OLAC NEWSLETTER
Volume 14, Number 4
December 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- OCLC Now Accepting Electronic Error Reports
- Call For Contributions (MC Journal)
- New CAPC Subcommittee Formed
- CAPC Audience Characteristics Subcommittee Charge

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

FROM THE EDITOR
Sue Neumeister

I would like to thank all the OLAC/MOUG Conference workshop reporters for submitting their informative summaries in time to be included in this issue. They have done a wonderful job!

There is still time to submit names for Vice President/President Elect and for Treasurer of OLAC. Sheila Smyth, Chair of the OLAC Nominating Committee, will be accepting nominations until January 6, 1995.

As always, this issue is printed before the ALA Midwinter schedule is published, so I will post those meetings of interest to OLAC on AUTOCAT and Emedia shortly after the schedule is made available. I can tell you that OLAC will meet on Friday, Feb. 3 (CAPC), Saturday, Feb. 4 (Business), and Sunday, Feb. 5 (Board) at 8:00-10:00 p.m. each night. Please check the ALA schedule for places.

Since the September Newsletter, there have been two new OLAC appointments. Pat Thompson is the CC:DA Audience Observer and Molly Hand is the ALCTS AV liaison. Their addresses are:

> Pat Thompson
> DuPont Library
> University of the South
> Sewanee, TN 37383
> pthompso@serap1.sewanee.edu
>
> Molly Hand
> McConnell Library
> Radford University
> Radford, VA 24142
> mhand@ruacad.ac.runet.edu

The *OLAC Newsletter* is a great place to share your ideas. The staff is always looking for special interest articles, book reviews, meeting announcements, and reports of interest to our membership. Please contact any member of the Newsletter staff if you would like to make a contribution.

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Mary Konkel

I don't know about you, but I am still "psyched," if I may borrow a word from my 12 year old daughter's vocabulary, from the energy and information gained from the joint OLAC/MOUG Conference held October 5-8 at the Chicago Marriott in Oak Brook, Illinois. Please join me in acknowledging Ellen Hines (Arlington Heights Memorial Library), Hal Temple (College of DuPage), and their very hard-working committee members from the OLAC and MOUG memberships for a job exceptionally done.

We also could not have done it without our key speakers, Carolyn Frost, Karen Horny, Joan Swanekamp, and Sheila Intner and the following workshop leaders: Laurel Jizba, Ann Sandberg-Fox, Nancy John, Leslie Troutman, Michelle Koth, Kathryn Burnett, Sue Stancu, Jay Weitz, Jose Diaz, Nancy Olson, Catherine Gerhart, Anke Gray, David Miller, and Glenn Patton.

Thanks also go to Baker & Taylor Books, Facets Multimedia, Innovative Interfaces, OCLC, and Professional Media Service Corporation for their generosity and sponsorship. I would also like to thank the many library institutions-- public, academic, and special who gave us numerous hours of their staff's time for planning, meeting, and delivering to us a conference of this caliber.

It was my pleasure to have had the opportunity to address you at the conference and meet many of you in person. OLAC conferences have always had a reputation for providing practical continuing education, opportunities for networking, and good food, friends, and fun. I hope you were able to avail yourself to all of the above. Those of you who were unable to join us, be sure to read the conference reports in this issue.

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Molly Hand from Radford University in Virginia as the OLAC Liaison to the ALCTS AV Committee. An experienced AV cataloger, Molly has also served as a member of the AV Committee in its "RTSD days" and was a member of the RTSD AV Subcommittee on Publisher, Distributor, and Library Relations. We look forward to Molly's reports.

As the remaining leaves just barely cling to the trees, I know winter is just around the corner, but happily along with it comes the holidays. I want to wish you all a wonderful holiday season and a happy, healthy and productive year. Hope to see you at ALA in Philadelphia!

FROM THE TREASURER
Johanne LaGrange

```
Reporting period:        July 1, 1994-September 30, 1994
Membership:              703
  Institutional - 305
  Personal      - 398

ACCOUNT BALANCE:  June 30, 1994

  Merrill Lynch WCMA Account      17,038.84
  CD at 7.20% matures 7/94        10,000.00
                                              27,038.84

INCOME

  Back Issues                         48.50
  Dividends--WCMA Account            240.72
  Interest--CD                       364.00
  Memberships                        942.00
  Royalties
      Cat. Unpub. Nonprin. Mat.      718.24
      Phys. Proc. Man ... advance    250.00
      Total Royalties                968.24

  TOTAL INCOME                                 2,563.46

EXPENSES

  Banking Fees
      Activity Fee                     2.10
      Annual Fee                      80.00
      Total Banking Fees              82.10
  Financial Consultant (T. Hoppel)   100.00
  Labels, Envelopes & Supplies        27.34
  OLAC Board Dinner (Conference)     259.87
  OLAC Newsletter (v.14, no.3)     1,380.32
  Photocopies                         91.07
  Postage/Permit                      24.97
  Publication (Phys.Proc.Man. ... ) 197.44
  Stipends                           962.50

  TOTAL EXPENSES                              (3,125.61)

ACCOUNT BALANCE: September 30, 1994

  Merrill Lynch WCMA Account                  26,476.69
```

ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
OLAC/MOUG NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Minutes

CAPC Chair Richard Harwood called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m. and introduced the Committee.

Members present: Lowell Ashley, Susan Bailey, Virginia Berringer, Diane Boehr, Nancy Rodich-Hodges, and Pat Thompson.

The minutes of the June 24 meeting were approved with one correction. On p.12 last paragraph, Delacorte should read Dellaporta.

1. **Review of activity since June meeting**

   R. Harwood reviewed the activity of the Committee since June. In September, the Committee submitted a proposal to CC:DA to change 7.7B2 to incorporate language-based enhancements to videos and films. It looked much the same as reviewed by the Committee in July with some slight changes in the "justification" section. Harwood also sent a letter to Harriet Harrison at CPSO requesting that LC revise its rule interpretation 7.7B2 to reflect the substance of CAPC's rule proposal so that implementation will not have to wait for CC:DA to finish its work. P. Thompson indicated that she had heard of a few more uses for this kind of captioning, namely, late night viewing when others are sleeping in the same room, and the ability to "hear" what's going on even in a noisy place. Harwood thanked D. Boehr for spearheading the writing of this proposal.

2. **Charge to Audience Characteristics (6xx Field) Subcommittee**

   The charge to the Audience Characteristics Subcommittee was discussed and approved. The Subcommittee will look at a number of things that have to do with improving access to audience characteristics for media materials. [See p. 48 in this issue for the text of the charge. --ed.]

3. **Update on Music Video Working Group**

   L. Ashley updated everyone on the status of the guide for cataloging music videos. The guide is looking for possible publication possibilities, the primary one at the moment is the MLA Technical Report Series. The MLA Working Group was initially appointed to produce a guide to the cataloging of videocassettes related to music or music itself. They were to address all areas of the cataloging of these materials, not just description but access also. The choice of entry was especially problematic. Some music people want main entry under uniform title for the piece of music or under performer. Although this is still controversial the Working Group is recommending the more common main entry under title for these works which is prescribed in the rules as written. CC:DA was consulted and they have indicated that under the current rules these would go under title.

The guide covers much more than choice of entry. It includes how to draw on other chapters as needed. It will be advertised in the OLAC Newsletter when final publication plans are made.

4. **Draft letter to Program for Cooperative Cataloging**

   R. Harwood distributed a draft letter to the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. Although the new organizational structure of this body will not allow for liaisons, per se, they are interested in having help with the development of the core level record for AV materials. They also might be interested in a group that could serve as a funnel for NACO activities based on AV formats. The draft letter includes OLAC's concerns and an offer to be involved in these activities. Many of the specifics about how the PCC will be run in the future are not known at this time but it is not too early to express interest. Harwood asked specifically if people had concerns about the letter itself. There was concern that the statistics were not quite the right ones to use. There was a feeling that some statistics indicating how much libraries spend on media and what the relationship is between, say, sound recording spending and video spending would be very useful. Also, it would be good to attach the "Rationale for Cataloging Nonbook Collections" just completed. Harwood also indicated that he will be getting more information in the letter about the membership of OLAC. If there are other comments, please send them to Harwood.

5. **The meeting adjourned at 8:15 a.m.**

Respectfully submitted,
   Catherine Gerhart
   OLAC Secretary

ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)
BUSINESS MEETING
OLAC/MOUG NATIONAL CONFERENCE
OAK BROOK, ILLINOIS
October 7, 1994

Minutes

1. **Call to Order, Introduction of Officers, Announcements**

   The Business meeting was called to order by OLAC President Mary Konkel at 10:35 a.m. Officers present: Heidi Hutchinson (Vice President/President Elect), Johanne LaGrange (Treasurer), Catherine Gerhart (Secretary), Sue Neumeister (Newsletter Editor), Karen Driessen (Past President), Richard Harwood (CAPC Chair). Konkel also introduced the liaisons: Ann Caldwell (OLAC Liaison to

MOUG), John Attig (OLAC Liaison to MARBI), Pat Thompson (CC:DA Audience Observer), Martha Yee (OLAC Liaison to the Association of Moving Image Archivists). There is one vacant position, the OLAC Liaison to ALCTS AV, which is in the process of being filled. Konkel asked that anyone interested in this position should contact a Board member.

Elections are coming up and currently nominations are being sought for the offices of Vice President/President Elect and Treasurer. If you are interested in running for office or have someone that you would like to nominate, names may be sent to Sheila Smyth, Chair of the OLAC Nominating Committee. Her address is in the September 1994 issue of the OLAC Newsletter.

M. Konkel announced that the "Rationale for Cataloging Nonprint Collections" is now finished thanks to the Cataloging Policy Committee. [See the September OLAC Newsletter for text of the Rationale. --ed.]

2. **Secretary's Report (C. Gerhart)**

   The minutes of the Business meeting of June 25, 1994 (ALA Annual meeting, Miami Beach) were approved as published in the September 1994 *OLAC Newsletter.*

3. **Vice President's Report (H. Hutchinson)**

   Hutchinson reported on the work of the Board to give the Vice President/President Elect a permanent job. The Board has passed the following motion unanimously: The Vice President will have and carry through his or her presidency responsibility for being the Board contact person for the OLAC Conference Planning Committee from the Committee's appointment to the end of the planning process. Note that this means it will fall to alternating Vice Presidents. The Board felt that it would simplify the process for the Planning Committees for OLAC conferences because they previously had to work with three different presidencies. They will now know that there is one person they can correspond with on the Board and, we hope, this will mean it will be more convenient for them.

4. **Treasurer's Report (J. LaGrange)**

   The second quarter 1994 report was published in the September 1994 issue of *OLAC Newsletter*. J. LaGrange updated the member numbers. There are 703 memberships, of which 305 are institutional memberships and 398 are personal memberships. As of June 30, 1994 the balance was $27,038.84. Although preliminary, the income as it stands now for this quarter is $2,542.61 and the expenses are $3,157.63, giving us a preliminary total of $26,423.82.

