FROM THE CHAIR
Ralph Papakhian

Greetings to all MOUG members! In this issue of our Newsletter you will see the preliminary program and registration form for our next meeting in Seattle on Feb. 6-7, 1996. Continuing Education Coordinator, Laura Gayle Green, and the Program Committee have prepared what is sure to be another highly informative and educational conference. We will have sessions on format integration, retrospective conversion, and OCLC's TECHPRO service. Small group meeting topics will include OCLC's reference services products, and authority work (names, title, and series). Please review the program, and register early for the conference so that the local arrangements and program committees can plan adequately.

By now you should have received the MOUG ballot. This year we are electing replacements for the Continuing Education Coordinator and the Secretary/Newsletter editor. The Nominations Committee has come up with an excellent slate. Please cast your ballot as soon as you receive it. Our thanks to the members who agreed to be nominated and to the Committee for doing such a fine job (Pam Juengling, Chair, Karen Little and Judy Weidow). While we are on the topic, let’s also recognize the excellent work accomplished by the outgoing CE Coordinator, Laura Gayle Green, and the outgoing Secretary/Newsletter editor, Judy Weidow.

As many of you have heard by now, the implementation of RILM on FirstSearch has been delayed considerably (now scheduled for the first quarter of 1996). The MOUG Reference Products Interest Group is monitoring this situation closely and is prepared to review and evaluate online RILM as soon as it’s available.

At the MOUG Board meeting in Louisville, this past September, we discussed the creation of a task force to review and evaluate PRISM with respect to the cataloging and processing of music materials. Such a review, with recommendations on system enhancements, has not been accomplished to date. I will be appointing this Task Force before the Seattle meeting with the hope that it can meet and prepare its agenda then. If you are interested in participating, please feel free to contact me. We will be looking for individuals who work on PRISM daily and who are knowledgeable about PRISM searching and index displays.

For example, we know already of one system enhancement we will be recommending. Sue Weiland has recommended the indexing of the ISMN. MOUG will write to OCLC on this matter as an organization. But that is not enough. If you feel this indexing capability is important, please contact your network, and OCLC as well (you can send letters to: David Whitehair, OCLC, 6565 Frantz Rd., Dublin, OH 43017-3395).

I am also pleased to report that the NACO-Music Project Handbook, prepared by Michelle Koth at Yale University, is now being distributed by MOUG. At the end of this Newsletter you will find ordering information. This handbook can be useful to potential NMP participants, as well as to provide a set of examples for preparing authority records in local systems.

(continued on page 3)
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Thanks to all who contributed to this issue of the Newsletter. The Newsletter is an occasional publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. Editor: Judy Weidow, Cataloging S5453, The University of Texas at Austin, P. O. Box P, Austin, TX 78713-8916.

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 Christine 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 for the previous two years are available from the Treasurer for $5.00 per copy). A copy of the quarterly financial report is available from the Treasurer on request.

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

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.
Finally I would like to report that I was able to attend the October 1995 meeting of the OCLC Users Council as an observer (representing MOUG). Alan Green and Tom Heck from the Ohio State University Music Library also attended several sessions as MOUG representatives. A brief report appears on p. 17.

This will be my last column! In Seattle, Karen Little takes over as the MOUG Chair. I would like to offer my sincere thanks to all of you MOUGites for providing me the opportunity to serve in this capacity. Surely there was more to do than I was able to accomplish. But most important we all seem to have great fun with our work and we have made a difference in the provision of library services for music materials. Long live OCLC! Long live MOUG! Don't forget to come to Seattle.

FROM THE EDITOR
Judy Weidow

Now that I've just about figured out how to put together a newsletter, it is time for my "30" column, as they say in the newspaper business. This is my final newsletter. It has been an interesting learning experience and I appreciate your vote of confidence and support. I have worked with many delightful contributors and I thank each and every one for their contributions and ability to meet deadlines. A newsletter is only as good as its contributors.

After this issue I will have a little time to start thinking about the next edition of The Best of MOUG. I would like to hear suggestions from you as to what you would like to have added to the next edition or what I can do to make it more useful for you. I would also like to hear if you don't think you need a new edition at all.

FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR
Laura Gayle Green

The 1996 MOUG meeting will be February 6-7, 1996, just before the Music Library Association meeting at the Seattle Westin, 1900 Fifth Ave., Seattle WA 98101. The Music Library Association got a great hotel rate: $100/night for single/double occupancy and $125 for a triple. Reservations can be made at 1-800-228-3000. The airport transportation is currently $7.95 per person, one way. Preliminary programs and registration forms for MOUG and MLA are included in the newsletter.

I've been hard at work with your Program Committee putting together a program for the meeting. Outsourcing seems to have been the watchword during my term, and I've tried to bring you programs addressing that issue. Outsourcing is a painful topic for many of us, and I hope that the 1995 and 1996 programs will have been ones to give you the opportunity to ask questions about outsourcing and what it means for your library. Our first speakers on the 1996 program are the TECHPRO folks from OCLC. This is a great opportunity to discover firsthand what happens with TECHPRO, and ask questions of those who are doing it. Steve Wright will be discussing his experience with MICROCON. His presentation is "An Impalpable Hit: Music and OCLC's MICROCON." I had substituted the word improbable for impalpable in the preliminary program.

Besides outsourcing, there will also be programs on format integration and FirstSearch. Joy Pile and Alice LaSota will be sharing some of the information they received as part of their NACO Series Training in a Series Authority Record Primer. Mark Scharff will be presenting a Name/Title Authority Record Primer as well. I anticipate some exciting discussions will be taking place in Seattle with this program!

I look forward to seeing you at the 1996 MOUG meeting! Bring your questions and a taste for the Pacific Northwest!

On another note, this is my last column as Continuing Education Coordinator. I have learned much in the past two years, and can only hope that I've given a portion back to MOUG of what it's given me in the past few years. MOUG members have been terrific -- when I've called many of you asking for what you wanted on the program, you responded with needed feedback. I hope these programs have reflected your interest and what you have wanted to explore. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to serve you -- and I hope you will support our new Continuing Education Coordinator as well!

NEWS FROM OCLC
Jay Weitz
OCLC

Cataloging

33 Millionth Record

The Kansas City (Missouri) Public Library entered a Spanish sound recording title as the 33 millionth record in the OCLC Online Union Catalog. The record, for the compact disc, "El Mundo esta Loco,"
by Banda Pistoleros, was entered Aug. 17 by Evelyn Pypes, media cataloger at Kansas City Public Library. The 32 millionth record was entered into the OCLC Online Union Catalog by the University of Strathclyde, in Glasgow, Scotland, on Feb. 16.

Name/Title Searching in the OLUC

One of the biggest changes in tagging with Format Integration, Phase 1, was the change for coding variant title access. Where catalogers used to add 740 fields, new practice calls for adding 246 fields in most cases. OCLC has now upgraded the OLUC indexing to include the 246 subfield "a" as part of the name/title derived searching. The indexing upgrade was installed on July 1. Bibliographic records added after this upgrade will automatically be indexed correctly. OCLC is running a scan to reindex records that were present before July 1. Only names in the 1XX field will be included in this name/246 index. This is in line with current practice for indexing names and titles.

Internet Cataloging Project Database Now Available

A searchable catalog of Internet resources--InterCat--is available at URL http://www.oclc.org:6990 through March 31, 1996. The InterCat catalog is an experimental, proof-of-concept database created through the OCLC Internet Cataloging project, which is funded in part by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, office of library programs. The InterCat catalog comprises nearly 1,000 bibliographic records for selected Internet resources. Using a Web browser, users can search the database, view retrieval lists, display records, and follow "hot links" to the described resources. The database was implemented by the OCLC office of research using OCLC SiteSearch and WebZ software. Records in the database have been created by librarians, most of whom are associated with the 181 institutions worldwide that are participating in the OCLC Internet Cataloging project. Each record contains electronic location and access information in a tagged field--856--which enables access to remote Internet resources.

OCLC to Convert 209,000 East Asian Titles

OCLC has entered into a retrospective conversion agreement with Cornell University, the University of Pittsburgh and the Chinese University of Hong Kong to convert a combined total of 209,000 Chinese, Japanese and Korean (CJK) titles from traditional catalog cards to machine-readable form. OCLC will process 86,000 records for Cornell University, including 66,765 titles in the Chinese language, 22,440 Japanese titles and 375 Korean titles. Under the agreement with the University of Pittsburgh, OCLC will process a total of 56,000 titles, which are primarily Chinese. The Chinese University of Hong Kong used the OCLC TAPECON service to convert over 80,000 titles of its collection. The remaining 67,000 titles--92 percent in Chinese and 8 percent in Japanese--will be processed by the OCLC CJK retrospective conversion staff. The libraries will ship their shelf-list cards to OCLC, and the OCLC CJK staff will use the OCLC CJK Plus system to convert the records online. OCLC is scheduled to complete the projects by June 30, 1997. OCLC CJK staff are also undertaking a retrospective conversion project of Chinese titles for the Harvard-Yenching Library.

