by early fall.
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Thanks to all who contributed to this issue of the Newsletter. The Newsletter is an occasional publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. Editor: Judy Weidow, Cataloging S5453, The University of Texas at Austin, P. O. Box P, Austin, TX 78713-7330.

Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be typed (double-spaced), submitted on 5 1/4” or 3 1/2” disk using Word, Word Perfect or ASCII text, or sent electronically. Articles should be consistent in length and style with other items published in the Newsletter. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged. Correspondence on subscription or membership (including changes of address) should be forwarded to Chris Grandy, Knight Library, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1299. (Dues: in North America, $10.00 for personal members, $15.00 for institutional members; outside North America, $25.00; back issues nos. 21-56 are available from the Treasurer for $5.00 per copy).

The Music OCLC Users Group is a non-stock, non-profit association, organized for these purposes: (1) to establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC products, systems and services and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users; (2) to encourage and facilitate the exchange of information between OCLC and members of MOUG; between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general; between members of the Group and appropriate representatives of the Library of Congress; and between members of the Group and similar users' organizations; (3) to promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards; and (4) to provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group.
### MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
#### FINANCIAL REPORT
4th Quarter
October-December 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Checking Account on September 30, 1993</td>
<td>$1,001.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Savings Account on September 30, 1993</td>
<td>13,467.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Available on September 30, 1993</td>
<td>$14,469.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$5,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Interest</td>
<td>71.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$5,137.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Expense: Fall Board Meeting</td>
<td>$412.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter (Postage)</td>
<td>34.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations/Refunds (Vendor)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage (Dues/Ballot Mailing)</td>
<td>193.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>670.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Gain</strong></td>
<td>$4,467.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Checking Account on December 31, 1993</td>
<td>$5,398.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Savings Account on December 31, 1993</td>
<td>13,538.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Available on December 31, 1993</td>
<td>$18,936.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
FINANCIAL REPORT
1993

Balance in Checking Account on January 1, 1993 $5,308.28
Balance in Savings Account on January 1, 1993 10,711.02
Total Cash Available on January 1, 1993 $16,019.30

INCOME

Memberships $6,745.00
Meeting Registrations 3,390.00
Bank Interest 306.71
Newsletter Back Issues 16.00
Best of MOUG 219.50
Total Income $10,677.21

EXPENSES

Annual Meeting:
AV $465.41
Reception/Coffee 1,166.27
Board Expense 1,881.33
Publicity 60.99
Honoraria 100.00
Miscellaneous 9.54
Board Expense:
Fall Board Meeting 1,072.80
ALA Travel (Chair: for MOUG/OLAC) 150.00
0.00
NACO Music
Newsletter (Printing and Postage) 2,212.72
Best of MOUG 22.20
Cancellations/Refunds 36.50
Printing 54.42
Postage 426.54
Supplies 100.90
Miscellaneous 0.00
Total Expenses 7,759.62

Net Gain $2,917.59

Balance in Checking Account on December 31, 1993 $5,398.03
Balance in Savings Account on December 31, 1993 13,538.86
Total Cash Available on December 31, 1993 $18,936.89
# MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
## FINANCIAL REPORT
### 1st Quarter
#### January-March 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Checking Account on January 1, 1994</td>
<td>$5,398.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Savings Account on January 1, 1994</td>
<td>$13,538.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Available on January 1, 1994</td>
<td>$18,936.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCOME**
- Memberships: $975.00
- KC Meeting Registrations: $2,265.00
- KC Workshop Registrations: $1,180.00
- Bank Interest: $69.29
- **Total Income**: $4,489.29

**EXPENSES**
- KC Meeting (To Date):
  - Board Expense: $991.96
  - Honoraria: $50.00
  - Miscellaneous: $124.54
- MOUG/OLAC Meeting:
  - Newsletter #56 (Printing and Postage): $825.45
  - Best of MOUG (Printing): $1,347.00
- **Total Expenses**: $4,138.95

**Net Gain**: $350.34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Checking Account on March 31, 1994</td>
<td>$5,679.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Savings Account on March 31, 1994</td>
<td>$13,608.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Available on March 31, 1994</td>
<td>$19,287.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Library of Congress and OCLC have changed the name, format, and distribution for the newsletter, CONSER, which has provided news of the Cooperative Online SERials program since 1976. Effective January 1994, the new newsletter, CONSERline, will be issued only in electronic format, semiannually in January and June, with additional issues released as needed to relay information of timely interest. The 18 national and full-member participants in the CONSER program authenticate serials records in the CONSER database, which resides in the OCLC Online Union Catalog.

Last fall, OCLC added enhancements to the PRISM service in cataloging, plus five more hours per week to system availability. This is the fifth major release of enhancements to PRISM since it was introduced in November 1990. OCLC has also added keyword searching to the CAT ME Plus software and has expanded record limits in the OCLC Authority File. We are expecting to re-implement the Name-Address Directory and the Union List Subsystem into PRISM using a hot cut-over in late August-September 1994.

In October 1993, OCLC began a 310,000-title retrospective conversion project for Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan. OCLC's RETROCON service is converting catalog cards for books written in English, French, German, and other Roman-alphabet languages to electronic form. The project will be completed in April 1996.
The Harvard-Yenching Library of Harvard University has signed a contract with OCLC for the retrospective conversion of 17,000 Korean titles in its East Asian collections cataloged between 1977 and 1989. The Harvard-Yenching Library's Korean materials constitute the largest Korean collection in any university in the United States. The project began in November 1993, and will be completed in 15 months.

The CJK TECHPRO service at OCLC is cataloging 1,550 books written in the Chinese, Japanese, or Korean languages for the East Asian Library at the University of Southern California. USC will ship the books (1,000 Chinese, 500 Japanese, and 50 Korean) to OCLC for cataloging. For each title, OCLC will use the CJK Plus system to perform copy or original cataloging according to USC's technical specifications, which include assigning Library of Congress call numbers and subject headings, and printing catalog cards for the library. The new records and catalog cards will contain CJK vernacular characters.

**OCLC's Cataloging & Database Services Strategy** was sent to the OCLC membership in November 1993. The four-page document outlines OCLC's cataloging enhancement strategy through the remainder of the decade. The paper sets forth a new vision for cataloging as libraries move further into the electronic age. The strategy includes: Improving productivity by further automating the copy cataloging and authority control processes; Facilitating links between local library systems and OCLC systems and services to increase library access; Providing authority control services; and Enriching the OLUC to support the needs of scholarship.

**Reference Products**

AT&T InterSpan Data Communications Services and OCLC have announced a trial program that will provide corporate information seekers with access to The FirstSearch Catalog via the Internet and AT&T's InterSpan Frame Relay Service (FRS), a worldwide, high-speed intelligent network operated by AT&T. AT&T's Internet Connectivity Options (ICO) will allow FRS users to connect to The FirstSearch Catalog. They will be able to search 31 of the 40 databases available on FirstSearch and order the full text of desired articles through OCLC's document delivery service. Upon completion of the two-month trial program, AT&T customers will have the option of contracting with OCLC for access to FirstSearch on an ongoing basis.

John Sullivan, Database Acquisitions Manager in OCLC Reference Services Division, has been talking with RILM's producers recently. Although there is not yet a contract, it looks promising for adding RILM to EPIC and FirstSearch. OCLC and the producers of RILM are currently exchanging information and test tapes. If an agreement can be reached, we would probably be looking at the end of the 1994 calendar year for loading the RILM database on EPIC and FirstSearch.

Cambridge Information Group and OCLC have reached an agreement to mount six databases on The FirstSearch Catalog and the EPIC service, OCLC's online reference services. The agreement enables OCLC to add the following databases from Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, a division of Cambridge Information Group: Environmental Sciences & Risk Management; FINDEX: Worldwide Market Research Reports; Safety Sciences & Risk Management, published in association with the University of Southern California and the University of Waterloo and focusing on environmental risks that affect occupational health and public safety; Aquatic Sciences & Fisheries Abstracts; AIDS & Cancer Research; and Biotechnology & BioEngineering.

Disclosure/Worldscope Snapshots, a full-text database of international financial information, is now available on The FirstSearch Catalog. Published by Disclosure Inc., Worldscope contains financial information on nearly 9,000 of the world's largest companies representing 32 countries. Areas of coverage include industrials, utilities, transportation, banks, insurance, and others. Worldscope is the fifth full-text database available on The FirstSearch Catalog.

INSPEC, one of the world's leading databases for scientific and technical researchers, is now available on OCLC's FirstSearch Catalog and EPIC service. The INSPEC Database, produced by the Institution of Electrical Engineers (IEE), is the world's largest and most comprehensive source of published reference literature in physics, electrical and control engineering, electronics, and computing. Coverage on both FirstSearch and EPIC starts in
1987 and includes some 2 million citations. The files will be updated weekly.

