FROM THE CHAIR
Karen Little

Welcome to another issue of the MOUG Newsletter. I hope that your summer has been safe and productive.

As you may remember, Jennifer Bowen was recently selected to represent the NACO Music Project (NMP) on the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Executive Council. She attended her first board meeting in May and reports on that meeting later in this newsletter. The PCC is a cooperative effort coordinated jointly by the Library of Congress and PCC participants. Cooperative projects falling under PCC efforts include NACO. As the sponsoring group of the funnel project entitled the NACO Music Project, MOUG currently limits its formal, organized participation to that single cooperative effort. There are, however, other cooperative projects with which we may wish to become involved as a group. With that in mind, I hope we'll have time to discuss this during our annual meeting in January.

Speaking of our annual meeting... perhaps our Continuing Education Coordinator, Neil Hughes, is incredibly hardworking and completely dedicated to the MOUG cause, or perhaps he always strives to complete projects months before the deadline, or perhaps he just wanted to get the program for our annual meeting well planned prior to the onslaught of people from around the world as they descend on Atlanta for the Olympics... Whatever the reason (or combination of reasons), Neil and his Program Committee have been working hard to prepare a wonderful program for us in New Orleans in January. Please take special note of his column later in the Newsletter and let him know if you have any additional programming ideas.

Also fully underway is the work of the Nominating Committee. Committee members Candy Feldt, chair (cfeldt@pearl.tufts.edu; (617) 628-5000), Marlena Frackowski, and Ralph Papakhian are busy compiling an excellent slate of candidates for our upcoming elections for Treasurer and Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect. The Treasurer's position runs for two years. The Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect position is for one year followed by two years as Chair and one as Past-Chair. If you are interested in holding either of these positions (or know someone who is), please don't hesitate to send your name to any Nominating Committee member. Nominating Committee members or current board members can give you more information on either of these very important positions.

(continued on page 3)
Thanks to all who contributed to this issue of the Newsletter. The Newsletter is an occasional publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. Editor: Lynn Gullickson, University of Northern Iowa, Rod Library, Cedar Falls, IA 50613-3675.

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 3.5" disk using WordPerfect 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.
Other committees are also hard at work. The PRISM Review Task Force (Jean Harden, Chuck Herrold, and Sue Weiland, chair) continues to review and evaluate PRISM with respect to the cataloging and processing of music materials. They are interested in hearing your thoughts on PRISM and cataloging. Also, the Bylaws Revision Committee is preparing revision suggestions for your consideration this fall.

Finally, the MOUG Executive Board will meet in Bloomington on September 14. If there are topics or concerns that you'd like MOUG to address (maybe a cure for cataloger envy?), please let any board member know. Thanks.

FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR, Neil Hughes

Mark your calendars! MOUG will meet in New Orleans at the Hotel Inter-Continental, Tuesday, January 28 and Wednesday, January 29, 1997. The final program still awaits MOUG Board approval, but our Program Committee (Richard Baumgarten, Holly Borne, Elaine Bradshaw, Peter Bushnell, Marlena Frackowski, Marty Jenkins, Margaret Kaus, Cheryl Taranto, and myself) is hard at work pulling together a varied program, with emphasis on the practical and the nitty-gritty. A closing plenary session entitled "The Changing Role of OCLC," designed to bring cataloging members and public-service members together at the end of the meeting and covering the history of OCLC, its current activities, and where the organization sees itself headed in the future, is proposed, as is an "Ask MOUG" session. This "Ask MOUG" session will depend on you bringing questions for a panel, so now is the time to start enumerating all those issues you've been pondering, such as: How do your colleagues provide public access to FirstSearch and other OCLC products? What sort of training are your colleagues providing or are they receiving in preparation for PCC/BIBCO work, and what are the personal opinions of the panel on the effect this will have on the size and quality of the national authority file in a year's time? What is the meaning of life? (If this session is approved, there will also be a space on the registration form where you may submit advance questions for the panel.)

MOUG's Program Committee and MLA's Education Committee are also pursuing a jointly-sponsored workshop on series authority, probably to be offered as a half-day session late on Tuesday afternoon and early evening. The focus will be on how to do series authority work to national standards in the local environment, rather than on NACO per se. This proposed session will have a separate registration and fee from the MOUG meeting-proper.

Having offered you this brief taste of New Orleans as a teaser, I shall await the sight of you in record numbers as we don our crawfish bibs and rally 'round the cry, "Laissez les bon temps rouler!"

FROM THE EDITOR
Lynn Gullickson

This issue contains reports of the program sessions which were presented at the annual MOUG meeting held this past February in Seattle.

The deadline for the next issue of the MOUG Newsletter is: October 21, 1996.

NEWS FROM OCLC
Jay Weitz, OCLC

CATALOGING

OCLC CatCD for Windows Offers OCLC Cataloging in Offline, Standalone Environment

OCLC CatCD for Windows, a Windows-based CD-ROM system used for offline cataloging, is now available, offering improved functionality to increase productivity in a more user-friendly environment. The new OCLC CatCD for Windows will replace CAT CD450, the DOS-
based compact disc cataloging system. OCLC CatCD for Windows makes it possible to catalog in a standalone environment, with access to an unparalleled volume of records taken from the OCLC Online Union Catalog, the world's most comprehensive bibliographic database. Features of the OCLC CatCD for Windows system include: CD-ROM searching; editing, original cataloging, and export of both authority and bibliographic MARC records; batch return of holdings to OCLC; label production; and card printing. With OCLC CatCD for Windows, catalogers can view several records at once. The Windows environment allows users to cut, copy, and paste between applications. Local area networking (LAN) capability enables catalogers to load software on a server, search compact discs via a LAN, and store and access local files on network drives. OCLC CatCD for Windows offers advanced indexing and searching capabilities including standard numbers, subject, and publisher searching. The compact disc system features 21 bibliographic indexes and nine authority indexes. OCLC CatCD for Windows is available in the following compact disc collections: Hispanic, Law, Medical, Music, Older Books, Pre-1900 Books (available in August 1996), Recent Books, Serials, Visual Materials & Computer Files, and Library of Congress Authorities. To run OCLC CatCD for Windows, users must have Microsoft Windows 3.1 or higher software loaded on a minimum 486 IBM-compatible microcomputer, with 8MB of memory, 540MB hard drive, and a double-speed CD-ROM drive.

Core Records From LC

On April 29, 1996, the Library of Congress began a six-month experiment in creating core level bibliographic records, to test the use of the core level record for original cataloging of LC materials and to compare production levels and costs with those for full level cataloging. The design of the experiment also requires catalogers to decide the appropriate level of cataloging for materials in the experiment and to consult extensively with reference staff. An archive of all current core record standards is available on the PCC Homepage at:


Among those taking part in the experiment will be members of the Music and Sound Recordings Teams I and II of the Special Materials Cataloging Division. Selected catalogers from the participating teams will apply the PCC core level standards for books, nonroman script materials, music and sound recordings to items identified for cataloging as part of the experiment. These materials would otherwise have received minimal level or production level cataloging. As a result of their observations during this experiment, the teams may recommend that certain types of materials routinely receive core level cataloging in future. LC will include some additional data elements, such as 504 fields, in core records produced as part of this experiment. All LC core records will include LC call numbers. In addition, core level records will be forwarded to the Decimal Classification Division to receive "Dewey" classification according to the same criteria as titles with full level cataloging. With this experiment, the Library of Congress joins with the BIBCO participants, i.e., those PCC libraries contributing full and core level records to the national databases, to further their goal of providing access to libraries' collections in a useful, timely, and cost-effective manner according to mutually acceptable standards. Records produced as a part of the experiment are loaded into the OLUC as part of the regular daily loads of LC Books records and the monthly loads of Music records. The records can be identified by the presence of "core" in field 039 and "pcc" in field 042, as described in Technical Bulletin 213.

Casalini Libri's Records Added to the OLUC

On May 29, 1996, OCLC began loading records from Casalini Libri, an Italian book vendor based in Fiesole, Italy. Casalini Libri's records, as well as future vendor records to be loaded into the
OLUC, are standard MARC records, with the exception of a local 938 field that is created as part of the batchload process. Vendor records which match an existing OLUC record will add a vendor specific 938 field to the existing OLUC record and set the vendor's holding symbol. This 938 field will contain vendor specific ordering data that will support OCLC Selection as well as PromptCat services. Vendor records which do not match an existing record, will be loaded as a new OLUC record with the vendor specific 938 field and holdings set. Casalini Libri's three character OCLC symbol is C3L. To facilitate retrieval of a specific vendor's records, OCLC has recently implemented a new OLUC vendor keyword (vn) index. This vendor index allows keyword searching of the 938 subfields $a (full vendor name) and $b (OCLC assigned vendor code).

