FROM THE CHAIR
Jean Harden, University of North Texas

Did you ever wonder why so many music students have reasonably good performance technique but know quite little about music when they enter college? I think I just stumbled upon part of the answer. The library where I work recently received a gift of scores of music that are approved for use in study and in competitions at pre-college levels in Texas (the UIL list, for the Texans among you). The great majority of this particular gift consists of scores for string orchestra. The pieces range from extremely easy to moderately difficult. Some are original compositions, but the majority are arrangements, of everything from standard works to very obscure pieces.

The works in this gift collection appear to be well suited for their intended use. Many give the music teacher an indication of the difficulty level, and they seem to be sensibly laid out and easy to see at music-stand distance. Some even include preparatory exercises to help ensure success with the piece itself. Although the gift we received consists of scores only, the parts are also published by the same companies; I presume that these are also well laid out and easily legible. The only problem is that a substantial number of the scores provide no hint of the identity or nature of those pieces that are here presented in arrangement.

My job in connection with this gift is to get it cataloged, with the help of a graduate music student who has considerable experience working in the music library. Since this is not our first project of this sort, we had some instructions written up (thank goodness!), which I cloned to suit the particular characteristics of this gift. The student used OCLC’s incredibly useful searching tutorial to brush up on her searching skills, then started searching, editing, and inputting, according to the instructions. I decided to assign call numbers myself rather than trying to teach the student to assign them.

OK: class number, composer cutter, work number (???!!?).... Wait a minute! What piece IS this? Sonatina in C for string orchestra by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, arranged by Walter J. Halen. Published by Wingert-Jones Music, copyright 1994. I bet Mozart didn’t call it Sonatina or score it for string orchestra. For that matter, key of C may be the arranger’s idea, not Mozart’s.

Several reference books and a substantial amount of time later, I have determined that this “Sonatina in C” started life as the first movement (Allegro) of a divertimento for two clarinets or bassett horns and bassoon, in B♭ major. With a good uniform title, including a Köchel number, now I can construct the work number.

It certainly would have made my life easier if the publication had given me some hint of these facts. More importantly, including them would have made the publication better for music education. Would it be feasible to include them, however? Who would know this information before publication? The arranger must know it. Presumably he worked from the original or at least was aware of the original. If the arranger doesn’t know, a responsible publisher would have researched the matter, to be certain that the work and the arrangement were free of copyright restrictions. Once the identity of the original is known, it would take only a few minutes for either the arranger or the publisher to write a paragraph or two setting out some relevant facts.

Of course, it is a cliché to say that published music often does not include adequate identifying information about the piece being presented. The uniform title, which the librarian determines, provides this information. Remember, however, that these scores are designed for teaching. Would it not be helpful (and educational) for the publication to say something
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about the original version of the piece, in addition to presenting the music? After all, the young orchestra student probably will never search for this piece in a library. A uniform title determined by a librarian will never come into the picture. Chances are that the information provided by the publisher is all the student will ever receive.

How could it possibly help the student if the publication gave some information about the original? Several ways come to mind immediately.

A good teacher could use such information as the basis of some two-minute lessons on music history, including stylistic history. The arrangements that have gone across my desk yesterday and today have been of pieces by such diverse composers as Froberger, Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, Mozart, Offenbach, and Jean Berger. That covers everything from the Baroque to the 20th century. Original scorings range from keyboard instrument through various chamber ensembles to full orchestra. One hopes that students playing these pieces would notice differences among them. A bit of printed information about the originals, perhaps amplified a little by the teacher, would go a long way toward explaining these differences and leading students to begin the long task of learning to distinguish musical styles and periods.

Furthermore, it might help the students to play the music more artistically if they knew the forces for which it was originally conceived and its approximate date of composition. A piece written as a trio would be played quite differently from one scored originally for full orchestra, a Baroque piece differently from a 19th-century work. Particularly in the beginning, the teacher would need to point out such stylistic distinctions, but eventually good students would learn to make them on their own. If information about the original scoring and era is not given, however, this learning process cannot even begin.

Finally, what if a student particularly likes that Sonatina in C by Mozart? In college or later, she may come into a library and ask for a score or recording of it. Each of us has probably fielded patron questions of this sort. If all the patron knows is the composer, the title Sonatina, the key C, and the medium string orchestra, chances are excellent that the librarian will be unable to help her find it again. If she knows, however, that it was originally a divertimento, the odds in favor of locating the piece go up substantially. If she also knows that it was written for clarinets and bassoon, the picture becomes even brighter. The more information known has about the original, the better are the chances of finding the piece again.

Do publishers of this sort of arrangement ever supply such information? Fortunately, some do. In the particular collection I am working on right now, some scores, including that of the now notorious Sonatina in C by Mozart, give nothing further than a made-up title-page (or caption) title, but many do better.

Sometimes useful information is incorporated into the title. For instance, there is "Jacques Offenbach. Orpheus in the Underworld. Finale" (published by Ludwig, c1989), "Bach-Stowkowski. Prelude in B minor [No. 24 of the First Part of Das Wohltemperirte Klavier"] (Broude Bros., c1949), and "Peter Ilyich Tchaikowsky. Trepak, from Nutcracker Suite" (Ludwig, c1987). Two of these three also give very brief "program notes" on the title-page verso that provide a little context. All furnish enough information in the title that a reasonably resourceful teacher could locate the original or a discussion of the original, to determine whatever else was needed to fill out a small lesson on history and style.

The title-page verso is a popular location for additional information, particularly about original scoring and historical context. Of course, this is much more helpful than just a title, which requires the teacher to do further research. Many of the scores I have seen in the last couple of days make use of the t.p.-verso technique. For instance, the Suite for Strings by Jean Berger (Kjos, c1983) says on the title-page verso "Suite for Strings was originally scored for two flutes and piano."

The Canzon and Fuga arranged by Robert S. Frost (Kjos, c1984) says, on the title-page verso in a prose section titled "The Composition," that it consists of "string orchestra arrangements of keyboard pieces from the works of outstanding composers from the early Baroque period (1600-1650)." The section goes on to point out that these pieces show the emerging style of the fugue and gives three-line biographies of each of the two composers involved.

Occasionally the captions give further information. They do so in the Canzon and Fuga. The Canzon is said to be "by Johann J. Froberger (1616-1667)" and the Fuga From "Harmonia Organica" 1645, by Johann Erasmus Kindermann (1616-1655)." Another example is "Eight Masterworks from the Baroque and Classical Periods" (Templeton, c1969), which has captions such as "Bourree, from Florilegium Primum. G. Muffat" or "Largo, from Celebres Sonatas. G. Tartini, op. 1, no. 5."

What does all this have to do with my original question: why music students often have reasonable technique but know little about music when they enter college? The answer, or at least part of it, becomes evident when one sees and thinks about the publications from which students learn music.

The ones I have at hand do a good job of presenting the notes themselves; the pieces are well chosen, well arranged or
These “educational” publications are less admirable, however, in their attention to information besides the written music. A discouraging number of them fail to present any data about the original piece on which the educational arrangement is based. This is despite the fact that arrangers or publishers must be aware of such information by the time the arrangement comes out.

Students cannot learn when they are not told or shown. Few pre-college teachers will have the time, the inclination, the resources, or the background to discover historical or stylistic information about the music on their own. Consequently, if educational publications intended for pre-college music students do not include historical or stylistic information, students will rarely have the chance to learn it. It is no wonder, then, that such knowledge is usually foreign to music students entering college.

From the Continuing Education Coordinator
Margaret Kaus, University of Tennessee

I hope to see all of you at the OLAC/MOUG Conference in Seattle, Washington on Oct. 12-15, 2000. It promises to be an interesting program. The conference theme is Music and Media at the Millennial Crossroads: Special Materials in Today’s Libraries. Keynote speakers Sherry Vellucci and Martha Yee start the program on Friday. The conference offers workshops on cataloging computer files, Internet resources, maps, music scores, realia, SACO, sound recordings and video recordings. On Friday there is a CORC Panel Discussion followed by poster sessions on Saturday. Don’t forget the receptions, tours, business meetings and various other activities throughout the conference. For complete details on the conference, see http://www.lib.washington.edu/msd/olac/default.htm

If you are unable to attend the OLAC/MOUG Conference, please plan to attend the annual MOUG Meeting in New York City, Feb. 20-21, 2001. This will be a full MOUG meeting. Please see the next edition of the MOUG Newsletter for complete program details.

Please note that I have recently started a new position. I am now working at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. My new title is Associate Professor and Music Cataloging and Reference Librarian. My new address:

University of Tennessee
George F. DeVine Music Library
Knoxville, TN 37996-2600

dx: (865) 974-0564

c-mail: mkaus@utk.edu

GENERAL NEWS

Keyword Searching Enhancements

OCLC is in the process of making some changes to Keyword Searching for WorldCat from the OCLC Cataloging, Interlibrary Loan, Selection, and Union List services. OCLC expects to install these changes on September 17, 2000.

Please watch the logon Message-of-the-Day for confirmation of when the changes will be installed. OCLC previously distributed Technical Bulletin 235. This document will be updated and redistributed prior to the implementation of these Keyword Searching enhancements, and it will be added to the OCLC Web site at http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/db.htm. Updates will be made to the existing keyword indexes; in addition, 15 new indexes and two new qualifiers will be added. The Frequency index will be discontinued. The new indexes include Access method, Citation/References, Conference name, Corporate name, Dewey Decimal class number, Extended author, Extended title, Internet resource, Library of Congress class number, National Agricultural Library class number, National Library of Canada class number, National Library of Medicine class number, Personal name, Standard number, and Universal Decimal class number. The new qualifiers include Cataloging source and Microform/Net microform.

The Niedersächsische Staats und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen—the State and University Library of Göttingen—is the first German university library to become a full OCLC member. The library will tape-load current materials into WorldCat and use the OCLC Cataloging and Interlibrary Loan services. The library traces its history to 1734, preceding the University of Göttingen by three years. The library now has more than 4 million volumes, including over 12,000 manuscripts, 3,000 incunabula and 15,000 periodicals. The Göttingen Digitization Center produces Internet and CD-ROM versions of the Göttingen Gutenberg Bible as well as of early travel books describing North America. During the 18th century, Göttingen developed for
the first time the concept of a modern research library, buying books and periodicals of research value worldwide.