For the introduction of two new electronic journals, OCLC has added enhancements to the GUIDON graphical user interface that increase the speed of dial access, improve the printing and downloading of documents, and facilitate multiuser access. With GUIDON 2.0, subscribers view the full text of articles with graphics and hypertext links to references, figures, equations, and tables. GUIDON also supports sophisticated Boolean searching and a document ordering capability. The Online Journal of Current Clinical Trials, introduced in July 1992, is a peer-reviewed medical journal, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science and distributed electronically by OCLC. Electronics Letters Online, available since December, contains the same 1,400-1,500 articles published per year in Electronics Letters by the Institution of Electrical Engineers (IEE). Sigma Theta Tau International, Honor Society of Nursing began publication in January 1994 of the Online Journal of Knowledge Synthesis for Nursing, which will help the nursing community stay abreast of information published in nursing journals and other published nursing research.

In a related development, the Online Journal Current Clinical Trials (OJCCT) has become the first electronic journal to be included in Index Medicus, the National Library of Medicine's internationally used abstracting and indexing service. Acceptance by Index Medicus (and its database counterpart MEDLINE) is a mark of high distinction for any journal and is especially notable in the case of OJCCT, which is owned and published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) in a joint venture with OCLC. Of the more than 3,800 medical journals indexed by MEDLINE, OJCCT is the first to be distributed solely through computer networks. Launched July 1, 1992, OJCCT received the 1992 Product of the Year Award from Database Magazine in recognition of its pioneering contribution to electronic publishing.

The American Institute of Physics and OCLC Online Computer Library Center have agreed to make Applied Physics Letters available electronically through OCLC's Electronic Journals Online system in January 1995. Applied Physics Letters Online, AIP's weekly journal, will provide concise, up-to-the-minute reports of significant new findings in applied physics. Subject areas covered in the online journal will include semiconductors; superconductivity; condensed matter; optics and solid state lasers; nonlinear optics; surfaces, interfaces, and thin films; preparation and properties of materials; and electrical and magnetic device properties.

Information from HeadsUp, a service that provides access to some 15,000 news stories and releases each day, will be available this spring as BusinessNews on The FirstSearch Catalog and the EPIC service. HeadsUp is a service from INDIVIDUAL, Inc., a Cambridge, Mass., company founded in 1989 to filter and customize information from a wide range of electronic information sources. BusinessNews will be comprised of brief summaries from two weeks worth of mostly business-related news items taken from some 300 wire services and other news sources. The summaries will appear in the EPIC and FirstSearch services the day after they are released by the various news services, so the databases will be updated daily.

A two-year pilot program, sponsored by OCLC and the OCLC-affiliated regional networks, gives librarians and media centers in public and private primary, secondary, and high schools access to The FirstSearch Catalog at a special rate. Through FirstSearch for School Libraries, school libraries and media centers can evaluate the feasibility of providing FirstSearch to students.

Rick Noble has been named vice president, reference services at OCLC, effective April 1. Mr. Noble has been with UMI, Ann Arbor, Mich., since 1990, most recently as vice president of electronic product development and marketing. From 1980 until he joined UMI, he was with Info Globe, the electronic publishing division of Canada's national newspaper, The Globe and Mail. Mr. Noble has a bachelor's degree in commerce and economics and a master of business administration, both from the University of Toronto.

Resource Sharing

PRISM ILL, installed in December 1992, has been enhanced to help users increase productivity and efficiency. Enhancements include: use of multiple constant data records for more efficient processing of ILL requests; a new "save" file for storage of work in progress; additional fields in workforms; automatic transfer of the ISSN from
bibliographic records to ILL records; new notes fields; increased time limits for "need before" and "due dates" for ILL; and an option for lenders to complete an ILL request from a "recalled" status.

FastDoc, a new service that provides fax delivery of articles in one hour or less, is now available from UMI and OCLC. FastDoc is a rapid document ordering option in The FirstSearch Catalog using UMI's PrroQuest PowerPages, a full image database system. FastDoc enables FirstSearch users to request and receive electronically the full image of serial articles they find in FirstSearch databases, complete with text, graphs, charts, and illustrations—within one hour. FastDoc is available now on two FirstSearch databases: ArticleFirst, an OCLC serials database; and Periodical Abstracts, a UMI serials database. More than 400,000 articles published in 1992 and 1993 can be ordered from these two databases via FastDoc, and more are being added each month. OCLC plans to extend the FastDoc option to all FirstSearch databases by 1995.

The FirstSearch Catalog Document Ordering/ILL System was named winner of the 1994 Computers in Libraries Information Product/Service (CLIPS) Award at the recent Computers in Libraries Conference in Washington, D.C. The document ordering and interlibrary loan system makes items located in FirstSearch databases available for delivery quickly and inexpensively. The FirstSearch Catalog, OCLC's online reference service designed for library patrons, was the 1992 CLIPS Award winner.

At the urging of the OCLC Users Council, OCLC will develop a lender reimbursement system to help reduce the administrative costs for libraries that charge or pay other libraries for interlibrary loans. The lender reimbursement system will be developed for OCLC's PRISM ILL, which already tracks borrowing and lending transactions. The system will be optional and used on a request-by-request basis when libraries are arranging a transaction with a library that charges. When the reimbursement system is invoked, the borrowing library is debited and the lender is issued a credit. OCLC will reconcile debits and credits on a monthly basis and send credits to net lenders and bills to net borrowers. The purpose of this service is to reduce staff time allocated to processing checks and invoices when libraries charge each other for ILL services. It does not imply, either for OCLC or its membership, any suggestion that libraries should charge their users for ILL—ideally, the exchange of money should be minimal, with lending canceling out borrowing.

Other News

MAPS The Micrographic Preservation Service became a division of OCLC on January 1, 1994, and changed its name to Preservation Resources. It will broaden its message to reach smaller and more diverse organizations that need reformatting services. New or enhanced pre- and post-filming services will include workshops, consultation, preparation, bibliographic control, storage, and access and distribution options. Preservation Resources produces high-quality microfilm and microfiche of books, manuscripts, scrapbooks, newspapers, architectural drawings, maps, and photographic materials. A nonprofit organization, it was founded in 1985 by Columbia, Cornell, and Princeton Universities, the New York Public Library, and the New York State Library, and was originally called the Mid-Atlantic Preservation Service (MAPS). In October 1990, the MAPS Board of Trustees, composed of representatives of MAPS' founding members, voted unanimously to transfer control of MAPS to OCLC. To reflect the transition from a regional to an international base, the name was changed to MAPS The Micrographic Preservation Service. Preservation Resources is housed in a 17,650-square-foot building dedicated on April 30, 1991, and located in Bethlehem, Pa.

OCLC is offering assistance to libraries damaged by the Jan. 17 earthquake in California. OCLC will assist with recovery of damaged workstations and offline products, expedite telecommunications line and workstation installations, and provide general systems advice to those in need. Last summer, OCLC offered disaster recovery assistance to flood-damaged libraries in the Midwest. In 1992, OCLC assisted libraries damaged by Hurricane Andrew. Libraries damaged by the 1989 California earthquake and by Hurricane Hugo were also assisted by OCLC.

Irene M. Hoffman has been promoted to director of OCLC Pacific, the OCLC service center for libraries in Western Canada, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington, and other Western states. In her new position, Ms. Hoffman is responsible for user training and customer service activities, such as workshops and system support.
and membership activities. Ms. Hoffman was associate librarian at the University of California at Davis from 1982 to 1985 and was library instruction coordinator at California State University at Los Angeles from 1985 to 1987. She began working at OCLC Pacific in 1987 as a marketing representative. She was appointed manager of sales and marketing in 1989. She is a graduate of Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, and earned a master's degree from the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science.

News From the Library Resources Management Division

Automated Authority Control in the Online Union Catalog

New database quality software developed by OCLC performs automated authority control of personal and corporate names and LC subject headings in the Online Union Catalog.

Corporate name heading corrections began May 14 and concluded July 20, 1993. The software corrected errors in 1,106,056 corporate name headings (110, 410, 710, and 810 fields).

LC subject heading corrections began Nov. 5 and concluded Dec. 16, 1993, making 1,988,895 corrections to LC subject heading fields (600 through 651 fields with second indicator 0).

Corrections to personal name headings began Feb. 2, 1994. The software is expected to correct about two million headings in 100 and 700 fields. Processing occurs in the background and does not affect system response time or availability.

The heading corrections increase the accuracy and reduce the cost of searching the Online Union Catalog, improve system displays, and reduce the need for pre- or post-cataloging verification and correction of name and subject headings.

The automated authority control software is also being used to correct records from Harvard University Library. An investigation is underway to explore applying the software to OCLC offline products, such as GOVDOC, and to other libraries' bibliographic files.

LSP and PRISM Authority Services

Since ALA Annual, two new sites--the University of Dayton and the University of Virginia--have joined the group of NACO libraries that use OCLC's LSP (Linked Systems Project) system to contribute their authority records to the LC Name Authority File. Immediately following ALA Midwinter conference, the University of Oregon started to receive training on OCLC's LSP system. OCLC's NACO/LSP sites now number 68, and they contribute about 4200 new and changed authority records per month to the LC Name Authority File.

