

# **OLAC NEWSLETTER**

## **Volume 15, Number 3**

### **September 1995**

---

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR

FROM THE PRESIDENT

FROM THE TREASURER

1995 OLAC AWARD IS PRESENTED TO LAUREL JIZBA

CALLING FOR NOMINATIONS FOR THE 1996 OLAC AWARD

CANDIDATES NEEDED FOR OLAC OFFICES

CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE CALL FOR VOLUNTEERS

CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

OLAC BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

OLAC BOARD MEETING MINUTES

CONFERENCE REPORTS

- ISBD(CF) Review Group
- Report from ALCTS AV
- Report From MARBI
- Report From CC:DA
- Report From AMIA
- Report From MOUG

NEWS FROM RLIN

NEWS FROM OCLC

OCLC USERS COUNCIL REPORT

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Scanning and Invalidating Obsolete Elements in the OCLC Online Union Catalog

- Opening for MOUG Liaison
- OCLC and Internet Resources

## BOOK REVIEWS

- A Library Manager's Guide to the Physical Processing of Nonprint Materials

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

---

### **FROM THE EDITOR** **Sue Neumeister**

As promised in the June Newsletter, a review of the OLAC sponsored book *A Library Manager's Guide to the Physical Processing of Nonprint Materials* by Karen Driessen and Sheila Smyth is in this issue. There are also reports from the ALA Annual Conference in Chicago and a progress report on the OCLC Project "Building a Catalog of Internet Resources."

If you would like to become more involved with OLAC, this is the issue that gives you all the information on how to nominate someone or volunteer yourself. OLAC is looking for members to (1) run for office (Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary), (2) volunteer to be a member of the Cataloging Policy Committee, or (3) volunteer to be the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) Liaison.

Unfortunately, with all the important information needed in this issue, the Executive Board members' and OLAC liaisons' addresses could not be included as usual in this September issue. However, they will be in the December issue. In the meantime, if you need to contact one of the Board members or liaisons, you can look them up on the new OLAC home page. Each section still needs to be expanded, but take a look and see what you would like to have included, deleted, or changed. This is your opportunity to give me comments, criticisms, suggestions on how to make this a better site.

Currently on the home page there are: \* Book reviews \* Conference reports and information \* OLAC Handbook and Bylaws \* Membership form \* Newsletters \* The Rationale for Cataloging Nonprint Collections. The Conference section includes a list of past conferences as well as current information on the 1996 OLAC Conference in Denton, Texas. The Handbook, Conference reports, and Newsletter issues are all hypertexted. Only 1995 issues of the OLAC Newsletter are loaded and HTMLed, but I hope to include previous issues soon.

The URL for the OLAC home page is: <http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/cts/olac>

**DEADLINE FOR DECEMBER ISSUE: November 1, 1995**

Return to Table of Contents

---

## **FROM THE PRESIDENT**

### **Heidi Hutchinson**

Whew! There went another whirlwind ALA Conference! And an exciting one for OLAC: decisions were made, new projects launched, a birthday celebrated, a member honored, ...

But let me back up a minute and introduce myself. I'm Heidi Hutchinson, from the University of California at Riverside, and I'm exceptionally pleased and proud to be serving as your OLAC President for 1995/96. As the new OLAC Executive Board begins its work, I want to extend a special "thank you" to Karen Driessen, our Past Past President, who is leaving the Board after three years, the same three years that I have served as Secretary and Vice President. I will miss her sorely at the Board meetings.

At the same time, I am pleased to welcome our newest Board member, Diane Boehr, CAPC Chair. Richard Harwood (former CAPC Chair) has shifted responsibilities and continues on the Board, now as Vice President/President-Elect. Richard has been on the Board since June of 1992, having been the first CAPC Chair to become a Board member following the 1992 Bylaws change making that position an OLAC officer. Also continuing on the Board are Sue Neumeister, our Newsletter Editor-in-Chief, who also began her position in 1992, Johanne LaGrange, OLAC Treasurer, who has just been elected to her second two-year term, Cathy Gerhart, OLAC Secretary, and last, but by no means least, Mary Konkel. Mary's leadership as OLAC President this past year has been an inspiration to me, and I will be counting on her wise counsel in the coming year. Yes, there's a lot to be said for continuity!

And speaking of continuity, OLAC celebrated its 15th birthday after the Saturday night Business meeting at Chicago's Hyatt Regency. There was much merriment, the largest birthday cakes I've ever seen, emblazoned with our snazzy OLAC logo, gallons of punch, bunches of colorful balloons, and photographs of every conceivable group: current Board, past leaders, OLAC Award winners (for the archives, Verna!). For this we gladly sacrificed our beloved Question and Answer session, but never fear, it will be back at the next OLAC Business meeting in San Antonio.

We were pleased and excited to be able to present the 1995 OLAC Award to Laurel Jizba, a founding OLAC member and past Chair, who has worked so hard recently on behalf of the Interactive Multimedia Cataloging Guidelines, including the ALCTS Preconference so many of us attended on Friday. Laurel was (almost) speechless. You can find the text of Laurel's award on p. 6 in this issue.

And how's this for a graceful segue, the membership was very evident at the aforementioned ALCTS Preconference on Cataloging Interactive Multimedia: most of the participants, instructors and teaching assistants were OLAC members! OLAC's financial support for the preconference was also appreciated.

OLAC is working on some exciting new projects this year. We have a new brochure and a home page on the World Wide Web. Kudos go to Sue Neumeister for developing both of those. Watch this space (and the rest of the Newsletter) for progress reports on the NACO funnel project for AV materials, to be spearheaded by OLAC CAPC, the 1996 OLAC Conference in Denton, Texas, and the development of guidelines for both an OLAC research grant and an OLAC Conference scholarship. It promises to be a busy year!

Return to Table of Contents

---

## FROM THE TREASURER

### Johanne LaGrange

Reporting period: April 1, 1995 through June 30, 1995

Membership: 620

Institutional - 265

Personal - 355

ACCOUNT BALANCE: March 31, 1995

Merrill Lynch WCMA Account	32,195.40
----------------------------	-----------

#### INCOME

Back Issues	3.50
Dividends--WCMA Account	438.93
Memberships	525.00
Royalties	
Cataloging Unpublished Nonprint ...	245.37
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>1,212.80</b>

#### EXPENSES

<b>Banking Fees</b>	
Activity Fee	2.55
Labels, Envelopes & Supplies	104.93
OLAC Birthday Party	992.53
OLAC Newsletter	
(v.15, no.1)	290.56
(v.15, no.2)	995.71
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,286.27</b>
Postage/Permit	103.36
Stipends	50.00
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>(2,539.64)</b>

ACCOUNT BALANCE: June 30, 1995

Merrill Lynch WCMA Account	30,868.56
----------------------------	-----------

## **1995 OLAC AWARD IS PRESENTED TO LAUREL JIZBA**

The OnLine Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. presented the 1995 OLAC Annual Award to Laurel Jizba for her numerous contributions to nonprint materials cataloging. The award was presented by Mary Konkell at the OLAC Business meeting held in Chicago in June. The text of the award follows:

*OnLine Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. presents the OLAC Annual Award to*

***Laurel Jizba***

*For her sustained and dedicated service to OLAC, serving on its first Executive Board and as its second Chair*

*For being a workshop presenter at OLAC conferences and sharing her expertise throughout the years as a panelist during question and answer sessions*

*For her consistent advocacy and lobbying efforts at the national level for audiovisual and computer file standards*

*For her wise guidance as Chair of the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access Interactive Multimedia Guidelines Review Task Force*

*For her energy and persistence in creating the interactive multimedia guidelines and her determination to provide hands-on cataloging experiences with these materials*

*For her innovative efforts in advancing the cataloging of scientific specimens*

*For her constant willingness to take on new challenges in the cataloging of audiovisual materials*

*On this day, Saturday, the twenty-fourth of June, nineteen hundred and ninety-five.*

---

## **THANKS FROM LAUREL**

I was truly surprised, and extremely delighted, to have received the OLAC Annual Award. I believe OLAC is the best medium-sized librarians' association ever, which makes this award very special. Of course, I have a biased viewpoint! Over the last fifteen years I have been one among many of OLAC's active, dedicated members working many hours to further the understanding and development of audiovisual and computer file cataloging standards. I am grateful for opportunities to interact with many talented colleagues and friends along the way. I

find it amazing that this award is not for one, but for multiple past projects, unearthed like buried gems from the sedimentary layers of my life, then cleaned, polished, and displayed in brass.

So it is with sincere gratitude that I extend my deepest appreciation and thanks for this OLAC Annual Award to the 1995 Executive Board and Awards Committee. I am also very grateful for a decade of generous support and encouragement given to me by the Michigan State University Libraries' administration and staff. The beautifully worded and designed brass plaque now has a very special place on my office wall, a lovely reminder of missions accomplished.

-- Laurel Jizba

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

## **CALLING FOR NOMINATIONS FOR THE 1996 OLAC AWARD**

The OLAC Award recognizes and honors a librarian who has made significant contributions to the advancement and understanding of audiovisual cataloging. The OLAC Award Committee is now accepting nominations for the 1996 award. The Committee (Mary Konkel, Richard Harwood, Virginia Berringer) will select a recipient based on nominations received, subject to approval by the OLAC Executive Board at the 1996 ALA Midwinter meeting in San Antonio.

Eligibility for nomination is as follows:

1. Nominees may be OLAC members, but membership in the organization is not a requirement.
2. The nomination must be accompanied by a statement that provides supporting evidence of the nominee's qualifications.
3. The nomination and statement must be postmarked no later than November 15, 1995, and must be received by the Award Committee Chair no later than December 1, 1995.
4. Nominees shall have made contributions to audiovisual cataloging by:
  1. Furthering the goals of standardization of AV and/or computer file cataloging, including MARC coding and tagging;
  2. Interpreting AV and/or computer file cataloging rules and developing policies on organization for these materials on the national and/or international levels;
  3. Promoting the understanding of AV and/or computer file cataloging, coding and data exchange by professionals unfamiliar with these materials and processes.

The award recipient will receive an engraved plaque containing an inscription recognizing his/her special contributions to the field.

Send all nominations by **November 15, 1995** (faxes and E-mail MUST be followed by a postmarked letter) to:

**Mary S. Konkel**  
**Chair, OLAC Award Committee**  
**Bierce Library 176A**  
**University of Akron**  
**Akron, OH 44325-1712**

**FAX: (216) 972-6383 E-mail: marykonkel@uakron.edu**

**Previous OLAC AWARD recipients:** Laurel Jizba, Ann Sandberg-Fox, Glenn Patton, Catherine Leonardi, Richard Thaxter, Sheila Intner, and Verna Urbanski. Nancy Olson received a "Founder's Award" in 1986.