REFERENCE PRODUCTS

RILM Now Available on FirstSearch and EPIC

RILM Abstracts of Music Literature, a comprehensive database of music bibliography, is now available on OCLC's FirstSearch and EPIC services.

Published by the Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale, RILM is an international bibliography of scholarly writings on music and related disciplines in 202 languages, including original language titles; title translations in English; full bibliographic information; abstracts in English; author, journal, and subject indexes. 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 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 1992. Records from 1993 will be added soon. The database will be updated quarterly.

New FirstSearch Release

Three new access enhancements, which give users more control and flexibility over their subscription, were added to FirstSearch in spring 1996. FirstSearch Version 3.2, also known as the Access Control Project, consolidated and/or streamlined access to FirstSearch in these ways: (1) authorization flexibility; (2) varying database user limits for subscription databases; and (3) shared group searches. Authorization flexibility enables libraries to provide open block and subscription access to FirstSearch under the same authorization. It lets users freely switch from a subscription database to a per-search database without logging off FirstSearch. Simultaneous logon restrictions for the subscription databases apply only to those files, while the per-search databases allow virtually unlimited access. Varying database limits for subscription databases allows libraries to buy enough user capacity for popular databases and buy less for databases with less frequent use, potentially decreasing the cost for subscription access to those less frequently used databases. Varying user limits by database extends to subscriptions for full-text access, but does not apply to per-search databases. Shared group searches permits a group of libraries to share a pool of searches without having to assign searches to individual group members. The group, rather than individual members, is required to purchase a minimum number of search blocks. Each member of a group has its own authorization, but no amount of searches are assigned to that authorization. Instead, searches are assigned to the group for use on a "first-come,
first-served" basis. Individualized access to the ILL Link capability, the administrative control module, and billing summary information will continue to be available to each group member.

Abstracts Added to Applied Science & Technology Index on FirstSearch

Abstracts for records dating from March 1993 forward have been added to Applied Science & Technology Index, a Wilson database on the FirstSearch service. Records in the database continue to be updated monthly, and the abstract field in each record is now searchable. In the coming months, abstracts will be added to the five other Wilson databases on FirstSearch: General Science Index, Humanities Index, Social Sciences Index, Art Index, and Education Index.

AIDS and Cancer Research Now on FirstSearch and EPIC

The AIDS and Cancer Research database, produced by Cambridge Scientific Abstracts (CSA), is now available on FirstSearch, under both per-search and subscription purchase options, and on the EPIC service. Database content is gathered from worldwide scientific literature as covered in several print indexes, including: Virology & AIDS Abstracts, Oncogenes & Growth Factors Abstracts, and Immunology Abstracts. Coverage includes the current year plus the previous five years. The databases will be updated monthly. AIDS-related topics include molecular and in vitro aspects; immunological, clinical and epidemiological aspects; patterns of disease occurrence and transmission; symptoms, diagnosis and treatment; AIDS-related diseases; and investigational drugs. Cancer-related topics are similarly comprehensive, focusing on the complex molecular aspects of cancer initiation, promotion, progression, and metastasis.

The New York Times Soon will be Available on OCLC FirstSearch Service

The full-text of The New York Times soon will be available on the OCLC FirstSearch service, an online reference system for end users in the library community. OCLC FirstSearch users will be able to access the full-text of The New York Times on the day of publication. Users can also access the full text of the most recent 90 days of the publication, and abstracts of The New York Times articles published from January 1, 1994 to the present. Beginning this summer, The New York Times database will be available to FirstSearch users by subscription, or in per-search blocks of 500 or more. The database will also be available on EPIC, a full-featured online reference system, used mostly by librarians and experienced searchers, that provides subject access and keyword and Boolean searching to a variety of databases.

RESOURCE SHARING

Recent ILL Milestones

The University of Colorado at Denver logged the 65 millionth OCLC interlibrary loan request in record time—just 33 days after the 64 millionth request was made. The request was made March 4, 1996 for an article, "Recent Advances in Reproductive Genetic Technologies," in the journal, BioTechnology. It was the first millionth interlibrary loan request to be created from a review record that came through the OCLC ILL PRISM Transfer (IPT) service. With the IPT service, interlibrary loan librarians can receive loan requests from patrons by electronic mail and route them onto the OCLC network of libraries via the IPT service.

The University of Connecticut made the 66 millionth OCLC interlibrary loan request, 18 months and 12 million interlibrary loan requests after it recorded the 54 millionth milestone. The request for the book, Aspects of Poverty in Early Modern Europe II, was made April 10, 1996.
Smith College Library, in Northampton, Massachusetts, filled the request on April 12, 1996.

The New Hampshire State Library logged the 67 millionth OCLC interlibrary loan request on May 30, 1996 just 48 days after the 66 millionth request was recorded. The 67 millionth request was for an article, "Competition and Allocative Efficiency: The Case of the U.S. Telephone Industry," from the publication, The Review of Economics and Statistics. The request was filled May 31, 1996 by the University of New Haven, in Connecticut.

GENERAL NEWS

AsiaLink Provides Asian Language Materials to Libraries

OCLC has opened a San Jose, California, office to provide a new service to libraries. The OCLC AsiaLink service will provide collection development, acquisitions, and cataloging for Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese materials. AsiaLink minimizes staff time spent in selecting, acquiring, and cataloging Asian language resources by providing shelf-ready materials to libraries. AsiaLink currently provides the following services to libraries: (1) Collection Development--Libraries can allocate a set amount of funds for Asian materials, and OCLC will handle selection and cataloging of materials from a list of criteria established by each library; (2) Asian Book Collections--Libraries may select a group of current interest materials from lists prepared by OCLC, one each in the adult and juvenile area in each of the four languages (totaling eight groups of selections); (3) Chinese--English Educational Packages--Libraries may select from three educational Chinese/English bilingual sets, intended especially for school libraries. These lists currently contain 50 titles each in the kindergarten to third grade and fourth through eighth grade levels and 20 titles in the ninth through twelfth grade level.

Tsinghua University Establishes OCLC Service Center in China

Tsinghua University in Beijing has established an OCLC Service Center to extend the FirstSearch service and other OCLC services to libraries and information centers in China. Tsinghua University houses the network center of the China Education and Research Network (CERNET), which is the Internet arm in China for educational institutions. Presently, 108 universities are linked on CERNET. The majority of the more than 1,000 universities and colleges in China are expected to be on the CERNET by the year 2000. The University has set aside half of its main lobby in the university library for an OCLC training room, in which 30 Pentium workstations are connected to CERNET. FirstSearch training has begun at Tsinghua and will take place throughout China in the coming months.

LIBRARY RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Database Scans for Database Quality Control: Ongoing Database Scan Project

Ellen Caplan of OCLC's OLUC Database Management Department has submitted the following report on database scans.

The following database scans were run from February 1996 through June 1996 as part of the continuing effort to improve the quality of the Online Union Catalog. Codes, values, and data were converted because they were either obsolete or incorrect. Corrections were made by scan software or pulled by scan for manual correction. Unless noted as manual correction, records were corrected by automated scan.

1) Fixed-field coding for DtSt (Type of Date) values “c” (Copyright) and “d” (Detailed).
   o Converted “c” to “t” and “d” to “e.”
   o 556,082 records converted in April 1996.
2) Fixed-field coding for DtSt (Type of Date) value "d" (Detailed).
   o Manually corrected Date2 when first two digits were not 01-12.
   o 1,455 records corrected in March 1996.

3) Fixed-field coding for DtSt (Type of Date) value "d" (Detailed).
   o Manually corrected second two digits in Date2 from 00 to two blanks.
   o 501 records corrected in April 1996.

4) Fixed-field coding for Date1 when DtSt (Type of Date) value was m.
   o Converted blanks to u’s in Date1.
   o 649 records converted in March 1996.

5) Fixed-field coding for Dates 1&2 when DtSt (Type of Date) value was “n.”
   o Converted blanks to u’s in Date1 and Date2.
   o 216,166 records converted in March 1996.

6) Fixed-field coding for Date1 when DtSt (Type of Date) value was “r.”
   o Converted blanks to u’s in Date1.
   o 15,925 records converted in March 1996.

7) Fixed-field coding for Date2 when DtSt (Type of Date) value was “r.”
   o Converted blanks to u’s in Date2.
   o 177,386 records converted in April 1996.