OCLC to Accelerate Upgrading of CIP Data in Online Union Catalog

Academic Book Center, in Portland, Oregon, has become the first book vendor to participate in a new OCLC program that will accelerate upgrading of Cataloging in Publication (CIP) from the Library of Congress (LC) in the OCLC Online Union Catalog (OLUC). Through an agreement with Academic Book Center, professional catalogers from the OCLC TECHPRO service will be stationed at Academic Book Center, where they will upgrade CIP records in the OLUC to full-MARC records as newly published materials arrive. TECHPRO catalogers at Academic Book Center expect to process approximately 3,000 OLUC/CIP records a month. OCLC CIP upgrade specifications are available on the OCLC home page, http://www.oclc.org, under "What's New, What's Hot." By accelerating the upgrading of CIP records in the OLUC, OCLC hopes to provide libraries with full cataloging records as soon as possible after publication.

OCLC to Complete Format Integration Project

OCLC announced plans to implement the final phase of Machine-Readable Cataloging (MARC) Format Integration on March 3, 1996. The Phase 2 implementation will allow libraries to describe items with characteristics of two or more formats, such as sound recording serials. The Phase 2 implementation will include several additional enhancements for catalogers:

- OCLC will use the opportunity to modify the display of the bibliographic record in the OLUC by standardizing labels between formats, modernizing terminology and adding a new element to indicate the type of control as required by USMARC.
- OCLC will introduce a new format, Mixed Materials, and eliminate the existing Archival and Manuscript Control format (AMC). The new
format will contain records for which no single other format predominates. OCLC is working on conversion of the bibliographic records in the AMC format.

- OCLC will enhance searching, allowing users to qualify by either the primary format of the record or by the format of the secondary characteristic or accompanying material of the item.

The Phase 2 implementation is a continuation of the format integration process that began in the fall of 1991 with USMARC Update No. 3. The process included the February 1995 implementation of Phase 1, which dealt with variable fields in the MARC bibliographic format. Phase 2 deals with fixed fields. The implementation will also include variable field changes approved at the June 1994 and February 1995 Machine-Readable form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI) meetings. The March 3, 1996, date was arrived at in consultation with the Library of Congress, National Library of Canada, ISM Library Information Services, Research Library Group, and Western Library Network.

Reference Products

RILM Update

The RILM Abstracts of Music Literature database is now scheduled for first quarter of 1996 availability on EPIC and FirstSearch. This depends on planned enhancements for FirstSearch now in progress and on the installation of other databases ahead of RILM on the schedule.

Resource Sharing

Custom Holdings

Custom Holdings, a new feature made available in PRISM ILL on August 27, 1995, allows libraries to customize their holdings displays so they only see the holdings of their preferred lenders. Technical Bulletin no. 208 explains Custom Holdings.

FirstSearch/ILL Real Time Transfer

On August 27, 1995, OCLC introduced real time transfer of FirstSearch ILL records to PRISM ILL. As soon as the requester sends the order, it is immediately sent to the requester's library PRISM ILL Review file. They will not see a difference on FirstSearch. Orders will no longer be stored and transferred once a day.

Northern Illinois University Logs 61 Millionth OCLC Interlibrary Loan Request

Northern Illinois University in De Kalb, Illinois, logged the 61 millionth OCLC interlibrary loan request on Sept. 13 for a thesis, "Factors Which Influence Students' Participation in Using an Electronic Mail and Bulletin Board Technique," by Hung-Liang Yao, an Ohio State University student. OSU filled the request Sept. 18. The University of Missouri-Rolla made the 60 millionth OCLC interlibrary loan request on July 19.

Preservation Resources Home Page Now on WWW

People navigating the World Wide Web can now find information or preservation and access services on the Preservation Resources home page. Examples of Preservation Resources' capabilities in digital scanning and indexing of microfilm are linked with the home page. Three highly illustrated books have been captured on microfilm, then digitally scanned and indexed. The resulting electronic books allow users to view a whole page or zoom in on illustrations. Through the home page, users can also learn the history and mission of Preservation Resources and about other aspects of its services, including bibliographic control of preservation microfilm; color and continuous tone preservation microfilm; the new generation of cameras for preservation microfilming; options for preparation of materials, filming of nonbook formats, rare materials, and items requiring special handling; and preserving and protecting preservation microfilm. The Preservation Resources home page is located at the URL http://www.oclc.org/oclc/presres/ and can also be reached through a link with the OCLC home page (http://www.oclc.org).

Preservation Resources Adds Digital Scanning Services

Preservation Resources now offers digital microfilm scanning and indexing services. Preservation Resources, which has a reputation for producing high-quality preservation microfilm, is applying its expertise in reformatting research materials to ensure high-quality digital scanning of these materials from microfilm. With these new services, Preservation Resources offers libraries easy, end-user access to preserved materials. In conjunction with the new services, Preservation Resources recently acquired a digital microfilm scanner. The gray scale scanner, manufactured by SunRise Imaging, handles roll film and microfiche. The unit will allow Preservation Resources to provide top-quality scanning in a production environment.
General News

OCLC PRISM Service Now Available 24 Hours, Five Days a Week

Beginning Sept. 3, the OCLC PRISM service is available 24 hours a day, five days a week, giving libraries an additional 34 hours each week to use the world’s most sophisticated online cataloging and resource sharing system. PRISM will be available around the clock on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, 23 hours on Thursday and 14 hours on Sunday. During the one-hour downtime on Thursdays, OCLC operations staff will create a backup image of the Online Union Catalog and related files. Sunday downtime will be used for backups, software installations, testing and other system maintenance.

News From the Library Resources Management Division

Scanning and Invalidating Obsolete Elements

As part of the continuing effort to improve the quality of the Online Union Catalog, OCLC periodically runs database scans on elements which are obsolete or incorrect. Since February 1995, OCLC has been running database scans to convert or delete some of the elements made obsolete with the implementation of Format Integration Phase 1. The following database scans were run from July 1994 through June 1995 as part of the continuing effort to improve the quality of the Online Union Catalog. Corrections were made by scan software or pulled by a scan for manual correction. Unless noted as manual corrections, records were corrected by automated scan.

Field and Description Records Converted

Fixed-field coding for reproductions described in field 533 on Book and Score records with Dat tp (Type of Date) 'r' and Repr 'a', 'b', 'c' or 'r' (run periodically).

Converted codes in Dates, Dat tp and Ctry (Country of Publication) based on the reproduction in field 533 to codes based on the original data in field 260 subfields $a and $c. If the program could not read the date in field 260, e.g., incorrect coding, text in subfield $c, data in fixed field did not match date in 260, the record was not converted. In addition, a Ctry code was supplied based on the place in field 260 subfield $a. If the place was not in the program’s table, ‘xx’ was supplied. 24,014

Obsolete fixed-field values in serial records loaded via Batchload.

Converted obsolete, non-blank values to 'blank'. 4,521

Cataloguing Source Code (Source) on LC monograph records.

Converted Source code to 'blank' on LC records which contained Source/040 subfield $a discrepancies. 7,251

Indicator values.

--Non-filing indicators: Supplied non-filing indicator value when 'blank' or 'fill' was present on records loaded via Batchload (run monthly). 12,255

--Obsolete indicator values: Converted obsolete, non-blank indicator values to 'blank' on records in the Online Union Catalog. 17

Heading fields, subfield $w.

--Subfield was deleted from records in the Online Union Catalog and invalidated for use in PRISM Cataloging in Sept. 1994. (From May 1993 through Sept. 1994, subfield $w was deleted from 11.7 million records). 745,440

--Manually corrected if more than 3 characters were present in the subfield 301

Call numbers.

Deleted 'In Process', 'MLC' numbers and other miscellaneous changes (run periodically). 2,553

Field 042 on serial records loaded via Batchload.

Manually deleted field 042, LCCNs, and subfield $w in fields 760-787 if not appropriate or corrected Encoding Level. 280

Field 043 (Geographic Area Code).

--Deleted extra spaces and numerics if the field was correctly subfielded. 1,237

--Manually deleted extraneous 'Do not use' notes or merged records. 589

Field 092, first indicator value '2'; field 245, subfield $j; field 246, subfields $c, $j, $k; field 246, subfields $c, $j; field 710, subfield $q; field 810, subfield $2; field 936 non-repeatability.
Manually corrected indicator value, deleted or corrected subfields and corrected non-repeatable fields in preparation for Format Integration Phase 1. All of the elements, except field 936, were invalidated for use in PRISM Cataloging in January 1995. Field 936 was made non-repeatable.