**Suite101.com To Use DDC in New Directory**

Suite 101.com, Inc. has signed an agreement to license the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) system from Forest Press Distributions, a subsidiary of OCLC, and plans to use it as a knowledge organization tool for its Best-of-Web Millennium Directory. Suite101.com was the first virtual community to have Web guides search the Internet for the best Web sites in their area of expertise. Suite101.com, based in Vancouver, British Columbia, currently has over 1,000 contributing editors, working from 30 different countries, who each manage a unique topic. Collectively, the editors have created 32,700 reviewed links, written 27,400 articles, and hosted 27,100 discussions, all archived and readily available at http://www.suite101.com. Since 1996, the Suite101.com community has grown to over 220,000 members, all of whom have unlimited access to a full suite of Web-based services, including topic-specific discussions and chats, personal start pages and home pages, Web-based e-mail, and electronic postcards. Suite101.com plans to launch the Best-of-Web Millennium Directory later this year.

**Karen Drabenstott Is Visiting Scholar**

Karen M. Drabenstott, associate professor, University of Michigan, has been named OCLC Visiting Distinguished Scholar for a seven-month term. The Visiting Distinguished Scholar program is sponsored by the OCLC Office of Research to bring experienced scientists, educators and administrators to OCLC. Dr. Drabenstott will design and develop a Web-based multimedia presentation to teach those without prior training how to use the Dewey Decimal Classification system to classify Web artifacts. Since 1987, Dr. Drabenstott has been a member of the faculty of the University of Michigan, School of Information, where she has taught courses in the areas of bibliographic control, library automation, online searching and multimedia production. She has conducted research in the areas of subject access, classification, search strategies, digital libraries and visual images. From 1981 to 1987, Dr. Drabenstott was a research scientist in the Office of Research at OCLC. Dr. Drabenstott is the author of four books and over 100 research reports, journal articles and conference papers. She has been awarded research grants from the Council of Library Resources, the Department of Education, the National Science Foundation and OCLC. The American Library Association has recognized Dr. Drabenstott's contributions to the field by awarding her the first Frederick G. Kilgour Award for Research in Library and Information Technology in 1998 and the Esther J. Piercey Award in 1988. Dr. Drabenstott received a bachelor of arts degree from Johns Hopkins University, and a master of library science degree and a doctoral degree in library and information science, both from Syracuse University.

**Erik Jul named Executive Director of OCLC Institute**

Erik Jul, associate director of the OCLC Institute, has been named its new executive director, effective June 1, 2000. He takes over from Martin Dillon, who has announced his retirement. Mr. Jul graduated summa cum laude with a bachelor of arts degree from Hope College. He holds a master's degree from Ohio State University and a master's in business administration from Franklin University. He has published extensively, and he is a founding editorial board member and contributing columnist to the Journal of Internet Cataloging, the first international print journal dedicated to this topic. He is also the founding associate editor of LIBRES, the first electronic journal dedicated to library research, and currently serves as guest editor of the Library Trends issue on library cataloging and the Internet. Mr. Jul also serves on numerous committees and task forces including the American Library Association ALCTS Networked Resources and Metadata Committee, the Internet Engineering Task Force, Universal Resource Identifier Group and the ALCTS Metadata Task Force. During his 14-year tenure at OCLC, he has held a variety of positions in the Computer Systems Engineering Division, the Documentation Department, the Office of Research and the Library Resources Management Division. He spearheaded the U.S. Department of Education- funded OCLC Intercat Project, which was instrumental in encouraging libraries worldwide to identify, select and catalog Internet resources according to library standards and practices.

**CATALOGING**

**OCLC Cooperative Online Resource Catalog Debuts**

The OCLC Cooperative Online Resource Catalog (CORC) is now available as a regular service. Built cooperatively with nearly 500 libraries over the past 18 months, CORC is a Web-based system for building bibliographic records and pathfinders (subject bibliographies) for electronic resources. CORC lets librarians work together to target the best Web resources available that fit local needs, leveraging a proven cooperative model to minimize duplication of effort and maximize knowledge sharing across libraries from around the world. CORC gives libraries the ability to make local resources available to the world and to make quality global resources available to local library users. By bringing together librarianship, technology and cooperation, CORC offers an unprecedented opportunity for librarians to apply their knowledge management expertise to the World Wide Web and guide users to valuable, authoritative Web resources. CORC offers a toolkit, based on technology developed at OCLC, that supports automated record creation,
authority control, URL maintenance and pathfinder creation. Libraries using CORC have the option of subscribing to the WebDewey service for access to the latest version of the enhanced Dewey Decimal classification database (updated quarterly) and use of an automatic classification tool to generate candidate DDC numbers during record creation. A special feature of the WebDewey service is its inclusion of selected Library of Congress subject headings—linked to the LC authority files—that have been intellectually mapped to Dewey numbers by the DDC editors and statistically mapped to Dewey numbers in OCLC's WorldCat database. More information about CORC is available on the OCLC Web site at http://www.oclc.org/oclc/corc.

MARC Bibliographic Update, 2000

At the end of April 2000, OCLC began making changes to its implementation of the MARC 21 bibliographic format. Most of the changes from Updates nos. 1-3 of "USMARC Format for Bibliographic Data" and from changes announced in "MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data" were implemented. Because many of the changes are more complex than simple validation and staff resources are limited, OCLC will implement the changes in this MARC Bibliographic Update project in phases. Technical Bulletin 236, "OCLC-MARC Bibliographic Update 2000," gives the details of all the changes for this Update. The bulletin is divided into two parts, based on the phased implementation schedule and is available on OCLC's Web site at http://www.oclc.org/oclc/tb/tb236/index.htm. Among the changes implemented in late April 2000 were:

- Most of the MARC format changes specified in Technical Bulletin 236.
- A number of additions and changes to the "OCLC-MARC Code Lists," including several changes to language codes.
- Workform/bibliographic record display and 006 prompt changes, including the addition of an 007 prompt in the Computer File format.
- Scans to delete obsolete codes for AccM (VIS) and Prme, and to delete fields 890, 901 and 911. In addition, AccM (VIS) and Prme were removed as labels in the record displays and 006 prompts. A number of changes being implemented, but a few that OCLC users may find of special interest include changes to 'Form,' changes for field 035, the addition of field 891, and changes to the record displays and 006 prompts.
- Value 's,' to identify electronic versions, is being added to 'Form' in formats where 'Form' already exists.
- There are record display changes being made to accommodate the removal of 'AccM' from Visual Materials and 'Prme' from Maps, and the addition of 'Form' in both formats. In addition, OCLC is changing the default 'fill' in 'Srce' to 'd' in all formats.

A user suggestion to change field 035 for local processing is also being implemented.

Field 891 is being implemented for a CONSER project to record publication pattern data.

The changes implemented in May 2000 included:

- Implementation of Encoding Level '3' (Abbreviated level) to support special projects.
- Implementation of Encoding Level '4' to complete support of the Core-level standard.

Among the changes to be made in future phases of this update are:

- Changes to Cataloging Source ('Srce') and field 040 to support the changes in the definition of Cataloging Source ('Srce').
- Changes to the Cataloging Source Qualifier to identify PCC (Program for Cooperative Cataloging) record in Brief and Truncated record displays instead of identifying them as Library of Congress records.
- Scans to convert or delete obsolete elements and data.
- Changes to card print for fields 028, 526 and 699.

The phased implementation begins in late April. OCLC will keep libraries updated on the progress of each phase and will announce changes in advance of each implementation.

Updating URLs in Bibliographic Records

A recent quality control enhancement now allows you to add and modify URLs in bibliographic records. Changes to records will be reflected in both WorldCat and CORC. The new feature was implemented on June 25, 2000, and was described in Technical Bulletin 239, "Integration of the OCLC Cataloging Service and CORC." Cataloging users may have seen "CORC" and thought it did not apply to them. This new capability was added in recognition of the difficulty in maintaining URLs when they change. With this new capability, any cataloging user with full or higher authorization may:

- Add a field 856 with a URL to any record that does not already contain field 856.
- Modify field 856 in existing records to update the URL to a new one.
- The only restriction is that you cannot add a new field 856 to a record that already has one. You can use the usual lock-and-replace commands to lock a record, add or modify field 856, and replace it. You will receive an appropriate credit for replacing the record.

United Kingdom's Wellcome Library Adds 44 Millionth Bibliographic Record to WorldCat

The Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine in London, England, entered the 44 millionth
bibilographic record into WorldCat on May 8, 2000. The record was for an article in a limited edition of secondary material relating to the Islamic philosopher al-Farabi: "al-Farabi wa-Tumas Murus, aw, al-Madinah al-fadilah wa-Jazirat al-tubEl (al-Farabi and Thomas More, or, The Excellent City and the Isle of Blessedness)." It compares Sir Thomas More's "Utopia" with a similar work by al-Farabi. The Wellcome Library is based on the collections of Sir Henry Wellcome and is a leading resource for medical history research in Europe. It holds over 600,000 volumes of printed works, with over 60,000 printed before 1850. It also holds extensive collections of western manuscripts, prints and other iconographic material. The Oriental collections form one of the major collections of Oriental manuscripts and printed books outside Asia. They span 3,000 years of documentation in over 43 different languages and record almost every area of human endeavor. The library has 20,000 users who visit from all parts of the world, and the library is extensively used through the Internet. The Wellcome Library is a member of the Wellcome Trust, the world's largest medical research charity dedicated to "promoting and fostering research with the aim of improving human and animal health," and can be found on the Web at http://www.wellcome.ac.uk.

Conversion of British Library Control Numbers

Beginning the week of August 7, 2000, OCLC began converting British Library control numbers to remove them from field 010. Field 010 is reserved for Library of Congress control numbers, but in the past OCLC has placed control numbers of a few other libraries in field 010. The numbers will be removed from field 010 and moved to field 029 and will continue to be present in field 015. This change will result in fewer false matches on LCCN searches. Later this year, as part of the National Library Control Number Project, 016 fields will be generated for all national library control numbers except the Library of Congress. Field 016 will be indexed in the "Standard Number" index that will be implemented when keyword searching is re-implemented in WorldCat. British Library control numbers are those that look like LCCNs but have an alphabetic prefix 'gb'. An estimated 737,000 records will be affected.