5. **Newsletter Editor's Report (S. Neumeister)**

A few copies of the September issue of the Newsletter are available at the conference if anyone would like them. The deadline for the next issue of the Newsletter is November 1. For those who are writing workshop reports, the deadline to get them to Ian Fairclough (Conference Reports Editor) is also November 1. S. Neumeister asked if there was anyone attending LC's Seminar on Cataloging Digital Documents and willing to write a report for the Newsletter. [See Anke Gray's report on p. 40 of this issue. -- ed.]

6. **Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) (R. Harwood)**

Please see separately submitted minutes of the CAPC meeting [p. 5-6] in this issue.

7. **OLAC Award (K. Driessen)**

The OLAC Award Committee is chaired by Karen Driessen with Heidi Hutchinson and Diane Boehr also serving. It is time again for everyone to consider sending in a nominee for this award. It honors a librarian who has made significant contributions to the advancement and understanding of AV cataloging. These nominations need to be sent to Karen by November 15th. Address and details appear in the September issue of the *OLAC Newsletter.*

8. **Library of Congress, Utility and Other Reports**
   a. **Library of Congress** (M. Konkel for Harriet Harrison)

   The new Chief of the Special Materials Cataloging Division (SMCD) is Susan H. Vita, who has been Acting Chief since November 1993.

   Beginning last June, music catalogers in SMCD's Music and Sound Recordings Teams 1 and 2 began cataloging directly on OCLC using national enhance mode. For the first time, LC's music catalogers are copy cataloging using our records. 11,582 books, scores, sound recordings, and added volumes were cataloged last fiscal year.

   Using a SWAT team/production level cataloging approach, which they have christened the PARTITUR Ensemble (PLC Arrearage Reduction Team Insuring Timely Universal Retrieval), Teams 1 and 2 will be tackling a 5,800 score arrearage, which is targeted for a March 30, 1995 completion.

   SMCD's Team 3 is handling the copy cataloging of popular music sound recordings in English, Spanish and French, and brief records of those recordings not found on OCLC. Team 3 cataloged 21,105 sound recordings last fiscal year.

Norma Hendrickson is the Acting Team Leader of SMCD's Computer Files Team which includes 4 catalogers and 1 technician. This is a relatively new team, having grown out of the former AV Section.

The Computer Files Team handles the cataloging of monographic computer files. Serial computer files are cataloged on CONSER by the Serial Record Division.

The CF Team is in the process of inventorying its shelves of interactive multimedia and is ready to begin cataloging these materials using the new interactive multimedia guidelines published by ALA this summer.

Two lists of format integration changes have already been made to the MUMS files at LC. A date of actual implementation will be worked out between LC, OCLC, and RLIN. The last LC phase of format integration concerns the Leader and 00X fields. Work will begin on this last phase in 1995.

b. **OCLC** (Glenn Patton)

Please see separately submitted report [p. 44] in this issue.

c. **RLG** (Ed Glazier)

Please see separately submitted report [p. 43] in this issue.

d. **Report from MOUG Liaison** (A. Caldwell)

A. Caldwell urged everyone to consider becoming MOUG members. There are registration forms in the conference packet. She also announced that The Best of MOUG is in its 5th edition and is currently available. Also, the NACO Music Project is trying to increase its membership so if you are interested in possibly contributing authority records for music headings please contact Mickey Koth or Ann Caldwell.

e. **Report on the Physical Processing of AV Materials Manual** (S. Smyth)

Sheila reported that A Library Manager's Guide to the Physical Processing of Nonprint Materials by K. Driessen and S. Smyth will be published in January 1995. She also thanked the many institutions and colleagues that have helped contribute to and edit the manual.

9. **New Business**

There was no new business.

10. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Catherine Gerhart
OLAC Secretary

ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)
BOARD MEETING
OLAC/MOUG NATIONAL CONFERENCE
OAK BROOK, ILLINOIS
October 7, 1994

Minutes

1. **Call to Order, Introductions, Announcements (M. Konkel)**

The Board meeting was called to order by OLAC President Mary Konkel at 6:35 p.m.

Members present: Mary Konkel (President), Heidi Hutchinson (Vice President/President Elect), Catherine Gerhart (Secretary), Johanne LaGrange (Treasurer), Sue Neumeister (Newsletter Editor), Karen Driessen (Past President)

Guests: Ellen Hines and Hal Temple (1994 Conference Chairs), Pat Thompson, Laurel Jizba.

E. Hines reported that a total of 290 people registered for the conference. They were very pleased with the staff and accommodations at the hotel. The comments in general have been very good in terms of the workshops. In the future, the Planning Committee may want to ask workshop leaders whether they prefer to present their workshops in the morning or afternoon. Hines commented that the only way so many people got their first choice of workshops was the flexibility of the workshop leaders.

K. Driessen commented on the excellent core group of conference planners and complimented them on their handling of the rough and smooth times leading up to the conference. M. Konkel requested that E. Hines and H. Temple make a list of the people that need to get thank you letters, including the hotel, the exhibitors, tour guides, workshop leaders, etc.

M. Konkel requested that the evaluations be typed up verbatim and sent to the Board. E. Hines requested some funds be set aside for a small celebration for the Conference Planning Committee. Konkel asked the Committee to also make a list for the next Planning Committee of the things that worked very well and those that did not work well. C. Gerhart asked if workshop leaders could get a copy of the comments from their workshops. No one thought it had been done in the past, but most thought that it was a good idea and the Committee will attempt to do it. L. Jizba and Ann Sandberg-Fox would especially benefit from this type of feedback since they intend to do the Interactive Multimedia Workshop again in the future. E. Hines also suggested that a software program to help with scheduling would have been very beneficial. (ACTION)

2. **Treasurer's Report/Update (royalties) (J. LaGrange)**

OLAC has received a royalty check from Soldier Creek Press for $718.24 for Cataloging Unpublished Nonprint Materials by Verna Urbanski. A total of 800 copies (500, 1st printing and 300, 2nd printing) have been printed. Also, OLAC has received $250.00 on advances on K. Driessen and S. Smyth's book. OLAC might consider advertising these publications in the Newsletter. (ACTION)

3. **Newsletter Editor's Report/Update (S. Neumeister)**

The deadline for the next issue of the Newsletter is November 1.

4. **Membership Directory Update (H. Hutchinson)**

There have been some delays in getting the Directory off the ground. Brian McCafferty is currently working on getting a letter out to the membership verifying the information currently held for each member and asking for some additional details. There were some technical problems but they have been resolved. It was decided that the Directory needed some prefatory material which H. Hutchinson will write. The question of putting the Directory on a Gopher was discussed but there were some questions about having people's addresses and phone numbers available to anyone who wanted them. Other groups sell their mailing lists but members have the option of removing their names from the lists. M. Konkel asked that this idea be brought up again at a later time for further discussion.

5. **OLAC Birthday Party Update (M. Konkel, K. Driessen)**

M. Konkel reported that the party would occur in a hotel room at the ALA Annual Conference in June. Formal invitations will be sent out to all past OLAC Presidents and award winners. The party will take the place of the Q&A Session after the Business meeting. For those Presidents and award winners who are unable to attend, it would be nice to find a way to include them through a phone call or a video taped message. It was requested that Ben Tucker also be contacted.

A general announcement will be made so that as many people can attend as possible. (ACTION)

6. **Appointments**
    a. **CAPC** (M. Konkel for R. Harwood)

        R. Harwood's term on CAPC is ending so the Board needs to start thinking about his replacement. Suggestions were made and will be followed up by M. Konkel. (ACTION)

        There will also be openings on CAPC to fill in the near future.

    b. **ALCTS AV Liaison** (M. Konkel)

        Due to the resignation of Anne Moore, there is a vacancy for the ALCTS AV Liaison. There are some good candidates and the Board will need to decide on an appointment in the next month. The information about each person interested will be sent out as soon as possible so this appointment can be made. (ACTION)

    c. **CC:DA Audience Observer** (M. Konkel)

        P. Thompson has been appointed to this position. In the past, getting documentation for CC:DA meetings has been a problem but various people will try to get her a copy of at least the agenda.

7. **OLAC Handbook Updates**
    a. **Service in More than One Capacity** (M. Konkel)

        After much discussion it was agreed that some kind of statement is needed in the OLAC Handbook regarding the issue of service in more than one capacity. It should indicate that a person should not serve on a committee and be a liaison from OLAC to the same committee at the same time. There was disagreement about whether a person could be an OLAC liaison to a committee and be a Board member at the same time. The other impetus for this policy, which was taken out of the justification in this draft, concerned that of spreading the work of OLAC among as many people as possible. Most thought that if this was the primary reason it should be put back in.

        The other issue concerns the gap between the resignation and the appointing of a new liaison. The main problem occurs if the vacancy happens right before a meeting. It is difficult to get the meeting covered in time. This will need to be addressed in a different place in the Handbook.

It was agreed that it is okay to have a short time lag between a resignation and an appointment. If the vacancy occurs right before a meeting the person resigning will be asked to continue until other arrangements can be made. The President will appoint a temporary replacement, if needed, using suggestions from the resigning person and the Board. M. Konkel will write another draft incorporating these suggestions. Also add a note saying: Elected officers are now covered in the new Bylaws recommendation. (ACTION)

b. **OCLC Users Council** (M. Konkel)

This topic stems from OLAC's interest in getting more involved in what OCLC is doing. M. Konkel has investigated the history of this liaison and there is nothing formal, but OCLC does consider it an official representative. OCLC sends the representative the agendas so that it can be determined if attendance would be beneficial. The Council meets three times a year so the suggested amount of $300 annually may not cover all three meetings depending on how far away the representative lives. It was suggested to change the third paragraph to read: "To assist in travel and lodging expenses, OLAC may commit up to $300 annually for Council attendance to be used at the contact person's discretion at one, two, or all three meetings. If the President is unable to attend, efforts will be made to designate an alternate geographically convenient to the Columbus area." If MOUG is interested, the Board may ask them to be our alternate when needed.

It was suggested that the last sentence of the second paragraph be made the second sentence of the paragraph. It was decided that the OCLC Users Council will be inserted after the section on liaisons. (ACTION)

c. **Elections** (H. Hutchinson)

In the last election, some difficulties occurred that were not spelled out completely enough in our Bylaws. The draft procedure being discussed is an attempt to clarify the Bylaws. It was suggested that since only personal members can vote, we need to add a statement indicating this in our Handbook. This can be added at the beginning in Section 1.