Field 210 (Abbreviated Key Title).
Converted obsolete first indicator value 'blank' (No information provided) to '0' (No title added entry).

Field 315 (Frequency) in Maps and Computer Files formats.
--Converted obsolete 315 field to field 310 when field contained single subfield $a$ or single subfields $a$ and $b$. (43 of the 1,731 records were coded as monographs and corrected manually after the initial scan was run. Either Bib $i$ was changed to 's' or the 310 was deleted.)

--Manually corrected when semi-colon was used incorrectly.

--Manually corrected to field 310 and field 321 when multiple frequencies were present.

Field 503 (Bibliographic History note).
Converted obsolete 503 field to field 500, 502, 504 or 518.

Field 537 (Source of Data note).
Converted obsolete 537 field to field 500. Under certain conditions, an introductory phrase 'Source of data:' was also added.

Field 582 (Related Computer File note).
Converted obsolete 582 field to field 500. Under certain conditions, an introductory phrase 'Related files:' was also added.

Field 700, 710, 711 and 730 (Added Entry Heading Fields).
Converted obsolete second indicator values '0', '1' and '3' to 'blank'.

On September 10th, 1995, OCLC invalidated the following elements for use in PRISM Cataloging:

- Field 210, first indicator value 'blank'
- Field 315
- Field 503
- Field 537
- Field 582
- Field 700, 710, 711 and 730, second indicator values '0', '1' and '3'

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Compiled by Jay Weitz

QUESTION: Does OCLC have an opinion on where to record producers of sound recordings?

AACR2r Amendments 1993 says that "producers having artistic and/or intellectual responsibility" can go in the statement of responsibility. But almost no one is doing that; mostly, one finds producers' names given in a vanilla 500 field, when they are mentioned at all. I suspect this is because it's usually very hard to tell whether the producer on a given recording has significant artistic and/or intellectual responsibility. There are a few obvious cases, one of which is the example in the Amendments. Some bands and pop singers apparently come to record with virtually everything decided; for others, the producer is practically part of the composing process. Apart from some folks who are really up on the pop scene, most of us catalogers don't know. So catalogers are hedging and putting them in a 500. Here we'd like to put them in the 508. Vanilla 500s aren't indexed in our keyword system and we don't want to trace them unless we're absolutely sure of their responsibility (in which case we'd put them in the 245 $c$). Using a 508 would make them at least keyword accessible. No one else is using 508 (of course, until FI Phase I, it wasn't possible), but it seems a logical place given the definition of the field.

ANSWER: Field 508 is a fine place for record producers when you believe they need to be recorded. The decision to put them there (and the separate decision to trace them) will depend on individual case judgments, as you have so accurately pointed out the varying intellectual responsibility they may have. By the way, according to the "Guide to Searching the OLCN" (p. 5:32), 500 notes are indexed in PRISM keyword searches of Notes (nt). Here's an idea for a guideline about deciding between 245 $c$ and 508, but it's based on thin air: If the producer is credited on the disc label, put the credit in 245 $c$; if it's only on the container, put it in 508. Does that make any sense? That might also help in deciding about an added entry, though that decision should be even more flexible.

*****
QUESTION: This question involves a corporate body added entry in which the last word of the name is in quotes. Should I punctuate the 710 like normal English, i.e., 710 20 Corporate body "name."

ANSWER: According to USMARC (it appears on 3/95 revision page X10 - p. 11, at the top), "The name portion of a name/subordinate body or name/title heading ends with a mark of punctuation. The mark of punctuation is placed inside a closing quotation mark." AACR2 seems to offer no guidance. USMARC does say that field 710 ends with a mark of punctuation (X10 - p. 10). The LCRI that defines "ending punctuation," LCRI 1.0C, includes "double quotation mark" as one of them. That MIGHT suggest that when a corporate name ends in a double quotation mark, that serves as the final punctuation, obviating the need for a period on either side of the closing quotation mark. But to be perfectly honest, I'm not sure. I think I'd go with the period within the closing quotation mark, but I don't think there is conclusive evidence for any of the options.

****

QUESTION: I'm cataloging a score with a ISMN, the first that I've personally seen. Please remind me how we're to code such things. To my knowledge, MARBI hasn't authorized a new field. Should it go into an 028 field with first indicator 3 or just into a 500 note?

ANSWER: The ISMN goes in field 024. If you have access to the USMARC Format for Bibliographic Data, 1994 Edition, instructions can be found there. It's pretty simple, though: First Indicator 2; then the letter "M" followed by the eight digits of the ISMN with hyphens or spaces removed, in subfield $a. That's it.

****

QUESTION: When duplicate records are reported to OCLC, how does OCLC determine the "preferred" record? We've been doing a lot of cataloging of standard repertoire on CDs lately and have run into a lot of duplicates, which we have duly reported. We always state a preferred record and list the others as dups; but sometimes it's hard to decide: I like this part of record #1, but record #2 has contents note. Or, record #1 is really great except the cataloger forgot to put in an 007, while the others all have an 007. I know when records are merged, access points from each are kept, but how about other parts of the record? I guess my behind-the-scenes question really is: Does it matter which record we give as the "preferred" one? Or will OCLC decide and we can stop thinking about it?

ANSWER: Although I cannot speak for everyone who does merges here at OCLC, the general policy is to retain the most complete record, the one to which we have to do or add the least. I always try to transfer manually any important unique information that will not automatically transfer, and I hope I have trained others doing music duplicates to do the same. There is a list of more than two dozen fields that will transfer from a deleted record if not present on the retained record (007, 010, 020, 024, 028, 033, 037, 041, 043, 045, 047, 048, 050/090, 082/092, 300/305, 306, 505, 520, 538, among others). Some users will also write little notes about what they want transferred, and I certainly consider those suggestions. OCLC has always said that records will be merged at our discretion, so you really needn't worry too much about telling us which record you prefer; in most cases, we tend to agree with users' suggestions, anyway.

****

QUESTION: Now that we all have the basics of 246 fields down, I'm wondering whether there is an order to multiple 246 fields. BF&S says first list those with 2nd indicator 0, then those with 2nd indicator 1, which makes a certain amount of sense. Then it says put the others in "the note printing order". What might "the note printing order" be? I figured AACR2r order, which is Source of the Title Proper first, then Variations in Title, then Parallel Titles and Other Title Information. This "order" is actually contrary to what BF&S says. I would just as soon invoke Weitz' First Law and put 246s in whatever order seems most reasonable. I also know that LC has given some guidelines, but they are for books, and I can't make much sense out of their statement anyway.

ANSWER: It's hard to give concrete rules about the order of 246s because sometimes they generate notes and sometimes they don't, sometimes they have to intermingle with explicit 500 notes and sometimes they don't. I guess those with Second Indicators 0 and 1 go first because they generally don't need to generate notes; that is, they usually restate part of what has already appeared in the 245 and do not have an introductory display constant in any case. Remember that you probably wouldn't use Second Indicator 1 for a parallel title not already in the 245. Any other parallel title would likely need further clarification and therefore require second indicator blank, anyway.

246 1# $i Parallel title on container: Sa Chants de la Synagogue de Florence

The stipulated order of 246s doesn't contradict AACR2; in fact, the "note printing order" of BF&S is supposed to encourage following AACR2. But let's be
honest: AACR2 doesn’t say much about the order of those notes, either. “Source of title proper” notes (5.7B3, 6.7B3) would usually be 500s rather than 246s because they don’t often contain a title, only refer to the one in field 245. “Variations in title” (5.7B4, 6.7B4) and “Parallel titles and other title information” (5.7B5, 6.7B5) cover the rest, leaving a good deal up to cataloger’s judgment. In short, you get to put the notes in what you consider to be their “most reasonable” order, after all.

****

QUESTION: What is the order of subfields in the 245, when you have $a, $b, $n, and $p? Let’s say you published a book (to make things simple) and the title page reads as follows:

MADMEN, MISFITS, AND MORONS
A chronology of music catalogers I have known by O.C. Elsie*
PART I--Your Favorite Cataloger Here*
[*Names have been changed to protect the satiric]

It seems to me the 245 would read as follows:

245 10 Madmen, misfits, and morons : $a a chronology of music catalogers I have known. $n Part I, $p Your Favorite Cataloger Here / $c O.C. Elsie.

