

OLAC NEWSLETTER

vol. 25, no. 1

March 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR

FROM THE PRESIDENT

TREASURER'S REPORT

OLAC MEETING MINUTES
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
MEMBERSHIP MEETING
MEET THE CANDIDATES

CONFERENCE REPORTS
MARBI
CC:DA
AMIA CATALOGING COMMITTEE
NEWS FROM OCLC

OLAC NACO FUNNEL PROJECT REPORT

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS
UPDATED CONNEXION BROWSER *TUTORIAL*
SURA-ViDe 2005 DIGITAL VIDEO CONFERENCE
MACHINE-GENERATED CONTENTS NOTES
UPDATED *AUTHORITY TOOLS*
ARLIS/NA ANNUAL CONFERENCE
ARSC 2005 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP OF THE ARSC CONFERENCE
BOOK REVIEWS
CATALOGER'S JUDGMENT : MUSIC CATALOGING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
DESCRIBING ARCHIVES : A CONTENT STANDARD

UCLA FILM AND TELEVISION ARCHIVE CATALOGING PROCEDURE
MANUAL
OLAC CATALOGER'S JUDGEMENT

FROM THE EDITOR

Jain Fletcher

In the column across from mine, our President, Robert Freeborn, entreats OLAC membership to consider becoming more involved in OLAC. I certainly second his opinion and hope that his comments will inspire many people to run for OLAC's open offices, now and in the future. Indeed, his points were so compelling that I kept them in mind while I was editing this issue. It occurred to me that there are so many ways to contribute to OLAC and they can (or might) be seen in reading through any issue.

I say "or might" above, because one contribution has been sorely missed from this *Newsletter* for about a year: it is the report from the Outreach-Advocacy Coordinator (OAC). Among the OAC's duties is to compile reports from people who have advocated for OLAC in their jobs, professional work or presentations, and then to send the compiled report to the *Newsletter*. So, not only is the OAC contributing to OLAC, so is everyone who advocates for OLAC and provides the OAC feedback detailing their advocacy.

The *Newsletter* would not exist without the contributions of people who are involved in OLAC. This includes regular column editors, Jan Mayo, Vicki Toy-Smith, Barbara Vaughan and Jay Weitz. But when you think about it, each of those columns has contributors and anyone who contributes to them is also involved with OLAC. For the Conference Reports column, our hard-working liaisons submit the reports to the column editor: in this issue, one report comes from our MARBI Liaison, John Attig, one from our new CC:DA Liaison, Greta de Groat and another from our AMIA Liaison, Sueyoung Park-Primiano. The Book Reviews column would not exist if it were not for people who provide reviews--this issue has three such contributors. OLAC members also provide fodder for the News & Announcements and Cataloger's Judgment columns by sending in announcements or by asking challenging questions.

There are also separate liaison reports, such as the OCLC Report by Jay Weitz.

Another report in this issue came from Ann Caldwell, the NACO-AV Coordinator. It is also worth remembering that each person who participates in the OLAC Funnel Project can also be considered to be commendably involved with OLAC.

Any dedicated OLAC cataloger can also use his or her specialist knowledge and experience to contribute. Examples of how this might work could include such opportunities as responding to the call for comments on LC rule interpretations, commenting on the AACR3 drafts, providing subject headings ...the list goes on. So, let me echo our President by asking you to please consider becoming involved and contributing in any and every way you can.

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Robert Freeborn

Greetings all! This time around I want to make an appeal to the membership. Since an organization can only be as successful as its least active member, I want to urge everyone to become more involved in OLAC. There are numerous ways to do this. Currently, OLAC is looking for an Outreach-Advocacy Coordinator to fill in the vacancy after the excellent work done by Ian Fairclough. The duties involved are given in the position description in the *OLAC Handbook*, which I reproduce here: "The OLAC Outreach-Advocacy Coordinator is responsible for promoting the purposes and objectives of OLAC and encouraging membership growth. This position also acts as a repository for fundraising data related to conference sponsorship and pursues conference donations in cooperation with the Conference Planning Committee. The Outreach-Advocacy Coordinator is an *ex officio* member of the OLAC Executive Board and is required to attend at least one Board meeting per year, consult with the Board and contribute regular reports to the *OLAC Newsletter*. At the Coordinator's request and the Board's discretion, task forces may be appointed as needed. A stipend of \$100 will be given for each board meeting attended. The term of office runs two years with the possibility of reappointment upon satisfactory performance."

So if you are interested in taking on this task, please contact a member of the Executive Board before June. We are hoping to make our decision at the Board Meeting this summer at the ALA Annual Conference.

Another way to contribute is to host an OLAC Conference. As many of you know, the 2006 Conference will be held in the Tempe/Phoenix region in Arizona. Our thanks go to Timothy Diel and his colleagues for their successful bid. But what of 2008--and beyond? We encourage you to invite our organization to your neck of the woods so that we can sample your region's cultural offerings and hospitality. In case you are unsure about the expectations in making a conference bid, the *OLAC Handbook* has an entire section on the topic (look under "OLAC Conference Hosting Requirements and Planning Guidelines" at <<http://www.olacinc.org/hb.html>>). So, please take a look and, if interested, check your calendars and start working on that proposal!

Other avenues that might be considered for OLAC involvement include serving on the Cataloging Policy Committee, acting as a liaison between OLAC and another library organization, or even running for a position on the Executive Board. While some of these jobs require many years of service to OLAC, others are just right for a newer member interested in making his or her mark. So I hope you will consider sharing your time and talents with your colleagues and help our organization in its progress towards greater and greater accomplishments.

TREASURER'S REPORT
Second Quarter and Year-to-Date
Through December 31, 2004
Bobby Bothmann, Treasurer

	2nd Quarter	Year-To-Date
OPENING BALANCE	\$2,106.02	
INCOME		
Memberships	\$3,862.00	\$4,178.00
Back Issues		\$7.00
TOTAL	\$3,862.00	\$4,185.00
EXPENSES		
ALA		\$400.00
Stipends	\$50.00	\$850.00

Postage & Printing	1,738.45	\$3,346.97
<i>Printing</i>	\$1,568.27	\$2,969.20
<i>Postage</i>	\$170.18	\$377.77
Web Domain	\$15.00	\$15.00
Miscellaneous	1,000.00	\$1,002.23
TOTAL	\$2,803.45	\$5,614.20
CLOSING BALANCE		\$3,164.57

**MEMBERSHIP as of December 31,
2004**

Personal:	404
Institutional:	241
Total:	645

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE
Boston, Massachusetts
Friday, January 14, 2005**

Minutes

Lisa Bodenheimer, CAPC Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. *Members present:* Lisa Bodenheimer, Lynnette Fields, Valerie Bross, Susan Leister, Kelley McGrath, Steven Miller, Linda Seguin. *Ex officio members present:* John Attig, Greta de Groat.

There were 33 attendees in total.

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the CAPC meeting held on October 2, 2004 at the OLAC Biennial Conference in Montréal, Canada were approved.

3. Announcements

The applicants for the open CAPC positions were thanked. The Committee was happy for the strong response to the call for volunteers. The successful candidates for the open CAPC positions will be selected at the OLAC Executive Board meeting on Saturday, January 15.

4. Reports and Discussions

a. *NACO/AV Funnel*

There was no report.

b. *CC:DA (G. de Groat)*

The draft version of Part 1 of the forthcoming AACR3 was discussed. Please see the full CC:DA report elsewhere in this issue.

c. *MARBI Report (J. Attig)*

John reports that there are two proposals currently under consideration. One is an old proposal regarding hierarchical geographic names, currently used as the 752 field, which was created for the United States Newspapers Project. A decision was made at ALA Annual in Orlando to create field 662 for subject access to hierarchical geographic names. The subfield codes available for this field need to be defined, and the subfield codes for the 752 need to be broadened to include the new codes. Since the 752 was created with US places in mind, the Committee is trying to generalize subfields so that they will be usable for all types of places, but without reference to any existing content standard, such as LCSH. This is proving to be challenging.

The other topic under discussion is a proposal from catalogers who deal with graphic material and the ambiguities of pictorial representation. In a graphic work, the subject can be a topic or what is depicted in a resource. A distinction can be drawn between these two perspectives on a visual resource. The functional requirements for doing this are not clear and there is the possibility that headings for what is depicted may need to be held in a separate index from headings that are about the subject of a work. Probably this will require a new set of fields, or the addition of

labels (such as a subfield \$4 relator code) but how this will work in catalogs and how it will work for users remains to be seen.

- d. *Subcommittee on Source of Title Note For Internet Resources (S. Miller)*
Refer to: <<http://www.olacinc.org/capc/stnir.html>>

The Source of Title Note document is currently being revised using screen captures. Feedback from OLAC, Autocat, and PCC members is being sought. The Subcommittee hopes to have a final draft by the time of the ALA Annual meeting in June 2005. Certain problems, such as page numbering of PDF documents, may be fundamentally un-resolvable. Serials also have a high level of complexity in source of title. However, it is still felt that this document can help catalogers to make cataloging decisions faster and in a more uniform manner.

- e. *Added Entries for Non-Human Actors and Other Entities (G. de Groat)*
There has been no further action on this proposal. It was sent back to Nancy Olson for comment, since she had originally suggested that this proposal be made, but she has not yet responded. The next step will be to send the proposal to the OLAC-List for wider comment. The proposal will be revised so that the recommendations will be more prominent, with the other information available as discussion points.
- f. *OLAC/CAPC Task Force on FAQ/Best Practices (L. Seguin, C. Gerhart)*
Cathy distributed a revised charge for the Task Force. The major issue is the scope of questions and answers, what belongs in a FAQ and what requires a fuller "best practices" document. Also discussed was where these materials belong on the Website. The Task Force hopes to have a first draft ready by ALA Annual in 2005.

Cathy and Linda would also like another member for the Task Force. Volunteers should talk to either Cathy or Linda.

- g. *CAPC Resource Maintenance Task Force (L. Bodenheimer for S. Roe)*
There was no report.
- h. *Further Comments on the CAPC Web Page (L. Bodenheimer for S. Roe)*
It was moved that the revised version of the CAPC Web page be made permanent. The motion was seconded and the motion passed by acclamation. The new page needs to be approved by the OLAC Board, who will give final approval for it over e-mail.

It was suggested that there be a section of the OLAC Website labeled "Publications", or something similar, that would accommodate documentation. The OLAC Board would need to approve such a change.

It was noted that the revision of documents, plans for archiving documents, and drawing a distinction between documents which are incomplete versus those which are ongoing are part of the charge of the CAPC Resource Maintenance Task Force.