It was suggested that Bo-Gay Tong Salvador (past OLAC Nominating Committee Chair) be sent a copy of this draft for her comments. Final wording could be approved at Midwinter so that the membership can vote in March. (ACTION)

It was agreed that the election next year will be handled under the new guidelines even though they will not yet have been voted on. Since there

are no previous guidelines it will be better to follow something than nothing.

It is important that the Bylaws indicate that ballots must be received by a certain date rather than postmarked since often postmarks are not legible.

d. **Other**

It was agreed that changes to the Handbook will be noted at each meeting. The Secretary will keep track of the changes. Some changes that are needed: Redo introduction to Handbook, start using revision dates on updated pages; make a title page (in color) for the Handbook; reissue for the June meeting; explain updating in the introduction; revisions will be approved at the meeting. (ACTION)

On p.18 of the Handbook, there need to be some changes given the new responsibility of the Vice President/President Elect for OLAC Conference program planning. Also, on p.22 the Board may want a reference to the voting procedure section.

M. Konkel looked into whether OLAC could sponsor or co-sponsor a program at ALA and she found that there is nothing preventing us from doing so. We do need to go through ALA for room reservations. We can also put these activities into the conference brochure. This might be another opportunity like the scholarship idea to use our funds for the good of all. We should ask Laurel Jizba if they need sponsorship for the Interactive Multimedia Preconference. Konkel will approach L. Jizba to see if there is anything she needs help with. (ACTION)

8. **Old Business**
   a. **Q&A Cumulative compilation**

   Tabled for discussion at Midwinter.

   b. **Scholarships**

   There was some discussion about who was working on this. P. Thompson, Virginia Berringer, J. LaGrange, and possibly Richard Harwood who was interested in looking at research grants, will be working on this in consultation with Bobbie Ferguson. Preliminary work will be presented to the Board at Midwinter. A charge will be written so the group will have a better idea what to do. (ACTION)

   Baker and Taylor gives scholarships like this so they might be a good place to start looking for examples.

9. **New Business**

   S. Neumeister has been working on an OLAC brochure. OLAC should also have a nice parchment copy of the Rationale to post in members' libraries. There was some feeling that more modern technology could be used as an illustration rather than the older looking film.

   As part of our 15th anniversary it might be nice to distribute the brochure and a parchment edition of the Rationale to members as a gift. A prototype will be done of the parchment for Midwinter. (ACTION)

10. **Adjournment**

    The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Catherine Gerhart
OLAC Secretary

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP (MOUG)
BUSINESS MEETING
OLAC/MOUG NATIONAL CONFERENCE
OAK BROOK, ILLINOIS
October 7, 1994

Highlights

Laura Gayle Greene, MOUG Continuing Education Coordinator, announced that MOUG will be meeting in February one day prior to the Music Library Association's annual meeting in Atlanta (February 8-12, 1995). Anyone with program ideas, questions, or comments should contact Laura at (816) 495-4191 or GREENL@SMTPGATE.UMKC.EDU.

MOUG president Ralph Papakhian announced that negotiations are continuing between the publishers of RILM (Repertoire International de Litterature Musicale) and OCLC. MOUG wholeheartedly supports this endeavor which would make the product available on Epic and FirstSearch.

All copies of the first printing of the 5th edition of The Best of MOUG are nearly gone. A second printing will be done. This publication is "a list of Library of Congress name authority records for music titles of the 10 most prolific composers including RV and F. indexes for Vivaldi, BWV index for Bach, K. index for Mozart and English cross

references for 12 Slavic composers." (Order information appeared in the September 1994 issue of the OLAC Newsletter)

Michelle Koth, Chair of the NACO Music Project Advisory Committee, reported that 13 libraries are currently participants. Stanford University has left the project. The project will soon begin absorbing seven music libraries whose home institutions have had general NACO training. These include Cornell University, New York Public Library, University of Chicago, University of Colorado, University of Maryland, University of Minnesota, and University of Virginia. At present the project is calling for applications for new members. The application involves answering questions about the music library's collection and institutional support. Also, a month-long study is required in order to gain an idea of how many headings not in the authority file typically might be encountered. There is no monthly or annual minimum number of headings required. Consistency and regularity of contribution are preferred. For further information or to obtain an application, contact Michelle at Yale University: (203) 432-0494 or BM.YMZ@RLG.

Ann Caldwell
OLAC Liaison to MOUG

CONFERENCE REPORTS
Ian Fairclough, Column Editor

1994 OLAC/MOUG CONFERENCE
Oak Brook, Illinois
October 5-8, 1994

NEW TECHNOLOGIES, NEW CHALLENGES
REPORTS FROM GENERAL SESSIONS

Dancing As Fast As We Can:
Keeping Our Feet Moving Amidst Rapid Change (Opening Session)
Presenter: Karen Horny, Northwestern University

The OLAC/MOUG Decennial Conference opened with a presentation by Karen Horny. Horny summarized well the present state of affairs for those of us in the AV cataloging world. One of the special challenges facing us today is the continual proliferation of new formats (videos, compact discs, multimedia, etc.) and Internet resources (electronic journals, Gophers, the World Wide Web, Mosaic, etc.). Horny described three facets to the challenge these materials pose for us:

1. The need to determine cataloging standards for each new type of material;
2. The need to maintain efficiency and prevent the growth of backlogs, and;
3. The need for continuing education for the staff who deal with these new materials.

In the area of setting standards, one obvious need is to establish guidelines for describing and analyzing Internet files. There are also new areas such as digitized visual materials where means of access need to be devised, using descriptive categories such as title, date, artist/photographer, collection name, etc. In regard to other standard formats, more work needs to be done in establishing guidelines for 'core bibliographic records' (essentially a compromise between minimal and full level bibliographic records). Horny encouraged us to confer with public services staff as we develop these new standards.

In the area of efficiency, Horny stressed the need to maintain our commitment to shared cataloging. The development of core bibliographic records could play a role in helping us to maintain efficiency, but she cautioned against the outcome of inadequate access to materials. Not shying away from controversy, Horny also recommended the consideration of 'outsourcing' for certain types of materials, especially when doing so would prove cost-beneficial.

In the area of continuing education, Horny introduced the possibility of using instructional technology, such as hypertext, for the training of staff and users at all levels. She also mentioned more traditional modes of education such as seminars, interest groups, and conferences. Whatever the educational setting, Horny stressed the need to always share what we have learned with our colleagues.

Overall, Horny's message was one of encouragement and hope. She believes that we as AV catalogers are especially well-positioned to deal with new types of materials, given our considerable experience as information organization specialists.

Stewart McElroy
Wheaton College

Education for the Digital Future (Opening Session)
Presenter:Carolyn O. Frost, U. of Michigan
School of Library and Information Science

The second presentation of the Opening Session was given by Carolyn O. Frost. Frost shared with us her personal vision for the future of AV cataloging. She discussed the characteristics of the new digital information environment, the challenges of creating access to materials in this environment, and the ways that Information and Library Studies programs are educating future professionals to meet these challenges.

The new digital information environment differs from the traditional paper-based one in many ways. One of the most fundamental differences can be seen in the existence of multimedia collections. The universe of digital information is already gigantic in scale and it is ever-growing, ever-changing. Existing collections are very diverse and are physically distributed throughout the world.

How are we to cope with this enormous, mutable universe of digital information? Frost recommended that we look for ways to utilize our existing cataloging skills in this new environment. For example, we should find ways to apply classification schemes to Gophers and Mosaic on the Internet. If we find that item-level cataloging is simply not feasible, we should look to other traditions of description (those of museums and archives, for example) to create access to digital information. For subject indexing we should consider the use of multiple thesauri. In short, we need to apply existing systems of organization to new contexts and be open to the possibility of broadening our skills, incorporating (or creating) other systems of description and access.

Sharing from her experiences at the University of Michigan (U of M), Frost explained how the curriculum in Information and Library Studies is changing. Core courses are being broadened to deal effectively with new technology, and new areas of specialization are being added. The methods of teaching are also changing, to include more experiential, hands-on learning (student projects that encourage creative thinking and the incorporation of newer technologies, for example). Professors are also encouraged to integrate their personal research into classroom teaching.

Frost explained in some detail three grant-funded projects that are taking place presently at U of M. One such project is the Art History Image Database Project, supported by the U.S. Department of Education. Frost is helping to design a prototype system for browsing digitized images (art slides) by using descriptive categories such as artist, title, country, medium, and technique. Ultimately, the project is meant to result in an organized, searchable database of 3,000 digitized images.

Frost's presentation was enlightening and inspiring. In a time when schools of Information and Library Studies are being closed down, it is indeed encouraging to hear of a program that is receiving grants and intentionally evolving to meet the informational needs of our technological society.

Stewart McElroy
Wheaton College

Training for Catalog Librarians (Luncheon Address)
Presenter: Joan Swanekamp, Columbia University

Joan Swanekamp of Columbia University reported on the work of the Cooperative Cataloging Council's (CCC) Task Group on Cataloger Training. After summarizing the results of the Task Group's recent survey of catalogers, cataloging department heads and administrators, she discussed her own and the group's views on what is needed for the training and ongoing development of effective catalogers.

Both training and management should be based on principles, with an emphasis on judgment and decision-making skills. Cataloging should be defined in terms of function and access rather than in terms of conformity to rules and achievement of the "perfect record;" training should be considered part of professional service; and support should be given to cooperative ventures and continuing education. Catalogers should have ongoing contact with the users of the catalog, with special efforts in that direction needed in larger institutions, and should be given access to the professional literature and opportunity and encouragement to meet in groups and confer by such means as e-mail. Swanekamp believes further that a cataloger with subject or language expertise should be able to apply that knowledge to the cataloging of materials in any physical format.

Swanekamp emphasized that institutions and administrators, not catalogers themselves, have the responsibility for providing training. Contrary to the fears of many catalogers, results just coming in from another survey indicate that among administrators in large institutions, at least, support for rethinking the training and management of catalogers is strong (though as a questioner later pointed out, such statements do not always translate into actions). Library schools also have an important role that needs attention, especially in light of the fact that some library schools no longer include cataloging in their core curricula and that many department heads report increasing difficulty in finding entry-level catalogers who do not require extensive training.

The CCC's involvement with these issues is ongoing. Its survey should be released in the near future, and a grant has been proposed to fund training programs, including the preparation of training materials. Swanekamp believes that these activities, along with changing conditions surrounding cataloging (such as the demanding materials that increasingly make up our backlogs and the recognition that LC cannot supply all of our cataloging) are contributing to a greater appreciation of catalogers and a wider recognition of the training and support we need to do our jobs effectively.