(This is assuming this book is a complete bibliographic item, that other music catalogers will be the subject of separate books.) Everything I can find in AACR2r and BF&S talks about the relationship between subfield $n and/or $p in relation to the *title proper*—in other words, the rules and examples always seem to talk in terms of subfield $n and/or $p following subfield $a. I am given direction on what to do if the other title info applies to the *part* ($n and/or $p) but not what to do if the other title info applies to the title proper when you also have subfields $n and/or $p present. I can’t think of any other way to catalog the book I made up for you; it seems reasonable; it just seems odd there is no example with subfields $a and $b along with $n and/or $p.

ANSWER: Subfields $n and $p can only be used following $a or other subfields $a or $p. Of course, you can punctuate so as to indicate the relationship of the part/section title/number to the other title information.

245 10 Cranks, curmudgeons, and compulsives : $a a chronology of music catalogers I have known. Part II, Your Favorite Cataloger Here / $c O.C. Elsie.

That’s why it says under $n and $p in BF&S that they qualify the title proper (subfield $a) and why $b says, "If the other title information has a part or section number or name, enter the number or name in subfield $b, not in subfield $n or $p."

*****

QUESTION: The recording I’m cataloging features totally instrumental versions of folk songs. The texts of the songs are included in the program notes, but those words are not sung on the recording. How should the Language fixed field and field 041 be coded?

ANSWER: Because the texts are not sung, we cannot, strictly speaking, call them printed versions of the sung or spoken texts. Record the language(s) of the program notes and the unsung song texts in subfield $g of the 041, NOT in subfield $e. Of course, because the recording is instrumental, the Language fixed field would be coded N/A.

*****

QUESTION: I’m presently cataloging a number of works for handbells. One of them contains no musical notes, only the texts with the word circled on which the bell-holder rings. There are 8 v., one volume for each different pitch of bell. My gut reaction is to treat this as type "a" rather than "c", with the rest of the record (especially 300) treated accordingly. I have a 500 note: "Texts only, with circled words for ringing." What do you think?

ANSWER: My inclination would be to treat it as a score. (One wonders if this is the standard "notational" system for handbell scores.) Other types of scores lack actual music (instructions for performance, for instance). You would certainly want to describe in a note the peculiarities of this "score", as you have said. You could describe it in the 300 as "8 v." and avoid calling it "of music", but I don't know enough details to offer any more help than that.

*****

QUESTION: I am wondering if I can justify inputting a series of Chopin CDs as new records. Arubesque Recordings issued four CDs in a series titled The complete works of Frederic Chopin; p1991 (e.g., #26864088, which is v. 2). It reissued these in 1995. The differences are: (1) the series now reads "The complete PIANO works of Frederic Chopin"; (2) the date is given as "pc1995, 1991." Using the OCLC input standards it appears that neither of these differences justifies a new record. Of course I
can be conservative and use the records for the 1991
issues, editing them (or not) to match the 1995
manifestations. What do you think?

ANSWER: From your description of the Chopin CD,
I'd say that a new record is certainly justified. The
new date of publication (1995) and the new series
name (it sounds as though it could be a new series
rather than just a title change) together would justify a
new record. Proceed with a clear conscience.

*****

QUESTION: My question is about #22146597. At
the top of the disk it says in large print:

Marlborough Music Festival
40th Anniversary

Below that in smaller print: Johann Sebastian Bach
Then in even smaller print, the various works are
listed:

14 canons (not "Fourteen")...
Orchestral suite no. 2...
Orchestral suite no. 3...

Performers, in small print, are also listed on the disc.
What goes in 245: the various titles, or
"Marlborough Music Festival 40th Anniversary" as
a collective title? Or would "Marlborough ..." be
put in a 500 "At head of title:" note?

ANSWER: The record online (#22146597) suggests
that the "Marlborough ..." might be a series, though it's
not coded as such. From your description,
"Marlborough ..." sounds as though it could be a
reasonable collective title, with the individual works
listed in the contents. If there is some other obvious
collective title on the container, you could alternatively
use that, but "Marlborough ..." seems to fit that bill.

*****

QUESTION: Very recently, I've been seeing
compact discs that have the words "Digital Master"
enclosed in a little rectangle somewhere on the item.
I'm wondering if this should affect coding in 007
subfield $n. I know that digital *re*masters are
considered analog recordings, but if the words are
"digital master", I'm not sure. I was tending toward
yes, those words would make it a digital recording.
Then I was looking at a CD entitled 16 Most
Requested Television Themes (OCLC #31198359).
There is no little rectangle, but in the little booklet it
states "Mixed and Digitally Mastered by: Chris
Herles, Sony Music Studios, New York City." (Not
REmastered. Just "mastered.") Well, these are
themes from I Love Lucy, Green Acres, Hogan's
Heroes, etc. Some of them are marked as being in
mono. These things CAN'T be original digital
masters. The booklet also gives the original
recording dates for all these items, ranging from
1951 thru 1966, with the theme from Hill Street Blues
tossed in, from 1981. As SPARS codes become less
common, I depend on what other indications there
are. Occasionally I see "Original Digital
Recording!" splashed on the label or container and
take that as sufficient evidence. But if the language is
changing...well, in short, do you have any ideas on
this?

ANSWER: These publishers just don't know how to
behave in civilized company, do they? I'm doing
some guessing here, but let's recall what a "master" is:
'an original positive recording with pits etched on a
blank disc by a laser activated by a digitally recorded
master tape, and used to make the matrices from which
compact discs are produced in multiple copies"
(Thorin & Vidali The Acquisition and Cataloging of
Music and Sound Recordings, 1984). In 007 $n, we're
talking about the original capture and storage of the
sound, not about any subsequent manifestation (such
as mastering). As you've figured out, recordings
predating the early 1980s (or maybe the very late
1970s, if we stretch it) cannot possibly be digital
capture and storage. Unless you want to include a
quoted note of some kind, I think you can pretty
much ignore indications of both mastering and
remastering. In SPARS coding, 007 $n is concerned
only with the first character; the other two can be
ignored.

*****

QUESTION: Here's a follow-up as to what
constitutes a digital recording. I'm never quite sure
where the lines are drawn in the SPARS codes. The
last one is the playback; the first one is capture; the
middle one is mixing and editing; and I don't know
where storage fits, the first or middle code. The 007
$n is for capture AND storage. A digital master
sound like storage to me, but that didn't
necessarily imply digital capture since there are
remasters. But if $n is for both capture and storage,
could one be analog and the other digital?

ANSWER: If you look at the codes in USMARC,
you'll notice that the definitions already account for
the distinction you're making. Code "d" (digital
storage) indicates electrical capture and digital storage;
"a" acoustical (non-electric) capture and direct storage;
"b" electrical capture and direct storage; "e" electrical
capture and analog electrical storage. Other
combinations (unlikely, I imagine) would be coded
"z". I think the only "capture" options are
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acoustical/non-electric or electric. The first SPARS code would actually be for "storage". From an old CD, I have explanations as follows for the SPARS first character: "D" "digital tape recorder used during session recording"; "A" "analogue tape recorder used during session recording." "Capture" must be understood as electrical, I guess, via microphone.

*****

QUESTION: About the 505, if either the basic or enhanced option is acceptable, why would one choose the latter? It takes a lot more time.

ANSWER: With the (theoretically) growing sophistication of local systems, the enhanced 505 was designed to allow improved access and greater differentiation among titles, names, and miscellaneous information in the future. The names and titles are uncontrolled, of course, and so don't benefit from any authority control. Unless your local system can now (or in the future might be able to) access such information and tell the difference by subfield coding, you will probably not want to bother with the enhanced 505.

*****

QUESTION: We get a lot of stuff with the performer's name on the disc plus "Greatest hits." Would the 245 be (e.g.)

John Denver $h [sound recording] : $b greatest hits. OR
Greatest hits $h [sound recording] / $c John Denver.

Assuming that the size of the lettering is the same and equal prominence appears to be given to both. "Greatest hits" seems to me to be awfully generic and not much use as a title proper. What about a 246 here?

ANSWER: This one is hard to generalize about; it depends on typography and prominence. All else being equal, I'd lean toward "Greatest hits" as the title proper, generic as it may be. But no matter which option you choose ("Name $h [GMD] : $b greatest hits" or "Greatest hits $h [GMD] / $c Name", it's probably a good idea to enter the other alternative in a 246.

*****

QUESTION: When a sound recording has no collective title, and the 245 is just a string of individual titles, is one supposed to make a 246 of the long, strung-together version of the title? The various sources I've consulted don't seem to agree on this. Which reminds me ... I thought that the 1993 Amendments to AACR2 standardized and simplified the placement of the GMD. Yet, in many of the guides, cheat sheets, and other documents relating to format integration that I've seen, the GMD continues to jump about merrily, as if the 1993 Amendments never happened. Did I miss something?

