

OLAC Newsletter
Volume 14, Number 3
June 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR

FROM THE PRESIDENT

TREASURER'S REPORT

OLAC AT ALA

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- OLAC Election Results
- Sources on Cataloging Internet Files

CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC) MINUTES

OLAC/MOUG NATIONAL CONFERENCE

- Outline of Conference Program
- Conference Tours
- Schedule of Events

CONFERENCE REPORTS

- Report from CC:DA Meetings
- Report from MARBI Meetings
- Report from MOUG
- Toward the Future of the Catalog

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

FROM THE EDITOR
Sue Neumeister

The long awaited OLAC/MOUG Conference is nearly here and all the information including the registration form, meeting schedules, and tours can be found in this issue. Many thanks to the 1994 Conference Planners who have done such an outstanding job.

The ballots have been counted and the results of this years OLAC elections are given on p. 6. I'd like to thank Bo-Gay Tong Salvador for her cooperation in submitting a report on short notice. Congratulations to the new officers. Also included in this issue are the Cataloging Policy Committee (CAPC) minutes and the last of the reports from the 1994 ALA Midwinter Conference in Los Angeles--CC:DA and MARBI. In addition, there is a report of the Music OCLC Users Group which was held in Kansas City and the colloquium "Toward the Future of the Catalog."

Due to schedule availability and time constraints, an abbreviated list of ALA 1994 Annual Conference meetings is included in this issue. The complete list will be posted on AUTOCAT and EMEDIA. Further descriptions of two particular meetings of note: "Moving Image Archives: Preserving Our History" and "Basic Map Cataloging for Non-map Librarians" can be found on p. 5. Anyone wishing to write a brief report on either program for the September Newsletter, please contact Ian Fairclough, Conference Reports Editor.

Finally, I would like to welcome Vicki Toy Smith to the Editorial Staff of the *OLAC Newsletter*. Vicki is the new Book Review Editor from Reno, Nevada. Anyone willing to write a review on books of interest to the AV cataloging community should submit their names to Vicki at this address:

Vicki Toy Smith
Getchell Library/322
University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, NV 89557-0044
e-mail: vicki@unr.edu
phone: (702) 784-4692

Deadline for the September issue: August 1, 1994

FROM THE PRESIDENT

Karen Driessen

It is springtime in the Rockies and a time of anticipation for all new things. As I write this, ballots are being counted for our new Vice- President/President Elect and our new Secretary. We are fortunate to have four very able candidates and it makes the choices very difficult. Good luck to all! Our many thanks to Bo-Gay Tong Salvador (Chair) and Mary Konkel of the Nominations Committee who are in charge of the election. [Please see p. 6 for election results. --ed.]

Soon we will be gathering in Miami for the annual ALA Conference and the OLAC meetings. I hope you will be joining us there for our traditional time slots on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday nights. Please check the "OLAC at ALA 1994 Annual Conference" on p. 5 for times and places.

Right after Miami we will begin to look forward to the OLAC/MOUG Decennial Conference "New Technologies, New Challenges," to be held in Oak Brook, Illinois, October 5-8, 1994. This promises to be our best one yet due to the hard work of Ellen Hines, Hal Temple and their very able committees. You will not want to miss it. Look for details and the registration materials elsewhere in this Newsletter.

As I look back on where we have been this year I wonder where the time has gone. It seems like only a few short weeks ago that I began my term as OLAC President and now the year is nearly over! It has been a rewarding experience for me and I am grateful for such a great group of Board members with which to work. I want to say a special THANK YOU to our Newsletter Editor, Sue Neumeister, for her fine job of keeping you informed of our activities and for keeping me and the rest of the Board on schedule all year. She has been the key to our contact with you, the members! I hope that if you have not been active in coming to OLAC meetings, you will try to find a way to do so in the coming year. The Oak Brook Conference will be an especially good opportunity to meet and share with your colleagues. We need the involvement of all of you to reach our full potential, and you will certainly gain from the experience as well.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Johanne LaGrange

Reporting period:

January 1, 1994 - March 31, 1994

Membership: 579

ACCOUNT BALANCE: December 31, 1993

Merrill Lynch WCMA Account	19,659.80
CD at 7.20% matures 7/94	10,000.00
	29,659.80

INCOME

Back Issues	28.00
Dividends--WCMA Account	126.20
Interest--CD	368.00
Memberships	1,237.00
TOTAL INCOME	1,759.20

EXPENSES

Banking Fees (Activity Fees)	1.50
OLAC Conference, 1994, advance	1,600.00
OLAC Dinner (Midwinter)	301.70
OLAC Newsletter (v. 14, no. 1) advance	1,000.00
Postage/Permit	75.00

Stipends	730.31
TOTAL EXPENSES	(3,708.51)

ACCOUNT BALANCE: March 31, 1994

Merrill Lynch WCMA Account	17,710.49
CD at 7.20% matures 7/94	10,000.00
	27,710.49

**OLAC AT ALA
1994 ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

Data are taken from preliminary conference schedules. Please confirm all dates, times, and locations in the final conference program.

CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE

Friday, June 24, 8-10 pm, Ramada Deauville / Baccarat Room

OLAC BUSINESS MEETING

Saturday, June 25, 8-10 pm, Fontainebleau Hilton / Imperial Ballroom 4

OLAC BOARD MEETING

Sunday, June 26, 8-10 pm, Alexander / Le Cafe

ALSO AT ALA

MOVING IMAGE ARCHIVES: PRESERVING OUR HISTORY

ALCTS AV Committee is sponsoring "Moving Image Archives: Preserving Our History," on Friday, June 24 from 2:00 to 3:30 pm. This session will provide an overview of the work of moving image (film and video) archives, addressing issues ranging from preservation and technical concerns to acquisitions of collections; public access and utilization to cataloging issues.

BASIC MAP CATALOGING FOR NON-MAP LIBRARIANS

The ALA Map and Geography Round Table will be presenting a program titled "Basic Map Cataloging for Non-Map Librarians" from 2:00 to 5:30 pm on Sunday, June 26th at the ALA Annual Conference in Miami. This introduction to the cataloging of maps will focus on the

aspects of maps which differ from other forms of material, having no title page, etc. The program will cover descriptive cataloging of maps, subject analysis, how to compute scale, applying the *Library of Congress Classification: Schedule G*, and the impact of format integration on maps. The speakers are Mary L. Larsgaard, Map and Imagery Lab, University of California-Santa Barbara; and Elizabeth U. Mangan, Geography and Map Division, Library of Congress.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor

OLAC ELECTION RESULTS

The OLAC Nominations Committee is pleased to announce the results of the spring election for the offices of Vice-President/President Elect and Secretary.