8) Fixed-field coding for Date2 when DtSt (Publication Status) value was “u.”
   o Converted 9999 to uuuu in Date2.
   o 303,940 records converted in March 1996.

9) Fixed-field coding for Computer File serial records.
   o Field 006 was created on Computer File serial records if Frequency and Regularity values other than “u” (Unknown) were present in the fixed field prior to Format Integration, Phase 2. If the value “u” was present, an 006 field was not created. Default values were used for all other elements in field 006, except T006 (Type of Material) and Gpub. Whatever was present in the fixed field for Gpub was used in field 006.
   o 3,290 records converted in March 1996.

10) Fixed-field elements which should contain blank values.
   o Converted nonblank values to blanks for all undefined fixed field elements. This included values which were formerly in Frequency and Regularity for Computer File monograph records.
   o 67,220 records were converted in March 1996.

11) Nonfiling indicators.
   o Supplied nonfiling indicator values when “blank” or “fill” was present on records loaded via Batchload (run monthly).
   o 2,398 records converted from February-June 1996.

12) Field 040 (Cataloging Source).
   o Manually deleted “core” in subfield $e and added “pcc” in field 042. Also may have added “core” in field 039, changed Elvl to “blank” and deleted “Corecord” if present in field 500.
   o 343 records corrected in March 1996.

13) Field 211 (Acronym or Shortened Title).
   o Manually deleted field 211. Data was either deleted or moved to field 246.
   o 18 records corrected in March 1996.

14) Field 214 (Augmented Title).
   o Manually deleted field 214. Data was either deleted or moved to field 246.
   o 73 records corrected in March 1996.
15) Field 503 (Bibliographic History Note).

- Converted obsolete 503 fields to field 500.
- Cleanup after invalidation in September 1995.
- 111 records converted in June 1996.

*****

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Compiled by Jay Weitz

Clarifications/Corrections from LC

Thanks to Deta Davis of the Library of Congress for the following clarifications and corrections to my previous Q&A column:

In the MOUG Newsletter (no. 63), a couple of your answers to questions do not agree with LC practice. Here they are:

p. 15, 2nd column: For items without a collective title, added entries for titles relating to the first title in the 245 field (subfield $a, the title proper) go in field 246, not 740.

p. 17, 1st column: We don't ever transcribe a date preceded by "c" as a "p" date, regardless of where it appears; such a date can only be used to infer the publication date, even if it is on the disc itself; only dates preceded by "p" can be transcribed as such.

*****

Question: We are in the midst of cataloging the Columbia label and have run into differing alphabetic codes in the manufacturer's number. The numeric code is the same, the albums are both stereo, etc., everything is the same except the initial alphabetic character, e.g., CS 1234 and another "copy" of the LP under PC 1234. In speaking to the archivist, he said these alphabetic characters are merely pricing codes the manufacturer supplies, and for all intents and purposes are treated as duplicates in his collection. I have seen these treated differently in OCLC: sometimes both manufacturer numbers are included in 028 fields in the same record (with a 500 "Also issued as..." note); sometimes there are separate records for each differing number (perfectly allowable under "When to Input a New Record," true?); and of course, sometimes only one number appears. I myself am trying to decide how to treat these "duplicate" LPs when doing originals. To catalog them on the same record or not to catalog them on the same record?

Answer: Well, that is the question, isn't it? But you've both asked and answered it. Columbia LPs were notorious for changing the alphabetic prefix whenever the price changed. New records are certainly justified for each such change, but if you find it more useful to catalog these as copies (choosing one prefix as the "real" one and noting differences in a note, for instance, with 028s for all), you may do so. OCLC really has no preference. That doesn't help you decide, I know, but you might sleep better knowing that whichever choice you make, it's OK.

*****

Question: Say I'm cataloging a book that is accompanied by a clearly subordinate sound recording with musical examples. When I create field 006 for the accompanying sound recording, do I code the REC006 "AccM" for the book it accompanies?

Answer: Just a bit circular, no? Please, don't make me dizzy. I'd suggest reserving the REC006 "AccM" for material that actually accompanies the recording itself: the program notes or booklet in the CD jewel box, for instance. Coding for the book would be redundant and strictly speaking, inaccurate, since the accompanying relationship is really the other way around.

*****

Question: We are using Passport for Windows and have some questions about the ALA character set. There are four diacritics in the ALA set which appear twice, once with a
space and once without a space [grave, tilde, circumflex and underscore]. I cannot find anything in the PRISM “Service Diacritics and Special Characters,” 2nd ed. about a difference and we are wondering which ones we should be using. Can you tell us what the difference is?

Answer: (Courtesy of OCLC’s Rich Greene) You must use only the nonspacing diacritics. The spacing diacritics, while valid in Passport for Windows, are not valid in PRISM. If you input one of them, you will receive an error message. The nonspacing diacritics, as well as a few other characters such as the musical sharp, have been approved for addition to the character set used in USMARC records but have not yet been implemented by LC, OCLC, and RLIN. The characters were added to align the USMARC character set with ASCII and ANSEL, the two predominant character sets used in the U.S. by most software and hardware. They were added to Passport for Windows in anticipation of the future capability. As of now, there are no immediate plans to implement the characters. The differences are primarily in appearance in printed products and display. The nonspacing character prints in the same space as the character it precedes; so, if you have a nonspacing tilde, it prints over the character it precedes, such as an 'n' in Spanish. The spacing tilde, on the other hand, gets its own space and prints as a separate item, so you’d have the printed sequence ‘-n’ instead.

There is little use in bibliographic records for the spacing characters, with the exception of the spacing underscore. If it were implemented, it could be used for electronic addresses in field 856. For example, one of my E-mail addresses is 'richard_greene@oclc.org'; this is a spacing underscore and is a separate character. If I were to use a nonspacing underscore instead, the E-mail system would not recognize the address.

****

Question: In cataloging a recording of Schubert’s “Winterreise,” I found a record with a uniform title that duplicated the title proper. Why is there a uniform title when the title proper is the same thing? I see also that this record has a 505, which I would have guessed to be right, but in another record input by the Library of Congress, there is no 505. So which is right?

Answer: In a case where the uniform title and the title proper would be the same, no uniform title is necessary (LCRI 25.1). Some libraries input one anyway to accommodate their local systems, which may not display things correctly under certain circumstances. Including a contents note or not is more a matter of taste, local needs, space, and ambition than of right vs. wrong. Libraries that have their 505s indexed or have keyword searching may be more inclined to include them then those who don’t. Some catalogers may base the decision to list contents depending on the source of the information: When contents appear on the label, include; when not, don't. But there's no right or wrong.

****

Question: When a cataloger chooses a source other than the disc or cassette label as the chief source, perhaps because it offers a collective title, does that mean that any other information taken from that source does not need the source indicated because it is now the chief source? What I mean is: suppose you have decided that the chief source will be the container. If there is information on the container that you want to quote in a 500 note, do you then not need to indicate the source as container, because it has become the chief source?

Answer: When you are making a quoted note, I think you always need to indicate its source unless it is the chief source (according to rule 1.7A3). Saying that the title comes from somewhere other than the chief source doesn’t make that place the chief source, any more than calling a tail a leg makes a horse a quintraped.
Question: Recently I was trying to catalog “Pavan no. 4” from Melchior Franck’s “Newe Pavanen, Galliarden, und Intraden.” Making a name-title added entry, everything is fine through Franck’s name and subfield $t;$ there is an LC authority record showing that the authorized form of the collection is indeed “Newe Pavanen, Galliarden, und Intraden.” Then I use a subfield $Sp$ for “Pavan,” and the trouble starts. It would seem that the number of the pavan should be in subfield $n,$ thus:

$St$ Newe Pavanen etc.....$Sp$ Pavan, $Sn$ no. 4

But AACR2R doesn’t seem to address this situation in Chapter 25 under the discussion about excerpts and parts of pieces. I can’t find any examples in BF&S where a subfield $Sn$ follows a subfield $Sp.$ I’m not sure there should be a comma after subfield $Sp.$ There is a pre-AACR2 LC authority record for this very excerpt, and it puts everything in subfield $p$: “$Sp$ Pavan no. 4,” but somehow that seems odd. How should this excerpt be subfielded?

Answer: Examples in BF&S are hardly exhaustive. There are a few such examples in Music Coding and Tagging, though (p. 137, Viseé example at the top, n88660019; p. 139, Leonarda example in mid-page, n83176152; the Caix d’Hervelois example at the bottom of p. 139 has changed). And although the context is different, the Grieg example in rule 25.32B2 shows the same form (n85373695). The subfielding you have suggested seems to be correct:

$St$ Newe Pavanen, Galliarden und Intraden. $Sp$ Pavan, $Sn$ no. 4

It is indeed odd, though, that AACR2 does not address the issue directly. The rules dance around it in 25.32, but seem only to imply that this is the way to do it. Unless, that is, we read 25.32A1 to mean that we should identify parts of larger works by “the title or verbal designation and/or the number of the part,” with the guidelines that follow to be used in special cases.

