

OLAC NEWSLETTER

vol. 27, no. 4

December 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR

FROM THE PRESIDENT

TREASURER'S REPORT

OLAC EXECUTIVE BOARD, 2007-2008 - UPDATED

LIAISON REPORT

NEWS FROM OCLC

OLAC/MOUG 2008 CONFERENCE PREVIEW

MARTHA YEE'S CATALOGING RULES FOR A MORE FRBR-IZED CATALOG,
WITH AN RDF MODEL

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

OLAC MEETINGS AT ALA MIDWINTER 2008

AMENDMENTS TO THE OLAC BYLAWS

MORE NEWS ABOUT GENRE AUTHORITY RECORDS IN OCLC

AN ADDITIONAL SOURCE FOR SOUND RECORDINGS METADATA IN
OCLC

RDF EXAMPLES USING MARTHA YEE'S CATALOGING RULES

2008 ARSC CONFERENCE

ISMIR 2008 - CALL FOR PARTICIPATION

BOOK REVIEWS

EDUCATION FOR LIBRARY CATALOGING: INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

OLAC CATALOGER'S JUDGEMENT

WE LIKE IKE, BUT WE'RE HANGING HIM

A SIX-DVD SET WITH CHANGING PUBLISHER

ADJUSTING MOTION PICTURE UNIFORM TITLES

GENRE HEADING FOR NONFICTION FILMS

EXPLICIT EDITION STATEMENTS, SO TO SPEAK

TERMS IN COMMON, AND UNCOMMON, USAGE
LANGUAGES OF SUBTITLES IN 041
FIELD 041 SUBFIELD \$h FOLLOWING SUBFIELD \$b
NO 007 FOR 3D AND REALIA
REALIA VERSUS REPLICA
SAME EVENT, DIFFERENT VIDEO PERSPECTIVES

FROM THE EDITOR
Jain Fletcher

This issue comes at a time of the year when the content is expected to be on the short side, since all the ALA reports and minutes are published in the issue prior to this one. While it is true that the lack of conference reporting does render a shorter issue, there is still a complete allotment of excellent contributions from our regular columnists and reporters. Along with Amy Weiss's book review column, Barbara Vaughn's news column and Jay Weitz's Q & A column, there is also an update on planning for the upcoming joint OLAC/MOUG Conference, as well as a special contribution from a guest columnist.

Yes, I said "guest columnist". For my last issue as Editor, I wanted to give something extra special to the readers of the *Newsletter*. So, I asked my esteemed UCLA colleague and long-time OLAC member, Martha Yee, if she was working on anything right now that might be in line with the interests of OLAC members. I let her know that I was especially interested in something stimulating and provocative. With such an open-ended request, Martha seemed a little uncertain as to how she might be able to fulfill it, but expressed her willingness to try. Her consequent contribution ended up being something beyond my wildest hopes. It is a short report about something she is working on and it gives links to that work. I hope that our readers read her report here, and also go to all the links, to get the full impact of the work she is doing. I expect you to find it as thought-provoking as I have.

While there would never be enough room to talk at length about all of my memorable working relationships over the years, I would like to mention a few, at least briefly. The first person who comes to mind is Sue Neumeister, who has been an invaluable behind-the-scenes editor for me, a sounding board for my thoughts and ideas and an estimable all-around advisor. Also, during my early days in this unfamiliar job, I will never forget that Kay Johnson was there for me at every turn and gave me crucial advice and support whenever I asked--despite the fact that she was also trying to perform her own job as OLAC President! Constancy is another trait treasured by

editors and all the regular columnists and submitters always came through with gratifying amounts of it. I would just like to give their names, in no particular order, so that you know who I mean: Jan Mayo, Barbara Vaughn, Vicki Toy Smith, Amy Weiss, Jay Weitz, John Attig, Greta de Groat, Kevin Furniss--and *all* others who wrote special reports for issues. I have said it before, and now I will say it for one last time in this space: OLAC has wonderful members! I have been proud to have had this opportunity to serve you.

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Vicki Toy-Smith

The ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia is coming soon! I look forward to seeing many of you at the OLAC Membership Meeting there. I am pleased to announce a time change for our member's meeting. The OLAC Executive Board conducted a poll of OLAC membership regarding possible meeting times; survey results indicate that a 4-6 p.m. slot would best suit the majority. So, the OLAC Membership Meeting will take place at that time on Saturday, January 12, 2008.

For the subsequent ALA Annual Conference in Anaheim, California, there will be a slight difference in the OLAC Membership Meeting time; it will be an abbreviated general session from 4-5 p.m., with a Q&A panel to follow at a location near the Membership Meeting location. Another poll will be taken in the Fall of 2008 regarding the OLAC Membership Meeting time to see if members are happy with the changes.

My thanks go to Bobby Bothmann, Sue Neumeister, and all of the OLAC Executive Board members for the assistance with the OLAC Bylaws survey. The amendments, which encompassed three revisions, were voted on and passed by our membership. The revisions included making the Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator a full member of the Executive Board, clarifying the term limits for the appointed offices, and defining the literal text of the OLAC Bylaws to define the terminology specific to postal mail (or "snail mail") balloting. The OLAC Bylaws now have been updated to reflect these changes.

As a result of this vote, the Board has welcomed Debbie Benrubi, who has been serving OLAC well in the Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator position since 2005. As

always, everyone should feel free to contact Debbie <benrubi@usfca.edu> with their ideas about outreach or advocacy.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Jain Fletcher, OLAC *Newsletter* Editor-in-Chief, for the excellent job she has done over the past six years managing our *Newsletter* issues. In addition, I wanted to extend an official welcome to Amy Weiss, who will become Editor-in-Chief in January 2008.

Last but not least: my thanks go to Kelley McGrath, Steve Miller, Kay Johnson, and David Reynolds for their work on the updated version of OLAC's *Introduction to Cataloging Electronic Integrating Resources: An Online Training Presentation* <<http://www.olacinc.org/capc/training.html>>. The online training presentation is a valuable early step in assisting catalogers who are new to working on integrating resources.

