FROM THE CHAIR
Ralph Papakhian

All MOUG members should have already received registration materials for the OLAC/MOUG National Conference which will take place this October 5-8 in Oak Brook, Ill. When you receive this Newsletter, you will still have time to register if you have not yet done so. (Contact MOUG Secretary, Judy Weidow for the registration form if you do not have it.) The program is extremely attractive for A-V and music folk alike, with a plethora of practical workshops combined with a few general sessions. Several tours have been arranged for attendees as well as a concert by the Newberry Consort. I also note that eight MOUG members are speakers or workshop leaders!

There will be important cataloging workshops on interactive media, videorecordings, computer files, maps, and sound recordings. But you will only be able to attend 4 of the 10 workshops listed! The presenters of the Sound Recording Cataloging (Master Session) workshop request that interested parties submit questions and photocopies of difficult examples prior to the meeting (these can be sent to Sue Stancu, Indiana University Music Library, Bloomington, IN 47405, stancu@indiana.edu; or, Kathryn Burnett, Josten Library, Smith College, Northampton, MA 01063, kburnett@smith.smith.edu).

Other workshops will be format integration (yes, it will happen some day), subject and genre access to films and videorecordings, internet, and automated authority control. The general session feature speakers all have extensive A-V and music experience: Karen Horney, Carolyn O. Frost, Joan Swanekeemp, Sheila Intner. I certainly look forward to this meeting and hope to greet all of you there.

Speaking of meetings, planning for February 1995 in Atlanta is starting. We have reserved the Tuesday evening and Wednesday (Feb. 7-8) just prior to the MLA annual conference. Current thinking is that we will schedule one or more workshops for the Tuesday evening. General and small group meetings would be arranged for Wednesday (along with business meeting). Please send your opinions on the meeting structure or suggestions for topics to the Continuing Education Coordinator, Laura Green.

We are now in the process of forming a Nominations Committee which will seek out candidates for the offices of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect and Treasurer. If you are interested in these opportunities, please identify yourself to any member of the board. We will make sure that all names are forwarded to the committee.

The NACO-Music Project (NMP) Advisory Committee has also made considerable progress arranging another expansion of that cooperative effort. Music catalogers at libraries who have recently been trained in general NACO work by the Library of Congress will be invited to participate in NMP. This will add several new members quickly, and we hope to be able to accommodate additional music catalogers as more institutions get the LC training. Also, because we know that several music catalogers at institutions that are not general NACO libraries are also interested in the project, there is an application process for new participants open to any cataloger who can garner institutional support (see p. 18 inside). We have been developing a cooperative training program where participants who gain "independent" status (meaning they can contribute authority records without review) (continued on page 4)
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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. 21-57 are available from the Treasurer for $5.00 per copy).
Balance in Checking Account on April 1, 1994: $5,679.08
Balance in Savings Account on April 1, 1994: 13,608.15
Total Cash Available on April 1, 1994: $19,287.23

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>1,656.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Interest</td>
<td>69.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,176.14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

#### KC Meeting:
- Board Expense: $501.00
- AV: 100.00
- Reception/Coffee: 600.00
- Miscellaneous: 20.50

#### MOUG/OLAC Meeting:
- ALA Travel (Snyder:Mid-Winter): 150.00
- Registration Mailing:
  - Printing: 307.20
  - Postage: 59.80

#### Newsletter #57:
- Printing: 819.80
- Postage: 187.05
- Supplies: 4.30

#### Best of MOUG:
- Postage: 105.59
- Supplies: 21.90

#### Office Supplies:
- Mailing labels: 36.97
- Postage: 1.90

**Total Expenses**: $2,916.01

Net Loss: (739.87)

Balance in Checking Account on June 30, 1994: $4,869.57
Balance in Savings Account on June 30, 1994: 13,677.79
Total Cash Available on June 30, 1994: $18,547.36
are then called upon to serve as a reviewer for another new participant. This should help us to expand NMP significantly with an ever widening circle of reviewers. I suppose it could go on indefinitely, but surely there is a finite number of music catalogers.

As a practical matter, I would also like to remind everyone that "Amendments 1993 to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, second edition" was implemented in May. These have some significant changes in GMD placement and capitalization which will affect much music cataloging. It might be interesting if someone were to submit a report to the newsletter on why these changes were made and how they help our cause.

You may recall in Deta Davis' "News from LC" column in the last issue of the Newsletter (or from the Kansas City meeting where this report was presented) that the LC Music and Sound Recordings Teams I-II were planning on using OCLC for cataloging. Recently I had an opportunity to talk with Deta, and she was able to report that this transition occurred during the week of July 5. Each cataloger was trained in OCLC input/edit and now has a Bibliographic Work Station on her/his desk which connects to OCLC and LC/MUMS simultaneously. The catalogers will do virtually all bibliographic work for scores and sound recordings directly on OCLC and the corresponding authority work on LC/MUMS. Bibliographic records from OCLC will be electronically transferred to MUMS daily in an overnight process, and then these records will be re-distributed by CDS to all subscribers of the LC music MARC records. Authority work will continue on MUMS as it is currently done. One curiosity in the current process at LC is that the catalogers will be able to issue an update command only once on an OCLC record. For technical reasons associated with the way records are distributed amongst the various systems, any changes made to existing LC records will have to be made on MUMS not on OCLC. So if you see and/or report errors on one these records, assume that it may take a month or so for the correction to show up in the OCLC version of the record. I'm sure we will get more details on this entire process from LC and OCLC, but I think it is one of the most exciting developments in music cataloging since the implementation of the Music MARC format in OCLC. My personal thanks to everyone at LC and OCLC who made this possible! Now we will have to go and recruit this bunch of new music OCLC users to MOUG.

See you in Oak Brook.

FROM THE EDITOR
Judy Weidow

This issue contains the remaining reports from the Kansas City meeting except for the report of Joan Schuitema's session "Cost Effective Use of OCLC Products: Staff Training" which will be in the next issue. You will find some good advice on video cataloging in the article on Jay Weitz's workshop. There are some informative articles on OCLC product pricing with Liz Bishoff's view from OCLC and John Popko's technical services administration point of view.

Are you confused by the new placement of the GMD? Jay Weitz sorts it all out for you in the question and answer section of News from OCLC.

Watch for the next issue which will have the registration materials for the Atlanta meeting. If you need registration information for the Oak Brook meeting, please let me know.

The next newsletter issue will also have reports on the Oak Brook meeting. The deadline for the next issue is October 31.

FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR
Laura Gayle Green

The Program Committee (Ruth Inman, Margaret Kaus, Lois Kuyper-Rushing, and Cheryl Taranto) is working on a great program for the Atlanta meeting. We've come up with several ideas we think MOUG members will enjoy. In the meantime, if you have a particular MOUG-type interest you'd like to see as part of the program, please feel free to contact me (greenl@smtpgate.umkc.edu; 816-235-1679) or any member of the Program Committee. I'm looking forward to seeing you at OLAC/MOUG and hearing about what you'd like to see in future MOUG programs!

NEWS FROM OCLC
Jay Weitz
OCLC

Cataloging Products

As part of ongoing discussions about cooperation between the Library of Congress and OCLC, we are pleased to announce a new cataloging authorization mode, National Level Enhance. This adds to the
existing capabilities of Enhance mode the ability to replace most Online Union Catalog (OLUC) records without regard to Encoding Level. National Level Enhance participants will be able to replace records with a blank or numeric (1 or 8) Encoding Level, including those from LC and other national libraries, within their authorized bibliographic format(s). This new mode was intended for use first by selected LC cataloging staff and potentially later by participants in the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC), institutions that have other cooperative cataloging agreements with LC, and others chosen in consultation with LC. Those authorized under the new National Level Enhance mode will be able to edit OCLC member input records (Encoding Levels I and K), tapeloaded records (L and M), and records from the many national libraries and other resource files (blank, 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, and I). Almost the entire bibliographic record, except for certain system-supplied data (OCLC number, Date Used, etc.) will be subject to alteration. Any participating OCLC library may apply at any time for Regular Enhance; applications are available from the network offices. Participation in National Level Enhance will be by invitation only, in consultation with LC.

**PRISM Basics Training Materials**, which teach searching and navigating the PRISM Service and all of its databases, are now available. These materials are designed for new employees, student assistants, those who have not used PRISM, and those who want a "refresher." The materials include CBT with course guide, a set of paper-based exercises, and reference cards.