Question: I am cataloging a bunch of 45 rpm records. I have seen on OCLC, older examples of 245 fields with “Tune / Sc Artist,” and, newer examples of both "A" side and "B" side titles in the 245 separated by subfield $Sb,$ with a 505, and/or a 246 or 740. Could you give me some "title" and tracing guidance with these records? There doesn’t seem to be much about 45s around.

Answer: You’ve seen different practices in cataloging 45 rpm discs both because things have changed over the years and because you have different options available. AACR2R 6.1G gives details on cataloging sound recordings without a collective title (usually the case with 45s), allowing the item to be cataloged as a unit or each side (title) to be cataloged separately. The latter isn’t done much anymore and is frowned upon by LCRI 6.1G1 and LCRI 6.1G4; but it’s still an option, linking the two records with 501 "With" notes. If you check AACR2R 1.0H1a and its reference to 6.0B1, you’ll see that you can treat the two labels on a disc as a single source. In the unlikely event that the 45 happens to have a collective title, it would go in the 245 and the individual titles (and respective statements of responsibility, if appropriate) in a 505. Lacking a collective title, both titles would go in the 245 and you would not need a 505; how the statement(s) of responsibility would be formulated depends on whether they are both the same or different. Rule 6.1G2 (make sure you’re looking at the updated “Amendments 1993” version with the GMDs re-situated following the first title) has examples for both common statements of responsibility (example two; though it has three titles, the idea is the same) and different statements of responsibility (example four). If you had a collective title in the 245, you could trace the individual titles from the 505 in separate 740s. For an item without a collective title, you could trace the second title from the 245 in a 740.
****

Question: Have you ever seen a fraction in a music number? How should it be entered? It appears as a fraction with a superscript 1, horizontal bar, and subscript 2 ("Edition Schott 01201½").

Answer: That’s a new one on me. My best guess is that it should be entered as closely as possible to how it appears, substituting the slash for the horizontal bar:

028 30 01201½ $b B. Schott’s Sohne

It might even be appropriate to include a clarifying note to say that the publisher’s number is fractional, to avoid further confusion. Wonder what it’s supposed to mean?

****

Question: If an item has a uniform title, would you add a 246 if it were identical? I have in mind OCLC #34500346:

100 0 Teresa, Sc Mother, $d 1910-
240 10 Simple path. Sc Selections
245 10 Meditations from A simple path / Sc Mother Teresa.

Answer: That would depend on a number of things. In this case, the 246 and the uniform title would NOT be quite identical (the uniform title includes "Selections," remember) and might subsequently file far removed from a 246 entry. You have to consider whether you need to generate a note and/or an added entry regardless of the 246’s resemblance to any other heading. Also remember that the 246 is an uncontrolled title and the uniform title is, by definition, a controlled title, no matter how much they may look alike. They perform different functions, are formulated according to different standards, and their status really should be considered independently of each other.

****

Question: The insert to a recording I’m working on (OCLC #32533876) says "Summersongs is the first of 'John McCutcheon's Four Seasons,' a series of family albums celebrating each season of the year." The 245 is "John McCutcheon's four seasons: summersongs." A DLC record for the CD has the same 245 and no series (OCLC #32535949). Is there no series because the 440 would be identical to the 245?

Answer: Judging simply from the information in the records and that you have provided, I would have been inclined to include a 4XX/8XX. The DLC record for the CD is copy cataloging, which LC generally doesn’t change much, so I’m not sure that we can take the absence of a 4XX as anything definitive; we also do not know how the potential series information might have been presented on the CD, if at all. But if a title proper and a series title are the same, you would indeed include both.

****

Question: "The best of the Capitol masters" (OCLC #26907196) may never have been previously released, so would DtSt be "s"?

Answer: Both the 245 and the 500 note say that these recordings are selections from the box set "Les Paul: the legend and the legacy," which the note says came out in 1991. Sounds like this CD IS previously released material. If the notes give original recording dates, the DtSt should probably be "p" with the earliest original recording date as Date2. If not, DtSt should probably be "r" with dates 1992, 1991.

****

Question: I have seen several records here and there that have as a 650 “Audiocassettes” or “Videocassettes” (not in the same record, of course). Is that correct?

Answer: Unless the audio cassette or video is ABOUT Audio cassettes or videos, those are not correct uses of the subject headings, assuming that we’re talking about 650s with second
indicator "0" for LCSH.

*****

Question: Down in the 245 $b$ of OCLC #20914187, the Soch. number for "Evgenii Onegin" is given as 20, although it should really be Soch. 24. What do you do when information on an item is known to be incorrect?

Answer: Information in the 245 is supposed to be transcribed from the chief source, whether it is right or wrong. If it's wrong, as is the case here, it should be so noted (with "[sic]") or corrected (with "[i.e., ...]"); both under AACR2 (Rule 1.0F) and (as this is pre-AACR2 cataloging) under AACR1 (Rule 132A2). If you've got the item (or a surrogate) in hand and the item really does not read "Soch. 20" as the Cyrillic LC copy says, we'd want to ask the inputting library before changing it, as there may well be different versions.

*****

Question: I read the transcription of your question and answer period at the most recent MOUG meeting and noticed that OCLC will be more restrictive in regard to duplicate records in light of the new 006 field capability. I am having a bit of trouble deciding what to choose for my type code for two titles. One is a tape of complete folk songs; it has an accompanying booklet with the printed music and words along with some historical background on the songs. Should it go on the scores or the sound recordings format? My other example might be a little more straightforward. It is a score of mariachi music with an accompanying tape of the songs in the score. I assume that the score is really meant for performance and that the tape is there just to give the uninitiated player an idea of what to shoot for. Both the mariachi and the folk song examples have some use as pedagogical items in addition to the performance possibilities. I can easily see that a music literature textbook with accompany sound medium would probably work best as a bibliographic record for the book and an 006 for the sound medium. What criteria do I apply in the examples above and would these examples be a place where OCLC might be a bit more lenient with duplicate records in the database?

Answer: As you have noticed, Format Integration has not solved all problems or simplified all questions. One category of materials that IS cleared up is the nonprint serial, which is now to be input on the nonprint format with BLvl "s" and an optional serial 006. The cases you ask about are still ambiguous and in some cases you'll have to toss a coin. The folk song tape with booklet could go either way. Base your decision on how substantial the "accompanying booklet" is. Since it has the words, music, and historical notes, it sounds fairly substantial, sight unseen. If you can tell that it was intended merely to supplement the recording, though, I'd go with the Sound Recordings format. As a general guideline in cases of doubt, it might be best to follow the Longstanding suggestion for read-along materials that consist of a book and recording: When in doubt, catalog as a recording with accompanying text. In your second case, since you can determine that the score seems to be the clearly dominant medium, I'd go with that. We might occasionally need to be a bit lenient on duplicates in these ambiguous cases, but I think we will try to make a reasonable choice whenever possible. We're all still finding our way here.

PCC REPORT

Jennifer Bowen

The Executive Council of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging met at the Library of Congress on May 13, 1996. Jennifer Bowen attended, as an elected member of the Executive Council representing the NACO Music Project.

PCC Strategic Plan

Most of the meeting was spent in revising the PCC Strategic Plan. A new PCC brochure will
serve as a "public" version of the plan for recruitment purposes. The text of this brochure, which will be distributed at ALA, will be posted on the PCC Home Page [address below]. Major changes to the Strategic Plan included:

Revised goals for both NACO and BIBCO contributions in light of empirical data. BIBCO has a long startup time as most libraries must first expand NACO participation to additional staff members before getting into the full program. As the program expands, an individual institution’s NACO participation may actually decrease because a larger percentage of headings will already be established. Future NACO expansion will likely come from tapping into new geographic or subject areas (e.g., British headings, AV, etc.).

Exchange of BIBCO program records between OCLC and RLIN: currently all program records are being created in OCLC, and OCLC is willing to exchange records if the exchange is equitable. The PCC Executive Council will continue to discuss this, as well as discussing the redistribution of program records by LC.

A new goal was added to increase the pool of BIBCO trainers. An existing goal to provide values training for existing NCCP and prospective BIBCO members will be met through a program planned for Midwinter 1997. The program will also be videotaped for later use.