Return to Table of Contents

---

## **CANDIDATES NEEDED FOR OLAC OFFICES**

Nominations are being sought for the offices of Vice President/President Elect of OLAC and for OLAC Secretary. Those interested in learning about the organization from the inside are asked to send a letter indicating which office they would like to run for. Nominations will also be accepted from the floor during the OLAC Business meeting at ALA Midwinter in San Antonio.

A Vice President/President-Elect is elected annually and serves a one-year term as Vice President, followed by one year as President and then a year as Immediate Past President. S/he performs all duties delegated by the President and presides at meetings when the President cannot attend. The Vice President/President-Elect must attend all Business meetings while in office or provide a suitable substitute at least two weeks before the meeting takes place.

The Secretary serves a two-year term, the election to be held in years alternating with that of the office of Treasurer. The next Secretary will serve from summer 1996 to summer 1998. The Secretary attends all Business meetings and must meet the same attendance requirements as the Vice President/President-Elect. The Secretary is responsible for preparation of official minutes of all Business, Board and/or special meetings of OLAC, to be published in a timely manner in the OLAC Newsletter, as well as reported as needed at the semi-annual OLAC Business meetings. The Secretary also handles any official OLAC correspondence at the direction of the President or the Executive Board and maintains the OLAC Handbook.

Members of the Executive Board receive a \$100 stipend for attending OLAC Business meetings during ALA conferences. If you wish to volunteer to run for either of these positions, please submit a brief description of your qualifications and professional activities to be printed with the ballot. If you wish to nominate another OLAC member,

please be sure that person is willing to serve. Submit this information by **January 2, 1996** to:

**Karen C. Driessen**  
**Chair, OLAC Nominating Committee**  
**Mansfield Library Instructional Media Services**  
**University of Montana**  
**Missoula, MT 59812**

**FAX: (406) 243-4067 E-mail: karend@selway.umt.edu**

Return to Table of Contents

---

### **CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE CALL FOR VOLUNTEERS**

The Executive Board of OLAC is looking for volunteers to fill upcoming openings on the OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee. Three positions will be opening this year, as well as an internship.

CAPC represents the "concerns of audiovisual catalogers in matters relating to the formation, interpretation, and implementation of national and international cataloging standards and related matters." Members serve a two-year term, interns serve a one-year term and are non-voting participants.

Candidates should have three years of current experience cataloging AV materials or equivalent experience. Additionally, candidates should interact regularly with online cataloging systems or have demonstrable knowledge of such systems. Most CAPC business is conducted during ALA Midwinter meetings and Annual conferences. Candidates for appointment to CAPC must be willing to commit time and funds as necessary to attend these meetings.

Appointments are made by the President of OLAC, following the consultation and review of applications by the current Executive Board. New members and interns will be appointed at the January Executive Board meeting and notified immediately by the President of OLAC. Newly appointed members and interns will receive all CAPC mailings from that point forward. Although the terms for new CAPC members and interns do not begin until immediately after the ALA Annual Conference, they should expect to attend the ALA Annual CAPC meeting and may volunteer for, or be assigned to, projects for the following six-month period.

Interns report directly to the CAPC Chair and may be assigned special duties or projects by the Chair. Interns who have served for one year may reapply for a second one-year term, but may serve no more than two consecutive one-year terms as an intern. Members whose CAPC terms are expiring may reapply for membership.

If you are a member of OLAC and are interested in serving on CAPC, submit a recent resume and a cover letter which addresses your qualifications by **November 1, 1995** to:

**Diane Boehr, Chair  
Costabile Associates  
4800 Montgomery Lane  
Suite 1050  
Bethesda, MD 20814**

**CAPC MEMBERS:** Diane Boehr (Chair), Susan Bailey, Virginia Berringer, Ann Caldwell, Mary Beth Fecko, Marlyn Hackett, and Nancy Rodich-Hodges.

Return to Table of Contents

---

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)  
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)  
ALA ANNUAL MEETING  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
June 23, 1995**

**Minutes**

The meeting was called to order by Richard Harwood, CAPC Chair at 8:01 p.m.

Members present: Richard Harwood, Chair, Diane Boehr, Susan Bailey, Lowell Ashley, Brian McCafferty, Nancy Rodich-Hodges, Virginia Berringer.

Liaisons: John Attig (MARBI Liaison), Pat Thompson (CC:DA Audience Observer), Harriet Harrison (Library of Congress contact), Eric Childress (ALCTS AV contact)

Guests: 31 other guests were present

1. Members and guests introduced themselves.
2. The minutes of the February 3, 1995 meeting as published in the *OLAC Newsletter* 15 (2) were approved with one correction. Nancy Rodich-Hodges did not attend the Philadelphia meeting.
3. Old Business
  1. OLAC/CAPC/NACO

R. Harwood began the discussion of the NACO funnel project which OLAC/CAPC is investigating. He introduced Sherman Clarke from Amon Carter Museum and Ann Dellaporta from the Library of Congress who were asked to talk about how funnel projects work. A. Dellaporta spoke briefly about the benefits of setting up a funnel project and how successful they have been. A funnel project lets the Library of Congress communicate with one person who then communicates with a larger

group. In the past, funnels have been organized based on subject or type of library.

S. Clarke spoke briefly about the funnel project that has been set up for art libraries with him as the coordinator. The Art Funnel Project is comprised of about a dozen libraries cataloging in the art field. He expressed the satisfaction that comes from contributing these records and adding to already existing records. The mechanics of contributing were reviewed and the mechanism for setting up the Art Funnel Project was explained. How the individual projects are set up is up to the coordinator and the participants.

Ann Caldwell spoke about the NACO Music Project and explained how it works differently from the Art Funnel Project. There is a need in these projects to have institutional buy-in so that the catalogers are supported in terms of time and money. With participation, each institution receives a NACO handbook which was recently written by Amy Mcoll.

Ann Caldwell announced that her institution, Brown University, was willing to support her as coordinator for the Media Funnel Project through OLAC. At the meeting there were seven people interested in participating that were not NACO participants. R. Harwood indicated that an article about this new project would be written for the Newsletter. The Board will discuss further with A. Caldwell the logistics of setting up the funnel.

## 2. Audience Characteristics Subcommittee Update

R. Harwood distributed a revised charge for this Subcommittee. Mary Beth Fecko has agreed to chair the Subcommittee and an additional consultant, Meredith Horan, has been included. The goal is for a discussion paper at the 1996 ALA Midwinter meeting.

## 4. New Business

### 1. MARBI Proposals/Discussion Papers

John Attig began by summarizing some of the issues from the Philadelphia meeting. The 655/755 proposal was discussed and will be on the table for a vote at MARBI at this Conference. It should have no trouble passing this time.

The proposal for marking reproduction fields is back in much the same form as the proposal discussed at Philadelphia. At that time CAPC was concerned about requiring everyone to code these linking fields even if they were not using them. This remains a concern of CAPC so it will be relayed in the MARBI discussion.

There will be a couple items having to do with the 856 field. One proposal will add it to the classification format and one discussion paper looks at adding a \$I for the Uniform Resource Location (URL) in the linking fields (76X-78X)

MARBI is beginning to talk about bringing the Canadian MARC and the UK MARC into closer alignment. This would allow easier exchange of records and less duplicate development work by each country.

Also, MARBI will be looking at defining some core elements of metadata which is machine-readable data about machine-readable information. Two discussion papers will be used to look at the issues and what might be recommended to the developers of this data. One issue will be what to do with the data.

Proposal 95-9, Encoding of Digital Maps in the USMARC Bibliographic Format, will be the big issue of concern to CAPC on the agenda. J. Attig explained that the main intent of this proposal is to change the type code of digitally encoded maps from "m" computer file to "e" maps. J. Attig pointed out that even after format integration a choice will still need to be made between map and computer file. If this proposal passes, it would set a precedent for the future since this could be done for any digitally encoded material. This would treat computer files more like microforms. In the case of this proposal, only one particular user group is being looked at, geographers. A broader issue is how the type code will effect the general material designation (GMD). This proposal never appeared as a discussion paper so it has not had the broad discussion it might have had. R. Harwood agreed with J. Attig that looking at how this change would effect other formats would be very beneficial and has strong reservations about this proposal.

## 2. Uniform Titles for Videorecordings (from ALCTS AV)

Martha Yee reported on a task force of ALCTS AV that is looking at the rule interpretation that limits the use of uniform titles in film cataloging. Many titles of films duplicate other works and should get uniform titles. This task force will be contacting the Library of Congress in the future but would like comments from CAPC by September 1. This group is looking at general video cataloging not archival cataloging. Harriet Harrison from Library of Congress didn't think there would be any problem making this change.

## 3. Defining MARC Field 650 Second Indicator for Sears Headings

Virginia Berringer reported on a discussion that occurred at the Cataloging of Children's Materials meeting at ALA in Philadelphia. They are

interested in pursuing a 2nd indicator value in the 6XX for the Sears subject heading. It is defined in OCLC but not in USMARC.

#### 4. NLM Audiovisual Cataloging Policy Changes

Diane Boehr reported on changes being made at NLM in regards to NACO participation. In order to streamline and be more productive, NLM will cease contributing authority records through NACO for their media cataloging. D. Boehr was wondering if OLAC/CAPC could write a letter to NLM encouraging them to change this decision since it is an important contribution they make to the community. It was decided that such a letter should be written and that the OLAC Board should be the one to write it.

#### 5. CC:DA Draft Charge on Music Moving Image Material Entry

Eric Childress led a discussion of the charge being proposed to CC:DA for a task group to look at main entry for music videos. The Music Library Association has been discussing this issue for some time and has brought it to CC:DA in order to ask for clarification. M. Yee pointed out that there are fundamental problems with the way works to be performed are treated in AACR2R. The rules do not address many of the issues that are common with mixed authorship of this kind. Often, there are different communities that view different portions of the work as more important. CAPC liked the idea of looking a little more broadly at this issue but had no concrete reply to make. They are interested in participating in the discussion. It was noted that this issue was not one that was spoken of in the AACR2000 talks.

#### 6. Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)

E. Childress will be chairing the development of the PCC core record for AV materials (AACR2R Chapter 7 and 8). He will be contacting the various groups of people that should be involved and hopes to have a draft by January 1996. Joan Schuitema will be the liaison from PCC to the group.

#### 5. Announcements

Jennifer Bowen announced that the video cataloging guidelines that the MLA Task Force has been working on will be issued in the MLA Technical Report series.