OCLC Pinyin/Wade-Giles Conversion Project

OCLC, in close cooperation with the Library of Congress (LC) and the Research Libraries Group (RLG), has developed plans for the conversion of authority and bibliographic records that use the Wade-Giles Chinese romanization scheme to reflect pinyin romanization. For details on the OCLC Pinyin/Wade-Giles Conversion Project, see the OCLC Web site at http://www.oclc.org/oclc/pinyin/index.htm and the LC Web site at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pinyin/pinyin.html. OCLC will convert authority records that have been identified as representing headings used in Chinese bibliographic records. This conversion is planned to be completed by October 1, 2000 (Day One), at which time all LC Chinese current cataloging will begin to reflect pinyin romanization. Converted authority records will be marked with appropriate codes in the 008/07 (Romanization Scheme) fixed field. Following Day One, NACO participants will also use the appropriate Pinyin Conversion Marker in new and changed authority records that involve pinyin romanization. OCLC began its conversion process on August 1, 2000, at which time LC and Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) participants began a moratorium on the creation of, deletion of, or change to any authority record that contains (or will contain) systematically romanized Chinese language data in 1XX, 4XX, or 5XX fields. The moratorium, scheduled to continue through September 30, 2000, is intended to ensure that all appropriate authority records are accurately identified and correctly converted by OCLC. During that period, LC and PCC participants will refrain from using pinyin for the formulation of systematically romanized access points in both bibliographic and authority records. For details about the moratorium see the LC Web site at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pinyin/moratorium.html. RLG will convert LC's Chinese language bibliographic records and distribute them to both LC and OCLC. This conversion is also planned for completion by October 1, 2000 (Day One) when all LC Chinese current cataloging will begin to reflect pinyin romanization. OCLC will begin converting the WorldCat bibliographic file, working backwards from the most recent records, soon after Day One. OCLC will convert all the Chinese language CONSER serial records (estimated to be about 7,000 records) in one group, early in the conversion process. Converted bibliographic records will be marked with a locally defined MARC 987 (Local Romanization/Conversion History) field. All OCLC Cataloging users should include an appropriate Pinyin Conversion Marker 987 in bibliographic records that contain romanized Chinese characters and that are created or locked and replaced following Day One. Records that include field 987 will not be converted subsequently by OCLC's pinyin conversion programs, eliminating the potential for possible erroneous conversion. For the definition of the Pinyin Conversion Marker for Bibliographic Records, field 987, and brief instructions on its use, see Technical Bulletin 240 "Pinyin Conversion Project at http://www.oclc.org/oclc/bib/ tb240/.

OCLC will also be offering an array of local data conversion options to both members and non-members.

OCLC Z39.50 Cataloging Service Indexing Upgraded

In August 2000, for libraries using the OCLC Z39.50 Cataloging Service, there was an indexing change for accessing the OCLC WorldCat database through the OCLC Z39.50 server. OCLC upgraded Z39.50 Cataloging indexing...
and attribute mapping from the current FirstSearch indexing to the new FirstSearch indexing. This change will benefit all libraries using OCLC Z39.50 Cataloging because users will have access to additional indexes for more precise searching and retrieval. These changes include both new Extended Author and Extended Title indexes. The Music Number index has been standardized for improved access to music titles. Control number indexes (ISBN, ISSN, LCCN) have been separated to allow for precision searching. Restrictors for language and document type have been expanded. Restrictors for Library of Congress (DLC) records and for microforms have been added. OCLC is currently mailing the new attribute mapping documentation to all current OCLC Z39.50 Cataloging users and to local system vendors that participate in the Local System Vendor Access Program (LSVAP). This documentation provides precise details on the new attribute mapping. Use attributes in the 5000 range are OCLC-specific, and are not part of the Bib-1 attribute set. Libraries may need to consult with their local system vendors if they have questions concerning changing attribute settings on their local Z39.50 clients. They need to be familiar with how to change local attribute settings to conform to the new indexing.

**Editorial Policy Committee Meets at the Library of Congress**

The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (EPC) held its 114th meeting at the Library of Congress on May 3-5, 2000. It was the first meeting chaired by Andrea Stamn, head, Catalog Department, Northwestern University. The meeting featured a presentation by Isabella Kubosch, project coordinator, Nasjonalbiblioteket-the National Library of Norway, on the challenges of translating the Dewey Decimal Classification system into Norwegian. The translation she is editing will be the fifth Norwegian edition of the DDC. The committee considered updates for several parts of the Dewey Decimal Classification system to be included in the next edition: Tables 1, 5 and 6; 004-006 Computer science; 305-306 Social groups and institutions; 320 Political science; 330 Economics; 340 Law; 540 Chemistry; 551.46-551.47 Oceanography; 616-617 Diseases and branches of medicine; and 630 Agriculture. EPC also approved drafts of the abridged edition versions of 560-590 Life sciences and 700 The arts. EPC recommended that the editors solicit outside opinion on several of the proposed updates. Discussion papers on the proposed changes to 004-006 Computer science, 305-306 Social groups and institutions, and 340 Law are available on the OCLC Forest Press Web site (http://www.oclc.org/fp) for user review and comment. The next meeting of the Editorial Policy Committee will be November 29 to December 1, 2000 at the Library of Congress.

**Anne Robertson Appointed To Dewey Editorial Committee**

Anne Robertson has been appointed to the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (EPC) through December 2002 to fill the term vacated by Giles Martin, former Australian delegate to the EPC. Mr. Martin joined OCLC Forest Press as assistant editor of the DDC in October 1999. Ms. Robertson is currently manager, Technical Services Branch, State Library of Queensland in South Brisbane, Australia. She has held a number of positions throughout the State Library, primarily in cataloging, indexing and organizing information and collections. She has cataloged everything from manuscripts to Internet journals, and she has considerable experience in the planning and management of automation projects. The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee is a joint committee of OCLC Forest Press and the American Library Association. The committee works with the editors of the Dewey Decimal Classification system and advises OCLC Forest Press on matters relating to the general development of the classification. The committee's ten members include public, special and academic librarians, and library educators.

**Dublin Core Releases Recommended Qualifiers to Improve Access to Information**

The Dublin Core Metadata Initiative (DCMI), an organization leading the development of international standards to improve electronic resource management and information discovery, has announced the formal recommendation of the Dublin Core (DC) Qualifiers. The addition of the DC Qualifiers enhances the semantic precision of the existing DC Metadata Element Set. For the past year, working groups of the Dublin Core developed these newly agreed upon refinements to give better access to information. The new recommendations for Dublin Core Qualifiers increase the effectiveness of metadata by giving it finer granularity. For example, a publication's date, which would be the Dublin Core Metadata Element, may be further detailed as a particular type of date by using a Dublin Core Qualifier such as date last modified, date created or date issued. The DC Qualifiers build upon the DC Metadata Element Set, which provides 15 categories to describe resources on the Web. Known as the Dublin Core, the metadata model has become the de facto standard for description of information on the Internet. Dublin Core's usage committee has launched the next step toward a cohesive metadata standard. The DC Qualifiers improve interpretation of metadata values and can be easily recorded or transferred into HTML, XML, RDF or relational databases. The evolution of DC Qualifiers draws from the input of many individuals across a broad array of disciplines. Users include museum informatics specialists, archivists, digital library researchers, libraries, and government information providers, and a variety of content providers.
Their efforts have led standards organizations, such as NISO (National Information Standards Organization) in the U.S. and CEN in Europe (European Committee for Standardization) to view the DC Metadata Element Set as a benchmark candidate for simple resource description on the Internet. More recently, new sectors, such as education and industry, have been attracted to Dublin Core's simplicity, multilingual scope, consensus philosophy and widespread adoption. More information about the new recommendation can be found at http://purl.org/dc/documents/dcmes-qualifiers.

REFERENCE SERVICES

OCLC WebExpress Provides Access to Local and Remote Resources through Customized Interface

The OCLC WebExpress service is now available to libraries worldwide, providing an easy-to-use, integrated gateway to local and remote Z39.50 information resources through a single, locally customized interface that puts the library at the forefront as an information provider. OCLC WebExpress brings the library’s full range of resources together by providing user access through a single interface to both remote and local information resources, such as the library catalog, the OCLC FirstSearch service, and non-OCLC Z39.50 reference databases. These information resources receive automatic configuration updates through the OCLC WebExpress Service Center, a Web site intended for use by librarians or service administrators that also provides current documentation, training materials, upgrades, feedback forms, and contact and support information. The information resources can also be linked to resource-sharing options. The OCLC WebExpress administrator interface includes Wizards that make it easy to set up access to information resources, group those resources for users, and set up user authentication. The administrator chooses the user interface look and feel, and creates a library home page if the library does not already have one. The library also has the option to allow users to create individual, customized OCLC WebExpress sub-accounts, which can store individual user information like search strategies for later use, user-specified URLs, or user-specified address information to make it more convenient for the user to complete interlibrary loan request forms. Libraries can also earn Amazon.com referral fees by having users purchase books through the OCLC WebExpress "Buy It" feature. The OCLC WebExpress service comprises two components: the OCLC WebExpress Service Center, which includes the demonstrations, ordering information, documentation, training materials and a repository of Z39.50 configurations from OCLC; and the integration software, which is stored at the library site on the library's Linux or Solaris server and includes the administrative module that allows the librarian to customize the user interface, select and add Z39.50 resources, and set up various levels of patron authentication and profiling. University of Washington and OCLC Work Together to Improve Access to Digital Collections OCLC and the University of Washington's Center for Information Systems Optimization (CISO) have formed a strategic alliance to ensure interoperability between OCLC SiteSearch and CISO's CONTENT Multimedia Archival Software. This agreement helps libraries to take full advantage of the powerful media-management capabilities of CONTENT and the comprehensive OCLC SiteSearch catalog offering. Libraries will easily be able to put their special media collections online in digital format and support a comprehensive, integrated search across cataloged materials. The CONTENT Software Suite, developed by CISO, is designed to handle all phases of media asset management—from placing media items such as photos, images, slides and audio/video clips online to ultimately providing ready access for a broad range of users, including researchers, students, curriculum developers and the public. Search capability from any Web browser is provided across multiple collections, and CONTENT also offers Web development tools to create customized interfaces to collections for specific purposes, such as public kiosks or class Web sites. OCLC SiteSearch software provides a flexible solution for an integrated catalog. It supports a comprehensive search across multi-type cataloged materials and allows the user to directly view a particular image, record or resource online. CISO (the Center for Information Systems Optimization) is a research laboratory in the Department of Electrical Engineering at the University of Washington. Formed in 1990, the mission of the center is to create tools and implement solutions for media asset management. As a result of research, extensive field testing, and close collaboration with the University of Washington Libraries, the center has developed the CONTENT Software Suite. CONTENT is now widely used by numerous groups and individuals within the university as well as at libraries, universities, and commercial enterprises across the United States. More information is available on the CONTENT Web site at http://content.engr.washington.edu.

