FROM THE CHAIR
Ralph Papakhian

You know, MOUG has a reputation for being a very practical organization. Our meetings and publications all focus on how to improve our use of OCLC to accomplish our work or on the changes we would like to see in OCLC products and services. The meeting in Atlanta this past February lived up to this reputation. The opening plenary featured Susan Vita (Chief, Special Materials Cataloging Division, LC) and Deta Davis (Team Leader, Music and Sound Recordings Team 1, LC). Their presentations on OCLC use by LC provided a fascinating glimpse at how the congressional library utilizes OCLC services and how LC has now begun to exploit the work of other OCLC participating music catalogers to build its own catalog. Our ideal of a cooperatively created, shared international database is slowly, but inevitably, coming to fruition. And the bibliographic control of music is surely, though quietly, improving.

Other sessions were devoted to products and services (PromptCat, TechPro, FirstSearch, EPIC), training, or to recent developments in cooperative cataloging. The meeting was preceded by a well attended, excellent workshop on score tagging/cataloging by our very own OCLC Liaison, Jay Weitz. As Chair of MOUG, I must publicly commend him not, only for the superior workshops he has conducted for us, but also for his significant contributions to our organization: newsletter articles, answers to innumerable questions, and yeomanly service as a good natured conduit between MOUG and OCLC.

You will be reading about all of these events in the Newsletter. We were concerned that after the highly successful joint OLAC/MOUG meeting last October, there would be a decrease of interest in attending the February meeting. But that did not turn out to be the case: Eighty-one registrants attended and enthusiastically participated in the sessions and activities. Our thanks again to the Program Committee for a job well done (Laura Gayle Green, Ruth Inman, Margaret Kaus, Lois Kuyper-Rushing, and Cheryl Taranto). While we’re reading about the past February meeting, planning is under way for Seattle, next February. The probable date for the meeting is February 6-7. Mark it on your calendar now.

Two new officers for MOUG were elected this past winter. Karen Little (University of Louisville) was elected Vice Chair/Chair Elect, and Christine Grandy was elected for another term as Treasurer. It was a hard fought, but fair election (no negative campaigning)—and our congratulations go to the victors as well as to the other nominees: Candice Feldt, Tufts University, and Lois Kuyper-Rushing, Louisiana State University. Let’s thank the Nominations Committee for a job well done (Sue Weiland, Chair, Pam Juengling, and Laura Snyder).

Now that I have mentioned Laura Snyder, I must make a point of thanking her for truly outstanding contributions to MOUG. She has now completed her four year stint as Vice Chair/Chair Elect/Chair Past Chair. But she also served as Continuing Education Coordinator in 1988-1990! MOUG owes her a debt of gratitude. Wherever you are when you are reading this, put your hands together and clap for a big round of applause.

(continued on page 4)
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 78713-8916.

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, 1299 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. 21-59 are available from the Treasurer for $5.00 per copy).

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

The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
FINANCIAL REPORT
1st Quarter
January-March 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Checking Account on January 1, 1995</td>
<td>$6,342.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Savings Account on January 1, 1995</td>
<td>$13,829.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Available on January 1, 1995</td>
<td>$20,171.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$1,285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Meeting Registrations</td>
<td>3,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLAC/MOUG Meeting Overage</td>
<td>1,393.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td>326.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Interest</td>
<td>77.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,732.62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>$210.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Expense</td>
<td>1,575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>147.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Badges</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Refund</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUG/OLAC Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Travel (Papakhian)</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACO Music:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA Travel (Schuitema: Midwinter)</td>
<td>66.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>40.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>54.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of MOUG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>18.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing (Envelopes)</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>16.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,607.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Gain</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,125.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Checking Account on March 31, 1995</td>
<td>$10,390.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Savings Account on March 31, 1995</td>
<td>$13,906.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Available on March 31, 1995</td>
<td>$24,297.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the coming year, we will hold an election for Secretary/Newsletter Editor and Continuing Education Coordinator. Although we have not yet formed a Nominations Committee, if you are interested in either of these offices, please feel free to contact any current officer. The Nominations Committee will try to identify two individuals for each of those positions sometime later this summer.

You all have heard by now that RILM will be made available via the OCLC's FirstSearch this Spring. This will be the first online indexing/abstracting service with a music focus offered through the FirstSearch system. Consequently, we have formed, in consultation with Ruthann McTyre, a MOUG Reference Products Interest Group: Ruthann McTyre, Chair, Leslie Bennett, Bonna Boettcher, Holly Bourne, Alan Green, Laura Gayle Green, Marty Jenkins, and, Philip Vandermeer. Ruth has served as the MOUG Public Services Coordinator for some time. We will be working with her to refine the charge of this group, but its immediate task will be to examine the RILM database once it has been mounted on FirstSearch and EPIC and to evaluate the appropriateness of the search engine and the indexing as it is presented through these OCLC Reference products. The group will then make recommendations to OCLC regarding possible changes, improvements and enhancements, and also report these results to the membership via the MOUG Newsletter. This is an exciting new development for music OCLC users and we will be monitoring it closely.

Finally, if you have any suggestions for sessions at our next meeting (or topics that you would like to see addressed), please bring those to the attention of Laura Gayle Green (Continuing Education Coordinator) soon. The program will be formulated over the next several months. MOUG officers will be meeting again in September, so if you have any other OCLC related issues which you think we should address as an organization, please feel free to contact me by phone, paper mail, or e-mail.

FROM THE EDITOR
Judy Weidow

This newsletter contains the first reports from the Atlanta meeting. Throughout this issue you will see announcements about RILM being loaded on FirstSearch in Spring 1995. Just before going to press, OCLC announced that this will not take place until Fall of 1995.

Are you still struggling with format integration? OCLC guru, Jay Weitz, makes it all clear for us in his mini-lesson on p. 10.

FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR
Laura Gayle Green

I enjoyed seeing everyone at the MOUG meeting in Atlanta. I'd like to thank those who attended -- we couldn't have a meeting without you. I especially appreciate those of you who took time to fill out evaluations -- I read them several times in order to better understand what you liked/disliked about this year's meeting and how to make next year's meeting even better. I'm working on naming Program Committee members and preparing for next year's meeting in Seattle. I anticipate that the meeting will include discussions about format integration, since it's just been implemented. If you have a topic you'd like to see pursued at a MOUG meeting, please contact me. Again, thanks for coming to MOUG, and I look forward to putting together an exciting program for the Seattle meeting!

NEWS FROM OCLC
Jay Weitz
OCLC

Cataloging Products

PRISM Authorities, installed Dec. 3, 1994, replaces the authorities functions previously provided by OCLC's Linked Systems Project Authorities System for participants in the National Coordinated Cataloging Operations (NACO) Program. PRISM Authorities allows NACO libraries to create and edit authority records in the PRISM environment; edited records are forwarded daily to the National Authority File. OCLC PRISM users can access PRISM Authorities as an information resource, as well as edit copies of authority records found in the file for downloading to their local systems. The new system allows the creation of records from a workform or existing record, full-screen editing, the use of constant data records, access to two records at one time, and record validation. The PRISM Authorities File contains records created by the Library of Congress and NACO participants and includes records of personal names, corporate names, conference names, geographic names, series, uniform titles and subject headings. The PRISM Authorities installation also includes changes that facilitate large fields in both bibliographic and authority records. Instead of the "continued" fields that now appear in large fields, these large fields (those larger than about 600 characters)
will be segmented. Segmented fields can be identified by a "segment number" in brackets following the line number. Each segment can be edited, deleted, copied, pasted, etc., using the same editing techniques that are used with whole fields.

OCLC is looking for participants in the "Building a Catalog of Internet Resources" project. Project volunteers will identify, select and catalog Internet-accessible resources and contribute machine-readable records to OCLC. The project is a coordinated effort among libraries and institutions of higher education to create, implement, test and evaluate a searchable database of USMARC format bibliographic records, complete with electronic location and access information (USMARC field 856), for Internet-accessible materials. A grant from the U.S. Department of Education funds 58 percent of the $107,327 project; OCLC is contributing the balance of the costs. The 18-month project is funded from Oct. 1, 1994, to March 31, 1996, through the federal Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-A. For more information on the "Building a Catalog of Internet Resources" project, contact Erik Jul at 1-614-764-4364 or by e-mail at jul@oclc.org. A "Project Overview," "Questions and Answers" and "Participant Enrollment Form" are available from OCLC via FTP and the World Wide Web. The OCLC WWW server is at http://www.oclc.org under "What's New ... What's Hot," "Internet Cataloging Project." The same information is also available via FTP at ftp.rsch.oclc.org/pub/internet_cataloging_project.

In collaboration with OCLC, UCLA is carrying out a pilot project to test the assumptions that underlie the core record cataloging concept developed by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). Since late December 1994, UCLA has been adding experimental core records for monographs to the OLUC. All records are supported by NACO authority work. The final set was expected to have been added to the OLUC by mid-March.

The National Library in Prague (NLP) now uses the OCLC PRISM service for cataloging its foreign acquisitions and is the first East European national library to contribute records to OCLC. NLP will contribute the Czech National Bibliography to the OCLC Online Union Catalog (OLUC) beginning with 1995 data. Loading of the backfile of 1983-1994 records into OLUC is under consideration. NLP will contribute the records in UNIMARC 94 format and OCLC will convert the records into USMARC for loading into OLUC. The agreement between NLP and OCLC came in association with Info Technology Supply Ltd. (ITS), OCLC's distributors for Central and Eastern Europe.

PromptCat is scheduled for release in April.

Reference Products

RILM Abstracts of Music Literature, a database of musicological bibliography, will be available in the fall of 1995 on the FirstSearch service and the EPIC service. RILM offers broad, international coverage and concise abstracts. All formats of scholarly works are included--articles, books, bibliographies, catalogs, dissertations, films and videos, conference proceedings and more. Concert reviews, recording notes, and pedagogical manuals are also included if they are of scholarly interest. Areas of coverage encompass historical musicology, ethnomusicology, instruments and voice, librarianship, dance, music therapy and various other fields as they relate to music, including literature, dramatic arts and visual arts as well as anthropology, sociology, philosophy and physics. An additional feature of RILM Abstracts of Music Literature particularly valuable to scholars is its in-depth indexing. All records are thoroughly indexed by names and subjects covered in each bibliographic entry. The RILM database contains approximately 200,000 records from 1969 through 1991. The database will be updated semi-annually. RILM Abstracts of Music Literature will be available by subscription as well as per-search on the FirstSearch service.

The FirstSearch service now offers immediate online access to the full text of nearly 1 million serial articles linked to citations in six FirstSearch databases and accessible using the FirstSearch document delivery system. Users can view the text on a computer screen, send it to their Internet e-mail address, or do both. Users also can send the document to a local printer. Full Text Online is the sixth FirstSearch document delivery option. Other article delivery methods include fax; interlibrary loan; overnight and ordinary mail; and FastDoc, a full-image service that provides automated delivery of articles from scanned collections within an hour. The full text is being supplied by UMI and is available for articles found in 1,400 journal titles. It is part of a system software upgrade, the sixth major upgrade since FirstSearch was introduced in October 1991. Other enhancements in the upgrade include: redesigned document ordering screens, more library holdings options, and the addition of the OR operator.