R. Harwood recognized the outgoing members of CAPC, Lowell Ashley, Diane Boehr, and Brian McCafferty and thanked them for their service. He introduced the new CAPC members, Ann Caldwell, Mary Beth Fecko, Marlyn Hackett and the new Chair, Diane Boehr. The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathy Gerhart  
OLAC Secretary

Return to Table of Contents

---

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)  
BUSINESS MEETING  
ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS**

**June 24, 1995**

**Minutes**

1. Call to Order, Introduction of Officers, Liaisons, Observers, and Announcements.

The Business meeting was called to order by OLAC President Mary Konkel at 8:09 p.m. Officers were introduced: Heidi Hutchinson (Vice President/President-Elect), Johanne LaGrange (Treasurer), Cathy Gerhart (Secretary), Sue Neumeister (Newsletter Editor), Richard Harwood, CAPC Chair, and Karen Driessen (Past President).

M. Konkel announced that the OLAC archives are being organized. Verna Urbanski is housing the archives and she has been working with an archivist to put them in order and put in place mechanisms to archive material in the future.

M. Konkel read the list of past presidents and asked those attending to stand. They were, in order of their service: Nancy Olson, Laurel Jizba, Sheila Intner, Katha Massey, Richard Thaxter, James Wallace, Glenn Patton, Verna Urbanski, Dorian Martyn Bollinger, Bo-Gay Tong Salvador, Sheila Smyth, Karen Driessen.

M. Konkel reported on the OCLC Users Council meeting. See full report on p. 40.

M. Konkel explained more about the process of organizing the OLAC archives. There will be three phases. The first phase is complete, and entailed organizing the existing materials. The second phase entailed organizing and integrating Verna Urbanski's papers into the archives. The last phase will be sending out a call to former members for contributions to the archives and the integration of any submissions into the existing material. The archives are now in good order, so contact V. Urbanski if you have a need to use it.

The OLAC sponsored publication *A Library Manager's Guide to the Physical Processing of Nonprint Materials* by Karen Driessen and Sheila Smyth is now published and available for purchase. See p. 47 for a review.

2. Secretary's Report (C. Gerhart)

The minutes of the Business meeting of February 4, 1995 (ALA Midwinter Conference) were approved as published in the June 1995 *OLAC Newsletter*.

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

H. Hutchinson reported on the progress being made on the OLAC membership directory. Data input is now complete and final editing and formatting is going on.

4. Treasurer's Report (J. LaGrange)

J. LaGrange gave an interim report current as of May 31, 1995. There are 620 members currently in OLAC. We started with a balance of \$32,195 in March. We had income of \$1,067 and expenses of \$473 with an ending balance of \$32,789. Plans are being made to develop ways to use our accumulated wealth in useful ways. Members will hear more about these plans in the next year. One plan is a scholarship for OLAC members to attend OLAC conferences and another is to give research grants.

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

S. Neumeister reported that two Newsletters have been sent out since ALA Midwinter. She announced that Bobby Ferguson will be taking over the indexing of the *OLAC Newsletter*. Cathy Leonardi was thanked for all her hard work as the OLAC indexer over the years. Featured in the next Newsletter will be a review of K. Driessen and S. Smyth's new book. The deadline for the September issue is August 1st. Also, OLAC now has a Web page which is very much under construction. A variety of information will be kept there including conference information, a membership form, OLAC handbook, Executive Board information. The address of the page is:  
<http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/cts/olac/>

6. Committee Reports

a. Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) (R. Harwood)

Please see separately submitted minutes of the CAPC meeting [p. 10-14] in this issue.

b. 1996 OLAC Conference Planning (M. Konkel)

M. Konkel reported on the plans for the 1996 OLAC Conference. It will be held in Denton, Texas, about 30 miles north of Dallas/Fort Worth, on October 3-5 at the Radisson Hotel and Eagles Point Golf Club. Sharon Almquist will be the Local Arrangements Chair and Ralph Hartsock will

be the Program Chair. Comments received from the last Conference will be looked at closely for programming ideas. Volunteers to work on the program are needed. More information will be found in future issues of the Newsletter.

## 7. Liaison/Observer Reports

### 1. MOUG (Ann Caldwell)

There are two new officers elected to MOUG, Karen Little will be Vice Chair/Chair-Elect and Christine Grandy was reelected Treasurer. A. Caldwell gave a summary of the activities of the NACO Music Project. The Project now has 42 libraries participating. As of December 1994 the NMP has contributed 16,850 new and 2,730 changed headings to the LC authority file. A manual for NACO music participants is in process.

### 2. MARBI (John Attig)

Please see separately submitted report [p. 29-32] in this issue.

### 3. CC:DA (Pat Thompson)

Please see separately submitted report [p. 33-35] in this issue.

### 4. AMIA (Martha Yee)

Please see separately submitted report [p. 35] in this issue.

### 5. ALCTS AV (Molly Brennan)

Please see separately submitted report [p. 27-28] in this issue.

## 8. Library of Congress and Utility Reports

### 0. RLG (Ed Glazier)

Please see separately submitted report [p. 37-38] in this issue.

### 1. OCLC (Glenn Patton)

Please see separately submitted report [p. 38-39] in this issue.

### 2. Library of Congress (Harriet Harrison)

H. Harrison reported on the activities at the Library of Congress. LC has begun cataloging their resources on the World Wide Web. The International Standard Bibliographic Description for Computer Files (ISBD(CF)) is being reviewed this summer. Barbara Storey is the new

Head of Maps Division. She is working on revising the Map Cataloging Manual which should be out at the end of the year. Deta Davis from Sound Recordings reported that they are mainly focusing on arrearage reduction activities. This sometimes means doing inventories for large collections of records. There are three unpaid sabbaticals available in music cataloging at LC. Lastly, LC is looking at collection level standards with the view of using collection level records to help with arrearage reduction.

9. Presentation of OLAC Award (M. Konkel)

M. Konkel presented the OLAC Award to Laurel Jizba. See p. 6 for text of the award.

10. Old Business

Karen Driessen read a few of the letters she received in response to her invitations to OLAC 15th birthday party. They were from Susan Gegenhuber, Jean Weis and Bo-Gay Tong Salvador. All wished OLAC continued success and a happy birthday.

11. New Business

A. Caldwell announced that the Automation Subcommittee of the Music Library Association is rewriting a document on automation requirements for music materials that originally appeared in a 1986 volume of Notes, an MLA quarterly publication. They hope to extend the scope of the document to include media and would like help from OLAC in doing this. The purpose of the article is to provide the librarian with a framework of automation requirements for making decisions while buying a first system or migrating to a new system. It covers requirements for online catalogs, acquisitions, circulation/reserve.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m. and followed by a reception to celebrate OLAC's 15th birthday.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathy Gerhart  
OLAC Secretary

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)  
BOARD MEETING  
ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS**

**June 25, 1995**

**Minutes**

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

The Board meeting was called to order by OLAC President Mary Konkel at 8:07 p.m.

Members present: Heidi Hutchinson (Vice President/President-Elect), Cathy Gerhart (Secretary), Sue Neumeister (Newsletter Editor), Karen Driessen (Past President), Johanne LaGrange (Treasurer), and Richard Harwood (CAPC Chair)

M. Konkel reported that the birthday party the previous night was a resounding success and thanked K. Driessen for her work on the invitations.

M. Konkel volunteered to continue attending the OCLC Users Council meetings for OLAC if H. Hutchinson would like her to. H. Hutchinson was glad to hear M. Konkel was willing to continue attending and appointed her to represent OLAC for Hutchinson's tenure as OLAC President.

2. Secretary's Report, Approval of the Minutes (C. Gerhart)

The OLAC Board meeting minutes of February 5, 1995 were approved as printed in OLAC Newsletter v. 15, no. 2, June 1995 with the following corrections: Under no. 8 (p. 18) the heading under letter "c" should read "Vice President Duties," under letter "d" the heading should read "Changes to the By-laws Article VI" and under 13 (p. 19) the amount allotted to the Preconference on Interactive Multimedia should be \$1,000.00.

A variety of changes and suggestions were made for improvements and corrections to the *Handbook*.

3. Treasurer's Report (J. LaGrange)

\$245 in royalties have been received on book sales.

4. Newsletter Editor's Report (S. Neumeister)

The deadline for the next Newsletter is August 1.

5. Vice President's Report, Membership Directory (H. Hutchinson)

H. Hutchinson reported on the progress being made on the membership directory. Brian McCafferty has input all of the information that was received back from members on the "tear sheets" and has compiled indexes for state, local systems and cataloging specialty. Some fine tuning of the cataloging specialty was done. S. Neumeister will be helping with the formatting. It will be sent to all personal and institutional members. Proofs should be ready and sent to H. Hutchinson by August 1. (ACTION) It will be in 8 1/2 x 11 format and will be sent out as a separate mailing. An extra 100 copies will be made for new members, special liaisons, etc.

6. Committee Reports

CAPC

R. Harwood recommended that OLAC proceed with establishing a NACO funnel project for AV materials, the specific scope of which needs to be determined. In particular, he recommended that financial support be given A. Caldwell to be trained as the coordinator of the funnel project. The project will entail personal and corporate names, but initially not series. D. Boehr and A. Caldwell will work out the details of how volunteers will be found and trained. A letter needs to be sent to our LC contact supporting this project and charging D. Boehr to make initial plans to begin the project. (ACTION)

R. Harwood reported on a recommendation CAPC has made that a letter be sent to NLM commenting on their decision to cease contributing name authority records for media materials. Since D. Boehr will be the Chair of CAPC, there would seem to be a conflict of interest in her writing the letter given her relationship with NLM as a cataloging provider. H. Hutchinson agreed to write the letter and have it come from the OLAC Board. (ACTION)

7. Observer/Liaison Renewals, Award and Nominating Committees (M. Konkel)

Liaisons were unanimously appointed for the various positions for the term 1995-1997. Molly Brennan was reappointed Liaison to ALCTS AV, Pat Thompson was reappointed as CC:DA Audience Observer, and John Attig was reappointed Liaison to MARBI. Letters of reappointment will be sent out. (ACTION) A MOUG liaison will need to be appointed since A. Caldwell is now a CAPC member. A call for volunteers for this position will be made in the Newsletter including the duties and responsibilities. (ACTION) [See p. 43]. Martha Yee, the Liaison to AMIA, was appointed for an additional year so that her appointment would end in 1997 with the other liaisons.

The Award Committee is chaired by the Past President, who will be M. Konkel. Two additional people, R. Harwood and V. Berringer were appointed as members of the Committee.

