

2017

OLAC NEWSLETTER



Volume 37

Number 4

December

2017

THE OLAC NEWSLETTER

The OLAC Newsletter (ISSN: 0739-1153) is a quarterly publication of the Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. appearing in March, June, September and December. Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged.

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Marcia Barrett
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz CA 95064
1156 High Street
barrett@ucsc.edu

ADDRESS AND EMAIL CHANGES

Debra Spidal
Washington State University
Libraries
PO Box 645610
Pullman WA 99164-5610
dspidal@wsu.edu

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Richard N. Leigh Ball State
University Libraries
2000 W. University Avenue
Muncie IN 47306
rnleigh@bsu.edu

CONFERENCE REPORTS EDITOR

Jan Mayo
Joyner Library
East Carolina University
Greenville NC 27858-4353
mayoj@ecu.edu

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS EDITOR

Yoko Kudo
University of California, Riverside
900 University Avenue
Riverside CA 92521
yoko.kudo@ucr.edu

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS EDITOR

Jay Weitz
OCLC
MC 745
6565 Kilgour Place
Dublin OH 43017-3395
weitzj@oclc.org

SPOTLIGHT EDITOR

Lisa Romano
Joseph P. Healey Library
University of Massachusetts
100 Morrissey Boulevard
Boston MA 02125-3393
Lisa.Romano@umb.edu

Material for publication in the OLAC Newsletter should be sent to the appropriate editor. Persons wishing to review books should contact Richard Leigh and indicate their special interests and qualifications. For AV cataloging questions, contact Jay Weitz. Articles should be submitted in electronic form, using standard word-processing software, and consistent in length and style with other items published in the Newsletter. For further guidance, please check the [OLAC Newsletter Editorial Stylesheet](#). Persons wishing to nominate themselves or other OLAC members for *In the Spotlight* should contact Lisa Romano.

From the Editor

Marcia Barrett

By all accounts, the recent OLAC Conference in Richmond was a big success! There's lots of information in this issue about the conference. Thanks to Jan Mayo for coordinating conference reporting!

Please note the opportunities to get involved with OLAC as an intern/member of CAPC or as a candidate for office, as well as the 2018 OLAC Research Grant.



Contents

From the President	3
From the Treasurer	5
From the Secretary	6
From the Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator	32
OLAC Conference Reports	33
OLAC Conference Sponsors	56
OLAC Conference Wrap-Up	57
OLAC Leadership Positions: Call for Candidates	61
Call for CAPC Participation	62
Call for Proposals for the 2018 OLAC Research Grant	63
News and Announcements	64
Members on the Move	65
In the Spotlight with Melissa Burel	67
ALA Midwinter Meetings of Interest	69
Reviews	73
OLAC Cataloger's Judgment Questions and Answers	75
News from OCLC	80
MOUG	90

From the President

Jeremy Myntti



OLAC recently held another wonderful conference in October 2017 in Richmond, Virginia. A big thank you to everyone who made this conference possible. The Conference Planning Committee, led by Kay Johnson from Radford University, spent so much of their time and energy over the past year planning this conference. It was great to see so many OLAC members in Richmond. There were around 130 attendees at the conference, with about half of them being first-time attendees!

One of the highlights of this conference was the many tributes given to OLAC's founder, Nancy Olson. Nancy has had many health challenges lately and is currently in hospice care. During the OLAC Membership Meeting at the conference, we were pleased to have a few OLAC members share their memories and thoughts of Nancy which touched everyone present. Thank you to everyone who attended the conference that signed the cards for Nancy and her family. These cards along with a photo of all conference attendees have been sent to Nancy to show her our appreciation for all that she has done to make OLAC what it is today.

In the closing session of the conference, I quoted our very own Jay Weitz in his chapter titled "Judgment and Imagination: Carrying Cataloging through Times of Change" which was part of the book *Conversations with Catalogers in the 21st Century*. In this chapter, Jay said:

Catalogers have long been used to two constants. First, the world we are trying to describe keeps shifting under our feet. Second, our standards have never been able to keep up with the shifting. Both of those points seem especially apt when we're talking about such resources as remotely accessed documents and Web sites that themselves can change without warning.

When done conscientiously, cataloging has always been more art than science. We catalog real-world resources that may or may not conform to the theories that our rules try to codify. ... The world of stuff to catalog is so vast, so slippery, so surprising, that individual judgment will always enter into our decisions ... Catalogers are not the mindless drudges that many non-catalogers imagine, but instead are thoughtful judges concerning matters of description and access. It is that judgment leavened with imagination that has carried catalogers through these decades of change. That same judgment and imagination will continue to stand them in good stead through

the era of ... RDA, any post-MARC data structure, and whatever future marvels the world sends them to catalog.¹

I agree with Jay that cataloging is an art that needs special skills, judgment, and imagination to continue moving forward with never ending changes. Conferences like the one we held in October 2017 are so important to be able to come together as a community and learn from each other.

If you are interested in becoming more involved in OLAC, there are several opportunities coming up in the near future.

- OLAC Membership Meeting at the 2018 ALA Midwinter Meeting -- February 9, 2018, 3:00-4:00. Denver, Colorado in the Sheraton Denver Downtown, Terrace.
- CAPC Meeting at the 2018 ALA Midwinter Meeting -- February 9, 2018, 7:30-9:30. Denver, Colorado in the Crowne Plaza, Red Cloud.
- Election season is coming up. Nominate yourself or a colleague for the offices of OLAC Vice President/President-Elect or OLAC Secretary
- Nominate a colleague for the 2018 Nancy B. Olson Award
- CAPC is seeking applications for member and intern positions
- Volunteer for the Website Steering Committee
- Apply for the OLAC Research Grant for a research project related to AV cataloging
- Volunteer to help with the next OLAC Conference

I appreciate all of the work that so many people have been putting into OLAC initiatives. Working with all of our members and working so closely with the Executive Board is an honor, and I thank everyone for all of the effort that you put into our organization!

¹ Weitz, Jay. "Judgment and Imagination: Carrying Cataloging Through Times of Change." In *Conversations with Catalogers in the 21st Century*. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2011.

From the Treasurer

Debra Spidal



Personal Memberships	292
Institutional Memberships	32
Total as of 9/30/17	324

	Quarter	FY-to-Date
Opening Balance	\$ 9,684.49	\$ 9,684.49
INCOME		
Memberships	\$ 3,498.00	\$ 3,498.00
EBSCO Subscriptions		\$ -
TOTAL INCOME	\$ 3,498.00	\$ 3,498.00
EXPENSES		
Events		
Stipends	\$ 300.00	\$ 300.00
Board Dinners		\$ -
Facilities		\$ -
Reimbursements		\$ -
Subtotal	\$ 300.00	\$ 300.00
Vendors		
Wild Apricot		\$ -
BluHost		\$ -
PayPal	\$ 103.70	\$ 103.70
Survey Monkey		\$ -
Marketing/Design		\$ -
YNAB	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
Subtotal	\$ 153.70	\$ 153.70
Operations		
Conference scholarships		\$ -
Research grant reimbursements		\$ -
Awards		\$ -
ALA Affiliate membership		\$ -
Taxes		\$ -
Overcharge adjustments		\$ -
Office supplies & postage	\$ 209.76	\$ 209.76
Subtotal	\$ 209.76	\$ 209.76
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 663.46	\$ 663.46
Closing Balance	\$ 12,519.03	\$ 12,519.03

From the Secretary

Jeannette Ho

Minutes of the OLAC Executive Board Meeting

Virtual Meeting through Skype

Wednesday, September 13, 2017



Present: Jeremy Myntti, Bruce Evans, Stacie Traill, Mary Huisman, Heylicken (Hayley) Moreno, Debra Spidal, Annie Glerum, Kay Johnson, Jeannette Ho, Jay Weitz

Absent: Matt Burrell, Marcia Barrett

Meeting started at 3:02 am EST

- Committee Report:
 - Conference Planning (Stacie Traill and Kay Johnson)
 - Prior to the meeting, Kay sent a report to the Board member summarizing some highlights and concerns regarding arrangements for the upcoming OLAC Conference in Richmond. The number of attendees registered at this time is lower than we would like (As an update to her report that said 76 were registered as of 9/8/17, Autumn recently sent a message saying that we now have 90 people registered).
 - Hayley has contacted her to explore ways to increase the number of registrants. It was pointed out that the listservs on the report used to publicize the conference did not include ALCTS-Central. Hayley also suggested reaching out to library science students in states such as Maryland and North Carolina, who are within driving distance of Richmond, and may be willing to attend the conference.
 - Kay reported that the OLAC Conference hotel was sold out as of last Wednesday, October 25. Conference attendees may want to find a roommate or stay elsewhere if they arrive on Wednesday. There are still plenty of rooms for Thursday through Sunday.
 - Only one person has used the conference service to request a roommate so far.
 - A question was asked about the hotel blocks per night. As of Wednesday, there were 110 rooms in the block for Thursday and Friday, a little less for Saturday. There were few rooms still available for Sunday.
 - Hayley would like to streamline promotion for the OLAC Conference. She would like to promote information about it through social media outlets and have a

- hashtag on Twitter so people can follow activities during the conference. Kay will work with her after the meeting to discuss ways to promote it.
- Stacie gave an update on programming for the upcoming conference in Richmond. Proposals have been received. So far we have received two proposals for Lightning Talks. This is not enough, and we will need at least two or three others. In an email discussion with the group helping with program planning, Jeremy suggested filling the remaining slots with CAPC members who can give brief updates on various activities or task forces from this group. In addition, we have only one volunteer so far for a round table facilitator for the Collaborative Problem Solving discussions and need several more. In the meantime, we have five proposals for poster sessions. Although we could have more, this number is probably sufficient. We have enough people (three) for the Linked Data Initiatives panel, and the workshop presenters are all set. Stacie will work with Kay on the logistics of scheduling and preparing rooms for the workshops.
 - Bruce said he will work with Stacie on recruiting CAPC members to give lightning talks.
 - Stacie said that she plans to extend the call for proposals to a few more days. She will contact Hayley with information to publicize this.
- Officer Reports:
 - President (Jeremy)
 - OLAC Board Meeting in Richmond
 - It was decided to have the Board member dinner on Saturday evening of the conference, instead of Thursday, October 26, when our meeting is scheduled. Board members were also asked to browse the links to restaurants on the OLAC Conference website and make recommendations to him. Jeremy would like to decide on a restaurant within a few weeks.
 - ALA Midwinter Room Request
 - It is time to request rooms for meetings at the upcoming ALA Midwinter Meeting. Jeremy would like to request theater seating with a head table, 50 seats, for the Membership Meeting, and a hollow square with 20 seats and 20 perimeter seating for the CAPC meeting. This is consistent with what we have requested in the past. Board members agreed that this was acceptable.
 - MOUG Liaison--Autumn Faulkner was appointed for 2017-2019.
 - AMIA Liaison--A past AMIA President approached Annie at ALA Annual about this liaison role. Jeremy is following up with the AMIA Cataloging and Metadata Committee to fill this position.
 - OLAC Archives—Jeremy contacted Liz Miller to find out the latest status of the OLAC Archives since nothing has happened with this over the past couple of years. He will look into how we should proceed with the Archives in the future.

- Vice President/President-Elect (Mary)
 - Mary has compiled a summary of past programs and is exploring various topics that we could do programming on during the Annual Conference
 - She will put out a call for topics/speakers
 - Someone suggested having a microphone at the Membership Meeting for Midwinter. It was mentioned that we did have one for the past conference, although we didn't use it.

- Treasurer (Debra)
 - Prior to the meeting, Debra shared links to the corrected 4th quarterly report for FY17) and the preliminary 1st quarterly report for FY18.
 - Debra reported that she has received historical Treasurer/Membership Coordinator documentation, as well as access to all of the online accounts and services that Autumn had used as past Treasurer.
 - Tax forms have been submitted.
 - Debra is ready to implement the rate change in membership dues effective October 1st.
 - We have added 44 new members since July 10th, mostly due to conference registration.
 - We can anticipate a large expense for renewing Wild Apricot. The cost may be between \$600 and \$800.
 - The membership software was updated in anticipation of the new rates, but it was discovered that some updates were incorrect, and had to be changed back.
 - We will have an expense of between \$200 and \$300 for giving refunds to members who were charged the wrong amount. Debra estimated the cost of the refund to be \$20 per person for most people.

- Secretary (Jeannette)
 - The OLAC meeting minutes from ALA Midwinter were sent to OLAC Board members for their review after ALA Annual. Jeannette submitted the corrected version to the Newsletter on August 10th. They appear in the current September issue.
 - The roster for OLAC Board members and appointees/liaisons was updated to include Autumn Faulkner's contact information for the MOUG Liaison position.
 - Jeannette monitored comments made in the Google Docs draft of the OLAC Handbook prior to the Board meeting. A reminder had been sent to Board members to comment on it by September 1st in mid-August.

- Outreach/Advocacy (Hayley)
 - Hayley is planning to meet with Kay Johnson and discuss ways to streamline the promotion of the OLAC Conference. She is interested in using social

media and exploring new methods to get people excited about the Conference.

- Hayley met with Marcia about what the Outreach/Advocacy coordinator should write about. Hayley would like to share stories about how OLAC members are using resources, promoting OLAC to fellow librarians, or advocating for AV cataloging. The stories could go in the Newsletter.
- Hayley would like to target library school students, a population that we have not traditionally reached out to. There could be potential life-long members of OLAC among future catalogers at those institutions if we showcase how much value they would get for joining our organization.
- Jeremy expressed support for the idea of reaching out to students. He mentioned an OLAC member who successfully promoted OLAC to one of his cataloging students at the University of Illinois who later joined it and became a professional cataloger. There could be other LIS professors among our colleagues that we could target.
- Hayley encouraged Board members to share similar stories with her.
- Newsletter Editor (Jeremy for Marcia)
 - The September issue of the OLAC Newsletter is on the OLAC website. The announcement for its publication was sent a little late this time since she had some trouble posting it to OLAC-L.
- CAPC Chair (Bruce Evans)
 - Bruce will put out call for agenda items in the near future for the CAPC meeting in Richmond.
 - Mega/Unified BP Task Force:
 - The membership of this group is now complete: Marcia Barrett, Teresa Keenan, Yoko Kudo, Melissa Burel, and Amanda Scott.
 - Advisors: Bruce is still working on getting advisors for this group. Some suggestions that have been put forward from task force members are: Jay Weitz, Greta de Groat, and Kelley McGrath.
 - BP TF authors will be “ex officio advisors”, as they will be involved with content drawn from their BP documents.
 - Next steps: 1) Come to final agreement on advisors, and approach tem; 2) Bruce to send email to five TF members and put together TF prospectus outlining its parameters and scope.
 - Whither 3XX effort from this summer?
 - Bruce discussed it with Mary Huismann over the phone on August 31, as the issue has morphed a bit. They identified and discussed three central “issues” that needed further action. Two are not pressing, one is.
 - Issue 1 (not pressing): Address inconsistency in treatment of non-RDA terms in MARC 344 and 347 fields. In a nutshell, RDA is unlikely to come up with standard terms for A/V concepts, so there is a need for standardization of terms outside of RDA. (Important side-note: this

would essentially be a reincarnation of the vocabulary/glossary effort; albeit with a somewhat different focus.) Mary and Bruce discussed some next steps that could be done without needing to form another task force to resolve this matter.

- Issue 2 (*pressing): Consider consistent treatment of 344 and 347 across formats. They talked about the need to put together a joint task force (OLAC and MLA; two people from each) to review both communities' sets of BP to see where practices line up or diverge and make recommendations for revision. The exact timeline will be dependent upon analogous needed OCLC/MARC updates. (In a sense, this issue most closely resembles Jay's original plea for help before Annual.)
 - Issue 3 (not pressing): Consider implementation of the new \$2 source codes for 33X and 34X. Next steps: Bruce and Mary check with OLAC and MLA's respective MAC liaisons to assess feasibility of a MAC paper like this passing. (Previous discussion indicates this may be a tough sell.)
-
- Follow up to RSC-sponsored Specialized Cataloging Community meeting at Annual.
 - At the above-noted meeting on June, Judy Kuhagen asked the A/V cataloging community (i.e. OLAC) for additional guidance on Representative Expression in IFLA-LRM, and to report back on this prior to the follow up meeting at Midwinter. After consulting with Kelley and Yoko, I found out that there is now a "[final](#)" [draft of IFLA-LRM](#) that was released just last month (link:) that reworked the section on representative expression quite a bit. So a possible next step could be to have all CAPC members read the newest version, and then brainstorm recommendations regarding representative expression per Judy K's request.
 - Cataloging Resources page revision effort
 - Next steps will be dependent upon prospective redesign of our website.
 - Accessibility MAC Paper:
Did not pass at Annual. Will come up again at a focus MAC meeting. See [PROPOSAL 2017-11 discussion](#) for complete information.
 - Joint MLA/OLAC Playaways TF Matter
 - Rosemary Groenwald expressed doubts about this TF. She suggested that this project be shelved entirely in an email she sent to Bruce on August 1st. In it, she wrote: "In order for this document to be valuable to AV catalogers, it should have been published quite a while back. I think most catalogers of Playaways have accepted the cataloging practice of the Playaway company while enhancing the records in ways that follow RDA rules as they understand them or a format that is a sound recording but also includes elements of the format "other." I'm not sure that publishing it so far after the fact will be of much use to most catalogers of the format other than to confirm that they have been doing it right! I'm not sure where all of this leaves the BP document. I guess I'd like to suggest that we poll the CAPC members, both current and past, as to whether they feel there is merit in still

- publishing a BP guide for Playaways. Then, depending on the results, we can formulate what our next step will be. “
- Prior to the meeting, Bruce clarified with Jeremy that this task force is a joint effort between MLA and OLAC. (There was a separate effort to create a summary document of issues related to cataloging Playaways).
 - Bruce will check with CAPC members to decide whether to continue to pursue this project.
- Committee Reports
 - Website Steering Committee (Annie for Matt)
 - Annie will help Matt maintain the website. She would like to be contacted when the Handbook revisions are ready to be published.
 - Election Committee (Stacie Traill)
 - There was a call for nominations for the next election in the Newsletter. Positions available this year include: Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary.
 - Stacie would like to recruit someone before the OLAC Conference to work on the Election Committee with her to put out broader calls for nominations.
 - December 31st is the deadline for nominations.
 - Stacie has a list of people that Marcia recruited from last year. She would like us to let her know of people who would be good candidates.
 - Nancy B. Olson Award (Annie):
 - An announcement was sent to OLAC-L on 9/5/2017
 - An announcement also appears in the September issue of the Newsletter.
 - The deadline for applications is December 1.
 - OLAC Research Grant Committee (Mary)
 - No report at this time
 - Discussion
 - OLAC-MOUG merger white paper (Jeremy Myntti and Bruce Evans)
 - A group will be formed to review the white paper and come up with recommendations on how to move forward. Three people from MOUG (Nara Newcomer, Molly O'Brien, Alan Ringwood) and the OLAC-MOUG Liaison (Autumn Faulkner) have already been appointed to it. Three more members from OLAC are needed. Mary, Hayley, and Bruce agreed to serve on it.
 - There is no timeline for this task force, but Jeremy thought their work should take place within the next few months. He proposed that the white paper be shared with the OLAC membership prior to the upcoming OLAC Conference in

Richmond, and that the task force meet afterwards in either November or December.

- Handbook revision and bylaws changes (Jeannette Ho)
 - See the comments people made on a [draft of the Handbook](#).
 - Jeannette summarized some changes that will be made that are non-controversial (replacing “Webmaster” with “Web Developer,” adding Heidi Frank to the list of Nancy B. Olson Award recipients, deleting any mention of “OLAC Production Editor” under “OLAC Stipends and Fees,” and changing the wording for the Secretary’s duties under Article V. Officers. Section 3d so that it conforms to the wording in the actual Bylaws that were voted on in 2014).
 - Changes people suggested to Article IX. Committees under “Section 2. Website Steering Committee”) will not be made at this time since this section of the Bylaws contains wording that was voted on in 2014.
 - Other sections (“Article V. Officers. Section 2 Appointed Officers” and “OLAC Executive Board: Duties of the Chair of CAPC”) will also be kept the same until we can have a discussion about whether a Bylaws change should be proposed to lengthen the term of the CAPC Chair to two years instead of one.
 - The section under “OLAC Website Steering Committee” outside the Bylaws had been discussed at Midwinter. The current wording in the Bylaws for this committee will be used in this section. Other potential changes that have been suggested will need to wait since they would require Bylaws changes. Jeannette said she would compile a list of all issues that would require such changes in the Bylaws after the meeting so that they can be discussed at a future meeting.
 - It was decided that under “OLAC Executive Board: Duties of the Treasurer/Membership Coordinator,” the President should be specified as the “other board member” who will help the Treasurer “peruse the IRS site (section for exempt organizations) annually.”
- OLAC Brochure
 - At a recent ALA conference, the Affiliates booth did not have any printed literature for OLAC. The OLAC brochure needs to be updated soon so that it can be distributed at booths in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 4:02 pm EST.

OLAC Executive Board Meeting

OLAC Conference

Omni Hotel, Rappahannock Room

Richmond, VA

Thursday, October 26, 2017

6:00-7:00

Present: Annie Glerum, Bruce Evans, Jeremy Myntti, Stacie Traill, Jeannette Ho, Jay Weitz, Mary Huismann, Heylicken (Hayley) Moreno, Debra Spidal, Kay Johnson, Casey Mullins

Started at 6:05 pm

- o **Committee Reports**

- o Conference Planning (Stacie Traill and Kay Johnson)

According to Kay, there are 131 total registrants for this conference. Sixty-five registrants are attending an OLAC conference for the first time.

The biggest problem dealt with during the conference so far are errors in schedules that were printed on name tags. Registrants need to check the emails they received prior to the conference or at the front desk to confirm that their schedules are correct.

Kay said she was a little concerned about the cost of the conference. She encouraged people to not share their reception drink tickets and not use all of them. We get charged for the cost of drinks that were actually ordered after the conference.