Now available from the American Library Association are the *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia* (Chicago : American Library Association, 1994) for $10.00. ISBN: 0-8389-3445-5. LCCN: 94-12686. OCLC #30547634. To order direct, call ALA Editions at 1-800-545-2433. Prepared by the Interactive Multimedia Guidelines Review Task Force of the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), these guidelines offer instructions on the cataloging of interactive multimedia resources. This emerging new class of materials uses sophisticated computer technology to allow users to navigate randomly through many types of media, interacting almost conversationally with the machine, customizing each presentation. Such materials are available in a variety of physical formats for a variety of machine environments. These guidelines are based on AACR2 concepts, particularly those found in the chapters for computer files, motion pictures and videotape recordings, sound recordings, and kits/multimedia (Chapters 9, 7, 6, and 1). They occasionally stretch those concepts to cover situations not specifically addressed in the existing rules. The guidelines are intended for temporary use within the Anglo-American cataloging community, allowing catalogers to test their usefulness before formal rule revision takes place.

The PromptCat service, which will provide cataloging for materials supplied by participating book vendors, is scheduled to be available in early 1995. PromptCat will deliver a cataloging record for any title having a monographic record in the OCLC Online Union Catalog.

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale entered the 30 millionth bibliographic record into the OCLC Online Union Catalog on March 22, 1994. It came five months after the 29 millionth record was logged, and 20 years after the first millionth record was entered in 1974. The 30 millionth record, added to the database using an OCLC Cataloging Micro Enhancer at 3:09 p.m. EST, was for the book, Comparative Study of PC-Based CAD/CAM 3-D Solid Modeling Utilization in Illinois, a thesis written by Michael J. Mulford.

The 1994 Electronic Dewey Update Disc, with over 200 changes from the 1994 Dewey updating bulletin, is now available.

**Dewey Decimal Classification: A Practical Guide**, which describes the key concepts behind DDC, and the two volumes of *Subject Headings for Children* will be available this summer. The latter offers simple, authoritative, and up-to-date sources for Library of Congress juvenile subject headings and the Dewey numbers that go with them.

As of June 20, 1994, the OCLC Authority File contained 3,326,566 LC Name Authority records and 209,288 LC Subject Authority records.

**Reference Products**

A new listserv for users of the EPIC service, OCLC's online reference service for library professionals, provides EPIC documentation over the Internet. EPIC-L provides the EPIC Reference Card, database documentation and price information for each database without requiring them to log on to EPIC. Users can also get lists of journal sources for individual EPIC databases. EPIC-L is modeled after FirstSearch-L, the Internet listserv that offers FirstSearch documentation, news about FirstSearch databases and search tips to users of The FirstSearch Catalog, the OCLC online reference service designed for library patrons. FirstSearch-L has been available for about one year and now has nearly 500 subscribers.
ABI/INFORM, a database that indexes and provides abstracts of articles from nearly 1,000 current business and management periodicals, is now available on The FirstSearch Catalog, OCLC's online reference service designed for library patrons. The ABI/INFORM database covers topics including company histories, competitive intelligence and new product development. It consists of bibliographic citations and 150-word abstracts of articles in U.S. and international professional publications, academic journals and trade magazines. The database is updated weekly and covers the period from August 1971 to the present. Produced by UMI of Ann Arbor, Mich., ABI/INFORM is available on The FirstSearch Catalog on a subscription basis only. ABI/INFORM has been available on the EPIC service, OCLC's reference service for library professionals, since 1990.

BusinessNews, a database that provides access to recent news stories and press releases, is now available on The FirstSearch Catalog and the EPIC service. BusinessNews contains brief summaries of news stories drawn from over 350 sources updated daily by the HeadsUp service of INDIVIDUAL, Inc. The database contains one to two weeks' worth of summaries dealing with subjects such as information technology, telecommunications, health care and defense. The summaries appear in FirstSearch and EPIC the day after they are released by the various news services.

To be released this fall, FirstSearch Version 3.0 will introduce the Boolean "OR" operator, full-text, and Holdings Control, making FirstSearch even easier to use and administer. Full-text ASCII articles from a thousand journal titles will be available online. Holdings Control will give library FirstSearch administrators the option to display regional or group holdings, or to turn off all holdings so that none are displayed with search results.

In late summer 1994, two new databases derived from the British Library Document Supply Centre's "Inside Conferences" will be made available on FirstSearch. ProceedingsFirst contains tables of contents records listing papers presented at worldwide conferences, professional meetings, and symposia to provide an overview of the activities at these meetings. PapersFirst provides access to individual papers presented at the meetings. Each paper will be described with key words and a description of up to 1500 characters.

Other databases that will be available on FirstSearch in mid-1994 include GEOBASE, Cumulative Book Index, Environmental Science & Pollution Abstracts, MDX Health Digest, and Index to Legal Periodicals.

Resource Sharing

Facts OnLine, a service that locates and retrieves documents from information sources in the former Soviet Union, is the newest document supplier in the OCLC PRISM ILL Document Supplier Program. Based in Camano Island, Wash., Facts OnLine can retrieve items from Russian libraries such as archival works, articles, books, patents, and genealogical documents on subjects including chemistry, law and regulations, science and technology, and specifications and standards. Facts OnLine works with a Russian counterpart, MITEK Research, and has reached agreements with a variety of Russian information providers including the Archive of National Economy, State Archive of Russian Federation, Archive of Ancient Acts, Diplomatic Archives, Moscow Archives, Military Archives, and St. Petersburg's Archives. Other information providers for Facts OnLine include the Archives of Russia, Ukraine, Belorussia and the Baltic States, Russian State Library, Patent State Library, State Medical Library, Saltykova-Zhedrina State Library of St. Petersburg, and the Inter-Institute of Scientific and Technical Information.

Other News

K. Wayne Smith, OCLC president and CEO, has announced the following appointments at OCLC: Don Muccino has been named executive vice president and chief operating officer. In this new position he assumes major responsibility for OCLC's day-to-day operations. Mr. Muccino joined OCLC in 1975 and was most recently vice president for information services. Phyllis Spies has been named vice president of member services, sales and international. In addition to her roles in sales and international, Ms. Spies will assume responsibility for OCLC's external relationships with groups such as RONDAC, Users Council, advisory committees, the Library of Congress, the American Library Association and others. Ms. Spies joined OCLC in 1973 and was most recently vice president of marketing and sales. Rick Schwieterman will have his responsibilities expanded as vice president of finance and administration. Mr. Schwieterman joined OCLC in 1992 as vice president of finance. Continuing in senior management positions are Gary Houk, vice president, OCLC services; Mary Landers, vice president, legal, and general counsel; Rick Noble, vice president, reference services; and Lee D. Olvey, vice president and assistant to the president.

Several other OCLC staff promotions were also announced recently. Richard Hale has been promoted to director of the OCLC quality assurance division.
Mr. Hale was formerly manager of the quality assurance department. He began his career at OCLC in January 1985 as a programmer/analyst in the office of research. Terry Noreault has been named director of OCLC research and special projects. Dr. Noreault was formerly director of the OCLC reference services development division. He came to OCLC in 1985 as a visiting distinguished scholar and returned later that year as OCLC senior research scientist. Thom Hickey has been promoted to OCLC chief scientist. He was formerly OCLC consulting scientist. Dr. Hickey came to OCLC in the spring of 1977 as a systems analyst and was one of the original members of the research department formed that summer. Mike Teets has been named manager of OCLC reference services development. He was formerly OCLC online systems section manager. Mr. Teets came to OCLC as a research assistant in 1986 while attending Ohio State University. After receiving a degree in computer information science later that year, he was hired as a programmer and has worked exclusively on OCLC reference products since then.

The proceedings of the Feb. 4, 1994, symposium held at ALA Midwinter in Los Angeles and titled The Future is NOW: The Changing Face of Technical Services, are now available. The symposium covered topics such as the role of outsourcing, extending local information resources, future electronic communications, and efficient centralized cataloging. Speakers included Michael Gorman, dean of library services, California State University, Fresno; Tia Gozzi, director of technical services, Stanford University; Arnold Hirshon, university librarian, Wright State University; Glen Holt, director, St. Louis Public Library; Colleen Hyslop, assistant director of systems and access services and head of technical services, Michigan State University; and James Rush, executive director, PALINET. Martin Dillon, director of OCLC's library resources management division, served as moderator. OCLC sponsored the symposium to give library professionals the opportunity to discuss future changes in technical services, as well as future methods for streamlining information processes and reducing costs. Copies of proceedings are available on the Internet, in hard copy, and on video tape.