Heidi Hutchinson is the new Vice-President/President Elect. She is a non-print materials cataloger at the Rivera Library of the University of California, Riverside, and is the outgoing OLAC Secretary. She was also a member of OLAC's Cataloging Policy Committee, and was a workshop leader at the 1992 OLAC Conference.

The new Secretary is Catherine Gerhart, who is Head of the Special Materials Cataloging Section at the University of Washington Library. She has been the OLAC observer to CC:DA for several years, and has been active in various committees of the Music Library Association.

SOURCES ON CATALOGING INTERNET FILES

The following is a short list of sources on cataloging Internet files. It was compiled by Lily Liu at UAMS and posted on AUTOCAT in May 1994 by Sarah Bryan of the University of Central Arkansas.

Dillon, Martin, et al. *Assessing information on the Internet: Toward providing library services for computer-mediated communication*.
Dublin, OH: OCLC.

Hockey, S. "Developing access to electronic text in the humanities"

Computers in Libraries, v. 13, p. 41-43, Fall 1993.

Intner, S. "Our electronic heritage- here today, gone tomorrow?"

Technicalities, v. 12, p. 9-12, March 1992.

Leahy, S. and Smith, R. J. "A suggested guide and comments for

cataloging electronic files ..." *Technicalities*, v. 12, p. 8-11, October 1992.

McGrath, E. "Cataloging legal databases available through LEXIS"

Cataloging and Classification Quarterly, v. 15, no. 1, p. 3-26, 1992.

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
ALA MIDWINTER MEETING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

FEBRUARY 4, 1994

Minutes

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

Members present: D. Boehr, P. Thompson (intern), S. Bailey, L. Ashley, B. McCafferty, N. Rodich-Hodges, V. Berringer.

Guests: several members of the Interactive Multimedia Task Force and 22 other guests were present.

1. Announcements:
 - R. Harwood asked for any corrections to the CAPC members' address list circulating.
 - An update by L. Ashley on the Music Library Association's document on cataloging music videos was added to the agenda under "Old Business."
 - J. Attig (MARBI liaison) is unable to attend this meeting and lead the discussion of the various MARBI proposals.
2. The minutes of the June 25, 1993 meeting were approved as printed in the September 1993 issue of the *OLAC Newsletter*.
3. Old Business
 - a. L. Ashley reported that there had been no substantive action on the document "A Guide to the Bibliographic Control of Music Video Material" since CAPC discussed it. The MLA Bibliographic Control Committee will discuss the document at the upcoming MLA meeting in Kansas City in March. The Working Group has continued to refine the document, incorporating some of the suggestions received from individuals and groups. Formal responses received included ones from CAPC, the Association of Moving Image Archivists, and Jean Weihs. ALCTS AV is planning to discuss the document at their Sunday meeting.
 - b. R. Harwood distributed the latest version of the document "Rationale for Cataloging Nonbook Material," which had been charged to CAPC by the Executive Board, and will probably appear in the *OLAC Newsletter* when finalized. The Subcommittee responsible for its contents are: M. Konkel, J. LaGrange, N. Rodich-Hodges, and V. Berringer.

R. Harwood explained the document and asked for further comments from CAPC and guests. K. Driessen suggested CAPC choose either "nonbook" or "nonprint" materials and use that throughout the document. The consensus was for nonprint,

and for materials rather than material. A major change was made to the second sentence of the document, from "Standardized cataloging of nonbook material is essential before collections can be fully integrated and made accessible using the same retrieval techniques as are used for accessing print material" to "Standardized cataloging of nonprint materials is essential to make collections fully integrated and accessible through the same retrieval techniques as are used for print material."

The final sentence was changed to read "The standardized cataloging of nonprint materials will lead the way into the next century of learning innovation."

Other cosmetic changes were suggested to smooth out the document. R. Harwood will attempt to clarify the last questionable passages at Sunday's Executive Board Meeting and set a goal for completion of the project by the Miami Conference.

R. Harwood thanked the Committee members, only two of which are still serving on CAPC.

4. New Business MARBI discussion

John Attig (MARBI liaison) was not present to represent OLAC CAPC's positions on MARBI. R. Harwood asked for a volunteer from CAPC to attend MARBI meetings for J. Attig. The MARBI agenda was reviewed for items of interest to CAPC. R. Harwood led the following discussions.

Discussion Paper no. 74: *Defining a New Subfield Code for Form Subdivisions.* Currently there are four categories of subject subdivisions: topical, form, chronological, geographical; and three subfield codes. The new \$v would be used to distinguish the form use of a subdivision from its general/topical (\$x) use, in the case of terms that can be used both ways. CAPC discussed and voted on the questions listed on p. 6-7 of Discussion Paper 74 ("Questions for Further Discussion"). Chair Harwood will summarize the results and send a written response to the MARBI Chair.

Proposal no. 94-6: *Addition of 007 (Physical Description Fixed Field) for Computer Files.* CAPC was in favor of adding this field to the USMARC format. Attachment A of the Proposal shows the breakdown of the character positions, with two options from which to choose. General CAPC consensus was in favor of Option 1. The question was asked whether the "f" code for "Remote" might not be an error, since "f" is previously used for tape cassette. A suggestion was made to add a "Not applicable" option (code "n") to the list as a default value.

Proposal no. 94-7: *Encoding of Atlases.* CAPC agrees that this proposal sounds very reasonable.

Field 658 for access to curriculum or course of study objectives (different from field 521--a note--because it is an access point with a controlled vocabulary). MARBI had adopted a proposal to create this field in New Orleans. CAPC had been in favor of listing audience characteristics, such as "Videorecordings for the hearing impaired" in a separate field. Tonight's discussion was inconclusive. R. Harwood suggested appointing a small task force to look at this issue and work with J. Attig on it.

a. CC:DA discussion

1. Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia

R. Harwood distributed copies of Discussion Paper no. 76 "Use of Interactive Multimedia Guidelines with USMARC" and introduced the four members of the CC:DA Interactive Multimedia Task Force present: Laurel Jizba, Jo Davidson, Eric Childress, and Nancy Davey and also acknowledged the CAPC members who had participated in the cataloging "test run." The final draft of the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia had been discussed in a Task Force meeting earlier that afternoon.

