



MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

NEWSLETTER

ISSN 0161-1704

2010 MOUG Annual Meeting Preview Issue

FROM THE CHAIR

Tracey Rudnick
University of Hartford



IN THIS ISSUE:

**From the Continuing
Education Coordinator3**

**2010 Annual Meeting
Preliminary Program,
Registration and
Hotel Information4**

News from OCLC.....6

**Best of MOUG,
8th ed.8**

**Questions & Answers
by Jay Weitz.....10**

My last column as MOUG Chair shall be my shortest. Serving on the MOUG Executive Board has been an honor, a privilege, and an invaluable growth opportunity. I extend my heartfelt thanks to Board colleagues with whom I have served, and to past officers who paved the way. Everyone's commitment, expertise, enthusiasm, and tireless efforts helped make this a rewarding experience.

While my term as Chair ends in March, I will continue one more year on the Board as Past Chair. (A Board member's work is never done.) I welcome our next Chair, Stephen Luttmann (University of Northern Colorado), who takes the baton March 21, 2010. His experience, keen intellect, and raucous sense of humor will serve MOUG well.

By the time you read this, MOUG will have wrapped up its first online election. Thank you to the Nominating Committee (Catherine Gick Busselen, Brown University; Keith Chapman, Rice University; and Steve Luttmann), to the candidates, and to MOUG officers Alan Ringwood and Diane Napert for their extra efforts to test and imple-

ment the e-ballots.

One last printing of *The Best of MOUG*, 8th ed., is available. Purchase yours before copies are gone. Thanks once more to editor Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University) for her ongoing efforts.

This year's MOUG program is in San Diego, California, Saturday–Sunday, March 20–21; **note the early registration deadline of December 31, 2009.** The program focuses on future directions and philosophical considerations in accessing music, especially as OCLC goes in new directions. Thanks to Bruce Evans for his indefatigable cheer and persistence in assembling the program with the Program Committee.

In my final words, I encourage you one last time to become involved with MOUG in some capacity. MOUG helped many of us launch our careers, and continues to help us keep up with new developments. It has provided much-needed support from “those who understand.” Please give back. MOUG is a great organization. *Ses membres le gardent fort.*

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is to identify and provide an official means of communication and assistance for those users of the products and services of the Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) concerned with music materials in any area of library service, in pursuit of quality music coverage in these products and services.

Thanks to all who contributed to this issue. The Newsletter is a publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. It is published three times a year: June, September, and December. Editor: Alan Ringwood, P.O. Box P, University of Texas Libraries, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78713-8916.

Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter and materials for publication should be addressed to the Editor. Articles should be submitted electronically in Word. Articles should be consistent in length and style with other items published in the Newsletter. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged. Correspondence on subscription or membership (including change of address) should be forwarded to Diane Napert, MOUG Treasurer, Irving S. Gilmore Music Library, Yale University, P.O. Box 208240, New Haven, CT 06520-8240. (Dues in North America are \$30.00 for personal members, \$40.00 for institutional subscriptions; outside North America, \$45.00 for personal members, \$50.00 for institutional subscriptions; back issues for the previous two years are available from the Treasurer for \$5.00 per copy.) A copy of the quarterly financial report is available from the Treasurer on request. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.

The Music OCLC Users Group is a non-stock, nonprofit association organized for these purposes: (1) to establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC products, systems, and services and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users; (2) to encourage and facilitate the exchange of information between OCLC and members of MOUG; between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general between members of the Group and appropriate representatives of the Library of Congress; and between members of the Group and similar users' organizations; (3) to promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards; and (4) to provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group. MOUG's FEIN is 31-0951917.

MOUG-L: MOUG-L is an electronic discussion list for the dissemination of information and the discussion of issues and topics of interest to music library professionals and users of OCLC products and services. To subscribe to MOUG-L, send an e-mail to listserv@lsv.uky.edu with the subject line blank. In the body of the message type: SUBSCRIBE MOUG-L <your name>

MOUG Web site: <http://www.musicoclcusers.org>

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Chair

Tracey Rudnick
Head, Allen Library
University of Hartford
Phone: 860-768-4404
E-mail: Rudnick@hartford.edu

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect

Stephen Luttmann
Music Librarian
University of Northern Colorado
Phone: 970-351-2281
E-mail: stephen.luttmann@unco.edu

Treasurer

Diane Napert
Catalog Librarian
Yale University
Phone: 203-432-0726
E-mail: diane.napert@yale.edu

Secretary/Newsletter Editor

Alan Ringwood
Head, Music Cataloging Unit
The University of Texas at Austin
Phone: 512-495-4191
E-mail: a.ringwood@austin.utexas.edu

Continuing Education Coordinator

Bruce J. Evans
Music and Fine Arts Catalog Librarian
& Bibliographic Access Unit Leader
Baylor University
Phone: 254-710-7863
E-mail: Bruce_Evans@Baylor.edu

OCLC Liaison

Jay Weitz
Senior Consulting
Database Specialist
OCLC Online Computer
Library Center
Phone: 614-764-6156
E-mail: jay_weitz@oclc.org

FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR

Bruce Evans
Baylor University



The preliminary program for our annual meeting in San Diego appears on pages 4-5 of this newsletter. I hope you will join us for a program filled with timely and engaging topics. Please note that this year the program begins Saturday afternoon and ends Sunday morning, rather than following our usual Tuesday through Wednesday schedule. In addition, we will begin the conference with a cookies and punch reception—a great way to socialize and network with your MOUG colleagues, as well as to recover from your travels to San Diego!