On Oct. 4, 1994, OCLC and its regional network affiliates will host an international videoconference on the emerging electronic, digital library. The purpose of the videoconference is to provide a forum for OCLC's 18,000 participating libraries to discuss the broad professional implications of the next stage of the electronic library--in reference, cataloging, resource sharing, electronic publishing and education. Sidney Verba, Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor and director of Harvard University Library, will be the keynote speaker. He will be joined by a panel of distinguished librarians and educators who will address critical issues that libraries and librarians face as they move to the next stage of the electronic library. Panel members include: Christine Deschamps, director, the University Library, University Rene Descartes (Paris V), France; Nancy L. Eaton, dean of library services, Iowa State University and chair, OCLC Board of Trustees; Hardy R. Franklin, director of the District of Columbia Public Library and immediate past president of ALA; Derek G. Law, librarian, Law Library, Kings College, London, England; Clifford Lynch, director of library automation, University of California, San Francisco; W. David Penniman, president, Council on Library Resources; and Duane Webster, executive director, Association of Research Libraries. K. Wayne Smith, OCLC president and CEO, will host the videoconference.

OCLC announces that its subsidiary, Information Dimensions Inc. (IDI), has sold its ZyLab division to ZyCo Incorporated, a newly formed corporation controlled by C-CUBED Corporation of Alexandria, Va. ZyLab develops and markets ZyImage, a document retrieval system for personal computers, and markets ZyIndex, a Windows-based document imaging and retrieval system. Jim Hackbarth, IDI president and chief operating officer, said the sale of ZyLab allows IDI to focus resources on its core products--the BASIS suite of document database management systems designed for the client/server environment. Mr. Hackbarth said IDI will continue to market ZyLab products and retains a license to continue to use ZyLab products that are embedded in IDI products.

News from the Library Resources Management Division

Quality Control

Automated authority control software ran against the OLUC from February 2 to April 29, 1994, and made 2.6 million corrections to personal name headings. We have now processed all corporate and personal names and LC subject headings with the automated authority control software, which made over three-quarters of a million corrections in Harvard's local system and over 5.6 million corrections in the Online Union Catalog. We are now working on the next phase of the automated authority control project, which is to develop software to correct series headings and Medical subject headings (MeSH).

In conjunction with the Name and Subject Heading Correction Projects run in 1993 and 1994, OCLC has been deleting subfields $w through a massive database scan. As of July 1, 1994, subfields
$w$ have been removed from 10,973,001 records. This scan is expected to be complete before the end of July; subfield $w$ will be invalidated in PRISM by August 20th. OCLC users should not enter subfield $w$ on newly-created records, as it is now obsolete.

Users have said they need more call numbers in OCLC records. Previously, our batchload software automatically stripped local call numbers from tapeloading libraries' records but we are changing that practice on a per library basis, following an evaluation to ensure that the local call numbers are valid. We have changed the software to retain call numbers for many of the larger RLIN libraries.

**Linked Systems Project**

In response to calls from the LC Cooperative Cataloging Council (CCC), NACO and the scope of the national authority file is expanding. Since the beginning of the year, the University of Oregon, Cleveland Public Library, and Wayne State University have begun using OCLC's LSP system to prepare and contribute authority records to the LC authority file. Another large training session for new NACO libraries is scheduled for this summer, in which the University of Miami, the California Academy of Sciences, North Dakota State University, and the University of Wisconsin--Madison will be trained.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**QUESTION:** I've been replacing OCLC master records by using the lock command, adding an LC-type call number of my own devising (class portion from the LC schedules) and then sending the replace command. It just occurred to me that maybe I don't really know what I'm doing. Am I on the right track or should I desist?

**ANSWER:** If the record to which you are adding a call number does not already have one in that scheme, what you are doing is called a Database Enrichment and your library is getting a credit for it (see the PRISM Cataloging User Guide, p. 6:6-6:7). Your network can tell you how much the credit is worth.

**QUESTION:** I am in the midst of cataloging lots of jazz recordings and am having a problem with subject headings. Could you explain to me when to use headings of the type "[Instrument] music (Jazz)" vs. the heading "[Instrument] with jazz ensemble"? The call number given in the record for the former heading would indicate that it should be used only with solo instrumental music, however I am finding numerous records where the heading is used for recordings of jazz ensembles, i.e. quartets, quintets, etc. Can you set me straight on this?

**ANSWER:** According to the *Subject Cataloging Manual (H 1916.5)*, such headings as "[Instrument] music (Jazz)" may be used for solo instrumental jazz or "to bring out featured instruments in ensembles on recordings, either real (in the recording itself) or advertised (on the record jacket for promotional purposes)." "[Instrument] with jazz ensemble" and "Concertos ([Instrument] with jazz ensemble)" are used "where there is a solo instrument accompanied by a jazz ensemble."

**QUESTION:** I'm cataloging a recording *Origins* by the group Nexus. This recording is (quoting from the notes) "a vivid reproduction of the kind of spontaneous, unrehearsed improvisation that can be experienced at a live Nexus concert." There also is the note under the contents: "all music composed by Nexus."

We routinely make 700 author-title added entries, but I have not come across an instance when the "author" is a corporate body. Logically I have no problem with "710 22 Nexus (Musical group). $f$ Song of the nine iron. $f$ 1992." However, I have never seen such an entry.

Jazz/rock groups would be a similar case, but most songs (etc.) are composed by a person (or a few people) rather than the whole group, and for our catalog we generally find it adequate for popular music to make separate added entries for the group and for the individual song titles. I have not been able to find an instance of a 710 with a subfield $t$ attached.

No other Nexus recordings in OCLC use the 710 subfield $t$; they use (if anything) 710 followed by 740s for the title added entries. However, for our catalog, a 710 subfield $t$ would result in more efficient searching. And, in a certain sense, it seems logical, as in: "Hey, did you hear the piece [XXX] by Nexus?"

**ANSWER:** All sorts of corporate entities have titles associated with them, why can't a musical group? Throughout AACR2 Chapter 25 ("Uniform Titles") are references to works entered under corporate headings (see for instance 25.2E2 and 25.3C2). Actually, I have found at least one musical precedent, albeit an old one, in AACR2 cataloging from the Library of Congress (and you know how I frown on cataloging-by-example). Take a look at LCCN 82-760975 (OCLC #7911443; member-input, not LC MARC Music), a disc by the ROVA Saxophone Quartet. Two of the works on the disc are attributed to the whole quartet and are so traced. One of those works is even in the authority file (n81097265):
QUESTION: The 1993 amendments to AACR2 made for some big changes in the placement of General Material Designations (GMD's) in the 245 field. Can you clarify the changes for me?

ANSWER: The changes mostly affect items that have no collective title, and you'll notice revisions of such examples scattered throughout the 1993 amendments. The GMD (in subfield $h$) now follows the first title in items lacking a collective title. This standardizes the position of the GMD directly following the complete title proper or the first title (where there is no collective title) in almost all cases and should simplify the cataloger's decision making. The presence of the subfield $h$ now dictates that second and subsequent titles will be contained in subfield $b$ rather than in subfield $a$ where there is no intervening statement of responsibility in a subfield $c$. Let's look at some schematic examples of the new practice.

245 10 First title $h$ [GMD] ; $b$ Second title ; Third title / $c$ Statement of responsibility.

Under the old practice, the GMD would have followed the last title and preceded the statement of responsibility. Note that a semicolon separates the first title and GMD from the subsequent titles. Yes, I know it looks funny, but let's keep in mind that we made up all of this ISBD stuff in the first place. Remember how funny it ALL looked back in the days of the revised chapters to AACR1? Relax. You'll get used to it.

245 10 Title proper $h$ [GMD] = $b$ Parallel title / $c$ Statement of responsibility.

This example is unchanged from the old practice.


Under the old practice, the GMD would have been at the very end of the field.

245 10 Title proper $h$ [GMD] ; $b$ remainder of title / $c$ Statement of responsibility.

This example is unchanged from the old practice. Note that a colon still separates the title proper and GMD from the other title information.

245 10 Title proper, $n$ Number of part, $p$ Title of part $h$ [GMD] / $c$ Statement of responsibility.

Again, unchanged from the former practice. The GMD follows all elements of the title proper, including the number and/or title of a dependent part.

245 10 Title proper ; $b$ remainder of title. Dependent title $h$ [GMD] / $c$ Statement of responsibility.

The GMD still follows the entirety of the title proper, including any dependent title or part numbering. A name and/or number of a part is not separately subfielded when it follows subfield $b$ or $c$.

245 10 Title proper, or, Alternative title $h$ [GMD] / $c$ Statement of responsibility.

Alternative titles are still considered part of the title proper, and are not separately subfielded.

245 10 First title ; $b$ and, Second title / $c$ Statement of responsibility.

Use subfield $b$ for titles subsequent to the first when there is no collective title, even if no GMD is present. This is to provide consistency in content designation and is a change from previous practice.

QUESTION: I've always understood that the presence or absence of parts does not justify a new record, i.e., if I have one score and find a record that describes that score and a number of parts, I cannot input a new record. I have looked for a rule that says this in Bibliographic Formats and Standards, but I cannot find it. Please let me know if I have merely invented this rule or that we cannot input a record if all else matches, but the item is "1 score" and the record describes "1 score + 15 parts."