5. Continued Discussion Regarding a Proposal on the Use of the 041 Field in DVD Records (K. McGrath)

Kelley McGrath will work with John Attig to make a proposal to MARBI so that all languages listed in the 041 subfield \$a can also be listed in subfield \$b so that there will be coded access to information on all printed titles available, including closed and open captioning as well as conventional subtitles. There is also an issue with how library systems use this field, since it is not often indexed and is an untapped source of information.

It is assumed that since this will not require a new field or subfield to be defined that an informal proposal will be sufficient. If, however, a formal proposal is requested, other groups such as AMIA will be consulted at that time.

6. New Business

- a. *Comments on the Background Document Describing the Draft of AACR3, Part 1*

Refer to: <<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair22.pdf>>

The draft of AACR2 Part 1 is not available for wide distribution. It was noted that there is a very short response time for comment on Part 1. However, individual CAPC members who wish to comment on the draft can be given access to the draft and deliver their comments through Greta de Groat before March 25, 2005 [date later changed to February 11, 2005]. Kelley McGrath has offered to examine the draft from the standpoint of visual materials, and Steven Miller has offered to examine the digital aspect of the draft.

b. *LC Implementation of Genre Headings*

While OCLC will accept LCSH terms in either 650 or 655 fields, it is not clear what is the correct practice for coding form/genre headings since LC has not moved to a consistent use of 655, although some records with 655 headings are being created. Lisa will request an update on LC's policies and progress with form/genre headings from David Reser in order to have an update by the ALA Annual Conference in June.

7. Adjournment.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Weiss
OLAC Secretary

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE
Boston, Massachusetts
Saturday, January 15, 2005**

Minutes

1. Call to Order, Introductions, Announcements (R. Lubas for R. Freeborn)

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. *Members present:* Rebecca Lubas, Lisa Bodenheimer, Jain Fletcher, Robert Bothmann, Cathy Gerhart, Amy Weiss. *Visitors:* Pat Riva, Sharon Rankin.

2. Secretary's Report (A. Weiss)

The minutes from the Board meetings held at the OLAC Biennial Conference in Montréal, Canada on Thursday, September 30 and on Sunday, October 3, 2004 were approved.

3. **Treasurer's Report (R. Bothmann)**

See the full Treasurer's Report elsewhere in this issue.

The budgetary situation for OLAC is still tight, but is improving. OLAC is currently operating in the black, even without the addition of funds raised by the Biennial Conference.

Robert Bothmann will try and send out renewal e-mails as soon as he can.

4. **Newsletter Editor's Report (J. Fletcher)**

The cost of the December *Newsletter* was \$1738.45. It was printed on different paper, which represents approximately \$200 total savings from the cost of equivalent-sized issues in the past. There was not much difference in the costs related to the mailing, but the lighter paper should help keep the weight of each copy below the 3.3 oz. mark (where the price per issue increases), which will help control postage costs.

Jain wants to keep the *Newsletter* to around 60 pages to control costs. Some columns in the last issue were heavily edited to help achieve this goal. This includes the Conference reports, which were split into two parts and divided between two issues. Jain explained that, although the second installment will not be seen until the June 2005 issue, the complete Conference reports are available now on the OLAC Website. The overall goal is to try to have a *Newsletter* that is substantial while trying to be economical. For this reason, there will not be any pictures in the *Newsletter* for the indefinite future, although there may be pictures online.

5. **Old Business**

a. *OhioNet Brochure*

The Board examined a draft brochure for OLAC created in conjunction with OhioNet. It was decided that the brochure created a misleading connection between the two organizations; therefore, the Board decided not to go further with the idea. Robert Freeborn will write to OhioNet and to former Outreach Coordinator, Ian Fairclough, to let them know about this decision.

b. *Outreach Coordinator*

OLAC is still without an Outreach Coordinator. The Board will ask for volunteers at the Membership meeting.

c. *2004 Conference Wrap-Up*

The Montreal Conference was a great success. All but one respondent on the evaluations found that the Conference met their needs and, in general, the individual workshops were well received. The workshops on E-resources and Videos were the most popular. The mix of American and Canadian presenters also seems to have worked well. Negative comments included lack of coffee breaks, no live Internet at the workshops, not enough space for the round table discussions, need for microphones in some rooms, and not enough space for the poster sessions.

Formal thank you letters to speakers and presenters have gone out. Copies of handouts, correspondence and other paperwork need to be sent to Archivist Iris Wolley. Robert Bothmann will burn a copy to CD of the Conference Website for the Archives. Robert Freeborn needs to send out thank you letters to the Conference planners, to the BNQ representatives, to the Conference chairs and to McGill University for use of their AV equipment. Letters should be copied to the supervisors of the individuals thanked.

The OLAC Executive Board urged that the money raised by the Conference be deposited in the OLAC accounts as soon as possible and that the temporary accounts set up for the Conference be closed.

6. **CAPC Report**

See the CAPC meeting minutes elsewhere in this issue.

The redesign of the CAPC Web page was discussed. Lisa Bodenheimer will send out the URL of the re-designed site so that the Board members can take a vote on it via e-mail. There was also discussion of whether to have a link for "Publications" on the OLAC Website for official OLAC cataloging resources. This would make these documents easier to find than they are in the CAPC page and would also make them easier to catalog. In fact, possibly two areas are needed, one for "Publications" and one for "Working documents". Version statements are also a necessity for these materials. The CAPC Resource

Maintenance Task Force is directed to work on this. Sue Neumeister can mock up a sample page so that the Board and the members at large can comment.

7. New Business

a. *Future of the OLAC Archivist's Position*

Current OLAC Archivist, Iris Wolley, has wondered about the future utility of her position given that archivists at Mankato State University will be working on the OLAC Archive. However, the Board feels that an OLAC Archivist will still be needed to collect and organize the materials. The materials are held by the Archivist for two years and then sent to Mankato with some level of organization. A *Handbook* revision may be required to clarify the job of the Archivist, as well as the length of term that the Archivist serves.

8. Closed Session

Discussed were CAPC positions (including discussion on *Handbook* wording on qualifications for Interns and Full members), the location of the 2006 Conference, the OLAC Award, and an elections report.

9. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Weiss
OLAC Secretary

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS
MEMBERSHIP MEETING
ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE
Boston, Massachusetts
Saturday, January 15, 2005**

Minutes

1. **Call to Order, Introductions, Announcements (R. Lubas for R. Freeborn)**

Vice President/President Elect Rebecca Lubas called the meeting to order at 8:01 p.m. She introduced herself and the other OLAC Board Members present introduced themselves. *Board Members present:* Rebecca Lubas, Robert Bothmann, Amy Weiss, Cathy Gerhart, Jain Fletcher, Lisa Bodenheimer. *Ex Officio members present:* Greta de Groat, John Attig.

There were 28 attendees in total.

The location of the 2006 OLAC Conference was announced. It will be held in Tempe, Arizona. Tim Diehl of Arizona State University will act as Conference Chair.

OLAC is looking for an Outreach Coordinator. Anyone interested in volunteering should contact an OLAC Board member.

The Awards Committee has selected a winner of the Nancy Olson OLAC Award. The announcement of the winner will be made at ALA Annual in Chicago.

2. **Secretary's Report (A. Weiss)**

The minutes of the Membership Meeting held in Montréal, Canada, in October 2004 were approved.

3. **Treasurer's Report (R. Bothmann)**

Please see the full report elsewhere in this issue.

4. **Newsletter Editor's Report (J. Fletcher)**

OLAC has now printed two issues of the *Newsletter* with the cost-saving thinner paper that has reduced the costs of printing the *Newsletter* "gratifyingly". There will be an attempt to keep the *Newsletter* to around 60 pages in length. As a result, the Conference reports have been split into two parts and divided between two issues, starting with December 2004; the remainder will be printed in June 2005. All the Conference reports are available now on the OLAC Website.

Some have asked in the past why there are no photographs in the *Newsletter*. The answer is: cost.

5. **Conference Report (P. Riva for M. Richard)**

The 2004 Conference was a success, with all but one of the evaluations being resoundingly favorable about both the Conference and the programming.

6. **CAPC Report (L. Bodenheimer)**

Please see the CAPC minutes elsewhere in this issue.

7. **Reports from Liaisons**

- a. *Association of Moving Image Archivists (S. Park-Primiano)*

Please see the full report elsewhere in this issue.

- b. *Music OCLC Users Group (R. Lubas for R. Freeborn)*

Mary Huismann is the new MOUG/OLAC Liaison. She is the Music Cataloger at the University of Minnesota. She will be present at ALA Annual in Chicago.

The 2005 MOUG meeting will be held February 15-16 at the Fairmont Hotel in Vancouver, B.C.

- c. *OCLC Report (J. Weitz)*

Please see the full report elsewhere in this issue.

- d. *CC:DA Report (G. de Groat)*

Please see the full report elsewhere in this issue.

- e. *MARBI Report (J. Attig)*

Please see the full report elsewhere in this issue.

- f. *LC Report (G. Kinnaly for D. Reser)*

Gene outlined the LC report being circulated at the Conference, highlighting items of interest to OLAC, including the program for publishers to provide summary notes for children's literature, development of an "access level" standard for most electronic resources cataloged by the Library of Congress, and the project to add 053 (call number) fields to music name authorities. Gene also clarified the use of

655 fields at LC. While some catalogers are putting them in on their own initiative, there is no official implementation of 655 form/genre heading at LC.

8. **New Business**

a. *OLAC Election Report*

There is one candidate for Vice President/President Elect: Steven Miller.

There is one candidate for Treasurer: Robert Bothmann.

OLAC members will receive ballots in March or early April. There will be room for write in candidates. [After Board discussion, it was decided no ballot would be distributed if candidates run unopposed].

9. **Adjournment**

The Question and Answer Panel followed the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Weiss
OLAC Secretary

MEET THE CANDIDATES

This OLAC elections year is unusual because there is only one candidate running for each office. According to the *OLAC Handbook*, and in consultation with the Board, no ballot will be distributed, because: "If candidates run unopposed, no ballot is required" (*OLAC Handbook*, p. 4).

Fortunately, as everyone will see after reading the following statements about their experience, we have two very qualified candidates in Steve Miller and Bobby Bothmann. They will serve OLAC well in their respective positions of Vice President/President Elect and Treasurer. Congratulations to both!

I would like to thank the Elections Committee, Diane Boehr and Jan Mayo, for their efforts in recruiting and selecting the slate of candidates, a remarkably challenging task. I encourage the membership to begin thinking about candidates for Vice President/President Elect and Secretary for next year and seriously consider your own interest in running. Holding an OLAC office is a rewarding opportunity to meet other catalogers and become involved at a deeper level in national AV cataloging education and policy.