Subscription pricing for the FirstSearch service, OCLC's online reference service for library patrons, has been reduced effective Jan. 2, 1995. More than 5,200 libraries currently subscribe to FirstSearch, one of the fastest growing online computer services in the information industry. With the new structure, pricing in the United States and internationally for base
package simultaneous logons (ports) has been lowered and ranges for port prices have been changed. Custom port prices for individually purchased base package databases will be increased to more accurately reflect the cost to OCLC of producing and/or maintaining these databases.

OCLC and EBSCO Publishing, a leading developer and producer of periodical and reference databases, have agreed to jointly create a database of full-text article images, and to make them available to their respective users in various electronic formats. The organizations will initially provide the images of articles from 1,000 general interest journal titles, expanding to as many as 1,500 titles as demand warrants. Leveraging the strength of its online systems and the rapid growth of the FirstSearch service, OCLC will make these images available online and accessible through its own databases such as ArticleFirst and FastDoc, as well as from many of the files it licenses from database producers. EBSCO will use the image database to create a variety of CD-ROM products that will enhance its current product line, which includes such popular products as Magazine Article Summaries, Academic Abstracts and Primary Search. EBSCO also plans to offer online access to the images. Articles will be available for fax delivery from OCLC late in 1995. In early 1996, following release of a FirstSearch World Wide Web product, OCLC will enhance its full-text service by supporting immediate on-screen viewing and desktop printing of the article images.

OCLC is now offering FastDoc, a bibliographic database on the FirstSearch service that gives library patrons quick, easy access to the full text of articles from over 1,000 popular general interest and business journals. The FastDoc database on FirstSearch, OCLC's online reference service for library patrons, includes citations to electronic full text--from both ASCII and image collections. So once an item of interest is located in the FastDoc database, the full text can be delivered to the patron online immediately, or within an hour via fax. The ASCII full text of articles can be printed from a workstation screen, downloaded to a disk, or sent via electronic mail to the requesting patron. FastDoc covers journal titles selected from two popular UMI databases: ABI/INFORM, the leading index of articles from current business and management publications; and Periodical Abstracts, a comprehensive reference to popular and academic serials. In addition to the online viewing and one-hour fax delivery, other document ordering options--regular mail and overnight delivery--are displayed, if applicable, on FastDoc document ordering screens.

The State Library of Iowa began a trial program of OCLC's FirstSearch service on Feb. 1, 1995. The Iowa FirstSearch Initiative will enable participating libraries to evaluate the use of remote resources in meeting the needs of local library patrons. The Central Iowa Regional Library, one of seven regional libraries in the state, will oversee the project, which involves libraries from throughout Iowa. Partially funded through the Library Services and Construction Act which is administrated by the State Library of Iowa, the project will make ports and blocks of searches for accessing FirstSearch via the Internet available to the more than 200 libraries participating in the project.

Nearly 600 libraries in Colorado will have the opportunity to participate in a FirstSearch pilot that began in February. The pilot will allow patrons of Colorado libraries to access the FirstSearch service. During the trial, participating libraries will have access to more than 50 databases and document ordering. For the month of April, ASCII full text will also be available. The project was organized by the Colorado Consortium for Database Networking (CCDN) and endorsed by Colorado Library Resource Sharing and Information Access Board (CLRSIAB). The Bibliographic Center for Research (BCR), an OCLC-affiliated regional network, will provide free technical support and training for all pilot project libraries.

Resource Sharing

Kansas State University logged the 56 millionth OCLC interlibrary loan request at 10:35 a.m. Friday, Jan. 20. The request was for the article, "Family Caregivers of the Frail Elderly," from the journal, Family and Community Health. The request was filled Jan. 24 by Southwestern College in Winfield, Kansas, the first library in the lender string. The 56 millionth OCLC interlibrary loan request came 64 days after the 55 millionth request was made by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

General OCLC News

The OCLC Internet Access trial program, which began a one year trial on April 17, 1994, has concluded ahead of schedule in order to make OCLC Internet Access to PRISM a permanent access option effective February 1, 1995. If you consider using Internet, please remember that OCLC support does not include troubleshooting Internet problems. OCLC can troubleshoot problems at the OCLC host and help users with OCLC microsoftware configuration for Internet access. For problems connecting to the Internet or reaching OCLC across the Internet, users must contact the Internet support staff at their institution.
In 1994, 110 libraries in Asia and the Pacific region became new OCLC users. As of the end of 1994, a total of 339 libraries in Asia Pacific were using OCLC products and services. Of the 110 new users, 35 are in Australia, 34 in Japan, 19 in Korea, two in Malaysia, nine in New Zealand, eight in Taiwan, and three in Thailand.

Liz Bishoff has been promoted to vice president, member services. In her new position, Ms. Bishoff will be responsible for relations with OCLC users and OCLC’s major constituencies, including Users Council, user advisory committees, the Library of Congress and other national libraries, and the American Library Association (ALA). She also assumes responsibility for the OCLC Pacific division, legislative monitoring activities, and the OCLC Corporate Information Center. Ms. Bishoff joined OCLC in 1987 as manager of the cataloging and database services department and most recently held the position of director of member relations. She is active in ALA, having served on numerous committees and as president of the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) in 1992-93. She is now a member of the ALA Council.

News From Library Resources Management Division

The Library of Congress has announced a change in policy concerning collections of song texts without music. Cataloging Service Bulletin no. 66 (Fall 1994, p. 42) states, "Current policy for the cataloging treatment of music-related materials is based on physical format. That in turn governs which chapter of AACR is used for the description which then governs the type-of-record value assigned." In other words, songbooks without music should now be entered as books, regardless of how they might be classified in LC. Policy on music instructional materials remains unchanged: If the item is predominantly music, catalog it as a score; if primarily textual, catalog it as a book. Type code changes may be sent to OCLC's Online Data Quality Control Section by phone, mail, or electronic mail.

LC MARC Standards has approved the ANSCR classification scheme for addition to the USMARC code list for relates, sources, description conventions, Part III: classification sources, field 084 (Other classification number). The designated code assigned is "anscr" and is now valid for use.

Format Integration Phase 1 was implemented January 31, 1995. This phase validates all variable fields, indicator values, and subfield codes in any input record. Phase 1 is similar to other MARC updates OCLC has done in the past, only it's bigger because it affects more fields. Phase 2, which will change fixed fields and control fields (00X), is scheduled for late 1995. OCLC will announce its plans for Phase 2 later in 1995. Format Integration requires no changes in cataloging practice, procedures, or workflows. It affects only some tagging conventions, but in most cases, there is no change. Changes with the biggest impact are in the notes fields and in varying forms of titles. Revision pages for Bibliographic Formats and Standards will be distributed to users this spring.

To make it easier for members with World Wide Web access to report bibliographic records needing correction, the Electronic Duplicate Report and the Electronic Bibliographic Change Report are now available through OCLC's home page on the World Wide Web. To access the forms, use these URLs:

- http://www.oclc.org/oclc/forms/bibdup.htm FOR DUPLICATES
- http://www.oclc.org/oclc/forms/bibchg.htm FOR CHANGES

Or access the home page with the URL, http://www.oclc.org/, and click first on "OCLC Documentation, Publications, and Forms" and then on "Forms." Fill the forms out online and send them to OCLC by clicking on the "Send" button. The forms have hypertext links to online instructions as well as to the text of the Bibliographic Formats and Standards reference manual. Use the forms to report filing indicator changes, Type Code changes, name and subject corrections, Non-book duplicates, and other types of corrections. For members without World Wide Web access, the Electronic Duplicate Report and the Electronic Bibliographic Change Report forms are also available on the Internet, via E-mail and FTP.

During December 1994, OCLC loaded the entire backfile of AVLINE records from the National Library of Medicine, a total of 27,354 records. Roughly 88% of these records are in the Audiovisual Media format, 10% in the Sound Recordings format, and 2% in the Computer Files format. We now expect to load new and corrected AVLINE records on a regular monthly basis. Please note that NLM does not currently distribute records for nonprint serials (including computer file serials) and will not do so until after MARC Format Integration Phase 2, currently scheduled for late 1995.

The master list of OCLC Enhance participants is now available on the Internet using either E-mail or FTP (file transfer protocol). The list is updated whenever libraries are added or deleted. Each institution is listed alphabetically by three-character code, followed by the institution name, regional network, and the bibliographic format for which it is authorized. Following are instructions for access to the Master Enhance List by each method.
I. E-MAIL METHOD (You may need to adapt these instructions for your e-mail program).

1. Address an Internet e-mail message to:
   "listproc@oclc.org".

2. Type the get command in the body of the e-
   mail message: "get doc/enhance
   master.enhance.list". Listproc e-mails you a copy
   of the Master Enhance List file.

II. FTP METHOD (The following procedure works
    for most FTP sites. FTP programs vary from site
to site, however, so be sure to read your FTP
documentation carefully).

1. Before you log on to OCLC's system, change
    to the first destination directory for the files you
    will download to your workstation or local system.
    (Use the "cd" command.) To change the current
directory on your workstation or local system

when you are logged on at OCLC, use the "lcd"
command. In FTP, the "cd" command changes
the current directory on the remote (OCLC's) system.

2. At your prompt, type "ftp ftp.rsch.oclc.org"
    and press <Enter>. The system responds with a
    request for you to log on.

3. Log on as anonymous. Use your own
    Internet E-mail address as the password. FTP
    responds with its own prompt: "ftp>." (Your
    prompt may differ.)

4. Type "cd /pub/documentation/doc/enhance/
    " and press <Enter> to change to the OCLC
directory that contains the Master Enhance List.

5. Type "get master.enhance.list" and press
    <Enter> to copy the file. The get command
    copies files into your current local directory.

6. Type "bye" and press <Enter> to exit FTP.

---

ENHANCE INSTITUTIONS
As of March 17, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGU</td>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>Ohionet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>San Diego County Law Library</td>
<td>Pacnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>PRLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>New England Conservatory</td>
<td>Nelnnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZM</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>WILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZN</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td>WILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRH</td>
<td>Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, UT Austin</td>
<td>Amigos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKG</td>
<td>Champaign (Illinois) Public Library</td>
<td>Illinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUG</td>
<td>Indiana University, Music ARL RECON</td>
<td>Incolsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUL</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Incolsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IXA</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Amigos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>Minneapolis Public Library</td>
<td>Minetx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>Public Library of Charlotte &amp; Mecklenberg County (N.C.)</td>
<td>Solinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBE</td>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>Ohionet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORU</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Pacnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRU</td>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
<td>Solinet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIN</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>Ohionet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>PRLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUS</td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>Pacnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEM</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>MLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>New England Conservatory</td>
<td>Nelnnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Solinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZM</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
<td>WILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZN</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
<td>WILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRH</td>
<td>Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, UT Austin</td>
<td>Amigos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAY</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Illinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>Amigos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUG</td>
<td>Indiana University, Music ARL RECON</td>
<td>Incolsa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION: I'm in a quandary here concerning the instructions for the 041 languages field in the new Bib formats document. We have a recording with works being sung both in the original language and in translation. The original languages vary. In the old sound recordings format under instructions for 041 subfield "h" there was a paragraph which read: "If the recording contains separate pieces, some of which are translations and some of which are originals in various languages, do not use field 041. In fixed field 'Lang,' enter the code for the language of the major portion of the text. In case of doubt, use code 'mul.'" I cannot seem to find any guidance on what to do in this situation in the new Bib formats document. Am I missing something that appears somewhere else in the new formats document, or has something changed that I'm not aware of?