ANSWER: This must be one of your inventions, Edison. Separate records for scores, parts, and scores & parts have always been justified. The text in Bibliographic Formats and Standards is not as explicit as it used to be (as I recall), but it's on p. 38 under "Analytical vs. comprehensive entry" where it says, "If a record for an item as a whole exists, you can create a record for a part and vice versa." So if you have a score alone and the only record you find online is for the score and parts, you may indeed input a separate record and vice versa. Same goes for the part(s) alone.
SUMMARY OF THE MOUG ANNUAL MEETING: MARCH 2, 1994, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Program

Wednesday, 2 March 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 -12:00</td>
<td>*Workshop: Cataloging Music Videos (Jay Weitz, OCLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:00</td>
<td>Plenary Session I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News from OCLC (Jay Weitz, OCLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NACO Music Update (Karen R. Little, University of Louisville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News from the Library of Congress (Deta S. Davis, Library of Congress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:45</td>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:00</td>
<td>Plenary Session II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Product Pricing: The View from OCLC (Liz Bishoff, Director, Member Relations, OCLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effective Use of OCLC Products: Staff Training (Joan Schuitema, Northwestern University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:45</td>
<td>Presentation and Discussion Sessions (Concurrent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCLC Reference Services: Comparing Costs with the Competition (Ruthann McTyre, Baylor University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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</td>
<td>Closing Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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 the Workshop, the 1st session of Plenary Session II and Closing Remarks. The next issue of the Newsletter will cover the 2nd session of Plenary Session II.

WORKSHOP

MOUG WORKSHOP: CATALOGING MUSIC VIDEOS
JAY WEITZ, OCLC

Report by Mark Scharff
Washington University

Jay Weitz conducted a video cataloging workshop based on a presentation made at the OLAC meeting in Washington, D.C. in the fall of 1992. This practical workshop was based on the current interpretation of AACR2, while avoiding the choice and form of entry controversy that is underway within MLA and the larger cataloging community.

AACR2 rules for cataloging music also apply to video cataloging, and are, to a great extent, a reflection of the conscious attempt of AACR2 to emphasize parallel concepts among formats. Videos are produced by many people with various levels of responsibility. The diffuseness of this responsibility most often results in the title as the main entry.

There are two cardinal rules for cataloging music videos: 1) "Be skeptical of everything you see on an item and be skeptical of everything you see in a bibliographic record"; 2) "Don't agonize". The same item can produce contradictory information about titles or dates, so record as many variants as possible in appropriate places in the bibliographic record.

Of special interest were the guidelines for inputting a new record vs. editing existing copy. The differences that could justify a new record are:

a) B&W vs. color (vs. colorization)
b) Letterboxing
c) Sound vs. silent
d) A significant difference in length; discounting contemporary ad trailers that account for the difference
e) A different machine required for playback
f) A change in the publication or copyright date
g) Dubbed vs. subtitles
h) Different languages

The presence or absence of multiple publishers, distributors, etc. do not justify a new record as long as one from the current record matches the item in hand. Uncertainties here are a consequence of the diffuseness of responsibility, as well as publishers and distributors who are not bibliographically "well-behaved." Quoted notes are a good idea in situations in which responsibility is not clear.
Other issues discussed were:

1) Chief source of information: rule 7.0B1 (a) and (b) may be thought of as being connected by an "and," as long as notes are used to clarify the information source(s).

2) Summary notes (520 field) are helpful, especially with the advent of keyword searching.

3) The 538 field was recently added to the A/V format; the VHS/Beta information should go here. For those who want this information to be prominent, rule 7.7B allows notes to be rearranged to highlight desired information.

4) "Colorized" may or may not be an edition statement, depending on how it is presented.

5) Durations should be formatted the same as sound recordings, i.e. expressed as "xx min., yy sec." in the 300 field, and either "xx min., yy sec." or "xx:yy" elsewhere.

6) The fixed field "Cty" has been traditionally coded for country of production, rather than of publication. This may change for videos because of the confusion this has created.

7) In the following situations the principal performer should be the main-entry and added entries would be similar to sound recordings according to LCRIs 21.23C:
   a) Non-fiction videos, such as lectures, interviews, rituals, or music recitals. In these instances, the technical contributions are usually small enough to be discounted.
   b) Non-staged or non-cinematic recital videos.
   c) Collections of performances in the above categories.

8) MTV-style and opera videos are entered under title. For straightforward videos of concerts, rule 21.1B2(e), entry under corporate body, may apply if the responsibility of the group goes beyond mere execution, etc.

9) To determine what names go in the statement of responsibility in the 245 field, use LCRIs 7.1F1, 8.1F1 for guidance; the basic concept being "overall responsibility". An element of cataloger judgment is required; a cartoon animator or a performer in a concert video could be in 245 $c. Presentation is also a factor. LCRIs 7.7B6, 8.7B6 give categories of people to be included in notes fields.

10) The role of numbers given on videos is often not as clear as it is for scores or sound recordings. In most instances, numbers should be included in a quoted 500 note. Numbers that look like stock numbers can be put in an 037 field. Some items are assigned ISBN's which should be recorded.

11) Confusion can arise from the variety of dates that may or may not appear and that may or may not be important, such as date of production, release, release on video, copyright of image, copyright of video, copyright of packaging, or accompanying materials. Dates from the chief source are significant. There are two important dates for determining publication date: Beta format was first sold in May 1975 and VHS was introduced in September 1977. A recent clarification in the Bibliographic Formats and Standards affects the "Dat typ" field. An item identical in content to a previous item but released in a different format should be coded "p". If an item is to be considered a re-release (Dat typ "r"), it must be in the same format as the old.

A handout of examples of bibliographic records of various types of video materials was distributed. Jay Weitz has graciously consented to send copies of this handout upon request. His address can be found on p. [2] of this Newsletter.

PLENARY SESSION II

PRODUCT PRICING: THE VIEW FROM OCLC
Liz Bishoff
Director, Member Relations, OCLC

Report by Jill Shires
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

PRISM, Reference Services, Telecommunications

OCLC has been changing its pricing structure over the last several years. In the late 1970s and early 1980s OCLC charges were based on first time use (FTU) of a record (about $1.50 per record for cataloging) and on ILL requests (about $1.25 per record). The cost of using OCLC for non-cataloging use, such as reference and ILL, was born by cataloging and ILL charges. OCLC membership found that concept problematic.

In 1985 unbundling of pricing began. Unbundling of pricing started a shift from transaction based pricing to charging for searching and producing and to giving credits for original cataloging. Initially four free searches were provided for one produce, i.e., 4-to-1 S-to-P. But as late as 1987-1988 some libraries had a search ratio as high as 12-to-1, with libraries who cataloged on OCLC bearing disproportionately high costs.
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As a consequence contribution pricing was introduced by OCLC in 1988. The intent of this policy was to equalize the overall fee structure. Contribution pricing was phased in over several years, with the search-to-produce ratio gradually decreasing. Since 1993 all searches are billable, and credits are given for adding to and improving the database, and for lending ILL materials via the system.

In 1992 Dr. K. Wayne Smith, President and CEO of OCLC, began addressing subject searching needs. The result was the development of keyword searching on PRISM. Keyword searching reduces the cost of cataloging by supporting subject analysis (being able to see subject headings of other records) and by facilitating classification (looking at other records which have the same subject headings). Keyword searching also retrieves items which are difficult to retrieve using derived or scan title searches. It is intended to supplement PRISM searching rather than to replace it.

However, keyword searching is not being used extensively because often managers have perceived it as being too expensive for frequent use. What is important with keyword searching is to use judgment as to when to use it.

Reference service pricing deals with EPIC and FirstSearch. EPIC consists of 46 databases designed to be used by reference librarians and skilled searchers. Its pricing is based on connect hours, charges for printing, and possible telecommunications charges. EPIC is available through Internet at no cost, as well as via dial access and dedicated line.

FirstSearch, a system designed for end users and novice users, offers a variety of pricing options for the 1,500 libraries which use it. One option is per search, in which the cost of searches decreases according to the volume the library purchases. OCLC has developed FirstSearch cards which an institution gives (or sells) to a patron. Cards have ten searches per card. A new option, subscription pricing, has been introduced so that libraries can more accurately predict their costs. Subscription pricing allows a library to buy a dedicated port at an annual fee. One or more databases can be chosen, so the use is customizable and flexible. The price is fixed and predictable. Smaller libraries will be able to form consortia which utilize single subscriptions.

Telecommunications has a variety of pricing options: dedicated line, dial access, and Internet. Reference has been using the Internet for some time. Later this year OCLC will introduce a first year trial for using Internet to access PRISM. This option is particularly good for small libraries which have a comparatively low use of OCLC. The Internet price is about half that of current dial access. Ms. Bishoff advised that the Internet is not a production environment, and that while some nodes are extremely reliable, others are not.