R. Harwood asked the question: Are the definitions in the Guidelines clear, simple, easy to understand? CAPC agreed that they are thorough, but may call for periodic review because terminology will undoubtedly change. There was some discussion on the use of the term "work" (see definition in footnote p. 8) rather than "item," the traditional cataloging term. L. Jizba gave an explanation for the origin of the term "work" in this context.

Further topics clarified by the Task Force members were the concept of user control (Point C.2.), combinations of separately issued works (Point C.7.), the form and content of the examples at the back of the Guidelines (particularly Example D), and the distinction between shared responsibility and mixed responsibility (in Appendix A). Using the word "shared" in the definition for "mixed responsibility" caused some confusion. Here CAPC made a suggestion for clearer wording: "If more than three persons or corporate bodies are responsible for the entire content of the interactive multimedia work, ..." CAPC unanimously agreed that with a few minor touchups, the Guidelines should be issued as soon as possible. R. Harwood thanked the Task Force members for their presentation and congratulated them on their excellent work.

2. Closed caption note discussion

D. Boehr suggested that though closed captioning is treated as a language note, e.g. "Closed captioned for the hearing impaired" or "Closed captioned for those learning English as a second language," it has many

other uses, and a note often isn't enough. P. Thompson pointed out there are now audio-enhanced media for the visually impaired as well.

D. Boehr argued in favor of a shortened, more general note, such as just "Closed captioned" and asked whether this information should be available in another area in addition to the note. Closed captioned version could possibly be an edition statement. And does the subject heading treatment need reexamination as well? It was suggested that this issue be placed on the CAPC agenda for a future meeting.

CAPC agreed that D. Boehr initiate the process for a formal proposal to CC:DA for a rule change regarding closed captioning.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heidi Hutchinson, OLAC Secretary

OLAC/MOUG NATIONAL CONFERENCE
October 5-8, 1994
Marriott Oak Brook, IL

OUTLINE OF CONFERENCE PROGRAM

OPENING GENERAL SESSION
Karen Horney -- Northwestern University
Carolyn Frost -- University of Michigan

In the opening general session, two established AV cataloging authorities will discuss their views on how education, training and retraining strategies for AV catalogers can help us keep up with our everchanging cataloging environment. How are library schools preparing us for this AV "new" world and how much of a factor are "on-the-job" training and continuing education classes/workshops?

LUNCHEON ADDRESS
Joan Swanekamp - Columbia University

This respected cataloging authority will discuss her work with the Cooperative Cataloging Council's Cataloger Training Task Group and its future impact on non-book catalogers.

SCHEDULED WORKSHOP TOPICS AND SPEAKERS

INTERACTIVE MULTIMEDIA CATALOGING

Presenters: Ann Sandberg-Fox, Cataloging Consultant

Laurel Jizba, Michigan State University

Discussion of the complexities associated with this "new format." It will include a review of descriptive cataloging issues and practical approaches to cataloging this specialized format.

VIDEORECORDING CATALOGING

Presenter: Jay Weitz, OCLC

A workshop focusing on cataloging rules and MARC format intricacies for videorecordings, including videodiscs and music videos.

COMPUTER FILES CATALOGING

Presenter: Nancy B. Olson, Mankato State University

A session on the ins and outs of cataloging computer software. Helpful suggestions aimed at resolving common software cataloging problems will be discussed.

FORMAT INTEGRATION

Presenter: Glenn Patton, OCLC

A discussion of the impact that format integration will have on AV catalogers.

MAP CATALOGING

Presenter: Catherine Gerhart, University of Washington

Anke Grey, University of Washington

An introductory session on how to catalog maps. It will address specific "map-related" problems such as scale, main entry, chief source of information and the notes fields.

SOUND RECORDING CATALOGING (FOR GENERALISTS)

Presenter: Michelle S. Koth, Yale University

Presentation and discussion on the cataloging of musical sound recordings aimed at catalogers with a moderate amount of sound recording cataloging experience. It may include discussion of musical uniform titles.

SOUND RECORDING CATALOGING (MASTER SESSION)

Presenters: Sue Stancu, Indiana University

Kathryn Burnett, Smith College

Presentation and discussion of advanced topics and problems related to the cataloging of sound recordings (aimed at catalogers with a great deal of sound recording cataloging experience). Panelists will discuss examples drawn from the audience.

SUBJECT AND GENRE ACCESS TO FILMS AND VIDEOS

Presenter: David P. Miller, Curry College

Examination of the difference between subject and genre access to videos and films focusing on the use of *LCSH* and the *Moving Image Materials: Genre Terms* thesaurus. A discussion of recent research comparing the two lists will be included in order to consider questions about which list to use, under what circumstances, and the implications of each decision on a patron's success at the OPAC.

INTERNET OVERVIEW

Presenters: Nancy John, University of Illinois, Chicago
Leslie Troutman, University of Illinois, Urbana

This two-part session will include an introduction to the Internet and search strategies, a discussion of the results of a word occurrence survey, and will attempt to address the question, "Is the Internet the ultimate AV material?"

AUTOMATED AUTHORITY CONTROL

Presenter: Jose O. Diaz, Ohio State University

This workshop will provide an overview of current research in automated authority control and will address its future impact on non- book authority work.

CLOSING SESSION

Sheila Intner, Simmons College

A review of workshops and activities and wrap-up of the major themes developed by other speakers throughout the Conference.

OLAC/MOUG CONFERENCE TOURS

Wednesday, October 5, 12:30-4:30 PM

Archives of the Curt Teich Postcard Museum and Lake County Museum, Wauconda, Illinois.

Curt Teich produced velvety, textured post cards from 1898 to the 1950's. The collection is accessible through an online catalog and includes before-and-after photographs of places as they changed over the years. The Lake County Museum has a collection of articles from everyday life in the Midwest.

The Museum of Broadcast Communications and the Chicago Cultural Center, Chicago, Illinois.