ANSWER: LC recommends a 246 for the uninterrupted string of titles (minus the GMD and subfielding) so as not to lose the access to that string we had before the 1993 Amendments to AACR2 (which placed the GMD in such cases at the end of the string). Why anyone would purposely want to search an arbitrary string of titles like that is a mystery to me, and I think LC is being compulsive or silly in this instance. Their guidelines for the 246 do stipulate that use, however.

Any document issued since the GMD placement change announced in the 1993 Amendments that does not have the GMD directly following the title proper, the last part of the title proper, or (where there is no collective title) the title first is simply incorrect. In fact, I blush to note that my own "Mini-Lesson on Fields 246 and 740," which appeared in MOUG Newsletter no. 60, has an incorrectly placed GMD in the next to last example 740 on p. 12. The offending part of the example should read:

245 00 Sinfonie Nr. 1 $h [sound recording] : $b Fogli ; Sinfonie Nr. 2 : Ricordanze ; Sinfonie Nr. 3 : Menschen-Los ... 

Sure is hard keeping it all straight, isn't it?

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

PLENARY SESSION I

HOW IS LC USING THE OCLC PRODUCTS?
Sue Vita, Chief, Special Materials Cataloging Division, Library of Congress

GOOD MORNING. I am pleased to be here to address you on behalf of Sarah Thomas, who was originally scheduled to speak to you today. Sarah sends her greetings and her regrets. She has recently been temporarily assigned as acting director of the special collections, and her new duties made it difficult to be here. Most of the BIG numbers in "The Arrearage" are in the special collections area--13 million pieces in both the manuscripts and the prints and photographs backlogs alone! So I have the pleasure of speaking to you. Last year was my first MOUG and MLA meetings. At the time I was...
ACTING Chief of the Special Materials Cataloging Division—since May I am no longer "acting". I am enjoying working with the staff and the special formats, and I am delighted to be here once again at MOUG/MLA.

Laura asked me to brief you on how LC is using OCLC—a tall order in 20 minutes because LC is so large and because each reading room uses OCLC differently: All the "general" reading rooms, like the Social Sciences and the Humanities Reading Rooms and even the Music Division Reading Room and the Recorded Sound Reference Center use OCLC differently, as you will see. There are also multiple uses in the different technical areas: acquisitions, cataloging, and reference. But let me see what I can do in the time that I have. Since Deta Davis will talk about Music Cataloging on OCLC, I will only discuss cataloging briefly and very generally, even though it occupies quite a prominent place in my consciousness. (Did you know that in order to accomplish our arrearage reduction goals for sound recordings—2 million items—we need to catalog or inventory 333,333—a third of a million pieces each year from now till the end of the decade?!)
average of 9,000 searches per month. Many of these searches were conducted by LC staff since only a few reading rooms offered public access to this service initially. As the experiment was extended through the end of November 1994, public access and usage increased. Since a single authorization number was used during the experiment, we can only surmise how FirstSearch was used differently by cataloging divisions and reading rooms through the results of an end user survey. One datum from the survey showed that just over forty percent of the respondents used FirstSearch to search out a particular topic, with smaller numbers searching by title or author. The Asian Division used FirstSearch for information on the Japanese earthquake, since the printed version of Japanese newspapers were slower in arriving than the electronic counterpart.

To understand better how FirstSearch usage was distributed between reference and cataloging service areas, OCLC agreed to another two-month experiment which began December 1, 1994. With several authorization numbers, OCLC was able to monitor FirstSearch use by separate service units within the Library: the Congressional Research Service, Law Library, cataloging divisions, and reading rooms. FirstSearch usage statistics provided by OCLC indicate that total searches in the Library for December swelled to almost 12,000! We are now awaiting the results of this experiment to understand usage patterns and preferences by staff and patrons in using FirstSearch. This will help us make recommendations on which databases to subscribe to in FirstSearch.

Reference staff comments were very positive. FirstSearch expands access to bibliographic information beyond our own bibliographic databases in the Library. The user interface in FirstSearch is simple to use so patrons can perform searches themselves with little or no instruction. FirstSearch lightens the administrative burden of handling a CD-ROM network, and may result in cost savings over the purchase of print or CD-ROM reference title subscriptions.

OCLC usage statistics by the Library of Congress for the initial test period of October through November 1994 confirmed high usage of the FirstSearch base package of databases. Out of 28,000 searches, one-third of the searches were on WorldCat, OCLC's online union catalog. ArticleFirst, an OCLC produced database of citations from table of contents pages of more than 11,500 journals] accounted for over ten percent of all searches. Other frequently searched databases, in order of frequency, were: Newspaper Abstracts, MEDLINE, Periodical Abstracts, ERIC, ContentsFirst (OCLC's database of journal table of contents pages), and the GPO Catalog. It should be noted that four of these databases were already available at LC in CD-ROM format during the test period.

PRISM

I have spent a lot of time describing our experiment with FirstSearch because it is new for us, and because the more general reading rooms are expected to give it heavy use in the future, should it continue to be provided. Yet, by far to date, it is PRISM which gets the heavy use—even by the reference librarians, who said they use it:

1. To supplement our catalog. "If we can't find it we look in OCLC. It is useful because it casts such a wide net."

2. To discover if something has been published. Who has it? (This helps for materials not acquired fast enough.)

3. To help patrons making telephone requests. We use it to determine availability local to the caller. We actually publicize OCLC's service this way.

4. For subject searches. For example, searching pieces for 5 guitars, found solos, pieces with piano accompaniment, etc.

5. To produce bibliographies. We search, do a screen dump, or export and dump to ProCite, to create a bibliography for a patron. For example, we have used it to compile various editions of George Bulow's monograph on David Heinichen (Dresden, 18th century), etc. OCLC also allows us to get a profile of the history of our catalog.

6. To take advantage of better searching capabilities than exist in our MUMS system: Place, Publisher, Date, Plate Number, Notes—are all used with file qualifiers to get results.

Notes: Searched Walt Whitman to find his words used in music.

Plate Number: Used when someone leaves an unidentified orphan sheet music page in the copy machine.

7. For vague reader or ILL requests: Andante published in Paris in the 1850s. Using these few elements we discovered that only one composer matched, and got the complete citation.
8. For collections development or acquisitions the use is extensive. In the past 20 years there has been a problem getting the copyright deposit for American composers and publishers. They have not been sending them in regularly on the 407 deposit or to register the copyright claim. The Music Division Librarians go to OCLC "like piranhas" and search for, e.g., Hal Leonard--143 hits were found. Using the brief display we find DLC holdings. We download into ProCite and sort on Edition Number. We then call the publisher and request those published items which the Library has not received. If a publisher says that they have, "No staff to research that," we reply that we can send them a list in picking slip order.

9. For preparing Program Notes for LC Concert Series. Newspaper obituaries are a rich source of information.

My reading of the usefulness of FirstSearch vs. PRISM is that FirstSearch will be more useful for more mainstream reference. Music reference needs are so specialized that FirstSearch may not be as useful. When I asked the Music Division Reference Staff which products would be most useful for their needs if added to the OCLC FirstSearch database they gave me the following titles--OCLC take note! Dance on Disc (NYPL) and The Music Index on CD-ROM (Chadwyck-Healey). Perhaps we should all lobby OCLC as a group to encourage a menu that is more favorable to the music world!

The Recorded Sound Reference Center currently doesn't use OCLC much directly, but they do use SILVER PLATTER'S CD ROM product heavily. It is the "single most consulted reference tool in the reading room (after MUMS)." It is our first resort for searching OCLC music sound recordings. We estimate that we use it dozens of times a day. The searching capabilities are better than MUMS because we can limit searches by format, e.g. by 78's.

We print out lists for patrons, e.g. Mildred Baily--print to disc and edit on Word Perfect. (Editing to print with small type reduces the amount of paper used.)

PRISM is used to search non-music sound recordings--published spoken word. Used to determine holdings information for referrals.

1. Search Silver Platter to get label name and number.

2. Search shelf to see if we have it.

3. Search PRISM for other libraries with holdings.

III. How do we use OCLC for Technical Services?

Currently the main uses for OCLC in the cataloging areas are:

1. Copy Cataloging
2. Music Original Cataloging
3. Serials Cataloging

FirstSearch

Like their reference counterparts, cataloging staff also found FirstSearch a valuable tool in their work. Some subject catalogers regularly used FirstSearch (WorldCat) to examine terminology and formulate subject headings based on word usage and index and subject descriptors in database records. They found it "friendlier" than PRISM because they didn't need to be so precise in their terminology.

Classification specialists in the Decimal Classification Division use FirstSearch to obtain a fix on new topics and words, and how they are classified in a scientific commercial database. INSPEC was used, for example, for engineering documents. Other catalogers used FirstSearch to obtain bibliographic information to support both the creation of name and authority headings for books being cataloged.