Much talk in recent times has focused on major anticipated changes to our profession, manifested in such things as the Taiga Forum Provocative Statements, “next generation” cataloging discussions, and other notable developments. On the opening day of our conference we have two plenary sessions that seek to tackle these issues head on. For the first plenary we have a very special guest. Matt Goldner, Product & Technology Advocate at OCLC, will speak to us about the Web Scale Management Service he is developing with Andrew Pace at OCLC. Our second plenary is a panel discussion that we are calling *Taiga, NextGen, and a Brave New World for Accessing Music*. Our panelists are Mark Scharff, Music Catalog Librarian, Washington University; Phil Ponella, Director, William and Gayle Cook Music Library, Indiana University; and Damian Iseminger, Technical Services Librarian, New England Conservatory. The moderator for the discussion is Wendy Sistrunk, Music Catalog Librarian, University of Missouri—Kansas City. This should prove to be a highly engaging and enlightening conversation.

Sunday morning begins with a complimentary continental breakfast. Following breakfast we have a session entitled *Archival Cataloging 101*. Maureen Russell, Head of Cataloging & Archivist, UCLA Ethnomusicology Archive, will teach us the basics of archival cataloging, with a special focus on music materials. Next Joseph Hafner, Head of Technical Services, McGill University, gives a presentation covering WorldCat Selection’s features for music materials.

To wrap things up we have an exciting twist on Ask MOUG. The participants are Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, OCLC, and, Vince Wortman, Product Support Specialist I, OCLC. This year Jay and Vince will share their views on many of the hot topics pertinent to

MOUG members. I’m sure there will be much to learn for all, including the speakers.

MOUG is again offering online registration for the annual meeting. We strongly encourage everyone to take advantage of this opportunity. A printable registration form will be available on the MOUG Web site for those who do not wish, or are unable, to register online. Our thanks to A-R Editions and the Music Library Association for working with us to make this convenient option available.

We would like to give you the opportunity to send your questions to our presenters in advance of the meeting. If you have questions on any of the session topics that you would like the speakers to address, please submit them to me at Bruce_Evans@Baylor.edu.

Finally, I ask you to please volunteer to staff the MOUG registration desk. For those of you arriving early on Saturday, we would greatly appreciate your help that afternoon on the registration desk. Please contact Sharon Benamou at benamou@library.ucla.edu if you are interested for Saturday afternoon, Saturday evening, or Sunday morning.

My sincere thanks to the MOUG Program Committee and the MOUG Board for all of their hard work and assistance in putting together a fantastic program!

Volunteers needed to compile summaries of Annual Meeting presentations

Volunteers are needed to compile summaries of the presentations that will be given at the 2010 MOUG Annual Meeting in San Diego. Summaries should be fewer than 1,500 words, and must be submitted to the Editor by Friday, April 16, 2010. The summaries will be published in the June 2010 issue (no. 104) of the MOUG *Newsletter*. Abridged versions will be published in the MLA *Newsletter*. If you are interested in preparing a summary, please contact Newsletter Editor Alan Ringwood at a.ringwood@austin.utexas.edu.

Music OCLC Users Group Annual Meeting
Saturday-Sunday, March 20-21, 2010
San Diego, California

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

Saturday, March 20, 2010

- 9:00 AM-1:00 PM MOUG Board Meeting
- 1:30-8:30 PM Registration
- 2:00-3:00 PM Reference Services Committee
- 2:00-3:00 PM NACO-Music Project
- 3:00-3:30 PM **Cookies and punch**
- 3:30-4:30 PM **Plenary session I: Web Scale Management Service and You**
Matt Goldner, Product & Technology Advocate, OCLC
- 4:30-4:45 PM **15 minute break**
- 4:45-6:15 PM **Plenary session II: Panel Discussion: Taiga, NextGen, and a Brave New World
for Accessing Music**
Panelists:
Damian Iseminger, Technical Services Librarian, New England Conservatory of
Music
Phil Ponella, Director, William and Gayle Cook Music Library, Indiana
University
Mark Scharff, Music Catalog Librarian, Washington University (St. Louis)
Wendy Sistrunk, Music Catalog Librarian, University of Missouri—Kansas City
(Moderator)

Sunday, March 21, 2010

- 7:00-8:30 AM Registration
- 7:00-8:00 AM Complimentary Continental Breakfast
- 8:00-9:00 AM **Archival Cataloging 101**
Maureen Russell, Head of Cataloging & Archivist, UCLA Ethnomusicology
Archive
- 9:00-10:00 AM **WorldCat Selection for Music**
Joseph Hafner, Head of Tech Services, McGill University
- 10:00-10:15 AM **BREAK**

Music OCLC Users Group Annual Meeting
Saturday-Sunday, March 20-21, 2010
San Diego, California

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM (cont'd.)

- 10:15-11:15 AM **MOUG Hot Topics**
 Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, OCLC
 Vince Wortman, Product Support Specialist I, OCLC
- 11:15 AM-12:30 PM **MOUG Business Meeting**

N.B.: Questions for any of the presenters may be sent via e-mail to Bruce_Evans@Baylor.edu.