Thousands of hours of tape recall the golden age of radio and television, along with screening of award-winning commercials. The tour will include a behind-the-scenes look at this archive of vintage and current radio and television programs.

The Chicago Cultural Center is the former Chicago Public Library building. The tour will include its Tiffany glass domes, mosaics, and marble walls and stairways.

Both tours will proceed by bus from the museums to local ethnic restaurants for dinner before returning to the Chicago Marriott Oak Brook.

Friday, October 7, 1:30-5:30 PM

Fermi National Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois.

The tour of this internationally acclaimed center for high energy physics research includes a look at its high-energy particle accelerator.

Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio, and Unity Temple, Oak Park, Illinois.

See the interior of Wright's home and studio and the exteriors of eleven homes designed from 1889 to 1909 when he developed his prairie style of architecture. Tour Unity Temple, Wright's first monolithic concrete structure and his first public building (a church).

Morton Arboretum, Lisle, Illinois.

Tour the Morton Arboretum, an outdoor museum of trees and bushes from all over the world. In addition, participants will visit the herbarium and see the rare print collection.

Replogle Globes, Inc., Broadview, Illinois.

This company makes globes for Rand McNally and other companies. See the construction of various kinds of globes, from start to finish.

Newberry Consort

The Newberry Consort is the resident early music ensemble of the Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois. The Consort performs music of the thirteenth through the seventeenth centuries, specializing in the late Middle Ages and early Baroque. It presents definitive interpretations of neglected and unusual works of great merit, drawn principally from the Library's magnificent early music collections.

Shopping at Oak Brook Center

An upscale shopping center, Oak Brook Center contains 170 specialty stores, including Mark Shale, Laura Ashley, F.A.O. Schwarz, Rizzoli International, and the Museum Shop of the Art Institute. Anchor stores include Saks Fifth Avenue, Neiman Marcus, Nordstrom, Lord & Taylor, and Marshall Field's.

Drury Lane Oakbrook

Drury Lane Oakbrook, a professional dinner theater, is presenting "The Most Happy Fella" during the Conference. If interested in tickets (\$22.00-\$25.00 or \$34.75-\$38.75), you may call the theater at (708) 530-8300.

1994 OLAC/MOUG Conference Planning Committee

The Planning Committee includes OLAC co-chair Ellen Hines, Arlington Heights Memorial Library; OLAC co-chair, Hal Temple, College of DuPage; MOUG co-chair, Connie Strait, Nichols Library, Naperville; Linda J. Evans, Chicago Historical Society; Lorraine Gorman, Arlington Heights Memorial Library; Marlyn Hackett, Cook Memorial Public Library; Cynthia Hsieh, Columbia College Library; Ruth Inman, University of

Illinois at Chicago; Li-Mei Ku, National College of Chiropractic; Susan Korn, Truman College; Stewart McElroy, Wheaton College; Lori Murphy, De Paul University; Richard Stewart, Chicago Public Library; and Swarna Wickremeratne, Loyola University, Chicago.

We welcome the recent addition of Lori Murphy and Stewart McElroy to the Committee. Li-Mei Ku has resigned and we wish to acknowledge her contribution to the work of the Committee.

New Technologies, New Challenges Schedule of Events

Wednesday, October 5

12:30-7:30 PM	Optional Tour and Dinner
7:30-8:30 PM	Registration

Thursday, October 6

7:30-8:30 PM	Registration
9:00-11:30 PM	General Session (C. Frost, K. Horney)
1:00-5:30 PM	Workshop I & II
7:30-8:30 PM	Conference Reception
8:30-10:00 PM	Newberry Consort

Friday, October 7

8:30-10:30 AM	Workshop III
10:30-11:15 AM	OLAC Business Meeting
11:15-12:00 PM	MOUG Business Meeting
12:00-1:15 PM	Conference Luncheon (J. Swanekamp)
1:30-5:30 PM	Optional Tour or Shopping

Saturday, October 8

8:30-10:30 AM	Workshop IV
11:15-1:00 PM	Joint Session (S. Intner)

Room Reservations

Reservations may be made directly with the Chicago Marriott Oak Brook (708) 573-8555 or 1-800-228-9290. Conference rates are \$79.00 a night for all rooms. Please identify yourself as an OLAC/MOUG conferee.

Airline Reservations & Limousine Service

If you wish, you may make airline reservations by calling McKinnon Travel at 1-800-545-8687. For transportation from O'Hare (\$14.00) or Midway (\$17.00) airports, you may call American Limousine at (708) 920-8888.

CONFERENCE REPORTS
Ian Fairclough, Column Editor

Anyone who attends a conference, workshop, or other meeting at which a topic of interest to the *OLAC Newsletter* readership is discussed, and who would be willing to submit a brief report, is invited to do so. Of interest are discussions of the cataloging of audiovisual works of all types (sound and video recordings, computer files, realia, etc.) as well as how such materials are described and accessed in online systems. Reports on the development of new technologies, such as Internet resources, are of particular interest. For further information contact the Conference Reports Editor. Thank you.

Ian Fairclough
Head of Cataloging
LSU in Shreveport
BITNET: shfair@lsuvm
Internet: shfair@lsuvm.sncc.lsu.edu
Voice: (318) 797-5070
Fax: (318) 797-5156
US Mail: 8700 Millicent Way, Apt. 715, Shreveport LA 71115

**REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON CATALOGING
DESCRIPTION AND ACCESS
1994 ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE
February 5 and 7
Los Angeles, California**

**Submitted by Catherine Gerhart
Audience Observer to CC:DA**

The Midwinter Meeting of CC:DA was punctuated by a plethora of reports from a wide variety of bodies and people. Many of these have appeared in other places so I will not go into detail on them. If more information is needed please feel free to contact me. The rest of the meeting was composed of a smattering of proposals in various stages of completion at the Joint Steering Committee level, and a very informative discussion of a request from OLAC to have an official liaison with CC:DA.