Answer: Some things certainly got smushed around in creating the single BF&S volume, but I think the essence of what you're asking still appears on p. 0:89, from the top all the way down to the "History" heading. As far as I am aware, policy has not changed, and you may continue to code as you have previously.

QUESTION: While I understand that "$x Scores" is inappropriate for subject analysis of a piece for a single instrument, is it correct to assign this subdivision to headings of the form "Songs (High voice) with piano"?

Answer: The subdivision "Scores" (and most of the other such musical format subdivisions) are not to be used under categories of works that are generally published in only one format, such as hymns, solo instrumental works, songs, vocal ensembles, etc. (Subject Cataloging Manual H 1160). It should not be used under the heading you've mentioned.

QUESTION: Another question about musical format subdivisions: The musical format subdivisions cannot be doubled up, right? For example, "Concertos (Violin) $x Solo with piano" cannot further be subdivided using "$x Scores and parts"?

Answer: "Doubling up" the format subdivisions is generally not done. Looking at a bunch of LC records, I find that they use the subdivision "Solo with piano" both when the item is a score alone (with the ensemble arranged for piano) (87-751358) and when the item is a score with part(s) (89-750066).

QUESTION: Am I correct in assuming that the term "Arranged" is used in a subject heading to qualify the current form rather than the original? For example, a Haydn trio for baritone, viola and bass arranged for three guitars should have "Trios (Baryton, viola, double bass), Arranged" rather than "String trios (Baritone, viola, double bass), Arranged"?

ANSWER: Yes, "Arranged" is used to qualify the medium arranged TO (the current instrumentation), not the medium arranged FROM (the original instrumentation).

QUESTION: Under what circumstances is it appropriate to use Type "d" for the cataloging of photocopies of holographs, copies produced and distributed (hence published?) only by the composer? I have always treated these as Type "c", with "[S.l. : J.Q.Public, 198-?]", a "Reproduced from holograph." note, and the appropriate subject headings for manuscript facsimiles. Should Type "d" be used if the only available date is a date of composition AND the score lacks a publishing statement? Is this not worth agonizing about, since format integration will be with us soon enough?

ANSWER: After searching for and finding a number of LC records for photocopies of manuscripts and holographs, I was just as confused, having found about as many entered as "d" as were entered as "c". So I asked LC directly. Here was the reply of LC's Deta Davis: "Our policy is to use code 'd' only if it is an actual, original ms. Any photocopy or published
reproduction is code 'c.' Any inconsistencies are errors and should be reported.

QUESTION: Is there ever a time when titles in the 505 are traced in 740's, at least according to national standards? My understanding is that is not done with any format, and I have found nothing in any of the various manuals that recommend using 740's for titles in the 505. I am also, however, seeing lots of records online that do that. I realize that libraries may choose to do it for various good local reasons, but I just wanted to nail down what the national standard may be.

ANSWER: There is no explicit national standard on tracing titles in contents notes, as far as I am aware. RI 21.30J, however, in the midst of its guidelines about title added entries, does state, "When in doubt, it is best to be liberal in assigning additional title added entries." We permit our members to trace titles from 505s, though we would prefer that only distinctive titles be so traced (that is, tracing titles such as "Symphony no. 3" would be meaningless). In fact, many users object when LC records come along and wipe out such entries. As long as only distinctive titles are traced and system limits are not exceeded, there is no objection to titles from contents notes being traced.

QUESTION: My question concerns a contents note to be added to a master record as a "database enrichment." The record is pre-AACR2 cataloging. I understand that the contents note has the individual titles separated by "period-dash-dash." What about cases where durations are readily available: Can they be included in the format "(MM:SS)?" (publisher or library) is useful.

ANSWER: In AACR1 252F7 and 252F10, the only provision for durations in Sound Recordings is in a separate note, in the form:

Durations: 9 min., 7 sec.; 10 min., 23 sec.; <etc.>

It's a bit unwieldy, to be sure, but those were the rules, pre-AACR2. Of course, you can't add a 500 note as a database enrichment. The format you've suggested mixes pre-AACR2 and AACR2, a practice I don't generally advocate. With the automatic transfer of certain fields during merges, however, such mixing can occur, so it isn't exactly unheard of. Let your Anglo-American Conscience Regulator (AACR) be your guide.

QUESTION: Would you consider these two records to be duplicates? One has in the 300, "1 score (46 p.)" whereas the other has "2 scores (46 p. each)." I ask this because it involves a general principle involving the publication of scores for 2 pianos. I suspect that the publisher issued one score, and that it was necessary to buy two copies; the approach in the second record implies that two scores were issued together, which of course sometimes does happen.

ANSWER: They sound like duplicates. When two identical copies are required for performance, that has always seemed to me a holdings question, not a question of bibliographic description in the 300. (A 500 note to that effect might be appropriate, though: Two copies needed for performance.) Please DO report such cases as duplicates.

QUESTION: In a related matter, I always report records which have, say, "1 score (2 v.)" vs. "1 score (2 v. in 1)" as duplicates, assuming that in the latter case the volumes were bound together after publication, and should not have been cataloged this way. The conservative approach, which seems to be an OCLC principle concerning the merging of duplicates, would allow both records to stand. Should I stop reporting these cases?

ANSWER: On this question of "2 v." versus "2 v. in 1" it's more difficult to generalize. If the latter is a local binding decision, these are duplicates. But I've seen cases where things have been issued both ways, and those have to be considered legitimately separate records. When you report such possible duplicates, any evidence to help determine who did the binding (publisher or library) is useful. I'll usually send the query on to the inputting library.

FORMAT INTEGRATION
Mini-Lesson on Fields 246 and 740
Jay Weitz
OCLC

The advent of Format Integration Phase 1 in January 1995 brought the 246 field out of the world of serials and into the larger bibliographic universe. Since then, many questions about the use of 246 and 740 have arisen. This little "cheat sheet" on 246/740 should help you apply the fields correctly.

246 VARYING FORM OF TITLE
(REPEATABLE)

Use for uncontrolled variants of the title for the entire item.

First Indicator
0 Note, no title added entry
1 Note, title added entry
2 No note, no title added entry
3 No note, title added entry

Second Indicator

blank  No information provided

Use when no information is provided as to the type of title; includes corrected forms of title, "at head of title" data, binder’s titles, colophon titles, container titles, and titles from sources other than 245; use also for additional title added entries formulated because of the presence of abbreviations, ampersands, numbers, symbols, etc. Information on the type of title may be provided in subfield $i$ (Display text). NO print constant is generated.

245 12 A hundred folkstunes [sic] from Hardanger = $b$ Hundert Volksmelodien aus Hardanger : op. 51 ...
246 30 Folkstunes from Hardanger
246 30 Volksmelodien aus Hardanger
246 31 Hundert Volksmelodien aus Hardanger

245 00 Regionmusiken $h$ [sound recording].
246 1  $i$ At head of title: $a$ Verbunk
245 10 Live at Moers Festival $h$ [sound recording] ...  
246 1  $i$ Additional title on container: $a$ Live at International New Jazz Festival

245 10 Father & son $h$ [sound recording].
246 3  Father and son

0 Portion of title

Use for part or section titles (245 subfield $p$), alternative titles, portions of the title proper and other title information for which access is desired, and initialisms or full forms of title (245 subfield $b$) not already the title proper. NO print constant is generated.

245 14 Der Ring des Nibelungen. $p$ Götterdämmerung ...
246 30 Götterdämmerung

245 13 Il principio, or, A regular introduction to playing the harpsichord ...
246 30 Regular introduction to playing the harpsichord

245 00 Greg and Steve present We all live together : $b$ plus song & activity book, leader’s guide ...
246 30 We all live together

245 00 ANSCR : $b$ the alpha-numeric system for classification of recordings ...
246 30 Alpha-numeric system for classification of recordings

1 Parallel title

Use for titles in another language than that of the title proper. NO print constant is generated.

245 10 Alternative instrumental music $h$ [sound recording] = $b$ Alternative Instrumentalmusik.
246 31 Alternative Instrumentalmusik

2 Distinctive title

Use for special titles that appear in addition to the regular title on an individual issue of an item. Print constant: "Distinctive title:". NOT generally used outside of serials.

3 Other title

Use for other titles that appear on the piece but are not specified by other second indicator values; subfield $i$ is not being used to provide text. Print constant: "Other title:". NOT generally used outside of serials.

4 Cover title

Use for titles from the cover. Print constant: "Cover title:".

245 00 Sonata 1 : $b$ Six sonatas, c. 1700 ...
246 04 Sonata 1 in D major

5 Added title page title

Use for titles, usually in another language, found on a title page preceding or following the title page used as chief source, or on an inverted title page at the end of the publication. Print constant: "Added title page title:".

245 10 Makbet : $b$ balet v dvukh deistviakh ...
246 15 Macbeth
**6 Caption title**

Use for titles found at the head of the first page of music or text. Print constant: "Caption title:"

245 00 Impromptus für Klavier, op. 5 ...
246 16 Impromptus über ein Thema von Clara Wieck

**7 Running title**

Use for titles printed at the top or bottom margin of each page of a publication, and for eyereadable headers in microfiche. Print constant: "Running title:"

245 10 Quadrilles ...
246 17 Herz's quadrilles

**8 Spine title**

Use for publisher-supplied titles found on the spine.
Print constant: "Spine title:"

245 10 Back at the chicken shack $h$ [sound recording] ...
246 18 Back to the chicken shack

**Subfield $i$ Display text**

Use for text to be displayed when none of the other second indicator display constants are adequate. When subfield $i$ is used, second indicator must be blank. Subfield $i$ precedes subfield $a$ at the beginning of the field.

245 04 The Bluegrass album $h$ [sound recording].
246 1 $i$ Vol. 3 has title: $a$ California connection
245 00 Stück für 2 Klarinetten in B ...
246 0 $i$ Parallel title on caption: $a$ Piece for 2 clarinets

Field 246 does not end with a mark of punctuation unless the last word in the field is an abbreviation or other data that ends with a mark of punctuation.

Initial articles are generally not recorded in field 246 unless the intent is to file on the article.

**246/740 Questions and Answers**

**QUESTION:** My question concerns items without a collective title. If Title 1 and Title 2 each had a parallel title would they be in 246's or 740's? I recall someone at the MARC Format Subcommittee
saying titles in the 246 refer to the whole and the 740 holds titles that are a part of a whole. This makes sense to me and my inclination is to put the parallel titles in 740's, but I can be easily convinced that a parallel title is a parallel title first and an analytical title second and should go in a 246.

ANSWER: That someone at the MARC Formats meeting was probably me. As I understand things right now (and we're ALL getting used to this new stuff), any analytic (part of the whole) title goes in a 740. That would include parallel titles of your Title 1 and Title 2. In other words, a title is a whole title (246) or an analytical title (740) first, then a parallel, caption, cover, etc. title.