OCLC and CIC Complete Phase I of Virtual Electronic Library Project, Agree to Suspend Phase II

The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) and OCLC have completed development of the CIC Virtual Electronic Library (VEL) Phase I and have agreed to suspend the joint development effort for the second phase of the project. The joint development project, which began in 1996, has to date resulted in a new distributed system (Phase I) that links online public access catalogs of the CIC university libraries, provides a Web-based patron interface and allows patrons to initiate their own interlibrary loan requests. However, until more is known about distributed system technology and its application to resource sharing among large groups of libraries, the CIC and OCLC have agreed to
sustain Phase II, which involved development of an independent client-server-based Interlibrary Loan/Document Request system. The OCLC SiteSearch WebZ software is the platform for the CIC VEL. CIC member libraries customized the interface provided by WebZ to meet the unique needs of its users and to work best with its local Web site. WebZ provides rapid, desktop access to the combined library resources of more than 60 million books, 550,000 serials and countless databases and digital systems owned or licensed collectively by the CIC's 12 major teaching and research universities. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation, with headquarters in Champaign, Illinois, is the academic consortium of the Big Ten universities and the University of Chicago, with programs and activities that encompass nearly all aspects of university activity. Member institutions include: the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois (Chicago and Urbana-Champaign campuses), Indiana University, the University of Iowa, the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, the University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The CIC Home Page is located at http://www.cic.uiuc.edu/.

**Wilson Select Plus Available on the New OCLC FirstSearch Service**

Wilson Select Plus, a new database that includes approximately 500 more full-text titles than the Wilson Select database, is now available on the new OCLC FirstSearch service. Initially, full-text articles in Wilson Select Plus have been linked to citations in the 13 H.W. Wilson databases available through the new FirstSearch. Linking from its full-text articles to citations in the other bibliographic databases on the service will be completed soon. Wilson Select Plus will replace the current Wilson Select database in the FirstSearch Base Package with Full Text and the General Reference Collection subscription packages. By June 30, 2001, all Base Package with Full Text and General Reference Collection subscribers will have access to Wilson Select Plus. The Wilson Select database will continue to be available to libraries that prefer the smaller file.

**RESOURCE SHARING**

**RLG and OCLC Explore Digital Archiving**

The Research Libraries Group and have begun discussing ways the two organizations can cooperate to create infrastructures for digital archiving. As a first step, OCLC and RLG have begun to collaborate on two working documents to establish best practices. "Attributes of a Digital Archive for Research Repositories" will outline the characteristics of reliable archival services, and "Preservation Metadata for Long-Term Retention" will propose approaches for descriptive and management metadata needed in the long-term retention of digital files. RLG and OCLC will bring key players together to review progress to date and identify common practices among those most experienced in the archiving arena. The draft working papers will then be reviewed by key stakeholders around the world. The papers are expected to serve as a basis for further exploration of roles and responsibilities of RLG, OCLC and others. Research repositories globally are working to develop infrastructures for identifying, acquiring, managing and accessing digital materials. Organizational models for successful digital archives being tested in Europe, Australia and North America hold promise for institutional and collaborative approaches to a wide range of operations and facilities. The draft documents will be made available on the RLG and OCLC Web sites, and comments will be invited from interested parties before final publication.

**OCLC Develops Global Resource Sharing Access Capability**

OCLC has formed the Global Sharing Program to foster international resource sharing. By formalizing rules for borrowing and lending beyond state and national boundaries, this new program makes it easier for participating libraries to identify lending partners around the world and to process international interlibrary loan transactions. The Global Sharing Program expands access and speeds delivery of international materials through improved staff productivity because it is easier to identify lenders, there are fewer blind requests for materials, and there is automated creation and tracking of requests. The Global Sharing Program also provides improved service to users through broader access to global materials, higher ILL fill rates and faster turnaround time. The program also offers controlled costs through the OCLC ILL Fee Management service, which streamlines the invoicing process by permitting a lender to charge and a borrower to pay via their OCLC statement, avoiding the administrative expense of currency conversion and cutting a check. The primary requirements for joining the Global Sharing Program are:

- The OCLC ILL Fee Management service is the only payment method accepted.
- Fax or Internet document delivery, such as Ariel, is the only delivery method for non-returnable material that can be used.
- Airmail or courier is the only delivery method for returnable material that can be used.
- Lending to all participants in the group is mandatory.

Currently 30 libraries are participating in the Global Sharing Program including the Library of Congress (United States), CISTI (Canada), University of Queensland (Australia) and the National Library of Education (Denmark). Any library wishing to participate in this Global Sharing Program must...
OCLC Plans to Distribute ILLiad Software to Help Libraries Streamline Interlibrary Loan Process

OCLC has signed a letter of intent with Virginia Tech Intellectual Properties, Inc. and Atlas Systems, Inc. to license and distribute ILLiad software, a leading interlibrary loan management tool that automates routine interlibrary loan functions and provides sophisticated tracking statistics to library staff. Pending completion of a final agreement, OCLC, working with its U.S. regional networks and international distributors, will become the sole licensor of ILLiad software. Atlas Systems will continue to develop and support the software. OCLC ILLiad software will provide a comprehensive interlibrary loan management system that automates routine borrowing and lending functions within a library's interlibrary loan department. ILLiad software includes interfaces to the OCLC ILL service, National Library of Medicine's DOCLINE service and RLG's RLINEILL service. Virginia Tech Intellectual Properties, Inc. (VTIP) works to identify, develop, protect and market discoveries resulting from research by Virginia Tech faculty, staff and students. ILLiad was created in the Interlibrary Loan office at Virginia Tech, and the Borrowing module is licensed through VTIP. Atlas Systems, Inc. provides service and support for the ILLiad system, as well as licensing the Lending module. Founded in 1996, Atlas Systems, Inc. also provides computer hardware and software consulting services.

Questions & Answers
by Jay Weitz

Q: In a collective uniform title of the type "Piano music, pianos (2)," should "pianos (2)" go in subfield +m or subfield +t? Initially, I was inclined to keep it in subfield +t since it seems to behave more like a qualifier than a medium of performance. I checked the authority file on OCLC and found that in 11 out of 12 cases, this was the treatment chosen by LC. It was also interesting to note that in the single occurrence of "+m pianos (2)" in an authority record (ARN: 4566639), the bibliographic record cited (86-752268) actually has it as part of subfield +t. OCLC's BF&S does not address this situation but "Music Coding and Tagging" (p. 136) says,"Phrases such as '4 hands' are part of the medium statement except when they follow a collective uniform title such as 'Piano music,' in which case they are not separately subfielded. However, consider as a medium statement qualifiers such a 'pianos (2)' that follow a collective uniform title." So, I am happy to comply with this interpretation, but I am curious if you can shed some light on the basis for LC's practice.

A: That quote from "Music Coding and Tagging" isn't very clear, is it? Too many mediums or something. In the upcoming second edition, the explanation is somewhat clearer (I hope), both in the description of subfield +m:

Among the types of parenthetical and other information not separately subfielded are:

Such phrases as "4 hands" and "pianos (2)" that form part of collective uniform titles:

100 09 José Antonio de Donostia. 240 10 Piano music, 4 hands. +k Selections
700 12 Sor, Fernando, ‡d 1778-1839. ‡t Guitar music, ‡m guitars (2). +k Selections.

and in the subsequent descriptions of subfield +m:

...Phrases such as "4 hands" and "pianos (2)" are part of the medium statement except when they follow a collective uniform title such as "Piano music," in which case they are not separately subfielded.

100 1b Poulenc, Francis, ‡d 1899-1963. 240 10 Piano music, pianos (2)
700 12 Beethoven, Ludwig van, ‡d 1770-1827. ‡t Lied mit Veränderungen, ‡m piano, 4 hands, ‡n WoO 74, ‡t D major.
700 12 Hensel, Fanny Mendelssohn, ‡d 1805-1847. ‡t Piano music, 4 hands. +k Selections.
100 1b Cooke, Arnold. 240 10 Suites, ‡m recorders (4), ‡n no. 2

When the statement of medium is the initial element of the uniform title, as it is in many collective uniform titles, record it in subfield +a in the 240, 630, or 730 field or subfield +t in the 600, 610, 611, 700, 710, or 711 field:

100 1b Schulhoff, Ervin, ‡d 1894-1942. 240 10 String quartet music
700 12 Blavet, Michel, ‡d 1700-1768. ‡t Flute music, flutes (2). +k Selections.
700 12 Boyd, Anne, ‡d 1946- ‡t Flute, piano music. +k Selections.

The rationale is that the "pianos (2)" portion is simply an integral part of the initial element, which in these cases
happens to be the medium of performance. The one authority record cited that was incorrectly subfielded (no97080415) is a machine-derived record and has been fixed.

Q: One of the general catalogers here tells me that LC is no longer using 490/0 for untraced series, but is either authorizing them for tracing or using 500 notes. She argues that there is really no such thing as an untraced series field any longer. I'm trying to confirm this. Are you aware of any recent decisions by LC that discourage or prohibit using the 490/0? What do you recommend to libraries that want to allow access to their 490/0 headings? Do you recommend changing them to 400-440 and setting up the system to access 490s, or moving them to notes?

A: LC decided in August 1989 (that's stretching the definition of "recent" just a bit too much) to trace all series being newly established, but did not change the trace/non-trace status of series already established. The decision is documented in LCRI 21.30L. OCLC users should follow the trace/no-trace decisions found in series authority records when they input original records. Users are NOT obligated to follow this guideline locally; that is, they don't have to trace non-trace decisions found in series authority records. The priority of series already established. The decision is documented in LCRI 21.30L. OCLC users should follow the trace/no-trace decisions found in series authority records when they input original records. Users are NOT obligated to follow this guideline locally; that is, they don't have to trace non-trace decisions found in series authority records. The OCLC Web site has an example: "Durations: 17 min.; 23 min.; 9 min." Your workshop on the University of Buffalo Web site has an example: "Durations: 1:17:00; 22:40." Should we be using the min. and sec. approach, or the 00:00:00 approach?

A: Music Cataloging Decision 6.7B10 stipulates that durations appearing in the notes area (either in a 500 duration note or in a 505 contents note) are to be expressed in the HH:MM:SS format, with hours, minutes, and seconds separated by colons. When an item contains only one musical work (as defined by AACR2), the total duration is given in the physical description (300) field and is stated in the form "XX hr., XX min., XX sec." according to LCRI and MCD 6.5B2.

Q: Please help, I cannot decipher the difference in code p and code r in OCLC's BF&S and the MARC 21 manual. When you have a sound recording of an item that originally was recorded in the sixties and released again in the 90s or whenever, do you use p or r? OCLC #39861877 uses a p; and #39750408 uses an r. Please differentiate these codes.