Kay G. Johnson
OLAC Elections Chair

Candidate for Vice President/President Elect

Steven J. Miller
Head, Monographs Department
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Libraries
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Background Information:

Steve Miller is the Head of the Monographs Department at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM) Libraries. He is responsible for managing monographic cataloging and acquisitions services, including planning, evaluating, adapting and documenting workflows, policies and procedures, all while supervising a staff of twelve. Prior to his current position, he had eight years of increasingly responsible experience as a professional cataloger, with a focus on electronic, music, and other non-book materials, as well as authority control, database maintenance, retrospective conversion, and integrated library system migration. Steve has an MLIS from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, an M.A. (and all-but-dissertation for Ph.D.) in Religious Studies from Marquette University, and a B.A. in English from the University of Iowa.

Statement of Interest:

I am proud to have been an OLAC member for the past ten years and I would like the

opportunity to serve this great organization further in the role of Vice President/President Elect. I have always been impressed with the expertise and commitment of OLAC members, not to mention their openness and friendliness. If elected, my primary responsibility would be to help maintain OLAC's core objectives related to the cataloging of audiovisual materials, namely, information exchange, continuing education, communication, shared practices and standards, and advocacy. In addition, I would like to explore ways in which OLAC might increase its profile nationally and internationally; encourage the development and promotion of more "best practice" cataloging guides for audiovisual resources--especially for cataloging online digital image, sound, and video files; and perhaps also to look at ways in which OLAC might play a more active role in the application of the FRBR model to electronic and audiovisual manifestations.

OLAC Activities:

- Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC), Member, 2001-present.
- CAPC Chapter 9 Task Force, Member, 2001.
- 2002 OLAC Conference, Workshop Presenter, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- CAPC Integrating Resources Task Force, Chair, 2002-2003 .
- CAPC Subcommittee on Source of Title Notes for Internet Resources, Chair, 2003-present.

Other Professional Activities:

- Wisconsin Association of Academic Librarians, Directory Committee, Member, 1996; Chair, 1997.
- Wisconsin Library Services OCLC Peer Council, Chair, 2001; Vice Chair, 2000; Past Chair, 2002.
- Program for Cooperative Cataloging, Standing Committee on Training, Task Group on Training for Integrating Resources, Chair, 2002.
- ALCTS Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group, Member, 2001- ; Vice Chair-Chair, 2005-2006.

Course and Workshop Development:

- Consultant/Primary Content Developer for OCLC e-learning course, "Cataloging Internet Resources Using MARC 21 and AACR2", 2001-present.
- Workshop Developer, PCC Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (SCCTP), "Integrating Resources Cataloging Workshop", 2002-2003.
- Course developer, ALCTS Continuing Education Implementation Group, "Rules and Tools for Cataloging Internet Resources" (first of five courses in

response to the Library of Congress "Action Plan for Bibliographic Control of Web Resources": Action Item 5.3, "Continuing Education"), 2003.

Publications:

- Forthcoming: "AACR2 and Integrating Resources", to be published in a volume of the *ALCTS Papers on Library Technical Services and Collections*, 2005.
- Transcription paper of "AACR2 and Other Metadata Standards: The Way Forward" by Ann Huthwaite, former Chair, Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR. Published in *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 36:3/4 (2003), p. 87-100.
- "Cataloging Nonprint Resources in the United States and China: A Comparative Study of Organization and Access for Selected Electronic and Audiovisual Resources", *International Cataloging and Bibliographic Control*, 26:2 (April/June 1997), p. 46-49. Based on national surveys conducted and paper written in collaboration with two colleagues.

Teaching:

- Adjunct Instructor, UWM School of Information Studies: teach 3-credit graduate course on "Metadata," 1998-present.
- SCCTP Integrating Resources Workshop: co-taught two-day workshop, Madison, Wisconsin, October 18-19, 2004; taught as one-day NASIG (North American Serials Interest Group) Preconference, June 17, 2004, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; taught as one-day ALCTS Preconference at ALA/CLA Annual Conference, June 20, 2003, Toronto, Ontario; and taught the Train the Trainer Workshop at ALA Midwinter, January 24, 2003, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- ALCTS "Rules and Tools for Cataloging Internet Resources": co-taught two-day workshop, September 13-14, 2004, Chicago, Illinois.
- "Preparing 21st Century Cataloging and Metadata Professionals: A Workshop for Educators and Trainers", sponsored by ALCTS, ALISE, LC, and OCLC: faculty member speaking on Teaching Strategies for Cataloging Courses for continuing education of working catalogers, ALA Midwinter Meeting, January 9, 2003, San Diego, California.
- ALCTS AACR2 2002 and Metadata Regional Institutes: faculty member, speaking on "Integrating Resources", November 1-2, 2002, Chicago, Illinois; November 4-5, 2002, Washington, D.C.; February 24-25, 2003, Orlando, Florida; April 4-5, 2003, San Jose, California.
- Training workshop on "Integrating Resources" given for the Program for Cooperative Cataloging annual meeting at the Library of Congress, May 2, 2002, Washington, D.C.

- Various other workshops, 1992-present.

Presentations:

- "Descriptive Metadata for Digital Images", Wisconsin Association for Academic Librarians Annual Conference co-presentation, April 22, 2004, Elkhart Lake, Wisconsin.
- ALCTS Electronic Resources Discussion Group: co-presentation on integrating resources, January 10, 2003, San Diego, California.
- "Top Trends in Technical Services", Wisconsin Library Association Annual Conference co-presentation, October 29, 2003, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- ALCTS Electronic Resources Discussion Group co-presentation: "AACR2 Revisions and Electronic Resources: Chapters 9 and 12", June 15, 2002, Atlanta, Georgia.
- ALCTS CCS Copy Cataloging Discussion Group co-presentation with fellow OLAC members Rebecca Lubas, Robert Freeborn, and Gene Kinnaly: "Revised Chapter 9-What Copy Catalogers Need to Know", ALA Midwinter, January 21, 2002, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- "Technologies for E-Learning", LITA 2001 National Forum presentation, October 13, 2001, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- Various other conference presentations, 1992-present.

Candidate For Treasurer

Bobby Bothmann

Electronic Access/Catalog Librarian

Library Services, Minnesota State University, Mankato (MSU)

Background Information:

Bobby Bothmann earned his MLIS from the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee in December 2001. Primarily he serves as Cataloger for electronic and print monographs and serials, providing leadership and technical expertise for electronic resource access. Prior to MSU Library Services, Bobby was the special formats cataloger at the University of Minnesota Libraries, Twin Cities where he was responsible for training and cataloging of cartographic materials, realia, microforms, electronic resources, sound- and videorecordings and other special format media. Bobby serves on the steering committee for MOTSE (Minnesota Opportunities for Technical Services Excellence), a program offering the library community throughout Minnesota continuing education opportunities in the form of workshops and self-assessment guides covering the basics of library technical services. He has written a workshop for

MOTSE on the *MARC21 Format for Holdings Data*, which he has taught numerous times, co-wrote a successful LSTA grant for MOTSE, and serves as the MOSTSE Webmaster. He has taught several workshops for regional library groups, including basic e-book cataloging and videocataloging. Bobby has been an active member of OLAC since the Fall of 2000. He spends his spare time playing with his two dogs, floating in a kayak, and working on a Masters degree in geography.

Statement of Interest:

Bobby has gained expertise in serving as OLAC Treasurer/Membership Coordinator and wants to continue in the position for two more years.

OLAC Activities:

- OLAC Treasurer/Membership Coordinator, 2003-2005.
- OLAC 2004, Montréal, Québec, Canada, Local Arrangements Committee, Webmaster for the Conference Website.
- OLAC 2002, Saint Paul, Minnesota, Conference Co-Chair, Member of the Planning and Local Arrangements Committees, 2001-2002.
- OLAC 2002, Saint Paul, Minnesota, Conference Treasurer, 2001-2002.
- OLAC 2000, Seattle, Washington, Poster Presenter.
- OLAC Member, 2000-
- NACO/AV Funnel, 2000-

Other Selected Activities and Scholarship:

- ALA, 2000-
- ALCTS, 2000-
- LITA, 2002-
- NASIG, 2003-
- MOTSE, 2001-
- PCC NACO Minnesota Funnel, 2002-
- Network Access & Applications Editor, *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 2005-
- Holmberg, Melissa and Robert Bothmann. 2004. "Management and Patron Usage of Electronic Journals: A Comparative Evaluation of a Fee-Based and a Free Electronic Journal Service." Submitted for publication to *College & Research Libraries*.
- Okuhara, Keiko and Robert L. Bothmann. "Who Could Ask For More? Beautiful Site, Cool Trainers, and Pleasant Trainees." *NASIG Newsletter* 19:3 (September 2004): 73.

- "E-Journal Management and Access Methods", with Melissa Holmberg. Presented at the North American Serials Interest Group Annual Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June, 2004.
 - "Survey of Trends for Catalogers of Special Formats", Research Project conducted May 2004.
 - Bothmann, Robert. "Cataloging Electronic Books." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 48:1 (2004): 12-19.
 - "Eek! It's E-Books", MINITEX Symposium, Reactor Panelist, September 14, 2000.
-

CONFERENCE REPORTS
Jan Mayo, Column Editor

**** REPORTS FROM THE ****
2005 ALA Midwinter Conference
Boston, Massachusetts

Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)
Liaison Report
submitted by John Attig
Pennsylvania State University

The Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information (MARBI) Committee and the USMARC Advisory Committee met for two sessions during the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts. The following is a brief summary of the meeting. More information is available on the MARC Advisory Committee Web page at <<http://www.loc.gov/marc/marcadvz.html>>.

Proposal No. 2005-01: Definition of Field 766 in the *MARC 21 Classification Format*

This proposal adds an additional subfield required in order to calculate numbers using some of the tables. MARBI approved the proposal.

Proposal No. 2005-02: Definition of Subfield \$y in Field 020 (International

Standard Book Number) and Field 010 (Library of Congress Control Number)

This proposal called for the definition of subfield \$y in fields 020 and 010 in order to distinguish between cancelled/invalid numbers (encoded in subfield \$z) and numbers that are valid but are either non-unique or not applicable to the resource being described.

In discussion, it was finally decided that the only distinction that needed to be made in the case of ISBNs and LCCNs was whether the number was a valid number that could be used for matching (subfield \$a) or a number that was in any way unreliable for matching (subfield \$z). MARBI defeated the proposal. Some clarification of the scope of subfield \$z will be added to the format documentation.

Proposal No. 2005-03: Definition of Subfield \$2 and Second Indicator Value 7 in Fields 866-868 (Textual Holdings) of the MARC 21 Holdings Format

This proposal calls for adding indicator value 7 and subfield \$2 to the textual holdings display fields, in order to identify the display standard used. MARBI approved the proposal.

Proposal No. 2005-04: Hierarchical Geographic Names

At previous meetings, MARBI had decided that the format should support the use of hierarchical place names as both place of publication and as subject, and that a new field (662) should be defined for the latter. The current proposal dealt with the subfield codes that should be defined for fields 662 and 752.