QUESTION: I've just encountered my first FI bib record in OCLC and of course have a question about it. It's a CD with four works by Xenakis; works 2-4 are listed in the $b of the 245 and also in separate 246 fields with 2nd indicator 5. I would have been more inclined to use 740s, viewing the titles as analytic. I was curious about the use of 2nd indicator 5, added title page title. If the $b titles in the 245 are distinctive but vary from the form of title in the 700 $t, would a 246 be appropriate? And if so, what should be the 2nd indicator? The choices don't seem to fit the situation very well.

ANSWER: The Xenakis record that you encountered was incorrect in its use of the 246 field, and I have since corrected it. You have it right in your note, and the distinction is fairly simple: Use 246 for uncontrolled variants of the title for the ENTIRE item; use 740 for uncontrolled analytical titles of independent works contained within the item and for uncontrolled titles of related works external to the item. When you have no collective title, as in this instance, each of the individual distinctive titles in the string could be traced in 740s. Also note that the second indicator structure of the 740 field has changed with Format Integration.

QUESTION: I'm cataloging Nelhybel's *Trois danses liturgiques*, which would formerly have had title added entries:

- 740 01 3 danses liturgiques.
- 740 01 Danses liturgiques.

I am doing these both as 246 10. First indicator 1 is supposed to generate a note, which I don't want to do, but the instructions for 246 say that a note is NOT provided if the 2nd indicator is 0 or 1. (I am assuming that 2nd indicator 0 is applicable for titles such as this. Also, if I were cataloging a piece with the title, say, Chorale prelude on Lobe den Herren, I suppose that if I wanted a title added entry for Lobe den Herren, it too would be 246 10.)

ANSWER: For the Nelhybel title added entries, I would use:

- 245 10 Trois danses liturgiques...
- 246 3 3 danses liturgiques
- 246 30 Danses liturgiques

That first 246 has first indicator 3 (no note, title added entry), second indicator blank. This is assuming that the title "Trois danses liturgiques" is for the ENTIRE item, not only one among a number of other works contained in the piece. The first 246 has a blank second indicator as it is formulated because of the presence of a number given in an alternate form. The second 246 has second indicator 0 because it is a portion of the title proper (number dropped). Same goes for your "Lobe den Herren" example, portion of title proper.

- 245 10 Chorale prelude on Lobe den Herren...
- 246 30 Lobe den Herren

QUESTION: I have the following situation:

- 100 1 Schubert, Franz, $d 1797-1828.
- 240 10 Piano music. $k Selections

I am trying to follow the latest rule interpretations about title tracings on this, which is easy enough except for the matter of MARC tagging under format integration. What I think I should do is trace the variant forms of the 245 $a using a 246 (since LC has decided to trace the $a anyway because of the new GMD placement, etc.), but this flies in the face of advice from LC given at MLA, which said if a title refers to a portion of the item being cataloged, trace it using 740 with indicators 02. What I have done in my first pass at the above record is to trace the 245 $a as follows:

- 246 1 Vierunddreissig valses sentimentales
  (The language of the chief source is principally German; the French titles are actually those supplied by Schubert to the works in question)
- 246 1 Valses sentimentales
  ... and then handled the tracings for the "12 valses nobles" using 740s, including the concatenated Title A ; Title B. (I am assuming that Title C would not be included since it is a non-distinctive, generic title that LC would not trace either singly or in concert with the preceding titles). This seems inconsistent, and I would feel much better about it if you were to tell me, "No, use 740's for all of them."

ANSWER: None of the individual titles is comprehensive (i.e., for the entire recording), so none of them alone would be 246's. The "Vierunddreissig valses ...", "Valses sentimentales", "12 valses ...", etc. would all be 740's. Field 246 is used only for titles that could be equivalents of the title for the ENTIRE piece (if there were a collective title). The title "34
and so on, but there can be no systematic attempt to do it before that date via Enhance, minimal level upgrades, there will be periodic announcements in PRISM News. Users are welcome to change existing records from MARC field 740 to 246. To make the changes from MARC field 740 to 246, it is represented by schematic example 17 or 18 (the last two under "Items without a collective title") rather than example 1. Titles A and B have to be immediately adjacent in order to justify the title added entry for all of them strung together.

QUESTION: Now that format integration is a fait accompli, who is going to go through the 30-odd million bibliographic records in the OLUC and make the changes from MARC field 740 to 246? Will it be our good and tireless friend, Algo Rithm?

ANSWER: We're keeping track of everyone who asks this question and its variations and are going to send this question and its variations and are going to send them strung together.

..." is just the first of the non-collective titles and is just as analytical as the others here. In this case, I also think you would not do the "concatenated" title thing either because the title proper of this item was not changed by the new subfielding practice; it would have ended before the other title information regardless. If we're looking at RI 21.30J, it is represented by schematic example 17 or 18 (the last two under "Items without a collective title") rather than example 1. Titles A and B have to be immediately adjacent in order to justify the title added entry for all of them strung together.

In May, after a hiatus of nearly two years, the Special Materials Cataloging Division gained a permanent chief, Susan H. Vita. Ms. Vita had been the division's acting chief since November 1993 and attended last year's MOUG and MLA meetings where many of you met her. The division is now moving ahead under her leadership. Barbara Tillett became the new chief of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office as of March 7, 1994. She came to us from the University of California, San Diego.

In April, the Enhanced Cataloging Division was abolished and ten catalogers and two technicians were reassigned virtually intact as a team to the Special Materials Cataloging Division as the Music and Sound Recordings Team III. Frank Seidlinger, also from the Enhanced Cataloging Division, serves as their team leader. For once in recent history, staffing on the music teams has become stable. However, there has been one sad note in our division. At the end of May, Virginia (AKA June) Gifford died unexpectedly, after a brief illness.

Cataloging productivity of music material in the Special Materials Cataloging Division is at an all-time high. In fiscal year 1994, the Music and Sound Recordings Teams I and II cleared a total of 11,582 items. This number includes full and copy cataloging for 3,449 scores, less-than-full cataloging for 1,897 scores, full cataloging for 2,005 music books, and 1,826 sound recordings cataloged as full and less-than-full. From early October to late December 1994, the two teams cleared a total of 4,267 items, this number includes full and copy cataloging for 3,449 scores, less-than-full cataloging for 1,897 scores, full cataloging for 2,005 music books, and 1,826 sound recordings cataloged as full and less-than-full. From early October to late December 1994, the two teams cleared a total of 4,267 items, which includes 548 sound recordings and 3,118 scores. We continue to have no arrearage of scores or books on music requiring full cataloging.

On October 3, the Music and Sound Recordings Teams I and II began a six month long SWAT effort called the PARTITUR (which stands for PLC Arrearage Reduction Team Insuring Timely Universal Retrieval) Ensemble. The goal of this team is to eliminate the arrearage of scores identified for less-than-full cataloging. The team consists of two groups of catalogers and technicians, each serving a three month detail. We began the project with 5,800 scores. Many have been found on OCLC, thus allowing us to catalog these items at a higher level of fullness than we originally anticipated in less time. It is expected that we will complete the project by the end of March, our projected completion date. Before the PARTITUR
Ensemble was formed, this arrearage was scheduled for completion at the end of 1997.

The Music and Sound Recordings Team III catalogs popular and jazz sound recordings by using exact-match copy on OCLC or by creating original, brief cataloging records. In fiscal year 1994, this team cataloged 21,105 sound recordings, creating 13,634 brief records and 7,471 exact-match copy records. In the first quarter of 1995 (October-December 1994) the Music and Sound Recordings Team III cataloged 7,329 sound recordings, with 3,772 utilizing copy and 3,557 newly created brief records.

Sound Recording Arrearage

The greatest challenge facing all the music catalogers in the Library of Congress is the 2 million item sound recording arrearage. Susan Vita, Chief of the Special Materials Cataloging Division, volunteered to assume responsibility for this arrearage. Management staff of the Special Materials Cataloging Division have been meeting throughout the past year with members of the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division to plan strategies for the processing of this arrearage. The first full-scale project to emerge from this planning is to catalog a collection of 500,000 historical jazz 78 sound recordings that the library received by gift and purchase from Robert and Jon Altshuler in Long Island, New York. We expect these sound recordings, known as the Altshuler Collection, to be cleared from the arrearage by the end of 1995 with the creation of inventory-level records by multiple SWAT teams formed from staff from all areas of the library. In addition to working on the Altshuler Collection, we have begun to catalog sound recordings from the Armed Forces Radio and Television Series (AFRTS). The records created from both these projects will be added to the Cuadra Star system managed in the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division. Other future projects for clearing the sound recording arrearage include the NBC Radio Disc Inventory of 75,000 78 rpm sound discs, Office of War Information Collection, and A to Z inventories of 33 1/3 rpm sound discs and compact discs. An A to Z inventory involves processing every item on the shelves from the beginning of our collection to the end.

With the size of this collection, we recognize that we will probably not be able to eliminate this arrearage with our current staffing levels. In fact, the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division had estimated that they would have needed 222 catalogers to fully catalog their collection, and this does not take into account cataloging scores and books on music. The Special Materials Cataloging Division has 25 music catalogers on all three Music and Sound Recordings Teams. With these figures in mind, we are pursuing the possibilities of various kinds of contract assistance. One aspect we are considering is to have a complete music authority file machine-generated from our existing Music File in MUMS. This machine-generated music authority file would include virtually all uniform titles in the MUMS Music File. We are also investigating the possibility of negotiating for cost-effective contract cataloging. However, funding restrictions may limit or prohibit this alternative.

Sabbatical Announcement

The Special Materials Cataloging Division is offering unpaid sabbaticals to music librarians to assist with sound recording arrearage reduction as mentioned above and to receive instruction in cataloging sound recordings. Participants will spend approximately three-fifths of their time each week performing intensive arrearage reduction activities. The remaining two-fifths of their time would be in one-on-one sound recording cataloging instruction with a senior cataloger in the Special Materials Cataloging Division. If there are multiple concurrent participants, classes in specific aspects of Library of Congress music cataloging practices may also be offered.

By the end of each sabbatical, participants will be familiar with Library of Congress sound recording cataloging practices. Each participant will also have the satisfaction of assisting with the arrearage reduction efforts that will serve the entire music library community.

Up to three sabbaticals will be offered simultaneously. This opportunity will be offered for one year. After the first year it will be reviewed for its effectiveness, and possibly renewed in subsequent years.

Requirements

Participants must have an MLS degree, significant academic music training, and some cataloging experience, preferably in music. The minimum duration for each sabbatical is three months and may continue to a maximum of six months. Under special circumstances, shorter durations will be considered.

Each applicant should submit a curriculum vitae or complete resume to: Susan H. Vita, Chief, Special Materials Cataloging Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC 20540-4370, indicating the time frame s/he is available with her/his application. A list of short-term apartments is available upon request.
For further information you can contact Deta S. Davis at (202) 707-5259 or davis@mail.loc.gov.

Cooperative Cataloging And Other Outreach

Core Record for Music

Under the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, the Task Group for the Core Record for Music formed and completed its work under the leadership of Joan Schuitema, chair. Other members of the group were Deta S. Davis (LC liaison), Michael Colby (UC Davis), Laura Snyder (Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music), and Sue Stancu (Indiana University). The group developed the core record, solicited responses from the music library community, and submitted a final report, on time, on September 15. We accomplished this without having had a single meeting, but rather all our group work was completed on e-mail. The core record is not intended to replace full or minimal level cataloging, but rather presents a third option for cataloging contributions. One key aspect of the core record is full authority control for all access points. This authority control (via NACO Music) along with training and program standards will assure high quality additions to our national databases.