Contact information needs to be obtained for attendees that were not on the original list of registrants. Conference planners had not originally planned to do late registrations. There are at least three people who needed extra chairs at the preconference on Thursday afternoon. Receipts are also off by a least one attendee who was not on the list.

Kay expressed concerns with the cost structure of this conference. She had lobbied to get a higher registration fee for this conference. She mentioned that other meetings, such as Charleston and NASIG have lower registration fees than ALA, but the cost of lodgings are not as expensive. She was also not able to get potential big donors (although OCLC and Midwest Tapes participated) this time due to this being an “emergency conference” during a year when the OLAC conference is not normally held. She had tried to get representatives from Zepheira to do a demonstration of their BIBFRAME tools, but this didn’t work out.

Kay thought that both OLAC and MOUG need to increase attendance to bring in more funding. Stacie said that attendance has been pretty steady for the last five or six OLAC conferences. There was a lot of feedback received in last year’s survey of OLAC and MOUG members about a potential merger of these organizations. Some respondents who could benefit from OLAC’s conferences found the amount of the registration fee to

be prohibitive. There is an ongoing discussion about finding the right balance between keeping the conferences affordable while raising sufficient funds. In the meantime, we have attempted to follow guidelines in the Conference manual, such as selecting dinner venues at affordable costs, keeping the costs of shuttle buses down, and not having more than one reception.

It was mentioned that cataloging meetings have traditionally not attracted huge sponsorships from vendors because of the perception that catalogers don't make purchasing decisions. Vendors may need to be better informed about the extent to which catalogers can influence purchases, such as the choice of an ILS. She would like us to pursue better deals with them so that we can cover more costs, such as AV (which was over \$800).

A question was asked if \$50 was too low for the cost of the preconference. It was suggested that if we can begin to offer multiple preconferences at the same conference, we might be able to raise more funds.

Debra said that sixty new members have joined OLAC last month, which could be because of the conference. She had been told that October was traditionally the peak month for renewals, but she has not seen any for this month. She wondered if the recent increase in membership fees caused this.

Jeremy asked Casey about having more combined OLAC-MOUG conferences. Casey replied that many people attend MOUG conferences because they are held immediately after the Music Library Association (MLA) conferences. Few attendees at the last MOUG conference, belonged to MOUG, but not MLA. It was also mentioned that people seem to have less funds to travel to professional meetings as they used to, so the convenience of traveling to one location for both of these conferences may be important to consider.

Jeremy asked if the next OLAC Conference should be held in 2019, or within the next two and a half years. Autumn, the former Treasurer, had previously raised a concern about the challenges that her successor would have in transitioning toward this role if the next conference was held too soon. Debra said that she has not been able to remove Nathan Putnam's name or contact information from OLAC's business account in PayPal. It was asked whether Nathan can help in this situation. Another person suggested that she close this account and open a new one. However, it is not clear whether the account is tied up with the one in Wild Apricot, the new organization/membership management system that Autumn selected and helped implement. There is a bit of a learning curve for this program. Debra would like to prepare early for the next conference. She mentioned that her term lasts for two years, and she is not sure if this is enough time for her to get involved with the next conference. Jeremy suggested that the next conference can be held off longer. We should also begin looking for people who would be interested in help host it. It was also mentioned that 2020 will mark the 40th anniversary of OLAC.

Hayley remarked that marketing for the conference had been done at the last minute. As a result, people learned about it too late. There needs to be ample time to publicize

the next conference in advance. It was mentioned that the Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator position had been vacant for a long time prior to this conference.

Kay suggested having a memorandum of understanding with the speakers about the honorarium and other issues. Things didn't always go smoothly this time over getting workshop descriptions and speaker biographical information upfront. It was suggested that a template be created where all requirements for conference planning is laid out in advance. Kay agreed that a checklist approach would be useful, and will take a look at the Conference Handbook. She said she would also like to get feedback from everyone who had been involved with the conference about things that they felt could be improved.

Regarding the timeline of the next conference, the OLAC-MOUG merger survey respondents felt that it was worse to meet during spring than during fall. Again, the MLA Conference takes place in February and MOUG's content has a lot of overlap. It was suggested that a more comprehensive study of conference experiences be conducted after OLAC and MOUG representatives finish discussing the potential merger between the two organizations.

Jeremy thanked and acknowledged all the work that Kay has done to plan and organize this conference.

o Officer Reports:

- President's report (Jeremy):
 - o OLAC Board Dinner
 - o The dinner will be held Saturday, October 28th at 6:30 at Casa del Barco on 320 South 12th Street
 - o Board members will meet in the lobby of the Omni Hotel at 6:15 to walk to the restaurant together.
 - o OLAC meetings at ALA Midwinter
 - Membership Meeting - Friday, February 9, 2018, 3:00-4:00 pm (Location TBD)
 - OLAC Board Meeting - Friday, February 9, 2018, 4:00-5:00 pm (OCLC Red Suite)
 - OLAC Board dinner - Friday, February 9, 2018, 5:30-7:00 pm (Location TBD)
 - CAPC Meeting - Friday, February 9, 2018, 7:30-9:30 pm (Location TBD)
 - o Research grant discussion at ALA Midwinter?
 - We need to ask Ralph Hartsock and Peter Lisius to see if either of them are attending ALA Midwinter and would be willing to give a talk
 - o OCLC Global Council update
 - A link to a Google Document describing changes to the OCLC Global Council (formerly known as the OCLC Members Council) was forwarded to Board members prior to the conference. The OLAC Handbook needs to be updated to reflect these changes.
 - o Next OLAC Conference proposal deadline

- According to the handbook, the board should decide on the next conference location at ALA Midwinter
- Vice President/President Elect's report (Mary):
 - No report at this time. She will report later on the Research Grant, which is not currently listed under the Vice President/President-Elect duties in the Handbook.
- Treasurer's report (Debra):
 - FY18 Q1 membership of 324 which is an increase of 63 this quarter
 - FY18 Q1 closing balance of \$12,519.03

- Secretary's report (Jeannette Ho):
 - Minutes for Virtual Board Meeting (held via Skype on September 13th)

On September 20th, Jeannette sent a draft of the minutes for this meeting on to the other Board members for their review. She plans to send them for publication in the December issue of the OLAC Newsletter on November 15th.

- Handbook revisions
- - Prior to the conference, Jeannette sent a summary of issues that came up during discussions about the Handbook that would require Bylaws changes. These potential changes would need to be discussed and approved before edits could be made to the Handbook. This includes the request from the Web Steering Committee, which was made two years ago.
 - She also sent a document containing non-controversial edits she plans to make to the Handbook that have been discussed so far. It also includes areas that would require Bylaws changes highlighted in yellow that require more discussion.

- Outreach/Advocacy report (Hayley):

Hayley reported that a Twitter hashtag has been set up for the conference (#OLAC2017). She has received some positive feedback from attendees who are enjoying the tweets.

- Newsletter Editor's report (Jeremy for Marcia Barrett):
 - The December newsletter will be published in early December. It will include the usual columns, plus reports on the OLAC conference and meetings of interest for ALA Midwinter. Also, we'll have the first report from our new OLAC/MOUG liaison, Autumn Faulkner.
 - Marcia is interested in including photographs from the OLAC Conference, so please send any you are willing to have published to Marcia (barrett@ucsc.edu).
- CAPC (Bruce)
 - Next CAPC Chair

We will vote for new CAPC interns and members at Midwinter. At this time, we will also vote for the new chair.

- Cataloging Resources Page (CRP): In a video conference call with Matt Burrell and Richard Leigh earlier this year, Matt informed us of the desire to create a whitepaper outlining his vision for the OLAC website (which of course has since been released). Because of the nature of his vision, the need to rename the files on the CRP would no longer apply. Now that we are further along in the calendar year, unless the changes to the website are imminent, he would recommend going forward with renaming the files on the CRP to make the page more useful in the meantime.

- **Committee Reports**

- **Web Steering Committee report (Annie for Matt Burrell):**
 - Matt and Annie will begin meeting in person regularly then meet with the entire committee quarterly.
 - Recommendation to include the Chair of SMaCR and a Website Content Coordinator in the Committee as well as Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator, Past-President, and Web Developer.

The Board members agreed with this proposal. It was suggested that in addition to these two positions, other people could also be brought in to this committee to work on various projects.

It was noted that these changes would require more changes to the Bylaws before they could take place.

Establishing a new position of Website Content Coordinator was suggested since the Committee has not always been able to find someone with both web development skills, and the cataloging/metadata knowledge needed to effectively plan the website's content. Thus, the Website Content Coordinator would handle the content on the website while the Web Developer would maintain its technical structure. The Content Coordinator would not need to be a Board member. The Past President would represent this Committee to the Board.

Someone suggested that another possibility would be to set up a committee dealing with the website content.

The question of whether this position would receive a stipend was asked. Debra expressed concerns about budgeting for this and Bruce expressed the same concern about the Continuing Education position. If the Website Content Coordinator is not a member of the Board, then he or she would not be required to attend meetings held at ALA Conferences, and therefore, would not receive a stipend. Stacie stated that there are not enough people at this time to perform the work of OLAC and

there is a need for more well-defined roles and positions, since asking for volunteers on an ad hoc basis has not been working.

One person commented that some positions may not require terms longer than one year, if there is not enough work to keep them busy for two years. A question was asked whether there is a precedent to assign one-year terms to appointed positions.

It was also commented that OLAC members may not perceive that this organization is as interactive as others. It may be beneficial to provide more opportunities for members to actively participate. This may help them feel more connected, while helping the organization to be more visible. In light of the recent membership dues increase, members may start wondering what they are paying for, especially since the newsletter is freely available online. How can OLAC provide value to those members?

Jeremy asked what it would cost OLAC if we had two more Board members plus a Continuing Education coordinator (who could possibly do webinars on a regular basis). He also asked whether we could get technical support from ALA, and how our costs would compare with other organizations who provide stipends for their presenters.

Bruce said that the role of the chair of SMaCR is up for discussion, as there are lot of potential things that this position could do. Another Board member remarked that it would be good to look at the role of the entire subcommittee. When it was first formed, it dealt with the maintenance of printed documentation. Now our documentation is online, so we don't go through the same publication process as we did in the past. It was mentioned again that there are not enough people to do the work. Someone else concurred and said the situation was the same with CAPC.

- Election Committee (Stacie)

Stacie brought a flyer to publicize the need for candidates to run for positions on the OLAC Executive Board. Two positions are open: Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary. The deadline for nominations is December 31st. She encouraged Board members to talk to colleagues about running for office and to encourage self-nominations.

Adjourned at 7:00 pm

OLAC Membership Meeting

OLAC Conference

Omni Richmond Ballroom

Richmond, VA

Saturday, October 28, 2017

12:15pm – 2:00 pm

Started at 1:00 pm

- **Welcome and Introductions**

Jeremy Myntti welcomed the attendees and called the meeting to order.

- **Announcements:**

- Conference update (Kay Johnson)
 - Kay urged attendees to fill out evaluations of the conference. Such feedback is important to help plan the next OLAC Conference
 - Evaluation forms and handouts from the various sessions are available on Dropbox. The link to it was sent by email prior to the conference.
 - People who are planning to attend Monday's tour of the LC Packard Campus Audio Visual Conservation Center in Culpepper, Virginia, should give their lunch orders to her by 2:00 pm
 - The reception will be held this evening this evening in the JR foyer from 8-10 p.m. There will be a roots band featuring Mark Campbell, an award-winning fiddler. Drink tickets may purchase two non-alcoholic beverages, 1 beer, or 1 wine.
 - Conference organizers have provided the projectors for the presentations to save costs.
 - Lanyards may be returned to the registration desk if attendees do not need them after the conference.
 - Nancy B. Olson, the founder of OLAC, is in hospice care. Two cards have been placed at the registration desk for people to sign.
- OLAC Conference Scholarship Awardee (Jeremy Myntti for Stacie Traill)
 - Emily J. Creo was congratulated for winning this year's OLAC Conference Scholarship. As the Head of Cataloging at Four County Library System in Vestal, New York, she manages four copy catalogers and is the sole professional cataloging librarian at her library, cataloging materials in a variety of formats. She received her MLIS in 2013, joined ALA's ALCTS division in 2014, and joined OLAC in 2016.
- Executive Board elections (Jeremy Myntti for Stacie Traill)
 - Two positions are open for nominations: the OLAC Vice President/President-Elect and the OLAC Secretary. Interested attendees were encouraged to nominate themselves by electronically submitting a letter with a brief description of their qualifications and professional activities to Stacie Traill. All OLAC members are welcome to run. If they nominate someone else, they should get that person's

permission first. There will be a stipend associated with these positions. The deadline for nominations is December 31st.

- Nancy B. Olson Award (Annie Glerum)
 - This award honors a librarian who has made significant contributions to the advancement and understanding of audiovisual cataloging.
 - The website for this award has been updated to refer audiovisual “and/or electronic resources” and computer files has been updated to “electronic resources.”
 - The deadline for nominations is December 1st.
 - Multiple nominations are fine.
 - Attendees who are interested in serving on the committee to select the award recipient should contact Anne Glerum or go to the Contact menu of the OLAC website to fill out a Contact OLAC form.
- OLAC Research Grant (Mary Huismann)
 - The new cycle for this grant will begin soon, with applications due in the Spring.
 - There will be a call for people to serve on the OLAC Research Grant Committee soon.
- CAPC call for member and intern applications (Bruce Evans)
 - CAPC is made up of seven members and seven liaisons for various external organizations (OCLC, LC, the MARC Advisory Committee, CC:DA, etc.)
 - Members serve two-year terms with the possibility of re-appointments; interns serve one-year terms which may also potentially be renewed.
 - Internships are intended to broaden participation on CAPC, and to help newer catalogers gain insight into the workings of an international cataloging committee. Interns may be assigned to special projects
 - A call for CAPC interns was sent to the OLAC-L email list. There will also be a call in the OLAC Newsletter.
 - Interested attendees may approach Bruce if they have any questions.

- Officer Reports:

- President’s Report (Jeremy Myntti):

Jeremy announced the meeting times of the OLAC membership and CAPC meetings at the next ALA Midwinter conference.

- The membership meeting will meet on Friday, February 9, from 3-4 p.m.
- The CAPC meeting will meet on the same day from 7:30-9:30 p.m.
- Both meetings are open to all ALA attendees.

Jeremy encouraged attendees to begin thinking about the next OLAC Conference. Those who are interested in becoming involved should contact a Board member.

- Vice President's Report (Mary Huismann):

Mary is planning topics and speakers for the OLAC membership meeting at the upcoming ALA Midwinter meeting and Annual conference. She encouraged attendees to let her know if they have ideas.

- Secretary (Jeannette Ho):

A draft of the minutes from the virtual OLAC Executive Board meeting that was held in September has been forwarded to Board members for their review. The final version of the minutes will appear in the December issue of the newsletter.

Discussions have continued for potential revisions to the OLAC Handbook. Some of the suggested changes can be made soon while others that would impact the Bylaws will require more discussion before changes can be made.

- Treasurer (Jeremy Myntti for Debra Spidal):

The total number of OLAC members is 324.

The closing balance for the budget is \$12,519.03.

See the Treasurer's report elsewhere in this issue of the newsletter.

- Outreach/Advocacy (Hayley Moreno):

- Twitter Hashtag

The Twitter hashtag for this conference is #OLAC2017.

- Share your story with me on how you are advocating for nonprint materials cataloging field

Hayley invited attendees to share stories with her about how they are using OLAC resources and promoting the organization.

- Newsletter Editor (Jeremy Myntti for Marcia Barrett):

The December issue of the newsletter will contain reports from the OLAC conference and announcements for events that will take place at ALA Midwinter.

Attendees who volunteered to serve as conference reporters should send their reports to Jan Mayo soon after the conference. If they have taken pictures of the conference, they should send them to Marcia Barrett.

- CAPC Report (Bruce Evans):

OLAC has formally approved and made appointments to the task force that will create a “unified” best practices document that will bring together common instructions from all of the best practice guides for various formats. Later during the conference, Bruce will present a lightning talk about this newly formed task force.

There was an informal open discussion on projects and ideas for CAPC on Thursday night of this conference. Bruce thanked everyone who came to this meeting. Some topics discussed at this meeting include: how to record attributes of the representative expression from the IFLA-LRM model (the canonical, best known, or most authoritative version of a work), whether to create a general best practices guide for all portable digital audio devices (Playaways, GoChip), and what actions OLAC should take with genre/form and demographic terms.

A joint MLA and OLAC working group has made recommendations regarding non-RDA terms that can be used in the 336, 337, 338, and 34x fields. It decided to recommend recording separate fields and adopting the source codes for these terms. The best practice guides need to be revised to reflect these recommendations. Mary Huisman, was thanked for leading this group last summer.

○ Updates

- Website Steering Committee (Annie Glerum for Matt Burrell):

Annie gave a shout out to Matt for all of the work he has done for the website, especially the one for the conference.

The new website has been up for a while, but some parts of it are still under construction. Attendees were encouraged to report issues with the website by filling out the Contact OLAC form on the “Contact” page. This form will go to Matt and he will forward it to the appropriate person or group.

Matt has proposed a new, more dynamic architecture for the OLAC website. Each object (e.g., document) on the website will have its own customized metadata and be arranged “on-demand” depending on needs. Users will be able to sort the objects by any metadata field or search all of them across the website at the same. The display for each object will be dynamically created when selected.

The committee has recommended that the chair of SmaCR be an ongoing member. It would also like a dedicated Website Content Coordinator to serve on it. The latter would be a new position and would be responsible for planning the content of the website. While it would involve using a text editor to create content, one would not need to know HTML in order to serve as one of the committee’s content editors. If anyone is interested in serving on the committee, see Annie.

- OCLC Update (Jay Weitz)

See the full report online.

A document summarizing news and announcements from OCLC is available as an online document on Dropbox. There will also be an updated version of it in the December issue of the newsletter.

Some highlights from the OCLC update report include the following:

The OCLC-MARC Update 2017 was implemented in September. It includes the MARC 21 changes announced in MARC 21 Updates No. 23 (November 2016) and No. 24 (May 2017). Details of this update are available in [OCLC Technical Bulletin 267](#).

New MARC codes, including the ones for the new controlled vocabulary terms to be used in the 33x and 34x fields, are included in this update. These vocabularies are defined in the RDA registry. Catalogers should refer to the chart at the end of the above technical bulletin, which shows how they should be applied and corresponding RDA rules. Catalogers should begin to use these new terms and codes.

OCLC's *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* document is in the process of being revised. A lot of the information in this Bulletin has been transferred into it.

- OLAC-MOUG Liaison (Autumn Faulkner)

Autumn explained that MOUG stood for Music OCLC Users Group and its purpose. Many people are members of both OLAC and MOUG. It formed in 1977, and will be celebrating its 40th anniversary at its annual meeting in February. If members have any stories, memories, or messages of congratulations to share, get in touch with Michelle Hahn.

- OLAC-MOUG White Paper (Bruce Evans et al.)

Bruce reminded attendees of the white paper. It is the culmination of a series of discussions that began during the 2014 OLAC Conference when someone at a Board dinner suggested a potential merger of the two organizations. A survey was sent to both OLAC and MOUG members and town hall-style meetings were held in both organizations to gather additional feedback. Jeremy Myntti, Nara Newcomer, and Bruce Evans were responsible for carrying out this project.

There will be a conference call on November 9th among representative members from the executive boards from both organizations to discuss the matter further. The individuals that will be attending include: Nara Newcomer, Molly O'Brien, Alan Ringwood, Bruce Evans, Mary Huismann, Hayley Moreno, and Autumn Faulkner.

- Discussion

- OCLC Global Council and OLAC's relationship (Bobby Bothmann and John DeSantis)

Bobby and John gave a presentation about the OCLC Global Council. It was formerly known as the OCLC Member Council and had a relationship with OLAC, where a representative from OLAC attended its meetings as an observer. It has now changed its name and structure. The OLAC Handbook will be revised to reflect these changes.

The OCLC Global Council is the international body that governs OCLC as a global library cooperative. It has 18,000 institutional members with 48 delegates elected to represent the three Regional Councils, which include: the Americas Regional Council (ARC), Europe, Middle East, Africa Regional Council (EMEA), and the Asia Pacific Regional Council (APRC). In addition, six trustees are elected to the Global Council. The latter works with the OCLC Board of Trustees, which has 15 trustees made up of nine librarians, and others from areas such as higher education, law and publishing. The Global Council met twice a year in the fall and in the spring. They now meet once a year in spring.

John DeSantis is serving his third term as a member of the Global Council, while Bobby is serving his first term. Global Council members are elected by OCLC members. Library directors typically cast the votes, so it is important to bring ballots to their attention so that they know to vote each year. Delegates serve three-year terms and are eligible for re-election to a second term. They are limited to no more than two consecutive terms. Allocation of the 48 delegates across the three regions are based on the percentage of total OCLC revenue each region generates. For instance, if a region generates 25% of the total revenue, they would get 4 seats equally distributed (25% of the 48 seats) and 9 additional seats (based on 25% of the remaining seats). ARC is currently the largest regional council, represented by many kinds of libraries. Each regional council has its own board, which also hold meetings once a year. EMEA meets in February, APRC meets in December, and ARC will meet for the first time during the next Monday and Tuesday in Baltimore.

John and Bobby said they were interested in hearing feedback on issues that people would like them to discuss with OCLC.

- [Tribute to Nancy B. Olson](#)

Bobby Bothmann, Sandy Roe, and Jay Weitz each shared personal stories and memories of their relationships with Ms. Olson, her impact on their careers, and her many contributions to advancing the cataloging of audiovisual materials. Some of her most important accomplishments include:

- Founding OLAC in 1980 at a time when there was not much support in the library profession for this type of work
- Authoring the book, *Cataloging of Audiovisual Materials and Other Special Materials*
- Encouraging and advising people on discussion lists on applying principle-based cataloging for AV formats
- Teaching workshops on AV and electronic formats, including a week-long workshop at San Jose University

- Serving as the first editor of the OLAC newsletter
- Writing the original AV glossary
- Publishing the index to the *Cataloging Service Bulletin*.

Attendees were encouraged to sign the cards for Ms. Olson, who is in hospice care, at the registration desk. Photos were taken of attendees that will be sent to her.