TREASURER'S REPORT
First Quarter, FY 2007/2008
July 1 through September 30, 2007
Kate James, Treasurer

	1st Quarter July-Sept.	Year-To-Date
OPENING BALANCE	\$12,107.90	
INCOME		
Memberships	\$492.00	\$492.00
Dividends	\$2.10	\$2.10
TOTAL	\$494.10	\$494.10
EXPENSES		
ALA	\$200.00	\$200.00
Bank Charges		
Savings	\$25.00	\$25.00
Checks	\$12.00	\$12.00
Stipends	\$100.00	\$100.00
Postage	\$20.91	\$20.91

Outreach	\$124.50	\$124.50
Miscellaneous	\$81.77	\$81.77
TOTAL	\$564.18	\$564.18
CLOSING BALANCE		\$12,037.82

Membership as of September 30, 2007

Personal:	409
Institutional:	180
Total:	589

**OLAC EXECUTIVE BOARD
2007-2008
--UPDATED--**

PRESIDENT

VICKI TOY SMITH
Cataloging/Metadata Services
Dept.
Getchell Library
University of Nevada, Reno
(775) 682-5601
<vicki@unr.edu>

VICE

**PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT
ELECT**
ROBERT BOTHMANN
Memorial Library
Minnesota State Univ.,
Mankato
(587) 389-2010
<robert.bothmann@mnsu.edu>

SECRETARY

KATHERINE RANKIN
Bibliographic and Metadata Svcs
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Libraries
(702) 895-2224
<katherine.rankin@unlv.edu>

TREASURER

KATE JAMES
Bibliographic Services
Milner Library
Illinois State University
(309) 438-5385
<kdjames@ilstu.edu>

CAPC CHAIR
KELLEY MCGRATH
Bracken Library
Ball State University
(765) 285-3350
<kmcgrath@bsu.edu>

**IMMEDIATE PAST
PRESIDENT**
STEVEN MILLER
School of Information Studies
University of Wisconsin-
Milwaukee
(414) 229-6640
(414) 229-6699
<mll@uwm.edu>

**OUTREACH/ADVOCACY
COORDINATOR**
DEBORAH BENRUBI
University of San Francisco
Gleeson Library/Geschke Center
(415) 422-5672
<benrubi@usfca.edu>

NEWSLETTER EDITOR
AMY K. WEISS
University Libraries
Florida State University
(850) 644-6321
<akweiss@fsu.edu>

NEWS FROM OCLC
Compiled by Jay Weitz

General News

OCLC and OCLC PICA Form One Global Organization

OCLC is uniting all offices under one name and visual brand identity to reflect a global enterprise with a unified strategy to serve libraries worldwide. As a result, OCLC PICA, with offices in the Netherlands, Australia, France, Germany, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States, will be known as OCLC. By bringing together all offices under one name and identity, libraries worldwide can benefit from OCLC membership, research and an expanded portfolio around a comprehensive set of products and services. OCLC has created global engineering and global product management divisions, with eight engineering centers across Germany,

the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States that will expand OCLC's ability to innovate and create products and services libraries need at local, regional and global levels. OCLC has also created teams of employees from various geographic regions, and has aligned activities in three major geographic areas: 1) the Americas, 2) Asia Pacific, and 3) Europe, Middle East and Africa. These organizational changes, along with the partnerships OCLC has made over the years, make possible this new strategy as one global enterprise. The OCLC organization is now uniquely positioned to provide libraries with services at the point of need. OCLC has continued to grow and attract new partners that have increased its resources and capabilities worldwide. Each organization that has joined OCLC has contributed distinctive competencies, vision and innovation to the global organization. The new OCLC organization is represented by a new logo and brand identity, which can be seen at <www.oclc.org/common/images/logos/oclc/OCLC_TM_Tag_V_LG.jpg>. This will be integrated in OCLC communications throughout the end of 2007. The OCLC global strategy represents an evolution of the cooperative that began in the 1970s as an intrastate group of 54 colleges and universities in the state of Ohio, sharing resources to save money and eliminate duplication of effort.

Collections and Technical Services

New Connexion Documentation

New Reference Card. A new 4-page reference card, *OCLC Cataloging Authorization Levels*, shows two things: 1) authorized cataloging actions for each type of OCLC authorization level, including "Search", "Limited", "Full", and higher, and 2) types of master record updates authorized for "Full" and higher authorizations. It is available at:

<<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/client/catalogingauthorizationlevels.pdf>>

SCIPIO Documentation. The following new documentation is available for *SCIPIO: Art and Rare Book Sales Catalogs*:

- For SCIPIO-authorized catalogers: *SCIPIO Cataloging Formats and Standards* (in PDF only):
<<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/client/cataloging/SCIPIOformatsandstandards.pdf>>.
- For Connexion Client users: *Use SCIPIO Records*
<<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/client/cataloging/specializedrecords/>>.

- For Connexion Browser users: Use SCIPIO Records
<[http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/browser/cataloging/sci
pio_records/](http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/connexion/browser/cataloging/sci
pio_records/)>.

SCIPIO: Art and Rare Book Sales Catalogs, formerly available from the Research Libraries Group (RLG), is now installed in the Connexion Browser and Client and is available in WorldCat. SCIPIO records describe art auction and rare book catalogs for sales from the late sixteenth century through the present. Any OCLC cataloger can retrieve, copy and paste, export, or print SCIPIO records. Only SCIPIO-authorized catalogers can create, add, delete, and take other actions on SCIPIO records.

OLAC/MOUG 2008 CONFERENCE PREVIEW

Rock and roll your way to Cleveland, Ohio for the 2008 joint OLAC-MOUG Conference!

The Conference will take place Friday, September 26 through Sunday, September 28, 2008, with a pre-conference workshop on Thursday, September 25. Please check the Conference Website <<http://www.notsl.org/olac-moug/home.htm>> for updates on program sessions, speakers, schedules, and local information. Conference Co-Chairs are Kevin Furniss (Denison University) and Sevim McCutcheon (Kent State University).