PRISM

But by far, the greatest use by cataloging staff is for PRISM.

Today, technological developments and a changing cataloging environment make it possible to look outward to the use of copy to bolster cataloging productivity. There is a shift in emphasis from an LC-oriented environment to one more nearly collegial in aspect. There is a shift in focus from a record's having a local orientation to one having a more universal one--records are created by various agencies and become candidates for use by other agencies. Thus the use of external source records is the present-day counterpart to previous efforts at improving cataloging productivity, as well as the means of supplanting the unsatisfactory aspects of minimal level cataloging.

Initially, the mechanics were rudimentary, with staff searching OCLC, making printouts, and rekeying the data to create records for LC use. Later it became possible for staff at LC to import records from OCLC, at first via tape load, and then through electronic means. While a vast improvement over the need to
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rekey the data, the use of this software made for an overall "clunky" procedure, requiring the intervention of staff to do extra steps that contributed to a certain inefficiency to the process. It was only with the installation of specifically designed load software in June of 1994, that the mechanical means of importing records from OCLC has now become a smooth, overnight procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>TOTAL PRODUCTION</th>
<th>COPY</th>
<th>% OF PRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>235,813</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>266,793</td>
<td>14,882</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>260,957</td>
<td>23,905</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>279,809</td>
<td>45,774</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acquisitions

Preliminary Cataloging

The staff of the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Control Division have found OCLC to be an enormous help. The major difference between the preliminary cataloging which is performed in this division and what is done in copy cataloging is that the access headings are not verified against the authority files. In general, as long as the record found on OCLC contains at least one subject heading, which must be in English, it will be imported and processed according to established guidelines. Since the majority of received books are already represented in MUMS by an acquisition level record (encoding level "a") the merge/replace feature of this automation enhancement has greatly reduced the clean-up process and the rate for downloading and processing records dramatically rose to 9.55 books per hour (a 57% increase over the pre-Generic Load rate.)

The greatest success has been in searching English (67%), French (62%), German (39%), Russian (28%), Spanish (31%), and Italian (19%).

In summary, we are pleased with the OCLC applications. OCLC has become a major reference tool in LC's reading rooms—a powerful tool in helping the reference staff give good service to their patrons. OCLC has also been successfully utilized in improving cataloging productivity—an important instrument in helping with our arraerage reduction efforts.

NOTE: I am grateful for the contributions of Sam Brylawski, Kay Guiles, Gary Huggens, Andy Lisowski, Bill Parsons, Robin Rausch, and Mark Sweeney, all of whom helped me prepare this talk.

REPORT FROM PUBLIC SERVICES COORDINATOR

Ruthann McTyre

MOUG Establishes Reference Products Interest Group

In his "From the Chair" installment from the April 1995 MOUG Newsletter, our fearless leader, Ralph Papakhian reminds us that "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."

As OCLC makes its way further into the area of reference products, MOUG is once again upholding its mission to "identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of OCLC concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services." (from the MOUG Mission Statement) by creating the Reference Products Interest Group. This Interest Group has taken shape since the last annual meeting in Atlanta and its members include Leslie Bennett, Bonna Boettcher, Holly Borne, Alan Green, Marty Jenkins, and Philip Vandermeer. Laura Gayle Green, MOUG's Continuing Education Coordinator, serves as an ex officio member and Yours Truly is serving as Chair in my capacity as Public Services Coordinator. The charge of the Reference Products Interest Group is as follows:

- 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 increased dialogue between catalog and reference specialists.

The immediate task for the Interest Group is 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. The Group will make recommendations to OCLC regarding possible changes, improvements and enhancements, and will report its study to the membership of MOUG via the newsletter.

Reference Products Interest Group Sessions at Seattle Meeting

Due to RILM’s place in the queue at OCLC, the Interest Group hasn’t really had an opportunity to initialize its immediate task. We had hoped to offer a report to the membership in Seattle, but since that probably will not be an option, we will be involved in two different sessions at the Seattle meeting. One session will feature Alan Green who will give a presentation on (to quote Mr. Green) “a RILM-less FirstSearch and EPIC, comparing those with the search engine on MUSE (NISC’s RILM CD-ROM).” The second session will feature Phil Vandermeer, Holly Borne, and Marty Jenkins leading attendees on a tour of databases on FirstSearch and EPIC pointing out useful resources that most of us wouldn’t necessarily think to use for music reference.

An Invitation to Music Reference Specialists!

If you are a music reference librarian and are not currently a member of MOUG, I invite you to consider joining. I must confess that in my younger years, my perception of MOUG was that it was a music cataloger’s organization. Then I was asked to speak at the San Francisco MOUG meeting and discovered that there is a great deal of interest in all aspects of public services—not just cataloging. In fact, as our chairperson himself has stated, our focus is to improve our use of OCLC to accomplish our work. As our work with OCLC products moves deeper into reference products, MOUG needs to hear from you, the reference specialist. SO WHAT ARE YOU WAITING FOR? If you have an interest in seeing that electronic music reference sources continue to improve (and be developed), now is a perfect time to get involved. We would certainly welcome your company. Join us! To paraphrase the old orange juice commercials, it’s not just for cataloging anymore.

See you all in Seattle.

NACO MUSIC UPDATE
Michelle Koth, NMP Advisory Committee Chair/RLIN Representative

NMP has surpassed the 22,000 mark for contributions to the LC name authority file. The statistics break down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and name/title</td>
<td>19,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series authority</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and name/title PVRs*</td>
<td>3,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series PVRs*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PVRs = Previously Verified Records; changes made to existing records. These changes can be added references or changes to the heading itself.

Another NMP participant has become independent for both names and titles: Phyllis Jones of Oberlin. This is an encouraging accomplishment. The effectiveness and expansion of the project depends on participants becoming independent as quickly as possible so that they can then begin reviewing new participants.

Ann Della Porta, Team Leader of Cooperative Cataloging at LC, has arranged for several NMP libraries to be reviewed by a music cataloger "on detail" to Coop Cat. As of September 5, the following libraries are being reviewed by Phil De Sellem:

- Brown University (OCLC) PRB-M
- Cornell University (RLIN) NIC-MU
- Eastman School of Music (OCLC) NRU-Mus
- Middlebury College (OCLC) VTM-MU
- New York Public Library (RLIN) NN-RH
- Northwestern University (OCLC) IEN-Mu
- University of Maryland (RLIN) MdU-Mu
- University New Mexico (OCLC) Nmu-FA

Other news:

Jennifer Bowen at Eastman has been nominated for the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Executive Council. The PCC Executive Council is PCC's governing body and serves to provide leadership and direction to the program. For more information about PCC and the Executive Council, go to gopher://marvel.loc.gov:70/11/services/cataloging/coop/coop_council on the Web.

The NMP Handbook is now being offered for sale through MOUG. An order form can be found at the end of this newsletter. The handbook is a compilation of examples with explanations for creating authority records. It does not encompass establishing the
headings; only how to cite the sources in which the information necessary to create the headings was found. The handbook is not an official publication of NACO, LC, or COOP CAT and does not replace any official documents.

OCLC USERS COUNCIL MEETING
OCTOBER 1995
Ralph Papakhian, MOUG Chair

Since minutes and reports of this meeting are circulated regularly and widely by OCLC in various media (OCLC Newsletter, OCLC's web page, etc.), I will report briefly on selected topics.

The annual theme of the meeting was "25 Years and Counting: OCLC and Libraries." K. Wayne Smith's opening report was upbeat, and enthusiastic about expanded products and services, particularly in the area of Internet services and an increased international OCLC presence. You can expect to see a year long celebration of OCLC's 25th anniversary. The focus of this particular meeting was "Human Factors and Information Technology." The various Users Council Interest Groups each addressed this topic, outlining the impact of technology on the humans that work in libraries. Much of that impact, unfortunately, is negative. Some suggestions were floated about having OCLC and or the regional networks serve as resources to deal with ergonomics in the work place and with the constant retraining now required with changing technologies. While some recognized the considerable improvement in library services as a result of technology (better and quicker information delivery, more efficient processing of materials) this topic seems to focus on the "more with less" theme so prevalent in current applied management. Of course, historically, technology has served a liberating function: the introduction of new technologies should relieve the human worker of manual labor in order for that worker to realize her/his human potential. Personally I think it's time for us to return to this more civilized use of technology. Indeed, the rapid increase in the implementation of technology in library services may even require more staff rather than less in order to effectively exploit these new resources. Put in other words, it might be better, and more humane to do "more with more" rather than "more with less."