Adjourned at 2:00 pm.

OLAC CAPC Meeting

OLAC Conference 2017

Omni Richmond Hotel, JR Salon C

Richmond, VA

Thursday, October 26, 2017

Present: Bruce Evans (chair), Mary Huismann, Kelley McGrath, Janet Schrader, Thomas Whittaker, Hannah Spence, Michelle Cronquist, Heather Pretty, Casey Mullin, Jeremy Myntti, Netanel Ganin, Deborah Ryszka, Scott M. Dutkiewicz, Hayley Moreno, Jay Weitz, Marsha Seamans, Jeannette Ho

Started at 7:15 p.m.

Note: Due to the lack of a quorum of CAPC members at this conference, this meeting did not have a particular agenda. It was intended to be an informal discussion about various CAPC-related initiatives and topics that it might address in the future.

Bruce welcomed the attendees and explained the purpose of the meeting. While no agenda was sent in advance, he had several preplanned topics, and then planned to open the meeting up to the attendees. He gave a reminder about a lightning talk that he will present later during the conference about the new Unified Best Practices Task Force, which will work on resolving inconsistencies between the various OLAC best practices guides, with the eventual goal of creating a single best practices guide for all formats that will be integrated with the RDA Toolkit.

Accessibility discussion paper

During the summer of 2016, an OLAC committee that was charged with proposing new methods of recording video accessibility information learned that the Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange was also working on similar issues. OLAC partnered with this committee to write a discussion paper and presented it to the MARC Advisory Committee at the 2017 Annual Conference. The paper was not adopted.

The committee has since drafted a new paper proposing the creation of new subfields for the 041 field (Language Code). Copies of this paper were distributed among attendees. It proposes that

- Subfield Sp be used for “Language code of accessible text (captioning)
- Subfield \$q be used for “Language code of accessible audio track (Described Video)
- Subfield \$r be used for “Language code of accessible visual language (Signing)

The paper stated that there is a lack of ISO codes for specific sign languages that can be recorded in subfield \$2. An attendee asked if it would be possible to find another list, or have OLAC create its own list of such codes. It was also suggested that language of intertitles for

silent films be assigned its own subfield, since they are not the same thing as subtitles. Another person commented that the 041 field may not have enough subfields to describe all aspects of captions that we would like to record, such as different technologies that are used for producing captions. In addition, Braille may be too complex to record in the 041 field. However, there is a strong case to be made for using this field to record the language for Described Video and captions for the hearing impaired. If there are additional details about captioning that cannot be recorded in the 041 field, one could choose to do so in a separate field.

It was also mentioned that inconsistent practices in legacy data may complicate the use of the 041 field. For instance, the second subfield \$a used to be used for the original language of the resource, which is now recorded in subfield \$h. However, one member expressed that it would still be useful to provide library users with the option of limiting by language of captioning for DVDs and Blu-rays.

At this point, the discussion returned to the issue of finding or creating a list of codes for sign languages. It was mentioned earlier that there is no ISO list of such codes. However, one attendee pointed out that ISO 639-3 does include codes for sign languages.

Playaways

A copy of an email from Rosemary Groenwald, the chair of the Playaways Task Force, was distributed among attendees. In this message, she raised some concerns and asked whether the Task Force should continue its work. In addition, a copy of a recent discussion on the OLAC-L email list regarding GoChip beam devices was also distributed. According to a message in this thread, GoChip devices contain “a small Wi-Fi router, rechargeable battery, and solid state storage preloaded with five feature length movies or an entire season of a television series, all enclosed in a 3.5” x 1” stick.”

Bruce noted that there were parallels between Playaways and GoChip beam devices, and asked whether both could be addressed in a single best practices document. One attendee expressed support for this idea, stating that there will always be people who are new to cataloging such formats and would like to be able to consult official documentation, even if it endorses what people are already doing. She also liked the idea of a general approach to applying best practices to standalone digital devices, since they should all be treated the same way. It was also observed that different formats come and go over time for such devices. Thus, a more general approach would make sense.

Representative Expression Attributes

A handout of section 5.6 of a paper on the IFLA-LRM model, “Representative Expression Attributes” was distributed among attendees. This topic came up during the 2017 ALA Annual Conference, during a special meeting with the CC:DA where representatives from various

specialist cataloging communities shared what they would like to see in the RDA Toolkit as part of the 3R Project.

Judy Kuhagan had said during this meeting that she would like to hear their feedback on representative expression attributes. OLAC is working on its response and Bruce invited attendees to share any feedback that they would like to include.

In the IFLA LRM model, representative expression attributes refer to characteristics that represent the canonical version of a work, which can be, but is not necessarily, its earliest or original expression. In some cases, it can be the best-known version of a work that is not the same as the original. As the paper describes, there may be other cases where these attributes can be a result of a mental process based on users' general understanding of what the "representative expression" of a work should look like, even if they have not been exposed to the original or early manifestations of the work.

One such attribute is the language of the representative expression. It was mentioned that RDA and LRM do not currently provide a good way to record the original language of a film, although we can do this in MARC21. It was also pointed out that the RIMMF software, which presents a mockup interface of cataloging at different FRBR entity levels, allows users to input relationship designators at the expression level. Such information should ideally only be recorded once, instead of recording it repeatedly for each separate manifestation. Additionally, there are other expression-level attributes (e.g., color, etc.) for films, music, and possibly, art and literature, that could also potentially only be recorded once at the expression level.

It was noted that it may be more difficult to identify representative expressions in some cases than others. One example is of a work originally created in Ancient Greece, where there is not a specific text to refer to. Another example is of an Indian film that was simultaneously released in two different languages, and later released in additional ones. This leads to questions, such as which language it was originally intended to be in, and which versions can be considered to be translations. It was observed that the latter information is not required, so one has the option of not recording it if it cannot be determined. In this particular example, each version of a film has the same cast, but is shot in different languages. In another example, the original expression of a film may not be cataloged, and one may not have any information about the original language. In some cases, one can find this information by tracking down the original screenplay, but this is not always possible. In other cases, an Indian film may be released a day earlier in the U.S. or the U.K., before it got released in India. Finally, someone gave an example of a spaghetti western that features actors from different countries who speak their own languages during the shooting of the film. Such films are subsequently dubbed into English.

It was observed that most cases won't be as complicated as these examples. It may not make sense to make representative expression attributes "core," except in cases where they can be successfully identified.

At this point, Bruce invited the audience to discuss any topics of their own choosing:

Best Practices for Works and Expressions

A question was asked about whether there has been any discussion on creating a best practices guide for records at the work and expression levels. While a past task force addressed FRBR attributes for moving image works in the past, its work was more theoretical and predated RDA. In the meantime, the best practices guide for DVDs and Blu-rays are more focused on manifestations. Questions were asked about whether it would be more appropriate for the NACO AV funnel or the PCC to create a best practices document for works and expressions. One attendee replied that this would not necessarily be the case, since the MLA has best practice documentation for creating music authority records.

Some potential issues that could be covered in such a document include: Where catalogers should obtain work and expression-level attributes from, how should they record this data, and whether the date of original production or the date of original release should be preferred. It was observed that reference sources may be inconsistent because they are not all referring to the same type of date. It was also commented that MARC21 may not be granular enough to distinguish between these types of dates, since subfield \$k of the 130 field may include either one. Another issue has to do with films, particularly educational ones, where the only date information is the copyright date on the title frames.

It was pointed out that the MLA best practices documentation may apply to elements within both authority and bibliographic records. For instance, the 046 field can be recorded at either level, so the same best practice guidelines for this field would apply to either one.

Authorized Access Points for Motion Pictures and Television and Radio Programs

Appendix 1 (“Motion Pictures, Television Programs, Radio Programs) in LC-PCC PS 6.27.1.9 is still provisional. A question was asked if there are any plans to re-examine it. The PCC Standing Committee on Standards will need to review all of the LC-PCC Policy Statements when the new RDA Toolkit is made available next year. Two OLAC members, Kelley McGrath and Adam Schiff are on it.

The OLAC best practice guide for DVDs and Blu-rays includes instructions for recording expression-level authorized access points for dubbed versions of films (e.g., 730 02 Citizen Kane (Motion picture). \$I French). Kelley McGrath stated that language expressions can be complicated for DVDs and Blu-rays, and that she did not prefer such an approach. There may be a need for better systems that can make use of language expression data, recorded in other fields such as the 041, instead of instructing catalogers to record additional authorized access points. In addition, such authorized access points were intended to facilitate browsing in OPACs, and users may not browse to obtain language information in this manner in today’s discovery systems.

LC Genre-Form Terms and Demographic Group Terms

An attendee asked whether CAPC has recently looked at the Library of Congress' Genre-Form Term manual and checked it against OLAC's genre-form term best practices guidelines to see if they are aligned.

The Library of Congress is considering the elimination of genre/form headings that begin with "Filmed" and "Televised" (e.g. "Filmed concerts," "Televised concerts," etc.). The idea is for headings to only describe genres or forms (e.g., "Concerts"). It was mentioned that before LC decided to split up such headings in this manner, OLAC had supported combining them into single headings (e.g., "Thrillers (Motion picture, television. etc.>"). OLAC also didn't agree some of LC's other decisions, such as having two separate headings "Films for the hearing impaired" and "Television programs for the hearing impaired," since they were supposed to describe expressions, and users looking for videos with special captioning would probably not care about the distinction between films and television programs.

A question was asked whether we can push for LC to address this issue. Janis Young, LC's liaison to OLAC, is currently busy with preparing LC's series of training videos at this time. For the time being, the review of demographic term proposals seems to be on hold until August of next year.

The Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) from ALA has decided to sunset its genre/form subcommittee. It plans to form a new one that will focus on best practices for applying faceted vocabularies. It would be good if someone on OLAC could serve on it. Attendance at ALA conferences will not be required since most of the work of this subcommittee will be accomplished online.

OLAC's best practices allow us to assign terms at multiple hierarchical levels, but LC's documentation says that we must use the most specific term. However, it still makes sense to follow OLAC's recommendation, especially in situations when our systems don't do a good job at referring users from one level of the hierarchy (e.g., narrower to broader terms) to the next.

It is not clear what demographic terms to record in the 386 field when multiple creators of a film have different nationalities. Musical compilations with multiple composers have a similar issue. One attendee stated that she preferred recording such information in authority records rather than bibliographic records. An example was described featuring a documentary on rock music that contained different individual performances that may be considered works themselves. Should there be a demographic term for the performance and/or the larger work being performed? In this particular example, some users may care only about a particular performance "snippet" and not care whether it is part of a larger work (i.e., the documentary).

Attendees were reminded that the subfield \$i in OCLC for the 386 field will soon allow us to specify the relationship between one or more members of a demographic group recorded in

this field and the resource being described in the record. One attendee commented that she did not think that this would be useful in a linked data world.

In the meantime, it was stated that LC is still approving proposals for new LCGFT terms beginning with the term “Filmed.”

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

From the Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator

Hayley Moreno

It is incredible how time flies; the 2017 OLAC Conference has come and gone. It was great see so many OLACers in Richmond, Virginia. We especially had some great discussions through Twitter so please make sure to search for the hashtag #OLAC2017 to see all the tweets that occurred throughout the event. Also, check out the 2017 conference album that has been posted on OLAC's Flickr and Facebook page (relive the cataloging frenzy!). Thank you to everyone who helped in promoting the event through Twitter and Facebook.



Being back from the conference I couldn't help but feel inspired from the sessions I saw and conversations I heard. One of the events that impacted me the most was the collaborative problem-solving discussions on the last day of the conference. Despite being weary from intense cataloging workshops the last session of the day erupted with great discussions. Tables such as the Advocating for cataloging, Sudden cataloger, and Cataloging horrors allowed attendees to share their stories and experiences with one another. It opened dialogues where colleagues were giving advice and commiserating as a group. With today's fast paced digital life, it can be difficult to find that human connection with others in the profession but conferences like these are vital in reminding us how important organizations like OLAC are in connecting us to common goals and causes. I hope others in the conference felt that connection with their colleagues and enjoyed seeing other OLACers that are just as passionate about non-print cataloging as they are.

Even though the conference is over, I hope we can continue the conversation on the importance of the work we do in OLAC. If you have any outreach ideas or have promoted OLAC in any way please make sure to reach out to me at morenoh@oclc.org. Hope to hear from you soon!

Conference Reports from the 2017 OLAC Conference, Richmond, VA

Jan Mayo, Column Editor

There's More than One Way to Groom a Cat(alog) – Preconference – Presented by Annie Glerum and Kathryn Lybarger

submitted by [Scott Dutkiewicz, Clemson University](#)

This preconference on metadata manipulation tools was a step toward filling the need of many catalogers and metadata wranglers, as evidenced by the attendance, which filled every seat in the room. The presenters, Annie Glerum and Kathryn Lybarger, are eminently qualified to instruct, being, respectively, Head of Complex Cataloging at Florida State University Libraries and Head of Cataloging and Metadata at the University of Kentucky Libraries. The session opened with Lybarger explaining regular expressions, and engaged the attendees with Regular Expressions Bingo. There was also a hands-on experience with Command Line and using it, in combination with regular expressions, to ferret out sometimes illusive data such as call numbers that begin with P. Glerum followed Lybarger with instruction on how to navigate XML “trees” using the analogy to trees or genealogical tables to accurately locate nodes and relations. Unfortunately, time did not permit much expansion on the different technologies (OpenRefine, Excel, MarcEdit), or many real-world examples. Glerum encouraged participants to play with the technologies, which is probably the best way to grasp the possibilities. In light of the keynote address given by Regina Reynolds the next morning, these technologies prove to be essential as Reynolds noted that catalogers must exploit machine intelligence to reduce cataloging piecemeal. So while this preconference did not meet its full potential due to time constraints, the effort is greatly appreciated, and similar presentations or workshops should be on OLAC’s future agenda.

Video, Audio, Digital, and All That Jazz: Bibliographic Transformation in an Era of Too Much “Stuff” -- Keynote Speaker Regina Reynolds, Director of the U.S. ISSN Center and Head of the ISSN Section at the Library of Congress

submitted by [Barbara Tysinger, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#)

Translating from Voltaire (*Le mieux est l'ennemi du bien*), who borrowed it from Pescetti (*Il meglio è nemico del bene*), Reynolds encourages us to consider the implications of the aphorism, “The perfect is the enemy of the good.” In this age of data proliferation, both real and spurious, do librarians have the luxury of crafting perfection? What things *must* be perfect? When is “good” “good enough”? For years we have struggled with the challenge of making “hidden” collections available and accessible when the time and resources for full, “proper” cataloging are limited. But when there is “too much stuff,” this task becomes more and more difficult, as well as more imperative. Acknowledging that the best material is of little value when the user cannot find it, how do we quickly identify “the good stuff”? We need to curate and evaluate, rather than insist on cataloging everything as we have in the past.

Reynolds points out that there were no cataloging standards or guidelines for the first online resources. Based on existing practices, catalogers had to think outside the box, relying on common sense and judgment, adjusting as necessary. In essence, they were making it up as they went along.

The emerging world of linked data also demands that we think outside the box, or, outside the record, and explore new ways of making “the good” available. We need to seek new ways to do more, better.

By eliminating duplicate effort, partnering with other expert communities, incorporating machine assisted “bionic” processing, crowd sourcing metadata, and adapting and using external data sources, we have the opportunity to link previously disparate resources, providing access to more “good stuff” than is possible when restricted to the realm of “the perfect” cataloging record.

To facilitate this cooperation, metadata as we know it is evolving. The newest IFLA Library Reference Model (IFLA LRM), a consolidation of FRBR, FRAD, FRSAD, was developed to resolve inconsistencies between those three standards. IFLA LRM was specifically designed to support and promote the use of bibliographic data in linked data environments.

Not surprisingly there are several projects exploring these possibilities, and Reynolds offered examples of a few, including [The Linked Jazz Project](#), using Linked Open Data technologies and the Library of Congress’ Labs Project, including “Beyond Words,” a crowd sourcing project to identify and index images in LC’s World War I era newspaper collection (<http://labs.loc.gov/> and scroll down).

However, any database, or linked data system, is only as good as its individual elements. Bad data does not become good simply because it is linked to other data (good or bad). And some things still must be perfect. With that in mind, Reynolds issued us a new challenge. Determine what must be perfect and what can simply be good. Find the good stuff. And the other good stuff. Link. Repeat.

Reynolds opened her address with a classical aphorism, encouraging us to seek “the good” and to accept that “good” is often “good enough,” something which is not always easy. I will close my summary with a quote from pop-culture, which perhaps reflects how many of us feel in today’s deluge of data:

*... times are rough
And I got too much stuff
Can't explain the likes of me.
-- Jimmy Buffett, One Particular Harbor*

Applying Library of Congress Faceted Vocabularies Workshop -- Presented by Adam Schiff, Principal Cataloger, University of Washington Libraries
submitted by Sandy Roe, Illinois State University

Schiff’s presentation—one of the first on this topic—was given to a packed room of engaged attendees. Despite the two-hour time constraint that necessitated a “whirlwind tour,” there was time for questions and some debate between audience members and the speaker.

The objective to tease out separate terms for discrete elements is much different from the often compound Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) with which we are more familiar. One example

Schiff provided for illustration is the Library of Congress Demographic Group terms *Japanese Americans* and *Women and Teachers*, rather than the LCSH *Japanese American women teachers*. If you have time for nothing else, study Schiff's two Background slides (3-4) that describe the problem that faceted vocabularies were developed to resolve, and the new functionality that they will provide for users (slide 169) along with examples of discovery system implementations (slides 170-181).

Although a few portions were skipped due to time constraints, Schiff's extensive slides plus exercises and their answers cover LCGFT general terms, moving image terms, music terms, and cartographic terms; LCDGT; and other facets of time period of creation, language, place of creation, country of producing entity, and music medium of performance. He described the available draft manuals and works in progress by various constituencies and where to find each one, including the [Draft LCGFT Manual](#), the Music Library Association's [Best Practices for Using LCGFT for Music Resources](#), and the Library of Congress [Demographic Group Terms Manual](#). SACO proposals for additional needed terms may be made to LCGFT and to LCDGT. The vocabularies themselves can be found in several places, and the presentation included screen shots and an explanation of each. Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms are available as authority records in OCLC and SkyRiver, through Classification Web and Catalogers Desktop (if you have a subscription), the Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms PDF files (updated annually), the LC Linked Data Service, and Library of Congress Authorities. The Library of Congress maintains the [list of LCDGT's 11 group terms and codes](#), e.g., age, education level, ethnic/cultural, and so forth. The LCDGT vocabulary itself is available from Classification Web and Catalogers Desktop (if you have a subscription), the LC Linked Data Service, the annually created PDF file, and Netanel Ganin's list. New and changed terms are posted in the monthly lists. [Free subscriptions](#) to the monthly lists can be arranged. Full MARC 21 authority records are available to [download](#). Note that LCDGT authority records are not available in OCLC Connexion or SkyRiver.

After covering those basics for each vocabulary, Schiff got down to the business of how to select and assign terms explaining, for example, the LCGFT rule of three and rule of four; and how to code the terms in MARC bibliographic or authority records as appropriate. He referenced the manuals but also indicated places where instructions are not yet finalized and suggested interim practices. The presentation was also peppered with useful group exercises.

In the final slide, Schiff calls attention to the fact that we "need critical mass of bibliographic metadata that includes these faceted attributes." For a thoughtful look on the implementation of faceted vocabularies in current cataloging and in our legacy records so that we can provide users of our data with meaningful displays and the ability to facet results, read the ALCTS CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee's white paper "[A Brave New \(Faceted\) World: Towards Full Implementation of Library of Congress Faceted Vocabularies](#)."

The most current version of Schiff's slides, along with his speaker notes, exercises, and answers are available from his [home page](#).

Foundations in Linked Data and BIBFRAME Workshop -- Presented by Amber Billey, Metadata Librarian, Columbia University

submitted by Jan Mayo, East Carolina University

Billey has been working with linked data in various capacities since receiving her MLIS in 2009. She realizes its concepts can be hard to digest and apply and has developed instructional materials and lectured on the topic, most recently at NASIG 2017 with colleague Robert Rendall, where they gave a more in-depth version of this OLAC presentation. It can be found [here](#).

While professing that it might be difficult to fit that presentation into two hours, she promised to do her best. Her agenda consisted of four main areas: linked data 101, ontology basics, TURTLE tutorial, and RDA elements in BIBFRAME.

The development of linked data was prompted by Tim Berners-Lee, who invented the World Wide Web (WWW) in 1989. Linked data has four basic rules: 1) use URIs (uniform resource identifiers) as names for things, 2) use HTTP URIs so people can find those names, 3) when someone looks up a URI, they should find useful information, and 4) include links to other URIs so people can discover more useful things. Linked open data is ranked on a five-star scale, one star means it is available on the web, two stars mean it is available as machine-readable structured data, three stars mean it is in a non-proprietary format, four stars means it has the first three and uses open standards to identify things, and five stars means the first four plus linking to other people's data to provide context. BIBFRAME currently falls between four and five stars.

Ontology is a formal way of naming and defining elements and their interrelationships with each other. MARC tagging is a partial ontology. Billey does not think use of MARC will stop anytime soon, but libraries are trying to escape the MARC silo so our information will become accessible through WWW. RDF (resource description framework) is the data model being used. She outlined some of the differences between MARC and RDF.

BIBFRAME is a linked data vocabulary that is formally encoded for machine processing. It relies heavily on MARC so that libraries will not lose their legacy data. It is meant to accommodate FRBR and RDA, but without being wedded to a specific structure or content standard. Billey then explained the various types of standards: structure (MARC, BIBFRAME), content (RDA, AACR2, DACS), value (LCSH, NAF, LCGFT) and encoding (3 x 5 card, MARC, XML).

Through a series of illustrative slides, Billey discussed the formation of RDF triples used to link data, how they can be used in XML, and how they can be grown into more complex interrelationships. Then she reviewed other terms used in BIBFRAME in more detail, providing numerous links with additional explanation and examples.