A: Which Type of Date code you use really depends on which dates you have available and how much evidence of a recording's previous existence you have at hand. Remember that the rules do not generally require you to go beyond the item itself to determine such things as bibliographic history and previous manifestations. You also need to keep in mind the priority chart of Date Type codes (on p. FF:25 in the print BF&S, and http://www.oclc.org/oclc/bib/dist.htm online). If the item you have in hand says, for instance, something along the lines of "Previously released as an LP in 19XX," you would be justified in using Date Type "r" and the "19XX" date as the original release/publication date. If the item in hand says something like "Recorded in 19XX," but has no explicit mention of a previous release, you could use Date Type "p" and the "19XX" date as the original release/publication date. In a case where you know that an item has been previously released in a different audio format but have no date for that previous release (say, a note that says "Previously released material!) and no date for the original capture, you would use Date Type "t" and a blank Date2. Obviously, there are many other possibilities, but I hope that gives you some idea.

Q: Field 041, subfield +b, says, "Do not enter language codes that already appear in subfield +a." Since sound recordings don't use subfield +a, can we ignore that sentence, meaning that you CAN enter language codes that already appear in subfield +d? For instance, if you have an opera sung in French, and there's a synopsis in French and English, you'd have:

| 041 086 | t+d fre +b eng frerger |

Your "Music Coding and Tagging" book, middle of p. 90, has this situation, so I'm guessing that the sentence does not apply only to subfield +a, not subfield +d. (Though I can't fathom what the difference would be, as subfield +d just substitutes for subfield +a in sound recordings.)

A: Regarding the 041 subfield +b question, I have taken MARC 21 at its word, though I'm not sure my interpretation is correct. For music (specifically Sound Recordings), it reads "subfield +b contains the language code(s) of material accompanying sound recordings if the accompanying material contains summaries of the contents of a non-music sound recording or summaries of songs or other vocal works (not translations of the text(s) contained on a music sound recording." Both the general definition and the audiovisual materials definition emphasize the use of the subfield +b when the language of the summary differs from that of the text or the sound track. The music explanation does not...
mention this restriction and I can only guess that it's because subfield *a* is not used for sound recordings.

Q: The definition of field 246, 3rd paragraph, says, "For items including several works but lacking a collective title, field 246 is used only for titles related to the title selected as the title proper, usually the first work named in the chief source of information. Titles related to other works are recorded in field 740 or other 7XX." It's the "usually the first work" part that bothers me. If you couldn't find a collective title on your sound recording and the chief source had two titles, each with a parallel title, I thought both parallel titles went in 740s, since neither pertained to the entire sound recording. This rule seems to say that the parallel title of the first work goes in the 246, and the parallel title of the second work goes in a 740, to wit:

What I think:

| 245 10 Opera festival *h* [sound recording] = *h* arias from famous Italian operas. |
| 246 30 Arias from famous Italian operas |

What BF&S seems to say:

| 245 14 The firebird *h* [sound recording] = *h* L'Oiseau de feu; The rite of spring = Le sacre du printemps / *c* Stravinsky. |
| 740 02 Oiseau de feu. |
| 740 02 Sacre du printemps. |

Who's right?

A: On the 246, MARC 21 explicitly states that 246 is to be used for titles related to the title chosen as the title proper (the first title) when there is no collective title. That is the exception to the comprehensive title rule. So your second example is correct (if you add a 740 for "Rite of spring").

Q: I keep reading MARC 21 and BF&S and keep having questions on the 246. Here's one more: Both of these sources strictly limit what kinds of other title information can be put in the 246. The only time you can use 246 has something to do with full form vs. initialisms. Does this stricture mean that, if the title proper has other title information that, by itself, is a useful title, it cannot go in a 246? Such as:

| 245 10 Opera festival *h* [sound recording] = *h* arias from famous Italian operas. |

Assuming that I think the other title information functions as a useful title, would "Arias from famous Italian operas" go in a 246 or a 740? Looking at the MARC 21 definition and scope of 740, it seems that other title information is not something you can put in the 740, either.

A: Other title information or portions of other title information fall under 246 Second Indicator '0' ("Portion of title"). So in your example, you would have:

| 246 30 Arias from famous Italian operas |

This is justified in the first paragraph of the code "0" definition in MARC 21: "Value '0' indicates that the title given in field 246 is a portion of a title for which access or an added entry is desired, but which does not require that a note be generated from this field." The information that follows in MARC 21 (about titles in subfield *p*, alternative titles, initialisms/full forms in subfield *b*, etc.) are stated to be examples, but do not exhaust all the possibilities.

Q: I'm working on the Hanssler CDs of Bach's complete works. One CD is particular contains a number of spurious works. There are no headings in the authority file so I will have to come up with some for the 700 fields. I can formulate a basic Bach *t* Suites, *t* m harpsichord, *t* n BWV 821, *t r B* major, etc. But since this is going to be an original record, I want to make sure that is the correct thing to do with these spurious works that according to New Grove have not been attributed to anyone else. Can I enter them under Bach's name and add a 500 note with the BWV numbers in question?

A: First, you should check the Schmieder (BWV) catalog to make sure the works have not been attributed. The BWV is the authoritative source, has much more detail than New Grove, and is ten years more current if you've got the 1990 BWV edition. If there is an attribution, make the appropriate composer/uniform title entry. If there is no attribution, you have to go with entry by the title (as examples see authority records mr99022421 and mr97113482). Music Cataloging Decision 21.4C1 addresses this question indirectly, but it doesn't really help much: "When a musical work has been erroneously or fictitiously attributed to a composer, optionally make, instead of the added entry prescribed by 21.4C1, a name-title reference from the heading for the attributed composer and the uniform title which the work would have if it were in fact by the attributed composer to the heading for the actual composer and actual uniform title, or to the title if the actual composer is unknown (see MCD 26.4B). Apply this option when doing so would improve access to the work, e.g., because an added entry under the heading for the attributed composer alone would be lost in..."
that composer's file, or because the work is represented only by a secondary entry in a bibliographic record.

Q: I have a page numbering question concerning an item that is two scores. Usually, the two scores have equal page numbering, so the solution in this case would be, for example, "2 scores (55 p. each)." However, since one of these scores has a short appendix, one of the scores has one more page than the other. The only place that seems to have any kind of information relating to this situation is MCD 5.5B1. It gives the example of "46, 39 p. of music." However, that refers to a single score with two different page numbering schemes. The only thing I can think of to do is "2 scores," just like you would do for "2 parts."

A: As I see it, there are two options, depending on how strictly we want to read the rules. Rule 5.5B2 reads in part, "If the item consists of different types of score ... give the details of each in the order of the list in 5.5B1, separated from each other by a space, plus sign, space. Add the pagination or number of volumes as instructed in 2.5B." So if these are actually two different types of score (say, a full score and a condensed score), there's no problem. But if we stretch the letter of the rule to include differently paginated scores of the same type (say, both full scores), you could describe them as such:

300 1 score (55 p.) + 1 score (56 p.)

The other option, and the one I think I'd prefer since it is simpler (and requires no stretch, lazybones that I am), resorts to Rule 2.5B21 (which LC locally chooses not to apply, but we needn't feel restrained by that). It reads, "If the volumes in a multi-volume set are individually paged, give the pagination of each volume in parentheses after the number of volumes." The example shows the paginations separated by a semicolon, space. This would result in:

300 2 scores (55; 56 p.)

In either case, you might want to mention the presence of the short appendix in a note, if appropriate.

Q: Should I be using the 546 tag for the language of song texts in scores? I have always seen just 500 used, except for sound recordings. Is this something new since I was a student? I'm kind of embarrassed that I've been putting language in a general 500.

A: That depends on how long ago you were a student. Until Format Integration about five years ago, the language note field 546 was valid only in Serials and the Archival Control formats. Now, 546 should be used for language notes in all formats, including Scores and Sound Recordings. Use 546 only when the note is devoted pretty much exclusively to the languages/scripts of the item's main content; notes including information about the languages of program notes, for instance, would be coded 500.

Q: For the first time in several years, I have to input a new record for a book of hymns without music. My instincts are telling me to use the scores format, even though there is no music, and I think I've read about this in the past (when all the manuals were separate before format integration), but I can't find anything in the documentation. Should I use books or scores format?

A: The treatment of hymnals without music has, indeed, changed since Format Integration. Current practice is to treat hymnals without music as books (Type "a").

Q: I'm cataloging a bunch (100-150?) of original cast recordings. Now that I'm about a fourth of the way through, a question occurs to me. If there is a statement on the disc itself, to the effect that this is a cast recording, it typically reads "Original Broadway Cast Recording" or "Original Cast Recording." In some instances, though, the statement "Original Broadway Cast" appears, without the word "Recording." I've been blithely transcribing all of the above as other title information, but it seems to me that "Original Broadway Cast" is really a statement of responsibility. Should we regard the phrase "Original Broadway Cast" as a statement of responsibility rather than other title information?

A: If we look at AACR2 rules 6.1B1, 6.1E1, and especially 6.1F1, and their respective LCRIs, it's clear that performers in the so-called "popular" idiom MAY be included in the statement of responsibility. Without getting into the debate over "popular" versus "serious" and the performer's intellectual responsibility, my gut feeling is that musicals would be grouped with operas in this respect, in that the performer's responsibility generally does not go beyond "performance, execution, or interpretation." LCRI 6.1F1 would have us shy away from including performers of musicals in the statement of responsibility. I don't really have a problem with including the statement "Original Broadway Cast" as other title information, since the missing word "recording" seems to be a logical implication. (If that makes you uncomfortable, you could add the missing word in brackets.) Alternatively, you might relegate it to either a quoted note by itself or as a quoted introduction to a 511 note that details the performers.

Q: In #17156763 field 041 has a first indicator of "0" (no translation in sight). To be correct this would have to apply only to the sound emanating from the disc. It is not a translation. It is German. But, the program notes are in three languages and the libretto is translated from the German into three languages. The answer must be that only subfield 4b
has no translation in sight. Therefore, indicator "0" is correct. If we take into account the other written translations the indicator should be "1." Is "0" the correct indicator?

A: The value of the First Indicator of field 041 in both Scores and Sound Recordings is determined by consideration of the main content of the item itself, not of any accompanying material. (There is one exception. When a score includes a translation of the vocal text printed as text, it is considered to include a translation.) For the recording in question to be considered to include a translation, it would have had to be sung in a language other than German, the original. So for a sound recording, when subfield 4 contains only the original language(s), the first indicator is "0".

Q: I am originally cataloging a piece of music entitled "Grand trio concertante" by Valentino Molino. I noticed other records of this same work in OCLC read "Grand trio concertante." One might apply AACR2 1.0F and write "Grand[d]" in the 245. However, on the title page, the cover, and the title page verso, the spelling is "Gran," which leads me to believe that perhaps this is a variant spelling of this title, rather than an omission of the letter "d." This is further given credence by the fact that the preface gives the title on the original manuscript as "Grand trio...", so maybe this is a variant form of the title. However, I am not totally sure about this, and so if you could please share your thoughts on the matter, I would be most grateful.