The discussion was inconclusive; it was very difficult to balance the needs to support particular conventions for encoding place-name hierarchies and the desire for subfields that would be generally applicable to any place-name hierarchy. It was decided to investigate further the existence and requirements of other standards, in particular the *Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names*. The saga will continue this summer at the ALA Annual Conference in Chicago.

Proposal No. 2005-05: Change of Unicode Mapping for the Extended Roman "alif" Character

This proposal corrects an earlier choice for mapping the character in question. MARBI approved the proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2005-DP01: Subject Access to Images

This discussion paper talks about the distinction between what an image is about and what is depicted in the image. MARBI had an interesting discussion. It seems clear that there is an issue here that should be explored further. The next step will be to determine the functional requirements for making this distinction in MARC records

and in MARC-based systems: searching/indexing, display of results, etc.

Other Business: MARBI received a motion from the ALCTS Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials in support of recording vernacular scripts and implementing Unicode. MARBI asked the Library of Congress for a progress report, and were informed that there should be a discussion paper or proposal dealing with some of the outstanding Unicode issues ready for discussion at the 2005 Annual Conference in Chicago. While this will not resolve all the outstanding issues, it should be a major step forward.

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

Liaison Report

submitted by Greta de Groat
Stanford University Libraries

This report covers amendments to AACR2; plans for AACR3 Part 1; CC:DA discussions and actions at ALA Midwinter in Boston.

AACR2

There is one more short amendments package planned for AACR2. The 2005 Amendments should be published this summer. They will probably contain revisions to the rules for capitalization to accommodate unusual corporate names such as "eBay" and "netLibrary", as well as revisions to the capitalization of German, removal of the Turkish word "bir" from the list of initial articles, and revisions to the definition of "colored illustrations". The proposal to revise 21.0D to allow wider inclusion of relator terms in headings has been withdrawn, to be considered in the revision of rules for access points in AACR3. This amendments package will be the last for AACR2; all efforts for the next few years will be given over to preparation of AACR3.

AACR3

The drafting of AACR3 is proceeding according to a very aggressive timetable. The draft of Part 1, "Description", was issued to CC:DA members for review in late December, and has received a limited and controlled distribution outside of CC:DA. Comments regarding the draft were due to CC:DA by February 11 for synthesis into the CC:DA report, due March 28. In the meantime, the JSC and editor Tom Delsey will be drafting Part 2 on choice of access points, which should be sent to the JSC to review this May. There will be a Part 3 on form of access points (including authority control), plus an overhaul of the introduction and general principles. The aim is to send the completed AACR3 to the publishers by the end of 2006 with publication

scheduled for summer of 2007. The rationale for the AACR3 is simplification and consistency, as well as to encourage its use as a content standard for metadata schema, and to incorporate FRBR terminology and concepts.

There is an excellent background on the draft of Part 1 at <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair22.pdf>. To summarize the major changes from AACR3:

Part 1 is divided into 3 sections: "General rules", "Supplementary rules applicable to specific type of content" and "Supplementary rules applicable to specific types of media". The "General rules" section is further divided into: "General rules for description", "Resources issued in successive parts" (i.e. serials and monographic sets issued over time) and "Integrating resources". Most rules have been moved into the "General rules" section, with references to the other sections when applicable. A section has been added on determining the focus of the description (roughly, mode of issuance), which guides the choice of chief source of information. This and the prescribed sources of information have been incorporated into the "General rules" section. The GMD has been divided into two parts, with a term indicating content and a term indicating medium. The rules are designed to apply equally to published or unpublished materials; rules from Ch. 4 that were inconsistent with general practice were deleted. The current practice of recording "[S.l. : s.n]" for unknown place and publisher is changed in favor of simply not recording this information if unknown. Area 5 has been renamed from "Physical description" to "Technical description". The SMDs have been realigned to provide a more consistent division between physical units and either presentation units or logical aggregations of content. Aside from these changes, most of the content of the draft is similar or the same as AACR2, but rearranged into this general-content-carrier format.

CC:DA Actions and Discussions, January 2005

Three of the task forces preparing reports on the AACR3 Part 1 draft met in a lively all day meeting on the Friday before the formal CC:DA meeting. Discussion included concerns that the two part GMD and SMD schemas were unwieldy, inconsistent and confusing, and that the generalization of choice of chief source and prescribed sources would result in unintended title changes for serials and more bracketing for non-book materials. It was noted that description of digital media was still unclear.

Discussion of AACR3 provided the main order of business for the formal JSC meetings. Jennifer Bowen, ALA representative to the JSC, reported on the recent JSC meeting and gave background information on AACR3. Points were synthesized from the Friday meeting and discussion continued along similar lines. CC:DA will

recommend that all digital sound and video recording media be treated as digital materials. Further concerns aired were that the accelerated production schedule of AACR3 was preventing a necessary re-thinking of the rules and therefore represented an opportunity lost. Some were interested in a "data dictionary" approach, others warned that library administrators would be disappointed that AACR3 would result in no significant change from current practice. A "Group of Five" produced a written statement and submitted it to CC:DA pointing out unresolved issues, such as multiple versions, acknowledgment of the automated environment, consistency with other metadata standards, more rigorous application of FRBR, and acknowledgment of the need to manage record sets and existing records.

Other CC:DA activities included reports on:

- Recent Library of Congress Activities, by Barbara Tillett.
- ALA Publishing Services, by Donald Chatham.
- MARBI, by Everett Allgood.
- NISO Standards Update, by Betty Landesman.
- Program Planning for Annual (one on AACR3 and one on Cataloging Cultural objects).
- CC:DA's Website, by Webmaster John Attig.
- The Task Force to Investigate CC:DA's Web Presence, by Mary Larsgaard.

Also heard was a proposal to correct the example in AACR2 12.3G1, "Change in numbering". It was agreed that the example is in error and it will be forwarded to the JSC Examples Task Force.

**Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA)
Cataloging Committee
Liaison Report**
submitted by Sueyoung Park-Primiano
New York University Libraries

AMIA's Annual Conference was successfully held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, from November 10-13, 2004. In addition to the many workshops, sessions, and committee meetings, the highlight of the Conference was a special screening of the newly restored *The King and I*, one of the only two films made in CinemaScope 55, in its original aspect ratio on a big screen.

For AMIA's Cataloging Committee, the torch has been passed on to Nancy Dosch,

Archivist at the National Library of Medicine, to preside as Chair for the next two years.

The Cataloging Committee's Standards Review Subcommittee, under the leadership of Sarah Ziebell Mann, has been very active in 2004. Reports were submitted to the Library of Congress CPSO relating to drafts 2 and 3 of the revisions to LCRI 25.5B. Comments related to direct-to-video releases and the qualifier "(Motion picture)", distinctions in the publication/distribution statement, the unreliability of GMDs to collocate works, and the need for a uniform title main entry. A third report was submitted to the Society of American Archivists' Description Section on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DAC5)*.

As mentioned in past reports, members of the Cataloging Committee continued to contribute to the ongoing development of the "MIC: Moving Image Collections" Website, which is now live at <<http://mic.imtc.gatech.edu>>. The Website has been greatly expanded and improved since this past August and September, so all are strongly encouraged to take a look, review it, and provide feedback. Comments and questions are most welcome and desired; they should be sent to <mic@loc.gov>.

Technical developments and specifications continue to be documented on the Project Website: <<http://gondolin.rutgers.edu/MIC/>>. MIC is built on a portal structure to customize information for its diverse audiences. "Choose a portal" to find resources and perform more complex searches for moving images ("Collections Explore") and organizations ("Archive Explore").

For the OLAC community, MIC's Education and Outreach Committee will be of particular interest. Under the leadership of Andrea Leigh, the Education and Outreach Committee's Cataloging and Metadata Portal has also recently been updated with links to resources on standards and tools, authority control, systems and utilities, and training and education. The site can be found at:

<http://mic.imtc.gatech.edu/catalogers_portal/cat_index.htm>. Again, all are encouraged to visit the site and give feedback. The catalogers in the AMIA community would especially value input from the OLAC community. If anyone is interested in contributing, we are still recruiting volunteers, so please contact me in person or by e-mail or Andrea Leigh by e-mail at <aleigh@ucla.edu>.

For more information on the Conference, Committee projects, or general questions relating to AMIA, please feel free to contact me by e-mail <syp3@nyu.edu> and/or visit the AMIA Website <<http://www.amianet.org>>. For more information about MIC, please contact the Project Director, Jane Johnson <jdj@ucla.edu>, and/or visit the MIC Project Website <<http://gondolin.rutgers.edu/MIC/>>.

NEWS FROM OCLC
Compiled for OLAC by Jay Weitz
For the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting
Boston, Massachusetts
January 2005

OCLC Cataloging and Resource Sharing Migration Dates

OCLC will retire Passport for Cataloging on May 1, 2005. Please note the following important dates:

Cataloging

- 1st Quarter 2005: Connexion Client version 1.30 released, including truncated lists and CJK.
- 2nd Quarter 2005: Connexion Client version 1.40 released, including Arabic.
- May 1, 2005: OCLC will retire Passport for Cataloging and all users of OCLC Passport for Cataloging must migrate either to the Connexion Browser or the Connexion Client.
- July 1, 2005: OCLC will retire CatME, CJK, and Arabic, and all users must migrate to Connexion.

Union Listing

- August/September 2005: OCLC will retire Passport for Union Listing and Connexion will support detailed holding (LDR) maintenance. OCLC will release more details over the next few months.

Information to help migrate to Connexion is available on the Connexion migration page at <<http://www.oclc.org/connexion/migrating/default.htm>>.

Connexion Browser Enhancements - November 2004

Among the enhancements to the Connexion Browser installed in November 2004 were:

- Search WorldCat using "true" keyword searching where multiple terms can be entered with a single index label, including enhanced and new indexes.
- Browse WorldCat using several new browse indexes.
- View search results with the truncated list similar to Passport and CatME.
- View a pop-up list of all indexed fields for the displayed match in the truncated view.

See Technical Bulletin 251 at <http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/251/default.htm> for more information.

Connexion Client 1.20 Now Available

A new version of the Connexion Client, the Windows-based interface to OCLC's flagship cataloging service, is ready for download from the OCLC Website. Among the enhancements version 1.20 includes:

- *NACO functionality*: Create and add new authority records, lock and replace existing records, and submit records for review by Library of Congress staff or peer reviewers.
- *Batch processing*: Enter search keys offline and process in batch mode to efficiently save records from WorldCat. Mark actions on multiple records and process all at once, including actions such as Update Holdings, Export, and Label Print.
- *Local files*: Set up individual or shared local save and constant data files that are stored on your workstation or a local network drive. Use local files when logged on or working offline.