The LSP system is part of the First OCLC System, which is gradually being replaced. Therefore LSP functions are being transferred to the PRISM service. The project, expected to be complete late this year, will permit NACO libraries to prepare national-level authority records in the PRISM service. In addition, all users with authorizations for PRISM Cataloging will be able to edit authority records for local use and export the edited records to their local systems.

Quality Control, Scans, Etc.

The third full pass of the Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) software through the OLUC ran from October 6 through December 25, 1993, merging an additional 73,895 duplicate Books records. DDR's total since June of 1991 is now 762,749 duplicates merged. It is running again this spring to pick up duplicates from the National Library of Australia (AUT) that were missed during the first few weeks of the third pass.

A number of database scans reconciling Dates and Date Types are in progress. One of interest to MOUG would be changing Date Type "c" to "s" when Date2 is blank and Date1 matches a single date in 260 $c$. Some 2,474 Score and AV records and 7,135 Maps and Books were corrected. We're now working on a scan to add Date2 when it was incorrectly missing.

In the campaign to remove subfields $w$ from the OLUC, 6,148,044 records had been purged between April 1993 and the end of February 1994. By the time the scan is complete, probably in July 1994, some 11 million records will have been touched.

After a three-month pilot project during the summer and fall of 1993, Books Enhance
participants were given the ability to upgrade Books CIP records before LC replaces them with full-level records. This was the final phase in a five-year investigation of the timely upgrading of CIP in the OLUC. Other phases included the cleanup of pre-1983 CIP records, the evaluation of CIP records in general, and a survey of Enhance libraries on the quality and timeliness of CIP upgrades by the national libraries.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

QUESTION: According to "When to Input a New Record", p. 45 of Bibliographic Formats and Standards, a new record is NOT justified by "Absence or presence of multiple publishers, distributors, etc. as long as one on the item matches one on the record, and vice versa." OCLC #12999415 has a first 028 of R9-4 $b Charles Foley; the 260 states only one publisher, "New York : Charles Foley." Our publication has no evidence of that first 028. The second 028 is identical to one we have, but "Charles Foley" appears only on the first page of our music. Our title page lists "Melville, N.Y. Belwin Mills Pub. Co." The date is the same. Is a new record justified?

ANSWER: Though I'm hardly an expert on music publishing, from your description, it sounds like the "Charles Foley" on the first page of music may be the copyright holder (?) and no longer the publisher for this edition. I would say that a separate record is justified with Belwin Mills as the publisher.

QUESTION: How should libraries submit change requests for compact discs or videos that have been re-mastered from the original medium (LP, film, etc.) but without a publication date reflecting the new medium?

ANSWER: There is no special procedure for submitting change requests for CDs or videos released in the new format but still identified by the date of release in the original medium. AACR2r 1.4F2, 1.4F7, 1.7B7, 1.7B9, and related rules in Chapters 6 and 7, as well as RIs and Music Cataloging Decisions are all the justification needed. If there is evidence for a "better" date of publication (in accompanying material, a catalog, publisher's material, etc.), that can help, but at the very least, an approximate date of publication (1.4F7) can be supplied.

Compact disc sound recordings became commercially available in Japan in October 1982, in Europe in February 1983, and in the U.S. in March 1983. Hence, dates prior to these cannot be considered legitimate dates of publication for CDs. Videos are more problematic, but my research suggests that Beta format became commercially available in May 1975 and VHS format sometime in mid-1977.

This problem with dates is a perennial one, but we are eager to change or correct any record that appears to be coded incorrectly and to merge records that appear to be describing the same item despite such date discrepancies.

QUESTION: Does anyone know where we could get, via FTP or disk, a little utility program that can add and subtract time periods expressed in hours and minutes? I would be inclined to provide the total duration in the collation of sound recordings made up of a number of pieces, if I had a handy little program that could perform the calculations quickly.

ANSWER (of sorts): You should note that according to Music Cataloging Decision 6.5B2 (MCB 21:3 (March 1990) p. 2) the total duration goes in the physical description area ONLY when the item contains one work (as defined in AACR2).

QUESTION: In MOUG Newsletter no. 56 (December 1993, p. 8), you answered a question about initial articles in uniform titles. Exactly which fields are considered uniform title fields? X30s, of course, and 240. The new BF&S document clearly states that one is to code the second indicator as zero and not to use initial articles. What about the 440? When used, it should contain the authorized form of the series, i.e., the "uniform" series title. BF&S, however, does not carry the injunction about not using a filing indicator; so it sounds like the 440 is not included in the set of fields considered to be uniform titles; and therefore we should continue to input initial articles and use a filing indicator. The plot thickens with the 740
field, which clearly is NOT a uniform title field. BF&S there says to "follow LC practice" which is to delete the initial article and use a first (filing) indicator of zero. If we're doing it for the X30s, the 240, and the 740, why not the 440? Can you clarify this?

ANSWER: Some of the pronouncements about uniform titles result from the capabilities (read: limitations, at least in the past) of LC's system. But some also result from the differences between the "pure" uniform title areas and those areas that are derived from descriptive information or that have a mixed function.

By "pure" uniform title areas, I mean X30s and 240, which have filing indicators; and subfields $t$ in various places, which do not have filing indicators. The texts in these areas are constructed, often VERY artificially, to fulfill a few specific purposes (you know, co-location and all that). Because they are constructed (even though they sometimes look just like transcribed information, in the case of many distinctive titles), doing so without superfluous initial articles seems a good idea (and, it's the law). With subfields $t$, of course, it's especially important since most systems have no way of ignoring initial articles there.

Field 440 serves a dual function, as it is both a transcribed, descriptive field AND, coincidentally, a uniform title field. The initial article should be retained here because of the field's transcription function, with the filing indicator compensating for it. This is similar to the function that the 245 serves for many distinctive titles that do not require constructed uniform titles (at least until we have 1XX $t$ in bibliographic records). We also transcribe the initial articles here, and compensate for them with filing indicators.

In a different sense, field 740 also serves two functions. Though it's not a uniform title, it is somehow "constructed" from information elsewhere (245, 500, etc.), but it also (usually) directly reflects transcribed information. I'm not sure why LC has chosen not to transcribe initial articles in 740s, but I guess it's partly because of the field's "constructed" nature (and the desire to save a few keystrokes).

QUESTION: Exactly what is meant by the value of two blanks in the Comp fixed field? BF&S says it means "no information supplied" and your Music Coding and Tagging book does not elaborate on that. Does the value of two blanks mean that the cataloger has chosen not to code the field (it is an optional field), or that the piece you're cataloging has not supplied any information (such as by having a non-descriptive title, e.g., Pumpkins on the Plains)?

ANSWER: Regarding "Comp", "no information supplied" generally means that the area simply has not been coded (as you point out, it is optional); the blanks do not otherwise convey any information. The code "uu" would cover pieces with non-descriptive titles or that do not have a readily determined form or genre. The code "zz" would cover pieces in forms not on the code list.

QUESTION: I'm cataloging a recording of Faure piano music where one of the items is Nocturnes 1-5. The uniform titles on the copy I have are:

Nocturnes, $m$ piano, $n$ no. 1-3, op. 33
Nocturnes, $m$ piano, $n$ no. 4, op. 36,
$r$ Eb major
Nocturnes, $m$ piano, $n$ no. 5, op. 37,
$r$ Bb major

I've been mulling this over, and I can't figure out the best way to do this. Faure messed this all up, of course, by giving them separate numbers, then grouping them differently by opus number. There is nothing in the LCNAF and people have made all sorts of different interpretations in OCLC. The way I see it, I have three choices: a) do it the way I've already described; b) group them together as Nocturnes, $m$ piano, $n$ no. 1-5 (since Faure did number them separately); c) use only opus numbers and not numbers in the uniform titles (which doesn't really work since Faure gave them the numbers -- why did he do that? He must have known it would confuse some poor cataloger).

ANSWER: These artists are so inconsiderate, aren't they? AACR2 25.32B1, its MCD, and their references to 25.6B all make it clear that your second choice is correct. This is corroborated by the established uniform titles for the various collections of Beethoven's string quartets. Most closely analogous is the uniform title for the "middle"
quartets, comprising the three op. 59 quartets, and the single quartets of op. 74 and 95:

*Quartets, $m$ strings, $n$ no. 7-11* (n82040729)

For both the Faure nocturnes and the Beethoven quartets, individual works are identified first by serial number in the collected sequence, then by opus number, and finally when needed, by serial number within the respective opus. To identify a collection of consecutive parts of the larger "work," the serial numbers in the collective sequence suffice.