Throughout the Strategic Plan, the "Anglo-American authority database" (formerly known as the LC authority files) will now be called the "PCC International Resource File!"

Other Issues

The need for a PCC "Operations Group," akin to that within CONSER, was discussed. The purpose of such a group would be to facilitate communication between PCC and member institutions. The Executive Council also discussed the agenda for the CONSER/PCC Joint Meeting on May 14, 1996. There was general consensus that PCC could learn from CONSER, as the two programs share many of the same ideals. The relationship between PCC and CONSER will be discussed further at the Executive Council’s November meeting.

PCC Training is currently conducted on a cost-recovery basis, with the institution being trained picking up the tab. It was noted that in the future documentation may also have to be paid for by institutions. Possible sources of funding for PCC were also discussed briefly.

The Executive Council discussed at some length the possible need for minimal contribution rates for members. It was decided, on the recommendation of CoopCat staff, that a minimum of 200 records per year for NACO participants be set, to justify costs. A general BIBCO minimum of 150 records per year was also set. "Smaller producers" would be encouraged to join funnel projects.

Standing Committee Reports

Automation. A proposal outlining clipboard requirements for transfer of MARC components between Windows Applications (by Mark Wilson) was approved. The Executive Committee also received a draft of a standard for automated NAR generation levels which was prepared by Gary Strawn.

Training. The committee’s membership structure and size were discussed briefly. The Executive Council approved a request by the committee to have BIBCO training conducted by pairs of trainers.

Standards. The Executive Council made several decisions regarding core record standards:

agreed to approve the JACKPHY core record over the PCCEXCO list when it is ready.

The AV Core Record was referred back to the Standards Committee.

No. 64/14
National-level series tracing decisions will be followed on all PCC bibliographic records.

After considerable discussion and a close vote, the Executive Council agreed that all core record standards will be changed to add the 502 for unpublished theses, in large part in response to concerns expressed by the music community. General concern was expressed that this was an example of "core record creep," with more and more data being requested by various special materials groups. In addition to music's concerns with the need for the 502 note in lieu of other publication information for unpublished theses, others present argued the importance of thesis information for interlibrary loan purposes, as well as for public services staff.

Once the series tracing and 502 revisions are made to the existing core records documents these will be considered complete and can be used.

The next PCC Executive Council meeting is scheduled for November 13th, at the Library of Congress.

For more information on the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, visit the PCC’s World Wide Web Site at:

http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/

REPORT FROM OLAC, Richard
Baumgarten MOUG Representative to OLAC

OLAC's Cataloging Policy Committee (CAP-C) met at ALA on Friday, July 5, 1996. There was some discussion on main entry for videos that are performances of another work. While feature films are a result of mixed responsibility and catalogers should give records a title main entry, not every cataloger uses the same main entry for filming of music performances and plays. Committee members and the audience spent some time deciding which videos were under discussion. CAP-C decided to table discussion further and wait for the ALCTS subcommittee decision on this topic.

The subcommittee studying expansion of audience characteristics gave their report. The suggestions included adding another subfield to the 007 field, adding another variable field, and using the existing fixed field and variable field (521). The committee and audience thought the latter recommendation was the best. OLAC would like to see the 521 become more standardized and less freeform.

The OLAC membership met on Saturday, July 6, 1996. A sparse crowd attended as many members felt they had better things to do on a Saturday night in NYC than attend a meeting. Heidi Hutchinson, OLAC President, announced the election results. OLAC had elected Sue Neumeister from SUNY-Buffalo as Vice-President, President-Elect and Patricia Thompson of the University of the South as Secretary. OLAC is looking for a new Newsletter Editor and Conference Reports Editor.

Officers and liaisons gave their reports. Ann Caldwell mentioned the NACO funnel project. A form and survey was sent to all OLAC members who expressed an interest in participating in the project. The survey includes a month-long self-study to determine how many headings potential participants would be expected to add each month. Five people will be chosen and receive training in Denton at the OLAC conference. The conference occurs October 2-5, 1996 and includes workshops on sound recordings, maps, videos, games, and Internet resources. The meeting concluded with an "Ask the Experts" session.

Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) 1996 Conference: “The Audiovisual Commons and the Electronic Future” October 2-5, 1996
Radisson Hotel and Eagle Point Golf Club
Denton, Texas (35 miles north of Dallas/Ft. Worth)

Registration before August 15, 1996:
$85.00 member of OLAC; $95.00 nonmember
Registration after August 15, 1996:
$100.00 both members and nonmembers

Registration includes catered breaks, luncheon, and reception with jazz band.

For more information contact:

Sharon Almquist
University of North Texas
Media Library, Box 5188
Denton, TX 76203
phone: (817)565-2486
Internet: salmquis@library.unt.edu

Features keynotes and hands-on workshops for people doing audiovisual cataloging.

Workshops:

Sound Recordings Cataloging (Jay Weitz)
Video Cataloging: the Basics
(Richard L. Harwood)
Video Cataloging: Beyond the Basics
(Diane Boehr)
Cataloging Internet Resources (Sue Neumeister)
Works of Art: An Art Educator's Wish List
(Nancy Walkup)
Representing Moving Images: Providing Access to Both Content and Container (Abby Goodrum)
NEM Online (Laurel Jizba)
Interactive Multimedia Cataloging
(Laurel Jizba, Ann Sandberg-Fox)
Toys, Games, Kits (Nancy B. Olson)
Map Cataloging (Catherine Gerhart, Anke Gray)
Archives and Photography Cataloging
(Richard Pearce-Moses)
Computer Files Cataloging
(Allene F. Hayes, Tricia Van Ryn)
Outsourcing of Audiovisual Cataloging
(Doina Farkas)

Keynotes:

The Library of Congress and the Audiovisual Commons (Barbara B. Tillet)
Cataloging Internet Resources: Findings and Futures (Erik Jul)

From Dishwasher to Chef in the AV Commons: Serving Up "Uncommon Fare" (Sheila Intner)

SERIES AUTHORITY RECORD PRIMER
Presented by Alice LaSota, University of Maryland at College Park and Joy Pile, Middlebury College

Report by Alice LaSota

The purpose of the Series Authority Record Primer was to present the general concepts behind creating series authority records for the Library of Congress authority file. This was done by discussing the different types of series and their definitions, series headings, searching, bibliographic details, treatment decisions, qualifiers and references, using series authority records and bibliographic records for scores and sound recordings as illustrations.

The Program for Cooperative Cataloging at the Library of Congress is sponsoring a number of 3-day training sessions on series taught by Judy Kuhagen of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office and PCC is encouraging music catalogers to participate. Alice and Joy attended one of these training sessions last July and since then have been under review by Phil DeSellem, senior music cataloger at LC, as they prepare series authority records for the authority file. For the MOUG program session, Alice and Joy discussed various aspects of series authority work that they learned at the training session with emphasis on music-related series work that they have experienced over the past year. Phil DeSellem was in the audience to serve as a resource person.

A series is a group of separate items related to one another by the fact that each item bears in addition to its own title proper, a collective title applying to the group as a whole. In other words, the items within the series are analyzable and each has its own bibliographic cataloging record including a series statement. The series statement is established according to the rules in AACR2 and the RIs' and the documentation in Z1 and C11, all of which supplement the USMARC.
Authority Format. The cataloger approaches this by first determining whether there is a series statement or something that could be construed as a series statement on the item in hand and makes a decision whether the statement is a monographic series, a multi part item, or a series-like phrase. The heading for the series authority record is searched in the bibliographic utility being used by the cataloger. Searching is the most important aspect of series authority work; the cataloger discovers whether the series is already set up or whether there is a conflict with another series authority record, name authority record, or serial title. The heading is established, keeping in mind the rules for source of information and for breaking conflicts. Bibliographic details, which include source data citation(s), numbering information, publishing information, cataloging source, and fixed field information, are added to the series authority record. Local treatment decisions given in the record include analysis, tracing, and classification practice. Finally, see references, see also references, and linking references complete the picture.

A Comparison of the Three Electronic Versions of RILM: NISC Muse on CD-ROM, and OCLC's FirstSearch and EPIC On-line Services. Presented by Alan Green, Ohio State University

Report by Marlena Frackowski, Pennsylvania State University

On Wednesday, February 7 Alan Green presented the results of his examination of the three electronic versions of RILM. The presenter's intention was to provide an assessment of the performance capabilities of each service in order to assist music librarians who are facing a decision of what electronic form of RILM to purchase for their libraries.