Next, she gave a tutorial on how to use TURTLE (Terse RDF Triple Language), which incorporates BIBFRAME terms, using several slides of examples. She also listed many other tools with links that could potentially be helpful. Finally, she showed how the RDA elements in BIBFRAME could be used in linked data.

Billey was an entertaining speaker, often amusing her audience while explaining difficult ideas. She took numerous questions as she went, making for a lively workshop.

Fun and Games: Cataloging 3D Objects Workshop -- Presented by Scott Dutkiewicz, Cataloger, Clemson University

[submitted by Julia Frankosky, Michigan State University](#)

It is not uncommon for libraries to collect 3D objects: from toys and games, to cookware, sewing machines, and educational aids such as anatomical models and rocks. Like anything in the library, if a patron cannot find them, what is the point of having them? Dutkiewicz's workshop covered how to tackle cataloging 3D objects, which can be a rather intimidating feat, especially for oddly shaped items. The main takeaways I left with were do not agonize and do not overthink things, especially in regards to the 33x fields. Use the information that you can glean from the item, add helpful 500 notes to clarify what you are trying to describe, and remember that "a picture is worth a thousand words" so consider adding a photo of the object in the 856 field when the exact words elude you.

Before this session I never really thought about how to distinguish between a game and a toy, but when it comes to assigning these items to the appropriate type of visual material in the 008 field, this distinction matters as toys and games each have their own codes (t and g, respectively). Dutkiewicz explained that the best way to tell the difference is that games tend to be competitive in nature with a prescribed set of rules, whereas toys are designed for play but there are no explicit rules. When trying to sort this out, keep in mind its primary intent and what is its intended use.

Dutkiewicz's workshop was peppered with images of 3D objects one might catalog, such as taxidermy scenes and sculptures, he also brought in actual items such as the board game Monopoly and a crocodile hand puppet and showed sample records for the objects while we talked through them as a group (including discussing areas where the records could be improved). The last portion of the workshop focused on how the cataloger can help patrons find this material by including appropriate MARC relator terms for subject headings and including genres terms from the many available ontologies we have at our disposal (such as LCGFT, LCDGT, ATT, and FAST) and if something is just too unique to be appropriately handled by existing ontologies, you can always create a local subject heading. The most important thing to remember is that anything can be cataloged, you just might need to think outside of the box.

Inclusivity through Documentation Workshop --Presented by Jessica Schomberg, Media Cataloger/Library Assessment Coordinator, and Jennifer Turner, Instructional Services Librarian, Minnesota State University, Mankato

submitted by Amanda Mack, University of California, Los Angeles

Schomberg and Turner conducted a workshop that encouraged attendees to be aware of accessibility issues, and the ways in which they can construct documents to make them straightforward and easy to use. For this workshop, the word “documents” encompassed a broad range of materials ranging from internal procedure works meant for staff to brochures or webpages targeted at the public.

The presenters introduced principles of instructional design and document design. The purpose is to assess the needs of users by considering such factors as the information to be communicated, characteristics of the audience being targeted, and the best ways to convey the information. Once a document is in use, it should be evaluated to determine what works, as well as what could be improved.

Accessibility concepts were also addressed. Although there are laws in place, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, accessibility is also a matter of ethics. Attendees were encouraged to think more broadly when it comes to accessibility by considering such conditions as color blindness, dyslexia, or even depression, which can cause a person to have difficulty focusing. To be certain we are providing accessibility, it is important to evaluate our resources for problems. For example, if a web resource does not lend itself well to use with a screen reader, an entire group of people (visually impaired) is being denied access. It was also suggested that whenever possible, plan ahead and anticipate needs rather than waiting for someone to request it, as this can lower barriers to access.

Much of the presentation focused on three subsets of design concerns and how they can be applied to document creation. The first step was to introduce an illustration of the Gestalt Principle, a theory from psychology that looks at the whole picture, rather than the individual elements. The illustration showed the different ways our brains process information, such as filling in gaps, tying together things in close proximity, and being informed by past experiences.

Next, Turner and Schomberg covered the visual elements, including images, proximity of text to images, and fonts. Images (including tables and diagrams) should be helpful, and can be used to bring clarity to the text. Poor proximity of words in relation to pictures makes the brain work harder to decipher the meaning. Fonts matter as well. If a font is too small, or unfamiliar, it also takes more brain energy to process, which detracts from the content. Clear examples of these can be found in the presentation slides.

The final design concern addressed was plain language. The purpose of plain language is conveying information in language that is easy to understand, so the reader can focus on the content, rather than the language itself. This includes using short sentences in active voice, using headings and white space to make it easier to follow, and avoiding embedded clauses and parenthetical statements that break up an idea. It is important to note that plain language does not necessarily equate to a shorter document.

For a group activity, attendees were asked to select one document out of several provided. We were then supposed to evaluate that document for what it did well in terms of accessibility and plain

language, and what could be improved. Attendees were then asked to share their comments with the group. Common complaints across documents were small fonts, unclear language, and confusing forms.

The presenters emphasized that it is important to evaluate your documentation and revise it as needed. It can be extremely helpful to have someone else look at it, because what is clear to us, might not be clear to someone else. There are also a variety of accessibility tools to help with his process. For example, Microsoft Office has an accessibility checker which can help look for content that might be difficult for people with disabilities to read. There are also online contrast checkers that help identify issues for people with low vision, and color blindness simulators that can output an image to show what it would look like to people with different types of color blindness.

In the end, if we work to create clear documents, the people using these documents will make less errors, which means less questions and less additional work for us.

Video Games Cataloging Workshop --Presented by Rachel Jaffe, Metadata Librarian, University of California, Santa Cruz

[submitted by Deborah Ryszka, University of Delaware](#)

Jaffe gave a thorough and in-depth presentation on the basics of video games cataloging. Her presentation provided novice and experienced catalogers with a hands-on opportunity to learn about the specific MARC fields needed to create, upgrade, and edit bibliographic records for video games. Jaffe's two-hour workshop covered the descriptive elements necessary to produce full and complete bibliographic records, as well as the headings needed to provide subject and genre access to these materials.

Jaffe's learning objectives for the session were: to gain an understanding of the unique characteristics of video games, to identify RDA instructions and MARC fields used in cataloging video games, and to become familiar with OLAC's *Best Practices for Cataloging Video Games* and other sources that augment the instructions given in RDA.

The workshop began with a detailed explanation of the special characteristics of video games and a description of the various platforms and formats used in gaming. Video games are published on a variety of platforms—personal computers, gaming consoles, handheld and mobile devices, and online. These games appear in an assortment of formats—cartridges, computer discs, and online. It is important to note and record these distinctions in bibliographic records, and there are specific MARC fields where these features should be mentioned. Information about platform specifics can be recorded in MARC fields 250, 538, and 753. Format characteristics and information are indicated in MARC fixed fields, as well as 3XX and 500 fields.

Jaffe gave attendees guidance on how to transcribe the title proper and other title information for video games. She noted that the source of information for the title proper of video games is the title frames. If title information from that source cannot be viewed, catalogers are instructed to take title information from a label printed on or affixed to the resource or from the container. When one of these options is followed, a note should be made indicating this.

Additionally, Jaffe discussed at length franchise titles and how these should be recoded and coded. Titles of video games that are part of franchises (e.g., Grand theft auto, The legend of Zelda, Need for speed, etc.) are particularly troublesome. Current cataloging rules have never dealt well with the modern concept of a franchise in video cataloging. For the specifics of recording titles, other title information, and franchise titles, Jaffe suggested consulting the appropriate rules in RDA and the specific guidelines for these areas in the OLAC best practices guide.

In the past, many video game catalogers have routinely recorded the platform of a video game as an edition statement. Many catalogers debate whether the platform name as presented on the resource is a true and valid edition statement. The OLAC best practices document recommends that catalogers transcribe a statement of the platform as an edition statement in the MARC 250 field. If this type of information is lacking and the cataloger deems it useful to the user, the platform designation is to be recorded in brackets in the 250 field. In addition to noting platform information in the MARC 250 field, Jaffe reminded those in attendance that platform names also can be recorded in MARC fields 538 and 753.

Jaffe thoroughly explained the values that catalogers need to use to code MARC fields 336, 337, 338. Further discussion focused on MARC fields 344, 346, and 347, and the vocabulary used in those distinct fields. Mention was made of the new controlled vocabulary lists that recently were added to MARC 21 documentation. These lists should be consulted and noted when recording data in the 3XX fields.

Applying genre headings to video games is problematic because no authorized list of these headings for video games currently exists. A task force is working on creating a list of genre headings with the hopes of having it published by the Library of Congress or OLAC. While waiting for this list, catalogers should follow the guidelines in the OLAC best practices guide for assigning genre terms. Those instructions tell catalogers to use the general genre heading “Video games” for all video games and to assign headings for specific game genres, if applicable.

The session concluded with a lively discussion on how to code for language in bibliographic records for video games. In instances where viewing the game is not possible, catalogers must rely on other sources or parts of the game to gather information about the language of the item. When this situation occurs, Jaffe advised using the label on the game, the container for the game, and/or an accompanying guide or instruction booklet to determine language content. If it would be helpful to the user or to clarify certain aspects of the bibliographic record, Jaffe urged catalogers to make a 546 note to explain the source of language information.

Basic Audio Recordings Cataloging Workshop --Presented by Mary Huismann, Music Catalog Librarian, St. Olaf College

[submitted by Michelle Hahn, Indiana University](#)

Huismann started off with the assumptions that members of the audience were already familiar with RDA and had access to the RDA Toolkit. She then initiated the presentation by showcasing the differences between AACR2r and RDA, as much of the audience is more familiar with the former. Such differences include: a greater concern for data elements; the establishment of data points to describe

content, media, and carrier; the permission to transcribe inaccuracies in data such as misspellings; the prohibition of most abbreviations and modification of several to “symbol” status; and the allowance of more cataloger’s judgement.

She also reiterated that RDA is a content standard, not a prescription for use of the MARC framework, and is organized in such a way that it more closely follows the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) structure. Such structure organizes elements into three areas: Group 1 is the description of works, expressions, manifestations, and items (affectionately called WEMI); Group 2 is the description of persons and people; and Group 3 is the description of concepts, objects, events, and places. FRBR is now being paired with the other Functional Requirements (Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD) and Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD)) into the Library Reference Model (LRM) by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA).

As Huismann entered into the practical application of RDA for audio recordings cataloging, she made sure we were familiar with the terminology found throughout the guidelines. Those terms include “alternative” which provides a substitute action to the previous guideline, “optional” which allows foregoing a guideline, “exception” which supersedes the previous guideline in a particular instance, “either/or” which invokes a specific action based on the item in hand, “agency preparing” which allows for local policy and greater cataloger’s judgment, “transcribe” meaning to take the exact wording of a descriptive element though applying certain guidelines for symbols/punctuation/capitalization, and “record” which allows us to accommodate the spirit of the content even if it is not an exact transcription of the data. She also noted particular abbreviations that are still permitted specifically for music-related content, such as choral voicing (i.e. SATB) op./no. in access points, duration (i.e. min. and sec.), and thematic index numbers.

After the more introductory and clarifying information, Huismann delved into the specific application of the RDA content standard in the MARC 21 framework, as well as decisions in record creation, such as whether to input a new record, how to determine the mode of issuance, and primary and substitute sources of information. By following the familiar order in which many of us catalog, Huismann flowed through RDA guidelines by number and explained how each was applied in the MARC 21 framework specifically for audio recordings. She also included a broad variety of audio formats and types of academic content beyond musical recordings.

Throughout the session, Huismann made sure to mention the various resources which prove to be exceptionally helpful in cataloging audio recordings, including OLAC’s own best practices, the Music Library Association’s (MLA) best practices, and the well-maintained Music Cataloging at Yale website, which music librarians have come to rely on for a multitude of information related to music organization and cataloging.

Advanced Audio Recordings Cataloging Workshop -- Presented by Mary Huismann, Music Catalog Librarian, St. Olaf College

submitted by Scott Piepenburg, Valdosta State University

This was the second of the sessions given by Huismann on the cataloging of audio recordings; the earlier one being on the basics of audio recordings cataloging. She said that this session would not duplicate that information but start with it and build on it.

The session began with the cataloging of spoken word records, a format many catalogers are not often faced with, the vast majority of sound recordings in libraries being of music. Sources of information were discussed, including other manifestations. Of particular note was the use of OBI strips, or spine cards, which are found primarily in Japanese recordings but are also used in some non-Japanese recordings. These spine cards can be a wealth of information. Also emphasized is that edition statements are important for spoken word records to differentiate from similar titles.

Something I had never encountered before was the “date table of precedence” or the order that applicable date types should be utilized. This order is *r,s,p,t,q* and are covered in OCLC’s *Bibliographic Formats and Standards Guides (BFS.)* Dates should be recorded in standard 4-digit format for the 2XX field but the EDTF structure can be used for the 046 tag when recording date of capture/recording/performance. Other numerical information of significance is the UPC value (which is 12 digits) or the EAN value (which is 13 digits.) These are useful as many systems store these values and they can often be searched simply by scanning them with a barcode scanner.

The 336, 337 and 338 tags were covered in detail, as they are often different for spoken word than for musical recordings, as well as their usefulness to searchers. This was expanded to the use of 34X tags to describe the storage format including any “analog vs. digital” capture and storage formats, allowing for an eye-readable value as opposed to that in the 007. RDA also provides coded values for these areas. The importance of the 546, which is required, was also stressed along with capture information in the 518 tag. Relationship indicators are in RDA 18.5 Appendix I.

The session moved along to streaming audio. A significant amount of time and energy was expended on what “streaming audio” actually is. If it is something that is “stored” or “burned” and has permanency, then it is not streaming audio. Oftentimes, these are played or accessed via a computer, thus requiring the use of 2-007 tags; one for the musical aspect and one for the computer aspect. Reference was made to the OLAC and MLA best practices guides for the cataloging of these formats. An important distinction was made for provider-neutral sources, meaning that they are not accessed via a license or proprietary login/authentication. In these circumstances, while the access URL for the file may be recorded in the 856 tag, if it requires authentication because it is purchased by a specific site, that information should not be recorded in the 856 tag.

The session moved on to cover “funky formats.” Sometimes a cataloger does not know what they have in front of them. Tools such as *VSO Inspector*, *K-probe*, *DVD Identifier* and *VLC media player* can often offer guidance in these areas. Some examples of these funky formats are SACD (Super Audio CD,) hybrid SACD, Blu-ray audio, enhanced-CD, MP-3, Dual-Discs, and USB. Along with this, analog formats such as vinyl recordings (encompassing 33 1/3, 45, and 78 rpm) along with reel-to-reel, 8-track, and cassettes as

well as some obscure digital formats such as DAT and Mini-disc. Other more obscure formats were covered in less detail.

With its plethora of examples and citations, even advanced catalogers would do well to review the slides from this presentation; they stand very well on their own without the narrative.

Cartographic Resources Cataloging: Navigating the Basics Workshop -- Presented by Paige Andrew, Maps Cataloging Librarian, Pennsylvania State University
submitted by Xiping Liu, University of Houston

Paige Andrew, widely recognized as an expert in maps cataloging, gave both the basic and advanced workshops on cartographic resources cataloging. This report will focus on the basic map cataloging skills taught in the first session. Andrew started the presentation by introducing some general sources for map cataloging:

- Cartographic materials: a manual of interpretation for AACR2, 2002 revision / Anglo-American Cataloging Committee for Cartographic Materials.
- Maps and related materials: cataloging, classification and bibliographic control / Paige G. Andrew and Mary L. Larsgaard, eds. New York: Haworth Information Press, 1999.
- RDA and cartographic resources / Paige G. Andrew, Susan M. Moore, and Mary Larsgaard. Chicago : ALA Editions, 2015.

He noted that even though the first book describes the rules under AACR2, it still provides a lot of illustrations for titles and physical descriptions and remains a valuable source for map cataloging.

Andrew then covered some general aspects about cartographic resources and their description. The primary type of maps is graphic. Maps convert 3-D reality into a 2-D substitute and that is why they have to include scale and projection data. Because a map may contain a main map and other ancillary maps, it is important to understand the bibliographic description is of the “main map(s)” only. Insets/ancillary maps are treated differently, usually included in a 500 note. Andrew also explained the difference between a “panel” which refers to the map itself and a “cover” which separates itself from the actual map. The two terms are often used in the source-of-title note.

Before delving into each descriptive area, Andrew briefly talked about his workflow for creating an original record. He recommended spending some time looking over the map first to get an idea of what is covered in it. This can be title, scale, projection statement, coordinates, date, statement of responsibility, publisher, and the topic, etc. He also suggested determining how many main maps are to be described before starting the description process. Authority work can be done either before or after the description is completed.

After that, Andrew began going through the main descriptive areas in the bibliographic record. For titles, it can be tricky because there can be more than one title to choose from. RDA 2.3.2.5 gives the instructions on handling more than one form of title: If the sequence, layout, and typography do not provide the basis for a clear choice, choose the most comprehensive title. In other words, the title selected should always include the geographic area and the subject matter of the cartographic item. If

no subject/topic is involved, it must always include the geographic area covered. A source of title note is needed if the title does not come from the map itself, i.e. from the panel, the verso of the item, or cover, container, envelope, etc.

Andrew then moved to explain scale types and scale statements. A scale is the ratio representing the relationship between a specified distance on a map and the actual distance on the ground. Scale statement is put in 255 \$a. There are three types of scale statement on a map:

- Representative fraction (RF) form
- Verbal statement
- Bar or graphic scale

Andrew then showed a few examples of how to calculate from the verbal statement. Some basic conversion rates can come in handy in such calculations. After that Andrew showed a short video on how to use the natural scale indicator to calculate from the bar or graphic scale, followed by a few hands-on exercises. If the scale is not shown in any of the three methods mentioned above, catalogers can supply "Scale not given" in the 300 field, or "not drawn to scale" or "scales differ" if a map is not drawn to a scale. With RDA, it uses "Scale approximately 1:xxxx" instead "Scale [ca. 1:XXXX]" which is the format under AACR2.

For projection statements, if there is one on the resource, record it in 255 \$b and supply the correct code in the fixed field accordingly.

The next descriptive area is the coordinates. RDA 7.4 covers the geographic coordinates element. Coordinates are expressed as set of points of longitude and latitude and are recorded in a specific order (left, right, top, bottom), in 255 \$c and 034 d, e, f, g. While it is not a core element, Andrew stressed that it is important to include the coordinates in the record because of their increasing importance for user retrieval. Andrew then introduced a very handy tool called "[Klokkan Bounding Box](#)," where by searching a place on google map, it will automatically provide the coordinates in MARC formats for catalogers to grab.

The last descriptive area covered was the physical description area. RDA 3.4.1.3 instructs to record the number of units and the type of units for an extent of the manifestation, for example "1 map" or "5 profiles." "Type of unit" list is mixed in with long list of exceptions under 3.4.1.3. For dimensions, place the map in "reading position" first and then measure from the neatline. The order is always to measure from top to bottom followed by side to side. Measurements are given in centimeters rounded up to the next highest. If the map is folded into a panel, cover, or envelope, always record the measurement of these component parts as well. If there is no neatline to measure from, Andrew said to record the size of the sheet and not to worry about the size of the map. After the general instructions, every participant at the workshop was given a map of downtown Richmond to exercise on measuring the dimensions.

Throughout the workshop, Andrew passed around physical maps to show the participants issues he mentioned in the presentation. It was a very informative workshop for catalogers who did not have much experience working with cartographic resources. Many participants stayed to take the advanced cartographic resources cataloging workshop.

Advanced Cartographic Resources Cataloging Workshop -- Presented by Paige Andrew, Maps Cataloging Librarian, Pennsylvania State University

submitted by Tachtorn Meier, Yale University

The topics covered during the Advanced Cartographic Resources Cataloging workshop were an overview of subject analysis and classification, an analysis of map reproductions (paper and digital), and a comparison of Globes and Atlases with sheet maps.

Andrew began the workshop with a brief overview of the basic principles of cartographic materials. One convention he pointed out is that it is common for an authorized access point to be recorded under the corporate body name when there is also an individual name appearing on the map, as it is understood that this individual created the cartographic work. Andrew commented that this is an acceptable practice so long as an access point has been created for the individual.

Next, Andrew presented a comparison of the bibliographic descriptions used for “atlases”, “globes” and “sheet maps.” Atlases are cartographic resources. However, the source of information for describing atlases is the same as when describing monographs (see RDA 2.2.2). Like describing monographs, the title and statement of responsibility must come from the same source and describe other physical information, if any, and the dimension for height only. Fixed fields specifically for atlases are: “e” for the type of record and “d” for the specific material designation (007). Other variable fields use the G Schedule from the Library of Congress Classification (G1000-G3122) for 050/052, the unit type “atlas” in 300, and include coordinates in 034 and 255.

Globes are three-dimensional representations. Typically, there is not as much textual information on globes as on sheet maps. Andrew suggested paying attention to physical details of the globe, such as meridian, cradle or outer ring. For describing bibliographic records Andrew commented on the following: In the fixed fields code “e” for the type of record and choose the appropriate code for relief types, use 007 for globes, use the G schedule from the Library of Congress (G3160-G3171) for 050/052, use unit type “globe” in 300, record other physical details such as mounted in wood, plastic meridian ring etc. in 300 subfield “b”, and record the diameter of the globe in 300 subfield “c”.

Andrew explained that globes have limited sources of information aside from the typical title, legend, etc. Often globes lack a publication date. Andrew asked that anyone interested in learning more about internet resources designed to date globes to contact him directly.

Andrew then moved on to discuss coordinates (see RDA 7.4). He confirmed that recoding coordinates is a core element for BIBCO libraries. Under AACR2, recording the coordinates is optional. However, the cataloger should record coordinates if they appear on the source. If not, the cataloger could choose to supply coordinates or leave them out. He strongly recommended including coordinates for all cartographic resources, especially when the information can be used in the form of a metadata bounding box for the GIS. Andrew also explained that geographic coordinates referred to the latitude lines, or parallels, from east to west parallel to the equator and longitude lines, or meridians, from north

to south between the North Pole and the South Pole. In the bibliographic record, coordinates are expressed in hemisphere (H), degrees (DDD), minutes (MM), and seconds (SS). Andrew remarked that he is part of the group looking into changing this rule. Recording coordinates in decimal degree is still an option. Record them in the order of westernmost longitude (HDDMMSS), easternmost longitude (HDDMMSS), northernmost latitude (HDDMMSS), southernmost latitude (HDDMMSS) and supply "0" to fill any missing digits.