---

**SUMMARY OF THE MOUG ANNUAL MEETING: MARCH 2, 1994 KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 2 March 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-12:00 Workshop: Cataloging Music Videos (Jay Weitz, OCLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:00 Plenary Session I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*News from OCLC (Jay Weitz, OCLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NACO Music Update (Karen R. Little, University of Louisville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*News from the Library of Congress (Deta S. Davis, Library of Congress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:45 *Business Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:00 Plenary Session II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Pricing: The View from OCLC (Liz Bishoff, Director, Member Relations, OCLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effective Use of OCLC Products: Staff Training (Joan Schuitema, Northwestern University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:45 Presentation and Discussion Sessions (Concurrent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*OCLC Reference Services: Comparing Costs with the Competition (Ruthann McTyre, Baylor University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Technical Services: Coping with Changes in OCLC Hardware and Software Requirements (David Lesniaski, St. Olaf College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45-5:15 Closing Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Pricing: A View from Technical Services Administration (John Popko, Assistant Director for Technical Services, University of Missouri--Kansas City)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This issue covers Plenary Session I (the “News from” reports), and the Presentation and Discussion Sessions; it also includes the minutes from the Business Meeting. The next issue of the Newsletter will cover Workshop: Cataloging Music Videos, Plenary Session II and the Closing Remarks.

---

**PLENARY SESSION I**

**NEWS FROM OCLC**

See Jay Weitz’s column above.

**NACO-MUSIC PROJECT**

Karen Little
Chair, NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee

**Introduction**

The NACO-Music Project (NMP) exists to create and contribute music-related name and name/uniform title authority records to the Library of Congress authority file. The NACO-Music Project acts as one contributor in a larger project that consists of over 100 libraries across the country. The Project is MOUG sponsored and is coordinated by Ralph Papakhian of Indiana University. It is guided by an Advisory Committee of four individuals who are appointed by the MOUG Board. The Project participants, music catalogers at fourteen different institutions, create or modify authority records, as necessary, for headings that they encounter in their cataloging. The creation and/or modification of records is accomplished according to specific Library of Congress guidelines.

**Participants**

In previous years, individuals had been added to the Project informally, often as a result of individuals being trained to contribute to the Project while employed by Indiana University and then moving on to other employment. But as the Project grew, this informality became increasingly impractical. So, in January of 1993, a call for applications to the Project was made. By the April 1 deadline, twelve applications had been received. The Advisory Committee’s intention was to select one or two
candidates, using the following as a basis for selection:
- strength of an institution's reference and score collections
- sufficient cataloging activity to support creation of a reasonable number of new headings
- ability to make a commitment of time and staff resources that the Project requires
- collection types that would add a diversity of headings to the Project's overall contributions
- ability to provide technical links to a utility
- whether the host institution is a LC-NACO participant

The Advisory Committee also considered geographic issues that would facilitate training and ongoing support. As mentioned earlier, this was the first time that applications for participation in the Project had been screened. This, and the strong pool of applications received, led to lengthy deliberations by the Advisory Committee. Finally, in August, the Advisory Committee's recommendation for six new participants went to the MOUG Board for their approval after which the selected institutions were announced. They were:

Bowling Green State University
Brown University
Oberlin College Conservatory of Music
Princeton University
University of California-Berkeley
University of Texas-Austin

Training for the institutions then began.

Although the original intention was to accept only one or two participants, the possibility of local training at many of the institutions under consideration allowed the Advisory Committee to increase that number to six. For instance, Yale University's close proximity to Brown University allowed Ann Caldwell, from Brown, the opportunity to easily travel to Yale for training. Catalogers at Oberlin, Berkeley, and UT-Austin were all trained in NACO procedures by catalogers in their libraries who were already participants in the larger NACO Project. Bowling Green State University will be trained by OCLC staff with a follow-up training session by Ralph Papakhian later this month. Unfortunately, Princeton had to withdraw from the Project prior to training.

This brings the total number of institutions participating in the NACO-Music Project to fourteen. They are:

Bowling Green State University
Brown University
Eastman School of Music
Indiana University
Northwestern University
Oberlin College Conservatory of Music
Stanford University
University of California-Berkeley
University of California-San Diego
University of Louisville
University of Texas-Austin
Vassar College
Washington University, St. Louis
Yale University

Statistics

It might be helpful to understand that from the total of fourteen institutions participating in the Project, only four catalogers are considered "independent." To be "independent" means that one's authority work has passed a rigid quality assurance test. Upon passing this test, that cataloger's authority work may be submitted directly to the Library of Congress's authority file as a NACO-Music Project authority record. All other individuals' authority work must pass through a reviewer. Mickey Koth, at Yale University, is the reviewer for authority work submitted by Brown University. Mark Scharff, at Washington University in St. Louis, is the reviewer for work submitted by Oberlin. Ralph Papakhian, as Project Coordinator, is the reviewer for all other catalogers with the exception of Sue Stancu, also at Indiana University, who is the fourth independent participant. Future expansion of the Project will rely heavily on other participants becoming independent contributors and therefore available to serve as reviewers.

Through this review process, a total of 4,905 new music-related authority records were contributed to the Library of Congress authority file by NACO-Music Project participants in calendar 1993. Changes were made to 580 existing authority records. This is similar to the number of contributions made in the previous calendar year.

We would also like to thank our liaisons at the Library of Congress. These are individuals who serve as resources for the more difficult headings that
we encounter. Our liaison through June of 1993 was Steve Yusko. Valerie Weinberg served as liaison until December when Virginia Gifford began her six month term. The participants greatly appreciate the assistance that these persons give us throughout the year.

Composer Projects

In addition to submitting authority records for name and name/uniform headings as they are encountered in a cataloger's daily work, the Project has supported the work of three composer projects. In these projects, authority records were created for all appropriate headings in Library of Congress AACR2 bibliographic records that were not already represented in the authority file and that required cross references. Linda Barnhart, at the University of California-San Diego, completed a Prokofiev project a couple of years ago. Mickey Koth, of Yale, finished a Robert Schumann project around this time a year ago. Currently, Mickey is working on a Beethoven project that she inherited from Linda. If you are interested in seeing authority records for a particular composer added to the LC NAF, please let me or any of the other participants know.

Welcome Packet and Handbook

An undertaking of the Advisory Committee this year, in addition to the selection of new participants, was to create a Welcome Packet. This packet contains a welcoming cover letter, a copy of the charge of the Advisory Committee, an address list of all participants, and, most importantly, a copy of the draft Handbook.

The Handbook was originally compiled by Mickey Koth and Jeff Earnest. Mickey now has primary responsibility for the handbook and continues to update and supplement it with additional examples. The Handbook is predominantly a primer with examples for use in constructing LC-style authority records. It is the NACO-Music Project's intention to continue to view the handbook as a working draft and to in no way consider the handbook as an authorized Library of Congress or NACO document. We were pleased, however, that it was consulted during the compilation of an official NACO document, The NACO Participant's Manual, which is due out in June. This manual, drafted by Amy McColl, NACO Coordinator for the Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries, will address general issues for individuals constructing full LC authority records.

Cooperative Cataloging Council/Other Library of Congress Initiatives

Throughout the past year, the Advisory Committee and NMP participants monitored the work of the Cooperative Cataloging Council and provided that group feedback when appropriate. The Library of Congress' Cooperative Cataloging Teams also took up some issues that directly relate to our efforts. The Teams solicited suggestions from NACO participants on so-called LC-centric Rule Interpretations and cataloging procedures. As a result of this solicitation, LC's Cataloging Policy and Support Office anticipates the implementation of certain improvements with the publication of revised documentation due out early this year. Two (2) improvements scheduled to appear in this update were submitted by our Coordinator, Ralph Papakhian. They are the elimination of linking references from pre-AACR2 headings and the easing restrictions on cross references for personal names. These changes should greatly facilitate the work of the NACO-Music Project. In addition, the Library of Congress has proposed several possible ways in which the NACO-Music Project might expand more quickly. We are excited about this prospect of quicker expansion and are pleased to have strong support and backing from the Library of Congress. We hope to have the mechanisms in place for additional expansion in the coming weeks.

Conclusion

As always, NACO-Music Project participants appreciate feedback on the work they are doing. We hope that the contribution of 4,500 to 5,000 music-related authority records to the Library of Congress authority file per year has some impact on the work of the music cataloging community. The MOUG Board supports the project with their time and money and would also appreciate hearing from you about the Project.
NEWS FROM LC
Deta S. Davis
Library of Congress

During the past year there has been considerable examination of the process of music cataloging at the Library of Congress and preparation for major changes in the near and long-term future. The process formally began with the creation of the Music Cataloging Task Force in March 1993, chaired by Mark Ziomek of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office. The charge to the group was (1) to recommend strategies for reducing the cataloging arrearages of sound recordings, scores, and other music materials; (2) to present options for how the responsibility for reducing the arrearage might be more evenly distributed over the arrearage reduction staff in the four areas responsible for cataloging music; (3) to review Library of Congress policy for cataloging music and recommend policy changes that will enable the library to use records generated outside the library more efficiently; (4) and to clarify the role of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office in establishing policy and responding to inquiries about cataloging practice. Other members of the task force were Catherine Garland of the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division, Ray White of the Music Division, Bill Palmer of the Enhanced Cataloging Division, and Ken Valdes and myself representing the Special Materials Cataloging Division.