The Nominating Committee is chaired by the Past Past President who will be K. Driessen. One additional member will be found to serve on the Committee. (ACTION) The open positions to be elected will be Secretary and Vice President/President-Elect. Nominations for CAPC members also need to be solicited in the Newsletter. (ACTION) [See p. 8 and 9].

8. Ad Hoc Committees

1. Research (R. Harwood, J. LaGrange)

J. LaGrange distributed a draft outline of a plan for how the OLAC Research Grant might work. The Board discussed a few issues and will get specific comments to J. LaGrange by October 1. (ACTION) A semifinal draft will be discussed at Midwinter. (ACTION) The general timeline will be a final report for the 1996 Annual ALA Conference so that the first grant could be given in the summer of 1997.

2. Scholarship (V. Berringer, B. Ferguson, P. Thompson)

V. Berringer reported on the draft guidelines for a scholarship for OLAC Conference attendance. This scholarship will be for an OLAC member, student or practitioner, who has not been able to attend an OLAC Conference. P. Thompson reported on some of the background information she collected in preparation to write the draft guidelines. Various comments were made on the draft concerning eligibility, amount of scholarship, application form and timing. Additional comments are due to V. Berringer by Oct. 1. (ACTION) The general timeline is to have this available for the 1996 OLAC Conference. This would mean a final draft will need to be approved and the Scholarship Committee appointed at the 1996 ALA Midwinter Conference so that it can be advertised in the March OLAC Newsletter and granted during the summer 1996. The advertisement should include a description of the OLAC Conference.

9. OLAC Archives (M. Konkel)

The inventory of the archives has been provided to us by Verna Urbanski. Corrections to this inventory can be sent directly to her. It was decided unanimously that the recorded tapes of meetings will not be saved in the archives. Recordings can still be made and used for review and minutes but will not be formally kept. Material from the last OLAC Conference needs to be sent to her as soon as possible. In terms of what e-mail to keep, it was agreed that most e-mail important enough to keep would be recorded in other places like minutes or

formal letters. V. Urbanski will continue to attempt to gather the files of other OLAC members that might add to the archives.

10. OLAC WWW Home Page (S. Neumeister)

S. Neumeister reported on the progress she has made on the Web Page for OLAC. She would welcome additional suggestions of things to add or change. The *Handbook* will be going up as well as information about CAPC.

11. 1996 OLAC Conference (Denton, TX) (M. Konkel)

M. Konkel announced that Sharon Almquist has agreed to chair the OLAC Local Arrangements for 1996 Conference and that Ralph Hartsock will chair the Program Committee. It was unanimously agreed that S. Almquist be given a gift membership to OLAC since she is not currently a member. The theme of the Conference and some program ideas were discussed. Speakers that have been approached to speak are Sarah Thomas and Sheila Intner. Other options were discussed. The dates of the Conference need to be worked out and the hotel needs to be approached to block out some rooms for Saturday night. (ACTION) S. Almquist will be working on setting up some tours. More information from the Oak Brook Conference will help in the planning. Board members will also forward any additional information on past conferences to H. Hutchinson to help her in the planning of the 1996 Conference.

12. The Board went into closed session and was then adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathy Gerhart  
OLAC Secretary

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

**CONFERENCE REPORTS**  
**Ian Fairclough, Column Editor**

**ISBD(CF) REVIEW GROUP**  
**Meeting of April 24-26, 1995**  
**Summary Report**

**Submitted by John Byrum**  
**Chief, Regional and Cooperative Cataloging Division**  
**Library of Congress**

Note: this report was originally posted to the electronic mailing lists EMEDIA, INTERCAT and AUTOCAT on May 31, 1995. It is printed here with the author's permission.

The ISBD(CF) Review Group met at the Library of Congress April 24-26, 1995 to consider a revised version of the text of the *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Computer Files* (1990) prepared at the chairman's request by Ann Sandberg-Fox who is serving as principal editor of the second edition. In attendance at this meeting were group members Sten Hedberg (Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek); Catherine Marandas (Bibliothèque nationale de France); Ann Sandberg-Fox (Colchester, Vermont); chairman John Byrum (Library of Congress) as well as corresponding members Laurel Jizba (Michigan State University Libraries) and Lucy Evans (British Library) and observer Claire Vayssade (Bibliothèque nationale de France). The meeting was made possible by a subsidy from the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) and a grant from the Research Libraries Group (RLG).

The first day was devoted to discussion of several issues-papers which Sandberg-Fox had prepared. These covered the topics most in need of reconsideration in the light of the rapidly developing technology which has influenced the creation and dissemination of computer files: interactive multimedia; the general material designation (GMD); sources of information; reproduction and multiple versions; designation of file; and, published versus unpublished remote texts. In addition, other aspects such as preliminaries, type and extent of file, physical description and notes were thoroughly discussed, as were a number of proposals received by the chair prior and subsequent to the formation of the review group. On the second and third days, the members focused on a close reading of the revision prepared by Sandberg-Fox, with the result that an agreed upon text emerged from the meeting. The draft will now be updated to incorporate decisions taken at this gathering and, with permission of the Sections on Cataloguing and on Information Technology, presented for world-wide review on or about September 1, 1995. Following a six-month comment period, a final version of ISBD(CF) Second Edition will be readied for IFLA approval and publication; in addition, the text will be shared with the authors of national and international cataloging codes, such as the Joint Steering Committee for AACR.

The following is a brief summary of the most important outcomes of the April 24-26 meeting and will be reflected in the revised ISBD(CF), presented in terms of the objectives that were set out to guide this project:

1. To take into account the emergence of interactive multimedia, a new and still developing technology that combines and stores products of audio and video technologies, together with text and graphics, on optical discs.

Regarding interactive multimedia, the review group concluded that all such resources be incorporated into the new version of ISBD(CF). This conclusion was reached because no existing ISBD covers these materials (which entered the mass market beginning in the mid-1980s), and because user-manipulated, non-linear

navigation using computer-controlled technology are hallmarks which characterize interactive multimedia. (These materials are distinct from multimedia/kits that are covered by the stipulations of ISBD(NBM).) As a result, the new version of ISBD(CF) will add or amend provisions regarding sources of information (0.5), edition (area 2), type and extent of file (area 3), dates (area 4), physical description (area 5) and the notes (area 7) to show treatment of interactive multimedia as a subset of computer files. Examples will be added to illustrate such files.

2. To consider the impact of developments in optical technology, as new and improved optical discs are replacing magnetic disks as primary storage devices.

The review group decided to improve ISBD(CF) to cover not only CD-ROMs (compact disc read-only memory) but also CD-Is (compact disc interactive), and other emergent forms such as photo-optical compact disc. As a result, the new version of ISBD(CF) will add or amend provisions regarding sources of information (0.5), edition (area 2), physical description (area 5), and notes (area 7). The term "disk" (spelled with "k"), currently used throughout area 5 to describe both optical and magnetic devices, will now apply only to magnetic devices, while "disc" (spelled with "c") will be used in relation to optical manifestations.

3. To provide for the availability of remote electronic files on the Internet, a global network of networks that allows users access to a vast wealth of remote electronic files, including books, journals, articles, reference sources, and even library catalogs.

Since, at the time ISBD(CF) was first formulated, this was a new area especially designed to treat these files, caution was exercised as to the kind and amount of detail to be given. Designations of the type of file are limited to general terms only--"data" and "program" and their combination "data and program." The review group decided that these terms are not adequate for the purposes of identifying the many different types of data files and software on the Internet. Indeed, the whole treatment of the designation of a file was thoroughly reworked and developed, with area 3 emerging as the one most thoroughly changed in revised ISBD(CF). Consequently, the second edition will propose several levels of specificity as appropriate. The current terms "data" and "program" will continue to be authorized, but data files can alternatively be indicated as "numeric", "text", "pictorial", "representational" or "sound", while programs can be identified as "utility", "application" or "system". Most of these categories are further delineated for more specific designation when appropriate; for example, a bibliographic database may be so identified, as may be a game. As before, the combination "data and program(s)" will continue to be used when applicable. However, alternative identification as to particular types of data and program(s) may be taken from the authorized listing and be used in conjunction with the following terms: "interactive multimedia" or "online service." These latter terms

also function as designations when terms from the authorized listing are not appropriate. Where, in the case of combinations, the program or the data may be incidental to the whole, the primary term only is to be given. As for the GMD, the group decided to retain "computer file" in the absence of a better alternative.

Further addressing Internet resources, the revised ISBD(CF) will provide better treatment of the networking environment where an electronic file may be accessed by several methods, reside in many directories, and require more detailed information, enabling users to locate and retrieve these files. Specifically, ISBD(CF) will be updated to include provision for universal resource locators (URLs), gopher and file transfer protocol (FTP) sites.

4. To deal with bibliographic problems arising from reproductions of computer files such that many computer file titles are now available in a variety of physical formats.

Although such problems are not easily resolved, the review group did authorize changes to areas 2 and 5 to better distinguish between an "original" and other versions thereof. Reformatting changes were moved from inclusion in the definition of edition to inclusion, instead, into the definition of what would not constitute a new edition. Also, output medium and display format are newly reworked phrases to better reflect computer files technology.

In addition, the review group agreed to significant modifications of the provisions concerning sources of information (0.5). Area 4 ("publication") will be amended to require treatment of all remote computer files as published materials. In addition, the glossary and examples will be updated and increased.

In the course of its meeting, as requested, the group considered the Official Draft Proposal of the IFLA Division of Bibliographic Control Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, with Barbara Tillett, one of the three consultants to that project, present for part of the discussion. It was decided that as a medium, computer files would provide a good test of the draft, and the group agreed to undertake an in-depth study. Specifically, (1) the use of the words "item" and "work" in the Functional Requirements document will be examined in relationship to related terminology in the ISBD(CF); (2) an experiment will be conducted to apply the suggested model using several types of computer files in several library environments; (3) the results of the experiment will be analyzed; and (4) a summary document, including any potential recommendations for the ISBD(CF) will be written. Laurel Jizba will coordinate this study for presentation by November 1, 1995.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

**The following reports are from the ALA Annual Conference  
held in Chicago, Illinois, June 23-27, 1995.**

---

**Report from ALCTS AV  
Association for Library Collections & Technical Services  
Audiovisual Committee**

**Submitted by Molly Brennan  
OLAC Liaison to ALCTS AV**

The Association for Library Collections & Technical Services Audiovisual Committee (ALCTS AV) met several times during the ALA Annual Conference. The main Committee met twice and the various subcommittees held separate meetings.

On Sunday, June 25th, Ann Sandberg-Fox gave a presentation describing the work being done on the revised edition of the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Computer Files (ISBD(CF)). The ISBD(CF) Review Group met at the Library of Congress April 24-26, 1995 to consider a revised version of the text. A summary report has been issued by the group. [See p. 23-26].