Next, Andrew demonstrated how to use the [Klokan Technologies Bounding Box tool](#). Andrew cautioned that this tool is oriented to draw the bounding box from North to South while many maps appeared to be oriented from Northeast to Southeast.

Andrew shared with attendees that the Library of Congress has created online training for the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH). This announcement appeared in the October 2017 issue of [base line](#), a newsletter of the Map and Geospatial Information Round Table.

With regards to the analysis of cartographic resources, Andrew encouraged catalogers to pay attention to the title, legends, and other textual information they encounter during the cataloging process. The map title alone might not provide the whole picture about the intent of the map, but together with textual information and legend, may provide the direct implication for the subject assignment.

There are different levels of geographic name heading starting from the World followed by Country, then any place names lower than country level are arranged up to two-levels of jurisdictions. Similarly, geographic subdivisions are also arranged in no more than two-levels of jurisdictions. For example, a city name in the United States would qualify by its state name and usually the state name is expressed in an abbreviated form such as Richmond (Va.). Some states do not use an abbreviated form when they are used as a qualifier such as Ohio and Hawaii. There are three geographic free-floating terms: Region, Metropolitan Area, and Suburban Area. They can be used to bring out the specificity of a given geographic area. For example, a map showing Richmond, VA and its surrounding would be assigned "Richmond Metropolitan Area (Va.);" for its subject because "Metropolitan Area" brought out the specification of "surrounding area." However, Andrew recommended including both "Richmond Metropolitan Area (Va.);" and Richmond (Va.);" in the subject area for this situation because generally the free-floating terms, if used, are not validated or controlled in OCLC.

There are many topical headings related to geographic resources. They are recorded in 650 fields and may be subdivided geographically by two, and in some cases, three or four level of jurisdictions. If needed, use MARC field 662 to record a hierarchical form of a place name. Topical headings related to geographic resources may or may not be allowed to be subdivided geographically. As an example, Andrew described how "Geology" can be subdivided geographically but "Geology, Stratigraphic" cannot. Andrew brought out a short list of topics commonly assigned to maps like railroads, land use, soils and agriculture, and zoning and real property. He added that currently there are seventy-five specific genre terms for cartographic materials. For the G schedule of the Library of Congress Classification, Andrew suggested that catalogers should consult with the 4th edition of "Classification: Class G; Geography, Maps, Anthropology, Recreation" published in 1976.

The last topic Andrew covered for this advanced workshop was cartographic reproduction. Andrew discussed the steps required to describe an item in hand (the reproduction) as if it is the original; code "r" in the fixed field (008/006) and provide both reproduction date and original date (if available); code

“f” in the 007--type of reproduction record; in 300 subfield “b”, add information regarding the original version (if available) in 534 or 776; add subfield “v” Facsimiles in subject fields. If available, the original date should be included in 050 as the last element in subfield “a”. Finally, record the reproduction date in subfield “b” after the author cutter number. To demonstrate, Andrew used a map that was reproduced from the original blue line print also called “reverse blue line print” as an example.

Toward the end of the workshop Andrew shared his experience with providing bibliographic descriptions for map reproductions from the digital resources at his library. He then proceeded to go through MARC fields related to this project. There are some differences when describing cartographic reproductions from digital sources to paper and reproductions from print sources to paper. Publication dates and places are taken from the digital source. Catalogers should add 530 to reflect the digital resource, 533 to reflect the type of reproduction, and add 856 to link to the digital version. Andrew suggested consulting with chapter eleven of the “Cartographic Materials: A Manual of Interpretation for AACR2, 2002 Revision 2nd Edition” published in 2003 and chapter eight of the “Map cataloging manual” published in 1991.

Andrew concluded the workshops by enthusiastically answering all questions and comments. It was clear from the level of attendee participation that his highly engaging presentation had stimulated much thought and reflection on current issues in advanced map cataloging.

Basic Video Cataloging Workshop -- Presented by Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, OCLC

[submitted by Jessica Robertson](#), Central Rappahannock Regional Library

Weitz led a presentation covering many aspects of how to interpret information and catalog video recordings. He joked that although this was a basic session, nothing about video cataloging is basic. He then encouraged the audience to join MOUG and OLAC if they deal with music or video cataloging respectively. He also invited everyone to use the best practice guides available from OLAC’s Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) and from the Music Library Association (MLA) Cataloging and Metadata Committee. These are both available freely on the web, and the MLA Best Practices are also available through the RDA Toolkit.

He shared the history of the DVD and Blu-ray with a special emphasis on the first release dates of these types of video recordings. He reminded the audience that no DVD from the United States can have a publication date earlier than 1997 (for Japanese DVDs, 1996). No Blu-ray disc can have a publication date earlier than 2006. If there are earlier dates on the items than those just listed, they may very well be important dates but they are not publication dates. Determining dates of visual materials is often difficult because the resource itself has multiple dates listed and because there may be various bibliographic “events” that visual materials have such as an original production date, release date, etc. Use your cataloger’s judgment about how much new material qualifies as “substantial” when coding the date fixed fields, and use the 500 fields freely to explain all dates if more information is needed for your users.

The rest of the presentation moved through most of the MARC record, highlighting guidelines from RDA and the OLAC Best Practices. OLAC Best Practices 2.2.2.3, for instance, states that the preferred source of information is the “label that is permanently printed on or affixed to the manifestation (e.g. a label on the surface of a videodisc). This choice does not include labels found on any accompanying materials or container.” When the presentation moved to the 007 fixed fields there were a few moans from the audience which brought laughter from everyone who could relate. Weitz led the audience through each of these fields and noted specifically that there is still no code for 4¼ dimensions and that the 007/07 (subfield \$h) will still be coded as “z” for now.

For most of the presentation, AACR2 rules were not discussed, but an exception was made when the RDA Content, Media, and Carrier fields were mentioned. The GMD from AACR2 was one-dimensional but the RDA 3XX fields are three-dimensional. The GMD should not be used in an RDA record, but the 3XX fields should be included in any record now regardless of whether it is cataloged according to RDA. He specifically noted that the OLAC Best Practices and OCLC recommend including both the terms in 3XX subfield \$a and the codes in 3XX subfield \$b. The Best Practices document further recommends that terms in subfield \$a and their vocabularies in \$2 be in a separate field from the corresponding codes in subfield \$b and their associated RDA code list in subfield \$2. Simply stated, this doubles the 3XX fields needed in the records since the \$a and \$b terms are from different lists and the \$2 is not repeatable.

There were many more practical tips shared throughout this presentation and although there was not much time left for questions, Weitz welcomed any follow-up questions through email.

Advanced Video Cataloging Workshop -- Presented by Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, OCLC

[submitted by Beth Thompson, University of North Carolina, Wilmington](#)

Weitz gave a lively session on advanced video cataloging. The session, building on his basic video cataloging session, provided current information on RDA instructions and the MARC 21 format on cataloging video recordings. Online media/streaming media was not covered in this session.

He started out encouraging those at the session who catalog music materials to join the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) and all to join the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) group. He stated the benefit and support they provided. Weitz also shared work OLAC’s Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) has been doing including the best practice documents that have been created for catalogers such as the *Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs*, *Video Language Coding: Best Practices*, and *Best Practices for Cataloging Video Games Using RDA and MARC 21*. Other best practice documents created by the Music Library Association (MLA) include *Best Practices for Music Cataloging Using RDA and MARC 21* and *Supplements to Best Practices for Music Cataloging Using RDA and MARC 21*. Weitz stated some of these documents have been integrated into the RDA Toolkit and that there is an initiative to compile all the OLAC Best Practices into a single document.

Short histories on DVD video and Blu-ray Discs were given by Weitz, discussing the years each format was developed and evolving or competing technology during its development. He said if we

remembered anything from this session, it was that commercial DVDs were first introduced/published in March 1997, late 1996 in Japan, and that Blu-rays became available commercially in June, 2006, so no publication date for these formats can be earlier than these dates.

At this point, Weitz covered in his presentation some basic video recording fields such as the Title and Title proper, Statement of responsibility, Language, Identifiers, Duration and Award note. He used the *OLAC Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs* and the RDA Toolkit to help describe the correct ways to catalog these fields and some differences between AACR2 and RDA rules. Weitz stated that current feature films and TV series credits no longer start a film but are delayed until much later in the film, sometimes even until the end of the film. This has added an extra challenge to cataloging this format.

A couple of interesting things I learned, Weitz used the *OLAC Best Practices for Video Games* document to show how to catalog a franchise title (Franchise title: individual title) such as:

245 04 The hunger games: Catching fire.

Weitz discussed accessibility content and gave a brief history on the differences between subtitles, captions, subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing (SDH) and audio enhancements. He used a number of great examples to show these differences.

In regards to the 028, there is a newly added second indicator 6 for the distributor number. The 037 field (Sources of Acquisition) is no longer being used for video recordings, but use the 028 instead.

Each award should be in a separate 586 (Awards Note) field. This is an open-ended field, and the cataloger can compose a description or use the description from the container. The field does not use final punctuation.

Weitz covered a lot of material during this session. It was all too short as Weitz's presentations are always informative and enjoyable.

Linked Data Initiatives Panel

[submitted by Julia Hess, Ball State University](#)

The panel opened with a presentation by Sarah Hovde, Cataloger at Folger Shakespeare Library. She dedicated her time to discussing the planning and prototyping process for putting together a digital asset platform at her institution. Beginning with a brief background of the Folger Shakespeare Library, she quickly moved onto the problem: the institution's plan to grow its digital collections without a way to manage them. In 2016, after determining that no existing platform would suit their needs, the library decided to build their own, working with an external team of developers.

Hovde noted that the Folger Shakespeare Library's collection is particularly suited for linked data because Shakespeare's work has been adapted so frequently, creating many different types of

relationships to manipulate. The library convened a working group to explore this and build a “prototype prototype” to look at using linked open data in the digital asset platform.

The working group faced a number of challenges: development of a data model with the few guidelines they had been given, cleaning of older data, creation of data for new digital assets, transformation of data to JSON, and communication between internal librarians and external developers. Despite all this, the library ended up with a working prototype that will be going live soon. Hovde ended with a number of recommendations for institutions that might be considering a similar project, such as prioritizing version control, thinking about scalability from the beginning, communicating clearly, documenting everything, and giving staff room to explore.

The panel continued with a presentation by Jeremy Myntti, Head of Digital Library Services at the University of Utah. He spoke about the Western Name Authority File project. Its end goal is to create a linked data ready authority file of names that can be used in conjunction with Library of Congress authorities. He opened with a short biography of Charles Savage, using his name as an example of one that is often found in unstandardized forms in records. He noted that this is caused by a combination of a number of factors, including that vendor platforms generally do not have good authority control solutions and most metadata librarians do not participate in NACO.

In 2016, the University of Utah was awarded a grant to explore the implementation of a regional controlled vocabulary for names to be used for digital collections. After investigating a number of data models and tools, they chose EAC-CPF and CollectiveAccess, respectively. They asked partner institutions to submit name authority metadata for aggregation and reconciliation against the Library of Congress authority file. This resulted in a significant amount of cleanup work and a number of names that could either be updated in the national authority file or added to it.

The researchers are currently in the implementation phase of the project, which primarily consists of working with the selected tools to evaluate their efficacy for the intended purpose. As they look forward, they are considering what it will take to move out of the pilot stage, including ensuring that the vocabulary works with multiple systems. The main advice Myntti offered to libraries preparing to move to a linked data environment is to make sure they have clean data, and specifically to be sure to match their authorities against another authority file.

The panel’s final presentation was given by Heather Pretty, Cataloging Librarian at Memorial University of Newfoundland. She began by discussing the Canadian Linked Data Initiative and her institution’s involvement in it, ranging from participation in working groups to contribution of thesis and authority records with added identifiers to editing of wikidata for Canadian musicians.

Next, Pretty spoke about plans for her year-long sabbatical, titled “Learning Linked Data.” Her primary goals for the year are to develop knowledge, to develop experience and expertise, and to participate in linked data initiatives. As part of that, she is beginning a project focusing on Newfoundland soldiers who fought in World War I, specifically those who participated in the battle of Monchy-le-Preux. She plans to use linked data to track both the soldiers and their regiment forward and backward from the date of the battle, focusing on geographic data and associated dates.

The panelists were all informative and insightful. In an environment in which the phrase “linked open data” is frequently tossed around and librarians often hear about the abstract promises of linked data, it was inspiring to hear about tangible projects that are underway now.

Lightning Talks

submitted by [Thuy-Anh Dang, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#)

The Limits of Subject Cataloging Media in an LGBTQ Collection / Jessica L. Colbert

Colbert spoke about an audiovisual cataloging project she undertook as a graduate student at the Gerber/Hart Library and Archives in Chicago. The difficulty in the project lay in the inadequacy of Library of Congress Subject Headings to describe this particular collection, which consists of LGBTQ erotica. Colbert found that LCSH coverage of LGBTQ topics was inadequate or even misleading (such as the current practice of using the form subdivision “Drama” which is meant for plays). Colbert also struggled to provide access to the genre of the collection, which tends to straddle the line between erotica and pornography.

OLAC CAPC Unified Best Practices Task Force / Bruce Evans

Evans, CAPC Chair, announced that OLAC has approved a task force to work on producing a document that unifies all of OLAC’s best practices guidelines. Marcia Barrett is the chair; the task force will work to produce a rough draft prior to the June 2018 rollout of the restructured RDA Toolkit. The task force will also make a recommendation on whether to integrate the Unified Best Practices document into the Toolkit.

An audience member raised the concern that RDA Toolkit integration means that OLAC’s Best Practices guidelines would no longer be freely accessible but instead would require a subscription to the Toolkit.

Adventures in 3D Printed Collections: Lessons Learned / Ann Kardos

Kardos, Metadata Librarian at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, described a pilot project in which she worked to organize, store, describe, and assess preservation needs for a small collection of 3D printed objects. The collection was created by a former graduate student and consists of 3D-printed models of biomolecules as well as the associated program files and extensive image files. Kardos spoke of the challenges in providing meaningful and useful metadata to such a collection.

RDA, MARC, DH: OMG, SMH / Catherine Oliver

Oliver, Assistant Professor and Metadata & Cataloging Librarian at Northern Michigan University, described the challenges she encountered in using RDA and MARC to catalog Digital Humanities projects

for the university's OPAC. Oliver found that current cataloging conventions and vocabularies tend to leave such projects under-described. Specific issues included inadequate material type, insufficient relationship designators, and uncontrolled fields.

Poster Sessions

submitted by Rebecca Belford, Brown University

The five posters addressed a variety of topics: circulation, discovery, metadata, preservation, and e-books. One common theme across the presentations—consistent with sessions throughout the meeting—was the importance of harmonized, clean, and full metadata.

The “Hill” Is Alive... with the Sound of Nordic Music: Collaboration in the Nordic Solo Song Collection at St. Olaf College / Kristi Bergland, University of Minnesota, and Mary Huismann, St. Olaf College

This project grew out of Bergland's DMA project to produce an edition of Nordic songs that was not (yet another) edition of works by Grieg. Of approximately 600 songs in the Nordic Solo Song Collection, 264 scores identified as published before 1923 have been digitized. It is housed on the open-source, cloud-based digital asset management system, Elevator (<https://elevator.stolaf.edu/>). Elevator draws metadata directly from MARC records in the catalog, resulting in mixed description levels: rich description for those items fully cataloged in physical form and brief records for those not yet cataloged. Future plans include audio and text diction and translation files. As of the poster session date, the digital collection is not yet live.

Reciprocal Impacts: IU's Media Digitization and Preservation Initiative (MDPI) and Metadata / Michelle Hahn, Indiana University

Indiana University's media digitization efforts are well known through Variations/Avalon projects. Hahn's poster focused on a corresponding large-scale digitization and preservation project, the MDPI. The title refers to interacting impacts of metadata and system development. Metadata issues include harmonizing records created over time with multiple rules and frameworks, including multiple MARC flavors that include the legacy 262 field. Harmonization challenges in turn affect display in Avalon. Everything in the MDPI is being digitized, even if ahead of metadata work. Currently, the match point between digitized versions and metadata for the physical format is barcodes. Hahn offered lessons learned, particularly managing expectations, not underestimating space or time needs, the pitfalls of relying on student workers unfamiliar with subject matter, and “scrub your data!” Slides and the poster image are online at <http://tinyurl.com/ReciprocalImpactsSlides> and <http://tinyurl.com/ReciprocalImpactsPoster>, respectively.

Getting More out of MARC for Music and Movies with Primo: Strategies for Display, Search and Faceting / Kelley McGrath, University of Oregon

The poster described the procedure for providing better access in Primo to selection criteria important for movies and music. Steps included normalization of fields, particularly MARC field 257, country of producing entity, for movies, and configuring the display of field 382, medium of performance. Country of production is offered in a dedicated movie search. The music search offers a set of facets for musical medium, offering multiple, combinable limits. Challenges in facets include collocation of identical information drawn from different sources or presented in different configurations, and the perennial challenge of aggregates. McGrath emphasized that, as catalogers, we put so much effort into

descriptions; we should insist that users can get this information back out. McGrath welcomes comments on the interface, which is live at <http://tinyurl.com/ydea3veq>.

The Ins and Outs of DVD Inventory / Jeanne Piascick and Joe Bizon, University of Central Florida

At the University of Central Florida Libraries, DVD cases are in open stacks with discs housed in slimline cases behind a service desk; DVDs and corresponding cases have identical barcodes. A DVD inventory project was created to identify any missing discs or cases. Students scanned barcodes on the shelves and on the cases. An Excel spreadsheet was then generated from Aleph. Once deduplicated, single barcodes remaining on the spreadsheet pointed to potentially missing items, which were then manually searched on the shelves. The good news? Very few missing items: out of a collection of approximately 7,000, only 139 DVDs and 54 cases were identified as missing. The collection will be fully restored after Acquisitions orders replacement DVDs for those not found.

Evaluating and Loading Ebook Metadata from OCLC WorldShare Collection Manager / Stacie Traill and Kelly Thompson, University of Minnesota

Metadata sources for ebook packages at the University of Minnesota Libraries are selected “by attempting to balance metadata coverage and completeness vs. effort required.” Sources may be the Alma Community Zone, WorldShare Collection Manager, or content vendors. The presenters found that in general, WorldShare Collection Manager offered the most complete metadata. MARC records are delivered to Alma via FTP from WorldShare, where they can be normalized and customized. Maintenance—new records, updates, merges, and deletes—are facilitated by scheduled Python scripts. The presenters pointed to an in-depth discussion of the process and Python scripting in [their article](#) in *Code4Lib Journal* issue 38.

Round Table Discussions

[submitted by Jan Mayo, East Carolina University](#)

On the final day of the conference, much of the morning was devoted to round table discussions, which were very productive. There were five facilitated topics and one additional topic discussed and reported on to the entire group:

Advocating for Cataloging: Demonstrating Our Value, facilitated by Bruce Evans, came up with three broad themes: 1) Catalogers need to emphasize that we are a public service; 2) we need to be plugged into the broader library via open houses, combined positions, etc.; and 3) what is the value of cataloging and how does it fit into the library’s strategic goals?

Sudden Cataloger: What Do Newbies Need to Know? was facilitated by Autumn Faulkner. This topic could apply to new catalogers, as well as seasoned ones suddenly confronted with a new type of material. They need instruction in non-intuitive things, like what is a good OCLC record and how are the cataloging tools applied? Also, expected competencies and benchmarks would be useful. An attendee suggested that cataloging is an apprenticeship, which prompted a room-wide discussion.

Cataloging Horrors: How to Cope When Working With Traumatizing Material did not have a scheduled facilitator, but Barbara Tysinger offered to do it. Participants felt it was important to be factual when describing such materials and to avoid being judgmental. There was some discussion of the possible need for trigger warnings. If possible, the cataloger should pass the material on to a colleague who is not disturbed by it. Also, ways to de-stress were explored.

Nuts and Bolts of Systems Migration, facilitated by Scott Dutkiewicz and Scott Piepenburg, suggested keeping a backup, documenting everything, and finding analogous functions from the old system in the new one. One attendee cautioned that sales people can sometimes overpromise what those who create the product can actually deliver.

Using Wikipedia, IMDb and Other Sites for Cataloging Media, facilitated by Martin Patrick, agreed that other useful sites are CTVA, Anime News, and cartoon wiki data. Responses to their report evolved into a lively and wide-ranging discussion of moving from public to academic librarianship and tips on getting that first job.

Management of Vendor Files of MARC Records, facilitated by Ngoc-My Guidarelli, cautioned that the vendors you meet with are not the programmers, so take what they tell you with a grain of salt. It is possible to negotiate a lot of what you want.

Handouts and further information for many of the sessions can currently be found [here](#). They will eventually be added to the [Conference Archive](#).

Conference Chair Closing Remarks

Kay Johnson

The hotel staff and accommodations have been wonderful. I would like to thank everyone at the Omni, including Michele, Nancy, Tramon, Ian, Zack, Houston, SianSian, Eric, Eddie, and Brittany and many, many others.

The last and current OLAC Boards have been very supportive to the OLAC Conference Committee, especially Stacie, Autumn, who encouraged me that hosting a conference is doable, Debra, Matt, Annie, Jeremy & Haley. Debra just started as OLAC Treasurer and has made our lives a lot easier and helped us save money by figuring out transfers between accounts.

Without the program presenters, there would be no conference. A huge thanks goes to Annie, Kathryn, Regina, Jay, Paige, Amber, Jenny, Jessica, Mary, Scott, Rachel, Adam, Jessica, Bruce, Ann, Catherine, Jeanne, Stacie, Kelly, Kelly, Kristi, Michelle, Sarah, Jeremy, Heather, and the round table presenters.

And there would be no program without the OLAC Conference Program Committee, chaired by Stacie Traill, with the following members: Marcia, Thuy-An, Autumn, Jeannette, T.J., Kate, Jeremy and Jessica. Thank you for putting together an excellent program.