REGISTRATION

MOUG is offering online registration through A-R Editions and MLA's conference registration page. The online registration form can be found at <https://www1.areditions.com/mla/conference-registration>.

A printable registration form is also available on the MOUG Web site for those who prefer not to register online. Simply print the form, fill it out, and submit it with your registration payment. Full instructions are available at the MOUG Web site.

CONFERENCE HOTEL

Paradise Point Resort & Spa
 1404 Vacation Rd.
 San Diego, CA 92109
<http://www.paradisepoint.com/>

Hotel reservations can be made by phone at 800-344-2626 or online at:
https://resweb.passkey.com/Resweb.do?mode=welcome_ei_new&eventID=31411.

Single/Double: \$226.00
 Triple/Quad: additional \$20.00 per night
 Per person CA accommodations tax: 12.6%
 Overnight parking: \$12.50/day
 Fitness center: complimentary
 In-room internet: \$10/24 hr.

Hotel reservations received after the cut-off date of **February 17, 2010** will be accepted on a space and/or rate availability basis only.

NEWS FROM OCLC

Compiled by Jay Weitz

OCLC Trustees Convene Council to Study, Develop New Record Use Policy

The OCLC Board of Trustees has convened a Record Use Policy Council, which will draw upon the fundamental values of the OCLC cooperative and engage with the global library community to develop the next generation of the WorldCat Record Use Policy. The intent is to recommend to the OCLC Board of Trustees a new policy that is aligned with the present and future information landscape. The new policy will replace the *Guidelines for Use and Transfer of OCLC Derived Records* that was developed in 1987.

The formation of this council was one of the recommendations contained in the final report (www.oclc.org/us/en/worldcat/catalog/FinalReport_ReviewBoard.pdf) of the OCLC Review Board on the Principles of Shared Data Creation and Stewardship, which was formed in January 2009 to represent the membership and inform OCLC on best practices for sharing library data.

The Policy Council is also charged with carrying out the other recommendations contained in the final report, including development of a policy to expand WorldCat's role and value in the broad information ecosystem.

The members of the OCLC Record Use Policy Council have agreed to undertake a significant body of work to canvass the current and future information needs of the library community and provide a broad and inclusive set of per-

spectives and experiences.

Over the course of the next several months, the Record Use Policy Council will:

- Review key values and principles underlying the current guidelines developed in 1987.
- Develop success criteria for a revised policy or guidelines.
- Conduct and disseminate the results of an environmental scan of data-sharing policies.
- Evaluate findings from the environmental scan and draft a new policy and recommendations for implementation.
- Develop a formal, transparent, and well managed process for vetting the new draft policy with the OCLC Regional Councils and the OCLC Global Council as the representatives of the OCLC membership.

The Record Use Policy Council will begin its work soon. The group will define an approach and timeline to carry out this important charge. The Council will submit a new draft policy and recommendations for implementation to the Chair of the OCLC Board of Trustees and OCLC President and CEO, for review and approval by the OCLC Board of Trustees in midyear 2010.

Interdisciplinary Studies Enhancement to WorldCat Collection Analysis

The ability to assess interdisciplinary studies across a collection is now available in WorldCat Collection Analysis.

Libraries are faced with the challenges of creating collections that cut across several subject areas and fields of study. Assessing the strengths and weaknesses of these collections is difficult. Classification systems do not treat these disciplines as a single subject, and interdisciplinary studies areas cross multiple subjects and call number areas. Now WorldCat Collection Analysis gives librarians the ability to assess their collections across areas of study, and compare their collection with their peers.

The interdisciplinary studies enhancement will help libraries:

- Define their own unique interdisciplinary studies areas, since one library area of study may not match another library area of study.
- Easily navigate through the OCLC Conspectus and traditional classification schemes to identify titles in multiple subject areas.
- Compare their interdisciplinary studies collection with peer libraries offering similar curriculum to identify overlaps and gaps.

Now librarians can limit an analysis by Category and/or Subject in addition to Division. Library staff can also name and save their Subject Profiles and have them available for use in the future.

RDA and OCLC

Resource Description and Access (RDA) is the new cataloging standard that will replace AACR2. It is being developed by the Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA (<http://www.rda-jsc.org/index.html>). Publication of the online, Web-based tool is planned for late in calendar year 2009. Publishers are the American Library Association, the Canadian Library Association, and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP).

OCLC has participated actively in the RDA development process through our ex-officio membership in the ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access and through our representation on the MARC Advisory Committee. We also have staff participating in the Joint Steering Committee's two RDA Examples Groups, and in the RDA/MARC Working Group, which is preparing proposals for MARC 21 format changes in support of RDA. In addition, OCLC is represented in the ALA RDA Implementation Task Force, which is planning for implementation activities in the U.S. OCLC staff have participated in program sessions sponsored by the Task Force with more participation scheduled for future sessions. OCLC staff have also recently joined staff from the three U.S. national libraries in discussions and planning for the testing/evaluation period that is planned for early in 2010. Cataloging staff in OCLC's Metadata Contract Services will participate in the testing.

Over the past several years, OCLC has also gained experience in creating FRBRized work sets based on bibliographic data in existing records and in creating similar relationships based on related ISBNs and ISSNs. There is also ongoing work using ONIX-based data created by publishers as the basis for records usable in library catalogs. All of this activity touches on aspects of RDA.