RILM Abstracts of Music Literature, the international bibliography of scholarly writings on music and related disciplines is presently available in one electronic version only, namely, "Muse" on CD-ROM from NISC (National Information Services Corporation). Alternative on-line access will be provided on OCLC's two electronic reference services: FirstSearch and EPIC. OCLC plans to launch the RILM database by early Summer 1996. Originally it was planned that at least a partial RILM test database (on EPIC) will be available for Alan Green's presentation at the MOUG and MLA meetings in Seattle. There was a delay, however, and a direct comparison of the three electronic versions of RILM was not possible at that time. Instead, Alan Green has used as a substitute the Dissertation Abstracts database for comparison of the search capabilities of "Muse" on CD-ROM, FirstSearch and EPIC.

The presentation began with an overview of the various search interfaces from the novice, advanced and expert user perspectives.

Novice Level Interfaces

In "novice" search mode FirstSearch provides clear instructions and examples of labeled searches for subject (at the top of the screen), author and title; all commands are typed and submitted using the ENTER key. No function keys are used.

NISC Muse uses the "fill-in form" approach and term "keyword" instead of "subject." That can be potentially confusing to a novice searcher; it may not be readily apparent to her/him how to conduct a subject search. All commands in Muse are submitted with the ENTER key but most subsequent commands require use of the function keys.

Both interfaces provide the nested Boolean searching capability with the operators AND, OR, and NOT. However, FirstSearch limits the user to only two OR operators per search, while Muse allows full Boolean searching without any limitations.
Advanced Level Interfaces

In advanced level searching FirstSearch provides numerous HELP screens with clear instructions for using various search tools; also RILM specific (e.g., HELP RILM LABELS). There are some restrictions placed on advanced level commands. Perhaps the most inconvenient is the lack of a fully functioning truncation character. This, and the limitation to only two OR operators per search means that in some cases the multiple search statements have to be used in order to carry out a complex search.

Muse, in comparison, provides the user with full Boolean searching capabilities. However, Muse in the advanced mode, unlike FirstSearch, does not provide example searches on the front screen. Also, HELP on the advanced searching techniques is less than adequate.

Expert Level Interfaces

EPIC, the OCLC on-line database service for professional users is a command driven interface. It features a broad range of advanced searching techniques and HELP screens. It does not permit, however, searching multiple databases at the same time. EPIC possesses the ability to search with prior set results, but some proximity searches are not permitted by the system. Also, the output results are not highlighted in EPIC as they are in Muse.

In addition to prior set searching techniques also available in Muse, this electronic platform offers the ability to edit words in earlier search statements, with automatic recalculation of later "dependent set searches."

The next part of the presentation was devoted to in-depth analysis and comparison of the specific advanced searching techniques in NISC Muse, FirstSearch and EPIC with regard to differences between the three, concerning the truncation, wildcard, masking, Boolean "nesting" and prior set searching, limiting by date, language and publication type, proximity and adjacency, and record downloading capabilities.

A short comparison of the costs for each service concluded the presentation. All prices Alan quoted were current as of the week of January:

- **NISC Muse** -- $1,395 per annum for a single independent workstation. Requires initial investment in a high performance IBM-compatible computer.

- **OCLC EPIC** -- $37.50 per annum. Less expensive than NISC Muse start-up costs, because the service is accessible through modem or Internet. $70 per hour charge fees (for time connected to the database and for each printed or downloaded bibliographic record) required.

- **FirstSearch** -- $1,400 per annum for up to five simultaneous users under "subscription" plan; intended for large institutions with simultaneous user ports already in place. Or, a flat rate per search under the OCLC search card payment plan (95 cents per search for the block of 500 searches), with the minimal equipment requirements.

At the end of the session, while answering the questions from the audience, Alan informed that the RILM database will be updated quarterly as opposed to RILM on CD-ROM which is updated annually. He also stressed that potentially RILM will become a more popular database than Music Index Database.

**FORMAT INTEGRATION, PHASE 2: AN UPDATE, Linda Gabel, OCLC**

*Report by Linda Gabel*

Thank you very much for inviting me to speak to you today. The purpose of my talk is to give you an introduction to FIT2, and detail how OCLC will be implementing it.

At this point, many of you may be scratching
your head, and wondering just what is involved in FI2.

On March 3, OCLC will install the last part of an effort to make the tagging and coding of bibliographic records more consistent across the formats. This project, completing the task begun with USMARC Update 3 in 1991, and continued with Format Integration, Phase 1 in February 1995, concentrates on changes to the fixed field and 00X fields of the bibliographic formats. It introduces a new format (Mixed Materials), eliminates another (AMC), and establishes a new field, 006, to allow for fixed field coding of additional characteristics and accompanying material. We’ll also be doing some other routine USMARC updates and changes.

I do want to take a minute here to say what it isn’t: FI2 is not the answer to the multiple versions dilemma that still plagues catalogers. You still will have separate records for the original, microform, and spoken recording of a book, or the myriad versions of a piece of recorded music, such as CD, tape, LP, etc.

My favorite analogy of FI2 is the hammer: if it doesn’t fit, get a bigger hammer. The whole impetus of Format Integration was how to deal with materials that don’t fit neatly into a single format. Where do you put a photo of a manuscript score? How can you control a book with an accompanying score and cassette?

Let’s choose a “for instance”: you have a sound recording that is issued on a monthly basis. Do you use the serials format so you can code the frequency, or do you use the sound recording format so you can code for the audience? Phase 1 let you put the 362 field (enumeration and chronology) on the sound recording format, and the 511 field (participant or performer) on the serial format, but it didn’t help with coding the fixed field and other control aspects.

We now have a way to deal with this: the 006 field. You will use the 006 field when you are describing something that has aspects of more than one format, such as the sound recording serial. The 006 contains 18 character positions that provide for coding information that normally is found in the fixed field, but is not available in the fixed field of the format you have chosen. You can think of it as an auxiliary fixed field. The 006 asks for the same information as the related fixed field would, so you don’t have to learn new codes. It is repeatable.

Back to our sound recording serial. The guidelines for choosing a format say that if a serial is textual in nature, use the Serials format. If it is nontextual, use the appropriate format, and add a 006 for the “serialness.” Now you can code for both the audience and the frequency.

What happens if you have a book with an accompanying score and CD? Choose the predominant item, and add 006 fields for the accompanying material.

The good news is that the 006 will also help with derived key searching, by allowing you to search on the format indicated in the 006 as well as in the fixed field. More about searching later.

OCLC is adding two new PRISM commands to deal with the 006. The first, “new006,” will provide a prompt screen for you to complete. You will need to include the format qualifier to tell the system what kind of 006 you want to build. So, for our sound recording serial, the command would be “new006ser.”

The other new command will redisplay the 006 in the prompted version. You can do a straightforward line edit, or you can retrieve the prompted display by issuing the “mod006” command. If there are two or more 006 fields in the record, add the line number to specify which field you want to edit.

Here is the prompted display for the serial 006. It takes the same codes and is subject to the same validation as the serials format fixed field. You
need to enter the values for the fill characters, and change any of the defaults that don't match your piece, then go ahead and send the field.

T006:  s  Freq:  #  Regl:  #  ISSN: SrTp:  #
Orig:  Form:  EntW:  Cont:  GPub:
Conf: 0  Alph:  S/L:  0

So let's suppose that our sound recording serial is quarterly, issued regularly, with no special contents, not a government publication, nor a conference publication, but it is successive entry.

006  [sqr p  0  0]

This is the resulting display when the 006 is returned to the bib record. PRISM will take the field and put it back into the bib record, displaying it as a straight string of characters. It must be 18 spaces long, and the brackets will make sure that the system doesn't collapse the empty spaces. You may edit the string as it appears, or you can call up the prompted display.

There are no indicators, and the prompted display ensures the correct number of spaces. If this were to change to a monthly, it should be fairly obvious which character position needs to be edited in the regular bib display.

Let's look at two different interpretations of Judy Collins' new work, "Voices." One library has cataloged it as a sound recording with accompanying book and score (OCLC#33274295). LC, on the other hand, has treated it as a book with accompanying CD and score (OCLC#32049254). In both cases, using format qualifiers to search would have missed one or both of these records. "Bks" would have missed the first record, "rec" would have missed LC's record, and "sco" would have missed both records.

FL2 allows you to enter all three aspects of this work in one record. We can start with the book as the predominant item, and add 006 fields for the accompanying score and sound recording.

The record is now retrievable using any of the three format qualifiers when you do a derived search. If your local system determines loan periods based on material type, you have more information to let your system do this automatically.

OCLC is taking this opportunity to work on the arrangement of the fixed field. You may be asking "why," and there are several reasons why we are doing it now.

First, FL2 is introducing a new element in the fixed field, Type of Control, so we had to add a new element.