Chairs of the various ALCTS AV subcommittees and task forces gave reports at the Tuesday morning meeting. Merle Slyhoff reported on the Audiovisual Publisher/Distributor Library Relations Subcommittee. The Subcommittee is working on a series of brochures, each covering a different nonprint format, which address quality packaging of nonprint materials with consistent title and packaging information. The Subcommittee should have mock-ups available by ALA Midwinter.

Johanne LaGrange reported on the work of the Standards Subcommittee. The Subcommittee is waiting to receive feedback from the National Association of Photographic Manufacturers in regard to the videocassette standard. The Subcommittee is also working on draft standards for the packaging of interactive multimedia. LaGrange will compile a list of data elements for IM and send them to Subcommittee members.

Sheila Smyth reported on the Task Force on Liaisons. This Task Force had completed a report addressing liaison relationships to the ALCTS AV Committee. The report has been forwarded to the ALCTS Board for action. Martha Yee reported on the Task Force for Uniform Titles. Yee has drafted a letter to the Library of Congress requesting they rescind the LCRI for rule 25.5B that addresses motion pictures and instead follow AACR2R as written in applying uniform titles to moving image materials. ALCTS AV will seek the support of other organizations in the audiovisual community for this position. Eric Childress reported on the Task Force on Labels. Childress requested that he be released from the Task Force to allow him to concentrate his energy on chairing the newly created Core Bibliographic Record for Audiovisual Materials Task Group of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. Molly Brennan graciously agreed to take over as chairperson of the Task Force.

The Committee discussed the amount of time spent on liaison reports at the main Committee meeting. After much discussion it was decided that beginning at ALA Midwinter (1996) liaisons would give brief oral reports accompanied by a written report. Any significant events or topics a liaison would want to bring up could be placed on the agenda.

The 1996 New York program was discussed. The proposed title for the program is "Here today, gone tomorrow?". The program will address preservation issues as it relates to media resources. The Video Round Table and Preservation and Reformatting Section of ALCTS will co-sponsor the program. The program will be held Saturday from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Jo Davidson, Marlyn Hackett and Johanne LaGrange will investigate four possibilities for the 1996 Conference.

Merle Slyhoff was appointed Chair of the Task Force to Examine the Name and Charge of the Audiovisual Committee. This Task Force was established at ALA Midwinter in Philadelphia partially in response to the proposal before ALCTS to create a division-level Digital Resources Committee. The Task Force is charged to examine the name and charge of the AV Committee in light of current developments in nonprint resources, technical services, perceptions of the word "audiovisual," and to address other issues with respect to the Committee's name and charge.

The Committee discussed the possibility of changing the meeting time on Tuesday morning to allow the Publisher/Distributors Library Relations Subcommittee (PDLR) time to meet. It was decided that PDLR would meet from 8 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. and ALCTS AV would meet from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. The Chair will request the same room for both meetings.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

**Report From MARBI  
Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee**

**Submitted by John Attig  
OLAC Liaison to MARBI**

The MARBI Committee met for three meetings in Chicago. The following items will be of interest to OLAC members:

- **Proposal 95-6:** *Definition of a Linking Code for Reproduction Information in the USMARC Bibliographic Format*

This proposal adds some limited support for the description of reproductions by marking and linking (using subfield \$8) those fields that apply to the reproduction. At Midwinter, it was agreed that (for the moment) descriptions of reproductions would be communicated in separate records that contained the

descriptions of both the original and the reproduction; that subfield \$8 was a reasonable way of marking the reproduction information (except for the 007 field); that whatever technique was approved should be required for all records describing reproductions; and that field 533 need not include subfield \$8 if no other reproduction fields are present in the record. In Chicago, there was considerable controversy over whether the description of reproductions should continue to use field 533 for those data elements already defined for that field (publication information, physical description, etc.) or whether the "regular" fields (260, 300, etc.) should be used instead. Although many of those present (including most of those representing the cataloging community) favored the second alternative, a straw poll indicated that everybody could accept use of 533 and that some (particularly system vendors) would have problems with the first alternative. The problem seemed to be with allowing fields like 260 and even 245 to be repeatable (as they would have to be if those fields were to be included in the description of the reproduction as well as that of the original).

Therefore, further work will be done on the proposal. It will be assumed that the description of the reproduction will consist of field 533 (with a \$8 subfield), an 007 field, field 776 (Additional physical form entry, with a \$8 subfield), and other fields (with \$8 subfields) as needed. The final detail to be worked out is what fields can and cannot be included (with \$8 subfields) in the description of the reproduction.

The OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee had expressed its concern that use of the subfield \$8 linking technique be optional, not required. MARBI confirmed its decision made at Midwinter that, if the description of the reproduction consisted simply of fields 007 and 533 (the present situation), field 533 need not include subfield \$8. In other words, current practice has been confirmed.

- **Proposal 95-9:** *Encoding of Digital Maps in the USMARC Bibliographic Format*

The purpose of this proposal was to clarify the coding practices in the Leader for digital maps. In this case, two codes might be used in Leader/06 (Type of record): "e" (Printed map) and "m" (Computer file). The proposal was (a) to redefine code "e" as "Cartographic material"; (b) to specify use of "e" rather than "m" for digital maps; and (c) to add a code to 008/25 (Type of cartographic material) for "digital" materials.

The first part of the proposal was approved. "Printed map" is clearly too narrow a category; the name will be changed to "Non-manuscript cartographic material." There seemed to be no interest in adding the code to 008/25.

Most of the discussion centered on the encoding practice. The point was made that digital maps are but one example of materials that belong to more than one type. We now seem to be exploring the limits of format integration. For materials which have both a distinct content type (cartographic, musical, graphic, etc.) and a

distinct physical format (computer-readable, recorded, projected, etc.), we still need to make a choice when coding Leader/06. A digital map can be coded either according to its cartographic content or according to its digital physical format, but not both. Although there was considerable sentiment expressed that users are more interested in content than format, it was also pointed out that the Anglo-American cataloging tradition emphasizes the physical format of the item.

No conclusions were reached. Therefore, with the broader definition of code "e", it will be technically legitimate to describe a digital map as either cartographic or as computer-readable. LC will prepare a discussion paper on the more general issues raised about content vs. format for discussion at Midwinter.

- **Proposal 95-10:** *Making Field 755 (Added Entry--Physical Characteristics) Obsolete in the USMARC Bibliographic Format*

At Midwinter, a discussion paper was presented calling for field 755 to be merged into field 655 (Index term--Genre/Form). There was consensus that the distinction between the two fields was not supported by systems or required by users. The proposal was approved.

- **Proposal 95-11:** *Definition of X55 Fields for Form/Genre Terms in the USMARC Authority Format*

In order to support the creation of authority records for form/genre (655) terms, the appropriate fields in the Authority Format must be determined. It was agreed to define X55 fields for that purpose. The remaining question was whether the same record could allow a term to be valid as both form (X55) and topic (X50) in the same thesaurus, as is presently the case with Library of Congress Subject Headings. The responsible office at LC did not feel the need for such a possibility; they are prepared (over time) to create either distinct topical and form terms or at least separate authority records for topical and form uses of the same term. The proposal to add the X55 fields to the Authority Format was approved.

- **Discussion Paper 85:** *Changes to Personal Name First Indicator Values*

Catalog records are being created under cataloging and coding standards that do not distinguish between single and multiple surnames, forenames and family names. When these records are loaded into a USMARC system, there is no way to code the indicator correctly. The discussion paper suggests defining value "blank" for situations where the correct value cannot be determined. It also asks whether the various categories identified are used by systems. There was agreement that family names need to be distinguished, that forenames probably need to be distinguished, but that the distinction between single and multiple surnames is not significant. LC will prepare a proposal.

- **Discussion Paper 86:** *Mapping the Dublin Core Metadata Elements to USMARC*

Metadata is machine-readable data describing a set of machine-readable data. There are various emerging standards for providing such data, such as the SGML-based header specified by the Text Encoding Initiative and the Content Standards for Geospatial Metadata. A conference sponsored by OCLC and the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA) met in March to attempt to develop a minimal ("core") set of data elements that could be accepted by all stakeholders and provided by the creators of data sets. The report of the conference is available on the OCLC World Wide Web site at <http://www.oclc.org:5046/conferences/metadata>. This discussion paper presents the list of core elements and discusses possible mapping to USMARC.

The core elements are: Subject, Title, Author, Publisher, Other Agent, Date, Identifier, Object-Type (text, map, graphic), Form, Relation (to other items), Language, Source, Coverage (spatial and temporal). In the MARBI discussion, it was agreed that this was a good first step, that some of the elements (such as Author--see Discussion Paper 88) presented mapping problems, and that the problem of version identification might need further work within the core definition.

- **Discussion Paper 88:** *Defining a Generic Author Field in USMARC*

As noted under Discussion Paper No. 86 above, the concept of "author" is not a simple one in USMARC. In defining the Dublin Core Metadata Elements, the only distinction supported was between "author" and "other agent" (editor, compiler, illustrator, etc.). If we need to rely on metadata as the source of bibliographic information about data sets and if they do not make the distinctions between main and added entries, between personal and corporate names, between direct and indirect name order, how can USMARC records be coded? This paper suggests three options: (a) arbitrarily choose one of the existing fields (probably 700) and live with the consequences; (b) relax the indicator definitions for 700-711 fields; and/or (c) define a new generic field for "Author" (probably using subfield \$e to indicate role). There was sufficient interest in exploring the third option.

- **Discussion Paper 90:** *MARC Format Alignment*

This paper described the efforts that have so far been made to identify differences between USMARC and the Canadian and British MARC Formats. In the case of CanMARC, the differences are minor and mostly involve coded data (007 and 008) values. Analysis of UKMARC is still at the conceptual stage, because there are major differences in approach and in details that affect almost every commonly-used field. The discussion indicated a willingness to proceed, on the grounds that many systems and vendors are loading Canadian and UK data. However, there was a recognition of the impact of the necessary changes. Further

work, including a preliminary discussion of the costs involved, will be forthcoming.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

**Report From CC:DA**  
**Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access**

**Submitted by Patricia Thompson**  
**Audience Observer to CC:DA**

CC:DA had a full slate of reports and discussions. The following are selected items of interest to the AV cataloging community.

Under old business, the Committee discussed a proposal to form a task force to investigate the cataloging of videorecordings that include predominant musical content. This issue was first brought to CC:DA at the Midwinter meeting in February 1995 by the Music Library Association. The major contention is whether the rules as currently written call for main entry under title or under composer. At that time CC:DA agreed that a task force would be formed after a specific charge was formulated. Brad Young had prepared a preliminary draft charge for the task force.