OCLC staff are also participants in cataloging discussions within the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) and are active in the creation and maintenance of cataloging standards within that organization, including the *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (FRBR), the *Functional Requirements for Authority Data* (FRAD), the *International Standard Bibliographic Description* (ISBD), and the UNIMARC Formats.

In preparation for the early 2010 testing, OCLC has begun work to implement the MARC 21 changes approved by MARBI in recent meetings (including its meetings at ALA Annual in July 2009). These changes will be implemented in the context of OCLC's existing cataloging, resource sharing, and discovery platforms. RDA offers the potential to change significantly how bibliographic data is created and used. These future possibilities, which the RDA online tool could facilitate, will be considered as part of the development of next-generation systems.

OCLC Announces Agreements to Extend Coverage in WorldCat

OCLC has signed five new agreements with national libraries and affiliated institutions that will significantly increase the coverage of records in WorldCat and the visibility of European and Middle Eastern libraries in WorldCat.org.

In Denmark, OCLC and Dansk BibliotekCenter (DBC) have agreed to load the Danish National Union Catalogue with holdings into WorldCat. DBC is responsible for providing the Danish national digital infrastructure as well as managing its national union catalog. The agreement will add approximately 10 million Danish records to WorldCat.

In Switzerland, OCLC and the Informationsverbund Deutschschweiz (IDS) have signed an agreement to load the records from five IDS consortia to WorldCat. IDS, which also includes the National Libraries of Luxembourg and Liechtenstein, will be loading approximately 10 million bibliographic records and 16 million holdings.

In France, OCLC and l'Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES) have signed an agreement to load 9 million records from Système Universitaire de documentation (Sudoc), the cataloging system for French academic libraries managed by ABES, into WorldCat.

In Slovenia, OCLC has finalized an agreement to load 3 million records later this year with IZUM, an organization which represents the interests of over 380 academic, public, and other libraries.

In Israel, MALMAD, a consortium of over 30 academic institutions, has just secured, as part of their OCLC cataloging subscription, a complete retrospective batch load of holdings data into WorldCat, which will ensure that all holdings will be visible through OCLC Connexion, OCLC FirstSearch, and WorldCat Resource Sharing.

For more information, visit the OCLC WorldCat Web site.

Announcing *The Best of MOUG*, 8th edition
Margaret Kaus (Kansas State University), editor

The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is pleased to announce the publication of the 8th edition of *The Best of MOUG*, a browsable, two-volume compendium of authorized name/uniform title headings from the Library of Congress/NACO Name Authority File for C.P.E. Bach, J.S. Bach, Beethoven, Boccherini, Brahms, Clementi, Handel, J. Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Telemann, and Vivaldi. There are also lists arranged by thematic index number for Bach, Handel, Mozart, Schubert, Telemann, and Vivaldi (by both Fanna and Ryom numbers, with a concordance from the former to the latter). Each list includes uniform titles and corresponding authority record control numbers and is current to September 2007.

It also includes an index of commonly searched English and other cross references with corresponding authority record control numbers for works by Bartók, Dvořák, Glazunov, Glière, Glinka, Grechaninov, Janáček, Kodály, Martinů, Mussorgsky, Prokofiev, Rachmaninoff, Rimsky-Korsakov, Shostakovich, Smetana, Stravinsky, and Tchaikovsky.

This browsable print resource is particularly handy at a reference desk to assist patrons when it may be inconvenient, if not impossible, to log on to OCLC's WorldCat® and search the online authority files. It is also an inexpensive yet authoritative resource for catalog departments that need to limit online searching of the LC/NACO Name-Authority File because of budget considerations, and has proven extremely useful in classroom settings and in workplace training situations.

This is the first new edition to appear since 2000, and the first to be issued in two volumes. The editor, Margaret Kaus, and the Executive Board of the Music OCLC Users Group wish to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the editors of the 1st through 7th editions, Ann (McCollough) Caldwell (Brown University; 1st-2nd eds.) and Judy Weidow (University of Texas at Austin, ret.; 3rd-7th eds.), who laid the groundwork for the present edition.

The cost per two-volume copy of the 8th edition is as follows (payable and shown below in U.S. funds only; includes shipping and handling):

\$36.00 (for orders to locations in the U.S.)
\$46.00 (for orders to Canada or Mexico)
\$58.00 (all other countries)

To order *The Best of MOUG*, 8th ed., use the order form on the reverse side of this page; or point your browser to <http://www.musicoclcusers.org/bestofmougorder.pdf>. Complete the form online, print it, and mail it via postal mail with your check to the indicated address. (Only pre-paid orders can be filled.)

For questions about the new edition, please contact the editor:

Margaret Kaus
Associate Professor
Original Cataloger
Kansas State University Libraries
Hale Library
509 Hale
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200
mkaus@ksu.edu
ph. 785-532-7263
fax 785-532-7644

Order form appears on reverse

ORDER FORM

THE BEST OF MOUG, 8th EDITION

THE MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP 2008

The Best of MOUG is an excellent tool for catalogers and public service librarians because it can be kept at a desk, card catalog or online terminal for quick access to uniform titles for the composers that are the most difficult to search online.