Next, some of the elements in the fixed field have changed their meaning over the years, but the labels haven't kept pace. For instance, "Repr" used to mean Form of Reproduction, so "Repr" made sense. Several years ago, it was redefined to mean Form of Item, de-emphasizing the reproduction aspect, so the new mnemonic is "Form."

Third, there are elements that appear in more than one format, but have different names, depending on the format. Books format has "Int lvl," but Computer Files has "Audience." We felt that it was important to be consistent in our names across formats. We will now use "Audn" in all instances.

Fourth, three of the formats had combination mnemonics, where we had two separate pieces of information in one fixed field element. "F/B" (formerly "MFB") can now be broken out into separate elements, "Fict" and "Biog."

Our challenge was to make the fixed field as meaningful as possible, but as concise as possible. All mnemonics (except "Dates" and "S/L") are now four characters long. We could now rearrange the elements into six columns across. In some formats that meant that we are able to fit the fixed field into fewer lines, allowing more variable fields to appear on the first screen. We could also
eliminate the use of the circumflex as a place-keeper.

There are eleven elements that exist in all eight formats. We have made sure that those eleven pieces are always in the same relative position in all formats. For added emphasis, we put what we considered to be crucial elements in the corners of the display, where your eye is naturally drawn to them. Please refer to Technical Bulletin #212 for all the changes in the mnemonics and layouts for the fixed fields.

I mentioned the new fixed field element: Type of Control, so what is it? With the elimination of the AMC format, we needed a way to indicate in fixed field coding that something is under archival control, regardless of the format. The mnemonic in the fixed field will be “Ctrl.”

There are two possible values: blank, for no specified type of control, and “a” for Archival Control. When a record has this element coded, it will appear in the brief display as [ARCHIVAL CONTROL]. This is not being added to the search qualifiers.

It is important to remember that not all manuscripts are archival, and not all archival materials are manuscripts. For instance, your notes from this presentation are manuscripts, but they probably don’t warrant archival control. However, Edison’s original wax rolls probably are under archival control.

How many bibliographic formats are there? One? eight? seven? Well, it depends. OCLC maintains eight formats, although LC and USMARC specify seven (OCLC distinguishes between Scores and Sound Recordings, instead of the USMARC format, Music).

FL2 is introducing several changes for formats. First, all formats can now be all bibliographic levels. Practically speaking, any format could conceivably be a serial. We are reserving the actual Serial format for print material. Computer file serials, including electronic journals, will continue to be entered in the Computer File format. Sound recording serials will be entered on the Sound Recording format, etc.

Second, we are introducing a new type code in the Books format: “t,” for Manuscripts. Use this code for language material in handwriting, typescript, or computer printout, including materials completed by hand or keyboard. Examples include letters, diaries, ledgers, minutes, speeches, manuscript books (including theses), and legal papers.

The AMC format is being replaced with the new Mixed Materials format. The type code for Mixed Materials is “p.” The work form command is “wfmp.” Use this format for collections when no single form of material predominates. Many of the things that used to be entered in AMC format will be entered here, especially if the collection consists of letters, photographs, and other paraphernalia. Usually the materials are collected by or about a person or corporation. If the collection was issued as a single unit, and intended primarily for instructional purposes, use the Visual Materials format, type: “o,” for kit.

OCLC is doing some maintenance on the formats apart from the FL2 requirements. The Audiovisual Materials format is being renamed as the Visual Materials format, and its format qualifier is being changed from “med” to “vis.” In the Computer Files format, its qualifier is being changed from “mrf” to “com.” The format qualifier for the Mixed Materials format will be “mix.” We will be eliminating the AMC work form command (wfmb), and the Computer File Serial work form command (wfms).

If this were a training session, I would go into great detail about the changes in practice you will need to learn. There are significant changes in the Dates and Type of Date/Status of Publication (DtSt) in the fixed field. There are changes in the codes, and in the use of the letter “u” to code for unknown digits.
The March 3 installation is not limited to just FI2 changes. We will be installing an interim solution for PCC Core Records, regular USMARC updates, and local use added entry fields. Please consult Technical Bulletins #212 and #213 for details.

So, what do you have to do to prepare for FI2? There are several things to do:

- CatME Plus, CATCD 450, Microcon and CJK Plus users will receive new software. Please load it before March 3 to ensure continuing functionality. There is no need to clean up existing files.

- Start reviewing your function keys and macros for format qualifiers, work form commands, or fixed field editing steps. You will need to adjust them after March 3.

- If you do catalog Computer File serials, complete any that may be in the Save file. Two elements will be eliminated from the Computer File fixed field. OCLC can convert existing bib records, but this information will be lost if it is still in the Save file.

- Start considering if your constant data records need to be adjusted, either for the new Type of Control, or for the new 006 fields, or if you need a Mixed Material constant data record.

- Examine your workflow for material-specific decisions. Are your serial catalogers comfortable with non-print serials, or will you handle them? Do you have policies on how you treat items with accompanying materials? Do you catalog the accompanying material separately, or do you treat them as a whole? This is a great opportunity to review some of these decisions, to see if the reasoning behind them still holds.

- Share the searching information with anyone who does any searching of the OLUC, including reference staff if they are using PRISM.

- Review the technical bulletin closely. You may want to annotate Bib. Formats and Standards until the new edition arrives. Make sure any reference cards or cheat sheets have the most current information.

But most important of all, DON'T PANIC!

Where You're Not Looking and Probably Should Be: Those Other FirstSearch Databases and Music Reference

Marty Jenkins, Wright State University; Phil Vandermeer, University of Maryland-College Park; Holly Borne, Butler University

Report by Jeannette Thompson

"What to Do While We're Waiting for RILM" was another subtitle given to this session by one of the presenters. Indeed, the presentation quickly proved that there is much information available via FirstSearch that will be useful even after the RILM database is added.

Music librarians have often been isolated from the print versions of non-music-related databases, as these frequently are housed in another building or at least in another section of the library. Now that we have the capability of accessing the electronic versions from our music libraries, it's time to examine them.

The three presenters divided the list of nonmusic databases from OCLC's FirstSearch service (skipping a few well-known ones, such as Library Literature) and began by searching each one with the subject term "music." They discussed their findings with the group, spending time on the dozen or so databases which impressed them the most. [The findings of music subject searches in FirstSearch databases follow this report--Ed. Note.]

Among the strongest indexes were some general ones. One highlight of the study is EBSCOMags, a new database on FirstSearch, which yielded over 73,000 citations under the subject term "music." Mirroring Expanded Academic Index...
with its coverage, EBSCOMags includes not only brief abstracts, but also includes lots of full-text articles. Examples of information found in this database were album reviews for a specified opera, including a full-text review; death date information, obtained from an obituary, to be used in a performance program; and helpful purchasing information under the terms "cordless and headphones."

A search in Periodical Abstracts yielded over 100,000 items, approximately 50% of which were audio reviews. When asked to compare this database with EBSCOMags, Borne felt that the latter was probably a lot better. Periodical Abstracts is broad in coverage but more scholarly than Reader's Guide. EBSCOMags has a combination of scholarly and popular coverage.

General arts and humanities databases with good music coverage include Arts & Humanities Search, Art Index, Humanities Index, and MLA Bibliography. Important music business coverage is given by ABI/INFORM and Business Dateline, with little overlap between the two. Scientific databases, covering technological issues, physics of sound, anatomy (including related music therapy aspects) include Applied Science & Technology Index, INSPEC, MEDLINE, and Microcomputer Abstracts (this last being a good source for software reviews).

Dissertation Abstracts, yielding over 21,000 citations under the subject term "music," is obviously useful, in fact nearly supplanting the Adkins and Dickinson volumes. Biography Index focuses primarily on popular music or popular treatment of "classical" musicians. EventLine is useful for conference and festival information. The GPO Monthly Catalog and PAIS Decade lead to helpful government information and sources. Education Index is not a bad source, but Borne felt that it couldn't compete with ERIC, another FirstSearch database. Newspaper Abstracts also yielded a large number of hits; it is an obvious source for good regional coverage.

Questions which followed the summary of findings helped attendees consider the use of the FirstSearch Service. Borne had already stated some of the considerations she gives when thinking about obtaining any database: "Is it going to help with reference questions? Will it help me do my job better? Will it help with collection development?"

A question was asked regarding the currency of these databases versus that of RILM or Music Index. Obviously, the databases vary widely in the timing of updates, but some, such as ArticleFirst, are updated daily.