One topic discussed in the Technical Services Interest Group may be of special interest to MOUG members. That was the imminent creation of a Task Force to study the credit for original cataloging. The Interest Group spent considerable time discussing the charge to that Task Force (variable charges based on cataloging level or format; elimination or increase in the credit; purpose of the credit and so on). Mary Konkel (University of Akron, representing OLC) and I both supported a serious investigation into the variable credit based on format of material since it is well known that AV and Sound Recording cataloging typically requires much more cataloging time than other materials. If this is an area you feel strongly about, do contact your User Council delegate and present your opinions. (Let MOUG know about it too.) Alan Green and Tom Heck were able to raise the question about RILM implementation at the Reference Services Interest Group. New products we can expect soon: Passport for Windows (before the end of the year), PromptSelect (a selection service combining dealers and OCLC for material and cataloging data delivery), CATCD for Windows, and Web browsers for FirstSearch.

The high point of this meeting was a reception honoring OCLC staff with 20 or more years of service. Sixteen staff members were introduced, plaques were distributed and a grand celebratory buffet was eaten. Seriously, this was a wonderful event, and for those of us who have been around a while, it was nice to see the faces behind some of the names we have seen and heard for so long. MOUG sends its congratulations!

This was the first Users Council meeting I have attended. All in all, I believe it is useful for MOUG and other special format Users Groups to attend and observe these sessions. It is still fairly clear that OCLC and the delegates to the Users Council focus on those areas of products and services which are voluminous and income generating. One would expect that, naturally. We should also, naturally, continue to make a point about the needs of special formats—if we don't, I'm not sure who will.
ANNUAL MEETING  
SEATTLE, FEBRUARY 1996

HOTEL

The 1996 conference site is the Westin Hotel, located at 1900 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101; telephone (206) 728-1000. Room rates are $100.00 single or double, $125.00 triple, $150.00 quadruple. Room tax is currently 15.2%. Reservations can be made by calling (800) 228-3000.

TRAVEL TO SEATTLE

By Air

SPECIAL UNITED CONVENTION AIRFARE DISCOUNT

United Meetings Reservation Center 1-800-521-4041
Open 7 days per week from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM EST
MLA ID# 557ZW

We have negotiated a contract with United Airlines for the 1996 convention. Anyone attending the meeting who flies United can receive a 5% discount off restricted tickets (requiring a Saturday night stay over) or 10% on full fare non-restricted tickets. Your travel agent can also book your tickets using the above information, and there are discounts on Domestic Air Freight for shipping packages to the meeting.

Please take advantage of this program which benefits MLA by providing free tickets for the Association.

Getting from Sea-Tac Airport to Downtown

- Gray Line Airport Express (626-6088) buses leave from the North and South booths outside the baggage claim area every 20 minutes from 5am to midnight with service to 11 downtown hotels including the Westin. Fares are $7.50 one way and $13 round trip (1995). No reservations. Scheduled travel time to the hotel is about 50 minutes (return trip time is around 25 minutes). Tickets may be purchased from hotel concierge or from Gray Line desks and drivers.

- Metro Transit (553-3000) No. 194 and No. 174 buses run from outside of the baggage area at the airport to the downtown about every 30 minutes. Fares are $1.10 ($1.60 during rush hours) one way. Both routes go within a few blocks of the hotel. If you plan to take Metro, we suggest getting a schedule at the airport or on the bus.

This includes a map and routing information since routes change depending upon the time of day and bus number.

- Taxi service from the airport is about $30 each way for up to 5 people.

By Car

From the South (and the airport) Driving North on I-5, take the Seneca Street exit in downtown (exit on the left). Proceed on Seneca to 6th Ave; take a right on 6th Ave. The hotel parking lot is at 6th and Westlake (about 6 blocks). From the North. Driving South on I-5, take the Stewart/Denny exit. Take Stewart to 6th Ave, take a right on 6th to the hotel parking lot.

Pricing at the Westin is $14.00/day (1995 prices)

For more meeting information see the Web Site at http://weber.u.washington.edu/~gibbs/seattle.html

MOUG MEMBERS BY OCLC SYMBOL UPDATE

Please note the following additions and changes to the "MOUG Members by OCLC Symbol" that appeared in the last issue of the newsletter.

Change:

KCP Kansas City Public Library James Sparks TO
KCK Kansas City Kansas Public Library James

Add:

JPL Jacksonville Public Libraries Lynne C. Jaffe jaffcl@jpl.ltd.ci.jax.fl.us (904) 630-2404
IKG Champaign Public Library Helen Widdis Melin hwmelin@prairienet.org (217) 356-1970

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
The University of Texas at Austin
P. O. Box P
Austin, TX 78713-8916
Phone: (512) 495-4191
Tax No.: 31-0951917

All orders must be prepaid.
Preliminary Program

MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION • 65th Annual Meeting
February 5-11, 1996 • Westin Hotel • Seattle, Washington

Note: Business meetings are generally open to observers, but participation is limited to committee members only. Boldfaced meetings are generally considered open, or program, meetings.

Monday, February 5

2:00 pm - 6:00 pm  Finance Committee (Business)

Tuesday, February 6

9:00 am - 12:00 pm  Finance Committee (Business)
2:00 pm - 10:00 pm  MLA Board of Directors (Business)
2:00 pm - 6:00 pm  MOUG Board of Directors (Business)
7:00 pm - 9:00 pm  MLA Registration

Wednesday, February 7

8:00 am - 9:00 am  MOUG Registration
8:00 am - 9:00 am  Continuing Education Workshop Check-ins
9:00 am - 5:00 pm  Continuing Education Workshop
• Copyright Law and the Music Library in the Age of Technology
9:00 am - 5:00 pm  Continuing Education Workshop
• Music Conservation Workshop
9:00 am - 5:00 pm  MOUG
9:00 am - 5:00 pm  MLA Board (Business)
10:00 am - 5:00 pm  MLA Registration
1:00 pm - 5:00 pm  Organ Crawl
1:00 pm - 6:00 pm  Cascade Country Tour
2:00 pm - 5:00 pm  Placement Service Desk
3:30 pm - 5:00 pm  New Members Round Table
4:30 pm - 6:00 pm  Reference Performance Subcommittee (Business)
5:00 pm - 6:00 pm  RLIN Catalogers
5:00 pm - 6:30 pm  Working Group on Survey of Music Library Personnel Characteristics (Business)
5:30 pm - 7:00 pm  Program Committee Dinner (by invitation)
7:00 pm - 8:00 pm  First-Time Attendees Reception
7:30 pm - 8:30 pm  Round Table Coordinators (Business)
8:00 pm - 11:00 pm  Exhibits Open
8:00 pm - 11:00 pm  Opening Reception

---

**Thursday, February 8**

*Exhibits Open 8:00 am - 6:00 pm*

7:30 am - 8:30 am  Chapter Chairs Breakfast (by invitation)
7:30 am - 8:30 am  Chapter Newsletter Editors' Breakfast (by invitation)
8:00 am - 5:00 pm  MLA Registration Desk
9:00 am - 9:30 am  Welcome to the 65th MLA Annual Meeting

9:30 am - 11:00 am  Plenary Session I
  *Music in Seattle*
  Topic TBA: Gerard Schwarz (Seattle Symphony Orchestra)

*The Selling of Seattle through Song: 1890-1910:* JoAnn Taricani (University of Washington)

*Jackson Street After Hours:* Paul de Barros (Program Director, Northwest Folklife Festival, and Jazz Critic, *Seattle Times*)
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Placement Service Orientation
  - *Interviewing Workshop*, sponsored by the MLA Placement Service and Personnel Subcommittee
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Subject Access Subcommittee (*Business*)
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Authorities Subcommittee (*Business*)
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee (*Business*)
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  MARC Formats Subcommittee (*Business*)
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Sheet Music Cataloging Working Group (*Business*)
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Social Responsibilities Round Table
  - Assistive Technology Appropriate for Libraries
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Public Libraries Committee
  - Creating Effective Handouts for Patrons
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  IAML-US Board of Directors (*Business*)
11:30 am - 1:00 pm  Online Reference Services Subcommittee
  - Comparing RILM on FirstSearch and EPIC, Alan Green (Ohio State University)
  - Music in general online databases, Michael Colby (University of California, Davis)
12:30 pm - 1:30 pm  *NOTES* Staff Luncheon (*by invitation*)
12:30 pm - 2:00 pm  Major Gifts Working Group (*Business*)
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm  Bibliographic Control Committee (*Business*)
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm  MLA Archives Joint Committee (*Business*)
1:00 pm - 2:30 pm  American Music Round Table
1:00 pm - 2:30 pm  Personnel Subcommittee (*Business*)
1:30 pm - 3:00 pm  Placement Service Desk
1:30 pm - 3:00 pm  Archives Round Table
1:30 pm - 3:00 pm  Automation Subcommittee (*Business*)
2:00 pm - 3:30 pm  ASK MLA: *Coping with Difficult People and Situations*
  Steven Fry (UCLA), Moderator
2:00 pm - 3:30 pm  Legislation Committee (*Business*)
2:30 pm - 4:30 pm  Membership Subcommittee (*Business*)
2:30 pm - 4:00 pm  World Music Round Table