The historic and elegant Renaissance Hotel <<http://www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/clebr-renaissance-cleveland-hotel/>>, adjacent to the Tower City shopping complex, will serve as the Conference hotel. Attendees will have the opportunity to view the newly-remodeled Cleveland Museum of Art at Friday night's reception and to tour the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame.

The Conference Planning Committee has been busy lining up an exciting array of speakers and workshops. Keynote addresses will be delivered by Lynne Howarth (former Dean of the Faculty of Information Studies at the University of Toronto) and Janet Swan Hill (Associate Director for Technical Services, University of Colorado).

The pre-conference workshop will feature map cataloging, presented by Paige Andrew (Maps Cataloging Librarian, Pennsylvania State University Libraries). This workshop will focus on contemporary paper maps, with some attention given to electronic versions of these resources.

Conference workshops will cover not only traditional cataloging, but other topics as well. Confirmed workshops include the perennially popular basic cataloging workshops for videorecordings (Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist, OCLC) and sound recordings (Mark Scharff, Music Cataloger, Washington University (St. Louis)). A basic session on music scores (Margaret Kaus, Original Cataloger, Kansas State University) has been added this time. In addition, advanced topic workshops for videos (Jay Weitz), sound recordings (Robert Freeborn, Music/AV Cataloger, Pennsylvania State University), and scores (Ralph Papakhian, Head, Technical Services, William & Gayle Cook Music Library, Indiana University) will be offered. Sessions will also be given on form/genre (Janis Young, Senior Cataloging Specialist, LC CPSO) and WorldCat Local (Cathy Gerhart, Music/Media Cataloger, University of Washington)

The Conference Planning Committee is securing confirmations for a few more workshops and speakers, so please stay tuned for further announcements!

Submitted by:

Mary Huismann

University of Minnesota

MARTHA YEE'S CATALOGING RULES FOR A MORE FRBR-IZED CATALOG WITH AN RDF MODEL

I have written elsewhere about the fact that our rules and our cataloging data are already considerably FRBR-ized and that what is lacking for the creation of true FRBR-ized catalogs is adequate software support. ("FRBRization: a Method for Turning Online Public Finding Lists into Online Public Catalogs." *Information Technology and Libraries* 2005; 24:3:77-95. [also at the California Digital Library eScholarship Repository <<http://repositories.cdlib.org/postprints/715>>].) Catalogers already collocate all of the expressions of a work using work identifiers (formerly

known as main entries). However, it is still up to the user to look through all of the various expressions and manifestations of the work and make decisions about which one is the most useful.

With the proliferation of methods of reproduction in the 20th century, this set of all of the various manifestations and expressions of a particular work has become more and more chaotic, however. At the International Conference on the Principles & Future Development of AACR in Toronto in 1997, I thought I heard a desire to revise AACR to further FRBR-ize the rules so that catalogers went beneath work collocation and performed expression and manifestation collocation to aid users in navigating this chaos. Instead, RDA seems to be headed toward an increase in chaos by atomizing the bibliographic description into lists of data elements that are all tied to the FRBR entity manifestation. As Hal Cain so eloquently put it in his September 6, 2007, post to Autocat, "Compiled bibliographic information has greater value than just the value of the separate data".

I have been a vocal critic during this process, but it occurred to me that people might not really understand what I was talking about without a demonstration code, an alternative RDA, so to speak. Thus, with the help of many generous and intelligent friends, whom I acknowledge in the Introduction, I have created such a code, which can be viewed at <http://myee.bol.ucla.edu/>. Since it is clear that there is a need to move toward more standard ways of coding cataloging data within the sphere of the Internet, I have made a stab at creating an RDF model of my cataloging code, as well. I am certain that it is currently a very amateurish effort, as it is my first data model of any kind, but it might encourage more expert data modelers to help improve it as a group effort. (I should say that I have already received considerable help from the most generous topic map expert Alexander Johannesen and am in the process of receiving more help from kind and generous RDF expert Bradley Allen). The data modeling process has already been valuable to me in that it has raised a number of issues that I suspect would arise in any effort to model the bibliographic universe (a discussion of these, including Alexander's comments and some from Sara Shatford Layne, can be found at: <http://myee.bol.ucla.edu/rdfmodel.html>).

It may well be that catalogers do not have enough information to collocate items at the expression and manifestation levels, and that the designers of our current Anglo-American cataloging practices were wiser than we seem to give them credit for these days in limiting collocation to the work level except in the case of prolific works, which get some expression collocation. It may also be that our illustrious leaders have so thoroughly de-professionalized cataloging that there is no longer any personnel available to carry out this user service. If either or both of those propositions are the case, I would suggest that we abandon the current RDA development process and

work instead on designing an effective RDF (or topic map?) model of our current cataloging rules and our millions of existing cataloging records.

The "Yee Rules" also contain some suggestions for reforming our practices in other ways to bring our entity definitions into closer alignment both with those of our users and with those of our colleagues outside the Anglo-American world, in order to facilitate better international cooperation in creating a virtual international authority file.

So, it is with some trepidation that I put this forth for your review and comment. If you have any comments, please send them to any of the following lists: RDA <rda-l@infoserv.nlc-bnc.ca>, FRBR <frbr@infoserv.inist.fr>>, and NGC4LIB <ngc4lib@listserv.nd.edu>, or to my e-mail address <myee@ucla.edu> and/or post them to my blog at: <<http://yeecatrule.wordpress.com/>>.

Thanks for your consideration!

Martha M. Yee
UCLA Film & Television Archive

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor

OLAC MEETINGS AT ALA MIDWINTER 2008

Here is the information on the OLAC meetings to be held at ALA Midwinter in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee Meeting
Friday, 1/11, 7:30-9:30 p.m.
Philadelphia Marriott (Downtown) - Room 302-204

OLAC Executive Board Meeting
Saturday, 1/12, 1:30-3:30 p.m.
Philadelphia Marriott (Downtown) - OCLC Red Suite
(ask at hotel front desk for OCLC's assigned room number)

OLAC Membership Meeting
Saturday, 1/12, 4:00-6:00 p.m.
Philadelphia Marriott (Downtown) - Room 408-409

I look forward to seeing everyone in Philadelphia!
Originally submitted (12/4/07) by:
Vicki Toy Smith, OLAC President
e-mail: vicki@unr.edu

AMENDMENTS TO THE OLAC BYLAWS

I am pleased to announce that the changes to the OLAC Bylaws specified on the online ballot have passed. An official electronic ballot was sent to each current personal member. The deadline for casting votes was October 5, 2007. All 10 amendments to the OLAC Bylaws have been approved.