Richard A. Stewart
Chicago Public Library

From Alexandria to Acturus (Closing Session)
Presenter:Sheila Intner, Simmons College

Sheila Intner of Simmons College provided the closing remarks and final summary for the OLAC/MOUG 1994 Decennial Conference. After thanking those responsible for arranging the conference, she noted the synergy present in the conference which pulled together OLAC and MOUG members in ten diverse workshops and a variety of other experiences including tours and a concert. Although the theme for the conference was "New Technologies, New Challenges," Intner noted a more subtle, ubiquitous theme of conflict constantly emerging. In both lectures and workshops, speakers identified conflicts in needs, values and perspectives between administrators and librarians, between catalogers and computer specialists, between user needs for access and diminishing financial resources, between bibliographic enhancement and core records, between continuity and flexibility and between local needs and national needs.

After summarizing the lectures and workshops, Intner shared her own analysis stimulated by what she had seen and heard at the conference. Not only had the participants received knowledge for their heads, but also moral support for their professional souls to fortify them in the future to address problems raised by the conflicts which currently prevail in cataloging. Intner went on to mention some of the broader issues impacting cataloging, such as institutional reductions, changes in demographics, new technology and the information explosion.

However, in the midst of this present matrix of change and conflict, Intner envisions a future where the present conflicts, problems and questions are resolved. What will this future be? She surmises that many catalogers will leave library settings and join information production by providing pre-publication cataloging for university and commercial presses. Catalogers who remain in libraries will tailor cataloging copy to local user needs through the reference interview, while subject searching will become ever more important and nonprint media will predominate. In essence, catalogers who remain in libraries will become either public service librarians or systems experts. However, this vision, according to Intner, will only come to fruition as catalogers prepare to work with intellectual content not physical carriers, become experts in bibliographic consulting and place each client and service in a global perspective to be managed efficiently and effectively.

Intner believes that OLAC and MOUG can be key players in resolving the present conflicts and ushering in this new reality for the cataloging community. However, in order to accomplish this task, efforts to educate and train must be increased by expanding communication through publication and conferences. Cataloging rules and tools must be improved to cover all information resources and to enhance access. Finally, Intner encourages members to expand their vision, capture decision-making power and use it wisely.

Diane Dates Casey
Governors State University

REPORTS FROM WORKSHOPS

Automated Authority Control
Presenter:Jose O. Diaz, Ohio State University

Most of Jose O. Diaz's talk was devoted to the CIC/OCLC/LC Extended Cooperative Work Experiment. This plan is an outgrowth of OCLC's Personal Name Authority Program, instituted in 1992 to standardize personal name headings found on bibliographic records in the OCLC Online Union Catalog (OLUC). The algorithm first normalizes the headings, capitalizing all letters, removing diacritics, and substituting spaces for punctuation. It then compares name headings with the Library of Congress Name Authority File (NAF), considers classification numbers and publication patterns, corrects headings, and creates authority records with 100, 400, and 670 fields. Catalogers review the machine-created records. Criteria considered include date, language, and country of publication; relationship of the author to the publication; and other titles published by the author. Records receive a 667 field stating that they were generated by OCLC. In case of doubt that an author is the same as one with a similar name in the authority file, a new record is created with a 667 stating, "Cannot associate with ."

A random sample of OLUC personal name headings had revealed that approximately 43% were correct and had corresponding records present in the NAF; 40% were correct but had no authority records; and 17% contained either variant forms or typographical errors. Common mistakes in headings were in birth or death dates or fullness of name. Other errors corrected included wrong subfield codes, names entered in direct order, variant forenames, wrong indicators, and use of maiden names.

At the present time only OCLC and Ohio State University are actively involved in the project. The Library of Congress may join before the end of this year, and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation libraries will join later. Diaz suggested that the project could benefit from having the bibliographical records swept by format, directing related headings to catalogers who deal with specific media.

In response to a question from Judy Sandstrom, Diaz predicted that the procedures would eventually become practice for all OCLC cataloging participants, but that OCLC was "starting small." In response to a question from Gabriel Pellegrino of Rochester Public Library, Diaz confirmed that there is a database of preferred forms left from the OLUC sampling which should have authority records created.

Use of handouts or more overhead projections with examples might have made some of the concepts easier to understand. After the presentation, some people expressed the wish that more research in the field had been described; others had hoped for more practical applications and less discussion of research.

Judith A. Sandstrom
Arlington Heights Memorial Library

Computer File Cataloging
Presenter:Nancy B. Olson, Mankato State University

Olson, author of many publications relating to cataloging audiovisual materials and a practicing cataloger, conducted the workshop on the issues, intricacies and complications involved in cataloging computer files. She emphasized the descriptive aspects of cataloging computer software and guided the workshop participants through relevant AACR2R rules and Library of Congress Rule Interpretations. In the process, she demonstrated solutions to typical problems.

Because technology changes faster than the cataloging rules, Olson discussed the difficulty and importance of correctly matching the appropriate cataloging rules and chapters to the item in hand. She repeatedly emphasized the "one rule at a time, one decision at a time" principle. As variations of materials begin to appear, she also stressed the need for familiarity with the rules. It is necessary to determine whether given items are interactive or independent. Olson suggested the example of the Barbie doll package. A package that contains one Barbie and two computer disks represents a cataloging problem: do you identify the package as a doll plus disks, or as two disks plus a doll? Olson used this as a good example of a kit where each item could be used independently.

Olson further pointed out how the rules for computer files differ from corresponding rules in other chapters; for example, the chief source of information. With computer software, because of the inability to run the material if equipment is not readily available, she suggested that if you cannot get to the title screen, use the title on the label or disk package. In all cases it is important to provide a note of the source. If there are many parts to an item and each part has a different title ("happiness is having one title"), prefer the one that has the most complete information.

Olson referred to the differences in the edition area for computer files. Publishers seldom use the term "edition." There are "updates," "supple- ments," and "versions." Whichever term is found on the item is used in the edition statement. Olson suggested indicating early in the record which version is in hand and using notes to link different versions.

She went over the serial characteristics of computer files and how to handle these along with the file characteristics for computer data and Internet sources. In exploring the physical description of the materials, she referred to the new rule interpretation of discs/disks. Give the diameter of the disc/disk in inches, to the quarter-inch. The spelling "disc" reflects the standardized spelling used by the computer industry for optical storage devices. The spelling "disk" is used for magnetic storage devices.

Olson went over the importance of specific notes and the need to make a nature and scope note of the file and the need and relevance of the system requirements note. If the information is available it should be provided in a note. If a backup tape exists in the package, explain it in a note.

Olson stressed the need to provide the same kind of subject access to software as for books. She emphasized the importance of headings that fit categories and genre headings. In addition, subject headings should be assigned to say what the item is about; and it is also important to say what it is. She concluded by giving examples to illustrate educational and fantasy games.

Swarna Wickremeratne
Loyola University, Chicago

Format Integration
Presenter:Glenn Patton, OCLC

Over the past few years the library community has been hearing much about format integration (FI) and there have been ongoing discussions about the impact it will have on our cataloging efforts. Final implementation dates are now fast approaching and the desire for fuller understanding of FI is apparent. Patton presented an excellent overview and explanation covering what has happened already and a timetable for future implementation.

One of the implications of FI is that redundancy and inconsistencies will lessen. Catalogers will be able to explain more fully the item being cataloged through use of additional tags. The result will be a format that is more flexible in cataloging, especially for audiovisual items and forthcoming media technologies. Patton assured us that FI will assist in enabling us to provide more useful information within the MARC structure without omitting any vital essentials. The result should be a record we can better utilize in the future.

The first and probably the biggest change is the extension of content designators so that all media can be assigned whatever tag is needed to appropriately describe the item. With this decision, conflicts and redundancy became apparent between some of the formats, resulting in multiple places in which information might be placed. Negotiations and discussion over the past several years have resolved these problems, with some tags becoming obsolete. Examples include the use of 310 and 321 in serials for the information which for maps and computer files is tagged 315. It was decided that tag 315 would become obsolete.

Changes to the Leader for the Type of Record (06) with "b" Archival and manuscript control becoming obsolete, and the addition of two new types, "p" Mixed material, and "t" Manuscript language material, will further assist cataloging. Also, Type of Control (08) will in the future show the Archival status with "blank," No specified type of control, or with "a," Archival control. These new codes will now allow us to show not only the "Archivalness" of an item, but also its medium.

In order to further describe an item, field 006 will be added for Fixed-length Data Elements; it will show additional material characteristics. The first character will be "Record Type." Characters 1-17 will enable catalogers to describe the item in more detail than is presently possible with field 008. For example, we will be able to describe all the aspects in a map which is also a puzzle.

Fields 246 and 740, Additional Title information, will also present major changes for monograph catalogers. Serials catalogers have been using 246 for varying forms of the title for some time, while monograph catalogers have used field 740 for varying title forms along with other uncontrolled titles. Now, with the availability of field 246 for all formats, some of the information we have been placing in field 740 will more appropriately be tagged 246. Such information includes: varying title for the whole work; subtitle; parallel title; and abbreviations or numbers within the title. Field 740 will be restricted to use for uncontrolled analytical titles and other related titles.

Another result will be the "cleanup" of elements that have never been used, such as serial tags 320, 330, and 331, and of obsolete indicators (2nd indicator of field 1XX; 1st indicator of field 260). Such obsolete information will continue to exist in older records (although some systems may choose, as OCLC has with the 1XX and 260 indicators, to convert them) but will not be used in new ones.

The schedule for implementation is still very flexible and subject to change. It is projected that by January 1995 everything except the fixed fields (Leader, 006, 007, and 008) will have been implemented. The fixed field information should be completed by the end of 1995.

Patton recommended the following sources of further information: Format Integration and its Effect on USMARC Bibliographic Format, prepared by Network Development and MARC Standards Office; available from LC's Cataloging Distribution Service; and Format Integration and Its Effect on Cataloging, Training and Systems (ALCTS Papers on Library Technical Services and Collections, no. 4), available from the American Library Association.

Diane Neverman
Follett Software Co., McHenry, IL

Interactive Multimedia Cataloging
Presenters:Laurel Jizba, Michigan State University;
Ann Sandberg-Fox, Cataloging Consultant

A lively, informative, and practical session, its intent was to help the cataloger with the basic questions: what is interactive multimedia?, and how does one catalog it? The need to consult the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia was emphasized.

The first difficulty in cataloging these materials is in determining whether the item in hand is truly interactive multimedia. To qualify, it must exhibit both of the following characteristics: 1) user-controlled, non-linear navigation using computer technology; and 2) the combination of two or more media that the user manipulates to control the order and/or nature of the presentation. In general, most pre-1993 materials would not qualify as interactive multimedia.

If the material does qualify, then the guidelines must be consulted in order to properly construct the bibliographic description. The session provided a field-by-field discussion of the cataloging of these materials, with much detail and examples. A recurring refrain throughout was the advice, "Don't agonize!" -- a reminder for catalogers to trust their judgment and to do the best they can without becoming obsessed with small decisions.

Practical handouts, with examples and definitions, added to the session's value for those needing to better understand and catalog this material.