I'll begin with the discussion of the OLAC request for CC:DA representation. OLAC was requested by the Chair of CC:DA to submit a request for a liaison to CC:DA. OLAC had tried to have an official liaison many years ago but had failed. Since it had been a few years, OLAC agreed to submit a request. While the request actually goes to the Executive Board of the Cataloging & Classification Section (CCS) of the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS) for a final decision, CC:DA is often asked for

a recommendation and so the request was discussed openly at the CC:DA meeting. The main point of contention was whether or not the ALCTS Audiovisual Committee covered the same "scope" as OLAC. OLAC argued that even though ALCTS AV might have a similar scope, it is not as focused on cataloging issues as OLAC and not as in touch with the audiovisual cataloging community. Despite the good case brought by OLAC, CC:DA voted not to recommend the inclusion of an OLAC liaison to CC:DA. Reasons for this negative recommendation include: 1) CC:DA is already too large; 2) if OLAC was given a seat it would open the flood gates for more groups to participate; 3) the length of time to get proposals through would increase; 4) increase in the documentation distribution list; 5) a seat for OLAC would diminish the effectiveness of ALCTS AV; 6) OLAC does not fit the guidelines for representation on CC:DA.

The main advice that CC:DA gave OLAC was to increase the communication between OLAC and ALCTS AV. A method for doing this was not forthcoming. (Note: as the unofficial liaison to CC:DA for three years, I have found it very difficult to successfully represent the OLAC position on the many issues that concern our group that are brought to CC:DA. In many instances I surveyed the membership of OLAC at ALA meetings only to discover at CC:DA, when asked to report, that we were on opposite sides of an issue with ALCTS AV. This situation has made for some awkward meetings. To help solve this communication problem, I will be submitting some possible approaches that could be put into place in the future so that ALCTS AV and OLAC can better work together, and so that the Audience Observer can more easily do the job he or she is appointed to do).

Bruce Johnson reported on the new catalogers desktop that is being developed by the Library of Congress Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS). This product will contain the LC Rule Interpretations, the LC Subject Cataloging Manual, USMARC Concise and other cataloging tools. To find out more about this product contact the CDS.

The Task Force on Communication of Outreach reported on progress it has made to help the cataloging community better understand the mechanism for submitting rule revisions. It will also be trying to contact non-library sources to garner information on how CC:DA may assist them in their work.

The Task Force on the Cataloging of Internet Resources reported on two recommendations it would like to make on the cataloging rules to improve their ability to describe these materials. One proposal involves: (1) adding to the end of the first paragraph of rule 9.0B1: "... program statements, first display of information, the header to the file (including "Subject:"), information at the end of the file;" (2) adding as a second paragraph: "If the computer file is unreadable without processing (e.g. it is compressed or printer-formatted), take the information from the file after it has been uncompressed, printed out, or otherwise processed for use." The second proposal would add an additional example to 9.7B1. Both of these proposals will be forwarded to the Joint Steering Committee for further consideration.

The Task Force to Review Reproductions Cataloging Guidelines submitted their final report. This report recommends: 1) that no revisions to the rules be pursued at this time; 2) that the publishing of the Guidelines as written be taken up with CCS; 3) the dissolution of the Task Force; and 4) that the entire document be submitted to JSC for their information. These recommendations were accepted and the Task Force disbanded.

The Interactive Multimedia Guidelines Review Task Force reported that they are ready to ask ALA to publish their Guidelines (which should be appearing in the near future) and proposed a rule revision to change the spelling of "optical disk" to "optical disc" in the rules. They also would like to delete the "laser" from "computer laser optical disc." These proposals will be forwarded to the JSC.

REPORT FROM MARBI MEETINGS
(Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee)
1994 ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE
February 5-7
Los Angeles, California

Submitted by Catherine Gerhart

Proposal 94-3: *Addition of Subfield \$u (Uniform Resource Locator) to Field 856 in the USMARC Holding and Bibliographic Formats*

The URL is a draft Internet standard currently under development that would describe a universal syntax which could be used to identify "objects" using existing Internet protocols. The proposal, which was approved, will put the URL in the 856 \$u.

Proposal 94-4: *008/22 (Target Audience) Code Synchronization in the USMARC Bibliographic Format*

This proposal calls for the definition of additional codes for 008/22 (Target audience) for books, computer files, music and visual materials. Currently codes available for some formats are not available for others. This proposal standardizes the coding in this data element, adding many codes to books and music and redefining the "j" (juvenile) for all four areas. This proposal was approved.

Proposal 94-6: *Addition of 007 (Physical Description Fixed Field) for Computer Files in the USMARC Bibliographic and Holdings Formats.*

This proposal creates an 007 for computer files. The difference between the two options presented in this proposal is how the issue of remote files is handled. The option that was finally approved will put the issue of remoteness in the 007/01 (Specific Material Designation). The 007 for computer files will include coding for: Category of Material (computer file); Specific Material Designation (cartridge, reel, disk, remote, etc.); Original versus Reproduction Aspect; Color; Sound; and Dimensions.

Proposal 94-7: *Encoding of Atlases in the USMARC Bibliographic Format*

This proposal calls for adding specific guidelines for the treatment of atlases following format integration. It changes the Leader/06 for atlases to "e" or "f" rather than "a", allows an 007 if desired, defines an 008/25 (Type of Cartographic Material) for atlases, and defines an 008/33-34 (Special Format Characteristics) for large print and loose-leaf atlases. This proposal passed.

Discussion Paper 76: *Use of Interactive Multimedia Guidelines with USMARC*

This discussion paper looked at two options and some discussion points for the future cataloging of interactive multimedia materials. Option 1 defines a new Leader/06 code for "interactive multimedia" that is linked to the computer files version of the 008. Option 2 uses the Leader/06 code "m" and defines a new code in character position 26 (type of computer file) in the Computer Files 008 field to specifically identify "interactive multimedia." There was some strong feeling that Option 1 is a much better solution because it separates these materials out from regular computer files. However, it could not be implemented until format integration. Option 2 could be implemented right away but most considered it not as good a solution. A proposal will be submitted for the Annual Meeting in Miami.

REPORT FROM THE MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

March 2, 1994

Kansas City, Missouri

Submitted by Ann Caldwell

OLAC Liaison to MOUG

The Music OCLC Users Group met on Wednesday March 2, 1994 at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in Kansas City, Missouri. Because of the upcoming joint OLAC/MOUG Conference in October, the format of the meeting was shorter than usual, taking one day instead of the usual day and a half.