For additional details on the Connexion Client 1.20 enhancements, see <http://www.oclc.org/connexion/interface/Client/enhancements/recent.htm>.

Holdings Experts Help OCLC Implement MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data

OCLC is in the process of implementing the *MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data* (MFHD), and invited holdings experts Frieda Rosenberg and Diane Hillmann to OCLC to advise OCLC staff on interpretations of the standard and on common usage of the standard to accelerate OCLC's implementation. WorldCat currently contains local holdings data for more libraries than any other single repository in the world. Those holdings support resource-sharing activities, measurably reducing the cost of

resource sharing for participating libraries. When these holdings are converted to the MFHD format, they will allow further reduction in resource-sharing costs through automatic routing of requests based on detailed information in the local data records.

Ms. Rosenberg is Head of Serials Cataloging, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She has worked with serials since 1979 and with the MFHD format since 1993. She is a co-author of the CONSER SCCTP "Serial Holdings Workshop" and is currently completing a "NASIG Guide to Holdings" for the NASIG Website. Ms. Hillmann is the Director of Library Services and Operations, National Science Digital Library. She is the co-editor of the recently published, *Metadata in Practice* and was a member of MARBI for 10 years, specializing in the Holdings and Authorities formats. She is also a current member of the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative Advisory and Usage Boards, and is co-chair of the DCMI Education Working Group.

As part of the implementation, OCLC will convert the existing repository of WorldCat Local Data Records (LDRs) to the MFHD format, and will add local holdings maintenance functionality to the Connexion Browser. In June 2005, libraries will be able to use the Connexion Browser to maintain local holdings in WorldCat in the MFHD format and OCLC will retire Passport for Union Listing. Libraries will also be able to use OCLC's Local Data Record Updating batch processing service (LDRUS) to maintain local holdings in WorldCat. Local holdings will continue to display in FirstSearch databases and in OCLC Resource Sharing. To support library migration to local holdings maintenance in the Connexion Browser and to the MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data, OCLC is working with the OCLC regional service providers to create an online tutorial plus training materials for the regional service providers to use in training library staff. OCLC will continue to release more details about OCLC's implementation of MFHD and the Union List service migration as they become available.

OLAC NACO FUNNEL PROJECT REPORT

Ann Caldwell
NACO-AV Coordinator

Once again, the OLAC NACO Funnel Project has had a productive year. For the fiscal year, October 1, 2003-September 30, 2004 (the government fiscal year), the fourteen

active participants added 1,857 new names, 13 new series, changed 237 existing names and added 3 new subjects. The statistics are available online at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/stats/total04.pdf>. Although that represents a decrease from the previous year, the fact is that some libraries were experiencing system migrations and other internal changes. This prevented them from devoting as much time as they were accustomed to for NACO and other activities. It can be hoped that the coming year will see an increase in numbers.

You may wonder why the series contributions are relatively low. In order to be a series contributor, you must qualify in two areas. First, you must be an independent NACO contributor. This means that once you have had NACO training and have been contributing headings for a while, your reviewer (in the case of the OLAC Funnel, probably me) has determined that your headings are of a high enough quality that you no longer need to be revised. Second, you need to take separate series training offered by the Library of Congress. This is a week-long session that covers all aspects of series headings and numbering; it is an excellent course. Following that training, you are again under revision for series headings. Once you are off revision for series headings, you may add headings for the Funnel Project. I would like to see more of the Project's independent contributors take this training so that we can get some of these pesky AV series under control.

Although there was not a NACO training session at the OLAC Conference in Montréal, I hope to be able to schedule training before the next OLAC Biennial Conference. In addition, as I have mentioned before, if there are any regional groups that are interested in participating in the Funnel Project, please contact me. The Project has its own page on the OLAC Website. If you would like additional information about the Project, please contact me (E_Caldwell@brown.edu) or 410-863-3716) or look at the Web page at <http://www.olacinc.org/naco-av/>.

NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor

UPDATED CONNEXION BROWSER *TUTORIAL*

The Connexion Browser *Tutorial* has been updated to include the revised module on

searching. This module now introduces the search enhancements that were released in November 2004. It covers Boolean searching, keyword and phrase searching, toggling between truncated and brief lists, and much more.

This section of the *Tutorial* will require Macromedia Flash Player to run. It is best viewed in 1024x768 screen resolution.

Enjoy!

[originally posted by:]

Linda Gabel

OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

6565 Frantz Rd.

Dublin, OH 43017

phone: (800) 848-5878, x6374

FAX: (614) 718-7196

e-mail: gabell@oclc.org

SURA-ViDe 2005 DIGITAL VIDEO CONFERENCE

Registration is now open for the SURA-ViDe 2005 Digital Video Conference. This Conference has become a widely recognized event for learning about development and deployment, showcasing the growing promise of digital video technology. This year's Conference will take place March 28-31 at the Georgia Tech Hotel and Conference Center in Atlanta, Georgia.

The Conference begins on Monday afternoon, March 28, at 2 p.m. at the nearby Georgia Public Broadcasting building. On Monday evening there will be a reception at the hotel and the keynote address by Dr. Elizabeth Daley, Executive Director of University of Southern California's Annenberg Center for Communication, and an expert on multimedia literacy. Two days of presentations and breakout sessions follow, covering a wide range of topics: instructional and research applications, usage in K-12, international initiatives, new technologies such as H.350, multicasting, data collaboration, managing digital collections, and HDTV over IP.

Post-conference workshops, with separate registration fees, are being offered Thursday, March 31st, providing an opportunity to extend the value of your time and travel.

- "Testing Your Bandwidth: Hands-On How-To for Big Video" - Explore the latest advances in interactive and on-demand applications, with an opportunity to gain hands-on experience with digital video software and hardware configurations. The session will include an overview of multicast, DVTS, DV/IP, HD/IP, costs, bandwidth requirements, and associated production considerations such as lighting and audio. (\$150)
- "Moving Image Metadata" - Learn the basics of providing metadata for moving image resources and collections. Topics include the new metadata system MPEG-7, PB-Core (Corporation for Public Broadcasting's enhancement of Dublin Core), the native data element set of the Moving Image Collections Project, METS (Metadata Encoding & Transmission Standard), and digital rights management. The session will feature the Moving Image Collections Project, a joint project of the Association of Moving Image Archivists and the Library of Congress, and created and maintained at Rutgers University, Georgia Tech, and University of Washington. (\$150)
- "Internet2 Commons Site Coordinator Training" - Become certified as an approved Site Coordinator for your institution to participate in the Internet2 Commons. (\$200)

For more information and to register: <<http://www.vide.net/conferences/spr2005>>.

[adapted from a message originally posted by:]

Dan Kniesner

Oregon Health & Science University Library

3181 S.W. Sam Jackson Park Road

Portland Oregon 97239

e-mail: <kniesner@ohsu.edu>

phone: (503) 494-3216

MACHINE-GENERATED CONTENTS NOTES

A Library of Congress CDS Technical Notice

On February 1, 2005, the Library of Congress began enriching bibliographic records with scanned table of contents (TOC) data in field 505, adding information previously available only via 856 links. The 505 data is generated from the TOC information and supplied by computer program. The field will be preceded by the supplied label, "Machine-generated contents note:". The 505 indicators for these machine-generated notes are set to "8" (No display constant generated) and "blank" (Basic; single

occurrence of subfield \$a).

Since the scanned TOCs come in a wide variety of formats and structures, some errors are to be expected in the placement and configuration of the 505 textual strings. ISBD punctuation for delineation of topics ("space hyphen hyphen space") is inserted after each line break within the TOC. Chapter and page numbers appear as captured from the scanned TOC images. The 505 data will not undergo review for punctuation. The following is a sample 505:

505 8 \$a Machine-generated contents note: PREFACE 1. Probability -- 1.1 Introduction 1 -- 1.2 Algebra of Sets 2 -- 1.3 Properties of Functions 5 -- 1.4 Matrix Algebra 13 -- 1.5 Three Approaches 16 -- 1.6 Conditional Probability and Independence of Events 39 -- 1.7 Geometric Probability 48 -- 1.8 Miscellaneous Examples 54 -- Exercises 73 2. Univariate Distribution -- 2.1 Random Variable 80 -- 2.2 Expectation, Variance and Moments 89 -- 2.3 Moment Generating Function 104 -- 2.4 Characteristic Function and Cumulants 106 -- 2.5 Some Standard Discrete Distributions 100 -- 2.6 Some Standard Continuous distributions 128 -- 2.7 Transformation of Variables 143 -- 2.8 Miscellaneous Examples 153 -- Exercises 175 3. Bivariate Distribution -- 3.1 Joint, Marginal and Conditional Distributions 188 -- 3.2 Moments, Conditional Moments 200 -- 3.3 Correlation and Regression 209 -- 3.4 Transformation of Variables 215 -- 3.5 Bivariate Normal Distribution 228 -- 3.6 Bivariate Dirichlet Distribution 235 -- 3.7 Miscellaneous Examples
LC records with existing 856 links to the TOC texts will be batch processed, modified and redistributed on a daily basis until all of the approximately 60,000 records containing links from the 856 to LC's Web-based dTOC (digital table of contents) records are enhanced. The 856 links to the dTOCs will remain in the records.

This effort should make TOC information more readily available within MARC records and increase access to this valuable data. Questions or comments regarding the scope or data content of these records may be directed to:

John Byrum

Regional and Cooperative Cataloging Division

Library of Congress

Washington, DC 20540-4380

e-mail: <jbyr@loc.gov>

phone: (202) 707-5196

As with all contents notes, these 505 fields will be available for editing by any library with a full-level (or higher) cataloging authorization. For anyone editing a machine-generated 505 field to conform to standard AACR2 practice, please change the indicator to "0" and remove the label, "Machine-generated contents note:" at the beginning of the field. See Technical Bulletin 246 for further information on "Database Enrichments":

<<http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/246/>>.

[*adapted from a message originally posted for the Library of Congress by:*]

Brenda Block

OCLC Quality Control

e-mail: <blockb@oclc.org>

UPDATED AUTHORITY TOOLS

It is my pleasure to announce the new and improved *Authority Tools for Audiovisual and Music Catalogers: An Annotated List of Useful Resources* for 2005. Please visit this resource at <<http://www.olacinc.org/capc/authtools.html>>.

This resource compiles descriptions of pertinent information sources related to doing authority work for headings on audiovisual and music bibliographic records. All of these descriptions are written by librarians who use these sources. Annually we accept new additions and edit existing entries to keep them current. At the beginning of 2004 we added a counter and recorded 6,925 hits!