The discussion began where the February meeting left off, with the point redrawn that the problem stems from a larger issue involving the definition of a work, the concept of authorship, of main entry, and shared vs. mixed responsibility and the way the rules relating to these concepts apply to works that are meant to be performed. It was also acknowledged that the issue is not limited to videorecordings, but any usable solution would have to cover any format that can include musical performances, such as computer files and interactive multimedia works.

Janet Swan-Hill, ALA's (outgoing) representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC), brought up the fact that JSC is planning a conference in mid 1997 to address major issues such as this and that a task force could prepare a position paper to be addressed at this conference. She also felt that the JSC would not be interested in dealing with a smaller issue that is part of a larger issue. Phil Schreur, the representative from the Music Library Association, said that would be good, but that we need a definitive interpretation of what the rules say as currently written.

An unofficial straw poll of the Committee voting members resulted in 7 out of 8 who felt that the rules as written call for title main entry. This led to a lengthy discussion as to whether an appropriate role for CC:DA is to interpret rules. One member explained that CC:DA has not interpreted rules in the past; they have decided what the rules were supposed to say and then recommended changes to them if they are not clear. Another member pointed out that if CC:DA does not interpret rules, then who should? If the members do not understand what the rules say, then how can they make changes to them?

In the end, it was decided to form two separate task forces. The first one will attempt to clarify exactly what the rules say to do as they are currently written, in order to solve the immediate problem for catalogers. The second task force will have a broader mission to examine the issues of cataloging works that were created for performance (not limited to music or videorecordings) and to address any deficiencies in the rules. The second task force may be charged with writing a position paper for the JSC conference.

The ALA representative to JSC reported on the status of several proposals affecting computer files and AV. JSC approved the addition of explanatory text to rule 9.5B1 to clarify the two spellings of "disk" and "disc." Changes to the glossary definitions are still to be considered. No decision was made on the proposal to standardize the form of the "mode of access" note for remote computer files because too many issues were raised about the purpose of the note and the uses of the information.

CC:DA had approved and forwarded several proposals from OLAC concerning rule 7.7B2, language note for videorecordings. JSC approved the deletion of the phrase "for the hearing impaired" from the closed-caption note, but declined to add references to or examples of open-signed and audio-described videos. The members were not sure that this information belonged in the language note. In addition, they believed that there is not a terrible rush to add "audio-enhanced" to any particular rule, and wished to wait to see what term will actually come into general use for this sort of enhancement.

The CC:DA Task Force on Communication and Outreach was discharged with thanks after the Committee voted to accept the pamphlet they designed and the document "How to submit a rule change proposal." Both of these will be sent to the ALCTS Cataloging and Classification Section for appropriate distribution. A position paper written by Sherry Kelley, "Call for CC:DA Action on the TEI [Text Encoding Initiative] Header" was discussed. The paper points out the increasing number of projects to digitally encode texts, and outlines the issues faced by catalogers struggling to apply cataloging rules to these documents. CC:DA voted to form a task force on the relationship between the TEI header and the cataloging rules.

Ann Sandberg-Fox reported on the meeting of the ISBD(CF) Review Group. See p. 23-26 for a summary of the meeting.

A lengthy discussion was held concerning questions and problems regarding the dissemination of CC:DA documents. Members expressed a need for better electronic access to documents, and it was pointed out that increased openness about the items up for discussion might promote a greater interest and participation in CC:DA among the cataloging community. However, much caution is needed to prevent untimely adoption of cataloging practice or policy that is still in the proposal stage and has not yet been formally adopted. A task force was formed to draft a recommendation to ALCTS on possible changes to the *ALCTS Policies and Procedures Manual* to address these problems.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

**Report From AMIA**  
**Association of Moving Image Archivists**  
**Cataloging and Documentation Committee**

**Submitted by Martha M. Yee**  
**OLAC Liaison to AMIA**

The Cataloging and Documentation Committee's group working on the revision of *Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual* met in Los Angeles in May to review responses to the cataloging practices survey. There were 67 responses to the initial questionnaire inviting participation in a larger survey; of those 67, 31 submitted the cataloging practices survey. Many thanks to those of you who took the time to fill out a minimum of ten pages of questions. The survey turned out to be quite a tome, and your responses are valuable.

At the marathon weekend session (graciously hosted by Jane Magree), the group read every survey and tabulated responses to the questions. It then laid out a plan for writing a report recommending areas where AMIM could use some revision, a timeline for the revision process, and a budget. The group is currently writing the report, which will be submitted to the Library of Congress and AMIA Cataloging and Documentation Committee members one month prior to the Toronto AMIA Conference. The report will be discussed during the Committee's meetings in Toronto, so all members are urged to attend.

If anyone has any questions about the survey or about the Committee, please contact Chair Linda Tadic. As of July 24, she can be reached at the University of Georgia Media Department (706) 542-0902.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

**Report From MOUG**  
**Music OCLC Users Group**

**Submitted by Ann Caldwell**  
**OLAC Liaison to MOUG**

I would like to begin by thanking Michelle Koth of Yale University for preparing most of this report, which is an update on the NACO Music Project (NMP). Koth is the Chair of the NACO Music Project Advisory Committee, a committee within MOUG.

As of June 1995 there were 42 music libraries or collections involved in NMP -- twice the number involved in June 1994. Libraries are added in a number of ways: (1) a music cataloger applies in response to a call for applications; (2) a music cataloger at a general NACO library requests to participate in NMP; (3) a music cataloger at an NMP library

moves on to a new position and requests to begin NMP participation at the new institution.

Five members of NMP have independent status. Independent status allows the member to contribute headings without submitting them first for review. A member can become independent in names and titles both at once or for names first, then titles, by passing a quality assurance test given by the reviewer. As members become independent, they review other participants' headings.

As of December 1994, NMP contributed 16,850 new and 2,733 changed headings to the authority file, almost a quarter of which were contributed in the fiscal year October 1993 to September 1994. During the five month period between October 1994 and March 31, 1995, NMP contributed 1109 new names, 5 new series, and 327 changed headings.

NMP has also created the *NMP Handbook*, a manual of examples specific to music, but useful for any subject area for its guidance in creating the 670, 667, and 675 fields in the authority record. It is currently in the process of being edited for publication by the Library of Congress. MOUG and the NMP Advisory Committee are planning workshops for the annual MOUG meeting in Seattle in February 1996. Although plans are not finalized, it is anticipated that these workshops will help prepare music libraries for PCC participation and may include instructions on creating series headings.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

## **NEWS FROM RLIN** **As Reported at the OLAC Business Meeting** **June 24, 1995**

**Submitted by Ed Glazier, RLG**

### **RLIN in a Windows Environment -- with New Connection Options**

A new version of the RLIN terminal emulation software that is compatible with Microsoft Windows\*\* was released shortly before ALA. This product gives users the ability to use RLIN for searching, cataloging, or interlibrary loan at the same time they are working with other online resources or even other facets of RLIN.

RLIN Terminal for Windows software (which is free) can be used in combination with new alternatives to a dedicated-line connection to RLIN. Users will be able to enjoy any or all of RLIN's services -- searching, cataloging, interlibrary loan, record transfer -- via the Internet or CompuServe.

### **RLIN Data Via Internet FTP**

Transferring RLIN records for local use via Internet FTP is a new service. No special software or hardware is needed. With a searching connection and this online service, users can easily acquire high-quality cataloging copy for local editing and reuse.

Users without an Internet connection can still transfer records directly to their local system using RLIN's "pass" command.

### **CitaDel Opens the Gates to Eastern Europe, Science & Technology**

RLG has released the Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS) Bibliographies -- the newest CitaDel file. The RAS file gives students and specialists in Slavic studies and social sciences information about materials published in the Commonwealth of Independent States and Eastern Europe; it cites and abstracts books, manuscripts, dissertations, plus articles from more than 10,000 periodicals.

### **More Ariel Sites, More Lending Resources, with AMIGOS & SOLINET**

Ariel for Windows\*\*, RLG's document transmission system for the Internet, continues to prove its value to a growing network of users. New distributorship agreements with the AMIGOS Bibliographic Council and SOLINET now make it easier to acquire the Ariel software and support for its use regionally. Overseas, four new distributors in The Netherlands, Italy, Israel, and Singapore are also making Ariel more readily accessible to their own and adjoining regions.

### **Expanded Service Hours**

In May 1995, RLG added ninety minutes to its hours of daily availability. All of RLG's online resources are now available 22.5 hours a day, Monday through Friday, as well as all through Saturday night and late into Sunday.

For more information about any of the topics in this report, please send e-mail to [bl.sal@rlg.stanford.edu](mailto:bl.sal@rlg.stanford.edu).

\*\*Windows is a trademark of Microsoft Corporation.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

## **NEWS FROM OCLC As Reported at the OLAC Business Meeting June 24, 1995**

**Submitted by Glenn Patton, OCLC**

### **Database**

As of April 1, 1995, there were about 804,000 AV records, 988,000 sound recordings and 61,000 computer files records. While growth of AV and sound

recordings remained at about 10% compared to last April, computer files growth was nearly 17%!

OCLC is now up-to-date in loading Library of Congress cataloging for sound recordings after some delays associated with processing "copy cataloging" records.

### **Database Quality**

Next on the list of database corrections to be done will be corrections to MeSH subject headings and to series headings. Both will happen later this summer. Progress also continues on database scans that result from Format Integration Phase 1, as well as planning for scans in preparation for Phase 2. Phase 1 scans include conversion of 2nd indicator values in fields 700, 710, 711 and 730 (about 9 million records converted); conversion of field 315 to 310 in Maps and Computer Files (about 1750 records converted); and conversion of obsolete notes fields and indicators (about 78,000 records converted).

### **Access**

Development continues on PASSPORT for Windows. User reaction to Internet access to PRISM continues to be positive. Changes in Internet access providers has helped to stabilize performance.

### **PRISM Service**

Work continues on Format Integration Phase 2. Screen display changes are nearly finalized.

Spring 1995 also saw the introduction of PromptCat and ILL Fee Management. Currently under way is a pilot test of PromptSelect offering access to selection tools and the ability to export ordering information to local systems.

Development has begun on a new version of Cat CD for Windows as well as a Windows-based ILL MicroEnhancer.

### **Internet Resources**

Interest in the Internet Cataloging Project continues to be high. We've met the goal of 135 project participants but there's still time to enroll and to contribute records.