**Strategy and Library Response**

These changes in PRISM pricing have brought about various results. One is a change in library behavior, in particular a reduction in the number of searches. To make a comparison, in 1985 S-to-P was 4-to-1; in 1994 S-to-P was 2.5-to-1. For large research libraries, in 1985 S-to-P was 8-to-1, while in 1994 S-to-P was 3.1-to-1. The change in pricing has reduced the overall cost of cataloging.

A question was asked if the cost referred only to the access of bibliographic records. The response was yes, because there is no cost for accessing authority records.

A comment was made from the audience that costs are down because faculty and other non-library staff are no longer allowed to search OCLC as a public tool. Ms. Bishoff spoke of an analysis of who the users are at different libraries. The analysis indicated that reference staff are not heavy users but ILL and collection development staff are.

There was a question of whether the concept of differential credits for the production of different formats has been considered. Ms. Bishoff replied that she has not heard discussion of this. She asked if audience members would support this concept, even reducing book credits, and she received positive response.

Another result of PRISM pricing is that the amount of original cataloging has continued to grow. In each of the last two years 10 percent more new titles have been created on the database than the previous year, with 1.2 million new titles created last year. The number of holdings attached grows 2 to 3 percent a year. Also the quality of the OCLC database improves as the enhance activities and database enrichment activities expand.

**FY95 Pricing**

For fiscal year 1994/1995 OCLC is continuing its revenue neutral pricing: prices will not increase more than the rate of inflation. Ninety percent of libraries should see no more than a 4 percent increase in costs. OCLC expects that 50 percent of libraries will see no more than a 2 percent increase. There will be a decrease in FTU cost and a modest increase in search cost. The PRISM Subscription Pricing Pilot will
expand its program. Finally, OCLC has made a permanent reduction in its telecommunications pricing.

**CLOSING REMARKS**

**Product Pricing: A View From Technical Services Administration**

*John Popko*

*University of Missouri-Kansas City*

**Biographical Information**

John Popko has been the Assistant Director for Technical Services for the University of Missouri--Kansas City University Libraries since 1985, served as a delegate to the OCLC Users Council since 1987, spent three of these years on the OCLC Users Council Budget Committee, and two years on the Executive Committee including the 1992-93 year as President of OCLC Users Council.

**Presentation**

I am cursed. I live and work in interesting times. Make that doubly cursed: I am a library administrator in a conscientious but financially strapped public institution, using OCLC as the foundation for our technical support, and therefore, I live and work in very interesting times.

My aim today is simple. I want to talk to you about and illustrate how I look at, analyze, try to make sense of OCLC pricing, its impact on our use of their products and services, how pricing has influenced some of our behavior, our efforts to control costs and maximize value, and our efforts to predict costs and allocate appropriate funds to cover these costs of our core technical processing. I will do this as quickly and in as much detail as I can because I have more to say than time available. Some of you in the audience might actually do for your libraries what I'm going to describe that I do. Perhaps some of you have never looked at OCLC and its relation to your operations from the perspective I intend to offer. After this session you may be convinced that you never want to. I will make reference to some of the past and present OCLC pricing models that Liz Bishoff presented to you in the opening session.

Let me set the stage by giving you some of the context in which I work at the University of Missouri--Kansas City. For the first time, this current fiscal year, our budget crossed the $1-million threshold for acquisitions of library material. Our library services are spread among three physical locations -- the largest and general library being the Miller Nichols Library, the Health Sciences Library, and the Dental Library. Our campus has current enrollment of just under 10,000 students; we offer a long list of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees, including a new interdisciplinary PhD program, all of which make serious demands on our library collections and services, and therefore on the Technical Services Division staff and systems which support them. In our library organization, Technical Services Division consists primarily of the core activities of acquisitions and cataloging, and the obvious related activities. It does not include circulation, nor interlibrary loan, nor reference work. So there are some aspects of OCLC use and cost which I will try to lay out for you when I'm talking only about Technical Services uses and other aspects of it in which I will identify the larger institutional framework. There are several of you here who are catalogers, so one final measure of the UMKC Libraries that might be useful to you is that in the 1992-93 fiscal year we cataloged 18,300 new titles on OCLC; add recataloging, reclassification, and retrocon, and we totalled 19,650 titles.

My job is simple to state, less simple to carry out: To balance the Technical Services Division commitment to support all the library collections, all the libraries services, and all the campus degree programs that the University Libraries System is responsible for. My Technical Services Division administrative responsibilities frequently require me to limit our support to levels that are less than desired, simply because of the limited resources at my disposal. That issue of balancing needs and demands against limited resources underlies what I'm trying to communicate to you this afternoon.

In addressing these campus-wide responsibilities, I look at several components of the costs required to run Technical Services generally, and the costs that are specifically associated with OCLC. I work with two simple goals: To try to predict our annual OCLC costs for budgeting purposes, and/or, to adjust our staff behavior, our use of OCLC, to survive within already established budgetary constraints.

What are the cost components that are included in my analysis and planning?

The costs to my libraries of using OCLC can be broken down into several levels. The first big portion of the cost continuum is the pricing established by OCLC. Within the large category of direct OCLC
costs, one category might be described -- for us at least -- as a relatively fixed cost: telecommunications. I can say that to you because we have had a relatively stable number of workstations running on a single dedicated chain for a number of years; we have upgraded those workstations from time to time, but the number has been fairly constant. Although OCLC might change slightly its charges for equipment lease or maintenance, or for system access, for us telecommunications is a relatively constant expense; certainly the most predictable of our direct OCLC costs. I also think of these costs as a kind of capacity investment, because we have been paying for and intend to pay for this access, this capacity, regardless of how we make use of the machines and available online time.

However, other OCLC costs do not seem as close to fixed costs to us as does telecommunications. You're aware of OCLC's multi-year restructuring and repricing known as Contribution Pricing, a shift in the direction of charges for access and credits for contribution. In addition, OCLC has recently made efforts to simplify its pricing structure by eliminating and/or collapsing a long list of product codes. We in our library, recognize and appreciate OCLC's efforts to keep their pricing revenue neutral, within the limits of general inflationary increases. However, efforts previous to and within the contribution pricing model over the last 10 years have resulted in the creation of some complex and confusing mechanisms -- (1) the search-to-produce ratio; (2) the creation of a six-month searching budget to help libraries predict and/or control their costs, and six-month adjustments to that budget to balance predicted behavior with actual behavior; (3) the reflection of that behavior as either a credit or an additional charge to the library; (4) the recalculation of the search budget based on rolling 18-month record of library activity; (5) the concept of earning free searches based on produces in ILL and Cataloging; (6) and most recently the discontinuation of free searches and the adoption of a structure of paying a fixed rate for every search. Even that simplification however, is complicated slightly with the option of a volume discount for the very heaviest users! The long-awaited introduction of keyword searching in Spring of 1993 added new opportunities, but it also raised concerns about budgeting for OCLC, because searches were originally priced at twice the rate of the more customary derived or numeric searches.

The second layer of cost consideration relates to the OCLC regional networks. We broker our services through the Missouri Library Network Corporation. I cannot emphasize often or strongly enough the importance of this second player, the OCLC regional network, in my library consideration of and analysis of OCLC costs. If you are not already aware of this, you must recognize that there are 20 regional OCLC networks. OCLC charges each of them the same fixed rate for each of its products and services. Networks are under no obligation to pass along those costs to their libraries in any consistent manner. The networks have adopted different models for membership and for pricing of their products and services. This can take the form of an overall annual service charge, of a percentage surcharge on all OCLC transactions, of a percentage surcharge on some transactions with some other transactions being free. It can include a discrete dollar surcharge on different transactions. This situation is further complicated because networks typically provide libraries the opportunity to prepay some or all of their predicted OCLC costs, and therefore gain a network credit or discount that must be worked into the financial figures. And finally, a network typically has several categories of membership, with different fees and roles in governance, which are then translated into different percentage discounts or credits. Our particular network made life very interesting for us this fiscal year, with significant impacts on how we calculate our costs, and how much we actually pay. They made several major decisions that all took affect July 1, 1993, on how we're going to calculate our costs and how much we were actually going to pay; major revisions with how telecommunications was going to be priced; the decision to pass through all OCLC costs without individual surcharges; revising the established categories of membership and therefore the annual service fee that each library paid. And though you might be aware that OCLC returned to libraries billions of dollars in telecommunications credits, our network asked us, and we agreed, to let them keep that credit in order to fund a staff position to provide much-needed training to network member libraries. I hope this gives you a sense of the complexity that the regional network introduces to our OCLC cost.