Cost per 2 volume set (includes shipping):	Quantity	Price
\$36.00 (United States)	_____	_____
\$46.00 in U.S. funds (Canada and Mexico)	_____	_____
\$58.00 in U.S. funds (all other countries)	_____	_____
Total:	_____	_____

All orders must be prepaid, with checks made out to the Music OCLC Users Group.

SHIP TO: _____

ADDRESS: _____

Contact info

Name: _____

Phone: _____ E-mail: _____

Please make your check payable to the Music OCLC Users Group

Check number _____

Send to:

Margaret Kaus
Best of MOUG editor
K-State Libraries
509 Hale
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200
Phone: (785) 532-7263
FAX: (785) 532-7644
E-mail: mkaus@ksu.edu

MOUG
Tax no./FEIN no.:
31-0951917

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Jay Weitz, OCLC



Learning to Be Content with Partial Contents

Q: I am having trouble with formatted content notes when I have a main title, then various songs or subtitles for that main title. I do not know the proper way to code them. I have found some examples, but nothing that looks concrete. Here is one example:

```
245 10 Sonata for trumpet and strings #h [sound recording] ; #b The virtuous wife ; The Gordian knot untied ; Pieces for harpsichord / #c Henry Purcell.
```

Now for the 505 00, the first three are straightforward, but for the fourth, there are titles for each piece. So, here is how I have done the coding:

```
505 00 #t Sonata for trumpet and strings -- #t The virtuous wife -- #t The Gordian knot untied -- #t Pieces for harpsichord : #t Trumpet tune, Z.S124 ; #t Air, Z.T675 ; #t A ground in gamut, Z.645 ; #t Hornpipe, Z.T685 ; #t Scotch tune, Z.655 ; #t A ground, Z.D222 ; #t Rigadoon, Z.653.
```

However, I think that after the title, “Pieces for harpsichord,” there should be a period, but then how do I use the punctuation to show that all the following titles are with “Pieces for harpsichord”? This has come up on a few other discs, so any help you could give me would be greatly appreciated.

A: In a case such as this, you need not a complete contents note, but rather a partial contents note. The first three works, as you’ve noted, are already accounted for in the title statement (245), so you need not repeat them in a contents note if you don’t want to. Instead, code the 505 field with a First Indicator “2” (which prompts some systems to display “Partial contents:”). Then you would include in the 505 only the contents that are not already accounted for:

```
505 20 #t Pieces for harpsichord. #t Trumpet tune, Z. S124 ; #t Air, Z. T675 ; #t A ground in gamut, Z. 645 ; #t Hornpipe, Z. T685 ; #t Scotch tune, Z. 655 ; #t A ground, Z. D222 ; #t Rigadoon, Z. 653.
```

The only difference is that the overall title of the partial contents (“Pieces for harpsichord”) should be followed by a period rather than a colon. The space-semi-colon-space following the part titles are correct as you had them. That is the convention we use. (I’ve also added a space between each “Z.” and the Zimmerman thematic index number.)

If you would still rather use a complete contents note, you’d do exactly what you already have done, except substituting the period for the space-colon-space following “Pieces for harpsichord” (and the added spaces in the Zimmerman numbers).

Cataloging MP3s on a Disc

Q: I’m trying to determine if the note, “Compact disc, MP3 format,” should be entered in field 538 or 500.

A: You should follow the recommendations of LC’s “New Sound Recording Formats” document (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsoundrec.pdf>) for MP3 files. In your case of MP3 files (presumably) on a CD-ROM, use a standard Computer File 007 as you would for other CD-

ROMs; the GMD “[electronic resource]”; describe the CD-ROM in the 300 subfield \$a as you usually would (either as “1 computer optical disc” or as “1 CD-ROM,” depending upon your institution’s choices of AACR2 9.5B1 options); 300 subfield \$b “digital, MP3 file”; and in subfield \$c, the dimensions of the CD-ROM (4 3/4 in.). Use a 538 note if the resource specifies particular playback equipment or other system requirements.

Should I “Part” or Should I “Score”?

Q: I have a volume in the Suzuki cello school series. It's the piano accompaniment for several pieces, and it was published separately. However, in each piece the cello part appears above the piano part, in reduced size (you know what I'm talking about). This is common when a part accompanies a score, but this item was published separately, as I said. The question is, would you describe this as a score (since it has two instruments' worth of staves) or as pages of music (since it is intended for use by a pianist, with the smaller cello part clearly there only for reference)?

A: If the cello part is included in its entirety (as opposed to just cues, for example), there doesn't seem to be any choice but to describe it as a score under AACR2. If the resource describes itself in some meaningful way, that should probably be included in the 245 field, a 254 field, or in a quoted note, depending upon what it says and how it says it. It might be a good idea for you to describe the particular configuration in a note if the self-description is either not present at all or is not descriptive enough by itself.

Parsing the SPARS Code

Q: I'm cataloging a CD which consists of two pieces. According to the information in the booklet, they were recorded in 1961 and 1967, in Moscow (it's Rostropovich playing cello concertos of Shostakovich). This is one CD from a set of CDs reissued from the EMI vault, so they were all originally EMI recordings. At the top of each CD is an indication of the number of sound channels and a SPARS code. This one says “Mono” and “DDD.” Is this a mistake? Mono is certainly possible; I noticed that other Soviet recordings in this set from the 1960s and early 1970s are mono (maybe they stayed with it longer than the rest of the world?), but are all marked ADD. This is the only one with DDD, and my understanding is that digital capture was technologically impossible. The only computers back then were mainframes, and nobody had figured out how to sample yet. Did I read somewhere that SPARS codes had become less useful than in the past for determining analog versus digital capture?