A final, and well-deserved thanks goes to the group that worked so hard to bring this conference together – The OLAC Conference Committee. – Autumn Faulkner, Teri Frick, My Guidarelli, Mary Beth Holm, Mei Kiu Lo, Elizabeth McCormick, Stacie Traill and honorary member, Christi Wayne. Mary Beth was unable to come to the conference, and Stacie, and Elizabeth had to leave early, but the rest of you, please come up to be acknowledged and have your picture taken. It's been a pleasure working with all of you, and getting to know you.

Finally.

Today is Reformation Sunday. Almost 500 years ago, on October 31, 1517, Martin Luther posted 95 theses that catalyzed a revolution. Luther's theses were a white paper of a sort about the rules of his

day. His revolution was part of the bigger reformation of intellectual and creative enlightenment that we call the Renaissance. By 1517, Guttenberg's printing press has spread throughout Europe, and printers were enthusiastic to print something besides the Bible that would have mass appeal. They eagerly printed Luther's treatises, which Luther didn't discover until he read one on the street, the concept of copyright being completely non-existent at the time. Luther's writings became widespread, and he is sometimes called the first modern media star. Luther had no intent or desire to cause a revolution, but one started around him. There are many parallels between his time period and ours. The OLAC Reformation began in 1980, when Nancy Olson formed a group to come up with the standards and practices to create MARC catalog records for audiovisual materials. At the time, the world of media existed mostly as films, cassettes, vinyl records, maps, kits, and other analog, print, and 3-D media that, if cataloged at all, were often organized by format (carrier) and accession number with a title or brief description recorded on an index card. The MARC format had been a standard for about ten years, and computerized cataloging was taking off, but still so new that the focus was on new and retrospective cataloging of books. Systems were called *Online* Public Access Catalogs to stress that this wasn't your grandmother's card catalog. Similarly, OLAC was named *Online* Audiovisual Catalogers to stress that these catalog records weren't your grandmother's accession cards. Nancy was part of a reformation that we could consider the Digital Renaissance.

Neither Luther nor Olson came from prestigious backgrounds, or had any notoriety before they became revolutionaries. Luther was a monk, and Olson was a cataloger at a former teacher's college that was then called Mankato State University. Both were not perfect, both could be intimidating, but both also had a sense of humor, cared for others, and most-importantly had a drive and a passion for a cause and for sharing that cause with others. The passion for cataloging audiovisual materials continues today in OLAC, and is evident by the presenters and attendees at this conference. We are not perfect, and neither is our media. OLAC is on the front lines developing and revising standards and practices to improve the access for existing media, tackle new media, and adopt technology to improve the efficiency and accuracy of bibliographic description to do what librarians do best – serve our user communities. Thank you for attending this conference, thank you for supporting OLAC, and thank you for contributing to the continuing audiovisual cataloging reformation.

It's been a great privilege and honor to serve as your conference chair. I wish all of you safe and uneventful travels back to your homes.

Thanks to OLAC Conference Sponsors!

Gold Level Sponsors



Silver-Level Sponsors



Conference Supporters



2017 OLAC Conference Wrap-Up

Kay Johnson, Conference Chair

Great programs, great food, great location, great trip to the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts and Carytown, great reception at the hotel, great trip to the National Audiovisual Conservation Center, and especially the great tributes to Nancy Olson... It's hard to believe it's all over! There were some glitches, but overall feedback has been good. You can read up on the programs in the conference reports elsewhere in this newsletter. For you stats-lovers, we had 65 first-time attendees out of 131 total attendees. Most attendees were from the U.S., but three were from Canada. The furthest traveler was from Bellingham, Washington.

You know the adage about pictures being worth a thousand words, so I'm going to let the pictures tell some of the story:



OLAC Conference Attendees after the Saturday Luncheon Membership Meeting



Sandy Roe giving a tribute to Nancy Olson. Bobby Bothman and Jay Weitz also spoke. Bobby and OLAC President, Jeremy Myntti, are sitting at the table platform.



Kay Johnson, Jay Weitz & Hayley Moreno



Scott Piepenburg & Kei Kiu Lo



A game of Trivial Pursuit at the Reception



Jeremy Myntti, OLAC President



OLAC Board Meeting (Debra Spidal, Stacie Traill, Mary Huisman, Hayley Moreno, Bruce Evans)

Call for Nominations for OLAC Officers

Stacie Traill

Interested in a leadership opportunity where you will learn about OLAC from the inside and help shape its future? OLAC is seeking nominations for the offices of **Vice President/President-Elect** and **Secretary**. Please consider nominating yourself! All OLAC personal members are eligible to serve and self-nominations are highly encouraged. To become a candidate, just submit a letter of nomination indicating the position for which you wish to run. The letter should include a brief description of pertinent qualifications and professional activities.

Members of the Executive Board receive a \$100 stipend for attending OLAC Membership meetings during ALA conferences. The deadline for nominations is **December 31, 2017**. Please submit requested nomination materials to Stacie Traill (trail001@umn.edu) by that date.

The official duties as laid out in the OLAC handbook are:

Vice President/President-Elect

This office is elected annually, with a term beginning in the summer following the ALA Annual Conference, and serves four years: a one-year term as Vice-President/President-Elect, followed by one year as President, one year as Immediate Past-President, and one year as Past-Past President.

The Vice President performs all duties delegated by the President and presides at meetings and other functions when the President cannot attend. The Vice President is expected to attend the OLAC and Executive Board Meetings while in office and is responsible for any OLAC-sponsored programs held at ALA Annual. The Vice President chairs the OLAC Research Grant Committee.

The OLAC President presides at all OLAC Membership and Executive Board Meetings. The President will submit quarterly reports for the OLAC Newsletter, and works closely with the OLAC Executive Board in guiding the operations of the organization.

The Immediate Past President serves as Chair of the Nancy B. Olson Award Committee and as a member of the OLAC Executive Board. The Past President may also be asked to take on an additional project which forwards OLAC's goals. The Past-Past President serves as the Chair of the Elections Committee.

Secretary

This office is elected every two years, with a term beginning in the summer following the ALA Annual Conference in the year elected. The Secretary serves two years; the next Secretary's term will run from summer 2018 to summer 2020. The Secretary is expected to attend OLAC Board, CAPC and Membership meetings at both ALA Annual and Midwinter conferences, and records the minutes of those meetings. The Secretary also maintains and disseminates the roster of the Executive Board, past OLAC Presidents, and OLAC appointees. In addition, the Secretary maintains the OLAC Handbook, and prepares any corporate reports required by the State of Minnesota.

Call for CAPC Participation

Bruce Evans, CAPC Chair

*****Call for CAPC Interns*****

OLAC's Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) is seeking applicants for intern position with a one-year term beginning after the 2018 ALA Annual Conference. Successful completion of a one-year term as intern often leads to a full-member position afterward.

Qualifications are as follows: An interest in AV cataloging and the willingness to help out with CAPC projects. CAPC business is conducted during meetings at the ALA Midwinter and ALA Annual conferences, and electronically between conferences. Candidates for appointment to CAPC intern positions must be willing to commit time and funds as necessary to attend at least one of these in-person meetings per year.

An intern is neither guaranteed appointment to CAPC as a full voting member nor reappointment as an intern. A maximum of two (2) interns may be appointed annually; an intern may serve no more than two terms.

If you are interested in applying for the CAPC intern positions, please send a letter detailing your qualifications and your resume via e-mail to CAPC Chair Bruce Evans (Bruce_Evans@Baylor.edu) by December 22, 2017. Feel free to contact me with any questions you may have. Appointments will be made at or after ALA Midwinter 2018.

*****Call for CAPC Members*****

OLAC's Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) is seeking applicants for full member positions with terms beginning after the 2018 ALA Annual Conference. Members serve two-year terms with possibility of reappointment to a second two-year term.

Qualifications are as follows: 3 years of current audiovisual cataloging experience or the equivalent; evidence of regular interaction with online cataloging systems or demonstrable knowledge of such systems. CAPC business is conducted during meetings at the ALA Midwinter and ALA Annual conferences, and electronically between conferences. Candidates for full member positions must be willing to commit time and funds as necessary to attend one in-person meeting per year of their term.

If you are interested in applying for the CAPC full-member positions, please send a letter detailing your qualifications and your resume via e-mail to CAPC Chair Bruce Evans (Bruce_Evans@Baylor.edu) by December 22, 2017. Feel free to contact me with any questions you may have. Appointments will be made at or after ALA Midwinter 2018.

Bruce J. Evans

Chair, OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC)
Assistant Director for Delivery Services
Baylor University Libraries
One Bear Place #97151
Waco, TX 76798-7151
office: 254-710-7863

Bruce_Evans@Baylor.edu

Call for Proposals for the 2018 OLAC Research Grant

Mary Huismann

Do you have a research idea related to audiovisual cataloging? If so, here's your opportunity! OLAC (Online Audiovisual Catalogers) is currently seeking applicants for the 2018 OLAC Research Grant.

This annual award of up to \$2,000 encourages research in the field of audiovisual cataloging, and may be used for travel expenses to the next OLAC meeting/conference to present the research results. Members of the Research Grant Award Committee will select a winning proposal based on the criteria of practicability and perceived value to the audiovisual cataloging community.

Full details on the grant and the application process can be found in the [OLAC Handbook](#).

Proposals must be submitted by March 1, 2018 to:

Mary Huismann
OLAC Research Grant Committee Chair
huisma1@stolaf.edu

If you have any questions about the Research Grant, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Mary Huismann
OLAC Vice President/President-Elect
Music Catalog Librarian
St. Olaf College
Northfield, MN 55057

News and Announcements

Yoko Kudo, column editor

2018 ARSC Conference: Call for Papers and Posters

The Association for Recorded Sound Collections invites proposals for papers, panels, and posters at its 52nd annual conference, to be held May 9-12, 2018, at the Radisson Baltimore Downtown-Inner Harbor, Baltimore, Maryland. The deadline for presentation proposals is January 2, 2018. For more information about the conference and proposal submission guidelines, please visit [here](#).

2018 NASIG Grants, Awards, and Scholarships

NASIG announces the beginning of the application cycle for its 2018 grants, awards, and scholarships to be awarded at the [33rd Annual Conference](#) being held in Atlanta, GA. June 8-11, 2018. The application deadline is February 9, 2018. To learn more about the available grants, etc. and application procedures, please check [this page](#) of the NASIG website.

2018 Jesse H. Shera Award for Distinguished Published Research: Call for Submissions

The Library Research Round Table of the American Library Association announces the 2018 Jesse H. Shera Award for Distinguished Published Research. The deadline for submitting entries is January 31, 2018. More information is available [here](#).

Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians (NOTSL) Scholarship

Applications for the 2018 Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians (NOTSL) Scholarships are now being accepted. Scholarship(s) will be awarded at the discretion of the NOTSL Scholarship Committee, not to exceed \$2,000, dependent upon need and number of applicants. Applicants must either be currently working in an Ohio library in a professional, paraprofessional, or support position in a technical services area, or be students (residing or studying in Ohio) currently taking coursework in librarianship. The deadline for submissions is Sunday, December 31st, 2017, and recipients will receive notification no later than January 31st, 2018. Application form is available on the [NOTSL web page](#).

Call for Proposals to Host Code4Lib 2019 Conference

The Code4Lib community is calling for proposals to host the fourteenth annual Code4Lib Conference in 2019. The deadline for proposals is midnight EST on Monday, January 22, 2018. The decision will be made via online popular vote. The results of the vote will be announced at the Code4Lib 2018 Conference in Washington, D.C., and then emailed out to the listserv following the conference announcement. For more information, please visit the [conference hosting page](#) and [How to Plan a Code4LibCon on the wiki](#).

Members on the Move

Hayley Moreno, Column Editor

OLAC members have been busy these couple of months presenting, writing, and being on the spotlight in other library organizations. Below are just a few examples of how our members are shining bright in the field of librarianship. If you too would like to be highlighted for some of your accomplishments, remember to email me at moreonh@oclc.org to be mentioned in the next Members on the Move column!

Paige Andrew (Penn State University)

- Presented a preconference workshop, “Map Cataloging Basics” at the 2017 Western Association of Map Libraries (WAML)

Bobby Bothmann (University State University, Mankato)

- Panelist, “*Cataloging for the future*” at the 2017 Minitex Technical Services Symposium: Linked Data and the Future

Brittney Buckland (Merrimack Public Library)

- *Was featured in the LITA Blog Spotlight Series in October*

Violet Fox (College of Saint Benedict/Saint John’s University)

- *Presented a poster, #critlib: Critical Librarianship for Fun and Profit” at the 2017 Minnesota Library Association Conference*
- *Co-presented, “Never forget who you really work for: Radical cataloging and the case for local adaptation” at the 2017 Minnesota Library Association Conference*

Kathy Glennan (University of Maryland)

- Presented, “*Rethinking, Restructuring, & Redesigning RDA*” at the 2017 Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians (NOTSL) Conference
- Presented, “*Update on the RDA 3R Project*” an ALCTS webinar

Michelle Hahn (Indiana University)

- Is the new Assistant Web Editor for the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centers

Nancy Lorimer (Stanford University)

- Panelist, “*Linked Data for Production (LD4P): Technical services workflow evolution through Tracer Bullets*” at the 2017 DCMI conference.

Jeremy Myntti (University of Utah)

- Co-authored an article, “*A Clean Sweep: The Tools and Processes of a Successful Metadata Migration*” which has been published in the Journal of Web Librarianship

- Co-presented, *“Supercharged Digital Collections: Moving from the Slow Lane to the Fast Lane with Scalable Open Source Infrastructure”* at the Utah Library Association conference.

Diane Robson and Catherine Sassen (University of North Texas)

- Co-presented, *“Just Catalog It! Providing Access to 3-D Materials”* an ALCTS webinar

Jessica Schomberg (Minnesota State University, Mankato)

- Also, co-presented, *“Never forget who you really work for: Radical cataloging and the case for local adaptation”* at the 2017 Minnesota Library Association Conference

Vicki Sipe (University of Maryland-Baltimore County)

- Authored, *“Association for Library Collections and Technical Services Annual Report 2016-17”* which has been published in the Library Resources and Technical Services Journal.

Stacie Traill (University of Minnesota)

- Co-authored an article, *“Leveraging Python to improve ebook metadata selection, ingest, and management”* which has been published in the Code4Lib Journal

Jean Weihs (Retired)

- Has written column series titled, *“Why I Became a Librarian: Women”* which is being published by the Technicalities magazine.

In the Spotlight with... Melissa Burel

Lisa Romano, Column Editor



In honor of the recent OLAC conference, we are catching up with Melissa Burel, the 2014 recipient of the OLAC conference scholarship. Melissa has found that receiving the scholarship was advantageous to her career in a lot of ways. Without the OLAC scholarship, Melissa would not have been able to attend the 2014 conference. At this conference, she enjoyed meeting many cataloging professionals who are leaders in the field. *Seeing so many intelligent catalogers in one place without apology really made me feel that being a cataloger is important, and part of my job is to demonstrate how important that role is within the library.* Plus, Melissa was able to use the training she received at the conference to improve her cataloging and be more effective in her training of other catalogers.

Last July, Melissa moved to Huntsville, Alabama where her husband started his first tenure-track position as Professor of Music Theory and Composition at University of Alabama Huntsville. Currently, Melissa is looking for a new job. However, she is still working on research articles with her previous colleagues from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville and presented the results from their study at the Southeastern Library Assessment Conference in November. Additionally, she is an intern to the OLAC CAPC committee. *So, I'm still having fun doing library work without a current position.* Melissa first became interested in libraries as a child. She participated in the library reading program and went to the library for fun. *I remember feeling so empowered that I could pick any book I wanted. How could anyone not like the library - they gave out stickers!* Later Melissa was inspired to become a librarian when she realized that not everyone loved the library and research like she did. While studying for her masters in oboe performance at Western Michigan University, she had to take a Music Bibliography course and really enjoyed the class.

We got to create our own imaginary music school and develop a library collection (with budget) that would support its curriculum, we evaluated sources, and discussed the focus of different databases. I remember feeling like it was a game to see how many resources I could find about a topic within each database. I soon learned that my colleagues all hated this class and I was really surprised. How could anyone not enjoy this? So that was my first clue that maybe I should be working in libraries. I then job shadowed and interviewed many librarians in the area in order to be sure I would like the profession, and then I applied to library school at Wayne State University in Detroit.

After library school, Melissa's first professional library position was at Florida State University as a copy cataloger and then a library specialist. Later, she was hired at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville as the Catalog Librarian. While at Florida State University, Melissa first heard about OLAC from her supervisor, Annie Glerum, who was on the OLAC committee developing cataloging guidelines for

streaming materials. *Now that I've been cataloging for a little while, I can see how valuable that documentation is and why she [Annie] was so passionate about contributing to that work.* Melissa finds that she references OLAC documentation often in her work.

Besides being the 2014 OLAC scholarship winner and an intern to CAPC, Melissa is a member of the OLAC Unified Best Practices Task Force. This task force was formed to combine all extant OLAC best practice documents into a single (unified) document. They will begin by reconciling duplicative and contradictory content. Then the task force will merge all of the best practices into a single, streamlined document, and also preserve the ability to sort by format. The ultimate goal is to get the unified best practices integrated with the RDA Toolkit.

Melissa thinks that her most important achievements in her career have been her accomplishments in research. In 2015, she was an Institute for Research Design in Librarianship (IRDL) scholar. The purpose of the institute is to assist librarians to complete a research study of their own design. Melissa's research involved exploring the university and library experiences of international students through a mixed-methods approach of in-depth interviews, photo diaries, and a survey. Specifically, she wanted to find out what kind of new or improved services or spaces would really serve the university's students. For two weeks, Melissa learned from some of the best people in research within the library world and the social science world. *The support and confidence I gained from the institute was really the best part.* Melissa feels that these efforts will have a positive impact on students. *I really enjoy doing research and figuring out how to communicate the results in a meaningful way. I want to make life better for students in whatever way I can, and I feel like doing research is one way that I can do that.*

And what is one of the things that Melissa most enjoys about library work?

I really enjoy the organizational framework within the whole library and the fact that what I do every day contributes to that larger information organization. If I do my job well and work to provide high-quality records, then users should be successful in their research. I'm excited about the idea that new frameworks and systems could make research and finding related sources easier for patrons, and I'm looking forward to being a part of that.

ALA Midwinter Meetings of Interest

Friday, February 9, 2018

RDA Toolkit Redesign Update and Preview (\$\$)

8:30 AM-4:00 PM

Colorado Convention Center, Room 201

FRBR Interest Group

10:30-11:30 AM

Colorado Convention Center, Room 303

OCLC Expert Cataloging Community Session

10:30 AM-12:00 PM

Colorado Convention Center, Room 304

OLAC Membership Meeting

3:00-4:00 PM

Sheraton Denver Downtown, Terrace

OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) Meeting

7:30-9:30 PM

Crowne Plaza, Red Cloud

Saturday, February 10, 2018

Copy Cataloging Interest Group (ALCTS CaMMS)

8:30-10:00 AM

Sheraton Denver Downtown, Governor's Square 10

Linked Library Data Interest Group (ALCTS LITA)

8:30-10:00 AM

Colorado Convention Center, Room 705/707

MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) Meeting 1

8:30-10:00 AM

Colorado Convention Center, Room 711

Public Libraries Technical Services Interest Group (ALCTS)

8:30-10:00 AM

Colorado Convention Center, Room 709

Cataloging Norms Interest Group (ALCTS CaMMS)

10:30-11:30 AM

Colorado Convention Center, Room, Room 705/707

OCLC Linked Data Roundtable: Stories from the Front
10:30-11:30 AM
Colorado Convention Center, Room, Mile High 1A

RDA Forum
10:30-11:30 AM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 601/603

Cataloging Management Interest Group (ALCTS CaMMS)
1:00-2:30 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room, Room 601/603

SAC Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation (ALCST CaMMS)
1:00-4:00 PM
Grand Hyatt, Mt. Oxford

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access I (ALCTS CaMMS)
1:00-5:30 PM
Sheraton Denver Downtown, Plaza Ballroom F

Holding Information Forum (ALCTS CRS)
3:00-4:00 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 104

MAGIRT Cartographic Cataloging Core Competencies Task Force Meeting
3:00-4:00 PM
Embassy Suites, Rexford Room

MARC Format Transition Interests Group (ALCTS LITA)
3:00-4:00 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 303

Faceted Subject Access Interest Group (ALCTS CaMMS)
4:30-5:30 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 303

Sunday, February 11, 2018

MAGIRT Cataloging & Classification Committee Meeting
8:30-10:00 AM
Grand Hyatt, Mt. Princeton

Metadata Interest Group (ALCTS)
8:30-10:00 AM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 703

Subject Analysis Committee I (ALCST CaMMS)
8:30-11:30 AM
Sheraton Denver Downtown, Plaza Ballroom F

Cataloging and Classification Research Interest Group (ALCTS CaMMS)
10:30-11:30 AM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 303

Cataloging Cartographic Resources Interest Group Meeting
10:30-11:30 AM
Grand Hyatt, Mt. Oxford

Library of Congress BIBFRAME Update Forum
10:30-11:30 AM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 601/603

CaMMS Forum (ALCTS CaMMS) Cooperatively Conscientious Cataloging
1:00-2:30 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 203/205

Authority Control Interest Group (ALCTS LITA)
1:00-4:00 PM
Embassy Suites, Cripple Creek Salon 2

MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) Meeting II
3:00-4:00 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 302

PCC-At-Large
3:00-4:00 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 601/603

MARC Advisory Committee (MARC) Meeting III
4:30-5:30 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 302

Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Participants Meeting
4:30-5:30 PM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 601/603

Monday, February 12, 2018

Heads of Cataloging Departments Interest Group (ALCTS CaMMS)
8:30-10:00 AM
Colorado Convention Center, Room 705/707

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access II (ALCST CaMMS)

8:30-11:30 AM

Sheraton Denver Downtown, Plaza Ballroom F

RDA Linked Data Forum Description

1:00-2:30 PM

Colorado Convention Center, Room 303

Subject Analysis Committee II (ALCTS CaMMS): FAST-Wikipedia Linking

1:00-5:30 PM

Colorado Convention Center, Room 107/109/111

Reviews

Richard N. Leigh, Column Editor

Practical Ontologies for Information Professionals by David Stuart

Practical Ontologies for Information Professionals is a lucid and forceful argument for the importance of ontologies in navigating information overload, and the critical role information professionals can play in both creating new ontologies and developing existing ones. The author defines ontologies as “formal representations of knowledge with rich semantic relationships” (1), especially those intended for recoding in linked data for placement on the semantic web. Librarians may be more likely to refer to these knowledge organization systems as “controlled vocabularies”, “taxonomies”, or “thesauri”, depending on their specialty. Catalogers are already familiar with several examples of ontologies, of course, including subject headings and authority files.