Another question addressed the adequacy of having one's library connected only to one online service, such as FirstSearch -- "Is it safe to put all one's eggs in one basket?" One problem with this monolithic coverage would be that of access to OCLC during certain times of the day. But a clear advantage is that a librarian can search all the music databases the same way.

**Music Subject Searches in FirstSearch Databases:**

A&H Search = A citation index with generally good coverage of music. (25,198 hits)

ABI/INFORM = Important coverage of the music business, international in scope and more scholarly coverage than BPI. (3,097 hits)

Agricola = Out of three million citations only 61 deal with music. Not very useful. (178 hits)

AppSci Index = Useful for searching on music and technology issues; physics of music, computer science, etc. English language only. (567 hits)

Art Index = Strong on interdisciplinary information concerning music, performance, and performance art included. (1,230 hits)

Article First = An excellent supplement to Music Index especially since it is updated daily. Especially good on popular music and culture. (7,191 hits)

Basic BIOSIS = While the occasional interesting citation appears, no music coverage to speak of.
Biodigest = Coverage for high school and lower-division undergraduates. No music. (32 hits)
Biol Index = Information from books and articles; primarily popular figures, or popular treatment of classical musicians. (2,163 hits)
Biol & Agr Index = (10 hits)
Book Review Digest = Book reviews from English sources, primarily general reading sources. (6,714 hits)
Books in Print = May be searched title, author, subject, or ISBN. O.P. and forthcoming books are included. (22,871 hits)
Business DateLine = Heavy on newspaper articles, but especially good for regional coverage. (2,589 hits)
Business News = Current stories only. Updated daily, weeded weekly. Very little on music. (84 hits)
Business Orgs = Directory of 26,000 new and established organizations, agencies, and publications. The music section is quite a grab bag. (64 hits)
Business Periodicals Index = Indexes only 340 magazines mostly of a popular nature. For more serious coverage of music and business try ABI/INFORM. (1,668 hits)
Consumer Index = Mostly reviews of music software packages. (588 hits)
Contents 1st = (1,383 hits)
Dissertation Abstracts = (21,289 hits)
Disclosure Corporate Snapshots = 11,000 corporations whose shares are traded in the U.S. Includes financial reports, addresses, names of CEOs. (96 hits)
EbscoMag = Mirrors Expanded Academic Index. Up-to-date and includes brief abstracts. Good coverage of CD reviews and citations from library journals. (73,094 hits)
Econ Lit = (45 hits)
Education Index = Citations for all areas of education. Includes reviews of educational videos. (5,329 hits)
Encyclopedia = One paragraph definitions of terms and concepts; includes brief biographical information and cross-references. (274 hits)
EngInd = (125 hits)
Environment = Music citations are on the topic of noise exposure and noise levels. (25 hits)
ERIC = Good coverage of popular music and the effects of music on society. 1966+ is a clear benefit. (9,770 hits)
EventLine = Useful for finding dates, locations, and contact information for conferences. (3,464 hits)
FactSearch = Good tool to locate surveys and studies. (173 hits)
FastDoc = Mostly pop and music business. Some classical coverage in trade magazines (New Yorker, New Statesman, etc.) Nothing scholarly. (809 hits)
General Science Index = Some useful citations on music therapy and electronic music. (339 hits)
GEOBASE = Includes citations from the Journal of the Acoustical Society of America. (68 hits)
GeoRef = (28 hits)
GPO Monthly Catalog = Books, circulars, hearings, posters, discographies. Key advantage; collection development of Govt. Docs. (434 hits)
Humanities Index = Also covers folklore, music, and performing arts. Good coverage of jazz. (5,712 hits)
Index to Legal Periodicals & Books = Good coverage of copyright, foreign regulations, lyrics & litigation, and public domain music. (145 hits)
INSPEC = Largest database for physics, electrical engineering, and computer science. Good coverage of computer and electronic music. (5,952 hits)
Library Lit = (1,554 hits)
MDX Health = Mostly music therapy. Lots of newsletters and popular health magazines. (90 hits)
MEDLINE = A surprising variety of music-related topics covered in medical journals: cognitive issues; ear-protection; effects of different types of music; articles on health (physical and mental) of individual musicians. (1,879 hits)
MicrocompAbs = 60% of music items were software reviews; 15% feature articles. Lots of pop-related material. (1,451 hits)
MLA = Mostly interdisciplinary pieces dealing with music and literature. Also some film music

No. 64/24
A Name-Authority Record Primer, Presented by Mark Scharff, Washington University
Report by Renee McBride, UCLA

Mark Scharff, a NACO specialist at Indiana University prior to assuming his current position as Music Cataloger at Washington University in St. Louis, MO, guided his audience through the elements and principles of name-authority records (NAR's), focusing on name-title authority records. Scharff selected this focus because name-title authority work is a vital aspect of music cataloging, and there is less guidance provided by cataloging and authority tools for dealing with name-title authority issues than name-authority issues.

Scharff began with a review of tools needed to create name-title authority records: informational resources such as dictionaries and biographical sources; materials in the Library of Congress (LC) reference section, which are listed in the Music Cataloging Bulletin (MCB); and coding and tagging tools. One of the resources discussed, the MLA Working Group on Types of Compositions' Final report, is available from the MLA Clearinghouse. To obtain a copy send $5 (check payable to MLA) with your order to Ralph Papakhian, Indiana University, Music Library, Bloomington, IN 47405.

Scharff next outlined steps to take in establishing a name-title authority record. Catalogers should determine whether the heading is in LC's permanent file and whether the heading is an appropriate candidate for authority work. It is important to recognize that a lack of necessity for references is not a deterrent to establishing an authority record. Scharff stressed several points: 1) the name portion of a name-title heading must be represented by a name record in the authority file and must follow the form established in that name record; 2) all the principles pertaining to name-title authority work are contained in AACR2R; and 3) the cataloger should be prepared to do research. Research requires choosing appropriate reference sources such as
bibliographies of manuscripts and early editions, authoritative biographies, and thematic indexes. A helpful tip to remember is that information about which thematic index to consult is sometimes present in the NAR's for composers.

Moving from the general to the specific, Scharff addressed special problems encountered in constructing name-title authority records, citing relevant rules from AACR2R, LC Rule Interpretations (LCRI) and Music Cataloging Decisions (MCD) throughout his discussion. Such problems include new works vs. arrangements, numbering systems for works, establishing the title proper, authority records for a part of a title, resolving conflicts, and generic vs. distinctive titles.

Scharff then described the construction of references, which present special problems in cases of singular vs. plural generic titles, titles of parts of works, misattributions, normalized spellings, and variants of variants. He next took his audience on a field-by-field tour of the name-title authority record, describing the functions and appropriate uses of each field. Some particularly important points were made in this part of the presentation: 1) the Rules fixed fields of corresponding NAR's and name-title authority records must be coded identically; 2) the cataloger may create a provisional authority record when too little information is available for the record to be authoritative; 3) the transcription of the title proper in the 670 field proceeds on the principles outlined in LCRI 21.30J, whether or not a general material designation (GMD) is involved; and 4) subfield b ($b$) may not intervene between $a$ and $p$ or $n$, though a comma may be used instead of a colon if the cataloger wishes to include other title information in the uniform title. The relevant example in AACR2R rule 1.1E5, including in the 1993 amendment, is incorrect.

In closing Scharff noted that the NACO Music Project diverges from LC practice in several ways: 1) including the main entry heading in the 670 field; 2) retaining the GMD in the 670 field; 3) citing the LC database in the 670 field; and 4) as a rule, including more information in authority records. Included in Scharff's handout was a very useful bibliography of resources for creating name-title authority records.

**RILM ANNOUNCEMENT**

Alan Green, Ohio State University

RILM was launched as an online database on the FirstSearch and EPIC services on 30 June 1996. To establish an account for searching RILM Abstracts on the FirstSearch or EPIC services, contact your local OCLC regional network office, or the OCLC sales office at:

OCLC Reference Services
6565 Frantz Rd.
Dublin, OH 43017

Phone: 800-848-5878 or 614-764-6000
Fax: 614-764-6096

---

**The Best of MOUG: 5th Edition is Still Available!**

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

Judy Weidow
Cataloging SS/55, The General Libraries
The University of Texas at Austin
P.O. Box P
Austin, TX 78713-8916

Phone: (512)925-4191
Tax No: 31-0951917

All orders must be prepaid.
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 $7.50 ($12.50 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

*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 lines, 24 characters 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.

Lynn Gullickson
MOUG Secretary/Newsletter Editor
University of Northern Iowa
Rod Library
Cedar Falls, IA 50613-3675

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
CEDAR FALLS, IA
PERMIT NO. 62

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