Not surprisingly, the most unpredictable, and sometimes uncontrollable aspect of our direct OCLC costs lies with our staff behavior. And this, of course, is influenced by the size of our acquisitions budget, the distribution of that budget across our different library locations and academic disciplines, any special projects that we might make a priority in any one given fiscal year that require extraordinary or unanticipated OCLC transactions, and the extent to which our staff are efficient in their use of OCLC. This efficiency can be a function of training, of documentation, of scheduling of staff, of the use of the Cataloging MicroEnhancer software, and other factors.

One final point I'd like to make in these general and still introductory remarks: There is a danger --
both in focusing attention and discussion on the principles associated with costs and in developing the spreadsheets and the graphs that I’ll share with you soon -- that an administrative view can focus on costs exclusively. In an 1892 play, Oscar Wilde wrote a line that has in recent years become a kind of mantra in the economic and financial struggle to control costs, to maximize return on investment, to deliver products and services, in both the profit and the not-for-profit sectors. He wrote, "What is a cynic? A man who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing." That quotation is a particular favorite of K. Wayne Smith, president of OCLC, and he cites it often in our OCLC Users Council meetings. As a Technical Services administrator, I cannot afford to become a cynic. I cannot lose sight of what it costs us to use OCLC, but neither I cannot overlook, nor can I allow my library administration to overlook, the value we receive in this exchange. For the vast majority of OCLC member libraries, use of OCLC for cataloging and resource sharing remains a highly cost-effective relationship. An enormous bibliographic database, the Online Union Catalog, built from the individual contributions of both national libraries and local libraries; increasing attention over many years to implementing and enforcing useful bibliographic input standards; major quality control efforts to reduce duplication and error in the database. All of this delivered at a cost that consistently falls near or below increases in costs as measured by the Consumer Price Index and the Higher Education Price Index. From my perspective, OCLC’s mix of price and value in its core resource sharing and cataloging services is meeting its corporate purposes of increasing the availability of library resources and reducing the rate of rise of library unit costs.

This presentation is supposed to be a combination of show and tell. I’ve done most of the telling and I’m about to do some showing. I’d like to move away from background information and general principles and get into the nitty-gritty of a couple of models we’ve used to try to identify, analyze, predict, and control OCLC costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: OCLC Costs In Relation To UMKC Libraries' Operating Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Libraries Operating Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Libraries OCLC Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC Costs as % of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TSD Operating Costs (Excludes Acq Budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TSD OCLC Costs (80% of Library Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC Costs as % of TSD Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 provides a snapshot of a library’s core OCLC costs (for cataloging and resource sharing) and how these relate to total operating costs and to Technical Services division operating costs over three fiscal years. Omitted from the table are costs of references services and major equipment. Technical Services costs are reasonably comprehensive, including salary, wages, and benefits for librarians, support staff, and student assistants, travel, supplies, equipment and furnishings, postage, telephone, OCLC costs, and so forth. Table 1 illustrates that over three years the OCLC costs to this total library system increased very slightly on a percentage basis -- one tenth of one percent per year. The Technical Services percentage rose more significantly, from 6.3% three years ago up to 7.6% and then up to 7.7% in the most recent year completed. Those are not bad figures, especially when you consider that looking at our cataloging statistics alone the jump from fiscal year 1991 to 1992 we saw an 82% increase in the number of titles we cataloged from 9,700 to 17,700 titles. The following year, from 1992 to 1993, we saw an 11% increase, up to 19,600 titles. These figures compare favorably with the increase in costs.
With this context, I want to offer you two models for looking at OCLC costs.

Let me begin by noting that the numbers and their formats I'm presenting to you today are part of a developing effort to design and document some local analytical tools. The numbers are not perfect. The techniques are not proven. Neither may be pertinent to your operations. I'm including them because it illustrates the lengths to which I've been willing to go (or perhaps the depths to which I've sunk) in my efforts to understand these phenomena and to communicate them to my director. What you'll see from here on is work-in-progress. My plan is a simple one: Collect the raw data; design an appropriate spreadsheet; examine the numbers; select some relationships to graph; correlate the tables and graphs to behavior and events. The execution of my plan is incomplete: I have made the least progress in correlating the tables and graphs to our known activities and behavior.

The first model that I work with is based on the long-established search-to-produce ratio. I knew this would be a complicated and risky measure because the search-to-produce ratio has changed over the years, the cost of the search has changed, and now there is no such thing as a free search. Nonetheless, I always held out hope that if we could make some sense of our searches and our produces then we could use that to predict our costs.

Figure 2 takes our study one step further: We move from the raw number of searches and the raw number of produces to a ratio. Earlier I described my process of analysis and admitted to having made little progress on relating graph lines to known activities and behavior. This graph prompted a notable exception to my practice. The noticeably inconsistent peak in 1990-91 is one of the few areas where we have tried to explain. It corresponds to the convergence of two activities -- serial retrospective conversion and a special cataloging project which necessitated extensive searching. This is at least partial explanation for why the ratio went through the roof and why the associated costs might have done the same.

Figure 1 simply tracks our produces and our searches, as performed in and by Technical Services, over a reasonably long period of time. Note the spread between the lines. For years, we have focused staff attention on search efficiency, trying to keep our search-to-produce ratio low to minimize payments for searches. On the graph, the greater the spread between the lines, presumably the greater the cost. Where the lines converge, we felt we were improving our efficiencies, and that costs should be more reasonable, controllable, or predictable.
Figure 3 attempts to bring together my notion that we can track and/or correlate the search-to-produce ratio and costs. If you look closely, you can see something that might resemble a relationship for a limited period of time, roughly 3rd-qtr-1989 through 2nd-qtr-1992. It's not real neat and it's not real smooth. You can see that the cost generally tends to lag slightly the changes in the search-to-produce ratio. And there are peaks and valleys that don't quite fit. In another example of the graph reflecting a change in conditions, note that in mid-1992, when OCLC began to bill all searches at standard rates, the solid line of costs soared for six months.

I conclude this discussion of my first model by noting that is was interesting and instructive, but it is inconclusive; it is not the holy grail of Technical Services administrators, a meaningful predictive tool for our OCLC costs. (There is a graph that I did not bring on which I combined searches, produces, and costs, and equalized the y-axis on the right and the left to try to lay them over one another. To use an analogy which might be particularly appropriate to this audience, the resulting visual representation might be likened to listening to recordings of Barry Manilow, Alice in Chains, and Vivaldi simultaneously.)

Let's consider a second model. At about this time last year, OCLC invited our regional OCLC network and the UMKC University Libraries to participate in a test of fixed fee subscription pricing for OCLC online transactions in the core services of interlibrary loan and cataloging. They offered two reasons. First, our network had recently restructured its service charge to move away from a transaction basis and toward an annual fixed fee. This matched what OCLC was proposing, so the fit seemed appropriate. Second, from OCLC's perspective our institution showed a pattern of relatively stable behavior over a number of years (in spite of the graphs I've shown you), a stability they felt might add a useful dimension to the pilot project.

The pilot project was designed to run one fiscal year -- July 1993 through June 1994. The primary purpose was to determine the extent and pattern of change on cataloging and resource sharing behavior under a flat fee pricing option. There were eight characteristics or criteria of this test that OCLC wanted to achieve, the two most important being simplicity and predictability. For a fixed fee the libraries were able to perform unlimited online cataloging and resource sharing activities, and all associated searching, on the PRISM Service. The products and services that were not included in the list that fell under the fixed fee umbrella were going to be billed and paid for separately. These included off-line products, contract and batch retrocon services, reference, telecommunications, hardware, documentation, CJK+, and some others. We did get to keep our contribution incentives. That is, we continued to earn credits even though those activities fell under the fixed fee umbrella. The charge that OCLC negotiated with us for the fixed fee services was based on our activity levels over the preceding two fiscal years. Originally the intent was that after one year OCLC would be in a position to decide if a fixed-price model would work for the larger membership. The overriding concerns for OCLC and the libraries participating in the pilot were that this kind of price restructuring was a major enterprise, it should only be undertaken after extensive analysis, and the new structure must be good for the OCLC membership both individually and collectively.

In addition to reports supplied by OCLC, I developed spreadsheets to attempt to document our transactions and to analyze the experience. Table 2 is a portion of a spreadsheet which looks at those transactions that were part of the fixed-fee pilot project. It records the number of each transaction in a given month last year, the number for the same month in the year of the pilot, the increase or decrease in transactions, the costs and their difference based on this year's transaction price, and appropriate cumulations. My purpose today is not to judge the pilot project, but merely to illustrate the extent to which I have tried to analyze what the cost might be under one pricing model and what it is this year under the fixed fee. While it is important to realize that the fixed fee cost is likely to vary for each institution, it is also worth remembering my previous warning against the danger of looking only at the costs and not considering the value of services received.