The position of OLAC Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator has become a full member of the Executive Board. I want to welcome Debbie Benrubi, OLAC Outreach/Advocacy Coordinator, to the Executive Board.

The Bylaws, which have been modified to distinguish between elected and appointed offices, now further clarify the term limits for appointed offices.

The Bylaws have been modified to include any form of standard, reliable balloting, including electronic.

Thanks to everyone who voted on the amendments!

Originally submitted (10/9/07) by:
Vicki Toy Smith, OLAC President
e-mail: vicki@unr.edu

MORE NEWS ABOUT GENRE AUTHORITY RECORDS IN OCLC

In September 2007, the Library of Congress implemented the distribution of Genre authority records (x55 tags) and these records have been available for searching and/or browsing via the Connexion Client (2.0) or Browser.

As explained in the September announcement, the x55 tagged authority records are also indexed in the LCSH index. An example of a newly added Genre authority record is sh2007025004 (ARN 7519072), Fiction films. Although the Genre index labels are not present in the authority searching or browsing dropdown lists in Client 1.7x, the genre indexes can be accessed via the command line. The index label for the genre index is "ge". An example of a search from the command line is: ge: films; an example of a browse search is **sca ge: films**.

Following the successful Connexion installation on December 9, 2007, catalogers who use the Connexion Browser can apply the "control" function for genre headings tagged 655, second indicator zero (0).

The ability to control these genre headings (tagged 655, second indicator 0) will be available in the 2.10 release of the Connexion Client, tentatively scheduled for release in late December 2007.

There are some restrictions regarding the controlling of genre headings:

- If a heading is not tagged as a 655, second indicator 0, but the text matches an established heading in a genre authority record (i.e., **Buddy films**), a multi-control window will open rather than automatically changing the tag and controlling the heading.
- Likewise, if a heading is tagged as a 655, second indicator 0, but the text matches an established subject and/or name headings represented by one or multiple authority records (i.e., **Baskets \$z Ohio**), a multi-control window will open rather than automatically changing the tag and controlling the heading.
- Genre headings tagged as 655, second indicator 0 will be included in a "Control All" command. If the tag/text of a correctly tagged genre heading matches an established genre authority record, the heading will be automatically controlled.

Reminder: At this time, SACO participants still have to wait to propose new headings.

Adapted from a post originally submitted (12/11/07) by:

Becky Dean

OCLC

e-mail: deanr@oclc.org

phone: 1 (800) 848-5878, ext. 5144

AN ADDITIONAL SOURCE FOR SOUND RECORDINGS METADATA IN OCLC

Beginning later in December 2007, OCLC will begin loading additional records for popular music sound recordings distributed by the Library of Congress. LC staff derives much of the data from the All Media Guide, verifying titles and standard numbers. Contents notes are also verified to be accurate with what is on the label, but may not conform strictly to the rules. The records generally lack added entries, subject headings, and LC classification numbers. Also, the records frequently lack main and added entries for performers, although a 5XX field for performers is usually present. Therefore, searching in the name indexes will seldom retrieve these records, and keyword searches for names will be more effective. Title searches will also often be a useful strategy. The records will have Encoding Level value '3' and a note that says "Brief record".

OCLC processing will attempt to match LC's records to records already input into WorldCat. If a match is found, some data from the LC record, such as LCCN, will be merged into the WorldCat record. The LC record will not replace the WorldCat record. Records that do not find a match will be added to WorldCat.

Because the records have Encoding Level '3', OCLC catalogers are able to modify and upgrade them. OCLC encourages other catalogers to do so as well. When upgrading the record to a higher encoding level, please delete the "Brief record" note. When one of these records is upgraded to an Encoding Level 'K' or 'T', institutions will receive a minimal-level upgrade credit.

Adapted from a post originally submitted (12/10/07) by:

Rich Greene

OCLC, Inc.

e-mail: richard_greene@oclc.org

phone: (614) 764-6154

RDF EXAMPLES USING MARTHA YEE'S CATALOGING RULES

I have revised my RDF title-manifestation and manifestation records using Martha Yee's Cataloging Rules, based on feedback from several people who know a lot more about this stuff than I do. Rather than send them to the list each time I revise them

now, I decided to put them on my website where people can look at them if they are interested. The records are available at: <<http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/~rd13/rdf/>>

As before, comments (and criticisms) are welcome. Feel free to copy and use however you want to.

Originally submitted (12/12/07) by:

Renette Davis

Head, Serials & Digital Resources Cataloging

University of Chicago Library

2008 ARSC CONFERENCE: PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA

The 42nd annual Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC) Conference will be held in Palo Alto, California, March 26-29, 2008. Stanford University will host the event, in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Stanford Archive of Recorded Sound.

The conference hotel is the Creekside Inn, located one mile from the Stanford campus and two miles from downtown Palo Alto. During the conference, single, double, and triple rooms are specially priced at \$130 per night. To receive the discounted rate, rooms must be reserved by March 9, 2008. Reservations can be made at 800-492-7335 or <res@creekside-inn.com>. Please refer to group code "ARSC" when booking. For more information about the hotel, situated on three-and-a-half beautifully landscaped acres, visit: <<http://www.arsc-audio.org/conference/hotel.html>> or <<http://www.creekside-inn.com/index.php>>.