M. Jaskinski
Arlington Heights Memorial Library

Map Cataloging
Presenters:Catherine Gerhart and Anke Gray, U. of Washington

Catherine Gerhart (Head, Special Materials Cataloging Section) and Anke Gray (Monographic/Special Formats Cataloger), both from the University of Washington, led two map cataloging workshops during the OLAC/MOUG Conference. Gerhart and Gray presented a two-hour, abbreviated version of their six-hour map cataloging training session, as an introductory course. The small size of the audience allowed everyone to look at some examples of published maps, and the opportunity to measure scale.

Topics covered included map cataloging resources, calculation of scale, how to date a road map, and the major differences between book and map cataloging. Participants examined sample map bibliographic records, received scale exercise homework, and saw a sample map workform.

Resources for map cataloging included, in addition to AACR2R, Cartographic Materials: A Manual of Interpretation for AACR2 prepared by the Anglo-American Cataloging Committee for Cartographic Materials (CM), and the Map Cataloging Manual (MCM) prepared by the Geography and Map Division, Library of Congress. The addresses for two sources of the natural scale indicator/map scale indicator were listed, and a brief bibliography of books about maps, mapmaking, and map librarianship was provided.

The major differences between book and map cataloging in the physical description include 1) the chief source is the entire map (AACR2R 3.0B2); 2) the title is chosen on the basis of sequence, layout, or comprehensiveness (AACR2R 23.1B3), and CM 1B8b); 3) the definition of prominence is defined as anywhere in any size type (AACR2R 0.8); 4) bracket additional place name information in the subtitle if it is not present in the title proper or misleading (AACR2R 3.1E2); 5) map-unique notes, such as the note for additional content of the map not represented by the title, justification for the date of situation (the date the data was taken) in the call number, and the type of relief (contours, form lines, gradient tints, hachures, pictorial, satellite imagery, shading, soundings, spot heights, etc. (AACR2R 3.7B1 and MCM p.3.6-3.12)); and 6) other notes, such as the source of the title proper whenever it is not taken from the recto (MCM p.3.14-3.18), a statement of responsibility note containing the name of the copyright holder (MCM p.2.2 and p.5.2), and contents notes in specific order of recto, verso, and cover (MCM p.3.30).

Main entry was also discussed. The main entry "is based less on prominence and more on who did what." The cartographer has to perform more than the mechanics of the drawing in order to receive main entry, while a corporate body would receive main entry only when it is a map-making body (AACR2R 21.2B2f). Often title main entry wins because there is no statement of responsibility.

Workshop participants were exposed to map terminology, such as orientation, inset maps, ancillary maps, neat lines, and view; and were made aware of the fact that some forms of map reproduction could affect the accuracy of scale. With this thorough introduction, attendees were ready to return to their institutions and begin.

Ruth A. Inman
University of Illinois at Chicago

Musical Sound Recording Cataloging for Generalists
Presenter:Michelle Koth, Yale University

Koth presented a well organized, informative workshop emphasizing classical music on compact discs. Handouts were distributed covering the MARC fields required for sound recordings, examples of records with various types of main entry, and how to formulate uniform titles and music subject headings. Also included in the handout were charts for

coding the fixed fields, the 007 field, and a chart for determining main and added entries. The geographic codes which were originally in the Music OCLC Users Group Newsletter no.34 were expanded by using the class G and LC bibliographic records.

The uniform title and music subject heading examples, along with the AACR2R rules and Music Cataloging Decisions that applied, provided invaluable information. Concisely arranged examples were given for determining the titles, listing the field indicators, and punctuation required. Subject headings for both instrumental and vocal music were discussed, and a "Handy chart to those darned chorus subject headings" was included as well as the period subdivisions for jazz and popular music and guidelines for their use. Practice exercises for uniform titles and subject headings were provided along with the answers.

During the presentation, Koth explained what information each MARC field should contain and where to obtain that information. Although the Library of Congress (LC) no longer uses the 045 (Date of composition), 047 (Form of Composition) or 048 (Instrumentation) fields, she recommends supplying them. Field 028 contains the label or matrix numbers, but Koth has not encountered matrix numbers except in the case of the Russian label Melodiya. The label number should always be given in the first note. When deciding whether the orchestra or the conductor should receive main entry status, choose whichever name appears prominently, in larger print. The "c" date appearing in the 260 field usually represents the copyright date of the artwork accompanying the sound recording rather than the date of the recording itself. If some of the selections are mono, a note "Some selections mono." is appropriate. Koth clarified where the durations for selections should be given; if there is only one work, the duration appears in field 300; if two or more works, the durations appear in a note field (when there is a collective title, the durations will follow the titles in field 505; when there is no collective title and each title is given in the 245 field, the durations will appear in a 500 field). In regard to added entries: the LCRIs limit the number, but catalogers nevertheless need to take their own collections and patrons into account when providing them.

This very worthwhile workshop presented a vast amount of information. The handouts will be very helpful in the future.

Marlyn Hackett
Cook Memorial Library, Libertyville, IL

Musical Sound Recording Cataloging (Master Session)
Presenters:Kathryn (Kay) Burnett, Smith College;
Sue Stancu, Indiana University

Expecting only eight to ten people to register for their specialized topic, the presenters chose to use an informal panel discussion format, rather than to give a formal presentation. Stancu had requested participants to submit cataloging questions with photocopies of relevant examples prior to the conference. She supplied handouts containing some of the examples with questions and answers, along with a flowchart summarizing procedures for determining access points for cataloging sound recordings. (The latter appeared some years ago in an issue of INCOLSA/OCLC Cataloging News, newsletter of the Indiana Cooperative Library Service Authority).

Stancu and Burnett projected transparencies of the examples in the handout and other examples while discussing the questions and related matters. Topics covered included: principal performer as main entry; tagging for motion picture soundtracks; composer vs. performing group as main entry; composer's name as title proper; an LP with two different labels; etc. Nearly fifty people attended each of the two sessions, generating many questions and comments from the floor. The presenters tended to endorse local practice over rigid adherence to LC policy, if local practice would yield more complete records for the national utilities.

There was some discussion of sources for help in music cataloging. Some basic titles mentioned were: Richard P. Smiraglia's Music Cataloging; Jay Weitz's Music Coding and Tagging; the Music Library Association's Report of the Working Group on Types of Compositions; and the Music OCLC Users Group's The Best of MOUG.

Judith A. Sandstrom
Arlington Heights Memorial Library

Subject and Genre Access to Films and Videorecordings
Presenter:David Miller, Curry College

Miller's presentation came from his years cataloging video and film at Emerson College, Boston. As part of a shared database cleanup, it was his task to reconcile areas of overlap between some Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) and Moving Image Materials (MIM) format/genre (f/g) headings. His goal in talking with us was, in his words, not to tell us what everyone should do, but to stimulate thought about providing these types of access and to talk of specific tools, mainly MIM, to use in subject headings.

MIM was developed in 1988 by the National Moving Image Database Standards Committee of the National Center for Film and Video Preserva- tion at the American Film Institute. A sample page was included in the handout.

Miller differentiated between a subject heading as the "aboutness" of a work and an f/g heading as the "isness." "Isness" can mean content (a documentary) or physical nature (a video), though we focused on content. Although LCSH contains some headings which are designated for use as f/g -- historical films, for example -- its coverage of f/g headings is anything but complete. Some terms can be used only as f/g descriptors (Comedy programs); some are disallowed in LCSH or are shuttled to another inappropriate heading (Magazines -- see Periodicals).

So-- what is a confused cataloger to do? Use both LCSH and MIM carefully, reading scope notes and watching for overlap. "Soap operas" appear in both lists and could create ambiguity in the same index. Some libraries add "--History and criticism," or something similar, for further clarification.

The next part of the presentation dealt with USMARC authorities applications for f/g terms, authorized USMARC coding, and the way various vendors might link, display, or cross-reference these headings. Examples were provided.

Miller then proceeded to describe his research examining levels of compatibility between MIM and LSCH headings in his shared database. He found that, although the majority of terms did not conflict, some had conceptual overlap and a few others were fine in MIM but disallowed in LCSH. Without database cleanup, patrons get mixed retrievals and incon- sistent access. These possibilities pose several questions for cataloging managers, such as: which vocabularies to use and for what; subdivision or qualification of terms for added clarity; and how terms will index and display.

Miller thinks that efforts at international consistency will result in local adoption of more coherent policies. He is confident that f/g and subject headings will be able to live happily ever after in the same database.

Judy Gummere
Lake Forest Library

Use Of/Research About Internet Resources
Presenters:Leslie Troutman, U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign;
Nancy John, U. of Illinois at Chicago

The first part of the session, presented by Troutman, noted the dynamic nature of the Internet, and the continual proliferation of its resources and users. This growth is at least in part due to improvements in user interfaces and in access tools. These improvements include graphical user interfaces (GUIs) based on point-and-click technology, and Mosaic-type browsing tools which enhance access. Troutman described Gopher and the World Wide Web (WWW), two popular Internet finding aids. WWW began in 1992 as

the "next step" in network access tools; its growth has surpassed that of Gopher. Troutman demonstrated access to several music library resources on the Internet. Several hot issues were noted, including gender concerns, training, copyright, ownership, and privacy.

John's portion of the session, titled "Subjectivity in Cyberspace," concerned subject retrieval on the Internet. She stressed the need for catalogers to get involved, as they have the skills necessary to define the finding aids for the Internet (that is to say, there is no need for "techies" to have to reinvent the wheel). John stated that some exciting things are happening in regard to the cataloging of Internet resources, but that one must realize that perhaps only 15% of what is on the Internet is of a permanence that merits being cataloged. The idea of a "self-cataloging" Gopherspace was presented. John also presented the results of research which analyzed search terms used on the Internet, and drew tentative conclusions from that research. Because of their unique experience in designing and using information access systems, John emphasized, the more catalogers are involved in Internet retrieval issues the better Cyberspace will be.

M. Jasinski
Arlington Heights Memorial Library

Videorecording Cataloging
Presenter: Jay Weitz, OCLC

Jay Weitz discussed the practical aspects of videorecording cataloging. He emphasized that catalogers should be skeptical of everything they see in a bibliographic record because everyone makes compromises and choices. Titles and dates can vary greatly depending on what portion of the item is used for information. For videorecording cataloging the chief source of information is the title frame and credits. However, the container may serve as the secondary source of information because catalogers don't always have access to a videotape player on which to view the credits and title frame. He suggested that if a cataloger is inputting a record and is unable to view the videotape, a minimal level record be created so that someone else can upgrade the record. The bibliographic record should account for as many variations in title as reasonably possible by means of notes and tracings.

Weitz discussed the importance of subject information in summary and contents notes. These notes are now retrievable on OCLC through keyword searching. He discussed various AACR2R rules, LCRIs, and MARC fields, as outlined below.