NACO Music

The NACO-Music Project currently includes 20 libraries, which contributed 3,518 new NARs (name authority records) in fiscal year 1994 and 459 new NARs to date in fiscal year 1995. In addition, 823 NARs and SARs were changed in the FY94 and to date in FY 95. June Gifford served as the LC liaison from December 1993 to May. She was succeeded by Lucas Graves. Responsibilities of the liaison include answering questions on descriptive cataloging and name authority control, investigating reports of duplicate headings, performing bibliographic file maintenance to the LC database, and circulating suggestions from the outside among LC music catalogers. As announced at last year’s meeting, the revision to the Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1, allowing the addition of authority records as part of a project or program, was published in May 1994. The introduction has added a new, fifth justification for name authority creation that states: "the authority record is needed as part of a project or program, e.g. creation of uniform title authority records for each composer's works."

Proposals for expanding the project and opening it to new libraries were approved by Sarah Thomas, Director for Cataloging. We hope that the success with which NACO-Music has involved independent members in the training and review of new participants can be replicated in future NACO-Music programs. To support these decentralized educational efforts, Michelle Koth of Yale University and Jeffrey Earnest of Stanford University prepared the Handbook of Examples for Use in Authority Records Created by the NACO Music Project. A draft version with revisions by Mark Ziomek of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office has been submitted to LC staff for comment.

Summary

As usual, the budget situation for the Library of Congress continues to be a major factor in all aspects of the library's operation. With the new Congress there are many uncertainties, with federal agencies facing almost inevitable rescissions. However, in the Special Materials Cataloging Division, we have been given authority to hire five additional technicians to assist with the elimination of the sound recording arrearage. We believe that we will also be able to replace any catalogers we lose in the foreseeable future. In the next year, we expect to achieve the cataloging goals set forth for us, thus providing the music library community with several thousand additional catalog records of sound recordings, scores, and books on music.

SUMMARY OF THE MOUG ANNUAL MEETING: FEBRUARY 7-8, 1995, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Program

Tuesday, February 7, 1995

7:00-9:00 p.m. Workshop: Score Tagging/Cataloging (Jay Weitz, OCLC)

Wednesday, February 8, 1995

9:00-10:15 a.m. Plenary Session I

Library of Congress' Use of OCLC in Public and Technical Services (Susan Vita, Library of Congress)

10:30-11:45 a.m. Plenary Session II
PromptCat: OCLC's Upcoming Acquisitions/Cataloging Service (Joanne Kepics, SOLINET)
TECHPRO, Outsourcing: Implications for Services (Martin D. Jenkins, Wright State University)
1:15-2:15 p.m. Small Group Activities
Cataloging Support Staff Revisited: Training (Michelle Koth, Yale University; Sue Weland, Ball State University)
How Do I Find Scores in FirstSearch? or How Do We Teach Our Patrons to Use OCLC Reference Products? (Leslie Bennett, University of Oregon)
2:30-3:15 p.m. MOUG Business Meeting
3:30-5:00 p.m. Program Sessions
Cooperative Cataloging Initiatives
Are Title II-C Grants Worth It?: The Saga of the Associated Music Libraries Group
Title II-C Retrospective Conversion Grants and the University of Illinois at Chicago
Score Retrospective Conversion (Ruth A. Inman, University of Illinois at Chicago)
Core Bibliographic Record and its Implications for OCLC Users (Joan Schuitema, Northwestern University)
Reference Issues
FirstSearch and EPIC: How Do We Get It and What Do We Do With It? (Ruthann McTyre, Baylor University)

PLENARY SESSION II

PromptCat: OCLC's Upcoming Acquisitions/Cataloging Service
Joanne Kepics, SOLINET

PromptCat overview

PromptCat provides fast copy cataloging for materials supplied by participating vendors. Available in April, 1995, PromptCat will deliver a cataloging record for any title having a monographic record in the Online Union Catalog.

Benefits of PromptCat:

* Increases productivity
* Complements your local system
* Streamlines workflow
* Increases access to your resources
* Ensures timely holdings information
* Includes unique OCLC record number in local system

PromptCat options:

Libraries select vendor to work with and may also choose:

* To have holdings set immediately or delayed 21 days
* Records by format, cataloging source, or encoding level
* Delivery by EDX, PRISM PromptCat file, tape, or cards
* Vendor supplied data
* Editing options

How PromptCat works:

Libraries decide on options listed above and complete an order form which is sent to networks. Vendors send a list of titles (manifest) and purchasing library's name to OCLC. OCLC uses the titles to set the library's holdings and produce an OCLC-MARC record for each title.

Pricing:

OCLC will charge a fee for each MARC record delivered to your library. The fee will include searching, editing, setting a holding, vendor data transfer to bibliographic records, archiving, and reports listing records processed. You also pay a one-time profiling fee for each vendor. Delivery charges for export, tape, cards, or EDX will be additional.

Using OCLC TECHPRO at Wright State University
Martin Jenkins, Music Library Coordinator, Wright State University

[Note: For more details on Wright State's situation, and a general look at the solution, see "Outsourcing Cataloging at Wright State University," by Karen Wilhoit, Serials Review v.20, #3 (1994).]

In 1992, the Wright State University Libraries faced a problem. The production from our cataloging department was below acceptable levels, and efforts to improve the situation had not been successful. Wright State catalogs about 18,000 titles each year; 93% of these are books, 3% are serials, and 4% are non-print formats. Typically there is LC or member-input copy for 95% of this material, with only 5% requiring original cataloging. In spite of the rather
straightforward nature of the material received, turnaround times of a month or more were common, with even longer delays for non-book formats. In addition, an arrearage of about 5,000 items had developed, which was felt to be too large a backlog for a collection of our size. It was this situation that prompted us to investigate contracting out our cataloging operation.

A contract was awarded to OCLC TECHPRO, and they began cataloging all materials being added to the collections at Wright State University in October 1993. Under this contract, we have been able to eliminate the backlog, get new titles into the catalog, and still save the Libraries about $250,000.

We have abolished one professional and nine classified staff positions. (The professional took early retirement. Between other available vacancies in the Libraries and persons who moved to other jobs, only one person was laid off, and he has since been recalled.) Our on-campus Bibliographic Control department now consists of one professional and two classified staff. The professional works on database cleanup, processes added copies and volumes, oversees our bindery processing, serves as our government documents liaison, and monitors the OCLC contract. The paraprofessionals prepare materials for the bindery, authority control work, linking of serials, shipping and receiving and downloading of records from OCLC. We also have student employees who do the physical processing, labeling and packing, as well as some routine database maintenance.

New materials are received in our Acquisitions department, and then are shipped to TECHPRO in Dublin, Ohio. (We were able to save shipping costs by incorporating OCLC into the route of the Ohio LINK van service.) When the books have been cataloged, they are sent back to WSU, and all physical processing is done in our Bibliographic Control department. TECHPRO stores our catalog records in an OCLC save file, and the records are then downloaded into our local Innovative Interfaces system.

If TECHPRO finds LC or NLM copy for a title, they verify the title, edition, imprint and series. Headings are assumed to be correct. If they work from member-contributed copy, all headings are verified, and contents notes are added for sound recordings (but not for other formats). If no copy is found, original cataloging is done in full compliance with national standards. Call numbers are accepted from copy, or formulated if needed. We do not have TECHPRO do shelflisting, since WSU had ceased shelflisting while still cataloging in-house.

TECHPRO charges are based on the format of the material (book, print non-book, or non-print) and the level of copy (LC/NLM, member, or original). Thus there are nine possible prices, ranging in our contract from $3.50 for an LC book to $22.00 for original non-print. For our mix of materials, this has averaged out to $5.60 per item, compared to an average of $17.00 per item when we were doing our own cataloging. TECHPRO guarantees turnaround times of 2 weeks for books and one month for other formats, another vast improvement on our previous situation.

Speaking only for the Music Library, I am very pleased with the results of our contract. First and foremost, I am getting material. During the year between when I arrived at WSU and when we began using TECHPRO, no new scores made it into the Music Library; now scores are processed in a month, or often less. The quality of the cataloging has generally been very good. Most of the errors I have found have been in the member copy, and most of these came from smaller public libraries. The original cataloging for recordings has been good, and the records have included all the necessary added entries. There have been some notable problems with lacking or incorrect uniform titles in score records. Since these problems were revealed, the current paraprofessional staff have had special training in uniform title formulation with Glen Patton from OCLC. What is more important, TECHPRO is in the process of hiring two professional music catalogers, so we should soon see even better quality in the original cataloging.

While outsourcing of the entire cataloging operation is not a course I would recommend to every library, it has certainly led to a great improvement in customer service here at Wright State. As a collection development librarian, I no longer feel as if the materials I order go into a black hole. As a public service librarian, I am pleased that patrons encounter fewer "In process" records in the OPAC, and to know that even when they do encounter them, I can tell them how soon the item will be available.

Minutes of the MOUG BUSINESS MEETING
Wednesday, February 8, 1995
11:15-12:00 Noon
Atlanta, Georgia

The business meeting, originally scheduled for 2:30-3:15 on February 8, was rescheduled to 11:15-12:00, as one of the speakers scheduled for Plenary Session II was unable to get there in the morning due to icing conditions in Atlanta.
1. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as written.

2. Approval of Minutes from Oak Brook, Ill. Meeting

The minutes were approved as written in Newsletter no. 59.

3. Board Reports

A. Chair (Ralph Papakhian)

Papakhian thanked the program committee: Laura Gayle Green, Lois Kuyper-Rushing, Margaret Kaus, Cheryl Taranto, and Ruth Inman. They received a warm round of applause. The local arrangements people were also thanked and given a round of applause.

He announced the election results: Karen Little was elected to Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect and Christine Grandy was reelected Treasurer. MOUG is looking for ways to utilize the skills of the other two candidates, Candice Feldt and Lois Kuyper-Rushing.

Laura Snyder was recognized for her 6 years of service as Continuing Education Coordinator, Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Chair, and Past Chair. Jay Weitz was recognized for his many years of service as OCLC liaison. Both received a round of applause.

Papakhian made a few comments about the success of the MOUG/OLAC conference in Oak Brook, October 1994. He asked the membership if they thought they would like to meet again with OLAC. The response was favorable. Nobody said no.

B. Past Chair (Laura Snyder)

Snyder was unable to attend the meeting.

C. Secretary/Newsletter Editor (Judy Weidow)

Weidow reported that 3 issues of the Newsletter, nos. 57-59, were produced last year. She encouraged anyone who wished to contribute to the newsletter to send her articles.

The Best of MOUG, in its 5th ed., was published in February 1994. The first 300 copies have sold out. Another 200 copies were printed. About 50 of these have been sold.

D. Treasurer (Christine Grandy)

Grandy reported that there was a net gain of $1,235.09 last year. A complete Treasurer’s report is printed in each issue of the newsletter.