The Lion Sleeps Under Many Covers: Transnational Trajectories of Mbube, Christopher Waterman (University of Washington)

Sounds from Saudi: Old and New Recordings from the Arabian Peninsula, Virginia Danielson (Harvard University)

Scandinavian Fiddling Traditions in the Pacific Northwest, David Lamb and Friends (Seattle, WA)

3:00 pm - 4:30 pm  Authorities Subcommittee

3:00 pm - 4:30 pm  Bibliography Round Table

Hunting Down Hedgehogs: The Search for Brahmsiana, Thomas Quigley (Vancouver Public Library)

Liszt, The Murl Library, and the Murl Society, Murl Sickbert (Hardin-Simmons University)

Handel as Victim: Composer-Publisher Relationships and the Discourse of Musicology, David Hunter (University of Texas, Austin)

2:30 pm - 4:00 pm  Investments Subcommittee (Business)

3:00 pm - 4:30 pm  Preservation Committee (Business)

4:00 pm - 5:30 pm  Education Committee (Business)

4:00 pm - 5:30 pm  Reference Performance Subcommittee

• 3rd Annual Reference Refresher

4:00 pm - 5:30 pm  Publications Committee (Business)

4:30 pm - 6:00 pm  Jewish Music Round Table

4:30 pm - 6:00 pm  Technical Services Round Table

4:30 pm - 6:00 pm  Research in Music Librarianship Round Table

4:00 pm - 6:00 pm  RILM Volunteers Reception (By Invitation)

9:00 pm - 11:30 pm  President's Reception (Corporate members and all persons with official MLA responsibilities, including all committee members, chairs, representatives, editors, coordinators, etc.)
Friday, February 9

Exhibits Open 8:00 am - 6:00 pm

7:30 am - 9:00 am  Administration Committee Breakfast *(by invitation)*
8:00 am - 9:00 am  Placement Service Desk
8:00 am - 5:00 pm  MLA Registration Desk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:00 am - 11:00 am | Plenary Session II  
*Multimedia in the Music Library*  
*Sponsored by the Video Round Table*  
*Moderator: Ian Fairclough (Louisiana State University)*  
*Developing Interactive Multimedia Studies in Music: The Bach Goldberg Variations: Tim Smith (Northern Arizona University)*  
*Computer Music Research and Composition from the Center for Advanced Research Technology in the Arts and Humanities at the University of Washington: Richard Karpen (University of Washington)* |

11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Placement Service Desk
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Bibliographic Control Committee
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Film Music Round Table
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Working Group on Survey of Music Library Personnel Characteristics *(Business)*
11:30 am - 1:00 pm  Video Round Table
11:30 am - 1:00 pm  Small Academic Libraries Round Table
11:30 am - 1:00 pm  Information Sharing/Bibliographic Instruction Subcommittee  
  - Teaching the Internet
12:30 pm - 2:00 pm  Resource Sharing & Collection Development *(Business)*
1:00 pm - 2:30 pm  Subject Access Subcommittee

*Music Thesaurus Project: Update and Online Presentation, Harriette Hemmasi (Rutgers University)*  
*Class M Online: Update and Online Presentation, Geraldine Ostrove (CPSO, Library of Congress)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm - 2:30 pm</td>
<td>Legislation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WWW demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm - 2:30 pm</td>
<td>Black Music Round Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gospel music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm - 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Online Reference Services Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm - 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Preservation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm - 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Large Research Libraries Round Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm - 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Investments Subcommittee (Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Facilities Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New technologies and facilities planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Conservatory Libraries Round Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>AMLG Directors (Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Working Group on Faceted Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm - 4:30 pm</td>
<td>ASK MLA: Managing Technological Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Gayle Green (University of Missouri-Kansas City), Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Public Libraries Committee (Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm - 4:30 pm</td>
<td>Reference Performance Subcommittee (Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm - 5:30 pm</td>
<td>Development Committee (Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm - 5:30 pm</td>
<td>Uniform Title Types of Composition Working Group (Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm - 5:30 pm</td>
<td>Bibliographic Instruction Subcommittee (Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm - 5:30 pm</td>
<td>Automation Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Online demos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm - 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Women in Music Round Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm - 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Education Committee (Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm - 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Organ Music Round Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 pm - 7:30 pm</td>
<td>Cocktail Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 pm - 11:00 pm</td>
<td>MLA Banquet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saturday, February 10

Exhibits Open 8:00 am - 12:00 pm

8:00 am - 9:00 am  Placement Service Desk
8:00 am - 10:00 am MLA Registration Desk

9:00 am - 11:00 am  Plenary Session III
MLA Town Meeting
sponsored by the MLA Self-Study Steering Committee
Mary Davidson (Eastman School of Music)
George Soete (Consultant)

11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Sheet Music Round Table
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  MARC Formats Subcommittee
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  MLA Board of Directors (Business)
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Information Sharing Subcommittee (Business)
11:00 am - 12:30 pm  Personnel Subcommittee
- Using student assistants
- Achieving staff upgrades

12:00 pm - 1:30 pm  Resource Sharing & CD
- Findings of projects including Basic Music Library
- Working with Faculty on Collection Development,
  Ann Silverberg (Austin Peay State University)

12:30 pm - 1:30 pm  Jazz & Pop Music Round Table
12:30 pm - 2:00 pm  Reference and Public Services Committee (Business)
12:30 pm - 2:00 pm  Contemporary Music Round Table
- composers Stuart Dempster and William Overton Smith

12:30 pm - 2:00 pm  Statistics Subcommittee (Business)
12:30 pm - 2:30 pm  Bibliographic Control Committee (Business)
1:00 pm - 2:00 pm  IAML-U.S. Business Meeting
2:00 pm - 4:00 pm  MLA/AMS RISM Committee (Business)
2:00 pm - 4:00 pm  System User Group Meetings
4:00 pm - 6:00 pm  MLA Business Meeting
7:00 pm  Buses leave for University of Washington
8:00 pm - 9:30 pm  Concert of Contemporary Music
directed by Stuart Dempster and William Overton Smith
9:30 pm - 11:00 pm  Local Arrangements Reception
Allen Library, University of Washington

Sunday February 11

7:30 am - 9:00 am  Program Committee (Business)
9:00 am - 12:00 pm  MLA Board of Directors (Business)
A Handbook of Examples for Use in Authority Records
Created by the NACO Music Project
prepared by Michelle Koth,
Catalog Librarian, Yale University Music Library
October 1995

The Handbook is a compilation of examples with explanations for creating citations for sources of information in the authority record. It does not encompass establishing the heading itself; only how to cite the sources in which information necessary to create the heading was found. Developed for the NACO-Music Project, it has served as a model for creating new authority records and has proven effective in training new participants. Other libraries may find the handbook useful for preparing local authority work or as an indication of how NMP records have been created. The handbook does not replace any other related documents, such as the Descriptive Cataloging Manual Z1: Name and Series Authority Records (Z1), the LC Rule Interpretations, the Music Cataloging Decisions, etc. It is not an official publication of the Library of Congress, NACO, COOP CAT, or PCC.

The following fields are included:

670: Source data found
667: Non-public general note
675: Source data not found

Please send a check for $5.00 ($10.00 Overseas) made out to the MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP. Send the check with your order to the MOUG Treasurer:

Christine Grandy
MOUG
Knight Library
1299 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1299
Phone: (503) 346-1850

TAX NO:
31-0951017

*The Handbook is available on a PREPAID basis ONLY. Orders without payment enclosed will be discarded*

NAME

ADDRESS

A check for ______ made out to Music OCLC Users Group is enclosed for _____ copies of A handbook of Examples for Use in Authority Records.
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal membership is $10.00; institutional membership is $15.00; international membership (outside North America) is $25.00. Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members receive all newsletters for the year, and any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). Personal members, please include home address. Institutional members, please note four line, 24 character per line limit. We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor (Faxon, etc.).

NAME: ____________________________

ADDRESS: ________________________

HOME PHONE: (___) ____________________ WORK PHONE: (___) ____________________

FAX NUMBER: (___) ____________________

INSTITUTION NAME: ________________________

POSITION TITLE: ________________________

INSTITUTION ADDRESS: ________________________

____________________________________

ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS(ES): ________________________

____________________________________

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

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

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

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

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