After a few meetings of this group, four participants with excellent credentials representing the music world outside the Library of Congress were invited to join us for a two day meeting on April 29-30. The outside participants were Linda Barnhart of University of California, San Diego, Ralph Papakhian of Indiana University, Joan Swanekamp of Columbia/University, and Ross Wood of Wellesley College. Topics explored by the Task Force included automation and the increased use of technology, LC's use of OCLC, cataloging simplification, and cooperative projects.

The "Recommendations of the Music Cataloging Task Force" included the recommendation originally offered by Ralph Papakhian that LC perform its music cataloging on OCLC. This recommendation was implemented in the Enhanced Cataloging Division, in November 1993, and will soon be implemented in the Music and Sound Recordings Teams in the Special Materials Cataloging Division. Many people at LC are contributing to the effort, with coordination from John Graves of the Automation Planning and Liaison Office. Significant obstacles have had to be overcome, such as creating communication links with OCLC, developing software that would work with both OCLC and LC's systems, and providing adequate hardware for each staff member. Planning for the conversion is continuing for the Music and Sound Recordings Teams. Remaining tasks include receiving the last of our hardware and negotiating the change in work procedures with the union.

Several issues brought up in the Task Force report will be addressed with the arrival of Barbara Tillett, the new chief of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office, who is coming to us from the University of California, San Diego. She is scheduled to begin work at the Library of Congress on March 7. Her reputation as an expert in bibliographic description and authority control will be a great asset as we examine music cataloging simplification issues brought up in the report, together with the responses you have sent us. Other issues we are holding for her arrival include transferring the responsibility for music policy questions to the Cataloging Policy and Support Office. Until final details are worked out, you can continue to send your queries to the music specialists in the Cataloging Policy and Support Office, Geraldine Ostrove or Mark Ziomek (cpso@mail.loc.gov), or to the team leaders of the Music and Sound Recordings Teams (palmer@mail.loc.gov or davis@mail.loc.gov). The final issue awaiting Ms. Tillett's arrival is developing the Library of Congress' official position on the Music Thesaurus. With her input, we will examine the impact of the Music Thesaurus on cataloging policy and decide how we will proceed with this issue.

Paralleling the library's cooperation within the book community, we are pursuing several examples of cooperation with the music library community. The issuance of the Music Cataloging Task Force Final Report for comment to MLA is an example of this outreach and a starting point for dialogue with the music cataloging community. We realize that we do not work in an ivory tower at the top of a hill and that we cannot ignore the contributions to music cataloging that you are making. We seek your comments and input on the issues raised in the report. With the enormous arrearages we confront we cannot afford to continue business as usual, but must reevaluate all aspects of our music cataloging.
In reality, we will not be able to please every interest, but we are working toward intelligent and considered solutions to the costs of music cataloging.

Under the auspices of the Cooperative Cataloging Council, the Core Bibliographic Record for Music Task Group is currently being formed. Joan Schuitema, from Northwestern, will be the chair. I will be the Library of Congress representative. Other members of the group will be named by Joan after the MLA meeting. The charge of this group is to develop standards for core bibliographic records for scores and sound recordings which can be accepted without modification or which can be dynamically enhanced by program participants.

Last year I reported on the major reorganization of the Cataloging Directorate and several resulting staff changes. The changes are almost continuous and it's hard to know what is business as usual. Since the reorganization, Special Materials Cataloging Division has not had a permanent chief appointed. Our seventh and current acting chief is Susan Vita. The vacancy announcement for our chief position is ready for posting and we hope that a permanent chief will be in place before the end of the year.

In the area of retirements, Ken Valdes, Team Leader of the Music and Sound Recordings Team II left the library in October. His successor, William Palmer began in January. Bill was the Head of the Special Cataloging Section in the Enhanced Cataloging Division and was a member of the Music Section when it was in the Descriptive Cataloging Division about twelve years ago. We welcome his return. Pat Hines, the Assistant Chief of the Special Materials Cataloging Division, also retired in October. The current Acting Assistant Chief is John Graves, who will be in this position until the middle of March. Music and Sound Recordings Team I will be gaining a new cataloger, Lucas Graves, by transfer. Yet another reorganization is currently in progress which involves the abolishment of the Enhanced Cataloging Division. As a result of this latest reorganization, the Special Cataloging Section from Enhanced will be moved virtually intact to the Special Materials Cataloging Division to become the Music and Sound Recordings III Team. Frank Seidlinger will be their Team Leader. Their work will remain the same.

In the Music and Sound Recordings Teams, with the use of consultative management, we have almost doubled our productivity since the reorganization. We have also achieved one of our major goals in arrearage control, clearing the arrearage of scores requiring full cataloging. When the Special Materials Cataloging Division was first given the mandate for clearing this arrearage, it had peaked at 4500 items. This arrearage was eliminated in December 1993 by the two Music and Sound Recording Teams while we kept current with receipts. At present no arrearage of scores requiring full cataloging exists. Our next goals are to clear the Production Level Cataloging (PLC) score arrearage and significantly increase our sound recording cataloging. We expect the PLC score arrearage to be eliminated by the end of 1997.

Our other focus, sound recording cataloging, will involve significant procedural changes. We currently face an arrearage of 1.3 million published sound recordings and 1 million archival sound recordings. The library has pledged itself to have 80% of this arrearage cleared by the year 2000 while keeping current with receipts. It is clear that with an arrearage of this size we cannot afford to perform traditional cataloging for each item and we must look for innovative solutions for this problem. We are working cooperatively with the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division to find a mutually acceptable way of managing this arrearage. One likely option would be to accept all OCLC sound recording cataloging with minimal, if any, editing. These OCLC records, along with inventory-level records, could be placed in a resource file at the Library of Congress. Overall, we are pleased with the improvements in cooperation and technology within the Library that will make possible this change. In addition, the music catalogers in the Music and Sound Recordings Teams I and II have committed to at least double their sound recording cataloging output. Other ways we are exploring of managing this arrearage include collection-level, accession-level, and brief cataloging, as well as contract cataloging.

A new program was begun last year to allow the exchange of catalogers from outside libraries into the Library of Congress and vice versa. One of the original participants was Michi Hoban, Assistant Catalog Librarian, Dartmouth College Library. She participated in the Library of Congress Catalogers Exchange Program from September 7 to December
3, 1993, reporting to the Music and Sound Recordings Team I team leader and working with Harry Price in Music and Sound Recordings Team II. She concentrated on examining the process of cataloging as it is actually carried out by the catalog librarians in the Library of Congress. Her visit resulted in a report with several recommendations which included improving automation and bringing our cataloging documentation up to date.

Enhanced Cataloging Division

Significant strides were made in the reduction of popular music sound recordings arrearages during fiscal 1993 in the Special Cataloging Section of the Enhanced Cataloging Division. A total of 22,861 sound recordings were cataloged representing a 33% increase in overall production.

On November 16, the cataloging staff began creating new records and updating exact match records for popular music sound recordings directly on OCLC. The advantage of not having to re-key exact match records became evident immediately as the cataloging production continued despite a period of training and time needed to get new printers functional. By the end of the calendar year, an additional 3,533 sound recordings were cataloged. The majority of records handled by the Enhanced Cataloging Division have copy on OCLC, but some original brief music cataloging is also being input directly into OCLC. All LC music records created on OCLC using copy cataloging will continue to contain field 042 code "lccopycat."

The Cataloging Distribution Service is not yet able to distribute the sound recording records created by the Enhanced Cataloging Division on OCLC, but will do so as soon as appropriate software is ready. The current target for this is June 1994. In the short term, there will be fewer sound recording records on the MDS Complete monthly music files. However, when the retrospective file of these records is received and processed by LC, MDS Complete subscribers can expect a one time release of a relatively large volume of sound recording records. Special notification will be included with that distribution file.

Processing Section
Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division

The Processing Section’s sound recordings processing staff—Section Head Catherine Garland, four catalogers and four technicians—undertook a variety of activities during 1993. Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound receives about 2700 new sound recordings each month through Copyright and a blanket order with Theodore Front. Among the retrospective sound recordings received last year were 350,000 jazz 78s from a New York collector and dealer; a Jelly Roll Morton collection; and sound recordings from collections such as those belonging to Danny Kaye, Aaron Copland, Jascha Heifetz, and Leonard Bernstein. To control these receipts, the division began planning for an in-house inventory control system which will use Caudra Star software.

Cataloging of the World Archive of Hispanic Literature on Tape was completed, as was cataloging of the Brander-Matthews Oral History Collection. The radio program “One Night Stand”, broadcast over the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service, was inventoried and cataloged, as was another radio broadcast series, “The Greatest Story Ever Told”. The NAACP collection was also cataloged. Work is progressing on a comprehensive finding aid to the library’s holdings of “Meet the Press”.