More information about the project and a participant enrollment form are available via OCLC's World Wide Web home page (<http://www.oclc.org>) or via anonymous FTP at "ftp.rsch.oclc.org" in the directory "/pub/internet\_cataloging\_project".

See p. 44-46 for more information.

Return to Table of Contents

---

## **OCLC USERS COUNCIL REPORT**

### **Submitted by Mary S. Konkel**

The third meeting of the 1994/95 OCLC Users Council was held May 21-23, 1995 in Dublin, Ohio. The focus of the meeting was "Cooperation and Competition: Libraries' and OCLC's Strategies for the Next Generation."

OCLC updated us on the present collaborative and cooperative activities they are engaging in, particularly in the electronic and international arena, including the availability of more full-text journal titles, additional databases, and e-journals. OCLC NetFirst, a comprehensive database of Internet resources will soon be available. More than 800 libraries outside the United States access OCLC services and it is expected that more international titles will be added to the Online Union Catalog (OLUC) this year than U.S. titles.

Bridget Lamont, Director of the Illinois State Library shared Abe Lincoln's thoughts... "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do and how we do it" in her remarks which focused on access and resource sharing. Resource sharing will become more intensive and international networking will become more important. Problem areas are the lack of federal funding and networks' concentration on bibliographic control rather than education and lifelong learning--efforts on our part could make a difference.

Erik Jul spoke about OCLC's project "Building a Catalog of Internet-Accessible Materials" which is asking participants to qualitatively select, catalog, and contribute full bibliographic records to the OLUC for Internet resources identified and accessed in their libraries. The project is sponsored by the U.S. Dept. of Education and continues through March 31, 1996. The listserv INTERCAT has been created to facilitate communication among project participants and interested others. See the March 1995 *OLAC Newsletter* for more information. This was a particularly satisfying meeting for me as we were left with the thought that through partnerships and cooperation the goal of achieving a seamless access to information can be achieved. As always, I'd be happy to hear your comments and pass on your concerns.

E-mail: [marykonkel@uakron.edu](mailto:marykonkel@uakron.edu)  
Voice: (216) 972-6257

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

## **NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor**

**Scanning and Invalidating Obsolete Elements  
in the OCLC Online Union Catalog**

As part of the continuing effort to improve the quality of the Online Union Catalog, OCLC periodically runs database scans on elements which are obsolete or incorrect. Since February 1995, OCLC has been running database scans to convert or delete some of the elements made obsolete with the implementation of Format Integration Phase 1. In September, OCLC plans to invalidate the following elements for use in PRISM cataloging:

- Field 210, first indicator value 'blank'
- Field 315
- Field 503
- Field 537
- Field 582
- Field 700, 710, 711 and 730, second indicator values '0', '1' and '3'

When a specific date is set for invalidation, it will be announced in *PRISM News*.

### **Other Format Integration Phase 1 Obsolete Elements**

In the coming months, we will review other elements made obsolete by Format Integration Phase 1 to determine if they can be corrected via scan. Details will be announced as soon as they are available. Although these elements are still valid, they are obsolete and should not be used. See *OCLC Technical Bulletin 206*, p. 3-4 for a list of the obsolete elements.

### **Reminders for Processing Records**

Records saved in the Cataloging Save File or downloaded to CAT ME Plus prior to being scanned may contain obsolete elements. If you do not process these records prior to the time the obsolete elements are invalidated, you may not be able to complete processing without manually correcting the elements to current practice. However, because initial scans have been completed, you should find that most of the records being saved or downloaded now will no longer contain the obsolete elements scheduled for invalidation in September.

Constant Data records containing these obsolete elements should have been corrected immediately after Format Integration Phase 1 implementation in January 1995. If you still have any Constant Data records containing these obsolete elements and have not corrected them yet, please do so immediately.

New records being entered into the Online Union Catalog should not contain any obsolete elements, regardless of the scan status. You must use current coding practice.

Changes related to Format Integration Phase 1 were first described in *OCLC Technical Bulletin 206* (9411) and subsequently incorporated into *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* (revision 1, 9503). See both documents for guidelines and instructions describing current coding practice.

## Obsolete Elements Converted in Existing Records

Field and Description  
Records Converted

In

### First Pass

Field 210 (Abbreviated Key Title), first indicator value 'blank'. Converted obsolete value 'blank' 3,820 (No information provided) to '0' (No title added entry).

Field 315 (Frequency) in Maps and Computer Files formats.  
-- Converted field 315 to field 310 when field contained single subfield \$a or single subfields \$a and \$b.  
1,731  
-- 43 of the 1,731 records were coded as monographs. These were manually corrected. Either Bib lvl was changed to 's' or the 310 was deleted.  
-- Manually corrected when semi-colon incorrectly used.  
9  
-- Manually corrected to field 310 and field 321 when multiple frequencies were present.  
8

Field 503 (Bibliographic History note).  
Converted to field 500, 502, 504 or 518  
77,567

Field 582 (Related Computer File note). Converted obsolete field 582 to field 500. Under certain conditions, an introductory phrase 'Related files:' was also added.  
129

Field 537 (Source of Data note). Converted obsolete field 537 to field 500. Under certain conditions, an introductory phrase 'Source of data:' was also added.  
975

Field 700, 710, 711 and 730, second indicator values '0', '1' and '3'. Converted values to 'blank'. Converted approximately 2 million records a month from February through June and 500,000 in July.  
11,455,933

Ellen Caplan, OCLC

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

OLAC is looking for a new MOUG liaison. If you are a member of both OLAC and MOUG and would be interested in filling the position described below, please write or send an e-mail message to Heidi Hutchinson.

Liaisons serve two-year terms which expire at the end of annual ALA conferences in odd-numbered years, i.e. 1995, 1997. Terms may be renewed. Liaisons are appointed by the OLAC President in consultation with the Executive Board. In the case of two-way liaisons, such as MOUG, the person appointed by OLAC should be a member of both OLAC and the other organizational unit and be mutually acceptable to both groups.

Liaisons report to the OLAC membership on the activities of their respective groups via brief presentations at the OLAC Business meetings and reports in the *OLAC Newsletter*. Presentations are made at those business meetings which are held during the ALA Midwinter meetings and Annual conferences. For liaisons whose groups do not meet at ALA, liaison reports will summarize either past discussions and decisions, or future meeting plans, as appropriate. Reports are submitted to the *OLAC Newsletter's* Conference Reports Editor summarizing matters relevant to OLAC areas of interest. The OLAC Executive Board will consult and appoint the new MOUG liaison at their ALA Midwinter meeting. Please respond by November 30, 1995 to:

**Heidi Hutchinson  
Rivera Library  
P.O. Box 5900  
University of California  
Riverside, CA 92517-5900  
(909) 787-5051  
HEIDI@UCRAC1.UCR.EDU**

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

### **OCLC and Internet Resources**

Note: The information below was compiled from Glenn Patton's handout at the OLAC Business meeting in Chicago and updated from Erik Jul's August 4, 1995 INTERCAT message. As of Friday August 4, 1995, there are 188 registered participants in the OCLC Internet Cataloging project. This is 125% of the project's original target of 150. The participants break down by library type roughly as follows: Academic/Research 116 Government (federal and state) 16 Four-year College 15 Law 11 Public 9 Health Sciences 7 Commercial 6 Two-year Community/Technical College 4 Special 2 State 2 --- -- Total 188

Participants represent 43 U.S. States, the District of Columbia, and eight other countries. Faculty at three schools of library and information science have incorporated project participation into advanced cataloging classes.

A list of project participants is available at:

<http://www.oclc.org/wwwdata/register.html>

Enrollment remains open throughout the project period. An outline enrollment form is available at:

<http://www.oclc.org/oclc/forms/parenr.htm>

### **InterCat Catalog**

The InterCat catalog was announced publicly on July 21, 1995, and is available at:

<http://orc.rsch.oclc.org:6990/>

As of August 4, 1995, the database contains 1,054 records. OCLC has been updating the database weekly, but will soon move to a daily update schedule.

InterCat uses the OCLC SiteSearch and WebZ software. To access InterCat you must use a Web browser. Some users have experienced difficulty accessing InterCat. Apparently, there is some incompatibility with certain Web browsers. Generally, difficulties arise when using older versions.

### **Features**

InterCat provides a full range of searching capabilities, such as:

- Boolean operators AND, OR, and NOT
- Nested parentheses
- Right truncation using the asterisk (\*)
- Wild card (replaces any single character) using the question mark (?)
- You can search or browse.
- You can change indexes.
- Language and date restrictors are not yet available.

Other features include:

- Labeled and MARC record display
- Browse lists
- Results lists
- Easy navigation with More (up or down) and Previous and Next
- Hot 856 files in both the labeled and MARC record displays

### **Other Activities**

Here is a partial list of some of the ongoing or near-term project activities:

- Monitor 856 fields for form, content, and functionality
- Examine records to gain insights into the nature of the resources cataloged and the suitability of MARC and AACR2R to provide meaningful and useful description and access records

- Monitor database usage and growth
- Correct MARC record displays so that lines wrap properly
- Implement date and language qualifiers

### **New**

A hypertext version of *Cataloging Internet Resources: A Manual and Practical Guide*, edited by Nancy B. Olson, is now accessible at:  
<http://www.oclc.org/oclc/man/9256cat/toc.htm>

### **Listserv**

Approximately 1,200 subscribers monitor and contribute to INTERCAT. Easy-to-access listserv archives are available at:

<http://lawlib.wuacc.edu/listproc/intercat/archive/>

OCLC will provide a link to these archives from the project's home page.

### **Sample Records**

Martin Wisneski of Washburn University School of Law has compiled an easy-to-access Web page of bibliographic records for electronic resources. Many of these records have been contributed by project participants, but some predate both the project and the 856 field. You may find these useful as examples. They are available at:

<http://ftplaw.wuacc.edu/icat/oclcrec/inet.html>

These archives will also be linked to the project's home page.

### **NetFirst**

Take a look at the May/June issue of the OCLC Newsletter for more information about the new reference database, NetFirst. A demo of this new database of Internet resources is available at:

<http://www.oclc.org/oclc/netfirst.htm>

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

## **BOOK REVIEWS**

**Vicki Toy Smith, Column Editor**

*A Library Manager's Guide to  
the Physical Processing of Nonprint Materials*  
by **Karen C. Driessen and Sheila A. Smyth**

### **A Review**

OLAC sponsored the publication of this book. It is a very useful guide to the physical processing of audiovisual material. The authors examined processing manuals from many libraries in compiling this manual and consulted a wide range of librarians, museum specialists, special collections experts, preservationists, and commercial library supply vendors. In the first part of the book, the authors write about management factors such as who the library users are, the

library philosophy, the budget, the facilities available, the physical environment, the equipment owned by the library, the staffing level, the time staff members have available for processing, and the variety of formats included in the collection which must be considered in making processing decisions. Library decisions and policies on circulation, storage, preservation, and security that affect processing decisions are also discussed. In the next section the authors discuss options for physical processing such as commercial processing, cost factors, packaging/repackaging, what to do with accompanying material, ownership marks, labeling, circulation pockets, etc., and barcodes. Ms. Driessen and Ms. Smyth present different options for processing such as classifying audiovisual materials with accession numbers or with Dewey or Library of Congress call numbers.