A: According to the Web site of the Society of Professional Audio Recording Services (<http://www.spars.com/history.html>), the SPARS Code

was designed for use with CD releases to delineate exactly which parts of the recording process were digital and which were analog. This program consisted of a series of guidelines set down by SPARS and given to CD manufacturers so that they might mark their product honestly and precisely. This pro-

gram flourished until the early 1990's. But by that time, the digital/analog technical scene had become so cluttered with conversions and algorithms for interface as to resemble rocket science, and many felt the SPARS code too simple to carry enough information to be meaningful. SPARS withdrew endorsement of the code in 1991. But many labels continued to use it, and the organization renewed its endorsement of the code in 1995.

That seems to be all they officially say about the issue. The Wikipedia entry on the SPARS Code (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SPARS_code) has a little more detail about the code's limitations, but not a lot. It's my understanding that digital capture in the sense that we're talking about was not really available until the early 1980s, and certainly not as early as 1961 or even 1967.

What this particular CD is trying to suggest about the supposed digital capture of sound at least a dozen years before the technology was available is difficult to say, but I'd be skeptical. Let's be generous and call it an error, either in printing or in the understanding of the SPARS Code itself. I would suggest coding the Sound Recording 007/04 (subfield \$e) as “m” for monaural and 007/13 (subfield \$n) as “e” for analog electrical storage. If you want to be extremely thorough, you could include a note explaining both the presence of the seemingly erroneous SPARS Code and the unlikelihood of its accuracy.

Questions & Answers

Audio Format Wars: DVD-Audio Versus CD

Q: I have a couple of questions related to a set that consists of one DVD and one accompanying compact disc. The record in OCLC has DtSt “p” and Dates “2009, 1976.” As far as we can tell, the contents of the DVD appear exactly the same as when it was first broadcast on television in 1976. However, due to the addition of the CD (copyright 2009), should the DtSt be coded “s” with a single date of 2009?

Also, the packaging refers to the accompanying compact disc as a “CD.” However, the publisher Web site describes it as a “DVD.” We are wondering if this is sufficient evidence to justify editing the record to reflect that it is a DVD-Audio disc. I'm not very familiar with DVD-Audio, and the OLAC DVD guide (http://www.olacinc.org/drupal/capc_files/DVD_guide_final.pdf) and the paper it linked to aren't very clear on how to identify this format. I tried to play the disc in my CD player and found it worked just fine. If it were a DVD-Audio, would it not play on standard CD players?

A: It seems to me that the addition of the CD and the reissuing of the two discs as a package mean that DtSt should be coded “s” with the single date. Concerning the identification of the audio format, evidence



Ex. 1: DVD-Audio logo

found on the resource in hand strikes me as usually more reliable than that found on a publisher's Web site. I don't have a lot of experience with DVD-Audio, either, but my understanding is that they commonly do not play on standard CD players. In fact, only DVD-Video players that are specially manufactured to be compatible with DVD-Audio, and dedicated DVD-Audio players

will play the discs, as far as I understand.

Most DVD-Audio discs will be explicitly identified as such, with a logo that looks similar to the DVD-Video logo except that where the DVD-Video logo says “video” at the bottom, the DVD-Audio logo says “audio,” logically enough (see Example 1). Likewise, many audio CDs will have the “Compact Disc Digital Audio” logo (see Example 2) somewhere on the label or accompanying material, or embossed in the plastic jewel case on the inside.

If none of this helps you positively identify the format of the audio disc, you could include a note about the ambiguity and the sources of the contradictory information, and note that the disc does seem to play in a standard CD player. For good measure you could also try playing the disc in a DVD player, if you have access to one.



Ex. 2: Compact Disc logo

Collective Title Bouts

Q: For sound recordings, AACR2 6.0 basically says that you use the disc (or reel, or cassette, or whatever) and label as your chief source, unless another source has a collective title. The LCRI to that rule says:

For sound recordings containing two works of the same type by one composer without a collective title on the label(s), do not consider as a collective title a title on the container or accompanying material that is made up of the name of the type plus one or more of the following identifying elements for the two works: serial number, opus number, thematic index number, key.

Examples are things like “Piano concertos no. 1 and 4” (not collective), but “The violin concertos / Prokofiev” (collective—it seems he only wrote two). From the examples, I gather that a medium statement is considered

part of the “type” in this situation, hence “Piano concertos” and “violin concertos” even coming into the picture. My questions are: (1) According to this LCRI, if a title of the sort called “not collective” when it is on the container or accompanying material, is on the label instead, is it collective? (2) If the title were “Piano concertos no. 1, 2, and 4” (so three works, not two), is it now collective?

A: Here are my best guesses at the answers to your questions. (1) LCRI 6.0B1 does seem to limit this narrowed definition of “collective title” to “a title on the container or accompanying material” and does not include such a title on the label. So I'd say that such a title on the label must be considered a collective title. (2) LCRI 6.0B1 again seems to limit its application to cases of “sound recordings containing two works of the same type by one composer,” so if there are three works, such a title would be considered collective.