Rule 7.7B10 (Physical description note): Field 538 has been expanded to include audiovisual materials as well as computer files. Therefore, the descriptions Beta, VHS, and U-matic are now recorded in that field instead of field 300. Sound characteristics

may also be included and these notes may be combined; for example: "VHS, stereo., hi-fi."

Rules 7.5B2 and 1.5B4 (Durations): If the playing time is stated on the item, give the time. The LCRI does not apply the option to give approximate time. Weitz stressed that catalogers should use caution and be tolerant of duration differences in bibliographic records. Variations of durations from the container, label, and actual timing of a video should not result in the inputting of duplicate records. If the container says "approximately," do not put "ca." in the record; rather, use "ca." only when the cataloger is estimating the duration.

Country of publication code: In the AV format this field is coded differently from other formats. The country of the producing agency is coded from $c of field 245 rather than from data in field 260. Weitz expects that under format integration, coding of the AV country code fixed field will be brought into line with the coding of that element for all other types of materials.

Statement of responsibility (Field 245 $c): This includes people and corporate bodies with overall responsibility. LCRIs 7.1F1 and 8.1F1 state that producers, directors and writers are to be credited with overall responsibility. An audience member commented that many records are listing executive producers in field 245; Weitz responded that their responsibilities are varied but not necessarily overall, and so they should not be included in 245 $c, though it may be appropriate to include them in field 508.

LCRIs 7.7B6 and 8.7B6 delineate responsibilities for a particular segment or aspect of the work to be listed in a credits note (field 508). LCRI 21.29D specifies when added entries should be made; all corporate bodies listed in field 260 are included. An added entry should be made even when the rules don't specify so, if the cataloger judges the corporate body of sufficient importance.

Weitz discussed the criteria for entering a new record into the OCLC database, as follows. Black and white versus color; sound versus silent; substantive differences in length, tape format, publication and copyright dates; and letter boxed versus full frame, all justify a new record. A colorized motion picture may also have an edition statement to this effect.

Length: Determine if there is a significant difference before inputting a new record. Look for other evidence of the existence of different versions of a video, differences that may indicate versions of varying lengths. For example: an instructional versus a theatrical version justifies a new record. Small time differences are probably due to the information being taken from different portions of the item or from actually timing the item; these do not justify a new record.

Dates: It can be helpful to know when various types of AV tapes became commercially available. Beta videos first appeared in May 1975; VHS tapes in Sept. 1977. Package redesign often causes a new copyright date to appear on the container. If the date is for

the artwork on the package, it can be recorded in a note but is not bibliographically significant. However, the date on a container can be significant if it is not a copyright date for the package artwork. Account for all dates and give as much information in notes as possible. Also, bracket dates in field 260 if the source is other than the film frames or video container.

Descriptive Video Services (DVS) tapes for the visually impaired justify a new record. This information may be input as an edition statement if it is presented as such on the item. Changes to 7.7B2 are in the works to expand the application of the rule beyond closed-captioning to include other sorts of audio and video enhancement. The language note for closed-captioning will be included in field 546 with format integration in January 1995. It is important to indicate if an item is closed-captioned, and this information is not always listed on the title screen or in the credits. Closed-captioning may be indicated by special symbols; a note is required, as well as the subject heading "Video recordings for the hearing impaired."

Weitz discussed locally made videorecordings, including locally produced, locally recorded, and off-air recordings. OCLC's manual, Bibliographic Formats and Standards, has guidelines for such records. Weitz also recommended Verna Urbanski's Cataloging Unpublished Nonprint Materials (Soldier Creek Press, 1992).

Weitz's final point of discussion concerned publisher numbers and the universal product code (UPC). Currently, publisher numbers are entered in field 037 and/or a 500 note field. With format integration, field 028 will be used instead. This field will be indexed and allows for generation of notes and added entries. Both the UPC and the international article number (formerly the European article number) will be entered in field 024 upon implementation of format integration.

Patricia Snyder
College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn, IL

**Report on
Basic Map Cataloging For Non-Map Librarians
(Part 2: Subject Headings and Classification)
1994 ALA Annual Meeting
June 26, 1994
Miami Beach, Florida**

**Submitted by Kathy Rankin
University of Nevada at Las Vegas
krankin@nevada.edu**

As reported in the September 1994 OLAC Newsletter, the presenters were Mary Larsgaard of the Map and Imagery Lab of UC Santa Barbara and Elizabeth (Betsy) Mangan of the Library of Congress Geography and Map Division.

Subject headings should not cover little bits of areas included on the map. They should be as specific as the individual item warrants, and should not be restricted to three subject headings. The publisher's intent in publishing the map is important to take into consideration when assigning subject headings. The publisher's intent should only be ignored if it is misleading, for example, the title says the map is a tourist map, but it does not include any tourist information. If broad subject headings are used, specific subject headings should not also be used unless the map includes specific information, and, in that case, the subject heading should be justified by a note. The subdivision "--Road maps" is not usually used under names of cities since cities usually have streets instead of roads. Subject headings should be selected in regard to the needs of the patrons of the specific library. They should relate to the primary map, but subject headings can be added for other maps on the sheet such as marginal or inset maps. Marginal maps are around the edges of a map, and inset maps are inset within the neat lines. Subject headings should be made for a place name only if it is indexed, and the current name of a place should be used, and it should be changed if the place name changes. The exception would be if the new name no longer covers the same area, and, in that case, there would be two names. If the same area is covered, there would not be a series change.

There are three possibilities for additions to city place names. One is metropolitan area, one is region, which is used when the city is not shown well, and suburban area, which shows the area around the city only. Names of city sections cannot be used to follow topical headings, and they can be used only with the three general types of maps: road maps, tourist maps, and maps that are not of a particular type. Coasts qualified with an area larger than a country or qualified by a country not used in indirect subdivision (i.e., the United States, Canada, Great Britain) are divided directly. For example, Tides--Pacific Coast (South America)--Maps. Coasts qualified by states of the United States, provinces of Canada, parts of the United Kingdom, or republics of the Soviet Union, as well as by any other country are divided indirectly. For example, Geology--California--Pacific Coast--Maps.

For a map to be a historical map, it has to show historical sites and events over a period of time. Usually these are histories of places. A plat map shows land ownership. The subject heading "Real property" would be used if the map shows how the land was divided up. If the map shows the names of the land owners, the subject heading Landowners would be used. The subdivision "--To 1800" was changed recently to "--Early works to 1800." If the map is a facsimile, the subdivision "--Facsimile" can be added to the end of each subject heading on the record. "World maps" can be used as a subject heading and can also be used as if it were a geographic class.

The classification number for a map reflects the area the map covers. If the map covers two main areas, the class number for the first area is used unless that area is not named in the title of the map. In that case, the number for the area that would come first

alphabetically is used. If a map includes three areas, the number for the larger area that includes all three areas would be used. There are now maps in the G schedule which show which numbers cover which areas, but because of the problems in converting the maps to machine-readable form, the maps will be moved to the Map Cataloging Manual when it is updated. When the map shows three cities, the number for the county or state is not used. Instead, use the number for the predominant city or for the city named first. If the map covers a specific subject such as railroads, use the cutter for that subject. The G schedule is very structured and at the end of the schedule, there are instructions on how to construct call numbers. The date of situation is usually the same as the date of publication. If in doubt, use the date of publication. The usual range for the last digit of a classification number for a particular area is 0 to 4. 0 is for a general map, 1 is for a map with a particular subject, 2 is for a map of a natural feature within that area, 3 is for a map of a first level of administration, usually a county, and 4 is for a map of a township.

LC publishes a list of geographic cutters for places within the United States including the Great Lakes. For cutters for foreign countries, the cataloger should try to find the cutter on a bibliographic record for a map of the same area. These cutters are being converted into machine-readable form, so they won't be available in a printed version. If a town is subsumed by another city, and the cataloger does not have information on its current status, the cutter for the town can be used. Otherwise it could be classified by the city section or by the cutter for the city. The colon technique can be used to divide a city or a first-level administrative division. A 2 or 3 follows the colon which follows the cutter for the city or other area. 2 is for the non-administrative areas of a city, and 3 is for administrative areas of a city (such as the boroughs of New York City).

Natural features are cuttered in the same way as administrative areas. Generally, do not cutter arbitrary administrative units created by government agencies (e.g., the Forest Service ranger districts or purchase units). A part of a forest is classified with the forest as a whole unless it is a very large area, and, in that case, a cutter is added for the sub-region. The word region can be added to lakes, rivers, etc., and that region is cuttered with the hydrographic feature upon which the heading is based. If the name of a forest, etc. is changed, but the geographic area remains the same, use the cutter and subject heading for the latest form of the name. If the forest, etc. became a part of another entity or was divided up and therefore is no longer in existence, the cutter is based on the name or the time depicted. Proposed town sites are considered to be the same as cities. Imaginary towns, etc. are classed in G9930.

A subject cutter is used if the map is not a general map. Only one subject cutter can be used, but it is possible to choose a cutter for a more general subject if a map covers more than one subject. The cutter should usually reflect the subject headings. The subject cutter A1 has three different meanings. When it is used under a classification number ending in 1 to 3, it is an outline or base map. If it follows a classification number ending in 4, it means that the map is not useful as a city map or it is a map of multiple cities.

For map series or sets the call number includes an indication of scale in place of the date of information. The last three digits of the denominator of the scale are lopped off, and an

"s" is put in front of the number. If there is no scale, use s000. For map series or sets drawn at two different scales, select the predominate scale, or, if neither scale is predominate, prefer the larger scale (i.e, the smaller number). For map series or sets drawn at more than two scales, use svar.

The 052 field is the geographic classification code. This code represents the geographic area and subarea and comes in part from the call number and partly from converting subject headings or notes to codes. As many of these codes as necessary can be assigned to a map.

With format integration, fields will be combined or made more specific. A record can have multiple fixed fields. The 006 lists the data elements from the fixed field. Local systems will have to have changes made to them to accommodate format integration. The variable fields will be done by the end of this year by LC, and the second phase, which consists of the implementation of linked fields from the serials format, will be done by the end of 1995. The cataloger will choose a format based on the physical item in hand. The different formats can be searched all together. LC will move atlases into the map file at the end of 1995 or at the beginning of 1996. One place to look for more information on format integration or to ask map cataloging questions is the map librarianship listserv MAPS-L. To subscribe to it, send the message "subscribe MAPS-L -your name-" to LISTSERV@UGA or LIST@UGA.CC.UGA.EDU. Mangan and Larsgaard are willing to answer map cataloging questions via e-mail. Mangan's e-mail address is: mangan@mail.loc.gov. Larsgaard's is: mary@sdc.ucsb.edu or, mary@wash.ucsdic.ucsb.edu.