Cooperative Cataloging

Presently NACO-Music now includes 14 libraries which contributed 4,663 NARs in fiscal 1993 and 1,768 to date in fiscal 1994. In addition, 1,026 NARs were changed in both FY93 and to date in FY94. The LC liaisons you have worked with were Steve Yusko from October 1992 to June 1993, Valerie Weinberg from June through November 1993, and June Gifford from December 1993 to the present. Quality control by the Library of Congress ended in late 1992. The liaisons continued answering questions, performing bibliographic file maintenance, and clearing up problems such as duplicate name authorities. A change in policy will be implemented in the next release of the Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1 this spring. It will allow libraries to add name/title authority records when they are needed as part of a project. The NACO-Music Project is recognized as a project for the purpose of this DCM. When this DCM is issued,
NACO-Music libraries will no longer be restricted to the Library of Congress practice requiring cross-references or recording research.

We are now discussing the possible expansion of the NACO-Music Project. The Library of Congress has suggested to the NACO Music Project Advisory Committee some possible options for expanding NACO Music participation. For example, we could be willing to work with the advisory committee in forming a second NACO music project. LC could train a second coordinator. We would need someone who would have strong institutional support for the project and an aptitude for creating and reviewing name authority records. There may be many qualified candidates among the current NACO Music Project participants who could take on this responsibility.

Library of Congress Cataloging Products

The Library of Congress is well along in its conversion of the Library of Congress classification to the MARC format. LC Classification online has significant potential for assisting catalogers and improving bibliographic access. The development was begun as part of a foundation supported project to improve access to business materials. Gerry Ostrove will be converting Class M and investigating the addition of subject access terminology to classification records as well as to the index.

The Library of Congress' Cataloging Distribution Service is announcing the release of the Music Catalog on CD-ROM. The Music Catalog is a single CD-ROM disk containing over 200,000 music-related US MARC records. Included are over 160,000 LC MARC records, 11,400 records describing the Albert Schatz collection of opera librettos, and over 30,000 opera-related LC Pre-MARC records. Morgan Cundiff will be making a presentation about the Music Catalog on Thursday at 4:00 at the Online Reference Services Subcommittee Program. Fully functional demo diskettes are available from Mr. Cundiff.

Closing Remarks

The budget situation for the Library of Congress continues to be a major factor in all aspects of the library's operation. So that it could fund mandatory pay increases, LC offered an incentive buy out program for 250 staff who were eligible for retirement. 245 staff members took advantage of this program. While some areas of the library may have additional staff cuts forthcoming, arrearage-reduction staff are generally protected from Reductions in Force because of the importance of our mission. However, it also looks as if we will be unable to hire any new staff for at least two years if not more. Dr. Billington has asked Congress for a $385 million budget for fiscal 1995, representing a 7.9 percent increase ($26.1 million) over fiscal 1994. This amount is needed to finance mandatory pay and price level increases and to prevent further reductions in service. Following Dr. Billington's presentation and request, Rep. Vic Fazio and other subcommittee members lamented that the LC budget is lumped in with that of the rest of the legislative branch, which is under heavy political pressure for reduction. Increases which are requested are unlikely to be approved. However, in the Cataloging Directorate and the Special Materials Cataloging Division we are optimistic that with our present staff, we can continue our high level of arrearage reduction and achieve the goals we have set forth for ourselves thus benefiting the greater music library community as well.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION SESSIONS

OCLC Reference Services: Comparing Costs with the Competition
Ruthann McTyre
Public Services Coordinator

While the actual costs and comparisons of the services are fairly cut-and-dried, there are other factors that contribute to the total costs of offering any of these services. Questions addressed by the group were: 1. What services does your library offer? 2. What gets the most use by librarians and by patrons? 3. Where does your funding come from? 4. Are you maintaining your paper versions of these products? There was considerable concern expressed over this final question. How do we convince our administrators that we MUST hold on to our subscriptions to the paper versions for our faculty and students?
Other considerations which were addressed all too briefly were staff considerations, funding, additional and hidden costs, number of databases available per service, cost savings (again bringing up the paper subscription dilemma), and non-dollar costs.

Unfortunately, time was not on our side for any kind of in-depth discussion. However, there is no reason why we can’t continue the discussion on cost comparisons via the Newsletter. How does the membership feel about the paper subscription issue? Now that many of us have had time to use EPIC or FirstSearch for an extended period of time, what changes would you like to see? How do the OCLC products compare with CD-ROMs? Do you look forward to the day we can, to quote a colleague, “dance on the grave” of CD-ROMs?

Articles used in preparation for this session are:


Zarnosky, Margaret R. “Knowledge served on a silver Platter: planning and paying for CD-ROMs.” RQ, v. 31, no. 1, Fall 1992, pp. 75-84.


Coping with changes in OCLC hardware and software requirements

David Lesniaski
St. Olaf College

The MOUG presentation made use of several transparencies which are not reproducible here. What follows is a summary rather than a typescript of the presentation.

Abstract

From OCLC’s beginnings in the late 1960s until quite recently, the various changes in OCLC technology and software did not substantially impact the way we used OCLC in cataloging. With the confluence of several developments, including the ability to access OCLC through a LAN, the Internet, and other software (e.g. Gateway), the increased speed and reliability of the OCLC network, the developments in computing technology, affordability of computers, and the enhancements to the Passport and Microenhancer software, many libraries are looking anew at how they are using OCLC in technical services. The development and acceptance of the cataloger’s workstation will both drive and depend on these changes. It is possible these changes will force us to reconsider the nature of the cataloging record.

Software

Developments in software, from word processing programs to music notation programs, coupled with hardware changes and other system enhancements have considerably shortened the distance from conception to product in many cases. It is now relatively easy, for example, to do desktop publishing which is comparable in quality to products requiring the services of a professional printer several years ago. I would argue the same trend holds for cataloging. Until the 1980s, OCLC terminals were used mostly for producing catalog cards, with the catalog card as the “product” of the intellectual work of cataloging. Most of us still produce cards for one reason or another, but the “product” more and more is found in the online catalog rather than the card catalog. Indeed, in many systems it is possible to do the cataloging locally, then upload to OCLC, which is the reverse of the process of the past two decades or so. So, two things have happened in the past few years: the product itself has changed from a card in the card catalog to an online record in the online catalog, and the distance from the conception to the product is closer and more locally based than previously (i.e., the form of the bibliographic record displayed in the local catalog usually is the result of local decisions rather than external decisions). These changes have implications not only for workflow but in the quality of the product we create, as I will argue later in this paper.

OCLC technological changes

I won’t spend much time detailing the various changes in OCLC technology from the M100 terminal to the M486 workstation of today. What is most striking to me in looking back on the M100 terminals (and theirrelatives) is their use in cataloging then compared to the use which PCs now have in cataloging. Most institutions—large or
small—had very few of these terminals relative to the number of people doing cataloging. Most catalogers worked from printouts or from workforms. In some cases the catalogers would have scheduled terminal time to input their own corrections or records; in other cases the catalogers would write out their corrections or workforms and give them to “the inputters”. This is how some institutions still operate. Many institutions, however, are moving away from paper-based workforms and are attempting to provide immediate OCLC access for every cataloger so each cataloger catalogs directly online. This is a major paradigm shift in the way we work (though, perhaps ironically, it brings back memories of an earlier era where catalogers typed their own catalog cards at their own desks.)

Several developments over the past several years have hastened this change. It is not due just to the move from “dumb” terminals to PCs, but is caused by this move coupled with the introduction and enhancement of the communications controller, the new network, the Passport software, the Microenhancer, and related CD-ROM products. These simultaneous developments have made it economically realistic for us to have direct access to the OCLC database (or the bibliographic record or workform) from our own machines; it has become less and less necessary—or efficient—to skimp on terminals and catalog via printout or workform. More specifically:

- computers are relatively inexpensive and can be used for many activities, not just OCLC;
- network access also is relatively inexpensive, and the potential for several types of access to the OCLC network [described below] has lessened the need for paper-based cataloging;
- the ease and flexibility of using Passport software for cataloging has lessened the time needed on the terminal for the physical act of keying in a record;
- the searching enhancements to OCLC coupled with Passport’s editing capabilities (such as cut-and-paste) make cataloging or editing online more efficient in terms of time and accuracy than printing out relevant bibliographic or authority records, editing the printouts, then keying the information into the bibliographic record.

Computers and network access are so cheap, in fact, that if you start adding up telecommunications and hardware costs, it seems more and more unrealistic to do the “double work” of writing/typing worksheets or printouts manually. For example, if you catalog 150 scores a month, and the act of typing up a score workform to give to an inputter (or to input yourself) takes, say, 10 minutes per score (and this isn’t unrealistic if you want to proof, check diacritics, then proof the record after it’s entered), this comes out to 1500 minutes or 25 hours per month. At, say, $10/hour labor costs (and this is not terribly high, especially if benefits are included) this comes to $250 per month or $3,000 per year for work which is duplicated and which is a complete waste of time. Even one port on the communications controller (which is a relatively expensive way to go, as shown below) at ca. $1,500 per year, coupled with a modest computer at $1,500 (amortized over 5 years for a real cost of $300/year) yields a total yearly cost of $1,800, leading to the conclusion that it is cheaper by far to catalog directly online than using paper workforms and scheduled terminal time. I’d also argue the product is better: there is less chance for error via multiple typings and less chance for errors in authority work, since the LC authority file and related bibliographic records are easily accessible.