A: Since the variant spelling appears virtually everywhere on your item and does not seem to be a title-page typo, I think it's safe to assume that this is a true variant spelling for this particular edition. Because the original edition had the spelling "grand," however, it also sounds like this spelling would be the proper uniform title. You could also supply a 246 title with the "grand" spelling.

Q: Why do I often see "Compact disc" notes coded as 538s in OCLC records?

A: Sometimes the simplest questions have the most involved answers. This one is a long story. In March 1996, an example was added to the then-USMARC Bibliographic Format with the text "Compact disc" as a 538 field (System details note). Apparently, the addition of this example had bypassed certain of the usual review processes. At the 1998 Music Library Association meeting in Boston, the Bibliographic Control Committee discussed the issue and decided that the "Compact disc" note referred only to physical description (AACR2 6.7B10), and so should be coded as a general 500 note. LC practice had always reflected this. The misleading 538 example no longer appears in the print version of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format or in the concise version on the Web, although it may not have been corrected yet in all print documentation. The 1999 edition of LC's "Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual" includes the "Compact disc" note among the examples in the 500 field. The BCC has issued an announcement that encourages "all sound-recording catalogers to return to the previous practice of coding "Compact disc(s)" notes in the 500 field."

Q: Recently, I found a Web site with guitar tablatures for Nanci Griffith's songs. This particular site has only the tabs, no scores. For a Web site, there is no 300 field, but for a paper version, would the 300 field be something like:

```
300 $b 30 p. of music: $b ill.. $c 28 cm.
```

Also, would the subdivision "+v Scores" apply to the subject heading? I searched OCLC but couldn't find an example of anything with just the tabs, although I did find things with scores and tabs.

A: For reasons that have never been entirely clear to me, LC has generally excluded chord diagram books from their music file. So if the site you cite consists of chord diagrams, it would be considered Type "a." I answered a related question in "MOUG Newsletter" no. 69 (April 1998, p. 16), which I append here:

Q: Some time ago, I had sent in a Type Code change request for OCLC #11193392, which is entitled "Mel Bay's dulcimer chord encyclopedia." I wanted it changed from "o" to "a." It seems to me that chord diagrams are generally treated as books by LC, not as scores. For example, see #31520339, Neal Hellman's "Dulcimer chord book." I can find other examples, especially of guitar chord books, if need be, to support this argument. You said something in the latest MOUG Newsletter (no. 68) about this very issue, where you leaned towards scores format for such items. The item in question really is not in musical notation. It has a representation of the fret board of a dulcimer with dots where the fingers are to be placed to give the chord, represented as a letter symbol at the top of the diagram. Do you really think that is a type of score?

A: In various Q&A over the years, I have said to consider such items as scores even when they do not have traditional staff notation. To my mind, this seemed in line with other things that do not have staff notation but are still considered scores (scores that consist entirely of performance notes, all sorts of graphic notation, etc.). As backup evidence, I found numerous LC records that seem to treat such guitar chord collections as scores, but there were as many where they were treated as books. As I so often do when it comes to the REALLY difficult questions, I deferred to the Library of Congress. Dena Davis was kind enough to
provide the following definitive answer: "You might not like my answer since it contradicts your position. We do not consider chord diagram books to be scores if they are exclusively chord diagram books. We even have a policy statement to that effect at the beginning of the Music-File Input-Update Manual under "Scope of the Music File." (The relevant passage in that internal LC document is quite explicit, had I thought to refer to it: "Records for books and book-like materials relating to music but whose primary content is not music notation, such as librettos, songbooks without music, books of chord diagrams, etc., reside in the BOOKS file." That is, they are coded as Type "a."). We treat them as books. If a piece of music is written in chord diagrams or a chord diagram book had enough music in it to be considered music, then we would consider it a score. Another way of looking at it is, since the chord diagram books generally are not musical compositions but information on playing an instrument, then they should not be treated as music. As a result of this, I examined our practice and discovered some recent chord diagram books cataloged in the Music File as scores. We will be correcting those records and sending a reminder to the catalogers of what the appropriate treatment should be."

In other words, such an item would be described simply as "p." rather than as "p. of music" since chord diagrams are not considered to be music, bibliographically. That would also suggest that the form subdivision "+v Scores" would not be appropriate. Check out #33407843, #38174460, and #9394154, for example.

**Summaries of MOUG Sessions**

**Series Authority Workshop**

Presented by Alice LaSota, University of Maryland

Summary by Renée McBride, UCLA, and Alice LaSota

Alice LaSota, Head of Music and Audiovisual Cataloging at the University of Maryland and one of the first two music catalogers to participate in the Library of Congress' (LC) intensive three-day series authority training, presented a "mini-workshop" to MOUG members on February 23, 2000. This was Alice's third such presentation at either MOUG or MLA. General areas covered included fixed and variable fields unique to the series authority record (SAR), issues peculiar to scores and sound recordings, and pitfalls to avoid. Alice noted that whereas name and name-title authority decisions are based on usage and reference sources, series titles are contrived by publishers, and series authority decisions are based on the published item and thorough searching of your bibliographic utility (the keyword "fin se" search is highly recommended). She also emphasized both the value and the necessity of the LC series training for submitting SARs to the national authority file; series could also be submitted through a library's NACO liaison independent in series, but series involving music uniform titles would have to be excluded. Before launching into details, Alice reassured attendees that music series are "not that difficult," and that book series can be much more difficult to work with, due to book publishing's longer history and plethora of languages and publishers.

The bulk of SAR documentation has been revised with clearly written, detailed RI's during the past 4-5 years by Judy Kuhagen, who conducts the LC series authority training workshops. Documentation includes USMARC Authority Format, DCM Z1 "yellow pages," AACR2, and LC Rule Interpretations (LCRI). Alice's handout includes listings of relevant rules in the above sources, as well as a sample series authority workform and definitions of "monographic series" (taken from the glossary of AACR2), "multipart item" (LCRI 1.6), "series-like phrase" (LC series training handout), and "subseries" (AACR2 glossary). LCRI 1.6, p. 2-5, presents ten examples of common series-like phrase situations; please note that this list is not meant to be all-inclusive.

In reviewing the SAR, Alice made the following points:

- Create a constant data record to save time, or use the OCLC authorities macro;
- When a corporate body, other than a commercial publisher with publication responsibility only, is responsible for the series, you must include a 410 +t cross-reference in the SAR;
- LC's practice since December 1989 is to trace all series (i.e., 645 +t a); the default treatment decision for new monographic series is to fully analyze, trace, and classify separately (i.e., 644 +a f, 645 +a t, 646 +a s); for analyzable multipart items, the default decision applies to analysis and tracing;
- +5 DPCC, which you will sometimes see in fields 642 and 645, is the MARC 21 code for the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, and indicates national-level decisions which apply to BIBCO records;
- It is helpful to use LC SARs as examples when creating 667 notes, especially when dealing with series-like phrases.

The discussion of issues peculiar to scores and sound recordings and pitfalls to avoid included the following observations:

- Multipart items are more common in music than book publishing;
- Don't take for granted publisher series statements like Complete piano works; determine the true comprehensiveness of the series with bibliographic searching;
- 100 +t series (e.g. composer or performer series) are more common in music than book publishing.
Alice spent some time explaining when a 100 + t series is and is not appropriate:
- A composer 100 is used when the series represents works by only one composer;
- A performer 100 or 110 is used when a sound recording series is built around a performer;
- When a series highlights both performer and composer, e.g. Bernstein conducts Berlioz, the composer appears in the 100 field;
- When a score series features an editor, a title main entry is used;
- When a series title features a variety of performers and/or composers, a title main entry is used.

Rule 25.5B addresses the use of qualifiers as part of the series title. Alice emphasized the following points regarding qualifiers:
- If a series title conflicts with a serial title, a qualifier is required, therefore you must search the bibliographic file as well as the authority file to determine whether or not you need a qualifier;
- The qualifying terms listed in rule 25.5B are not given in priority order, i.e. you are free to choose the term most appropriate to your situation;
- Any corporate body or place used as a qualifier must be present in the authority file; do not delete, rearrange, or change the punctuation of the established corporate body;
- The qualifier "(Series)" is used when a series title is the name of a corporate body.

When creating an SAR for an entity already represented by an existing NAR, the NAR should be canceled or converted to an SAR. Alice noted that in NARs containing collective uniform titles, e.g.,

Liszt, Franz, t d 1811-1886. t t Piano music. t k
Selections

4XX cross-references can be included without justification in 670 fields. While this makes life easier for the person enhancing the NAR, the lack of 670s makes it very difficult for others to check the bibliographic records of the 4XX sources. When this occurs, it becomes quite challenging to identify those that represent the same bibliographic entity as your series title.

In closing, Alice stressed the importance of LC's series authority training, noting that such training is indeed necessary in order for a library to be able to contribute SARs to the LC authority file. Alice also noted that LC would like to see more music catalogers participate in the training.

If you would like a copy of the workshop handout, you may contact Alice at: al31@umail.umd.edu. Keeping in mind that Alice is not an official reviewer for NACO, you are also invited to contact her with series questions that you encounter.

RILM Abstracts on FirstSearch
Robert Acker, Emma Dederick-Colón, Rebecca Littman

RILM on FirstSearch was evaluated by Robert Acker (DePaul University), Emma Dederick-Colón (Indiana University) and Rebecca Littman (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee). The Automation Requirements for Music Materials (http://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/committee/co_adm_autoreq.htm) (from the Music Library Association's Automation Subcommittee) was used as a basis for evaluation. For the most part, the FirstSearch implementation of the RILM database meets the requirements, with a few important exceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Points</th>
<th>Robert Acker (DePaul University)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liszt, Franz, t d 1811-1886. t t Piano music. t k</strong> Selections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the remarks I have to make about access points refer to the Old FirstSearch version of RILM, the version currently implemented at my library. However, I did gain access to the New FirstSearch for awhile, and I will make comparisons to the new version as I go along. I will also stray occasionally from the Automation Requirements to discuss other access points in this database. All references to title fields in the Automation Requirements should apply to subject searching in RILM as well. Only those segments of the Requirements that are problematic will be mentioned here.

2. Headings and cross-references from name/title authority records, transcribed titles, and uniform titles (including their associated names, if any) will be searchable together by the public (i.e., it will be possible to search a title without knowing what sort of title it is). It should be possible, however, to restrict a search to one type of title only.