New for this year:

- *The Da Capo Catalog of Classical Music Compositions* by Jerzy Chwialkowski
- *Mulheres compositoras* by Nilcéa Cleide da Silva Baroncelli
- *Enciclopédia da música brasileira : popular, erudita e folclórica*. [the 4-volume version]
- *The Encyclopedia of British Film* edited by Brian McFarlane ; associate editor, Anthony Slide
- *Quinlan's Film Directors* by David Quinlan

I want to thank all contributors and to welcome one new contributor this year: James L. Soe Nyun. I also want to thank Sue Neumeister, our tireless Webmaster.

[*adapted from a message originally posted by:*]

Robert Bratton

Cataloging Librarian

University of Maryland Libraries

ARLIS/NA ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The 33rd Annual Conference of the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) will be held on April 1-6, 2005 at Houston, Texas. The Conference will bring together over half the membership of 1,200 art and architecture librarians, artists, educators, publishers, and visual-resource professionals, representing universities, museums, art schools, and public libraries. Joining them will be scores of exhibitors, booksellers, technology vendors, guest speakers, and local professors, librarians, and curators.

The theme of the 2005 Conference is: "Beyond Borders: Collaborative and Explorative Ventures in Arts Information". The choice of city allows the program to draw on talent and expertise for sessions on Pre-Columbian and Latin American art, twentieth century architecture, collectors and the city's own great museums. The plenary address will be delivered by Fred Heath (Director of the University of Texas Libraries) and John Lienhard of the University of Houston, (creator of "The Engines of Our Ingenuity"). The Conference program, along with guides to registration, hotel, and transportation, can be found at the Conference Website <<http://www.arlis-tmx.org/arlisna2005/>>.

For additional information, please contact:

ARLIS/NA Headquarters
329 March Road, Suite 232
Ottawa, Ontario K2K 2E1, Canada
phone: (800) 817-0621
e-mail: <arlisna@igs.net>

ARSC 2005 ANNUAL CONFERENCE

ARSC proudly announces its 39th Annual Conference, to be held in the "Live Music Capital of the World", Austin, Texas, March 30-April 2, 2005. Hosted by the University of Texas at Austin, in collaboration with ARSC's Texas Chapter, this Conference promises to be lively, enjoyable, and memorable--one you will not want to miss!

For further details about the Conference, visit
<<http://arsc-audio.org/conference2005.html>>.

ARSC is dedicated to the preservation and study of sound recordings--in all genres of

music and speech, in all formats, and from all periods. The upcoming Conference will reflect this focus. Among the vast array of talks, topics will include:

- music producers and sellers in Austin
- music history and collections in Austin and Texas
- recording technology
- classical, folk, country and gospel music
- copyright issues
- digital preservation

Other exciting activities are being scheduled. The Conference will include tours of the Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library and the Austin City Limits studio at KLRU.

As a bonus, Conference registrants are likely to find many treasures at the Austin Record Convention. Advertised to be the largest sale of recorded music in the United States, the Convention will take place at the Crockett Event Center, during the weekend of the Conference.

For questions, please contact Kurt Nauck, ARSC Conference Manager, at <nauck@78rpm.com>.

[message originally posted by:]
Anna-Maria Manuel
ARSC Outreach Committee Chair

PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP OF THE ARSC CONFERENCE

There will be a pre-conference Workshop held on March 30, 2005, the day before the Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC) Annual Conference in Austin, Texas, March 31-April 2, 2005. The Workshop is jointly presented by the Association for Recorded Sound Collections, Education and Training Committee and the Kilgarlin Center for Preservation of the Cultural Record, School of Information, University of Texas at Austin. The Workshop is called, "The Assessment, Preservation, and Access of Audio Collections in the Digital Age: an Archival Case Study", and will be held on Wednesday, March 30, 2005, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:45 p.m.

Detailed information and the registration form can be found at <<http://arsc-audio.org/workshop05.html>>.

[*adapted from a message originally posted by:*]

Nancy J. Seeger

Senior Sound Recordings Cataloger

Library of Congress

Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division

Recorded Sound Section

Washington, DC 20540-4698

phone: (202) 707-5494

FAX: 202-707-8464

e-mail: <nsee@loc.gov>

BOOK REVIEWS

Vicki Toy-Smith, Column Editor

Cataloger's Judgment:

***Music Cataloging Questions and Answers
from the Music OCLC Users Group Newsletter***

By Jay Weitz

Arranged and edited by Matthew Sheehy

Jay Weitz is the Music OCLC Users Group's (MOUG) OCLC liaison; he is a specialist on music who has written a music cataloging "question and answer" column in MOUG's *Newsletter* since May 1989. This book is a compilation of those columns, edited and arranged by Matthew Sheehy, the Assistant Head of Access/Collection Services and the Performing Arts Bibliographer at Rutgers. Most of the questions and answers that have appeared in Jay's column are included. They are arranged by topic, each topic starting with the most recent question and answer first, then going back through time. The earlier questions were included to provide a historical perspective. Because of this approach, questions and answers contain references to outdated technology, superseded documentation, old rules, dead URLs, old forms of headings and guidelines that were promised but never appeared. In some cases, Jay has added corrective or clarifying notes; also, in cases where errors in answers were corrected in later issues of the *Newsletter*, the correction is here found directly after the error.

The title came about because Jay believes that the idea of cataloger's judgment

"...highlights the notion that cataloging is an art rather than a science. It emphasizes that real-world instances, in spite of our never-ending efforts to codify practices, will always defy those efforts. The world of stuff to catalog is so vast, so slippery, so surprising, that individual judgment will always enter into our decisions. And it suggests that catalogers are not the mindless drudges that many non-catalogers imagine, but instead are thoughtful judges concerning matters of description and access"(p. xix-xx).

The topics covered are, "When to input a new record", "Sound recordings", "Main and added entries", "Titles", "Description and related fields", "Notes", "Subject access", "Numbers", "Fixed fields", and "OCLC services". There is a 2-page bibliography of works cited in the text and an explanatory section, "Acronyms, Abbreviations and Other Cryptic Designations". There are also three indexes: 1) a topical index by question number; 2) an AACR2 rule, LCRI, and MCD (*Music Cataloging Decisions*) index by question number; and 3) an OCLC-MARC field index by question number.

It is refreshing that Jay never answers questions in a preachy way. In fact, his answers are clear, practical, and concise, while his sense of humor is evident throughout. This book will be a very helpful reference for music catalogers and the indexes will make the book even more useful for them. The book is hardbound, with a sturdy binding that will stand up to lots of use and it has a generous enough gutter that it could be rebound. Everyone who catalogs music should have access to a copy.

Published in 2004 by: Libraries Unlimited, Westport, Conn. (xxvii, 265 p.) ISBN: 1-59158-052-8 (\$ 45). LC: 2003058907.

Reviewed by:
Katherine L. Rankin
Special Formats Catalog Librarian
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Describing Archives: A Content Standard
Society of American Archivists

Archivists have reason to celebrate the long-awaited publication of *Describing Archives: A Content Standard*. Devised and compiled initially by members of the American and Canadian archival community, this volume is intended to help archivists describe their collections at all levels, creating consistent points of access or

index terms that will assist researchers in finding the materials they seek.

Describing Archives: A Content Standard, also referred to as DACS, replaces Steve Hensen's 1989 second edition compilation, *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts* (APPM). Hensen's work has long been the place for archivists to look for guidance at how to formulate their catalog record entries for creator names, titles, etc., since the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*, 2nd ed., rev. (AACR2) are so sketchy in this area. DACS builds on Hensen's work and carries the concepts into the electronic environment within which most archivists currently work, including the Web, XML, and Encoded Archival Description (EAD). DACS not only addresses questions on how best to formulate a catalog record, but also describes the various levels within the finding aids for archival and manuscript collections. Moreover, DACS includes data elements from the two international archival conventions of the *General International Standard Archival Description* (ISAD(G)) and *International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families* (ISAAR(CPF)).

DACS is divided into three main parts: "Describing Archival Materials", "Describing Creators" and "Forms of Names". The data elements described within the chapters in each of the first two sections usually include a note of "Purpose and Scope", "Exclusions", "Sources of Information" and "General Rules". Best of all are the multiple examples illustrating the points. (The compilers point out that the examples given in Part 1 are meant to be illustrative and not prescriptive.) Even better, additional examples are also given for the first two parts showing the encoding necessary for both EAD and MARC 21, two widely used descriptive standards.

In addition to the three basic sections, there are a number of very useful chapters. One is a short introduction that may help archivists--especially those new to this area of work--to learn about basic archival principles. The compilers have also included a succinct overview about archival description. Four appendices include a glossary of terms, a bibliography of companion standards, and crosswalks. The crosswalks include tables showing the relationship between APPM to DACS, DACS to EAD and MARC, and DACS to the two international standards ISAD(G) and ISAAR(CPF). The final appendix includes examples of short finding aids, at all levels of description, fully encoded in EAD and MARC. The examples are drawn from an assortment of personal papers, family papers, organizational records and collections, helping to demonstrate more fully how the data elements may be utilized.

While it does not cover specific types of media already addressed by other library and archival standards, *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* meets many of the needs of the archival community. Congratulations are in order to the many thoughtful people

who worked on this volume by incorporating their insights and combined knowledge into meeting the daily needs of today's archivist. Highly recommended.

Published in 2004 by: Society of American Archivists, Chicago. (269 pages). ISBN 1-931666-08-3. \$49.00 (SAA members \$35.00)

Reviewed by:
Jacquelyn K. Sundstrand
Manuscript and Archives Librarian
Library Special Collections Department
University of Nevada, Reno

UCLA Film and Television Archive Cataloging Procedure Manual

By the UCLA Film and Television Archive

When Martha Yee announced the availability of the UCLA Film and Television Archive Cataloging Procedure Manual (CPM) on the Archive's Website, I leapt at the opportunity to review it because I knew I would personally profit in the process. As a nationally recognized scholar in the field of moving image cataloging, Martha Yee requires no introduction to catalogers. Moreover, under Yee's leadership as the Cataloging Supervisor, the UCLA Film and Television Archive has historically set standards for and actively promoted the cataloging of archival moving images for the last decade or so. Last modified on November 2004, the CPM continues to fulfill this tradition with an exemplary documentation of procedures.

In her announcement of September 22, 2004, on the OLAC List, Yee explained: "We use a combination of *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*, 2nd ed., rev. (AACR2R) and *Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual* (AMIM2) rules, *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (LCSH) and *Moving Image Materials: Genre Terms* (MIM) genre and form terms in MARC 21 format records on Voyager. The procedure manual indicates which rules we are following in any given situation and contains many examples. In addition, the CPM contains local rules for uniform titles, supplied titles, local subject headings and genre/form terms, and terms for use in the physical description of archival moving image materials, with an extensive glossary of the latter, including suggested MARC 21 coding. The glossary in particular might be useful to institutions that deal on an occasional basis with film or video".