The OLAC/MOUG meeting in Oak Brook had a total of 284 attendees, and 83 of these were MOUG members. The Atlanta meeting had 81 MOUG attendees.

We currently have 278 personal members, 274 institutional and 25 complimentary members.

E. Continuing Education Coordinator (Laura Gayle Green)

Green thanked the Atlanta program committee for a fine program. She is in the progress of organizing a program committee for Seattle 1996 and encouraged any interested persons to attend the meeting later in the day.

She encouraged attendees to make comments on the evaluation form.

F. OCLC Liaison (Jay Weitz)

Weitz pointed out some of the highlights of his OCLC report which was printed for the packet and is included in "News From OCLC" in this newsletter.

1. PRISM Authorities was installed Dec. 3, 1994, replacing the authorities functions previously provided by OCLC’s Linked Systems Project Authorities System for participants in the NACO Program.

2. OCLC has reached an agreement to load RILM on FirstSearch and EPIC. It should be loaded in Spring 1995. [Since the February meeting, the date has been changed to Fall 1995].

3. LC has changed their policy concerning collections of song texts without music. Songbooks without music should now be entered as books, type a, instead of type c, regardless of how they might be classified in LC. Weitz advised members to submit type code changes for these materials.

4. LC MARC Standards has approved the ANSCR classification scheme for addition to the USMARC code list for relaters, sources, description conventions, Part III: classification sources, field 084 (Other classification number). This should be validated by the end of February, 1995.
5. Format Integration Phase 1 was implemented January 31, 1995. This is described in Technical Bulletin no. 206. More information will be available soon. The revised pages for Bibliographic Formats and Standards should be distributed in Spring 1995.

6. During December 1994, OCLC loaded the entire backfile of AVLINE records from the National Library of Medicine. Roughly 88% of these records are in the Audiovisual Media format, 10% in the Sound Recordings format, and 2% in the Computer Files format.

7. The master list of OCLC Enhance participants is now available on the Internet using either E-mail or FTP.

4. Other Reports

A. Report from LC (Deta Davis)

The complete text to Davis's report can be found in her "News from LC" in this newsletter.

B. NACO-Music Project Advisory Committee Report (Mickey Koth)

Seven new members were added to the NACO Music Project this year. Five have gotten their NUC symbols. The University of Minnesota deferred participation. Indiana Archives was added, Berkeley dropped and Stanford added as the Berkeley cataloger moved to Stanford. There are currently 21 participants. The NACO Music Project has contributed 16,850 new authority records and 2,733 changes since October 1987.

LC is considering publishing the NACO handbook. It is currently under review by LC and negotiations are underway for revisions.

Partial funding for an NMP participant to attend MLA was approved by the Board. Joan Schuitema received funding for the Philadelphia ALA meeting in January.

The NMP Advisory Committee members for 1995-96 are: Mickey Koth, Chair, Ralph Papakhian, Joan Schuitema, and Judy Weidow. They will meet during the Atlanta meeting to review applications for new participants.

C. OLAC Liaison Report (Ann Caldwell)

Caldwell was not at the Atlanta meeting. Her report on OLAC news from the January ALA meeting is in this newsletter.

D. Reference Services Interest Group (Ruthann McTyre)

McTyre is forming a MOUG Reference Products Interest Group:

To evaluate, review, and promote new or changing OCLC Reference Products for the membership of MOUG.
To serve in an advisory capacity to OCLC regarding the suggestion of improvements, etc. to the products.
To share information regarding all aspects of the products to the membership via the MOUG newsletter and annual meetings.
To monitor other reference products and services as they compare to OCLC reference products.
To encourage membership and involvement of music reference specialists in MOUG to reflect the changing "face" of OCLC as it continues to move forward in the reference product arena.
To encourage an increased dialogue between catalog and reference specialists.

The immediate task for the interest group:

To thoroughly examine the RILM database once it has been mounted on FirstSearch and EPIC and to evaluate the appropriateness of the search engine and the indexing as it is presented through these OCLC Reference products.
To make recommendations to OCLC regarding possible changes, improvements and enhancements.
To report the study to the membership of MOUG via the newsletter.

She asked for anybody interested in being in the group to contact her.

[Ed. note] At the end of the meeting, the following people were appointed to the committee:

Ruthann McTyre, MOUG Public Services Coordinator, Chair, Laura Gayle Green, Philip Vandermeer, Laura Gayle Green, Marty Jenkins, Bonna Boettcher.

5. Old Business

There was no old business.

6 New Business

Ian Fairclough made the following motion: "The MOUG Membership affirms its relationship with
OLAC and recommends that MOUG continue to meet jointly with OLAC, at a minimum on a decennial basis." The motion was passed by acclimation.

Taras Pavlovsky expressed that the OCLC CATCD users were concerned with the lack of communication on the product. He felt a need for more information on development. He also wants to be able to access OLUC from within CATCD, and he wants OCLC to increase the music collection to three disks. Papakhian suggested that the CATCD users get together during the meeting to define their concerns and give an informal written report to the Board.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Weidow
MOUG Secretary

PROGRAM SESSIONS

Are Title II-C Grants Worth It?: The Saga of the Associated Music Libraries Group Title II-C Retrospective Conversion Grants and the University of Illinois at Chicago Score Retrospective Conversion
Ruth A. Inman, University of Illinois at Chicago

Frederick Douglass said, "We have to do with the past only as we can make it useful to the present and the future." As we anticipate the goals and activities of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, we may discover useful information for present and future music cataloging from an examination of a past cooperative project, namely the U.S. Dept. of Education's Title II-C grants awarded to the Associated Music Libraries Group for cooperative retrospective conversion.

The library community has recognized for many years that a cooperative approach to the creation of bibliographic records according to standards is more efficient and cost-effective. The standards chosen for either original cataloging or retrospective conversion will have a wide impact, affecting database quality, and become an economic issue in an integrated, automated library.

Based on a stratified random sample chosen for retrospective conversion from the University of Illinois at Chicago M shelflist, I examined the extent to which UIC benefited from the AMLG's cooperative approach to bibliographic and authority control for scores. "Benefit" was defined as the identification of high quality bibliographic records that matched the manual catalog cards, and became synonymous with records which could be treated as LC copy cataloging (with little or no editing, and corresponding authority records).

Based on the results, one may conclude that the AMLG Title II-C grants for conversion were successful. Without original and enhanced cataloging and name authority records from the Grant libraries, the time and cost of conversion for UIC could have been 20% greater or more.

As we take steps to increase cooperative cataloging, such as train catalogers well, instill values of commitment to standards and timely and useful access, and continue to develop user-friendly documentation, we can also improve our cataloging by increasing our basic proofreading skills.

Cooperative Cataloging Initiatives Core Bibliographic Records
Joan Schuitema, Northwestern University
Report by Renee McBride, University of California-Los Angeles

Moderator Joan Schuitema (Northwestern University) described the work of the Cooperative Cataloging Council Core Bibliographic Record for Music Task Group, reviewed the core level record for music materials, addressed issues and concerns regarding the concept of the core record, and discussed the implications of the core record for OCLC users.

The core record's level of completeness falls between minimal and full, and results from a push for more productivity combined with the desire to avoid minimal level records. The core record is intended to contain the minimum amount of information necessary for both identification and access. Criteria for identifying core record data elements were drawn from responses to a survey distributed by the Task Group in May 1994 and from previously approved core record criteria for monographs (cf. Cromwell, Willy. "The Core Record: A New Bibliographic Standard." LRTS 38/4 (Oct. 1994)).

In order to clear up some misconceptions, Schuitema noted that the core record is not intended to replace either full or minimal records; that the core record is dynamic, meaning it can be upgraded from core to full level if desired; that core record standards are flexible and allow for cataloger judgement and local practice; and that all core record access points are under authority control.
Implications for OCLC users include a possible change in how we think about cataloging, since it is now easier to change and correct information online, and less authority work over time, since all access points will be supported by records in the national authority file.

The Task Group's final report, which discusses all aspects of the core record and concerns raised by catalogers in detail, is available on the Library of Congress' MARVEL. To access MARVEL, telnet or gopher to: marvel.loc.gov, then select: Libraries and publishers (Technical Services)/Cataloging at the Library of Congress: Programs & Services/Cooperative Cataloging Programs at the Library of Congress/Cooperative Cataloging Council/Core Bibliographic Record for Music Task Group.

FirstSearch: How Do We Get It? What Do We Do With It?
Ruthann McTyre, Public Services Coordinator

The original title for the session is 'FirstSearch and EPIC: How Do We Get It? What Do We Do With It?' but my comments are going to center on FirstSearch because EPIC is much more black and white in how really belongs more in the gopher to: marvel.loc.gov, then select: Libraries and publishers (Technical Services)/Cataloging at the Library of Congress: Programs & Services/Cooperative Cataloging Programs at the Library of Congress/Cooperative Cataloging Council/Core Bibliographic Record for Music Task Group.

FirstSearch makes it available in a variety of ways. I'd like to use the situation that my home institution, Baylor University along with our area consortium, the Alliance for Higher Education (or AHE), have developed with OCLC as a model.

Baylor's first experience with FirstSearch was not successful. The library purchased several blocks of searches and set up a system to sell search cards to patrons. The standard PR was done to encourage the purchase of the cards, but very few sold. The second attempt was to issue coupons to all faculty for a free card that offered 10 searches. Again, there was very little success. Then came an opportunity for AHE members to participate in a free trial period offered by OCLC for FirstSearch. During the free trial period, AHE institutions had unlimited access to 35 databases. The trial period lasted throughout the Spring of 1994, ending June 1. The point of the trial, other than getting librarians and patrons hooked on using FirstSearch as part of their research, was to get some sense of what databases were used the most and what the peak load was so an appropriate number of ports could eventually be assigned.

The purchasing of ports is, in a way, the initiation fee into the consortial agreement. Each institution decided how many ports it was willing to support and then paid $4500 per port. Buying ports is a logical way to go because it allows for unlimited usage. AHE members purchased a total of 13 ports in June, adding 4 more in September, for a total of 17. During this time, OCLC announced a "summer sale" in which for every 2 ports purchased, OCLC would give a third port free, giving AHE members access to a total of 25 ports, or 25 simultaneous log ons. These ports gave AHE members access to the basic package of WorldCat, ArticleFirst, ContentsFirst, GPO Monthly Catalog, Medline and ERIC. To have access to more databases, AHE members worked together with OCLC to identify a core of databases beyond the basic package and pay subscription prices for those. AHE also paid for a portion of the cost. According to Elizabeth Snapp, who chairs AHE's Council of Library Directors, this has been the touchy part of such a consortial agreement. It's touchy because once the members choose a product, OCLC goes to the vendor for a subscription price that is based on the number of institutions involved. If one player drops out, then they have to go back to the vendor and start all over, putting the other libraries in a difficult spot when it comes to paying more per subscription. Beyond that each member institution paid for additional databases by buying either blocks of cards or blocks of open searches. Baylor had blocks of open searches accessible to the library staff still in reserve from the time prior to the free trial period, which gave access to additional databases above those available for public access.

Currently at Baylor, there is free public access to ten databases. The patron must see a library staff person to get the authorization code and password and is encouraged to seek the help of a staff member when they first use FirstSearch. If access to more databases is needed, the reference librarians use the open search authorization code to assist the patron in utilizing the 44 databases available through that account.