One cannot search or browse name/title authority headings or cross-references. Only subject keywords are available for searching and browsing. The subject heading exact phrase index is browseable, but there are no cross-references there. It would be desirable to search and browse the RILM name/title authority file. For example, a search of Handel's Julius Caesar should retrieve the authority file for the correct heading, Giulio Cesare, which should be searchable. In all fairness to OCLC, this is an internal, homegrown thesaurus used at RILM, and I'm not sure how easy it would be to make the authority file available for searching. Certainly there are no links from the authority file to actual records, as far as I can see. Most subject headings are modular in nature; for instance a composer's name, followed by a specific work, followed by more qualifications. One should be aware that if the heading begins with the composers name, first names...
will be spelled out; however, if the composer name is a subheading, only the first initials are used. For example, "Mozart Wolfgang Amadeus," but "Operas - Mozart W.A."

In the question and answer session that followed, Barbara McKenzie from RILM pointed out that the XReference index has searchable cross references. However, it would appear that composer-title cross references are not available at the moment. She also stated that composer name headings are always used when subheadings with composers' first initials exist.

4. It should be possible to search single-character strings in 240, 245, 505, 7XX or 8XX [title and contents notes fields]. In particular, number (usually +o) and key (usually +r) should be fully searchable in these fields.

The single-character "a" is a stopword which cannot be overridden. This is a major problem; an override (using quotes as other systems do) should be possible for this character. Other single-character letters (b through g) are searchable, as are numbers. However, the symbol for sharp (#) is a stopword, since it is used to refer to a FirstSearch statement number. The symbol for flat (b) is the same as the letter b. It would seem this would not be a problem in RILM, since it appears most references to sharps and flats are spelled out.

In NewFirstSearch, it appears that the letter "a" is now searchable, even though documentation still lists it as a stopword. However, including it in a search will result in false drops unless proximity operators are used. E.g., mozart a concerto+ piano retrieves 184 records, including several which have as a subject heading, "Mozart W.A." Users should use adjacency operators in "expert" mode if using this feature. E.g., a w major retrieves relevant results: Kw:mozart concerto+ piano and kw:a w major yields 5 citations.

This brings up a couple of search tips: First, while headings for composers spell out first and second names, composer names as subheadings only give last name followed by first and second initials, as I mentioned previously. For comprehensive searching, it is probably best to include only a last name unless it is likely more than one composer will be retrieved (e.g., Bach, Strauss, or Mozart families).

Secondly: in searching for keys, use the proximity operator with the words "major" or "minor" with the letter of the key: e.g., b w minor, to retrieve works in the key of B Minor.

Searching for the symbol "#" in NewFirstSearch no longer gets an error message, but retrieves unexpected results since it is the symbol for a wildcard search.

At this point I would like to digress by mentioning another useful index which is not included in the Automation requirements but which can be used to narrow searches. That is the Classification index. Using a search in the classification index is a good way to narrow down a search without having to think of subject or keyword terms. E.g., sh:handel and sh:operas and cl:performance practice would be a way for a performer to find information pertinent to performance practice of Handel operas.

A few peculiarities when one browses the exact phrase classification index:
- Performance practice and notation is followed by "performance practice". It would appear that there was a change in usage by RILM at some point.
- Subheadings are alphabetized rather than in logical order (e.g., "--ca. 1600-1825" followed by "--general", then "--notation and paleography" then "--to ca. 1600"

A more general search using "performance practice" (e.g., cl:( performance practice ) ) as a keyword classification search would yield better results.

In addition to classification phrases, it is also possible to limit searches by searching for class number as well. These numbers are not in the help screens, but should be. The numbers may be found in the front matter of printed volumes of RILM as well as on the searching guide Alan Green wrote for the RILM web site, under the "cl" example: http://www.rilm.org/rilm-web.html. The direct link to the class table is http://www.rilm.org/classnum.html. For example, cl:25 and su:violin+ retrieves literature about Baroque violin. (class number 25 is Historical Musicology (western music) to ca. 1750 (Baroque) ). Using class numbers combined with date qualifications is a good way to keep up to date in a particular area, for instance, 01 is Bibliography & Librarianship.

Limiting by document type in both versions of FirstSearch does not break down the different types of articles in the drop-down menus. In addition to periodical articles, article types include articles in books, symposia, festschrift, and other documents. A subject heading search for Handel operas, (sh: (Handel and operas) and dt:art) limited to articles of all types, yields 167 records.

However, it is possible to limit to periodical articles by including it in an Expert search or by using the index labels in a basic search: E.g., sh:(Handel and operas) and dt:ap restricts the "Handel and operas" search to periodical articles, narrowing the results to 80 records.

I was informed that OCLC did not permit RILM to have more than 5 document type limiters when the database indexes and limits were set up in 1995-96. If OCLC chooses
not to provide more choices of article types in basic and advanced searches in NewFirstSearch, at least these types should be mentioned in help screens, with search tips on how to restrict searches in expert mode to particular types of articles.

Stop lists and synonym lists

1. The system should allow any stop list to be locally defined. This is not possible, nor possibly desirable, but there should be an override. It would appear that "a" is no longer a stopword in the New FirstSearch implementation of RILM, even though it is still included in the system stopword list.

2. The system should allow the creation of a locally defined synonym list, so that a search entered in one way (e.g., with a common misspelling) will be performed as if it had been entered as defined in the list (e.g., correctly spelled). If such a synonym list exists, it will be possible to override it during a search.

No synonym lists exist, either system-wide or locally defined. However, it is possible to use truncation, plural, and wildcard characters to expand one's search in expert search mode. It would be nice to have such a synonym list (e.g., for multilingual musical terms), or at least a plurals function, but also for variant spellings of composers names, English vs. original-language titles, etc. Thus users could search for "sonata" or "symphony" and also retrieve "sonatas" or "symphonies," respectively. I have seen online systems such as Dialog implement such a plurals function with the option to turn it off if an exact search is desired. Apparently the NISC version of RILM has such a synonym list, with the option of turning it off for exact matches. As for a synonym list, perhaps MOUG and the RILM office should work together to supply one for OCLC.

Note: in the question and answer session that followed, it was agreed that authority cross-references would be a better means to solve the problem of variant spellings of composer names and titles of compositions.

E. Index Attributes

d. Subjects (6XX).

In old FirstSearch, the default index is Subject, which to an inexperienced user is somewhat confusing, since this index includes title and abstract fields as well as the subject heading field. To limit to subject headings, the subject heading field (sh) is available. In NewFirstSearch, the su: and sh: keyword indexes are not currently present but will be added in the near future.

Conclusion

For the most part searching is quite flexible in RILM. The database's authority file is homegrown and modular in character. It would be nice to have access to Composer and composition title cross-references, but in all fairness this is something that OCLC and the producer of the RILM database will have to work out. In the meantime I would encourage searchers to be flexible, to search not only subject headings but also abstracts and titles (i.e., keyword searches), since studies covering several works will only get a more general subject heading. For instance, if several Handel operas are discussed in an article, the subject heading would be Handel, georg frederic - operas. The individual operas discussed would be listed in the abstract, if we're lucky! As is the case with any database searching, one must be flexible and broaden a search if not enough information is retrieved. For example, broaden a search to "Handel operas" to find citations that might cover the particular opera for which one needs information.

While the single-character string "a" is not easily searchable, I would question how important it is in this database, since keys are rarely given in subject headings. Work numbers are more often given, and using a single letter, unless one uses proximity, will most likely retrieve a composer's first initials rather than the intended key. Naive or inexperienced users would require special assistance and instruction in using proximity searching.

Similarly, the symbols for sharps and flats are not used in RILM but are spelled out. While using the "#" symbol no longer results in an error message in New FirstSearch, it retrieves unexpected results since it is a truncation symbol.

I would like to see more detailed limiting of article types, (that is to say, include a limit to periodical articles) since naive users selecting this limit are expecting periodical articles and not articles in books and other materials. If this is not practicable, at least search hints should be provided on how to limit in expert mode.

I would also hope that the "help" screens describing the various indexes in RILM are expanded and include more meaningful examples. I am sure that some of us in the user community could assist in that regard if needed.

I hope that OCLC will consider implementing these suggestions, and that this discussion will stimulate you to find creative ways to search the database. I also encourage you to share your own experiences and strategies for effective searching in RILM.

In the question and answer session that followed, Barbara Mackenzie from RILM pointed out that the Xreference index
has searchable cross references. However, it would appear that composer-title cross references are not available at the moment. She also reported that there would be a reload of the database in the fall with several enhancements, including the addition of direct links to parent-child records for chapters and books in citations. She encouraged us to recommend other changes for this reload, since OCLC would not likely make a similar reload for some time.

A discussion of synonym lists arrived at a consensus that, for composer names and composition titles, links from the authority file would be more desirable. A synonym list would be more appropriate for multilingual musical terms.

A Search History should be available from all in-house terminals; other modes of searching should be available from all staff terminals.

A. General

1. All search options applicable to public use will be available from all in-house terminals; other modes of searching should be available from all staff terminals.
   • Doesn’t apply.

2. It should be possible to search using either menus or commands, both separately and in combination.
   • Meets this requirement. Through the Advanced Search one can combine menus and/or commands (labels) for a search.

3. The system will to the greatest extent possible ignore or forgive errors in spacing, punctuation, and diacritics.
   • Double spaces and punctuation are ignored in the keyword search not in the exact phrase. (e.g., au=Lasocki, David = 0 hits, au:Lasocki, David = 75 hits).
   su: or = David Lasocki = 4 hits (searches title, abstract and subject indexes)
   sub auth ref (keyword): same as an keyword or exact phrase

Diacritics are not included in the bibliographic records but if one supplies them in the search it ignores them in both the Keyword Search and the Exact Phrase. (e.g., au:Bártok Bela=37 hits, au=Bártok Bela 31 hits ; au:Bartok Bela=37 hits (including records for Bela Bartok, Jr.)

4. A search history will be available to the user; this history will display the number of hits for each search step and will be viewable without losing the current search.
   • A Search History is available. To see the Search History one needs to start a new Search Screen and select the History button. By doing this FirstSearch assumes that you want to combine a new search with the previous search and includes the last search executed in the Word,Phrase search box(es).

The Search History Screen displays the number of hits for each search step. Allowing to execute the last search without re-keying the data in a number of ways: 1) by selecting the Results button or the Record button either at the top or at the bottom of the Search History Screen; 2) by selecting the link from the last Previous Search listed; 3) by selecting the Return button from the Search History Screen which will bring you back to a Search Screen with the words (or search number) of the last search executed included in the Word,Phrase search box; or 4) by selecting the Back button in your browser until you get to your last search (Caution: FirstSearch may loose your data depending on how long you have been online).