Chapter 1 (“What is an ontology?”) focuses on how ontologies can be used by libraries and digital repositories. The author shows how ontologies provide indexing support, retrieval support, and organization and navigation support. Information encoded in an ontology can be queried in complex ways : to highlight relationships, to show hierarchies, to visualize data, etc.

Chapter 2 (“Ontologies and the semantic web”) shows how ontologies are currently being used in libraries, cultural heritage institutions, and commercial organizations. The author explains the potential benefits of “moving from a web of documents to a web of data, from one that is primarily designed to be read by humans to one that can be read by machines” (27). The Resource Description Framework, RDF triples, and XML are discussed, as are classes, subclasses, and properties.

Chapter 3 (“Existing ontologies”) lists the most widely-used ontologies, comparing their respective strengths and weaknesses. Ontologies are considered for constructing ontologies (RDF, RDFS, SKOS, OWL2), for usage in libraries (Dublin Core, Bibliographic Ontology, FRBR, RDA, Bible Ontology), for usage in cultural heritage institutions (Europeana Data Model, CIDCO-Conceptual Reference Model), and for usage on the web (DBpedia ontology, Friend of a Friend ontology, Schema.org, Facebook Open Graph Protocol).

Chapter 4 (“Adopting ontologies”) explains how to select an ontology for usage, based on variables like clarity, coherence, extendibility, minimal encoding bias, minimal ontological commitment, goodness of fit, format, currency, adoption, documentation, licensing, etc. Benefits of choosing an extant ontology include cost-effectiveness, colleagues to communicate with, and facilitating the interoperability of data. The author suggests surveying the available options in an ontology library (such as Linked Open Vocabularies, BARTCO.org, The Taxonomy Warehouse, BioPortal) or an ontology search engine (like Swoogle, Watson, Falcons).

Chapter 5 (“Building ontologies”) describes how to develop an ontology from scratch, via a 12-step methodology devised by the author (with inspiration from four prominent ontology development methodologies originally published between 1995-2001). Stuart also provides a case study : developing a Bibliometric Metrics Ontology element set with Protégé - a free, open-source ontology editor and framework created by Stanford University.

Chapter 6 (“Interrogating ontologies”) focuses on how to search semantic web ontologies, via Simple Protocol and RDF Query Language (SPARQL) or web crawlers. Ontologies may be queried not only for informational purposes (i.e. research), but also to determine if the ontology is suitable for repurposing or to understand how the ontology is currently used. Simply reading the documentation is not advisable for a large or complex ontology; software or online tools will be better, especially if utilized by an experienced computer scientist.

Chapter 7 (“The future of ontologies and the information professional”) predicts possible developments in the usage of ontologies and suggests possible avenues for librarians to create their own ontologies. Natural Language Processing and machine learning are discussed, both for their own merits and as part of a hybrid approach involving human vetting of their results. The author predicts ever-increasing diversity for ontologies - open and closed, formal and informal, centralized and distributed, etc.

Practical Ontologies for Information Professionals is extremely well-organized, allowing it to be read either straight-thru or referred to for ready-reference. Each chapter has an easily understandable title and equally informative subsection titles (ex : “Alternative semantic visions”). Even the figures and tables are well-described! The prose is admirably clear, too, especially for such a complicated topic. Anything that is simultaneously both this abstract and this technical will inevitably be a challenging read, but the author does an excellent job of helping readers scale the “knowledge pyramid” from data and information to knowledge and wisdom.

Published in 2016 by: Neal-Schuman, Chicago; Facet Publishing, London (viii, 184 p. ; 24 cm.) ISBN 978-0-8389-1511-0 (U.S.); 978-1-78330-062-4 (U.K.); (softcover : \$79.20, £59.95)

Reviewed by:
Richard N. Leigh
Metadata & Digital Resources Developer
University Libraries
Ball State University

OLAC Cataloger's Judgment: Questions and Answers

Jay Weitz, Column Editor



Source Material

Question: I am contributing English-language cataloging for a DVD that's already represented by the Spanish language of cataloging record #798129718. There is no date on the item other than the copyright date of the film, so I had no clue what the publication date was. This information IS given in brackets on the Spanish record. I know I can use this date in brackets because it is from a source outside the resource. There are two other Spanish records that match the EAN, #352874994 and #991836646, but #798129718 has the same stock number as the item in hand given in a note: "RTC DVDA-4523." That is why I'm favoring the date information of "[2004?]" over the other two attempts ("[200-?]" and "1998"). I would like to provide the source of the information in a note. All this background to ask: How would one cite the OCLC record #798129718? Or does one provide the information less directly with a statement like, "Date of publication obtained from Spanish language record"?

Answer: Your general statement of "Date of publication obtained from Spanish language record" seems like a reasonable route to take, if you feel obligated to explain the choice. But as I read the relevant sections of RDA 2.8.6, 2.17.7, and the related PSs, I'm not sure that you need to include such a note. Not that it hurts. If you can figure out where the institution might have come up with the "[2004?]" date, that would be even more useful to explain, but don't drive yourself crazy trying to figure it out.

Not Classified Information

Question: I have noticed the 090 field is now always replaced with 050_4 in the records we add to OCLC. (Well almost always. OCLC #915137360 was input back in July 2015 and still has field 090 in the master record.) Is this a new/preferred practice, even for non-PCC libraries? I'm asking because if this is the case, we will have to update our cataloging policies for call numbers.

Answer: The issue of 050/090, 082/092, and 060/096 goes all the way back to the beginnings of what is now MARC 21 in the 1960s, when the format was literally still USMARC and was largely still the province of the Library of Congress. Until 1982, the 050, 060, and 082 Second Indicators for "Source of Call/Classification Number" were undefined, so there was no way to indicate that a number had been assigned by an agency other than LC or NLM. OCLC's 09X locally-assigned call number fields were defined out of necessity so that OCLC participants could enter call numbers. This was also still the era of printed catalog cards and the 09X fields were the mechanism by which to generate properly formatted call numbers on cards and labels. In recent years, OCLC has been making a deliberate effort to bring

OCLC-MARC more closely into alignment with MARC 21 proper. In this post-catalog card world, such an effort makes increasingly more sense and should theoretically make any transition to a post-MARC environment that much smoother. Our ongoing revisions to *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* (BFAS) have included stating preferences for using the standard call number fields (050, 060, 082) over the locally-assigned fields (090, 092, 096). For at least the past decade, OCLC has been transforming most 090s into 050s, 092s into 082s, and 096s into 060s whenever a record is added to WorldCat or is replaced. There are cases where these transformations don't happen automatically and I suspect that #915137360 may be one of those. You'll notice that the 090 in that record contains a subfield \$f, which is not defined in field 050. My guess is that our conversion algorithm chooses simply not to deal with 09X fields containing subfields \$e and/or \$f, out of an overabundance of caution. Fields 090, 092, and 096 are still valid and usable in WorldCat. In most cases, the system will automatically change these fields to their proper MARC 21 equivalents, so you really needn't feel obligated to change your local practices or workflows in this regard.

Three-Dimensional Mess

Question: I catalog my library's three-dimensional materials. Lately I've run across a few records where the 336 is "tactile three-dimensional form" when simply "three-dimensional form" would be correct. One example is the game *Above & Below* (#958058779). Another is the electronics kit *Makey Makey* (#957495533). Are these likely a misunderstanding by the inputting libraries? (Most 3D is meant to be manipulated, but that's not the definition of "tactile" here.) Or could it have been added by one of the OCLC algorithms?

Answer: The distinction between *tactile three-dimensional form*, "A content type consisting of content expressed through a form or forms intended to be perceived *through touch* as a three-dimensional form or forms" and *three-dimensional form*, "A content type consisting of content expressed through a form or forms intended to be perceived *visually* in three-dimensions," is fairly subtle if you're not looking for it. In the case of #957495533, the original record included the 33X fields as they currently appear (though OCLC did add the subfield \$b codes that corresponded to the Content Types specified), so this wasn't the product of one of our algorithms. The original record also had the GMD "[kit]" in 245 subfield \$h. The original record for #958058779 did not include the 33X fields but did include the GMD. The 33X fields with the subfields \$b were added on 2016 September 21. This was also not the result of anything that OCLC did. Although this was a case of cataloger confusion, it is a common error that can be exacerbated by a sometimes porous line between 3D resources specifically intended to be tactile and 3D resources that may be coincidentally tactile even if not so intended. The Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM) and OLAC have been working together (first on MARC Discussion Paper No. 2017-DP03, <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp03.html>, and then on MARC Proposal No. 2017-11, <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-11.html>) to improve the ways that we record Accessibility Content (RDA 7.14) and if I'm remembering correctly, clarifying the distinction between those two Content Types may (or should?) be an incidental part of that work. If you have other OCLC numbers for records with the same error, I could look at them in our Journal History tool to see if we could have misapplied the 336 somehow. If the other records are from the same institution, though, you may want to just make the corrections.

Irrational Numbers

Question: I was taken aback first thing this morning when one of my staff alerted me to this text in BFAS which had eluded my awareness until now:

028. SCO and REC. Absence or presence of field alone does not justify a new record. Compare differences in field 245, field 260, field 264, field 300, field 500, etc., to justify a new record. Specific differences in numbering, except for minor variations in completeness, justify a new record.

VIS. Absence, presence *or difference* in field alone does not justify a new record. Compare field 245, field 260, field 264, field 300, 5xx for differences to justify a new record.

Is this still true (I know BFAS chapter 4 is due for a revision)? If so, why does a difference in 028 **not** matter for visual resources but it **does** for music formats? I'm feeling embarrassed since I very assuredly told my staff earlier that (at least significant differences) **do** matter for **all** formats. Frustratingly, the OLAC best practices are silent on this question. Thanks in advance for setting me on the right path and helping me understand the rationale.

Answer: The newly-revised "When to Input a New Record" is now available. This is the current state of the text on field 028:

028 Publisher Number

ALL except REC and SCO. Absence or presence of field 028 does not justify a new record. A difference in field 028 alone does not justify a new record. Compare fields 245, 260, 264, 3xx, and 5xx for differences to justify a new record.

REC and SCO. Absence or presence of field 028 does not justify a new record. Specific differences in numbering, except for minor variations in completeness, justify a new record. Compare differences in fields 245, 260, 264, 3xx, and 5xx to justify a new record.

It is not that differences in publisher numbers for resources other than scores and sound recordings don't matter, it's that those differences *alone* cannot necessarily be counted upon to signal the need for a separate record. Conversely, a match of videorecording numbers alone doesn't necessarily signify a

match of the resources themselves. Scores, of course, have a long history of plate and publisher numbers of great bibliographic significance. Over the much shorter history of recorded sound, the significance of numbering has also been recognized to be vitally important. The same cannot really be said of other sorts of resources, including videorecordings. In the early history of video cassettes, in particular, there was at least one video publisher, Warner Brothers, that gave the same videorecording number to both the VHS and Beta versions of the same film. In other words, the videorecording number represented the film itself rather than what we'd now call the manifestation as a VHS cassette or a Beta cassette. They stopped doing that at some point, but they definitely did it. Much more common with videorecordings has been simple inconsistency in how these "Video Recording Publisher Numbers" are applied. Often enough they represent differences in price, packaging, cover design, and the like, things that we generally consider to be bibliographically insignificant. (This is not to say that the same thing, especially regarding differences in price, hasn't happened with sound recordings as well.) In many cases, differences in video publisher numbers may alert a cataloger to look for other differences (such as region, broadcast system, the presence of added materials or languages, and so on), but a difference in the numbers by themselves don't necessarily tell us much of anything.

Combination Unlock

Question: Our library will use only the DVD in a two-disc DVD/Blu-ray combo pack. Is it best to create a record for both versions in WorldCat even in this case?

Answer: It is legitimate to catalog such a combo pack as it is published with the two discs. It's also legitimate to catalog each one separately. If you are adding only one of the discs to your collection, you can choose to catalog only that one by itself. The OLAC *Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs Using RDA and MARC21* (http://olacinc.org/sites/capc_files/DVD_RDA_Guide.pdf) gives guidance on cataloging DVDs and Blu-ray discs separately and in combination (including an example).

Is This a Video Which I CD Before Me?

Question: I'm cataloging a CD of performances by a Chinese pop singer. It comes with a "Video CD" with a few music videos on it. According to Wikipedia, this format is also known as Compact Disc digital video or VCD, and was the first format for distributing films on standard 4 3/4-inch optical discs. It was widely used throughout Asia (except Japan and South Korea) instead of VHS and Betamax, and though it's been superseded by other media, it remains a popular low-cost option in Asian markets. (The record label is located in Beijing.) Wikipedia further states that Video CDs are playable in dedicated VCD players, most DVD and Blu-ray Disc players, PCs, and some video game consoles. And that the format was created in 1993 by the usual suspects (Sony, Philips, Panasonic, JVC). It's called the White Book standard. When I put it in my PC's drive, it says it is a CD-ROM. I actually found copy for this CD + VCD (#252794140), which called it "1 videodisc (CD, 4 3/4 in.)" in 300 subfield \$e. There was no attempt to code for it in 006/007 nor 33X/34X. I've never heard of this critter before. Do I have a videodisc? Or a computer disc? Have you ever heard of this?

Answer: All of the records for Video CDs that I can remember seeing (and yes, I've seen many) were from Asian sources. Believe it or not, the MARC 21 definition of the DVD code in the Videorecording 007/04 (OCLC subfield \$e) explicitly includes Video CDs: "Laser optical (reflective) videorecording system that uses a digital technique called PCM (Pulse Code Modulation) to represent video information on a grooveless, smooth, round plastic disc. The disc is read (played back) by a weak laser beam that registers data appearing on the disc as tiny pits or depressions of uniform length. DVDs are usually 4 3/4 inch in diameter (but a smaller 3 inch diameter disc may be produced commercially in some cases) and the disc or its packaging usually bear the term or trademark: DVD, DVD VIDEO, or VIDEO CD (in this case, the trademark is the standard one for COMPACT DISC, but with the added phrase DIGITAL VIDEO below it). This system has been in use commercially since late 1996." As we can infer from MARC 21, VCDs can be treated much like DVDs in nearly all respects (including calling them videodiscs). If there's anything on the resource itself cautioning about which equipment to use, that might make a good 538 field to quote or paraphrase; even in the absence of anything on the resource, some cautionary note might be helpful.

On the Beam

Question: Our cataloging Department has just ordered a series of titles in a brand new format. It's known as a "GoChip Beam." More info can be found about this new format at libraryideas.com/gochip. Do you have any ideas about how we might catalog this type of item? It seems that we have to have a whole new slew of 3XX fields to accommodate this brand new format. Anything you might suggest would be greatly appreciated.

Answer: In the sense that the GoChip Beam "contains a small Wi-Fi router, rechargeable battery, and solid state storage preloaded with five feature length movies or an entire season of a television series, all enclosed in a 3.5" x 1" stick" (according to the *Library Journal* article cited by *Library Ideas*), in bibliographical terms it seems like it could be treated at least in part similarly to a Playaway device. *The Guide to Cataloging Playaway Devices Based on AACR2 Chapters 6 and 9* is under revision for RDA and is no longer available on the OLAC website, but here's a link to the preliminary RDA update document: http://olacinc.org/sites/capc_files/PlayawaysAndRDA.pdf. This should give you at least a bit of an idea how to catalog the GoChip Beam. Admittedly, the Beam is a standalone video device, not a standalone audio device, but even the Playaway folks later came up with a video device, the Playaway View, and a tablet device, the Playaway Launchpad. The Type Code (Type, Leader/06) should be coded "g" for the video aspect; Type of Visual Material (TMat, 008/33) coded "v" for videorecording. There should additionally be a field 006 for the electronic aspect, 006/00 (Type) coded "m", 006/06 (Form) coded "q" (Direct Electronic), 006/09 (File) coded "c" (Representational). Fields 007 for the video and the electronic resource aspects should be used. For the 300 and 33X fields, here's what I'd suggest, with the number of "video files" dependent upon the number of films or TV episodes on each device:

300		1 video media player (5 video files)
Content Type:	336	\$a two-dimensional moving image \$b tdi \$2 rdacontent
Media Type:	337	\$a video \$b v \$2 rdamedia
	337	\$a computer \$b c \$2 rdamedia
Carrier Type:	338	\$a other \$b cz \$2 rdacarrier
	338	\$a other \$b vz \$2 rdacarrier

News from OCLC

Compiled by Jay Weitz



General News

Szabo Appointed Chair, Gray-Little and Sidorko Take Seats on OCLC Board of Trustees

John F. Szabo, City Librarian of the Los Angeles Public Library, was formally appointed Chair, and Bernadette Gray-Little, Chancellor Emerita at the University of Kansas, and Peter Sidorko, University Librarian at The University of Hong Kong, took their seats on the OCLC Board of Trustees during the board's November meeting. Gray-Little, who had previously served on the board from 2009–2014, was appointed to the board by the Board of Trustees. Sidorko was elected to the board by OCLC Global Council in March 2017. There are currently nine librarians from six countries serving on the 14-member OCLC Board of Trustees.

- John F. Szabo served as an OCLC Global Council Delegate before he was elected to the Board of Trustees by Global Council in April 2014. He replaces Sandy Yee, Dean (retired), Wayne State University Library System, as Board Chair. Yee served as Board Chair from 2012–2017. Yee will continue to serve as a member of the board.
- Bernadette Gray-Little is Chancellor Emerita, the University of Kansas, where she served from 2009–2017. While Chancellor, Gray-Little was named to the Board of Directors of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and to the board of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), which she chaired. She served as a member of the National Science Foundation Advisory Committee for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences. Prior to becoming KU's 17th Chancellor, Gray-Little held leadership positions at the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill, including Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Dean of Arts and Sciences, and Executive Associate Provost. She was a faculty member in the Department of Psychology. Gray-Little earned her B.A. from Marywood College and an M.S. and Ph.D. from Saint Louis University. She was a Fulbright Fellow, a Social Science Research Council Fellow, and received a Ford Foundation Senior Scholar Fellowship through the National Research Council.
- Peter Sidorko has enjoyed a career in academic libraries spanning over 30 years, and is currently the University Librarian at The University of Hong Kong (HKU). In this position he has full responsibility for leading and directing all aspects of the HKU Libraries network of six libraries. Sidorko is a past Chair of the Joint University Librarians Advisory Committee (JULAC), a forum to discuss, coordinate, and collaborate on library information resources and services among the libraries of the eight tertiary education institutions funded by the University Grants Committee in Hong Kong. He is also the Chair of the Board of Directors of the JULAC Joint Universities Research Archive, the company established to govern JURA, a collaborative print storage repository. Sidorko was President of the Hong Kong Library Association, serving from 2011–2012. He is a member of the Board of Directors of CLOCKSS; a past Chair of the Asia Pacific Regional Council Executive Committee of OCLC (2013–2014); a delegate of the OCLC Global Council (2011–2015); Vice-President/President of the OCLC Global Council (2015–2017); a former Board member of the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD); a member of the Elsevier Asia Pacific Library Advisory Board (ALAB) (2014–); a member of the

Wiley Publishing Asia Pacific Library Advisory Board, (May 2016–); and a member of the Steering Committee of the Pacific Rim Research Libraries Alliance (PRRLA, 2011–).

Two members completed their terms on the OCLC Board of Trustees: Berndt Dugall, Direktor a.D./Librarian at Universität Frankfurt’s Universitätsbibliothek Johann Senckenberg (Frankfurt am Main, Germany); and Loretta Parham, CEO and Director of the Atlanta University Center Woodruff Library, an independent academic library for the shared benefit of four HBCUs (historically black colleges and universities).

Cataloging and Metadata

OCLC-MARC Update 2017

On September 9, 2017, OCLC installed changes related to the OCLC-MARC Update 2017. This update implements MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings format changes announced by the Library of Congress in MARC 21 Updates [Number 23](#) (November 2016) and [Number 24](#) (May 2017;), as well as all MARC codes announced by the Library of Congress between June 2016 and May 2017. Details of the 2017 Update are available in [OCLC Technical Bulletin 267](#), including:

- New code “n” in Bibliographic Leader/18 (Descriptive cataloging form; “Desc”) is defined for “Non-ISBD Punctuation Omitted.”
- Bibliographic format Score 008/20 (Format of Music; “FMus”) has new code “p” for “Piano Score;” code “b” redescribed and renamed “Miniature or Study Score;” and codes “l” (Condensed score), “k” (Vocal score), “i” (Score), and “z” (Other) redescribed.
- Bibliographic field 028 has been redefined and renamed “Publisher or Distributor Number,” has First Indicator renamed “Type of Number,” has First Indicator code “1” (Matrix Number) redescribed, has First Indicator “3” renamed to “Other Music Publisher Number,” has First Indicator code “4” renamed “Video Recording Publisher Number,” has a new First Indicator code “6” for “Distributor Number,” has subfield \$a renamed “Publisher or Distributor Number,” and has subfield \$b (Source) redescribed. There have been corresponding clarifications to Bibliographic field 037.
- Bibliographic field 340 (Physical Medium) has new subfield \$g defined for “Color Content.”
- Bibliographic field 382 (Medium of Performance) has new subfield \$3 defined for “Materials Specified.”
- Bibliographic field 647 has been defined for “Subject Added Entry -- Named Event.”
- Bibliographic field 885 has been defined for “Matching Information.”
- New subfields \$0 (Authority Record Control Number or Standard Number) have been defined for many existing Bibliographic fields.
- Subfield \$4 has been renamed “Relationship” consistently throughout the Bibliographic format.
- Subfield \$6 (Linkage) has been defined in over 230 Bibliographic fields where it has been defined by MARC 21 and in corresponding local OCLC fields.
- Subfield \$8 (Field Link and Sequence Number) has had the new Field Link Type “u” defined for “General Linking, Type Unspecified” in both Bibliographic and Holdings records.
- New Holdings field 347 “Digital File Characteristics” is defined.