The conference will offer a vast array of appealing presentations. Some samples of sessions in the planning stages (and, therefore, subject to change) are:

- Archival issues and new tools for collection assessment. Reporting repositories include the Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Columbia University, Yale University, the New York Public Library, the Rodgers and Hammerstein Archives of Recorded Sound, and the University of North Texas Music Library
- "A Primer on Analog Playback" - presented by the Technical Committee
- A panel discussion by Ampex pioneers, about the history of magnetic sound recording technology in the Silicon Valley
- "Preservation, Access, and Copyright" - including a talk by the author of the congressionally-mandated "Study on the Current State of Recorded Sound Preservation"

- Numerous talks focusing on classical, jazz, and popular artists and repertoire.
- Ethnographic and ethnomusicological recordings
- An examination of the beginnings of and reactions to recorded sound in the 19th century, including a recreation of an 1878 tinfoil phonograph exhibition. During this session, ARSC's new First Sounds Committee will speak about its initiative "to make humanity's early audio legacy accessible to all people, for all time"

ARSC's Education and Training Committee will present "Don't Stop the Music: A Workshop on Grant Funding for Audio Preservation" on March 26, 2008, at Stanford University's Campbell Recital Hall. Archivists, librarians, and collection managers-- anyone who works with or manages archival sound recordings--will gain information about identifying grant-making institutions, meeting intake requirements, and exploring possible partnerships with other institutions. The workshop will feature speakers from The GRAMMY Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Make plans to join friends and colleagues in Palo Alto. More details about the 2008 ARSC Conference can be found at: <<http://www.arsc-audio.org/conference/>>.

Originally submitted (11/16/07) by:
 Anna-Maria Manuel
 ARSC Outreach Committee Chair

ISMIR 2008 - CALL FOR PARTICIPATION

The Ninth International Conference on Music Information Retrieval will take place September 14-18, 2008 (Sunday through Thursday), in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Since its inception in 2000, ISMIR has rapidly become the premier venue for the multidisciplinary field of accessing, analyzing, and managing large collections and archives of music information. The expansion of the music information retrieval (MIR) community reflects the enormous challenges and opportunities presented by the recent and tremendous growth in available music and music-related data. ISMIR provides a forum for the exchange of ideas between representatives of academia, industry, entertainment, and education, including researchers, developers, educators, librarians, students, and professional users, who contribute to this broadly interdisciplinary domain. Alongside presentations of original theoretical research and practical work, ISMIR provides introductory and in-depth tutorials, and a venue for the showcase of current MIR-related products and systems.

For a full description of the Conference and the guidelines for submitting papers, please see the full "Call for Participation" document at: <http://ismir2008.ismir.net/cfp>.

We look forward to seeing you in Philadelphia!

General Chairs:

Dan Ellis, Columbia University

Youngmoo Kim, Drexel University

Program Chairs:

Juan Pablo Bello, New York University

Elaine Chew, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study / University of Southern California

Adapted from a post originally submitted (11/21/07) by:

Juan Pablo Bello

Assistant Professor, Music Technology

New York University

e-mail: <jpbello@nyu.edu>

BOOK REVIEWS

Amy K. Weiss, Column Editor

Education for Library Cataloging: International Perspectives

Edited by Dajin D. Sun, Ruth C. Carter

Many of the readers of this publication will already be familiar with the content of *Education for Library Cataloging: International Perspectives*, as it was co-published simultaneously as 3 volumes of *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* (Volume 41, Numbers 2-4, covering the final issue of 2005 and the first issue of 2006). For those who missed it the first time around, the editors explain their motivation thusly: "Although studies or reports on cataloging practices outside of the United States have been seen in the library literature from time to time, very little is published about how education for cataloging develops in other parts of the world. Now that there is

growing interest and effort to foster international cataloging standard and cooperation, an understanding of how education contributes to the cataloging profession globally would be significant and beneficial". Sun and Carter explain that American library schools' efforts were not included since they were already "well covered" by Janet Swan Hill's "Education for Cataloging and the Organization of Information" (The Haworth Press, Inc., 2002).

Education for Library Cataloging "...contains 22 papers by 28 authors from over twenty countries spanning six continents and covers both formal education and continuing education of cataloging librarians in these countries". There are three countries from Africa (Botswana, Nigeria and South Africa), four from Asia (China, India, Japan and Korea), six countries from Europe (Austria, The British Isles, Germany, Poland, Slovenia and Spain), three countries from Latin America (Argentina, Mexico and Peru), four countries from the Middle East (Egypt, Iran, Israel and Saudi Arabia) and Australia. There are two papers apiece on Australia and China, though both adopt different approaches to their subject matter. Length, style, and quality varies significantly from article to article. Since they are independent works, they can also be read in any order. There is a fantastic index, consisting mostly of personal names, corporate names, documentation, and consortia.

It goes without saying that this book is not beach reading, and may strike even cataloging educators as being fairly dry. One does not come to hard research for fluid prose, but its style makes reading more than a few articles at a time (and expecting to retain anything) almost impossible. This may also be due to the fact that virtually all of the authors are practicing educators in the countries about which they speak, meaning English is often not their first language. One exception to the dry prose is Jerry D. Saye and Alenka Sauperl's article on Slovenia ("Cataloging Education on the Sunny Side of the Alps"), which was written by an American with teaching experience at The University of Ljubljana in tandem with a current assistant professor there. It provides excellent content and perspective, but is breezy almost to the point of annoyance.

One very real concern about *Education for Library Cataloging* is that most of the articles provide reams of data, but very little analysis. Many authors assemble charts to show what classes each library school offers, and at what year, and for how many hours. Virtually none interview any of the professors, though, much less the students involved. Painstaking efforts are also made to show where catalogers fall in the pay and status hierarchy, but few authors elucidate how these situations came to be, or if they are likely to change in the future. Even worse, most of the authors entirely ignore the influence of their countries' political regimes on the higher education climate. A pleasant exception are the four articles on cataloging in the Middle East, especially Zahiruddin Khurshid's article on Saudi Arabia, which includes some of the most

provocative statements in the book. Perhaps this is unfair caviling, however, as the authors were undoubtedly limited by the strictures of the CCQ. Each of these countries should have its own book about cataloging education someday, and these articles are a fine start.