Sheet Music Variants

Q: OCLC's *Bibliographic Formats and Standards*, Chapter 4, "When to Input a New Record," says that absence or presence of 245 subfield \$b is *not* a reason to input a new record. How about when you are staring at two copies and that is the only difference? I have two copies of *Goofus*, a 1930s song by Wayne King and William Harold, words by Gus Kahn. The "cover" (i.e., title page) of copy 1 has the title "Goofus," the statement of responsibility, some artwork, and a photo of Phil Harris. The caption is the same. The other copy has "Goofus : a corn-fed fox trot ditty" along with statement of responsibility and only a big logo of the publisher on the "cover." Caption is the same, except the title is "Goofus : comedy fox-trot song." Same publisher and copyright date, same plate number, same type font of music. The title on the caption of copy 2 is smaller than the first one, I guess because the longer title is on two lines. The copies have different ads. Are these two copies or different editions?

Now, to muddy the waters, there is quite a lot of space between the music systems. Looks like someone took the opportunity to fill it, so copy 2 also has chord symbols plus chord diagrams for ukulele—not during the piano introduction (there isn't room), just accompanying the singer. So that is another difference. Or perhaps it was the other way around, that it first got published with the chord symbols and diagrams, then they got taken out, leaving the extra space between systems. Does that change your answer? In OCLC, I find a match for copy 1 (#124082240). There is no match for copy 2, but there is a record with yet another variant of the title and different cover art, plus an edition state-

ment in a 500 (#8767828). What if the subtitle's presence on one and its absence on the other *was* the only difference, or the only difference except for ads and "cover" art?

A: Cataloging of sheet music is a fine art at least partly different from the cataloging of other notated music, as is evidenced by the guidelines compiled by MLA's Working Group on Sheet Music Cataloging Guidelines a few years ago. I don't pretend to be an expert on all of its ins and outs, but as you describe the two publications, the difference of other title information really isn't the only difference. The presence/absence stipulation regarding 245 subfield \$b is intended partly to account for differences between first and second level descriptions (AACR2 1.0D), or minimal and fuller level records.

The presence of the chord symbols and diagrams in one and not in the other strikes me as a difference justifying separate records. In the record for the version with the chord symbols, include that in a note. You may want to differentiate the two records with notes about the existence of the other version (possibly as local notes or local edits). Were the subtitle's presence the only difference, well, you have the advantage of the two demonstrably different title statements in hand. I would say separate records are still justified, and would note that difference in each record. In everyday cataloging when one would be unlikely to have different versions in hand to compare, I might suggest locally editing an existing record, all other things being equal, if there was significant doubt.

Singing the Praises of the Vocal Score

Q: Musicals (staged or filmed), as performed, typically have relatively broad instrumentation, a pit orchestra or studio ensemble (though I am aware that the composer typically does not do the orchestrations). At least they did until synthesizers appeared, and sometimes still do. Thus when I get scores with a song or collection of songs from musicals with just the vocal line and piano accompaniment, I use "vocal score" in all the usual places (uniform title, physical description, subject headings). I'm seeing an awful lot of copy on OCLC that does not do any of that.

A: For the scores of musicals, whether complete, selected, or a single song, your interpretation concurs with mine. Unless you have evidence that a musical was originally written with piano accompaniment alone, you can probably consider them "vocal scores" in the AACR2 sense. LCRI 25.35D1 would have us designate them "vocal score" in the physical description and in the uniform title. Of course, AACR2 doesn't deal with subject analysis, but adding the appropriate "Vocal scores with x" subdivision to the subject heading would also be logical.

Questions & Answers
There are Musicals and Then There are Musicals

Q: Please advise on when to use “Musicals” and when to use “Motion picture music” as a subject heading—specifically, when something that walks and quacks like a musical is a film. I’ve always used “Musicals” for live, staged productions where the songs are integral to or at least relate to the plot, and “Motion picture music” for the (usually) largely instrumental “background” music of a movie. Since many staged musicals are later made into movies (think *The Sound of Music*), I used “Musicals” also for musicals-as-movies, because it seemed reasonable to keep the two versions together. Now I wonder if that is correct. The scope notes in the authority records for “Musicals” and “Motion picture music” haven’t resolved it for me.

A: “Musicals” (topical/sh85089018) is assigned to “music for theatrical productions consisting of musical numbers (songs, ensembles, and dances) integrated into a dramatic framework.” Taking that literally, it seems to exclude film versions of stage musicals. “Musical films” (topical/sh85088121; genre/sh2007025016) would cover the film musicals, regardless of whether they are adaptations of stage musicals (such as *Chicago*) or are composed for the screen (such as *State Fair*, later transformed into a stage musical). “Filmed musicals” (genre/sh2008025647) covers filmed performances of live stage musicals. “Motion picture music” (topical/sh85088056) covers “musical works composed for sound films or performed on soundtracks.” Broadly speaking, of course, that would include any musical film, but I believe the intention is limited to what we would ordinarily consider (and which one of the 450s says directly) “Background music for motion pictures.”