LANS, TLP, Gateway

Access to OCLC for the past several years typically has been through the OCLC Communications Controller (also called the comm controller). This device normally provides a direct connection from an individual workstation to OCLC. It also can be quite expensive, since each port can cost nearly $1500 per year. There are now other possibilities for OCLC access, including LAN (Local Area Network)-based connections and an Internet connection.

A LAN connection allows a local network to act as an intermediary between the stations linked to the network and the comm controller. Rather than the 1-1 terminal to comm controller port connection, the LAN allows several users to share a smaller number of ports (assuming not everyone logs on at once). Although this option usually requires the initial costs of connecting to the LAN, the savings from decreasing the number of ports on the comm controller can more than make up for this expense over a few years (and there are the other benefits of direct access to campus or institutional LANs in addition to OCLC).
A more sophisticated solution is offered by the TLP (Telecommunications Linking Program). This bypasses the comm controller and allows direct access to OCLC's network from your local network. All the terminals in your institution (or your institution and neighboring institutions) can be connected to your LAN; the TLP will allow the LAN to communicate directly with the OCLC network. Initially this solution is not cheap, either, for it requires at a minimum direct access to a LAN which can communicate with the OCLC network. OCLC telecommunications charges probably will not be less than your institution now pays, but the network connection will allow more people to access OCLC by bypassing the limitations of the comm controller.

An even more elaborate connection is offered through the Gateway software: built on the TLP, the Gateway software will allow any kind of terminal (from dumb terminal to PC to Macintosh) to connect to OCLC through your LAN. There is an additional initial charge of $16,000 on top of the LAN/TLF charges. Gateway is targeted to large institutions which have made a substantial investment in many different types of equipment and would find it more economical to pay for the Gateway software than to replace equipment hitherto incompatible with OCLC's Passport software.

In late April 1994 OCLC is planning to allow access to the database through the Internet, using Passport software. There will be a per-hour connect charge, but it likely will be around $3.50/hour, considerably less than dial-access charges from many locations. (However, if you plan on using the Internet option, calculate your costs carefully: more than 2-3 hours per day would be more expensive than the charge for a comm controller port.)

How does all this affect workflow?

In my view paper-based cataloging is a thing of the past. It seems far less expensive to catalog directly on OCLC (or on a local system) than to scribble on workforms and have an inputter transcribe the information. See the various costs and scenarios detailed above. Although equipment charges are "up front" costs and seem quite high compared to the cost of, say, xeroxing workforms, the labor costs of paper-based cataloging are much higher. They are not as noticeable simply because they are hidden. Moreover, it seems that the chances for error are considerably diminished if the cataloging passes through one set of hands rather than two or three and if the cataloger constructing the record has immediate access to the LC authority file and the OCLC database. Authority work, too, can change; it probably is easier in the online environment to do authority work at the time of cataloging.

We also have to be more aware of the different possibilities for using OCLC, especially for those of us in remote locations or stand-alone libraries. Equipment and networking possibilities are changing rapidly, and knowledge of these changes can benefit our work greatly.

The future

OCLC's Passport software requires less in computing power than most software. For example, it would be difficult to find a word processing program with any kind of sophistication which would require as little in hardware as Passport requires. This likely will change, however. The OCLC CJK system requires a 486 processor and operates in a Windows environment; the Library of Congress cataloger's workstation, a CD-ROM based product containing the RIs, MARC codes, and the LC subject heading manual also operates in a Windows environment and requires at least a 386 machine. I suspect both OCLC and the "next generation" of online catalogs will operate in a windowed environment as well.

There has been a good deal of static over the past few years about the lack of uniformity in the display of information in online catalogs. No two systems display cataloging information in the same way. Many systems allow the user to select the amount and type of information displayed. How this information is labeled and the order in which it is presented often are decisions made at a system level, and are not made in reference to any commonly-agreed upon set of standards or guidelines (such as AACR2). I do not see this situation changing; if anything, I suspect the flexibility of display in the online catalog will increase. Though catalogers are destined to be the curators of the arcana of the MARC record, it is conceivable that we, too, would be able choose the form of display we encode, from the present workform to (who knows?) a menu-driven, windows-based interactive workform.
The product

Until quite recently the "product" of our cataloging efforts was a set of catalog cards; OCLC functioned as a high-powered printing program. All that has changed with the advent of the online catalog. Now the "product" of our cataloging is both richer and more amorphous in the online catalog: richer because the information in the cataloging record can be accessed in many ways hitherto impossible; amorphous because access to the same bibliographic record—nor to mention its form and display—can vary widely from one system or user to the next. It is painfully clear that the profession's concept of the bibliographic record, now based on a set of rules designed for a card environment, is less than optimal online. Even the basic distinction between "descriptive" information and "access points" has become blurred. For example, most online systems provide at least keyword access to contents notes, yet contents notes traditionally are thought of as descriptive. (Since some systems can provide keyword access to any field in the record, all fields are keyword-accessible. Perhaps we should think of the bibliographic record in terms of "controlled vocabulary" and "uncontrolled vocabulary" fields rather than "descriptive" fields vs. "access points".)

Conceptual difficulties with the bibliographic record in the online environment aside, I am concerned with the "do less with less" philosophy which seems to have a significant following at the moment, especially among administrators. The call for redefining a "core" bibliographic record and the emphasis on minimal-level cataloging, driven in part by the cost of doing full-level cataloging and the cost of adapting copy cataloging to a specific institution's needs, likely will cause a significant loss of access to important information in the bibliographic record. Ironically, the flexibility of access provided by the online environment coupled with the increasing size of most catalogs requires better, not worse, cataloging. A collection of 200 items would need only the most rudimentary catalog (unless it were a peculiar and highly specialized collection); a collection of 20,000 items would need a much different level of cataloging to provide adequate access, and a collection of 2,000,000 items requires still a better catalog. If your library had, say, 1,500 books on environmental law, the user would expect the catalog to help him or her distinguish among them without excessive effort. It is hard to see how cataloging records lacking rich subject and keyword access, contents notes or summaries can be of significant help to users of such a collection, especially as catalogs increase in size. While some collections can get by with terse bibliographic records in their catalogs, not all can. Ultimately, all cataloging is local. The record which is adequate for one institution may not be so for another, and it is the responsibility of each institution to ensure that its own records are detailed enough for its patrons. However, it seems that each institution creating a master bibliographic record has a responsibility to provide as much accurate information as possible; entering minimal records merely passes the responsibility for enhancing the record on to someone else. In some cases this is desirable, if other libraries have information the inputting institution does not. Institutions which could take the time and trouble to provide full-level records but which choose not to are shirking their responsibilities to the cooperative effort which is the OCLC database. A national emphasis on minimal or core-record cataloging will ensure that catalog users generally will overlook information of use to them because the catalog will not lead them to it. It seems fruitless to spend enormous sums on acquiring items for our libraries which will be inaccessible or so inadequately described in the catalog that patrons will not be able to use the catalog to decide whether or not the items are of use to them. If a library can't afford to catalog the items it purchases, it shouldn't acquire them in the first place. It is that simple.

Moreover, as our technological environment becomes richer, it should be possible to include different information in the catalog. Integrated software packages operating in a windowed environment now provide both a flexible display interface and allow the embedding of several different types of information in one document. It is not all that difficult for a letter, say, to contain text, graphics, and sound. As different operating systems become better able to share data, as data transmission speeds increase and hardware continues to improve, it becomes more likely that catalogs in the near future will contain not only text but graphics, musical notation, and sound. It would seem that creating records now which are both accurate and complete would be the best investment for future enhancements to the catalog.

The way in which libraries use OCLC in cataloging is changing. OCLC's progress in
providing many communications options for different situations means it is more cost effective for catalogers to have direct access to OCLC than to edit printouts or paper workforms. The improvements in Passport software have made the mechanics of creating and editing the cataloging record much easier than previously. Other software (e.g., Windows, Newkey) can be used with Passport to enhance its efficiency. The next few years likely will see a continuation of these improvements in telecommunications and software efficiency, coupled with a move toward a windowed environment. The product—the bibliographic record—also is changing, but less because of consensus within the cataloging community than decisions made by system designers and local system librarians. The OCLC database is a monumental cooperative achievement. Just as OCLC is continuing to provide better access to its database, we in the cataloging profession need to continue to provide high quality cataloging to that database, and prepare to initiate enhancements to the cataloging record in a timely manner as the technology becomes available. If we cannot do so, we will find ourselves marginalized as cataloging managers at best and outsourced editors at worst. We owe it to our patrons and ourselves to do better.

Minutes of the MOUG BUSINESS MEETING
Wednesday, March 2, 1994
2:00-2:45 p.m.
Kansas City, Missouri

The meeting was called to order by Chair Laura Snyder at 2:10 p.m.

1. Adoption of agenda

   The agenda was adopted as written.

2. Approval of minutes

   The minutes of the last business meeting were approved as written in the MOUG Newsletter, no. 54 (May 1993).