Overall, *Education for Library Cataloging: International Perspectives* is a difficult but rewarding read. By changing the format of publication for these articles, Sun and Carter have challenged us to read them in a new way. Rather than cherry-picking our favorites and skimming the rest, this presentation asks that we read every article in its entirety. For those who take that challenge, there are many unexpected epiphanies, such as: "Cataloging education receives less respect and emphasis in America than virtually anywhere else"; "Catalogers in America need to engage with the international community to share their cataloging technology and documentation (and not just in English!); "Cataloging education worldwide downplays practical experience, which is often lacking entirely"; and, "The demand for qualified catalogers far outstrips the supply, and most catalogers are forced to learn their trade at their first entry-level position".

We all participate in cataloging education, albeit usually in an informal setting. Anyone who leads a workshop, mentors a junior faculty member, trains a graduate assistant, or supervises a technical services department could benefit from *Education for Library Cataloging: International Perspectives*. But since virtually every library school may already have access to the individual articles herein via bound volumes of the CCQ and online full-text databases, this might not be a "must purchase" item. However, it is still recommended.

Published in 2006 by: The Haworth Information Press, Binghamton, N.Y. (492 p.)
ISBN: 0-7890-3112-4 (hbk.; \$69.95); ISBN: 0-7890-3113-2 (pbk.; \$49.95).

Reviewed by:
Richard N. Leigh
AV Cataloger
McKeldin Library
University of Maryland

OLAC CATALOGER'S JUDGMENT
Jay Weitz

We Like Ike, But We're Hanging Him

Question: Our institution wants a framed text with a Dwight D. Eisenhower quote on it to be cataloged before it is hung. But cataloging it does not seem easily done. It is a quotation, not a picture, and appears to be a poster that was framed locally. There are no illustrations of any kind. It exists strictly of a statement, set exclusively in capital letters, by Dwight D. Eisenhower, from a letter he wrote to the American Library Association's Annual Conference, Los Angeles, 1953. The best guess about it is that it was an ALA poster that someone had framed, then donated to the library to be hung with other statements of the same type (which, fortunately, do not have to be cataloged). The text reads, "The libraries of America are and must ever remain the home of the free, inquiring minds. To them, our citizens--of all ages and races, of all creeds and political persuasions--must ever be able to turn with clear confidences that there they can freely seek the whole truth, unwarped by fashion and uncompromised by expediency". It is completely typeset; it has no handwritten signature or anything else. The type is black and printed on cream-colored paper. It is 8 x 10 inches, matted and framed to 16 1/2 x 13 5/8 inches. The record will be cataloged in the national database, so it is really important to get it right.

Answer: My inclination would be to catalog it as any other poster (Type "k", TMat "i"), following 8.5D4 for the unframed dimensions and 8.7B10 for the details and size of the frame. Following OCLC's augmentation of LCRI 1.1C (in BFAS 2.1, "GMDs and Library of Congress Rule Interpretations"), I would probably use the GMD "[picture]", as incongruous as that sounds, although one could also argue that omitting a GMD all together makes as much sense.

A Six-DVD Set With Changing Publisher

Question: The six-DVD set of the "Rocky" movies is posing a slight dilemma for cataloging. The first five "Rocky" movies were all put out by Fox, but the sixth, "Rocky Balboa", is a Columbia title. Fox is publishing the set, and it includes that sixth title. How would this be cataloged as a set when the last DVD has a publisher different from the first five?

Answer: According to AACR2 1.0A2(b)(i), for a multipart monograph such as this, the description would be based on the first or earliest part. The cataloger would simply include a note stating that the sixth volume is published by a different entity.

(For videorecordings, it would probably be a good idea to trace that entity in addition to the publisher of the first five volumes).

Adjusting Motion Picture Uniform Titles

Question: This is a question about LCRI 25.5B Appendix I concerning motion picture uniform titles established for related work or subject access. The "PCC/LC Practice for Assigning Uniform Titles (Providing Related Work/Subject Access When Cataloging Any Resource Related to a Motion Picture)" explains how to establish a uniform title to be used as a 730 related work added entry or subject heading for a work about or related to the motion picture, as well as how to establish it with a qualifier (such as "Red Pony (Motion picture : 1949)") if it conflicts with the title of another resource. However, no mention is made about adjusting the heading in the 130 field on records for the actual motion picture. This is in contrast to the old LCRI 25.5B (before it was revised), which says in parentheses, "Existing records in which the motion picture is used as a main or secondary entry must be adjusted", and gives an example where "Red pony (Motion picture)" was established to be used as an added entry on a new work about the film, and added also as a main entry in the 130 field on a record for the actual film. However, this instruction has been dropped from Appendix I. The only place in Appendix I where it mentions adjusting headings on existing records appears to be for a different situation ("Same title, different resources"), when a uniform title is assigned to distinguish a motion picture from another resource *entered* under that same title. However, this instruction no longer exists for situations where a uniform title is assigned for works that are related to or about a motion picture. Is there a reason why the instruction was dropped, or should catalogers continue adjusting the main entries of records for the motion picture when a uniform title is established to provide related work/subject access? When enhancing records, I have also been adding 130 fields if the motion picture title has been established, and find that related work/subject access tends to be a more common reason for these headings.

Answer: This is merely a guess (since it would need to be verified with LC), but it might have something to do with the LCRI's general preference for using an existing heading unless a change is necessary. This preference regarding the cataloging of the motion picture itself is stated in Footnote 1. For secondary access, it is stated in Footnote 2. (In the print version of LCRI 25.5B Appendix I, the footnotes appear respectively on the bottom of Page 3 [dated April 2005] and Pages 10-11 [dated August 2006]. In the *Cataloger's Desktop* version, the two section headings "PCC Practice for Assigning Uniform Titles (Cataloging a Motion Picture Itself)" and

"PCC/LC Practice for Assigning Uniform Titles (Providing Related Work/Subject Access When Cataloging Any Resource Related to a Motion Picture)" are both hot links. Click on each and the respective footnote comes up in a box [although online, they are no longer labeled or identified as footnotes the way they are in print].) It notes that the old guidelines sometimes called for qualifications that would no longer be required under the new guidelines, but that catalogers should "...continue to use such headings in main, subject, and added entries". It is also useful to remember that LC does not use AACR2 to catalog moving images (it uses AMIM instead), so catalogers there are not bound by the LCRI. There may also have been some consideration about limiting the burden of extra work for PCC participants by not requiring them to go back and adjust headings on existing cataloging. This is not meant to stop anyone from doing that additional work, it simply does not mandate that they must. Again, these are just my guesses.