Indeed, Section 26.5, "UCLA Film and Television Archive Terminology, Definitions, and Abbreviations List", is an excellent reference source for understanding the various

film, video, and sound formats and processes, as well as for identifying proper MARC 21 coding. Quite often, definitions will be broader than those found in AMIM2 and include anecdotal history lessons. For example, the definition of frames per second (fps) cites a letter to *American Cinematographer* from Kevin Brownlow:

"16 [fps] was standard in 1914 ...but it was changing as early as 1915. The speed was rendered obsolete by the habit of 'racing', projectionists speeding up the film so they could get home early...As a result, cameramen were obliged to increase their speed of cranking, and by 1920 many films were cranked at 20 fps. By the mid-Twenties, the average speed for American films was 22 fps, and they tended to be projected slightly faster. Western Electric engineers, checking the average speed of Broadway theaters, discovered that they were running between 22-26 fps, and this was one reason 24 fps became the standard for sound. I admit that the pioneer cameramen I interviewed insisted that they cranked at 16 fps throughout the silent era. But having had to speed-correct scores of silent features for television, I can confidently state that most of them, apart from D.W. Griffith's early features, were photographed significantly faster than 16 fps."

In another example, "Busch" is defined as a "...color process used ca. 1928. 'Additive two-color. The negative is produced by running 35 mm. film horizontally through the camera. Twin lenses form a pair of images upon a single frame area; image pairs are superimposed when projected'--Trimble. (007 byte 13 (Refined categories of color), code c); use in the 903 \$b subfield".

Given these examples from the glossary, one might suppose that the manual is not appropriate for libraries with a more commonplace video or sound collection. However, detailed definitions of terms encountered in general collections, such as Dolby, Dolby-A, DTS, monaural, NTSC, etc., are also included, and they should benefit those new to or inexperienced with cataloging audio-visual collections. Beyond the glossary, sections on holdings fields provide additional definitions and clear instructions of MARC 21 coding to further aid in cataloging video and sound recordings.

There are sections, of course, that are more suited to archival collections with unique holdings or apply only to UCLA Archive. One should not forget that the CPM is designed for a specific archive with a targeted audience that does no shared cataloging. For example, sections on inventory inputting, preservation notes, local policy, collection-specific procedure (e.g., "Hearst collection"), and Voyager-specific notation can be ignored unless someone is trying to set up procedures for an archival collection in a similar cataloging environment. When the Archive's procedures diverge from AACR2R and AMIM2 rules, the manual clearly identifies that, as mentioned by Yee above. In Section 5.1.1, the CPM instructs not to follow "...the option of adding general material designators (GMDs) to the description", and

explains that this "...local policy is due to our practice of treating videocassettes as copies of films when necessary". On the other hand, each section provides cross-references to AACR2 and AMIM2, as well as LCRI, when applied and appropriate to serve as further clarification and documentation on procedure decisions.

To improve access to its collection, the Archive also maintains local subject, genre and form headings (Section 6.4.2), such as "Christmas programming", "Academy Award films", and "Student films and video". It also performs double-indexing of proper names (Section 6.4.4.1) to "...allow patrons to conduct a single broad search on a topic such as Wrestlers, without needing a list of every person who ever wrestled". Although the Archive establishes local access headings, it also uses NAF records. More importantly, the Archive is an AV Funnel NACO member and Section 8 provides step-by-step instructions on authority work from searching to creating authority files with a helpful list of abbreviations for commonly cited reference works.

Another extremely helpful section is for the body of description. For those who wrestle on occasion with cataloging television programs or serials, Section 5 provides explicit instructions and detailed examples to address individual episodes, parts, or excerpts. Within this section, instructions on notes fields include a table with explanations and examples of the 5xx MARC 21 fields that serve as an ideal template for creating concise and informative notes, albeit most of the examples are of the Archive's holdings.

There are other sections and procedures that I found extremely helpful, but lest I lose readers with my rambling analysis, permit me to conclude here by simply recommending the CPM as a fine example of cataloging documentation and training tool for both libraries and archives and catalogers and archivists. If I were asked how to improve this resource, my greedy reply would be to add a search feature to afford better retrieval of all of the desired information by a casual user.

Published in 2004- by: UCLA Film and Television Archive, Los Angeles, California.
Available on the Internet at:
<<http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/CPM%20Voyager/CPMV00TofC.html>>

Reviewed by:
Sueyoung Park-Primiano
Special Formats Cataloger
New York University

OLAC CATALOGER'S JUDGMENT

Jay Weitz

Captioning and Subtitling

Question: In an effort to give added access to our patrons with hearing disabilities, our institution would like to use the subject heading "Video recordings for the hearing impaired" for videos and DVDs with subtitles, as well as those identified as closed-captioned or signed. In our cataloging records, the language of the subtitling is identified in the 546 field. Would this be an appropriate application of the subject heading? It does seem as if some definitions of "captioning" are evolving. The SDH (Subtitles for deaf and hard-of-hearing) are described as a subtitling mechanism of DVDs for captioning. Maybe a broader interpretation is needed for using this heading.

Answer: Indicating the languages of subtitles and closed captions in field 546 is a commendable practice. But when applying the "Video recordings for the hearing impaired" subject heading (sh87000886), catalogers need to keep in mind the differing technologies and intentions of subtitling and captioning. For instance, by definition, closed captioning has traditionally been accessible only with special equipment or the like, although that has changed considerably in recent years. Again traditionally, subtitles have been accessible without special equipment. With the advent of DVDs, however, one often has the ability to display a huge array of subtitling and/or captioning possibilities.

People also need to keep in mind that the original intentions of closed captioning were quite different from those of subtitling. Captioning now has a wider audience than originally intended, including TV watchers in noisy public places, such as restaurants and bars. Even so, captioning and subtitling remain different. Captions generally seem to be made on the assumption that the person reading them cannot hear the audio, so other audio cues (such as indications of laughter, applause or other non-textual data) are routinely included. Captions also render a *verbatim* (or close) transcription of every word, using rolling text bars. In contrast, subtitles rarely include any indication of non-textual data, on the apparent assumption that the listener/reader is actually able

to hear such things as laughter or applause in context. Although practice varies from translator to translator, subtitles often do not render every single word, but instead provide a condensed essence. Occasionally, some passages are even allowed to go untranslated because the thrust of the action may be obvious or translation would be superfluous (for instance, shouts of a character's name or "yes"/"no" sorts of exchanges that are clear without translation). One could go on, but you probably get the picture, so to speak.

Field 041 for Subtitles

Question: For the 041 field, the MARC 21 example shows first indicator "0" for not translated and subfield \$b for language codes of subtitled languages. Since it can be argued that translation is involved, what is the reasoning on first indicator choice? Is the answer the same for films that are dubbed, resulting in a more comprehensive presentation of the additional language(s)? Is there any correct use for a film with subtitles to be coded 041 1 subfield \$b?

Answer: With respect to subtitles, the second example in the current MARC 21 (page dated October 2003) under field 041 subfield \$b, where it specifically refers to audiovisual materials, the first indicator is coded "1" for "Item is or includes a translation". This would suggest that subtitles are considered translations in MARC terms. Dubbed films would likewise be considered translations. MARC currently insists, however, that "...subfield \$b contains the language code(s) of overprinted titles (subtitles) when they differ from the language of the sound track", thereby excluding language codes already found in subfield \$a.

Notes and Added Entries for Cast

Question: I have a few questions concerning a motion film or video production's cast and how they are credited in 5xx fields. AACR2R Rule 7.7B6 states: "List featured players, performers, narrators, and/or presenters". In OCLC's *Bibliographic Format and Standards* (BFAS), under 511 first indicator "1" (Cast), there is a note with the names of 6 actors as well as their role-names. Does this mean that the "Rule of three" in AACR2R (Rule 1.1F5) does *not* apply to a 511 note, meaning, the rule only applies to the statement of responsibility (245 subfield \$c) and to no other field? If yes, would this mean that all actors and their role names would have to be listed in 511 and therefore in individual 700s? If not, and the "Rule of three" *does* apply, should only the first actor be named as his/her name appears on the film's or video's

credit list? If this is up to cataloger discretion, how does one decide whom to include?

Answer: AACR2 Rule 1.1F5 is specifically about the statement of responsibility (field 245 subfield \$c), as is the corresponding Rule 7.1F in the "Motion Pictures and Videorecordings" chapter. Rule 7.7B6, which covers the extended statements of responsibility for films and videos (including cast and credits), does not explicitly include the so-called "Rule of three". My guess has always been that this is so because, in contrast to *most* (though obviously not all) books, the intellectual responsibility for which tends to be fairly concentrated, the intellectual responsibility for film is usually (though again, not always) widely diffuse over a range of disciplines. Until November 2000, when Rule 7.1F1 was slightly re-worded to incorporate what was intended to be additional guidance on the matter, there were LC Rule Interpretations for both 7.1F and 7.7B6 that offered more detail on whom to include and whom not to include (again, with no mention of the "Rule of three"). Although these two LCRI's have been cancelled, their spirits live on in practice. Additionally, there remains some significant guidance in the surviving LCRI 21.29D, which covers not the statements of responsibility, *per se*, but the added entries that may result from those statements. The section of this LCRI concerning "Audiovisual Materials", especially Point 3, can be read as solid suggestions for who should be included among the cast:

"3) Make added entries for all featured players, performers, and narrators with the following exceptions: ...

b) If there are many players (actors, actresses, etc.), make added entries under the headings for those that are given prominence in the chief source of information. If that cannot be used as a criterion, make added entries under the headings for each if there are no more than three."

Individual circumstances will vary, but generally speaking, use such hints as the credits printed on a label or container (and, of course, the credits appearing within the film itself) to limit the cast listing to those most prominently named. Their roles will sometimes be useful to include parenthetically (filmed plays or operas in which characters' names may be well known, for instance), but that, too, will depend on the circumstances. My interpretation of the above LCRI excerpt is that, when the criterion of prominence is used, the "Rule of three" does not apply. The order of names should follow their order of prominence in the source, if that applies. All of this is subject to cataloger's judgment, which no one should hesitate to exercise. It is also interesting to note that neither the Paris Principles nor the ISBDs have the "Rule of three" that exists in AACR2. Furthermore, in my understanding of the direction toward AACR3, the "Rule of three" is unlikely to survive in its present form, possibly being made optional or disappearing all together.

Notes and Added Entries for Crew

Question: Here are a few questions concerning the crew of a motion film or video production. AACR2R Rule 7.7B6 states: "List persons (other than the cast) who have contributed to the artistic and/or technical production of a motion picture or videorecording and who are not named in the statement of responsibility ... Do not include the names of assistants, associates, etc., or any other persons making only a minor contribution". In BFAS, the 508 field definition describes the crew as "... individuals or organizations (other than members of a cast) who have participated in the creative and/or production of the work". When does a crew member "contribute to the artistic and/or technical" part of a production and when not? When is a crew member's contribution "major" and when is it "minor"? On what grounds does the cataloger decide who in the crew was should included or excluded from the 508 field?