Table 3 attempts to perform a similar year-to-year comparative analysis, in a slightly different format. But it focuses on those transactions which were not a part of the pilot project. The intent of the spreadsheet is to give us a quick look at whether we're spending more or less than the previous year on those transactions that fall outside the fixed fee pilot, because it is crucial that we analyze both sides -- the predictable and the unpredictable -- of our total OCLC costs.

What results or conclusions am I willing to draw from six months of the fixed-fee pilot project? Transactions are up; costs are up. Preliminary discussions with OCLC suggest we both feel the need to extend the pilot test for at least another year, to collect a sufficient amount of data over time to see if useful patterns emerge. A preliminary conclusion is that the fixed-fee model does help us predict a larger percentage of our total costs. If we have miscalculated our actual use of products and services outside the fixed-fee umbrella then this difference in costs is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Fee Experiment Transactions</th>
<th>July FY93 No.</th>
<th>FY94 No. (Decr.)</th>
<th>Inc. Unit $</th>
<th>$ Total</th>
<th>August FY93 No.</th>
<th>FY94 No. (Decr.)</th>
<th>Inc. Unit $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATALOGING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0042 PRISM Keyword Srch-Cat *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0043 PRISM Keyword Srch-RECON *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0131 Search Cataloging Subtotals</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>2,477 (1,128)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>718.33</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>2,794 (15)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0281 Search RECON Subtotals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>91.93</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0961 Searches over 15,000/month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3352 Display Holdings - Cataloging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Online Cataloging Prime</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,020 (61)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>448.80</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2550 Online Cataloging Nonprime</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>38 (193)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>29 (99)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3350 Online RECON Prime</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3355 Online RECON Nonprime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERLIBRARY LOAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0314 PRISM Keyword Search - ILL *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0431 Search ILL Subtotals</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>560 (37)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>162.40</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3581 Display Holdings - ILL</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>357 (17)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>110.67</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3611 Union List Holdings Display</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4501 ILL Request</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>342 (56)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>88.92</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4512 ILL Loan Review - PRISM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4511 ILL Referral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERIALS/UNION LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0731 Search Serial Subtotals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4011 LDR Creation - UL Agent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4081 LDR Creation - Full Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3571 Display Holdings - Serials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3601 Union List DH - Serials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPARISONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transactions</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>5,474 (846)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,777.08</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of all FY94 unit costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual FY94 Fixed Fee Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(521.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMK $ Advantage (Disadvantage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,878.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total OCLC FY94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,379.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total OCLC FY93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,499.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PRISM Keyword searching became available April 1993
| Table 3: Increase (Decrease) of Library's OCLC Non-Fixed-Fee Costs FY1993 and FY1994 |
|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                    | July   | Aug.   | Sept.  | O      |
| CATALOGING                         |        |        |        |        |
| 1001 Catalog cards                 | 0.0120 | (217)  | 9.09   | 3,077  | 334.21 |
| 1008 Cat: Ship                     | 0      | (11.25)| 0      | 52.88  | 0      |
| 1011 Cat cds retuns&adj            | 0      | 0.00   | (9)    | 0.79   | 0      |
| 1031 PDF profile                    | 1      | 75.00  | 0      | 0.00   | 0      |
| 1063 Orl cataloging workform       | (0.2500)| 5     | (35.75)| 2      | (17.75)| (15)  | 43.50 |
| 1064 Original cat. new             | (0.2500)| (72)  | 232.50 | 4      | (15.50)| (17)  | 55.00 |
| 1071 Holdings delete credit        | (0.0800)| (19)  | (0.09)| (55)   | 9.55   | 42    | (12.58)| 26    |
| 2565 Database enrichment           | 0.0000 | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | (2)   | 1.00  | (1)   |
| 2591 Export                        | 0.0450 | (15)   | 26.46  | (272)  | 12.20  | (74)  | 3.92  | (131) |
| 2650 GOVDOC retrieval/set          | (0.0000)| (100) | (12.00)| (169)  | 20.28  | 171   | 20.52 | 734   |
| 3491 Minimal rld upgrade           | (0.0000)| (1)   | 2.00   | 5      | (10.00)| (8)   | 16.00 | (3)   |
|                                   |        |        |        |        |
| INTERLIBRARY LOAN                  |        |        |        |        |
| 4541 ILL stats report             | 0.0000 | 1      | 0.15   | 0      | 0      | 2     | 0.30  | 0     |
| 4548 ILL stat rpt: Ship           | 0      | 0.23   | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| 4531 ILL stat rpt annual fee       | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| 4532 ILL stat fee adjust          | 0      | 0.00   | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| 4561 ILL lending credit           | (0.0600)| (24)  | (8.52)| (50)   | (30.86)| (7)   | (21.44)| 2     |
| 6031 Compuserve connect           | 0.0000 | (744)  | (96.72)| (727)  | (94.51)| (810) | (105.30)| (554) |
| 6051 Autho for dial acc           | 0.0000 | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
|                                   |        |        |        |        |
| DOCUMENTATION                      |        |        |        |        |
| 8063 Part inst by OCLC symbol      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 2      | 14.00 | 0     | 0     |
| 8065 Part inst by OCLC inst nm     | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 2      | 12.00 | 0     | 0     |
| 8065 Bib fnst & std                | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 17     | 425.00| 0     | 0     |
| 8081 OCLC-MARC code lists          | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 2      | 16.00 | 0     | 0     |
| 8103 Cataloging user guide         | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 4      | 80.00 | 0     | 0     |
| 8120 OCLC workbook                 | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| 8133 Discsries 2nd ed.             | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| 8501 Books format                  | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
|                                   |        |        |        |        |
| MAINTENANCE                        |        |        |        |        |
| 9514 Maint: 3yr EM0 ext            | 0.0000 | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| 9562 Maint: M310                   | 0.0000 | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
| 9565 Maint: M386                   | 5.0000 | 0      | (10.00)| 0      | (10.00)| 0     | (10.00)| 0     |
| 9572 Maint: Hard disk              | 0.0000 | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     |
|                                   |        |        |        |        |
| TELECOM                            |        |        |        |        |
| Telecom system fee (modem)         | (1)    | (95.00)| (1)    | (95.00)| (1)    | (95.00)| (1)    |
| Basic system service fee (term)    | (7)    | (385.00)| (7)    | (385.00)| (7)    | (385.00)| (7)    |
| Telco modem                        | (1)    | (100.00)| (1)    | (100.00)| (1)    | (100.00)| (1)    |
| Telco 1st term                     | (1)    | (115.00)| (1)    | (115.00)| (1)    | (115.00)| (1)    |
| Telco 2nd term                     | (1)    | (125.00)| (1)    | (125.00)| (1)    | (125.00)| (1)    |
| Telco remaining term               | (5)    | (215.00)| (5)    | (185.00)| (5)    | (185.00)| (5)    |
| 6111 Network service fee           | 1      | 100.00 | 1      | 100.00 | 1      | 100.00 | 1      |
| 6801 System access fee             | 7      | 980.00 | 7      | 980.00 | 7      | 980.00 | 7      |
| Telo Telecom credit                | 1      | (93.98)| 1      | (93.98)| 1      | (93.98)| 1      |
|                                   |        |        |        |        |
| TOTAL                              |        |        |        |        |
|                                   | (1,192)| 212.12 | 2,237  | 292.31 | 79     | 724.73 | (722)  |
going to be less disruptive to our budget than it would be without the predictable component. Because there are no limits on searching, cataloging, and ILL transactions under the fixed-fee model, we're confident that in any given year we'll be able to deploy the staff in any way we choose, to tackle all the material we have to process, without limiting ourselves solely on the basis of OCLC charges. We also recognize that the fixed-fee contract price in subsequent years will be based on our behavior in preceding years. To the extent that we might have exceeded OCLC's estimate of the searching, cataloging, or borrowing we would do, the contract price would be adjusted upward. To the extent that we did less than we estimated, that contract price would be adjusted downward in subsequent years.

A final caution: As a Technical Services administrator, I must guard against a tendency from my staff to view the fixed-fee subscription as setting some kind of limit on their behavior and a tendency from any fiscal administrator to view the fixed-fee model as an opportunity to save money. I view the fixed-fee pilot project as an effort to bring a higher percentage of our total OCLC costs under predictable control over a longer period of time, and to spread out changes in that predictability so they are less disruptive to any one, or even two, library fiscal years.

In conclusion, our library has survived efforts to improve, to simplify, to analyze, and to predict OCLC costs and pricing from the days of unbundling to the future of subscription pricing. We'll continue to work with OCLC to control costs, but we'll do so in the context of the cost effective productivity that our technical services operations require.

FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICES COORDINATOR
Ruthann Mctyre
Public Services Coordinator

FastDoc on FirstSearch

As many MOUG members already know, no doubt, OCLC is now offering FastDoc on FirstSearch, a service from which one can obtain full-text articles faxed in less than one hour for a mere $10.50 in North America or $15.50 internationally. Initially, 750 journal titles on ArticleFirst and Periodical Abstracts will be available. According to the brochure from OCLC, over 400,000 articles published in 1992 and 1993 are stored in digital format to insure good quality copies. It is also stated in the brochure that OCLC plans to extend this service to all FirstSearch databases. Payment can be made either by credit card or deposit account.

Being the curious sort, I phoned Tam Dalrymple at OCLC about what music-related titles are included and being the helpful sort, she faxed the list to me.

As one might expect, it's slim pickings for music. The list concentrates on mainstream titles, business titles, and the like. The music titles (and any others that looked remotely interesting in terms of music resources) included are:

- Arts Education Policy Review
- Billboard
- Dance Magazine
- Design for Arts in Education
- Downbeat
- Film Comment
- Film Quarterly
- Guitar Player
- Journal of Popular Culture
- Musical America
- Opera News
- Ovation
- Performing Arts & Entertainment in Canada
- Premiere
- Rolling Stone
- Village Voice

NACO MUSIC UPDATE
Michelle Koth
NMP Advisory Committee Chair

Call for Applications

The NACO Music Project is calling for applications from music catalogers interested in participating in the project. The NACO Music Project (NMP), under the auspices of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG), creates and contributes name and name/uniform title authority records to the Library of Congress Name Authority File as part of the national NACO project. NMP is administered through a funnel configuration. The NMP coordinator reviews the headings of participants until they become independent. Those independent participants then review new participants' headings until they too become independent. Independent status is defined as having the authority to contribute name and/or name/uniform title authority records without review. A participant can become independent in stages, with names first, then name/uniform titles, or for both at once.

The NMP Advisory Committee has established an application process to help in the selection of qualified participants. The process consists of requesting the
application questionnaire, completing the questionnaire, and conducting a simple, month-long study. The study is to help determine the number of name and name/uniform title authority records that you might be able to contribute on a monthly basis. While it is recognized that NMP participants may not be able to contribute all of the headings they might typically encounter in one month, the figure will give us some idea of the potential of each participant. We also recognize that the potential of each participant will vary. There is no monthly or annual minimum number of records required.

Participation in NMP is granted to both an individual and the institution. Accordingly, the questions on the application relate to both the individual and the institution. The deadline to submit completed applications is January 1, 1995.

To request an application, contact:
Michelle Koth, Chair
NACO Music Project Advisory Committee
Yale University Music Library
PO BOX 208320
New Haven, CT 06520-8320
W (203) 432-0494 F (203) 432-7339
internet: bm.ymz@rlg.stanford.edu
bitnet: bm.ymz@rlg

REPORT FROM OLAC
Ann Caldwell
Moug Representative to OLAC

This report covers highlights from the Online Audiovisual Catalogers’ last two sequences of meetings held during the American Library Association meetings in Los Angeles, February 5-7, 1994 and in Miami, June 24-26, 1994. These meetings are held on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday evenings and are, respectively, meetings of the organization’s Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC), the membership meeting, and the Executive Board meeting.

The Cataloging Policy Committee is chaired by Richard Harwood, of the University of Tennessee. A continuing discussion revolved around Lowell Ashley’s A Guide to the Bibliographic Control of Music Video Material. He has received comments from CAPC, the Association of Moving Image Archivists, Jean Weihs, and ALCTS-AV. At the Miami meeting he announced that the guidelines will be available in 1995 or 1996 without the controversial sections on main entry. A task force chaired by Laurel Jizba, Michigan State University, prepared guidelines for cataloging interactive multi-media. After discussion and clarification of some points at the Los Angeles meeting, in Miami she was able to announce the guidelines’ availability. Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia is available from the American Library Association for $10.00. She also announced that a preconference is being planned for the 1995 annual meeting of ALA in Chicago as well as regional institutes tentatively planned for 1996.

Other news of interest from CAPC is the Rationale for Cataloging Non-Book Material prepared by a group chaired by Richard Harwood. This document discusses the importance of these materials in a library collection. The guidelines will be printed in the OLAC Newsletter, will be available at OLAC conferences, and to individuals upon request.

The group also discussed the lack of LC cataloging for videorecordings. Harriet Harrison, the new LC representative to OLAC, reported that LC has suggested that OLAC request that a non-voting member be placed on the Cooperative Cataloging Council.

New officers were announced at the business meeting: Heidi Hutchinson (University of California, Riverside) is the new Vice-President/President-elect and Catherine Gerhart (University of Washington) is the new secretary. Martha Yee is the liaison from the Association of Moving Image Archivists and Vicki Toy Smith is the new book review editor. Following reports from the utilities, MARBI, ALCTS-AV, and CC:DA there were lively question and answer periods.

The OLAC membership is eagerly awaiting the OLAC/MOUG conference in October.

EXPLORING WORLDCAT: SOUND RECORDINGS
Submitted by Ken Thomas
OCLC

Editor’s note: WorldCat, the OCLC Online Union Catalog is a remarkable reference tool. No other database can give you the comprehensive information contained there: 28 million records—books, serials, sound recordings, and more, in more than 300 languages from 17,000 libraries. Effectively searching WorldCat takes thought and planning because of its special characteristics. This regular feature gives you tips on how to unlock the research potential of this rich resource and discover its wealth of knowledge.
On what album does Barbra Streisand sing Claude Debussy's *Beau Soir*? Is the album available on compact disc?

WorldCat on FirstSearch is a great resource for musical questions like these—whether they're on Streisand or Strauss or Mozart or Madonna.

The reason? The database contains almost one million bibliographic records representing sound recordings of jazz, classical, popular and traditional forms of music from all over the world. It is the most extensive discography of sound recordings available.

However, to search for sound recordings effectively requires knowing the fields where musical information is found and using the limit action for sound recordings.

**Knowing Where to Look**

The most-used search on The FirstSearch Catalog is the subject search, which searches keywords from 43 subject, title and selected notes fields. But, except for album title, most of the information you need about a song or sound recording—format, performers, musicians, instrumentation, etc.—won't be found using a basic subject search. You'll need to specify the notes field in your search. Here is a list of the specific musical information you can find in the notes field.

- Titles. Other titles, subtitles, cover titles, and titles of related works may all be accessible in the notes field.
- Individual works on a sound recording. Song titles, song duration, and vocal forces may be detailed.
- Bibliographies. The presence of discographies and other bibliographic references is often found in a note.
- Performers, instrumentation and credits. The names of producers, directors, musicians, composers, performers, back-up performers, and instrumentation information may be listed in notes.
- Details of an event. The date, time, and place of a recording and its publication year often appear in a note.
- Original/Reproduction. Bibliographic details of the reproduction or original version of a recording are found in notes.

In addition, you often receive extensive technical details in bibliographic records representing a sound recording. Indications of the recording format (compact disc, cassette, 8-track tape, reel), the speed (33 1/3, 45 or 78 rpm), or the recording characteristics (analog, digital) may be included.

If you are looking for an album title, search by title bound phrase (ti=) if you know the exact title, or by title keyword (ti:) if you are unsure of the exact title or know only some of the words. Use Wordlist to identify exact entries of titles; then search for the title by typing the Wordlist number.

Combine title keywords with proximity operators W (with) or N (near) or the Boolean operators AND or NOT to add precision to your title keyword search.

**Using Limit**

To restrict the records retrieved to sound recordings, use the Limit action. To set the sound recordings Limit action, type 1 and press <Enter>. Type 2 for the publications type category, and then 5 to limit retrievals to sound recordings.

In addition to sound recordings, you can limit by language and publication year. So, if you are looking for a sound recording in a certain language recorded in a certain year, use all of the restrictors.

**Search Example**

Here's how you could find information on the question in the example above. Type nt:beau soir and nt:streisand. Six records are retrieved, and when you display the first one, you see that *Beau Soir* is the first song on side one. In addition, you see that the album title is *Classical Barbra*, the song *Beau Soir* is 2:37 long, Ms. Streisand performs with the Columbia Symphony Orchestra, Claus Ogerman is the pianist and conductor, and the format is compact disc.

If you have some hints or advice about searching for sound recordings, drop us a line and tell us. We all want to become better online searchers; your tips could help everyone. The address is Editor, OCLC Reference News, OCLC, MC135, 6565 Frantz Road, Dublin, OH 43017-3395.

(from the printed *OCLC Reference News*, Jan./Feb. 1994, No. 20)
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, Dvorak, 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.

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

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
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, 1299 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. MICHENER LIBRARY
SERIALS DIVISION
GREELEY CO 80639