Plenary Session I consisted of updates from various constituencies. Jay Weitz of OCLC reported on a number of projects of interest to AV catalogers. The Library of Congress has begun to catalog its backlog of sound recordings by inputting records directly in the OCLC Online Union Catalog. News about PRISM service includes the addition of five more hours per week of system availability. Keyword searching has been added to the CAT ME Plus software. There are also expanded record limits in the OCLC Authority File. There were several announcements from the Library Resources Management Division. New database quality software performs automated authority control of personal and corporate names and Library of Congress subject headings in the Online Union Catalog. The corporate name heading corrections program was run from May 14 to June 20, 1993 and corrected 1,106,056 corporate name headings. From Nov. 5-Dec. 16, 1993, 1,988,895 Library of Congress subject headings were corrected. The personal name scan began on Feb. 2, 1994 and is expected to process nearly 2 million records. Finally, of interest to NACO participants, LSP, currently on OCLC's First System, is

being replaced and will be transferred to PRISM. This project will be completed late this year.

Karen Little, University of Louisville, gave an update on the activities of the NACO Music Project. Since the previous year's meeting, five additional participants have been added, bringing the total to 14 libraries. Those new participants are Bowling Green State University, Brown University, Oberlin College Conservatory of Music, University of Texas at Austin, and the University of California at Berkeley. During 1993, 4,905 new headings were added and changes were made to 580 records. A revised version of the NACO Music Handbook is in preparation as well as a handbook from the national NACO project.

Deta Davis reported news from the Library of Congress. A Music Cataloging Task Force recently spent several days at the Library and made some recommendations with regard to workflow. Significant reductions in the arrearage continue, partly through cataloging on OCLC. In addition, 22,861 popular music sound recordings were cataloged by the Enhanced Cataloging Division, but will probably not be distributed until June 1994. Reorganization within the division has nearly doubled productivity. Davis reported on a new CD-ROM product the Library is marketing, The Music Catalog on CD-ROM, which includes, among other things, MARC records for the RISM libretto project from the University of Virginia.

Laura Snyder, MOUG Chair, conducted the Business Meeting. There were 104 attendees at the Conference. In the most recent election, a by-laws revision was passed making institutional members non-voting. A 5th revised and expanded edition of "The Best of MOUG" has just been published. This is "a list of Library of Congress name authority records for music titles of the 10 most prolific composers including RV and F. indexes for Vivaldi, BWV index for Bach, K. index for Mozart and English cross references for 12 Slavic composers." This is available from Judy Weidow at the University of Texas at Austin. The Business Meeting ended with discussion of the upcoming OLAC/MOUG Conference in October.

Plenary session II featured two speakers, Liz Bishoff, Director, Member Relations, OCLC, and Joan Schuitema of Northwestern University. Bishoff's talk was entitled "Product Pricing: the View from OCLC." In this talk, she traced the history of pricing at OCLC from the early days of FTUs (first time updates) through contribution pricing begun in the 1980s. With the advent of keyword searching on PRISM in 1992, OCLC added additional search charges. This service, however, reduces the overall costs of cataloging through support of subject analysis and classification and the ability to retrieve difficult items. The two reference services, EPIC and FirstSearch each have their own pricing structures, the former based on connect hours and the latter on a variety of options including per search and subscription. Likewise, there is a variety of options depending on whether one's line is dedicated or dial access. This change in price structure from FTU to contribution has resulted in a change in library behavior. In 1981 there was a search to produce ratio of 4 to 1; in 1994, this had dropped to 2.5 to 1. For 1994/95 OCLC plans to

continue revenue neutral pricing with a modest increase in searching costs and a reduction in telecommunications costs.

Joan Schuitema, Music Technical Services librarian at Northwestern University talked about her experiences in training staff (both regular staff and students) in efficient use of OCLC. Some of her tips included: use OCLC in the way it was intended, become familiar with the billing process, take advantage of non-prime-time pricing, contribute new cataloging, eliminate unnecessary searching, reduce the number of dedicated terminals, make use of a local area network if it is available since it cuts down the dedicated line costs, use the Cataloging Microenhancer, take advantage of credits for Enhance and minimal record upgrade, and use the lowest level of staff possible for specific tasks. Schuitema has been very successful in her use of student assistants for many tasks within the library and her model is one to admire and emulate.

Ruthann McTyre, Baylor University, led a small group discussion entitled "OCLC Reference Services: Comparing Costs with the Competition." While the actual costs and comparisons of the services are fairly cut-and-dried, there are other factors that contribute to the total costs of offering any of these services. Topics discussed were reference services, staffing considerations, funding, hidden costs, number of databases available per service, cost savings, and non-dollar costs.

A concurrent discussion session was led by David Lesniaski of St. Olaf College. His talk, entitled "Technical Services: Coping with Changes in OCLC Hardware and Software Requirements" began with an historical overview of cataloging and the various tools that have traditionally been involved in the process. In order to efficiently adapt to a machine environment he emphasized the importance of investing in equipment that makes people more efficient. Ideally, every cataloger should have access to OCLC and/or a local system. He finished by speculating on whether the future would bring a true Windows environment for everyone.

Closing remarks were made by John Popko, Assistant Director for Technical Services, University of Missouri--Kansas City. His talk entitled "Product Pricing: a View from Technical Services Administration," focused on the search for a meaningful means to predict OCLC costs. He cited the various costs associated with OCLC use: telecommunications and contribution costs established by OCLC, regional network costs, and staff behavior including the size and distribution of the acquisitions budget, the presence or absence of special projects, and the efficiency of the staff. His institution is currently testing fixed fee subscription pricing as a means of predicting costs. The results of this test, for the first year, were that both transactions and costs were up. The test will be extended for another year in order to detect any patterns.

**THE COLLOQUIUM
"TOWARD THE FUTURE OF THE CATALOG"**

AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR CATALOGING AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

Submitted by Susan Hayes
New York University

A colloquium on the future of the catalog was presented by Richard Smiraglia and Greg Leazer at Bobst Library, New York University, April 12, 1994. Smiraglia began the proceedings by noting the timeliness of Nicholson Baker's recent article in the *New Yorker* about the general inadequacy of present online systems. He said that much of this inadequacy is due to the fact that two kinds of bibliographic entities--works and items--are being "mushed together" in the catalog, when their physical and intellectual components should be treated separately.