Additionally, OCLC has validated MARC codes announced in fourteen [LC Technical Notices](#) issued between June 2016 and May 2017. OCLC has also converted all existing Bibliographic fields 260 (Publication, Distribution, Etc. (Imprint)) subfield \$d (Plate or Publisher's Number for Music (Pre-AACR2)) to field 028 and will make field 260 subfield \$d obsolete. **Although MARC 21 Authority Format changes from Updates No. 23 and No. 24 are documented in Technical Bulletin 267, the Authority record changes will be implemented not at this time but instead at a future date in coordination with the Library of Congress and the Name Authority Cooperative (NACO) of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). LC, NACO, and OCLC will make announcements at that future date.**

Resource Sharing

100 Libraries Now Using Tipasa Interlibrary Loan Management System

Just eight months after its introduction, 100 libraries are now using Tipasa™, the first cloud-based interlibrary loan management system that automates routine borrowing and lending functions for individual libraries. OCLC introduced [Tipasa](#) in January 2017 as a new interlibrary loan management system built on the OCLC WorldShare technology platform that takes full advantage of the world's largest resource sharing network. Tipasa reimagines features and functionality of the Windows-based ILLiad service and moves them to the cloud. Because updates and enhancements happen automatically in the cloud-based system, Tipasa requires only limited IT resources. The simple staff interface is easy to use, making it easy to train staff, volunteers and student assistants. OCLC continues to develop Tipasa in phases. New features and functionality will be added over time, such as RapidILL integration coming later this year. ILLiad users will move to Tipasa as their functionality needs are met in the new system. ILLiad will be supported as Tipasa continues to expand; no end date has been set for ILLiad. Libraries considering a migration to Tipasa can review resources to learn more about the system, the libraries that are live and the members of the OCLC ILL advisory group. There is also a Community Center space for ILLiad libraries interested in moving to Tipasa. Current Tipasa users can access the [OCLC Community Center](#) to connect online, share best practices, stay up to date on new product releases, and contribute ideas to improve OCLC services. From the Community Center, users can also access Tipasa's Support and Training website, which includes a comprehensive collection of training and documentation resources. Tipasa complements a growing list of OCLC resource sharing solutions. OCLC's WorldShare Interlibrary Loan (ILL) provides core interlibrary loan services to thousands of libraries around the world. OCLC also acquired Relais International, the leader in consortial borrowing, in January. Together, these systems and services deliver a comprehensive set of resource sharing solutions for libraries around the world.

Digital Collections Services

OCLC, Internet Archive Collaborate to Expand Access to Digital Collections:

OCLC and [Internet Archive](#) are working together to make the Archive's collection of 2.5 million digitized books easier to find and access online and through local libraries. OCLC will process metadata from the Internet Archive for its digital collection, matching to existing records in WorldCat, the world's most comprehensive database of information about library collections, or adding a new record if one does not exist. The WorldCat record will include a link leading back to the Archive.org record. From there, searchers can examine or potentially borrow the related digital item. Internet Archive will also add a link from its records to WorldCat.org, the online resource that makes it possible for searchers to quickly and

easily find and access resources in libraries nearby--and worldwide. Read the [Internet Archive blog post](#) at for more about this collaboration.

CONTENTdm Supports IIIF Presentation API, Wider Access to Digital Content

OCLC now supports IIIF Image and Presentation APIs in its CONTENTdm digital collection management software, ensuring that its member libraries and institutions can share and present millions of digital images across a variety of applications and platforms. CONTENTdm, currently used by more than 2,500 institutions worldwide, was recently redesigned to create a new end-user experience for any device. The redesign supports the [IIIF Image API](#), which provides a common mechanism for manipulating digital images for display and download. The [IIIF Presentation API](#), which makes it possible to present image metadata and navigate through complex digital objects, is now the second API added to CONTENTdm. The International Image Interoperability Framework (IIIF), driven by a thriving community of libraries, museums, software firms, scholars, and technologists working with digital images and digital image repositories, provides a community-driven set of shared API specifications for interoperable functionality in digital image repositories. IIIF creates new ways to collaborate with other institutions and gain from collective efforts, providing users with a rich set of common functionalities to view, compare, manipulate, and interact with digital items on the Web, an experience made portable--shareable, citable, and embeddable. Because of the incorporation of IIIF, CONTENTdm users now have access to open-source tools that use IIIF specifications. Libraries with CONTENTdm can now support their communities with the latest research support tools to help them get the most out of their unique collections. Those institutions that may lack some software development capabilities can still use this innovative software, developed by others. For example, [Mirador](#), an open source, community driven web-based multi-window image viewing platform, uses IIIF APIs to allow for side-by-side comparison of digital images, with the ability to zoom, display, compare, and annotate images from around the world. Mirador gives researchers rich access to view, compare, and annotate rare and unique content across IIIF repositories. OCLC support of IIIF APIs was discussed at the CONTENTdm User Group Meeting 2017 on September 28, in Kingston, New York, USA. The meeting was held in conjunction with The Northeast Regional Digital Collections Conference. This event provided opportunities for digital collections creators and curators in the region and beyond to network, share best practices, participate in workshops, and learn from leaders in digital cultural heritage.

CONTENTdm September 2017 Release is Now Live

The September 2017 release for CONTENTdm is now live, and it further improves the newly redesigned end-user interface for CONTENTdm. This release brings the International Image Interoperability Framework (IIIF) Presentation API to CONTENTdm. Coupled with previous support for the IIIF Image API, CONTENTdm sites now serve as a platform for IIIF-compliant image viewers, such as Mirador and the Universal Viewer. For more information about IIIF, see <http://iiif.io/>. The responsive website adapts to any screen size and has significant usability, performance, and accessibility improvements. The responsive website is production-ready and is now the default end-user website for more than 50 active CONTENTdm users. This release contains several additional improvements to the new responsive website:

- IIIF Presentation API support, which allows CONTENTdm users to leverage the work of the IIIF community.
- More HTML and CSS options in the graphic web editors, so users can create more sophisticated customizations without being a web developer.

- Friendlier HTML class names that make it easier for users to use custom CSS to match the style of your library site or other sites you manage.
- Accessibility improvements to increase WCAG 2.0 compliance.

For more details about this release, see the [CONTENTdm Release Notes page](#). Note: The responsive website exists alongside current 6.x CONTENTdm websites. Public URLs will default to version 6.x websites until you request to make the switch. Nothing in 6.x is changing in this release. When you are ready for your end users to start using the new responsive website, you will need to contact [OCLC Support](#) to schedule the upgrade.

Member Relations, Advocacy, Governance, and Training

OCLC Partners with Libraries on Projects Funded by IMLS

OCLC is partnering with libraries, library schools, and organizations on four projects that were recently awarded grants through the Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program of the Institute of Museum and Library Services. These projects will further IMLS goals to enhance the training and professional development of librarians, faculty, and library leaders, and educate the next generation of librarians. Learn more about [IMLS grants](#).

- **Supercharged Storytimes for All.** As project lead, OCLC will expand Supercharged Storytimes, the early literacy curriculum developed by its WebJunction program in collaboration with Washington State Library and the University of Washington, and deploy it nationally for all library practitioners to access. In partnership with New York State Library, Minnesota State Division of Library Services, and Southeast Florida Library Information Network, WebJunction will train 20 expert online trainers to deliver the curriculum across five to eight state and regional systems. WebJunction will also train 100 facilitators from across the country to guide group staff learning in their libraries. Through Supercharged Storytimes, librarians will be able to plan storytime using research-based early literacy techniques, and will be equipped with approaches to reach underserved communities, engage parents and caregivers, and measure program outcomes. Collaborators on the project include the Public Library Association and the Campaign for Grade-Level Reading.
- **Skills for Community-Centered Librarianship.** OCLC's WebJunction program will produce webinars and disseminate resources to support this project led by the Free Library of Philadelphia, which will develop library staff outreach, program development and leadership skills that are essential to fostering and sustaining community-centered librarianship. The project partners will shape, test, and refine a curriculum, initially benefiting 250 to 300 library staff, and then deliver it to the broader library field. In addition to OCLC, partners include the American Library Association and an advisory board composed of LIS faculty and professionals from multiple public library systems, small and large.
- **LIS Education and Data Science for the National Digital Platform.** Drexel University's LEADS program (<http://cci.drexel.edu/mrc/research/leads/>) is a transformative doctoral training initiative grounded in library science foundations that integrates a new focus on data science. The program will select 18 library school doctoral students across the country to participate in an online course and an intensive three-day data science boot camp at Drexel University in preparation for a 10-week data science internship. Students will intern with a LEADS project partner, including OCLC Research, to apply their coursework in a real-world library setting while

conducting original research. The program will result in a cohort of future faculty members who can bring data science knowledge and skills into library graduate schools across the country.

- **Library as Research Lab: Immersive Research Education and Engagement.** This University of Michigan project (<https://www.si.umich.edu/news/new-model-training-tomorrow%E2%80%99s-librarians>) will develop a new library-as-research-lab model in LIS education and professional development. The project will help to build research skills and professional capabilities in the academic library workforce, and foster and enhance mentoring capabilities in the profession. As one of four advisory board members, OCLC Research's Lynn Silipigni Connaway will provide her expertise in investigating how participating students and librarians achieve competencies in research skills and what other educational benefits they gain from the project.

Design for Learning: All Seven Modules Now Available

Online learning opens up a world of opportunity for learners, and having engaging courses and prepared trainers are essential to a successful experience. Designing and facilitating online learning are skills that require solid teaching fundamentals, practice, and space to master. It takes time to develop a well-rounded understanding of the elements of planning for and delivering a successful online training. Whether you're a seasoned in-person trainer and interested in how to approach training online, or someone interested in what it takes to teach online, [*Design for Learning: 21st Century Online Teaching and Learning Skills for Library Workers \(D4L\)*](#) has what you need to build a foundation and prepare your first online training. Learning online has become a norm in continuing education. From attending live online webinars, participating in self-paced course content, or blended learning experiences hosted by WebJunction, there are many options for online education. It's not uncommon to encounter library staff who have received their library degree from a partially or fully online university program. From a one-hour learning experience to a 2+ year learning investment, online learning makes a significant difference in our daily lives and long-term opportunities. WebJunction is pleased to be the host of this incredible learning content focused on the wide-range of skills and information needed for online teaching. The *Design for Learning* program helps to address the multitude of issues surrounding the development and delivery of online courses. Through this intensive seven module training, you will:

- ease into learning online,
- consider the fundamentals of successful instructional design,
- refine your instructional plans to be attentive to cultural competencies and learning styles,
- evaluate and plan for meaningful and effective online learning communities,
- explore what it takes to build and surface useful and engaging online content, and
- plan to do it all in an online learning platform

Design for Learning: 21st Century Online Teaching and Learning Skills for Library Workers (D4L) is designed to enable library workers to transfer their in-person teaching skills to the online environment. Since 2015, *Design for Learning* has been teaching library workers how to design instruction and teach online. The first two cohorts included participants from all types of libraries, subject specializations, and library experience levels, all over the country. Based on their experiences with the program, the courses have been improved and adapted for WebJunction's free course catalog. The program is comprised of seven online self-paced modules: *Orientation, Foundation, Diversity, Community, Content Creation, Course Management, and Capstone*. D4L was developed as a partnership between the [South Central Regional Library Council](#), Syracuse University's [School of Information Studies](#), and the Empire State

Library Network (<https://www.esln.org/>). It is funded as a three-year grant, by the [Institute of Museum and Library Services](#) (grant number RE-06-14-0014-14). Login to [WebJunction's Course Catalog](#) and explore this content today.

OCLC Research

Research and Learning Agenda for Archives, Special, and Distinctive Collections in Research Libraries
[Research and Learning Agenda for Archives, Special, and Distinctive Collections in Research Libraries](#) by Chela Scott Weber, Practitioner Researcher in Residence for the OCLC Research Library Partnership (RLP), was created with the input of dozens of RLP members and is intended as a map for OCLC with many potential routes for further exploration and engagement with allied institutions. This research and learning agenda represents the latest in a long line of OCLC Research efforts on behalf of archives and special collections in research libraries, to discern and respond to current and emerging needs in the community, and to convene colleagues across the profession to collectively move the profession forward. It is practitioner focused and represents the results of numerous conversations, reading broadly, and thinking carefully about the most pressing needs that face our collective collections and operations. The agenda addresses areas of inquiry and potential research and learning opportunities, building on recent work in the profession. Several themes and topical areas of investigation are identified, and the paper presents potential research and learning activities for each of these areas. Ultimately, using this agenda, the RLP will consider where work is already being done in the profession, how OCLC can best leverage its strengths and resources to make the most impact, and where there is interest and energy across the RLP community, in order to discern where it makes most sense for OCLC to focus its efforts.

Research Information Management: Defining RIM and the Library's Role

Research information management (RIM) is the aggregation, curation, and utilization of information about research and is emerging as an area of increasing interest and relevance in many university libraries. RIM intersects with many aspects of traditional library services in discovery, acquisition, dissemination, and analysis of scholarly activities, and does so through the nexus with institutional data systems, faculty workflows, and institutional partners. RIM adoption offers libraries new opportunities to support institutional and researcher goals. In [Research Information Management: Defining RIM and the Library's Role](#) prepared by Rebecca Bryant, OCLC Research Senior Program Officer, and a working group of librarians representing OCLC Research Library Partnership institutions, learn more about what RIM is, what is driving RIM adoption, and the library's role in RIM. The publication is intended to help libraries and other institutional stakeholders understand developing research information management practices—and particularly the value add that libraries can offer in a complex ecosystem. This work is part of a suite of publications and resources around RIM practices. Read [more](#) about upcoming research and reports in the area of research information management.

OCLC Research and euroCRIS Announce Strategic Partnership

OCLC Research and [euroCRIS](#), the international organization for research information, announce a strategic partnership to recognize and understand international research information management practices through collaborative research. The two organizations signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) earlier this year. Research information management (RIM) is the aggregation, curation, and utilization of information about research and is emerging as an area of increasing interest and relevance in many university libraries. RIMs, also broadly known as Current Research Information

Systems (CRISs), are gaining interest and attention worldwide for their contribution in dealing with new policies on open science, research funding, and national assessment. RIM intersects with many aspects of traditional library services in discovery, acquisition, dissemination, and analysis of scholarly activities, and does so through the nexus with institutional data systems, researcher workflows, and institutional partners. RIM adoption offers libraries new opportunities to support institutional and researcher goals. OCLC Research staff, euroCRIS board members, and librarians from OCLC Research Library Partnership institutions have been working together since early 2017 to develop a Survey on Research Information Management Practices, which will offer research institutions worldwide the opportunity to share information about their practices. OCLC Research and euroCRIS will synthesize these survey findings into a research report expected in 2018. This survey will launch later in October. More about this project is on the [OCLC Research website](#).

The Realities of Research Data Management, Part Two

The Realities of Research Data Management is a four-part series that explores how research universities are addressing the challenge of managing research data throughout the research lifecycle. In this series, we examine the context, influences, and choices higher education institutions face in building or acquiring RDM capacity—in other words, the infrastructure, services, and other resources needed to support emerging data management practices. Our findings are based on case studies of four institutions: University of Edinburgh (UK), the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (US), Monash University (Australia), and Wageningen University & Research (the Netherlands), in four very different national contexts. [The Realities of Research Data Management, Part Two: Scoping the University RDM Service Bundle](#) explores the nature of the RDM capacity acquired by the four research universities, highlighting key factors that shaped the contours of this capacity, and providing 13 key takeaways that provide useful starting points for institutions as they consider their own RDM services. The [first report](#) explored the background surrounding the emergence of RDM and introduced a simple framework for navigating the RDM service space. In this second report, the authors look at the RDM service bundles of the four universities to better understand how the local RDM service bundle is shaped by the complex interplay of internal and external factors, institutional requirements, and local choices. A few of the key takeaways for libraries:

- RDM is not a monolithic set of services duplicated across universities; it is a customized solution shaped by a range of internal and external factors operating on local decision-making.
- Scoping an RDM service bundle sufficient to meet institutional needs does not necessarily mean implementing the full range of services within the RDM service space.
- Even institutions that scope their RDM service bundles to include services in each of the three components of the RDM service space—Education, Expertise, and Curation—can differ in the extent or emphasis placed on a particular component.
- The RDM service bundle is not just a “back-office” component of a university’s research support infrastructure; it often plays an important public-facing role.
- No RDM service bundle is an island—all are connected, to a greater or lesser degree, to the broader, external RDM service ecosystem.

Academic Library Impact

ACRL and OCLC announce the release of [Academic Library Impact: Improving Practice and Essential Areas to Research](#). Developed for ACRL by OCLC Research, this valuable resource investigates how libraries can increase student learning and success and effectively communicate their value to higher

education stakeholders. The full report is freely available for download on the ACRL website. More information is also available from the [OCLC Research website](#). Now more than ever, academic libraries are being asked to demonstrate value to their institutional stakeholders, funders, and governance boards. *Academic Library Impact* builds on ACRL's 2010 *Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report* and the results of the subsequent Assessment in Action program. It demonstrates how libraries are now measuring library contributions to student learning and success, and recommends where more research is needed in areas critical to the higher education sector such as accreditation, student retention, and academic achievement. This action-oriented research agenda includes:

- a report on all project phases and findings;
- a detailed research agenda based on those findings;
- a visualization component that filters relevant literature and creates graphics that can communicate library value to stakeholders;
- a bibliography of the literature analyzed; and
- a full bibliography of the works cited and reviewed.

Led by Lynn Silipigni Connaway, Ph.D., OCLC Senior Research Scientist and Director of User Research, all components were produced in partnership with OCLC staff and partners including William Harvey, Vanessa Kitzie, Stephanie Mikitish, and Dale Musselman. The components include analyses of library and information science (LIS) and higher education literature, focus group interviews and brainstorming sessions with academic library administrators at different institution types within the United States, and individual interviews with provosts. Building on established best practices and recent research, *Academic Library Impact* clearly identifies priority areas and suggests specific actions for academic librarians and administrators to take in developing programs, collections, and spaces focused on student learning and success. It includes effective practices, calls out exemplary studies, and indicates where more inquiry is needed, with proposed research designs. It identifies the next generation of necessary research to continue to testify to library value. This new report is a significant milestone for ACRL's Value of Academic Libraries initiative and for the profession. The report is now available as a free PDF for download, and a print edition for purchase will be available through the ALA Store in October 2017. A companion online tool, "[Visualizing Academic Library Impact: The ACRL/OCLC Literature Analysis Dashboard](#)" helps librarians and researchers filter the existing literature for studies most relevant to their research interests and visually explore the literature and other data in the form of charts and graphs.

Partnership Supports Renewed *From Awareness to Funding Study*

The Public Library Association (PLA), a division of the American Library Association (ALA), the ALA Office for Library Advocacy, and OCLC are pleased to announce a partnership to produce an update to OCLC's 2008 report, "[From Awareness to Funding: A Study of Library Support in America](#)," which explored voter attitudes and perceptions about library funding. This landmark study was created to conduct research, develop strategies, create materials, and evaluate the potential of marketing and communications programs aimed at increasing and sustaining funding for U.S. public libraries. It was one of the first to bring forward U.S. voter perceptions about library funding and library support that revolutionized library advocacy efforts, including:

- Library support is only marginally related to library visitation;

- Perceptions of librarians are an important predictor of library funding support; and
- Voters who see the library as a 'transformational' force as opposed to an 'informational' source are more likely to increase taxes in its support.

As in 2008, Leo Burnett is conducting the national household survey, which will be fielded in the next month. The new survey will add questions related to federal funding for libraries, as well as additional response options related to library programs and services that have emerged in recent years. The new report is scheduled for release in early 2018.

The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting

In October 2016, a group of eminent library leaders, research collections specialists, and scholars gathered at Norton's Woods Conference Center in Cambridge, MA, to commemorate the career of Dan Hazen (1947–2015) and reflect upon the transformation of academic library collections. Hazen was a towering figure in the world of research collections management and was personally known to many attendees; his impact on the profession of academic librarianship and the shape of research collections is widely recognized and continues to shape practice and policy in major research libraries. Drawing from presentations and audience discussions at *The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting: A Symposium Inspired by Dan C. Hazen*, this publication examines some central themes important to a broader conversation about the future of academic library collections, in particular, collective collections and the reimagining of what have traditionally been called "special" and archival collections (now referred to as unique and distinctive collections). The publication also includes a foreword about Dan Hazen and his work by Sarah E. Thomas, Vice President for the Harvard Library and University Librarian & Roy E. Larsen Librarian for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. [*The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting: A Synthesis of the Harvard Library's Hazen Memorial Symposium*](#) by Constance Malpas and Merrilee Proffit is not only a tribute to Hazen's impact on the academic library community, but also a primer on where academic library collections could be headed in the future, and is a must read for anyone interested in library collection trends.



M U S I C O C L C U S E R S G R O U P

The Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) is the voice of music users of OCLC's products and services.

Through our publications, annual meetings, and other continuing education activities, MOUG assists novice, occasional, and experienced users of all OCLC services in both public and technical services.

We also provide an official channel of communication between OCLC and music users, advocating for the needs and interests of the music library community.

A year's personal membership, including a subscription to the MOUG Newsletter, is **\$30 US** (North America) and **\$45** (outside North America). Institutional membership is **\$40** (North America) and **\$50** (outside North America). Please direct all correspondence to: Tomoko Shibuya, MOUG Treasurer, Music Metadata Librarian, Metadata & Discovery Services, Northwestern University Libraries, 1970 Campus Dr., Evanston IL 60208.

For more information, visit our website at:

<http://www.musicoclcusers.org/>