This consortial set-up has been quite successful—so successful in fact, that we are sometimes experiencing turnaways. This is not due to inadequate numbers of ports necessarily. It is happening due to capacity usage reaching 100% at certain times during the day, especially in the late afternoon. Still, it's a good arrangement—sort of a "cake and eat it too" way of getting access to all that FirstSearch has to offer in a cost-beneficial model.
FirstSearch can also be made available at the state library level. Federal and state moneys have been used to place FirstSearch in Arizona, Arkansas, Kansas and Illinois. Illinois has purchased 99 ports for 2600 libraries.

So once we've gotten it, WHAT DO WE DO WITH IT?

According to the responses from the query I posted on MLA-L, it's used in a variety of ways. For some it's the first place to look if an item isn't located in the library's catalog, but for others it's a last resort. For some, it's part of the normal search strategy and is used like any other reference tool. It's a place to look at current citations for major music journals that Music Index hasn't gotten to yet. It's used to build general bibliographies and to do specific subject searches. At one music library, the patrons can access FirstSearch through Telnet on their VAX accounts and can create bibliographies that can be manipulated using word-processing software. One colleague pointed out that she thought having the option of doing a music-related search in, for example, a social sciences-based database was a terrific option. It allows for some fairly specific searching—one example would be a search for protest music. Many people use it to verify citations for ILL and for acquisitions. Catalogers have told me that they use the WorldCat to track down obscure material before going to the OCLC terminal. Others use it for most of their presearching for music cataloging when they are, to quote, "trapped at the reference desk." It promotes resource sharing and certainly makes ILL easier—several reported that ILL usage has increased. According to Paul Cappuzzello at OCLC, during test periods, 60-70% of all searching is done in the Base package, with the majority of that done in WorldCat. From the comments I received, that seems to hold true in music libraries. Of course, music libraries must still rely on other CD-ROM products like Music Index.

What can we expect in the near future?

Document delivery is available now, but OCLC has added the FastDoc database, which is a subset of the ArticleFirst database. FastDoc contains those items that are available either through the regular document delivery channels or are immediately available for viewing on-line or for being printed from your computer. For every article printed, OCLC charges $2.50 or debits 5 searches from the account or from a search card. This is all really great, but I didn't find any music citations that offered view, e-mail, or print options in 30 minutes of searching FastDoc.

Another thing to watch for in news from OCLC, includes a pilot project currently underway at George Washington University. There, plans are being developed to convert the reserve reading room into electronic format. So, bearing all this in mind, my advice to you is this: don't blink or you'll be behind!
to travel to current members' institutions or for the coordinator to travel to new members.

There are now 39 active participants in the NACO Music Project, with five independent members. Independent status allows the member to contribute headings without submitting them first for review. A member can become independent in names and titles both at once or for names first, then titles, by passing a quality assurance test given by the reviewer. Sue Stancu, Mark Scharff, and Michelle Koth are independent for both names and titles. As members become independent, they review other participants' headings. The roster of current NMP participants with their independent status allows the member to contribute headings is as follows:

- Archives of Traditional Music (InU-AT); OCLC
- Bowling Green State University (OBgU-MA); OCLC
- Brown University (RPB-M); OCLC
- Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh (PPI-MA); OCLC
- Cleveland Public Library (OCI-FM); OCLC
- Cornell University (NIC-Mu); RLIN
- Eastman School of Music (NRU-Mus); OCLC
- Indiana University (InU-Mu); OCLC
- Miami University (OxM-Mu); OCLC
- Middlebury College (VtMiM-Mu) OCLC
- New York Public Library; RLIN
- Northwestern University (IEN-Mu); OCLC
- Oberlin College Conservatory of Music (OOC); OCLC
- Pennsylvania State University; OCLC
- Rogers & Hammersteins Archive (NN-RH); RLIN
- San Jose State University (CSJU-CM); OCLC
- Stanford University (CS-Mar); RLIN
- SUNY at Stony Brook (NSBSU-Mu); OCLC
- University of California, Los Angeles; RLIN
- University of California, San Diego (CU-SMu); OCLC
- University of Chicago (ICU-JRM); OCLC
- University of Colorado (CoU-Mu); OCLC
- University of Houston; OCLC
- University of Iowa; RLIN
- University of Kentucky; OCLC
- University of Louisville (KyLou-Mu); OCLC
- University of Maryland (MdU-Mu); OCLC
- University of Minnesota; RLIN
- University of North Florida; OCLC
- University of North Texas (TXDN-Mu); OCLC
- University of Notre Dame (INdHLMu); OCLC
- University of Oregon (ORU-Mu); OCLC
- University of Southern California (CLSU-ML); RLIN
- University of Texas at Austin (TxU-Mu); OCLC
- University of Virginia (ViU-Mu); OCLC
- Vassar College (NPV-Mu); OCLC
- Washington University of St. Louis (MoSW-Mu); OCLC
- Yale University (Cy-Mus); RLIN

**FORMER PARTICIPANT:**
University of California, Berkeley (CU-MUSI); LC

Stanford University had been an inactive participant while they had no music catalogers. Phil Schreur, who was the NMP participant at the University of California-Berkeley, has since become Head of Technical Services at the Stanford Music Library. Since it is NMP policy to reconsider both the individual and institution when the cataloger leaves, the music catalogers at UC-Berkeley will need to re-apply should they wish to be involved with NMP.

The NMP Handbook was revised in 1994 and distributed to NMP members. It is currently in the process of being published by the Library of Congress. At the October MOUG Board meeting, distribution through MOUG was discussed. Shortly after the OLCAC/MOUG meeting, David Reser at LC contacted me to say that Mark Zbiomek of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office wanted to publish it. We are in the midst of discussing the issues of main entry, GMD, and other things.

The MOUG Board is providing funding for an NMP member selected by the Advisory Committee to attend both meetings of ALA. The goal is to have NMP represented at authorities and cooperative cataloging-related meetings and to establish links to other groups concerning authority issues. Joan Schuitema will once again represent us.

The following statistics represent the contribution of NMP from October 1987 through December 1994. It should be noted that most NMP members began participation several years after NMP began. Also, the statistics for Indiana University reflect, in part, the NACO component of the Associated Music Libraries Group Title II-C retrospective conversion grants and represent headings from these AMLG libraries:

- Berkeley, Cornell, Eastman, Harvard, and Indiana. As of December 1994, the NACO Music Project contributed 16,850 new and 2,733 changed headings to the authority file, almost a quarter of which were contributed in the fiscal year October 1993 to September 1994: 4,833 (4,177 new and 656 changed).
The revision of the Z document resulted in some major changes in the creation of authority headings. NMP disagrees with some of these changes. For example, LC no longer mandates the indication of main entry (unless the title is generic) or the inclusion of GMD in the 670 field. NMP believes that main entry and GMD should be included in all cases because the information they provide can aid in identification and conflict resolution. One of the changes is welcome: it is no longer required to have cross references in a name/title record in order to create it. NMP can now create name/title records for any title. Previously, we added name/title records without cross references only in composer projects and for individual titles in LC records in OCLC or RLIN. The NMP Advisory Committee consists of four members of NMP: the Coordinator, Ralph Papakhian, a representative from the MOUG Board, an OCLC representative, and an RLIN representative. The latter three serve two-year terms. One member of the Committee (not the Coordinator) also serves as chair of the committee during the second year of her term on the committee. The MOUG Board representative collects the messages on NMP-L, the project's listserv, for the NMP Archives. The in-coming MOUG Board representative is Judy Weidow. The OCLC representative is Joan Schuitema, and the RLIN representative is Michelle Koth. Since there were no other RLIN members at the time the MOUG Board met in October, Michelle Koth was designated RLIN representative for a third year and re-appointed Chair.

The NACO Music Project participants appreciate any feedback on the headings they contribute.

It is hoped that the almost 20,000 headings that have enhanced the LC name authority file have also made the work of all music catalogers easier and faster. Keep in mind that this project is supported by the MOUG Board with their time and money. They would like to hear your comments.

REPORT FROM OLAC
Ann Caldwell, MOUG Representative to OLAC

As is the custom, OLAC met three times during the ALA Midwinter meeting. This report will attempt to hit the highlights of those meetings.

The first of the meetings was the Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) which met on Friday evening, February 3. CAPC has made a proposal to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging volunteering its services in developing a core record for audio-visual materials. LC is very receptive to this, although no action has been taken on it yet. In the area of old business, the wording of mle 7.7B2 regarding closed captioning was discussed. A proposal was forwarded to CC:DA expanding the wording of this rule and adding additional examples. Currently, the rule states "Indicate captioning or signing for the hearing impaired" and includes an example "Closed-captioned for the hearing impaired." The proposed change would involve both of the areas, with the rule being changed to "Indicate language-based enhancements (e.g., closed-captioned)". The example previously cited would be changed to "Closed-captioned" and two additional examples would be added: "Open-signed"
and "Audio-described". There are several reasons for this proposed change. First of all, closed-captioning "now extends beyond the deaf and hearing-impaired communities to include English-as-a-second-language (ESL) students and similar groups who use captioning to learn an additional language. Also, captioned viewing is often preferred by viewers viewing a program in any environment where it is unwelcome or impractical to adjust the audio output to audible levels." In addition "enhancement technologies now include not only the well-established closed-captioning and open-signed but audio described as well."

Two MARBI proposals were discussed. The first, MARBI Discussion Paper 81, deals with the form of music codes (047 field). The second, MARBI Proposal 95-2, deals with the use of a subfield $v$ for form subdivisions. A new subfield $v$ is proposed for "form subdivisions in fields 6xx and 755 in the bibliographic format, 1xx, 4xx, and 5xx in the authority format, 75x in the classification format, and 6xx in the community information format and new fields 183, 483, 583, and 783 for subdivision headings in the authority format." The proposal also "reviews the desirability for such a subfield and discusses technical issues involved in implementing such a change. It poses questions on retrospective conversion, issues of authority control and implementation options."

Finally, it was announced that the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Reproductions have been published.

At the OLAC Business Meeting, treasurer Johanna Legrange announced that there are now 718 OLAC members. A discussion then ensued about the need for an index to the OLAC Newsletter. Martha Yee, liaison from AMLA (Association for Moving Image Archives) announced that 100,000 bibliographic records from the UCLA Film Archives are now available in Melvyl.

Harriet Harrison, the Library of Congress representative to OLAC and NACO coordinator for audio-visual materials, announced that approximately 200 computer title files were being cataloged each month. Other computer file cataloging news from LC included the fact that LC will be simplifying the 538 field (system requirements note) for books with accompanying computer disks.

OLAC President Mary Konkel informed the audience that OLAC is looking for a host site for its next conference. Anyone interested should contact her.

OCLC Users Council Meeting, January 23-25, 1995 "The NII, the Internet, and OCLC: The Next Generation."
Sean Ferguson, Ohio State University

Robert Croneberger (Director, Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh) "Community Networking and Connecting to the Information Highway"

"Libraries can't be passive recipients of information from the National Information Infrastructure," said Croneberger. "At the very least, we are mediators," he said. Speaking from his experience in overseeing the development of the Three Rivers Freenet, which is operated by the Carnegie Library, Croneberger advocated a leadership role for libraries in building such projects. He also emphasized the need to provide equal, no-cost, and uncensored access to information for Internet/NII end-users.