Genre Heading for Nonfiction Films

Question: For "Films for the hearing impaired", what genre term should catalogers be using for a nonfiction (educational, instructional, exercise) item, an item not previously/originally released on television? It seems as if the term "films" in this case would refer to the way in which the item was originally captured (i.e., celluloid, digital, camcorder tape), that is, not meaning only "motion picture". What is your take on this situation? Is there a better term that catalogers should be using for these closed-captioned nonfiction items? If so, what would you suggest?

Answer: According to the draft of LC's *Subject Cataloging Manual H 1913 "Moving Image Genre/Form Headings"* <<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cps0/h1913.pdf>>: "As used in this instruction sheet and in the genre/form headings themselves, the term 'films' refers to works that are originally recorded and released on motion picture film, on video, or digitally. The phrase, 'television programs', refers to those works that are originally telecast". The genre/form heading "Films for the hearing impaired" is intended to cover both fiction and nonfiction moving images captured on film, video, or digitally.

Explicit Edition Statements, So to Speak

Question: How are libraries handling CDs that have explicit lyrics or themes? For instance, between the uncut and the edited versions of Kanye West's CD *Late registration*, there is nothing on either CD to indicate which one is the version the

artist intended. The only statement that differentiates between the two is the "Parental Advisory Explicit Content" icon on the uncut version. Is this enough to justify a 250 "Explicit version"? Of course, according to AACR2 1.2B4, that phrase could be added to the 245 in brackets, but the 250 seems preferable, if possible. Any advice would be helpful.

Answer: AACR2 6.2B3, 1.2B4, and their respective LCRI's appear to be tailor-made for such circumstances as the "explicit" version versus the "clean" version of sound recordings, the records for which "...would otherwise show exactly the same information in the areas beginning with the title and statement of responsibility area and ending with the series area" (LC practice as stated in LCRI 1.2B4; in many or even most cases, the publisher numbers and/or standard numbers will differ, but they lie outside the areas stipulated in the LCRI). When the resource itself does not present something that can be construed as an intelligible edition statement, the cataloger may supply one in brackets (in Field 250 and in the language and script of the title proper). Following 1.2B4 to the letter, one would supply such an edition statement only in cases where both "explicit" and "clean" versions were known to exist, although such knowledge is not always possible. If there is information on the resource that explains the situation but was not deemed suitable as the edition statement (such as a "Parental Advisory: Explicit Content" statement), that could still be appropriate as a quoted note. Ideally, catalogers would strive for consistency in any supplied edition statements, though that does not seem likely. Most of the terms that come to mind in this context (for example, "explicit", "uncensored", "clean", "censored") seem value-laden. But then again, the very issue of altering or not altering artistic intent is value-laden, so perhaps it is unavoidable.

Terms in Common, and Uncommon, Usage

Question: This is a question about the 300 tag in video games. For a Nintendo or a PlayStation video game, it would seem that a better term for the 300 tag would be "computer optical disc" rather than what is normally used for electronic resources, i.e., "CD-ROM" or "DVD-ROM". Is this what the consensus is? In looking through *OLAC Newsletters* and other sources, there do not appear to be any examples specific to video games not played on a computer.

Answer: If the specific material designation of "computer optical disc" applies to the resource, AACR2 9.5B1 absolutely allows its use. Such so-called "terms in common usage" as "CD-ROM" and "DVD-ROM" are mere options under 9.5B1. LCRI 9.5B1, which prefers the "terms in common usage", is labeled "LC practice" and although many (if not most) institutions have chosen to follow LC's lead in this regard,

catalogers may choose otherwise. As always when making this kind of local decision, it is a good idea to document such choices, as well as the rationale for them.

Languages of Subtitles in 041

Question: In a discussion about coding the 041 field for DVDs, I was surprised to find that my opinion was in the minority. I was under the impression that if the main languages and the subtitles were the same (e.g., English, French, and Spanish), catalogers did not need to add a subfield \$b. Then, if any of the subtitle languages differed from any of the main dialogue languages listed in subfield \$a, catalogers would code only for the different languages in subfield \$b. For example, for a DVD in English and French, with subtitles in English, French, and Spanish, only "spa" would be coded in subfield \$b. Unfortunately, documentation for my version of this practice cannot be located in *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* or the *Technical Bulletins*. My colleagues claimed that this is the old way; the rules have since changed and now all languages must be coded. Which way is correct?

Answer: As the MARC format is currently worded (the current version of its guidance for Field 041 is from *MARC 21 Update 6*, dated October 2005), catalogers are supposed to include in subfields \$b only those Language Codes that are not represented in subfields \$a: "Subfield \$b contains the codes for languages of summaries, abstracts, subtitles or captions (open or closed, intended for users with hearing disabilities) *when the language is other than that of the text*" (emphasis mine). However, the 041 field is currently in flux as a result of "MARC Proposal 2007-01" <<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2007/2007-01.html>>. This proposal redefines subfield \$b for summaries and abstracts only and creates a new subfield \$j for subtitles and captions. The exact wording of any of the changes will not be known until the *MARC 21 Update 8* is published. (*Update 8* will carry the date of October 2007, but if tradition prevails, it will not actually be made available by LC until six, or seven, or eight months later, which would be around April to June 2008. That would mean that it would be implemented by OCLC probably around April to June 2009.) Although it is not completely certain that the new wording will work out this way, it is my hope that the languages of all subtitles and captions (not only those that differ from the original text) will be recorded in the new subfield \$j.

Field 041 Subfield \$h Following Subfield \$b

Question: The use of subfield \$h in Visual Materials format records appears to be

going against the guidance. Lately, more often than not, subfield \$h follows strings that include both subfields \$a and \$b. As an example: for a Spanish DVD, with optional English or French subtitles, the 041 appears like this:

- 041 1 spa \$b eng \$b fre \$h spa

According to the 041 instructions, subfield \$h cannot follow subfield \$b. Still, this construction seems perfectly logical. What do you think?