SEMINAR ON CATALOGING DIGITAL DOCUMENTS
Library of Congress
October 12-14, 1994

Submitted by Anke Gray
University of Washington, Seattle

The Seminar on Cataloging Digital Documents, sponsored by Sarah Thomas, Director for Cataloging at the Library of Congress, was a very full 2 1/2 day learning experience. It began at the University of Virginia (UVa) in Charlottesville. UVa has a number of initiatives underway to use the power of computer technology to enhance research and education, and the electronic centers were the focus of our visit. We had an hour in each of the following areas to learn about their projects and to ask questions: the Electronic Text Center, the Digital Image Center, the Social Science Data Center and GIS (Geographic Information Systems) Lab, the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities, the Music and Special Collections Centers (two centers established but not

yet fully operational), and Cataloging (where Edward Gaynor, Head of Original Cataloging, spoke about the cataloging and organization of electronic materials).

The function of the Electronic Text Center is to collect, create, and put online electronic texts. While they do acquire many commercial products already marked up in Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML, the standard UVa has chosen to use), they also scan and mark up locally a number of texts. These locally created electronic documents include headers created in accord with the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI). Catalogers "cleanup" these TEI headers to provide standard cataloging information. (For an extensive discussion of the electronic text cataloging project see "Cataloging Electronic Texts: The University of Virginia Library Experience" by Edward Gaynor. *Library Resources & Technical Services,* vol. 38, no. 4 (Oct. 1994), pp. 403-413).

Holdings information for electronic materials is handled in one of two ways depending on whether or not UVa actually holds and maintains the material locally. If the material is held locally, an exact holdings statement appears in the record. If the material is accessed via the Internet, the patron is referred to the remote source with no attempt made to list actual holdings. If patrons are pointed to the Grounds-Wide Information System (GWIS), their local networked information system, then catalogers do occasionally check the GWIS to make sure the pointer is still valid and update the record if needed. Sample notes statements include:

- Electronic mail on Internet and Bitnet.
- Available online through the GWIS.
- Available through the World Wide Web server.
- Description based on printouts of [date]; title from title screen.

The second day of the Seminar consisted of speakers on a number of topics. Susan Hockey, Director, Center for Electronic Texts in the Humanities (CETH), provided an overview of computing in the humanities (computers were first used to study texts in the humanities in 1949) and discussed SGML and TEI. Carl Fleischhauer, Coordinator, American Memory, LC, shared some of the issues the American Memory project has faced. Lynn Marko, Head, Monograph Cataloging Division, University of Michigan Library, discussed the University of Michigan's move to an electronic environment for its users. David Williamson, Senior Descriptive Cataloger, LC, gave a demonstration of the electronic CIP software he is developing. Diane Vizine-Goetz, Research Scientist, OCLC, presented a number of issues regarding electronic materials that OCLC will be studying in the next year or so. Erik Jul, Manager, Customer Services, OCLC, discussed the Building a Catalog of Internet Resources Project for which he is project leader.

Two presentations were of particular interest to OLAC readers. Joan Swanekamp, Head, Original and Special Materials Cataloging, Columbia University, gave an overview of the new ALA publication, Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia. These guidelines are for use by American libraries only; they have not yet been adopted by the international library community. ALCTS is sponsoring a one-day workshop on interactive multimedia before the 1995 ALA Annual Conference in

Chicago. Edward Gaynor raised several questions to ponder: Should MARC be something else? Is there a need for a separate bibliographic record independent of its source (given electronic documents with TEI standard headers)? Should we stop thinking of computer files as separate and discrete entities? Are they not just another carrier of information? That is, do we need chapter 9 of AACR2R?

David Bearman, Editor, Archives and Museum Informatics, was a most provocative dinner speaker. He was particularly concerned about the digitization of the cultural heritage of the universe and whether or not we would succeed in preserving that heritage. He sees four challenges to the task. The political challenge is to find the resources and methods to digitize billions of records. The intellectual challenge is to develop a new set of paradigms more appropriate to the vast majority of materials (namely the non-book materials) in our cultural heritage. (Only 25% of LC's holdings are actually books). Subject analysis as it is currently defined does not work well to define the "aboutness" of non-book items, an attribute which may be audience-dependent. The professional challenge is to deal with the end of descriptive cataloging as we know it. Electronic materials will carry their cataloging within them to be called out upon demand; there will be no need for a discrete, centralized catalog. The personal/social/ethical challenge is to find a way to fairly compensate the creators of intellectual property in the electronic age.

The third (half) day provided an opportunity for questions and answers, as well as general group discussion of what the immediate issues to be resolved are. It was clear that we came from varied backgrounds of experience with electronic materials and had varied agendas. Some libraries had already made the decision to "catalog the Internet" for their local catalogs (selectors are responsible for choosing Internet materials as well as traditional print materials). They were concerned about refining the format, providing more complete access to Internet resources, and developing the possibilities of automated cataloging via SGML-tagged documents. Others did not feel they had the resources to catalog the Internet, or more specifically, to maintain records for items which seem often to change their mode of access. They thought it would be better to work towards one centralized electronic catalog of Internet resources. The burden of maintaining records could then be shared. One voice cautioned against spending inordinate amounts of time cataloging and re-cataloging the same intellectual material (albeit in different formats) when so much of the world's intellectual material has not been cataloged at all. Perhaps it is time to revisit multiple versions.

As technology changes, we may be able to automatically track changes in the electronic world which can then be reflected in our catalogs. We may also be able to create catalog records automatically, on demand, from information imbedded within the digitized items. Users may be able to call up documents directly once they have retrieved such a record. The nature of cataloging, of providing access to information, is changing. While we did not agree on a clear plan of action, we did all agree that catalogers will be left behind unless we take an active role now in the development of new means for providing access to the electronic world. This involvement must be not only with traditional library committees, national and international, but also with the Internet Engineering Task Force

(IETF) and other organizations setting standards for the description of electronic information.

NEWS FROM RLIN
As Reported at the OLAC Business Meeting
Friday, October 7, 1994

Submitted by Ed Glazier, RLG

EUREKA:
RLG's easy and powerful patron-oriented search service made its debut on September 1, 1993, providing access to both RLIN bibliographic and CitaDel files. In its first nine months, Eureka logged more than one million searches.

ARIEL FOR WINDOWS:
In response to user feedback on the DOS-based version of the Ariel document transmission system, RLG created a Windows version of Ariel for even faster, more flexible, and much easier document delivery over the Internet; the new Ariel became generally available in August.

ZEPHYR:
RLG released its Zephyr Z39.50 service, which provides access to the RLIN bibliographic, authority, and CitaDel files for Z39.50 client applications. The Z39.50 computer-to-computer information retrieval protocol allows local systems to search remote databases and provide users with the same interface as for local databases. In June, the Library of Congress implemented a Z39.50 client in its local MUMS system, providing LC catalogers access to RLIN records. RLG also has an agreement with both ISM of Canada and PICA of the Netherlands to provide reciprocal access to each other's databases through Z39.50 client/server applications.

RECORD TRANSFER BY FTP:
Libraries that have been contributing records to RLIN by tape can now contribute the records by FTP. Institutions with dial-up or Internet connections to RLIN that wish to export RLIN MARC records to an FTP server can now take advantage of the new RLIN PUT command.

NEW CONNECTIVITY OPTIONS:
Two new telecommunication options were added to the RLIN PC terminal software: AsTer for asynchronous terminal communications, and LANTerm for multiple terminals connected to a local area network and a LANPad. RLG has started working on the Windows version of the RLIN PC terminal software that will also include these telecommunication options.

OTHER RLIN ENHANCEMENTS:
Phase 2 of the implementation of the USMARC Holdings format--the display of USMARC holdings information on RLIN Partial and Full displays--has been completed. The RLIN Computer Files (MDF) file was clustered. RLG continued to work with LC and OCLC to implement format integration according to the revised schedule. The first phase, affecting variable fields, will be implemented in December 1994.

NEWS FROM OCLC
As Reported at the OLAC Business Meeting
Friday, October 7, 1994

Submitted by Glenn Patton, OCLC

PRISM AUTHORITIES:
The prime focus of this project is moving NACO users from LSP to PRISM but it also allows local editing of authority records before exporting them. Expected installation date is early December. Watch for Technical Bulletin 205, describing the changes that affect all cataloging users and a new edition of the Authorities User Guide.

FORMAT INTEGRATION, PHASE 1:
Installation of the first phase of format integration will follow in early January. Technical Bulletin 206 will describe these changes.

INTERNET CATALOGING:
OCLC has received further funding from the Dept. of Education for a continuation and expansion of the Internet cataloging project.

ELECTRONIC ERROR REPORTING:
OCLC will now accept error reports via the Internet. PRISM News contains instructions for downloading the forms and gives the address to which completed forms should be sent. [See p. 45-47 for full instructions. --ed.]

PROMPTCAT:
Even though most of the initial activity for PromptCat (a new service to automate the delivery of cataloging copy) is centered on the major book jobbers, discussions for the future include vendors like Professional Media Services that may be of interest to AV users.

AVLINE:
Finally we can report some progress on loading AVLINE records. We are now testing matching algorithms and hope to load the complete files before the end of the year.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor

OCLC Now Accepting Electronic Error Reports

As of October 1, 1994, OCLC users may submit bibliographic change requests and duplicate record reports to OCLC via Internet e-mail. Designed to complement existing error reporting procedures, the new electronic reporting service will allow users to send messages quickly and easily.

OCLC has created three files: two forms for reporting changes, and a third file containing instructions on completing and sending the forms.

```
        File-name              Form/instructions

     bib.change.report      Electronic Bibliographic Change Report
     dup.report             Electronic Duplicate Report
     bib.instructions       Instructions for OCLC's Electronic
Error/
                            Duplicate Record Reporting
```

You may include all types of changes on the Electronic Bibliographic Change Report, including type code changes, filing indicator corrections, as well as general changes and corrections. Requests supported by hard- copy proof (e.g., photocopy of title page) should not be sent via e-mail. You may report corrections to more than one bibliographic record in a single message. All records reported on one message should be the same format type (for example, all books, or all scores).

Use the Electronic Duplicate Report for all formats except Books. Again, you may report multiple records on one message, but they should all be of the same format.

Do not report book duplicates, authority record changes, or changes you could make yourself with a full-mode authorization. Please consult chapter 5 of Bibliographic Formats and Standards for general information about quality control procedures.

To retrieve the files, you may use either e-mail or FTP. The service will also be available from World Wide Web (WWW) in the future. Sections A and B below give the two methods for retrieving the forms. Section C describes how to use the electronic forms through the Internet.

A. **E-MAIL METHOD**

You may need to adapt these instructions for your specific e-mail program.