The rest of the book consists of detailed information on physical processing practices for cartographic materials, sound recordings, motion pictures and videorecordings, graphic materials, computer files, three-dimensional artifacts and realia, and kits and interactive media. For each type of media, the authors provide a definition of that type of material, considerations for its storage, types of containers that can be used to store it, options for labeling it, where to place circulation pockets, locations for barcodes, security devices, how to store accompanying material, and where to attach gift plates. Different options are given in all these areas. The authors include many figures to illustrate the placement of labels, etc. The appendix includes a list of processing suppliers and products, a selected bibliography, and an index.

This book is an extremely thorough and understandable guide to the physical processing of media. It will be very useful to a library just beginning to collect audiovisual material, a library adding a new type of media to its collection, or a library that would like to review its physical processing procedures to determine if they could be improved in terms of saving time, providing more security for materials, easier retrieval of media by staff members and/or patrons, and better preservation of media.

Published in 1995 by: Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn. (xxiii, 241 p.) in the Greenwood Library Management Collection. ISBN 0-313-27930-6. \$59.95 hdbk.

Reviewed by

Katherine L. Rankin  
(University of Nevada, Las Vegas)

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

---

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

### **Verna Urbanski, Column Editor**

**QUESTION:** For the 028 42 how do I recognize whether the number is formatted or unformatted? If I have a choice, should I prefer to continue putting the number in a 500 as the last note, in order to keep the 538 as the first note?

**ANSWER:** I have had trouble with the notion of formatted and unformatted too, so I consulted Jay Weitz at OCLC who helped me to understand. The terms "formatted" and "unformatted" do not refer to any characteristic of the number or its presentation on the item, but rather to how the cataloger wants to handle the number in the catalog record. If the cataloger wants a number that will index, then it should go in the 028. If all that is needed is to record the existence of the number and the cataloger is not worried about indexing it for retrieval, then a simple 500 note (what we have always done in the past) is adequate. The 028 is a "formatted" presentation of the information, the 500 note is the "unformatted" presentation.

The next issue is where the note will display. Right now, using an 028 42 will cause a formatted note to print as the first note. Personally, I am not interested in having what months ago was considered ephemeral information suddenly treated as the most important note in a catalog record. So, on my cataloging, when I use an 028, I code 028 40 and input a separate 500 note with the number and make it the last note. Truthfully, when I edit member records for our files, I don't add an 028. I just use 028 on my new records for OCLC. ---VU

**QUESTION:** 511 0 Narrator: John Doe (since that's the way it used to look, and since there'd be a colon for a 511 with indicator 1) or, Narrator, John Doe (since in the 508, comma follows function - but colon follows credits). And, if I have a narrator who is represented only by a voice and goes in the 508, I guess it would be a comma???

**ANSWER:** Even though the print constant (Narrator:) is no longer available, we still follow the form suggested by AACR2R in 7.7B6. Use 511 0 Narrator: Jesse Jackson, or Host: Doris Day, or Presenter: Medley Schmidt. The form and content of the note is not affected, it is just that the cataloger now supplies the term. Indicator 1 still generates the term "Cast:" automatically. ---VU

**QUESTION:** I am cataloging a video which has no title on the title frames, but does have a spoken title at or near the beginning of the video. Should this spoken title be used? What if there is a title on the videocassette label, but it is different from the spoken title? Should one be preferred over the other? Chapter 6 of AACR2R says to prefer printed information on a sound recording over audio information, but chapter 7 is silent (no pun intended!) on the topic. Chapter 7 just says to use the title frame which, according to the Glossary in AACR2R, is a frame containing "written or printed" information. This situation often comes up with locally made videos or ones put out by mom & pop operations. We do view all videos and prefer the title on the title frame over the cassette label, but are spoken titles just as good as printed ones?

**ANSWER:** I would use the title as found printed on the item and prefer that to the spoken "title." My reasons: (1) If it is a commercially distributed item, it will probably be listed by the external title in sources; (2) when people have it in hand to catalog (and are therefore searching for copy) many catalogers do not (or cannot) mount the item to view the credits and would be quite unaware of a title found only as a spoken title; (3) it will be easier for the media staff to handle (unless the cassette is relabeled to reflect the

spoken title). I have noticed in cataloging sound cassettes for conference proceedings that spelling for spoken elements of the title as well as speakers names, can be problematic! So, I would use printed information over spoken. I would also make it clear by notes and added entries that there is another title present.

One caveat. If the spoken title is more descriptive of the item than the container title, I might use it as the main title and note/trace the container title. Second caveat. Be wary of container titles that may be a series or a set title. Sometimes that can be very hard to discern if you only have one title of a set. Notes and added entries for variations will alleviate some of these difficulties. ---VU

**QUESTION:** Is taping off-satellite the same as taping off-air (and therefore treated as unpublished according to Bibliographic Formats and Standards, p. 35)? I have been using PBS Adult Learning Satellite Service as a publisher in the 260 for items taped off-satellite. Buying a license to tape something sure "feels" like publication, but feelings can be deceptive.

**ANSWER:** I would treat off-satellite the same as off-air as described in section 3.7 of Bibliographic Formats and Standards. Off- satellite still has the same characteristics as off-air for the purposes of description. I think it would still be true that "beaming" a program does not constitute publication. I would include a note in the cataloging: "Recorded under license from the PBS Adult Learning Satellite Service, on such and such a date." ---VU

**QUESTION:** For sound recordings, mono. and stereo. are recorded in the physical description (300 \$b). For videos, it is given in a note. Page 46 of OCLC's Bibliographic Formats and Standard indicates that a difference between mono. and stereo. can justify a new record for MED, REC and MRF. Can one use that statement to justify a new record for videos even though the information is recorded in a 500 field and not in the 300 physical description?

**ANSWER:** Many catalogers ignore stereo/mono indications on videos or are inconsistent in recording the information in bibliographic records. Generally, I think it is preferable to use an existing record when your item in hand says "stereo" but the record online does not include that information. On the other hand, if there is an explicit conflict (for instance, clearly noted "mono" in the online record and clearly indicated "stereo" on your item in hand), I would say a separate record is justified. Often, this kind of difference will be reflected in some other element of the description such as the video publisher number also being different. Unless it is pretty clear that there is a real difference and not simply information absent in the bibliographic record, tend to use the existing record. ---Jay Weitz OCLC

We all also need to get in the habit of completing the subfield \$i of the 007 to state explicitly the type of sound whether known (typically m, q or s) or unknown (u). I notice that even some records which state "stereo" in a 500 (or incorrectly in the 300 subfield \$b) don't include a subfield \$i in their 007 field. ---VU

**QUESTION:** OCLC's *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* (p. FF:19) is very clear that CTRY in the fixed field should be coded for the country of the producer, not the distributor. The trouble is, I haven't been able to find a single record which is coded this way!! (Not even my own original cataloging, I am ashamed to admit). Can you shed some light on why most, if not all, stuff in the OLC is coded "wrong"?

**ANSWER:** I suspect that this element was coded for country of production because the format was initially envisioned to accommodate FILM as in Cannes, Hollywood and the Stars' Walk of Fame. For art films and feature films, where the film was produced could be important, but the application of the format has become much broader than that and for much of the material the distinction is just not important. For most of the material I catalog, I have absolutely no way of knowing where it was filmed and no real reason to care most of the time. The distributor and its location is much more important to me and to other persons acquiring the material. That being the case, most catalogers end up coding media as they code other materials. The choices are not very good--code for distributor and be "wrong" but helpful or code for country of production and have to code "xxblank" much of the time. ---VU

I also understand that the trend remains in the direction of treating AV the same as everything else now. Most catalogers have been doing this all along. The difference once made some sort of sense when most films were reels and rentals and not widely available on a commercial basis. Now that videos are more widespread than film reels ever were, the distinction is utterly nonsensical. If you code for the location of the entity that appears in the 260 subfield \$b, no one will fault you. ---Jay Weitz OCLC

**QUESTION:** I have several questions about the chief source of information for slides and where to get the title. In AACR2R 8.0B1, we are instructed to use the "item itself including any labels, etc. ... If the item being described consists of two or more separate physical parts (e.g. a slide set), treat a container, that is, the unifying element as the chief source of information if it furnishes a collective title and the items themselves ... do not." What does AACR2R mean by "a slide set"? What is the difference between a set of slides and a "slide set"?

The situation I have is a folder with a title on the cover, "Epidemiology and surveillance slides," a corporate body and imprint information. Inside are two plastic sheets of slides in a pocket on one side and printed material, including a narrative in a pocket on the other side. The first slide shows a map of Wisconsin with the words: "AIDS/HIV the epidemic in Wisconsin." The accompanying narrative for slide #1 says: "This is the presentation title slide." The remaining slides show charts, graphs, maps and facts. Each slide label carries the same program name. They are numbered 1-40. I am trying to interpret rule 8.0B1 which tells me that if the item is in two or more separate physical parts (e.g., a slide set) use the unifying container title as chief source. Is what I have described "a slide set" and should I use the container's title? Or, do I treat the title slide as the chief source?

**ANSWER:** The two terms (slide set or set of slides) are synonymous. AACR2R is not trying to establish a distinction between the two. 8.0B1 acknowledges that for lots of

graphic materials, the item itself (while the most desirable place to find a title) may not have a title or may have different titles on the many parts of the set of things. In those cases, a unifying container title can be viewed as the "real" title by which it would be known.

The situation you describe certainly qualifies as a slide set. I would consider the title found on the slides to be the title of the item, especially since that title (AIDS/HIV the epidemic in Wisconsin) is repeated on each slide. "Epidemiology and surveillance slides" almost sounds like a set or series title. If you cannot confirm that it is a set or series title, I would just add it as a 246 container title and trace. The key aspect of 8.01B is to give the cataloger flexibility, so if there is not a satisfactory title on the item itself, the container is seen as a next best source. It is not so much a matter of you must PREFER the container title as that you are allowed to consider it to be a good substitute when the real chief source fails you. ---VU

---

Last modified: December 1997