Another reason for the inadequacy of present-day OPACs is related to the fact that relationships among bibliographic entities are only implicitly expressed, when they should be explicitly mapped. Smiraglia then went on to discuss the concept of "the work." He said that, until now, catalogers have had no clear idea of what constitutes a work and have been using the term to mean many (sometimes contradictory) things. According to Smiraglia, a work is composed of both an ideational and a semantic content. When *either* of these is changed in any way a *new* work--not just a new manifestation of an old work--is created. Then, the new work must be related to its progenitor in the catalog.

Smiraglia noted that Barbara Tillett, in her dissertation research, has described seven different kinds of bibliographic relationships. In his own dissertation research, Smiraglia focused on one of Tillett's categories, the derivative relationship, and discovered that there are actually seven distinct types of derivative relationships: simultaneous, successive, translation, amplification, extraction, adaptation, and performance. He also posited the existence of an 8th type: the predecessor relationship.

Smiraglia said that his research shows that, while estimates had projected that 16% of works in the catalog had relatives, the reality was 49.9%. Smiraglia also discovered that 50% of the time, relationships were not reflected in the cataloging. He noted that while many published works beget no relatives, other works give rise to large bibliographic families, which need what he termed "nodes of control," which function as super-access points. By the use of these "nodes," relationships among family members must be mapped, thus providing pathways for the user.

Greg Leazer began his presentation by reiterating Smiraglia's point that most of the deficiencies in today's OPAC stem from a confusion, and a conflation, of the item and the work. Leazer noted that the atomic unit of today's OPAC is the item, whereas the atomic unit of tomorrow's catalog will be the work. Leazer contends that, since most users want a given work (rather than a given manifestation of a work) it should be our job to build a catalog that primarily controls works and expresses relationships, and only secondarily controls physical items. Leazer envisions this catalog as being composed of two related

files: one that describes works, and one that describes items. Eventually the cataloging of the items could probably be accomplished by an expert system, leaving the (much more intellectual) task of controlling works to catalogers.

Readers of this Newsletter will be interested to learn that audiovisual materials, especially film manifestations and sound and video recordings, figured prominently in both Smiraglia's and Leazer's illustrations of bibliographic relationships. Interestingly, in the examples that Smiraglia used, no works in audiovisual formats served as progenitors of bibliographic families, although they were amply represented as members of bibliographic families. According to Smiraglia, an audiovisual work may serve as a progenitor, but all that can be said for certain is that the younger (i.e., more recently published) the progenitor, the more complex (i.e., composed of multiple formats) the bibliographic family.

In his primary example, Smiraglia traced the pattern of relationships generated by the novel *The Light in the Piazza* by Elizabeth Spencer. Audiovisual members of this family included the film version and the sound recording of the music composed for the film.

Leazer noted that the bibliographic family generated by one audiovisual progenitor, the movie *Alien*, was particularly large and complex, and contained multiple audiovisual formats (film manifestations and sequels, sound recordings) as well as print ones (screenplay, novelization).

Smiraglia and Leazer defended the theoretical nature of their presentation by reminding their audience that only by radically reconstituting the nature of the catalog could the research library of the future become a social instrument in the solution of human problems.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

V. Urbanski, Column Editor

QUESTION: I am hoping that you can shed some light on a question regarding date coding for video releases of motion pictures. More specifically, in the case of a date type "p" where the second date refers to the year of production, how does one define "production?" The OCLC AV Media format manual parenthetically qualifies the term "production" as "the date the material was made." If I am cataloging a videocassette of a motion picture that was originally released in, say, 1975, can I assume that the original release date corresponds to the production date? The actual production of the motion picture may have taken place during 1973 and 1974, for all I know. If 1975 is the earliest date appearing on the item, am I justified in using it as the production date (in the absence of additional information), when, in fact, production may have preceded this date by any number of years?

The question arose while cataloging a 1990 videorecording of *Grease*. Both the container and videocassette label bear the date "c1977." However, the date appearing on screen is "c1978." According to both *Motion Picture Guide* and *Magill's Survey of Cinema*, *Grease* was released in 1978. So I am wondering whether to interpret this to mean that the motion picture was produced in 1977, but not released until 1978, and, hence code for date type "p" with the dates 1990 and 1977. This particular item may be an anomaly, but it has caused me to question the concept of production date, and how we define and determine it.

ANSWER: As I have told others with similar questions, remember that the essential thing is to describe your item in such a way that it is clearly identified. The predicament that you describe is the classic case of having to do your best to provide distinct, accurate description without making yourself crazy or misleading the user of the record.

In the situation you describe (1977 on case and cassette, 1978 on the film itself), I would use 1990, c1978 in the 260 and add a note: "Date on container: c1977."

I feel quite strongly that the object of cataloging is to identify an item. Sometimes that identification cannot be complete without the help of notes. In doing my own cataloging, or in trying to select the appropriate record to use off OCLC, I try to be charitable and create (or select) a record that is reasonable. If there are things that are just too "iffy" to be handled by a note then I may select to create a new record.

In the meantime, I wouldn't worry overly about becoming a film scholar in order to catalog videos. The date you use as a production date on your catalog record may well be a release date, but you have done the best you can with the time and information available. You have not purposely misled anyone and you have provided sufficient information to allow those with a closer scholarship of film all the information they need to ferret out the usefulness of the record to their needs. --- VU

QUESTION: I am cataloging a stack of dance videos most of which contain several complete ballets/dances or excerpts. My difficulty is in deciphering how to formulate analytical added entries for the ballets/dances. I've consulted the following sources: AACR2R (specifically 21.1A1, 21.6D, 21.7B1, 21.24-21.27, 21.30M), LCRI (for 21.30M), Olson's 3rd ed. of *Cataloging of Audiovisual Materials*, and *OLAC Newsletter* Q&A column going back several years. Nothing addresses my problem directly.

What I am uncertain about is whether to use the choreographer or the composer in the name/title added entry. It seems logical to enter under the choreographer, because of the visual nature of the medium. The choreographer seems to me to be "chiefly responsible for the artistic content," especially with most of the modern dances which use music not intentionally written to accompany the dance. I checked the LCNAF but could not find a single name/title entry for a choreographer. Many classical ballets are entered under the composer in the authority file, but this would seem to be the result of 21.20 which applies to scores and recordings only, a presentation of only the composer's contribution to the work.