Carol Henderson (Executive director, ALA Washington Office) "Congress and the Electronic Library"

Henderson's presentation focused on the impact that the Republican-led 104th Congress might have on library-related legislation. She outlined the mixed funding prospects for libraries, as the new Congress aims toward a "devolution" of government to its most basic level. While the services provided by libraries seem to fit within the goals of the Republican agenda, some cuts are inevitable. Areas which should receive support are technology and telecommunications. Henderson reported that ALA leadership will be promoting a strong role for libraries in facilitating intellectual activity in the 21st century. Expansion of the Washington Office staff is underway, including the creation of a new technology department.

Rick Weingarten (Executive director, Computing Research Association) "National Policy, the Players, and the NII"

According to Weingarten, the concept of a national information infrastructure "is here to stay" because it represents "a basic transformation in our thinking about information technologies." However, he emphasized that the NII's scope and speed of development will likely be limited by political forces, the complex web of parties and interests involved, and the enormity of the policy and planning issues. Librarians are able, and should be willing, to become an ingredient in the "primordial soup" of individuals, organizations, governments, politics, and proposals.
Don Muccino (Executive vice president and CEO, OCLC) "The NII, the Internet, and OCLC: Strategies for the Next Generation"

Muccino emphasized that OCLC's new technological platform, and its commitment to client/server architecture, provide the flexibility to meet different users' needs effectively and economically as the NII evolves over time. As the NII grows, OCLC will be continually advancing its capabilities and developing navigational tools.

Users Council delegates and invited speakers held a discussion on "The Roles of Libraries and OCLC in the Global Telecommunications Environment." Various aspects of libraries' and OCLC's current or potential roles in the NII environment were mentioned, including advocacy, training of both staff and patrons, providing new services, forming new partnerships, archiving/electronic publishing, and research and development.

K. Wayne Smith (President, OCLC) updated delegates on international expansion, PRISM enhancements, and reference services in his meeting-opening report.

Phyllis Bova Spies (Vice president for member services, sales, and international, OCLC) discussed OCLC pricing plans. She reported that per-search charges for FirstSearch may be increased minimally in the near future. Any changes in PRISM charges/credits are on hold pending further study and feedback.

Liz Bishoff (Vice president for member services, OCLC) updated delegates on OCLC products and services. For 1995, the three main areas of focus are expanding reference services, enhancing PRISM, and expanding into new international arenas, including Central and South America.

Delegates met in four special interest groups, and reported on their discussions to the full council:

- The Communications and Access group focused on the popularity and growing use of Internet access to PRISM, and a demo of Passport for Windows (due for release in Summer '95).
- The Resource Sharing group discussed unmediated Inter-Library Loan issues, and OCLC's new capability to provide libraries with detailed statistics on ILL PRISM usage, ILL management, and document delivery.
- The Reference Services group focused on issues surrounding the use of Internet resources, and OCLC's proposed on-line survey of FirstSearch end-users.

Elaine Albright (OCLC Users Council president) encouraged support for and participation in OCLC's project, "Building a Catalog of Internet Resources." The project initiates a nationwide, coordinated effort among libraries and institutions of higher education to create, implement, test and evaluate a searchable database of USMARC-format bibliographic records, complete with electronic location and access information, for Internet-accessible materials.

Users Council delegates introduced two resolutions dealing with OCLC's pricing of Internet access to PRISM, but deferred discussion and action on them until the May meeting.

Users Council will next meet May 21-23, with a focus on "Library Collaboration and Cooperation: The Next Generation."

Detailed minutes from OCLC Users Council meetings, from October 1990 through January 1995, are available on the Internet. To receive meeting minutes via e-mail, send a message to listproc@oclc.org. Commands should be typed on separate lines in the body of the message, not in the subject line. Enter the command 'index uc' to receive the index of archived minutes. Enter get [path] [filename] for the requested meeting minutes. For example, enter the command 'get uc minutes.jan95' to receive a copy of the January 1995 Users Council meeting minutes.

The Best of MOUG, 5th Edition
is Still Available

Send $10.00 (North America) $15.00 (Overseas) to:

Judy Weidow
Cataloging S5453
The General Libraries
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All orders must be prepaid.
Music OCLC Users Group
Bylaws
Revised January 1988
Amended December, 1993

ARTICLE I. NAME
The name of this organization shall be the MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP, hereafter referred to as the Group.

ARTICLE II. OBJECTIVES.

SECTION 1. To establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC systems and subsystems and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users.

SECTION 2. To encourage and facilitate the exchange of information:
   a) between OCLC and the members of the Group;
   b) between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general;
   c) between members of the Group and appropriate representatives of the Library of Congress; and
   d) between members of the Group and similar users' organizations.

SECTION 3. To promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage, and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards.

SECTION 4. To provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group.

SECTION 5. The Group is a non-stock, non-profit association, organized and operated exclusively for said purposes. No part of the net earnings shall inure to the benefit of any individual. No officer, member, or delegate of a member shall, as such, receive compensation except that reasonable compensation may be paid for services of employees of the Group.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Membership in the Group shall be open to all individuals and institutions interested in the stated objectives of the Group.

SECTION 2. The annual dues shall be set by the Executive Board, subject to approval by the membership at the annual meeting. The Treasurer shall bill members in the last month of the fiscal year, and notify members three months in arrears. Those whose dues are not paid within ninety days thereafter shall be automatically removed from the membership list of the Group.

SECTION 3. Voting privileges shall be extended to individual members only. [added 12/93]

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The officers of the Group shall be:
   1) a Chair;
   2) a Vice Chair/Chair-Elect or Past Chair;
   3) a Secretary/Newsletter Editor;
   4) a Treasurer; and
   5) a Continuing Education Coordinator.
These officers shall constitute the Executive Board.

SECTION 2. Nominating Procedures. Candidates for office shall be presented to the membership for election by a slate issued by the Nominating Committee. The Committee shall be comprised as specified in Article VII, Section 2. Candidates for office must be members of the Group and must file an acceptance of the nomination with the Committee.

SECTION 3. Election Procedures. Officers shall be elected by a plurality of the ballots cast by the voting membership. Ballots shall be distributed no less than two months before the meeting and shall be returned by the voting members to the Nominating Committee no later than the date specified on the ballot. A majority vote of the voting members of the Executive Board shall resolve a tied vote. [amended 12/93]

SECTION 4. Terms of office. The term of office of the Chair shall be two years as Chair and one year each as Vice Chair/Chair-Elect and Past Chair. An incumbent shall not succeed him/herself. The offices of Secretary/Newsletter Editor, Treasurer, and Continuing Education Coordinator shall be two years. An incumbent in these offices may succeed him/herself. In order to assure a measure of continuity within the Executive Board, a call for the nomination and election of two of the four offices (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Secretary/Newsletter Editor, Treasurer, and Continuing Education Coordinator) shall occur each year, with the remaining two offices to be nominated and elected on the alternate years. In the event of the resignation, incapacitation or removal of any of the officers, the remaining officers shall select a replacement until the next election. The officers shall serve until the adjournment of the final session of the meeting at which the names of their successors are made public.

SECTION 5. Duties of officers. The officers shall perform the duties prescribed by these Bylaws and by the parliamentary authority adopted by the Group.

1) Chair. The Chair shall act as chief executive officer with general supervision and control of the affairs of the Group. The Chair shall also serve as a member ex officio of all committees except the Nominations Committee, and shall act as ex officio liaison to OCLC and other appropriate affiliations as indicated. In addition, the Chair shall serve as Past Chair, as a non-voting, advisory member of the Executive board, for a period of one year following the two-year term of office.

2) Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect. The Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect shall act as Chief Executive Officer in the event of the inability of the Chair to serve. The Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect shall also assist with general supervision and control of the affairs of the Group at the discretion of the Chair.

3) Secretary/Newsletter Editor. The Secretary/Newsletter Editor shall record the minutes of the annual business meeting and the sessions of the Executive Board. In addition, the Secretary/Newsletter Editor, as editor-in-chief of the principal vehicle for communication to the membership, shall assure publication of the Newsletter at appropriate and timely intervals.

4) Treasurer. The Treasurer shall act as Membership Officer, and shall be responsible for all financial accounts of the Group and for maintaining accurate records of income, expenditures, and membership for submission to the Executive Board.

ARTICLE V. EXECUTIVE BOARD.

SECTION 1. The Executive Board, comprised of the elected officers, shall:
1) have general supervision of the affairs of the Group;
2) act in the name of the Group between the annual meetings of the Group;
3) fill by appointment any vacancy in office for the unexpired term;
4) provide a report of its activities at the annual meeting;
5) authorize necessary disbursements through checks drawn on the account of the Group and signed by the Treasurer;
6) perform such other duties as are specified in these Bylaws.

ARTICLE VI. NETWORK ADVISORY COUNCIL.

SECTION 1. The Network Advisory Council, comprised of one delegate from each of the networks within the OCLC system, shall serve to promote and strengthen communication between the Group and the networks. At the request of the Executive Board, to which the Council is advisory, each network may appoint one delegate.

SECTION 2. The Advisory Council shall meet annually with the Executive Board.

ARTICLE VII. COMMITTEES.

SECTION 1. Program Committee. A Program Committee, comprised of three members plus the Continuing Education Coordinator, shall be appointed by the Chair, immediately following the annual membership meeting. It shall be the purpose of this committee, under the direction of the Continuing Education Coordinator, to prepare in detail the program of activities for the forthcoming annual meeting.

SECTION 2. Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee, comprised of three members, shall be appointed by the Chair no less than six months before the annual meeting. Membership may include one member of the Executive board, except the Chair. The Chair shall nominate from among the current membership two candidates for each office, and shall mail receive, and tally ballots and report the election results to the Executive Board and to the membership.

SECTION 3. Such other committees, standing or special, shall be appointed by the Chair, in consultation with the Executive Board, as the membership or the Executive Board may recommend in fulfillment of the objectives of the Group.

ARTICLE VIII. MEETINGS.

SECTION 1. Annual Meeting. An annual membership meeting of the Group shall be held at a time and location to be determined by the Executive Board.

SECTION 2. Business Meeting. A business meeting shall be held during each annual meeting of the Group. The membership in attendance at the business meeting shall constitute a quorum.

SECTION 3. Special Meetings. The Chair may call a special meeting at the request of either the Executive Board or five members of the Group. The purpose of the meeting shall be stated in the call. At such a meeting, no business may be transacted other than that stated in the notification.

ARTICLE IX. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY.

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Group in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not found to be inconsistent with these bylaws and any special rules of order the Group may adopt.

ARTICLE X. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS.

These Bylaws may be amended in a mail ballot by a two-thirds vote of ballots cast by the voting membership. Proposed amendments should be submitted in writing and signed by five members. [first sentence amended 12/93]
ARTICLE XI. DISSOLUTION.

Should future exigencies make the dissolution of the Group necessary, the properties of the Group shall be disposed of as deemed fitting by the majority of the membership.

1988 Bylaws Revision Committee
Don Hixon, Chair
David Knapp
Dawn Thistle

Amended by vote of the membership, 12/93
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
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