Answer: As I read the current version (dated October 2005) of Field 041 in MARC 21, I find no explicit prohibition of subfield \$h following subfield \$b, although neither of the subfield \$b examples includes a subfield \$h. Catalogers should not read too much into examples, which are usually OK as far as they go, but are not meant to be definitive or complete in many cases. As the introduction to *MARC 21 Bibliographic* states, "The examples illustrate the application of specific MARC content designation. *The data may be fuller or less full than would be used in actual cataloging practice*" (emphasis mine). Historically, there have been several unfortunate conflicts built into subfield \$b, which has been used both for summaries/abstracts and for subtitles/captions. Those two different uses are not necessarily compatible. For the summaries/abstracts use of subfield \$b, one can question the need for coding subfield \$h for the "original" language at all. After all, the summary or abstract does not have to be a translation of anything. If summaries or abstracts in multiple languages are present, determining that one or another was the "original" language may well be impossible (and could be totally unrelated to the original language of the main text). The subtitles/captions use of subfield \$b, however, sure feels to me as though an accompanying subfield \$h would often be appropriate. Traditional subtitles are often translations, albeit sometimes condensed, rather than word-for-word. Traditional captioning (for the hearing impaired) often does not involve translation, tending to be mere transcription of the audio in the same language. With DVDs especially, though, the possibilities are endless and the 041 coding often incredibly complex. However, as noted in the previous answer, the whole state of Field 041 is subject to change with the implementation of "MARC Proposal 2007-01".

No 007 for 3D and Realia

Question: Should there or should there not be a 007 tag for three-dimensional artifacts and realia? Some of the guidance says that catalogers should add a Field 007 (usually a \$a = k for non-projected graphic), but other guidance indicates that no 007 tag needs to be added. There are numerous examples of records for this material showing both ways, with and without an 007. In general, there seems to be quite a lot

of angst about the 007, for whatever reason. Some say that if an item is not purely paper or print (monograph or serial), then it probably should have a Field 007. However, this may not apply with realia. What do you say?

Answer: MARC 21 has defined a Field 007 for "Unspecified" (007/00 is coded "z"), but OCLC has chosen not to implement it. In OCLC, three-dimensional objects and realia would not have a Field 007.

Realia Versus Replica

Question: Why does AACR2 make such an issue over distinguishing realia from replicas in its definition of "realia" ("An artefact or naturally occurring entity, as opposed to a replica")? For instance, with a replica of a dinosaur bone, a cataloger would still use Chapter 10 to catalog the replica. It still is a three-dimensional object. It is just not clear why there is such a distinction between three-dimensional objects and realia. Why was Chapter 10 not called, "Three-dimensional objects"? If you could shed any light on this at all, it would be very helpful.

Answer: As AACR2 Rule 10.0A1 states in part, that Chapter 10 covers "...the description of three-dimensional objects of all kinds (other than those covered in previous chapters)". The glossary defines "artefact" as: "Any object made or modified by one or more persons". It defines "object" as: "A three-dimensional artefact (or replica of an artefact) or a naturally occurring entity". Finally, it defines "realia" as: "An artefact or naturally occurring entity, as opposed to a replica". It is rarely helpful when such definitions trade-off using each other as parts of their definitions, but this is an unavoidable limitation of language. The intention of Chapter 10 was to cover everything else that could not easily fit into the other chapters. This has to include a whole bunch of things: things that could be considered at least possibly semi-bibliographical (such as educational models and replicas and other sorts of educational materials); things that are human made but were not originally intended as bibliographical objects (such as clothing, machines, kitchen utensils, sculptures, and so on); things that are not human made (such as rocks, leaves, and so on). In an AACR2 context, the most important distinction made in the "realia" definition between the "real" and the "replica" might be that the "replica" would be human made, and so be expected to have a publisher/manufacturer, a place of publication/manufacture, and a date of publication/manufacture, whereas a naturally occurring entity would not. An artefact in the AACR2 sense straddles those two worlds in that it is human made, but any details of manufacture may or may not be known (or even be knowable in many cases). These distinctions become important

mainly in AACR2 10.4, where catalogers generally do not provide a place, publisher, or date (not even "s.l". and "s.n".) for naturally occurring entities; but generally do try to provide a place, publisher, and date (even if it is "s.l". and "s.n".) for things that are published, such as replicas. Again, the human-made artefacts are in the middle, depending upon whether they were "intended primarily for communication" (Rules 10.4C2, 10.4D2, 10.4F2). So, a replica of a dinosaur bone would be cataloged according to Chapter 10, but because it is known to be a replica, its publisher/manufacturer, place, and date may be known, and would be recorded in the 260 field. Had it been an actual dinosaur bone (one not "mounted for viewing or packaged for presentation", according to Rules 10.4C2, 10.4D2, and 10.4F2), there would not even be a 260 field, since "Publication, Distribution, Etc". is not an issue in this case.

Same Event, Different Video Perspectives

Question: In cataloging locally-produced videorecordings of university events for the university archives, several cases have arisen where there are two videocassettes that record the same event, but from different cameras. For example, one copy will be from a stationary camera focusing on the speakers, while the other copy will be from a roving camera which provides changing angles on the speakers as well as views of the audience. Should these be cataloged on one bibliographic record or two? One argument is that the event itself is exactly the same on both copies, so there should be one bibliographic record with notes explaining the differences in the copies. Another argument is that the different visual content justifies a second record, analogous to what is done for widescreen vs. full screen DVD formats.

Answer: A cataloger could legitimately treat such cases in either fashion, depending upon what better suits the situation and users. When the option to create a single bibliographic record is chosen, the cataloger could describe the differences between the two versions of the videorecording in an informal contents note (500) or in a formal contents note (505). When the formal contents note route is taken, it might be necessary to supply bracketed titles that would clarify the differences, unless there are such titles already on the resources that can be used. In choosing to create separate records, probably the best way to differentiate the otherwise similar or identical descriptions would be through (again presumably supplied) edition statements that clarified the differences.