As I see it, I have the following options:

1. Quit wasting time worrying about how and "just do it." One member record gave all the titles as 740s and all the choreographers and composers as simple 700s.
2. Follow seemingly established method of entering title under composer when it can be determined the music was written for the dance and enter choreographer as simple added entry. When previously composed music is chosen, enter title under choreographer.
3. Enter all works under choreographer and give composers as simple added entries when they seem important. (It occurs to me that someone searching for music by J.S. Bach may not really be interested in a video of a dance that someone has choreographed to one of his fugues--but that is a whole different issue!!)

ANSWER: I think the most practical course of action is to enter the video by title, provide composer/title analytics as appropriate for the music and an added entry for each choreographer who has a significant piece on the video. I would think that most catalogers would use choreographer main entry primarily for the printed transcription of the dance. I think if we wanted to, we could become quite exercised about shared/mixed responsibility, degree of responsibility, when an adaptation becomes a new expression completely and many other momentous aspects of decisions like this. Or, we can follow an accepted pattern that provides significant access points and move on to the next cataloging or management challenge. Increasingly, the "fascination of the abomination" holds less and less appeal for me as a cataloger and the more practical approach of "what provides access without violating cataloging rules and traditions" holds more and more charm. --- VU

QUESTION: We are cataloging a bunch of computer games from Sierra and are struggling a bit with the dates. The flap of the disk label which laps over onto the "back" (do I say "verso?") of the disk has a small copyright date. A string of characters appearing on the front full disk label appears as: "INT#(series of numbers).(series of numbers). 92." Or, series of numbers and some other two letter combination which could be taken to be a date. This statement always appears in conjunction with the version number and includes parts of the version number in the first two sets of numbers. In addition, the final two "date-like" numbers are confirmed by the dates in the program directory. So that, in the above 92 example, the directory will show some files with 1992 dates. We assume this to be a manufacturing or printing date and bracket it in the 260 subfield c, but wonder whether the copyright date, when it differs, should also be included? If yes, how would you transcribe? (I am having trouble thinking about the copyright date as significant for anything other than when the disk label itself was printed, but I could well be wrong and, in fact, the copyright date may be the best way to collocate titles). I have been unable to reach Sierra to find out what these elements mean.

ANSWER: I am (perhaps naively) a fan of copyright dates. I take them pretty seriously to mean that something significant happened to the content of the item which caused the "author" to want to exert her/his right of ownership. So, I would preserve the copyright in some permanent field on the catalog record. Most of the time I would include it in the

260. Keep in mind that many libraries cannot mount the software to view the internal files. They rely on the external date to tell them whether or not they have found copy for a title. So if the only date available is the external "c1991" they would assume that a record which included only "1992" (as found in the internal file information) was not a match for them. I would transcribe the dates you describe as [1992], c1991. If you are not satisfied that an external date has relevance to the content of the item--for example if the external date is "c1991" and the internal files indicate "1992"--use the implied internal date in the 260 (for example: [1992?]) and add a note that accounts for the external date, such as: "Date on disk label: c1991."

I try to stress to everyone who will listen that it is more important to provide information sufficient to help people reach reasonable conclusions than it is to try to establish "always do thusly" guidelines. If people are given enough information to rightly assess that the person who created the bibliographic description of the item had the same item in hand, then the catalog record is functioning correctly.

You are probably correct that some software manufacturers incorporate updating information in series of code numbers. The trick is that you as the cataloger have to see enough of these to determine that they are a reliable reflection of sequential changes. For the individual who cannot mount the software, treating the sequential numbers as a significant source of date information presents a clear risk factor. If experience indicates that the sequential sets of numbers match the internal dates, I would say that you are safe in using them to establish an implied date of publication. --- VU

QUESTION: As cataloger for a college with an active P.E. department, I thought I'd seen everything in the line of sports videos. But, the latest batch.....

Now I am prepared to make a plethora of added title tracings for "Title on container front:", "Title on container spine:", "Series title on container:" and the like. Also, I view all these little gems just to see what titles/series are given on the film itself.

I have about a dozen videos from Truckee River Studios in two main series. Each has an identical label on the cassette stating: "Truckee River Studios : Video coaching : copyright 1990 Truckee River Studios; duplication prohibited..." No distinguishing titles or tape numbers, so I guess I can ignore the 1990 date from further consideration. (But, I dread the day when someone goes no farther than this and puts in an entry for one video using this "title"). For my own sanity I wrote the tape number on each label as soon as it was viewed to make sure it would get back in its own container.

There are two containers with the title "Developing the setter." Tapes are numbered 651 and 651B. I expected tape B to be simply a runover, as the publisher's flyer that we ordered from said there was just one tape. But, no! When tape 651 was viewed it turned out to be tape 655, titled "Developing the setter" and ran 87 minutes. 651B turned out (when viewed) to be tape 656, titled "Developing the setter: tactical concepts and drills," also 87 minutes. --Not really a cataloging problem, so ignore this paragraph if it sounds like I'm complaining too much!

Then, there's "Women's strength training" (OCLC# 21554743)--60 minutes, c1987, copyright on labels, c1982. Mine has the same title and c1987, but it runs 85 minutes and has date on the container c1992. New OCLC record here? Which dates in 260 subfield c and Fixed field DATES:??

Going on, there are two in the series "Coaching women's volleyball; advanced series" (625, Offensive tactics and 626, Defensive tactics). Both have copyright dates on the film c1986 and copyright dates on the containers c1992. The publisher's flyer states that they contain "footage from the 1988 Olympics and the 1990 Goodwill Games." Sooooo, do I ignore the film copyright dates 1986? What IS going on here?

ANSWER: Regarding "Women's strength training," I would say that a new record is needed. I would use 1992 in the fixed field and in the 260 and code the date tp as s for single date. I was reading the definition of "r" as dat tp in *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* and I think this would not qualify as an "r" --take note on page FF:29 of the sixth bullet which indicates that a change in running time indicates a new item and not just a reissue. --And I don't really think it qualifies as a "p" date either.

For "Coaching women's volleyball," I think you have to ignore the dates on the film for the purpose of establishing a publishing date. Consider it a 1992 item. In both of these cases, I would put on a note to cover the existence of the other dates in the items. This is especially important when you are entering a new record on OCLC. This lets both members and OCLC staff know what your item looked like, even if they end up not agreeing with your decision. --- VU

Last modified: December 1997