5. Online, context-sensitive help will be available at any time without losing the search in progress.
   • Extensive Help is available, context sensitive to the search technique for FirstSearch, but not to the RILM database. It recognizes which database you are searching and gives you a link to the limited help guide for that particular database. Examples are not customized for RILM.

When one selects help from the Main Search Screen (for either Basic or Advanced Search, one is thrown into the general FirstSearch help and from there one must select the RILM Database Help Topics menu (the database specific help) which provides the information below. The two most relevant sections are Indexes and Labels and the Search tips.

Following is the database specific help menu for RILM:
Why select this database?
Subjects included
Coverage/update frequency (1960, updated monthly)
Indexes and Labels
Basic searches
Exact-phrase searches
Searching tips
More Online help (for FirstSearch not RILM)

Through the help menus, whenever it applies, FirstSearch provides a link to the related section of the Database Specific Help, in this case RILM. (e.g., when referring to the usage of the Index Labels in the Command Search Guide, a link to the Index Labels for RILM is provided)

Selecting the Exit Help button from any Help Screen will take you back to your search in progress, or you can use the Results button or the Records button.

It would be useful if help files were searchable and if the RILM help guide could include music related examples. The
Index Labels need to be defined, including the Default Index. For those that search more than one index at a time, information on which indexes they are searching should be included next to the label listing. The RILM Website: RILM on OCLC FirstSearch by Alan Green (www.rilm.org/rilm-web.html) provides helpful information about RILM. It would be useful to have all related help in one place.

B. Searching

1. The end result of any search will be the same regardless of the order of steps (e.g., whether one searches author-then-title, or title-then-author, the end result will be the same).
   • Meets this requirement.

2. Search options will remain substantially the same (as far as this is consistent with logic) regardless of the order of steps.
   • Meets this requirement.

3. It will be possible to obtain appropriate bibliographic records through any type of initial search, without re-keying (e.g., to search on a name-title cross-reference would cause the necessary chain reaction leading to records using the proper uniform title).
   • Does not meet this requirement. An initial search does not lead you to the appropriate authority record. One can search the Xreference Index for certain names but the reference found does not link you to the correct form of name. One has to do a new search and re-key the correct form of name. If using the exact phrase index, one has to be careful not to include the punctuation given in the authority record (e.g., searching for Tchaikovsky in the Xreference (keyword) Index will retrieve an authority record showing Cățkovskij, Petr II'c as the form used by RILM. Typing the punctuation in an Exact Phrase Index will result in 0 hits).

   It would be useful to have hyper links provided in the Authority file, which will automatically execute the search for the correct form of name. Hyper linking will also be useful within the elements of the bibliographic record (e.g., Author Index, linking to other works by the author cited; Subject Headings, and other indexes in the bibliographic record).

   One could consider the Exact Phrase Index Browsing as an alternative to the authority file (for the author, classification, title, journal title, and subject heading indexes).

   “Browse Index lets you:
   Verify that a word or phrase exists in an index
   Check the spelling or spelling variations of a word
   See how many records in the database contain your word
   Check the wording of an exact phrase”

   The Related Subjects option is the only type of cross-reference that I could find (see also type). One could Limit Current Search with Selected Subject Headings to narrow a search or use the Subject listing to retrieve related articles.

4. Searches in which multiple indexes can be combined on the same search line (or the equivalent in GUI systems) will be allowed.
   • This is possible through both the Command Search (with labels) (in the Basic and Advanced Search) and through the Advanced Search (by entering one Word, Phrase per Index).

5. Full Boolean searching will be available; this includes searching by any combination of access points, or by more than one term from a single access point.
   • Meets this requirement. One can select any combination of indexes in the Command Search or in the Advanced Search.

6. In searches drawing upon more than one index, it will be possible to specify the index to be searched for a particular data element.
   • Meets this requirement. This is possible by doing a Command Search with Index Labels or by selecting an index from the Index or the Keyboard Index menus of the Advanced and the Basic Search.

7. It will be possible to interrupt a long search (a search in which the results are taking a long time to be retrieved and displayed), with patron options to revise, see partial results, continue, abandon the search, etc.
   • All searches were retrieved fast enough which didn’t allow me to try this feature effectively. My previous experience has been that one could use the Stop button from the Browser and successfully stop any searches in progress. No partial results can be seen. To display results from a stopped search one could use the Reload button from the Browser (Repost from data).

   Revise/continue/abandon a search can be done by using the Back button on the Browser or by selecting the Search button which will include the last search executed in the Word, Phrase search box(es).

8. It should be possible to specify adjacency as well as single words.
   • Meets this requirement.
   Adjacency:
   N (near)
   Type n between two words – (two words in any order)
   Type n and a number (1-25) between two words – records found contain both words, in any order, with no more than that number of other words between them.
N can be use in a Keyword Index only, it cannot use n in an Exact-Phrase Index.

W (with)
Type w between two words – (two words, in the order typed)
Type w and a number (1-25) between two words – records found contain both words, in the order typed, with no more than that number of other words between them.
W can be use in a Keyword Index only, it cannot be use in an Exact-Phrase Index.

Boolean Logic [AND, OR, NOT, ( )]
Single words:
Default Word,Phrase = AND allowing single word searching.
Boolean Logic [AND, OR, NOT]
N (2-25)
W (2-25)

9. It will be possible to limit a search, either at the beginning or at any time during the search, by any currently valid format or other data coded in the MARC record in the fixed fields, 006, 007, or 008, or given in the 245 rh. It should be possible to limit by other criteria specified by the local library, such as location, date, or publisher.

- One can limit the records any time during the search in the Advanced Search, on the Search Screen or on the Search Results Screen before FirstSearch processes your search.
- In Basic Search one can limit the records on the Search Results Screen after FirstSearch processes the search.

There are different types of Limits one can apply in different ways (see below). It is possible to limit by date. The publisher field is indexed and one can do a combine search specifying the publisher in the Publisher Index, this will limit records retrieved to the publisher requested. This works only for records added after 1988. One can use the Browse Index to determine which key words to use when searching for a particular publisher. RILM uses a keyword approach for the Publisher Index (e.g., a search with Indiana in the Publisher (Keyword) Index will retrieve publishers with Indiana in their name = Indiana University Press, Indiana State University, etc.).

MARC format is not applicable.

Limits options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years:</th>
<th>(Format = yyyy-yyyy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type:</td>
<td>Books; Articles; Commentary; Media; Diss; Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language:</td>
<td>English; French; German; Italian; Polish; Russian; Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Limit By Subject Heading (Other Limit Settings Ignored)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose subjects headings from the current search

One desirable feature will be to limit searches to holdings in local library or state.

10. Coded data that can be incorporated into a search will be available to patrons in an expanded, readily intelligible form. This form may be built into the system or may be specified by the individual library.
- N/A

11. It will be possible to include in search strings any symbol currently included in the American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII) character set or a system-defined synonym for any such symbol. For example, the musical symbols for sharp and flat will be fully searchable.
- The ‘b’ (as in flat) and ‘#’, symbols are searchable in FirstSearch.
- The sharp (#) symbol causes the system to display the following error message: "Result sets are indicated by # followed by a result set number."

To search for “#” and “b” keys use: f-sharp, e-flat / f sharp, e flat / f-dur and c-moll. This could be addressed in the guide to RILM.

b w major [in Subject (keyword) Index] = 26 records
E w flat w major [in Subject (keyword) and Title (keyword) Index] = 1 hit

Last year the FirstSearch WorldCat Review Task Force made the following recommendation for FirstSearch:

"word or phrase" terminology is misleading. Default search for multiple words with no operators is "and" across whatever type of search is being performed. In order to search a phrase, one would have to use a proximity operator (w) or use an Exact Phrase Index (e.g., ti= ‘"

There have been no modifications regarding this issue.

Display
---
| Rebecca Littman (UW-Milwaukee) |

The display features of RILM on the new FirstSearch were discussed last by Rebecca Littman of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. As with the Searching, Indexing, and General portions of the automation requirements, there are several elements in the display requirements that are not applicable to a bibliographic database such as RILM. But overall they could be easily adapted to fit.

A. General

Requirements such the display of the initial search string and total hits returned are easily met, as are the display of author and title (equivalent to 1XX and 245 MARC fields). The
concept of uniform title (240) is not applicable. The suggestion was put forth that this space could be used to turn the "brief display" into a true brief record that includes the journal title, volume, and page number, etc. Thus providing users with the information needed to track the item down without having to go into the full record. This would result in a reduced load on the OCLC servers by largely eliminating the user's need to toggle back and forth between the list view and the full record.

B. Individual Record Display

In the full record display the requirement that labels be in full-text, non-coded terminology is met well.

Where there is a problem is in the case of a journal whose title is an acronym or abbreviation (e.g. FoMRHI - Fellowship of Makers and Restorers of Historical Instruments). No cross referencing exists to provide clearer information such as the name of the publishing organization or an ISSN, to verify the publication. The table version of the list of titles included in RILM on FirstSearch that is accessible does not include ISSNs at all.

Flexibility of display, such as AACR2 vs. MARC orders, at the institution level is a liability in a bibliographic database environment because it opens up the possibility of the user being confused if the information they are looking for is in a different place on different campuses. OCLC's inflexibility in this case is, in fact, a good thing.

C. Multiple Matches

Multiple matches for journals and festschriften are a necessity in order to gain access to articles within the journals and festschriften as long as full source information is provided in each entry. Display errors have been found on occasion. RILM is working with OCLC to correct the problem.

Limiting searches by elements like document type, language, or year, is expanded in the new FirstSearch and does seem to work well.

D. Sorting of Bibliographic Citations

This is where RILM on new FirstSearch fails. While the system appears to provide both pre- and post-search sorting, neither seems to actually work. An example was shown of a pre-search sort by descending date where the records showed up in the following date order: 1997, 1990, 1989, 1996, 1991. An example of a post-search sort by descending date was shown where the results displayed in the following date order: 1990, 1972, 1997, 1974, 1974, 1988, 1974, 1975, 1989. No reason for the lack of sorting could be determined.

The new FirstSearch has excellent "signage" to facilitate moving around in the database. A clearly labeled side-bar provides quick links back to the brief title lists and previous searches. Clear instructions on how to print or e-mail records are also available. However, all guides to searching are FirstSearch-related, not database-specific. There is virtually no online information that directly relates to RILM itself. Clicking on the "help" button at the top of the screen results in a table of contents list of FirstSearch help at the bottom of which is a choice to read "about the selected database." This reveals only a very general description of RILM. As mentioned earlier the list of journal titles indexed in RILM does not include ISSNs or cross-references of any kind.
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