3. Board reports

   A. Chair (Laura Snyder)

   Snyder introduced the current members of the Board, and thanked Tim Cherubini and Sue Weiland for their services as Continuing Education Coordinator and Secretary/Newsletter Editor, respectively. She then introduced the new Board members: Laura Gayle Green, replacing Cherubini; and Judy Weidow, replacing Weiland. Continuing Board members are Snyder as Past Chair, Ralph Papakhian as Chair, and Chris Grandy as Treasurer. Snyder thanked all the candidates, noting that agreeing to run takes as much commitment as serving. She also recognized the Nominating Committee for fielding a fine slate of candidates. Snyder said that it is not too soon to begin thinking about candidates for the offices coming open next year (Treasurer and Vice-Chair). Anyone who think s/he might be interested in either position is encouraged to talk to a current Board member for more information.

   Snyder announced that the other issue on the ballot, the amendments to the bylaws, passed by a wide margin. She thanked Jack Knapp and those who worked with him in proposing the amendments (Marilyn Craig, Candice Feldt, Sue Ellen Stancu, Anna Sylvester); and Chris Grandy for pulling it all together and preparing the ballot. The revised version of the bylaws will be published in a future issue of the Newsletter.

   The work of the NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee (Karen Little, Chair; Michelle Koth, Ralph Papakhian, and Laura Snyder) was recognized: several new participants have recently been added. Koth is the new Chair, and Snyder welcomed new member Joan Schuiltema (replacing Little).

   Snyder thanked Jay Weitz for leading the morning workshop; all the speakers; and the Program Committee. No meeting would be much without people willing to work up a program and people willing to speak! Finally, Snyder thanked the membership for the privilege of serving as Chair of MOUG.

   B. Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Sue Weiland)

   Weiland reported that there were three issues of the Newsletter mailed last year (issues 54-56). She asked speakers and people writing summaries to contact Judy Weidow for more information concerning sending their material to her for inclusion in future Newsletters.
C. Treasurer (Chris Grandy)
Grandy reported that MOUG currently has 264 personal and 275 institutional members. She pointed out that quarterly financial reports appear in each Newsletter and referred people to the Newsletter for a full accounting, mentioning just two important figures: a net gain of $2,000 for 1993, with $18,936.89 in cash available.

D. Continuing Education Coordinator (Tim Cherubini)
Cherubini noted that a total of 104 people participated in the meeting, attending the workshop or the general meeting or both. He announced that work is just beginning on the program for the 1995 meeting in Atlanta, and encouraged anyone interested to attend the Program Committee meeting.

4. Other reports

A. Best of MOUG (Judy Weidow)
Weidow announced the publication of The Best of MOUG, 5th edition. It has just been published and is available for purchase now. The price is $10.00. Weidow gave a brief description of the 5th edition, noting that it has authority record numbers for 10 prolific composers with English cross-references for the works of 12 Slavic composers. The RV and F. indexes for Vivaldi have been retained, and BWV and K. indexes added for Bach and Mozart. Everything is current to January 1994.

B. OLAC liaison (Ann Caldwell)
Caldwell has just replaced Ian Fairclough as the MOUG/OLAC liaison. She gave a report from the meeting of the Cataloging Policy Committee at ALA Midwinter. CAPC reviewed Lowell Ashley’s report on main entry and related matters for music videos and Richard Harwood’s justification for the cataloging of non-book materials. A set of guidelines for cataloging interactive media will be issued this spring; and a manual for the physical processing of non-print materials is also about to be published. CAPC also discussed several MARBI proposals, and the issue of establishing an OLAC representative to ALCTS.

5. Old business

There was no old business.

6. New business

A. RILM on FirstSearch/EPIC
Snyder thanked Jay Weitz for his quick action on addressing the fate of RILM. When Dialog suddenly dropped RILM from the list of indexes to which it provides access, Weitz picked up on Dialog’s action and started the process of investigating whether RILM could be added as a database to FirstSearch and EPIC. Serious discussions are currently underway among the appropriate parties.

B. Searching improvements for OCLC products—Discussion
A brief discussion concerning what enhancements people would like to see on PRISM, FirstSearch, and other OCLC products elicited the following ideas: 1) ability to qualify a search by format when using the browse indexes; 2) build browse indexes for names and subjects; 3) index all subfields in uniform titles; 4) add proximity searching and/or positional operators to keyword searching; 5) add field 262 subfield e to the index for the music number search; 6) add the PRISM capabilities to the CAT CD products. Anyone who is interested in working further on these suggestions should contact Ruthann McTyre.

7. Joint meeting with OLAC: program preview
Snyder explained that OLAC, unlike MOUG, meets only every other year. OLAC meetings are popular—attendance increases every year—and OLAC has become famous for the quality of the workshops held during meetings. Snyder went on to outline the cost of the joint meeting. Registration is significantly higher than for MOUG meetings, but is offset by other savings and benefits: the meeting (three days), is twice as long as a typical MOUG meeting; the registration fee includes a luncheon and the Newberry Consort concert; the hotel is cheaper than usual at $80.00 per night; and Chicago is within driving distance of a significant number of people. The membership was referred to an outline of the preliminary program in their registration packets. Ruth Inman and Connie Strait (both from the Chicago area) spoke from the perspectives of the Program and Local Arrangements Committees. The meeting will be a combination of practical workshops and sessions dealing with philosophical issues. The Internet session, for example, will have a hands-on
part as well as a discussion of how libraries and catalogers should respond. An additional session on authority control is being considered. Also, suggestions are being sought for people to serve on the panel for the advanced level sound recordings cataloging workshop. Oak Brook is a western suburb of Chicago, a pleasant area with several attractions close by, in addition to activities in downtown Chicago. Additional suggestions for tours are welcome. Snyder closed by mentioning the need for increased publicity for this meeting; anyone interested in assisting should contact Laura Gayle Green (Continuing Education Coordinator). Meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sue Weiland

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE BEST OF MOUG IS BACK!!!

The 5th edition of the Best of MOUG is now available. This edition has added a Bach BWV index and a Mozart K. index and is current to January, 1994. For more detailed information and ordering information, see the order form on the inside back page of this issue.

MOUG/OLAC NATIONAL CONFERENCE
October 5-8, 1994
Marriott Oak Brook, IL

Make plans for the joint meeting with OLAC in October. The theme of the program is "New Technologies, New Challenges," focusing on the evolving cataloging environment and the required education, training, and re-training strategies to keep up with it. There will be workshops on automated authority control, interactive multimedia cataloging, videorecording cataloging, computer files cataloging, subject and genre access to films and videos, map cataloging, format integration, two sound recordings workshops and an Internet overview. Optional tours will begin on Wednesday and will include the Curt Teich Postcard Museum, Lake County Museum, Museum of Broadcast Communications, Chicago Cultural Center (the former Chicago Public Library building), Fermi National Laboratory, Frank Lloyd Wright buildings, Morton Arboretum, and Replegie Globes. There will be an evening concert by the Newberry Consort.

The Marriott Oak Brook Hotel is located about 25 miles west of Chicago and across the street from Oak Brook Center, a shopping center with many stores (Marshall Fields, Nordstroms, Saks, Neiman Marcus) and restaurants. Rooms are $79.00 a night for all rooms.

Registration will be $85.00 and will include the concert and a luncheon.

Look for your registration materials in a separate mailing in June.
ORDER FORM

THE MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP PRESENTS

THE 5TH EDITION

THE BEST OF MOUG, 5th EDITION

The 5th edition of The Best of MOUG is now available. It contains Library of Congress Name Authority File records, current to January 1994, for Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Telemann and Vivaldi, with RV and F. indexes for Vivaldi’s instrumental works. It also contains English cross references for Bartok, Dvorák, Glazunov, Glinka, Janacek, Mussorgsky, Prokofiev, Rimsky-Korsakov, Shostakovich, Smetana, Stravinsky and Tchaikovsky. This new edition has added Bach arranged by BWV number and Mozart arranged by K. number.

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 $10.00 (North America) $15.00 (Overseas, U. S. funds).

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

NAME
ADDRESS

Please make your check out to the Music OCLC Users Group for $10.00 ($15.00 Overseas).

Send to:
MOUG
Judy Weidow
Cataloging S5453
The General Libraries
The University of Texas at Austin
P. O. Box P
Austin, TX 78713-7330

Phone: (512) 495-4191
FAX: (512) 495-4688
E-mail: LLJW@UTXDP.DP.UTEXAS.EDU

TAX NO: 31-0951917
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal membership is $10.00; institutional membership is $15.00; international membership (outside North America) 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): ____________________________

________________________________________________________________________

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

___ $10.00 Personal (North America)
___ $15.00 Institutional (North America)
___ $25.00 Personal and institutional (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and Mail to: Chris Grandy, Treasurer, Music OCLC Users Group, Knight Library, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1299.

Judy Weidow
MOUG Newsletter Editor
809 W. Center St.
Kyle, TX 78640

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO
JAMES A. MICHELEN LIBRARY
SERIALS DIVISION
GREELEY CO 80639