Additional perspectives from Sharon McKinley at the Library of Congress (writing personally only and not representing official LC policy):

As for musicals and movies, if it walks and quacks like a musical, it is, to my mind, a musical! The musical/film headings are confusing, overlap, and are not completely analogous. My personal, flawed, and stripped-down understanding: The term “Musical” applies to the structure of a dramatic work. It also applies to the music from that work. A

motion picture is (to me) a physical format which can have one or more of any number of structures, including that of a musical; the music that is written for a film is motion picture music. If you have a score or sound recording for music from a motion picture, the first heading should be “Motion picture music.” Secondly, if the dramatic work in question is a musical, I would double the headings and apply “Musicals” as well, even though they both have the broader heading “Dramatic music.” I would *not* worry about whether the work was originally conceived as a motion picture (such as *State Fair*) or as a stage show (*Annie*).

I find the subject authority records using the word “theatrical” a bit confusing, because to me that word implies a stage show. But now that I think of it, people talk about the theatrical release of motion pictures, so maybe I’m just thinking like a musician instead of as a filmgoer. See LCCN 2002557657 for an example of a recording of a musical turned into a movie, with the doubled headings. I’m sure we can find examples all over the lot, but I like this one.

There are other headings associated with musicals/movies:

- **Musical films** (Use for: Film musicals; you might in theory use THIS on *State fair*, but I wouldn’t! It has been used sketchily over the years. It seems to be more for books ABOUT them and has a PN number on the record).
- **Filmed musicals** (a form/genre heading for a filmed stage performance; no bibs in LC but there are a small number in OCLC, used in exactly that way).

It’s obvious that this is a convoluted bunch of headings, and they’ve been applied in different ways. I personally think you’re doing the user a favor by doubling the headings, but others may think more literally.

Confusion is understandable among catalogers, let alone library users.

One 028 or Many?

Q: I have a question about tagging publisher's numbers in the 028. I have a two-volume set with the publisher numbers "S110021--S110022." According to BFAS, a range of numbers like this would be entered in one 028 field with a dash between the two numbers, because OCLC will index "each number in the range from the first to the last in increments of one, to a maximum of 20." However, our local system does not index any number after the first and the only way to retrieve both numbers would be to enter each in its own 028 field or use the search "S110021--S110022" to find the bibliographic record. Of course, we don't always have the first volume of a set, and therefore would not know the first publisher's number that might be in a field 028. To make sure we will always be able to search all numbers, I have been entering them in separate 028s and adding a note. This was always the RLIN practice, which I never liked after knowing what OCLC could do with a range of numbers. Now that I am creating new records that will go to OCLC, I've been wondering what to do. This is especially a

problem when there are more than two numbers in a range. There can be a *lot* of 028 fields. What do you advise?

A: The (sometimes questionable) convenience of being able to input a range of numbers in field 028 is OCLC practice, but we recognize that this doesn't always work with other implementations of MARC21. In fact, neither MARC21 itself nor LC's own *Music and Sound Recordings Online Manual* (MOIM) includes the option of such number ranges in the 028. Instead, each number is given its own separate 028. You may follow that practice or, if you don't mind the extra step, input the number range in the master record but the individual 028s in your local version of the record. MOIM suggests limiting the number of 028s to fifteen when there are lots of them, but that would be up to you. In cases where you create multiple 028s and it isn't possible to automatically generate a usable note, input an explicit 500 note and code the 028 Second Indicators so that no note is generated from the 028 fields.

For Music Scholars, Teachers, Performers, Librarians—

Notes



Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association

Your Indispensable Companion For:

- Scholarly Articles
- Penetrating Reviews
- Bibliographic Essays
- Lists of New Publications
- Advertisements for Books, Recordings, Scores, Journals, and Other Services
- Sound Recording Reviews
- Digital Media Reviews
- Music Publishers' Information
- Video Reviews

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Annual membership in the Music Library Association (includes a subscription to NOTES): Individuals, \$90.00; Institutions, \$125.00; Students, \$35.00; Retirees, \$60.00; Corporate Members, \$450.00; Corporate Patrons, \$750.00. Annual U.S. subscription without membership: Individuals, \$85.00; Institutions, \$100.00. Postage (surface mail) supplement for Canadian and other foreign addresses: members, \$10.00; subscribers, \$5.00. Recent single issues are available at \$20.00 each (\$21.00 foreign). All back volumes are also available. All payments must be in U.S. funds, payable to the Music Library Association, Inc., and sent to the business office: 8551 Research Way, Suite 180, Middleton, WI 53562.

Alan Ringwood
MOUG Newsletter Editor
University of Texas Libraries
The University of Texas at Austin
P.O. Box P
Austin, TX 78713-8916

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal Membership is \$30.00 (North America) and \$45 (outside North America); institutional membership is \$40.00 (North America) and \$50.00 (outside North America). Membership includes subscription to the *Newsletter*. New members will also receive any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor. Please note that subscriptions, once placed during the annual renewal period, may not be canceled, and no refunds will be given.

NAME _____
PREFERRED ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____ COUNTRY _____
WORK PHONE (____) _____ FAX NUMBER (____) _____

INSTITUTION NAME _____
POSITION TITLE _____
E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

A check payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP must accompany this application. Rates are as follows:

- _____ \$30.00 Personal Membership (North America)
- _____ \$45.00 Personal Membership (outside North America)
- _____ \$40.00 Institutional Membership (North America)
- _____ \$50.00 Institutional Membership (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Diane Napert, MOUG Treasurer, Irving S. Gilmore Music Library, Yale University, P.O. Box 208240, New Haven, CT 06520-8240.