1. Address an Internet e-mail message to: listproc@oclc.org
2. Type the "get" command in the body of the e-mail message:
   get doc/forms [file-name]
   Substitute one of the file names given above in the "get" command.
3. Send the e-mail message.
   Listproc e-mails you a copy of the requested file.

B. **FTP METHOD**

The following procedure works for most FTP sites. However, FTP programs vary from site to site, so be sure to read your FTP documentation carefully.

1. Before you log on to OCLC's system, change to the first destination directory for the files you will download to your workstation or local system (use the "cd" command). To change the current directory on your workstation or local system when you are logged on at OCLC, use the "lcd" command. In FTP, the "cd" command changes the current directory on the remote (OCLC's) system.
2. At your prompt, type "ftp ftp.rsch.oclc.org" and press . The system responds with a request for you to log on.
3. Log on as "anonymous". Use your own Internet e-mail address as the password. FTP responds with its own prompt: "ftp>" (your prompt may differ).
4. Type "cd pub/documentation/doc/forms/" and press to change to the OCLC directory that contains the forms and related instructions.
5. Type "get [file-name]" and press to copy the files. The "get" command copies files into your current local directory. Substitute one of the file names given above in the "get" command.
6. Type "bye" and press to exit FTP.

C. **COMPLETING THE FORMS**

Once you have copied the forms, follow this procedure:

1. Use an editing or word-processing program to complete the appropriate form.
2. Save the form as an ASCII (text-only) file.
3. Mail the form via Internet email to: bibchange@oclc.org

Linda Gabel
Online Data Quality Control Section, OCLC

Call For Contributions

The editors of *MC Journal: The Journal of Academic Media Librarianship* are issuing a call for contributors to the next issue. This peer reviewed electronic journal focuses on all aspects of academic media librarianship.

Media Works is a new column which debuted in the most recent issue. Highlighting practical solutions to everyday life in academic media centers, a different author is featured in each issue. If you're doing something effective you'd like to write about, submit for this column!

DEADLINE FOR THE NEXT ISSUE IS FEBRUARY 1, 1995.

To submit a manuscript or Media Works column, please send your ASCII file via e-mail to: Lori Widzinski, Editor at HSLLJW@ubvm.cc.buffalo.edu OR Terrence McCormack, Associate Editor at LWLTEMCC@ubvm.cc.buffalo.edu.

You may also send your ASCII file via US mail on a 3.5 inch disk to the editors above at the following address: Media Resources Center, Health Sciences Library, Abbott Hall, University at Buffalo, 3435 Main Street, Buffalo, NY 14214-3002.

We are hoping with the next issue for full HTML capabilities, so graphics and links to other Internet resources will be available.

The editors would be happy to discuss any ideas for articles. They may be reached via the e-mail addresses listed above.

New CAPC Subcommittee Formed

The Audience Characteristics Subcommittee was formed in response to an earlier discussion by OLAC's Cataloging Policy Committee of MARBI Proposal 93-12: Additions to Accommodate Curriculum Information in USMARC Bibliographic Records. The Proposal called for the addition of "new data elements and changing existing ones in the USMARC Format for Bibliographic Data to accommodate curriculum information." The initial discussion of 93-12 by CAPC touched on the addition of audience characteristics (as defined in the Subcommittee's charge) to the scope of Proposal 93-12. Audience characteristics are not included in the final version of 93-12; therefore, CAPC is looking at other alternatives as described below. CAPC will put forward a proposal on audience characteristics to MARBI if the discussion at the next February meeting indicates such action is warranted.

Proposal 93-12 was approved with amendments by MARBI on June 27, 1993, and approved by LC on August 4, 1993. The text of Proposal 93-12, amendments, and status information is available on LC's Gopher, MARVEL.

CAPC Audience Characteristics Subcommittee Charge

Charge:

Prepare a discussion paper describing various ways in which the MARC record might be modified to provide access to material based on audience characteristics or on features designed to accommodate special needs of potential users.

- The discussion paper should consider whether such access should be to the characteristics of the potential users, e.g., handicaps or disabilities, or to the characteristics of the material, e.g, captioning for the hearing impaired or audio description for the visually impaired.
- The discussion paper should consider various methods of providing access, including: fixed field coding, 655 terms indicating the special features of the material, a new field for terms indicating audience characteristics, and any other possibilities that should be considered.
- The discussion paper is due to the CAPC Chair by January 16, 1995 for discussion at the February 3, 1995 CAPC meeting in Philadelphia.

Audience Characteristics Subcommittee: Virgina Berringer and Nancy Rodich-Hodges. Consultant to the Subcommittee: John Attig, OLAC Liaison to MARBI.

Richard Harwood
CAPC Chair

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Verna Urbanski, Column Editor

The following Q&A Session took place during the OLAC Business meeting at the ALA Annual Conference in Miami Beach in June. The panel was moderated by Karen Driessen. Panelists included: Ann Sandberg-Fox (Consultant), Sheila Intner (Simmons College), Glenn Patton (OCLC), Ed Glazier (RLG), Jean Weihs (Consultant), Harriet Harrison (LC).

QUESTION: We are cataloging a group of opera videocassettes. In addition to the usual thirty-seven copyright dates, they are now showing up with phonogram dates. This particular one has on the box c1988 Metropolitan Opera Association, p1991 Deutsche Grammophon; the label has c1988 Metropolitan Opera Association, p1990 Deutsche Grammophon; the box cover photograph is c1991; the booklet cover photograph c1991. The credits on the video has c1989. What is the best way to handle these dates in the record?

ANSWER: I would use 1991 in square brackets, because I would guess that this is the time when the producer brought it on the market in its current form (with text and box). The p refers to the sound, since it is connected to Deutsche Grammophon; the c dates are for the text, box, and video. If you are really nervous about it, you could use [1991?]. ---JW

I agree. You have to have a precedent to make you feel more comfortable about selecting 1991. It couldn't be dated earlier than the latest copyright, but you are guessing it was distributed in 1991. ---SI

[I would tend to transcribe these dates as [1991?], c1989. Or, at least include the copyright date from the video credits in a note. ---VU]

QUESTION: I am wondering how to catalog the new minidisc that came to subscribers with the June issue of Rolling Stone Magazine. It looks like a small CD inside a case. It can only be played on a specific Sony player. Its main claim to fame is that it is recordable and that the player is not affected by motion or jarring.

ANSWER: What is actually inside the case is a technology very much like a compact disc, but smaller. There is actually a 2 1/2 inch disc inside the case. It is an optical medium, but recordable. There is a data version of it that would be used with a computer. In many ways it is parallel to the situation we have with compact disc sound recordings and compact disc as a data carrier. This new item is properly called a "MiniDisc"--one word with a capital "D". It is functioning as a storage medium for sound. Sony is attempting to popularize this as a new, viable format.

Since 6.5B1 offers the option of using an appropriated term when the item is other than one of those listed, it would seem you could use something like: "1 sound miniDisc (2 1/2 in. in cartridge)." For the time being, it might be useful to specify in a note that it is recordable and what machine is needed for playing it. ---GP

One of the things about this medium is that apparently it attenuates to higher frequencies in order to compress more on the disc, so there have been a lot of complaints about it not being an adequate archival medium because it does not reproduce everything from the original source. Sony's major goal was a medium that was recordable and small enough to put in a player the size of a Walkman. The quality of the sound was not a major consideration. That might make it difficult for libraries to accept it as a useful medium.

Right now one of the things you can't do yet is to code fixed fields for it. The coding would be "none of the above" or "other" most of the time. ---EG

QUESTION: I was cataloging an interactive media with two previously issued motion pictures and I wanted to make an access point for the titles of each of the motion pictures. I think the added entries should be 730 uniform titles with (Motion picture) after it, but do you always have to put (Motion picture) on the end, and why, if it doesn't duplicate some other title in your catalog?

ANSWER: It is my understanding that you do not need to use the phrase (Motion picture) to distinguish it unless there is a conflict. There is a confusion with that primarily because there was a practice for a long time of using (Television program) all the time. The rule interpretation has been changed on that and it now reads the same as the (Motion picture) RI does. There is still conflict about that. Some people argue that they want it all the time and others argue that they don't want it at all. I have to look at the rules every time to be sure I am understanding. It is my understanding that you do it when there is a conflict. And, you should not add it in anticipation of a conflict, but only if one exists. ---HH

The reason it was put in parenthesis was to distinguish it from a GMD. The same situation exists with other media. The RI that we have in place also goes on to computer files. ---ASF

I just looked at that rule interpretation recently and I do know that it only goes into effect when there is a book that needs an added entry. That is a problem, because if you are coming at it from an AV collection, you are only authorized by RIs to use a uniform title when there happens to be a book that needs an added entry for a motion picture. There are plenty of other times when it would be useful to have them on motion pictures when there are title conflicts. If you just used chapter 25 of AACR2R and did not look at LCRIs, you are authorized to do all those things by chapter 25. But there are many libraries that will only do what LC does. And, LC does not use chapter 25 across the board. ---Martha Yee (UCLA)

QUESTION: It is my understanding that we should put the format type, like VHS, in a 538 field. Why do I still see some libraries putting it in the physical description area (300)? Are you allowed to do that?

ANSWER: No. The format should go in the 538.

QUESTION: How do you treat two identical videos that have the same publisher but two different distributors? Should they be considered different records for the database?

ANSWER: That is one of the fields (260 $b) that qualifies for OCLC for inputting a new record. ---GP & SI

This happens in Canada all the time. We get items that were produced by American firms, but they are distributed in Canada by Canadian companies. Our rule is that if the distributor is part of the item that cannot be removed, that is, it is on the film or videotape as part of the running credits, then it gets its own new record. If there is just a sticker on the outside of the container, we just ignore it. ---JW

Remember also from OCLC's perspective, you always have the option of editing the existing record to reflect what you have. ---GP

In AACR2R itself, the glossary definition of "edition" says that a change in distributor does not create a new edition. However, that has never been put into practice. In fact, I think when you look at OCLC guidelines on when to make a new record, they encourage you to input a new record when the distributor varies. ---Martha Yee

I equate this situation with the facsimile reprint situation in monographs. The item carries the original title page plus a title page for the new publisher. Those are treated like different editions. The confusion is that the original publisher is still there, unlike with a paperback where the original publication information may not be on the item. ---Virginia Berringer (U. of Akron)

OCLC's bib input standards clearly says that if you have more than one body in the 260, and your information matches one of them, you can edit the record. ---Pat Thompson (U. of the South)

One problem with AV materials is that catalogers very often don't differentiate between producer and distributor. They put the producer of the item in the 260 when it should be put in the $c of the 245. ---Hal Temple (College of DuPage)

If you always treat a new distributor as ignorable, then you may not realize when you have a new item, a different item or an item with a new label on it. And, I think you have to be careful about which is which when you catalog for a research collection. ---SI

Last modified: December 1997