Answer: Much of my previous answer regarding cast also applies to the other credits. Once again, LCRI 21.29D offers considerable indirect guidance. The intention of the rules was never to denigrate the contributions of any of the people who participate in the creation of a film, but instead to keep record size, cataloging costs and the necessity for authority work, etc. within reasonable limits. It was also intended to try to anticipate which types of film artists and creators were most likely to be sought by the largest number of users. Directors, producers, and screenwriters (listed in LCRI 21.29D, and in the cancelled LCRI 7.1F1, but unfortunately omitted from the list of examples in the re-written rule proper), considered to have generally the greatest overall responsibility, are usually placed in the statement of responsibility (field 245 subfield \$c) and are traced. Depending upon the individual film being cataloged, it may be appropriate to list other contributors there as well (for instance, the composer and librettist for a filmed opera, the chief animator for an animated film, and so on). The cancelled LCRI 7.7B6 specifically listed such roles as photographers, camerapersons, cinematographers, animators, film editors, narrators, voices, and composers, among others, as appropriate to include in credits fields. Again, judgment has to be exercised; guidance may be gleaned from the main credits of the film itself, from the label, and from the container.

The Trouble with Television Series

Question: In your video workshop, you suggest putting a television program title in the 4xx/8xx as a series if the publisher treats it as a video publisher series; however, if it is not a publisher series, to put it as a title added entry in the 730 field. So if there is

a video with "A&E Biography" on the container, would it be correct to put that in the 4xx/8xx instead of the 730? On the other hand, if it *only* appeared on the screen as part of the original program, would it be put into the 730? (There are two records for this TV series in the authority file: one treats it as a publisher series and the other as a uniform title).

Answer: It is often difficult to make the distinction between the title of a television series (be it broadcast or cable TV) and the title of a videorecording publisher's series. Moreover, the subtleties of such distinctions are not necessarily on the minds of videorecording publishers when they put together such videos and design their labels, packaging, or promotional materials. This is all further complicated in instances where similarly-named and possibly (but not necessarily) related entities (such as "Arts and Entertainment Network" [nr92019436] and "A & E Home Video (Firm)" [no95029668]) are involved. As if that were not confusing enough, catalogers can be thrown off by the unfortunate use of the term "series", both in the formal cataloging sense ("a group of separate items related to one another by the fact that each item bears, in addition to its own title proper, a collective title applying to the group as a whole"--AACR2, Appendix D) and in the vernacular sense of "(a) a daily or weekly program with the same cast and format and a continuing story, as a soap opera, situation comedy, or drama; (b) a number of related programs having the same theme, cast, or format" (*Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, 2nd ed.). All that being said, let me try to address your questions.

If at all possible, try to determine how the video publisher is presenting the information about the television series name. Is it saying simply that "this program was originally presented as part of such-and-such television series on so-and-so network"? Or is it indicating that "we are repackaging the programs originally presented as part of such-and-such television series as our own series of videorecordings with the overall title of X"? By all means, the authority file should be used for guidance, but it is important to be sure about the identity of the authority record that is found. In almost every case of a videorecording publication of a television program, there should be a related-entity added entry (field 730) for the uniform title of that television program (as an example: "Biography (Television program)" [no97026146], which is a *related title entry*, not a series in the AACR2 sense). In addition, if it can be determined that the videorecording publisher is presenting some form of the title of the television series as a videorecording publisher's series, a 4xx/8xx combination would also be appropriate (see for example: "Biography (A & E Home Video (Firm))" [no97030434], which is a *series* added entry in the AACR2 sense).

A Computer-Oriented Multimedia "Thing"

Question: Within the CD-ROM entitled, *The Religious Landscape*, there are many different pieces. Some are textual, but there are also photographs, sound tracks, video clips, and other media included. Would this be considered a computer-oriented multimedia "thing"? Should it be cataloged on a computer file workform?

Answer: First, consider the various components of the CD-ROM together and see if any particular component medium (text, sound, video, still photo, etc.) either predominates or can somehow be construed as the "main" content to which everything else might be considered subordinate. From your brief description, it does not sound that way. If you agree, then it makes sense to regard it as a Type "m" computer file. It would most likely be coded File "m" for "combination" or as "i" for "interactive" if that is more appropriate.

CD and DVD: Two Sides of the Same Disc

Question: I am cataloging my first music CD with the CD on one side and a DVD on the other side (somewhat like vinyl records with two sides). Complicating matters, the record in OCLC does not even mention the DVD part. This leads to a couple of questions. How should the 300 be recorded, since it is only one disc, but two-sided? It seems to me that "1 sound disc" does not represent it accurately. However, adding a subfield \$e for 1 DVD does not seem the correct way to treat the DVD aspect, either, because that solution would make it appear as if there were *two* discs. What to do?

Answer: Yes, I have heard that some of these discs are called "Dual discs". This is one of those issues on which the AV and music communities will eventually need to come to some sort of consensus. Until that time, however, here are my suggestions on how to treat these. The decision must be made, case-by-case, as to which one is the predominant medium; that decision will dictate the choice of "Type Code", GMD, and physical description. If the item in hand is primarily a sound recording, describe it as such, with the various other aspects outlined in notes, 006s, and 007s, as appropriate. On the other hand, if it can be determined that it is primarily a DVD, describe it that way, with the sound recording aspects in notes, and so on. If the item itself is described in some helpful way, a quoted note may also be useful. If the DVD side has both DVD-Audio and DVD-Video, describe that side as such. You are correct that treating the subordinate medium as accompanying material in field 300 subfield \$e does not work, because that misleadingly implies two separate discs.

Definition of "Feature Film"

Question: We would be interested in your definition of "feature film".

Answer: Here is the definition from *Archival Moving Image Materials* (2nd ed.): "A moving image work that is at least 40 minutes long. Historically, a feature was a theatrically released fiction film. In its broadest current definition, this term includes fiction and nonfiction works that are released theatrically, directly to video, or made-for-television". The scope note in the authority record for the LC Subject Heading "Feature films" (sh85047538) says: "Here are entered individual full-length fiction films with a running time of 40 minutes or more". LC's online *Moving Image Genre-form Guide* <<http://www.loc.gov/rr/mopic/migform.html#Feature>> has the definition: "Work, usually originally released theatrically or direct to video, with an original length of at least forty minutes (or four or more 35 mm. reels)". The earlier (1988) print first edition of that tool had some additional detail, which also appears in a note in the aforementioned authority record: "Use for films which consist of 4,000 or more feet of 35 mm. film, or 1,600 or more feet of 16 mm. film, i.e. with a running time of 40 min. or more".

Directors of Theatrical Films

Question: According to LCRI 21.29D, added entries for directors, etc. do not have to be made if there is an added entry for a production company, unless the person is the director of a theatrical film. What is your understanding of a "theatrical film"? Is it a film of a theatrical production, for instance, a film of a performed play of Hamlet? Or is it any film made for a movie theatre, such as Peter Jackson's *Lord of the Rings*? If it is the latter, what about movies made for TV? Obviously, no matter what the rules may say, an added entry for a famous director could be made, per cataloger's judgment or institutional practice. Nonetheless, the real question is: should an added entry for a director of a movie always be made--or not?

Answer: Many of the rules and rule interpretations regarding the cataloging of moving images remain in the mindset of the days before the widespread distribution (via videotape and videodisc) of what are loosely termed "theatrical films". That was back in the time when the vast majority of films that libraries collected and cataloged tended to be instructional materials and the like. Back then, a major identifying aspect of many such instructional materials (filmstrips, slides, films) was the production

company (names such as Schloot, Educational Audio Visual, and Eye Gate House come to mind), and any individuals credited with producing, writing, and directing were usually anonymous in-house employees of these companies. Within that context, the restriction about generally not making added entries for directors, producers, writers, etc., when there is an added entry for a production company, makes sense. As to "theatrical film", the only definition that I find at hand is from the *Random House Unabridged*, which distinguishes these films "made for exhibition in theaters" from those made for television. However, I do not believe that this is the distinction the RI is trying to make. It might be more fruitful to refer back to the previous answer about the definition of "feature films". The intention of the RI, at least as I interpret it, is to distinguish broadly "fiction and nonfiction works that are released theatrically, directly to video, or made-for-television" from specialized, instructional, and other similar sorts of films not intended for a mass audience. A "theatrical film" would certainly not be limited to filmed plays, and in today's context, I would not even limit it to films that end up in your local cineplex. So, in sum, my advice would be three-fold: 1) to include personal name added entries for directors, producers, and writers for most of those broadly-defined "feature films"; 2) not to include such entries, in most cases, for those specialized films that have a tracing for an overall production company; and 3) to use good (cataloger's) judgment (erring on the side of including added entries) for those films about which you cannot decide.

MCPS

Question: What is the meaning of the designation "MCPS" that is found on some recordings?

Answer: "MCPS" is Britain's Mechanical-Copyright Protection Society <<http://www.mcps.co.uk/>>, which appears to be an equivalent of ASCAP or BMI. A brief description from its Website seems to confirm this: "The MCPS collects and distributes 'mechanical' royalties generated from the recording of music onto many different formats. This income is distributed to their members - writers and publishers of music".

Coding Dates for Sound Recording Compilations

Question: I was asked to clarify what to do in the case of a sound recording that includes several previously released works. In this case, it is a compilation of original

soundtracks from several different film scores. Each of the selections has a different original release date and has not appeared in this particular manifestation before. My initial thought was to go with DtSt "p" (the date of distribution/release/issue and the date of production/recording differ by at least one year, even though there are several dates), but then I wondered if "m" (multiple dates) is more accurate. It seems that this scenario is occurring quite a lot lately, with all manner of compilations being issued. They are technically not really reissues since they have not necessarily occurred in these particular compilations before. Am I making this more complicated than it is?

Answer: Some of the (justifiable) confusion may arise from the differences in practice between visual materials and sound recordings. In a sound recording case such as this, the Date 1 would be the date of the compilation in hand, which may be the latest of multiple phonogram copyright ("p") dates, or may be an explicitly stated "p" date for the compilation. When there are multiple dates of earlier releases, the earliest of those dates is Date 2. For sound recordings, this is considered a reissue of previously released material (even though it may never have been released in this particular configuration), and so the DtSt would be coded "r". If, instead of previous release dates, there are only dates of the original sound capture, the earliest of those would be used as Date 2 and the DtSt would be coded "p". Should the compilation happen to have both the dates of original capture and the dates of previous release, the Type of Date hierarchy prefers code "r" (and so the earliest of the previous release dates in Date 2).