

**OLAC NEWSLETTER**  
**Volume 10, Number 1**  
**March, 1990**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

FROM THE CHAIR

FROM THE TREASURER

OLAC ELECTIONS

OLAC CAPC MINUTES

OLAC BUSINESS MEETING

OLAC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

PHYSICAL PROCESSING MANUAL ALERT

1990 OLAC CONFERENCE -- *TECHNOLOGY: FRIEND OR FOE?*

ALCTS AV COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

MARBI REPORT

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

CD-ROM DISC MAINTENANCE AND CARE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

---

**FROM THE CHAIR**  
**Verna Urbanski**

Firstly, many thanks to all those of you who attended the midwinter meetings of OLAC. It never ceases to amaze that at the end of long and thing days of ALA conferencing so many of us still are able to get together and say coherent things -- or at least things that seem coherent at the time! We had much to report of interest and several pertinent cataloging issues to discuss as you can see by reading the minutes of the meetings.

The Executive Board is pleased to announce that a program of internships to CAPC is being initiated. There have been so many good volunteers to serve on CAPC the last two years that the Board would like to capitalize on this interest. Complete details of length of internship and what responsibilities are involved will hopefully firm up between now and the annual conference. We are asking two of the CAPC volunteers to accept posts as interns. The Executive Board is hoping that a system of internships will groom future members of CAPC. Internships will give opportunities for more involvement with CAPC without expanding the permanent membership.

---

**FROM THE TREASURER**  
**Catherine Leonardi**

**Reporting period:**

October 31, 1989 through January 15, 1990

Account balance October 31, 1989 \$2,699.25

**INCOME**

Interest 50.62

Memberships 2,484.44

Interest on CD 533.86

Back issues 16.25

**TOTAL INCOME** -----  
3,085.17

**TOTAL** \$5,784.42

**EXPENSES**

Newsletter v.9, no.4 (advance) 800.00

Editor bulk mail permit 120.00

Index editor mail permit 60.00

ALA (Chicago) stipend for Chair 100.00

Renewal notices 1990 119.84

OLAC Conference: Phone 8.82

**TOTAL EXPENSES** -----  
1,208.06

Account balance January 12, 1990 \$4,576.36

CD at 8.0% matures 3/90 6,000.00

**TOTAL OLAC ASSETS** \$10,576.36

Current membership = 663

---

## **OLAC ELECTIONS**

### **Verna Urbanski**

J.O. Wallace reports for the OLAC Nominations Committee that nominations have come forward for only one person for each of the offices open for election this year. By tradition, when positions are uncontested, the nominees are appointed to the position.

I would therefore like to announce the following new officers for OLAC:

#### **VICE CHAIR/CHAIR ELECT: Bo Gay Tong**

Bo Gay holds a BA. from Stanford University and an M.L.S. from University of California, Los Angeles. She was Cataloger, University of California, San Diego from 1980-1986, and since 1986 is Systems/ORION User Services Librarian, University of California, Los Angeles.

Her many activities in OLAC include serving as a member of the OLAC Conference '86 Planning Committee, 1985-86 and as the Chair of the OLAC Conference '88 Planning Committee, 1986-88. She has also been the OLAC liaison to MARBI, 1986-89 and an Ex officio member of CAPC, 1986-1989.

#### **SECRETARY: Ellen K. Hines**

Ellen holds a BA from University of Illinois - Urbana/Champaign and an M.L.S. from the University of Illinois. She was Cataloger, Arlington Heights Memorial Library from 1984-1988 and has been Assistant Head, Technical Services at Arlington Heights since 1988.

Ellen has served as Secretary since early 1989 when she was appointed to complete the term of Susan Gegenhuber.

---

## **ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC) MINUTES ALA MIDWINTER MEETING, JANUARY 5, 1990**

**Reported by Ellen Hines, Secretary**

The meeting was called to order at 8:08 PM in the Gold Coast Room of the Hyatt Regency Hotel by Sharon Almquist, CAPC Chair.

1. The minutes of the June 23, 1989 CAPC meeting were approved, pending any corrections or additions received by the Chair in the next month.
2. There were four additions to the agenda:
  - o Verna Urbanski--subject heading issues
  - o John Attig--CC:DA task force discussion

- Glenn Patton--MARBI
  - Sheila Smyth--processing manual update
3. Verna Urbanski provided an update on the progress of the manual for locally produced materials. Examples are in the final stages of being collected and analyzed, and the April 1990 goal for completion of the text (and submission to Nancy Olson for editing) should be able to be met.
  4. Sheila Smyth reported on the plans for the upcoming OLAC Conference ("Technology: Friend or Foe?") to be held in Rochester, New York on October 17-19, 1990. She passed out an outline of the scheduled speakers and workshops, discussed the Conference registration fee (which will include lunches), and said that more detailed information will be appearing in upcoming issues of the newsletter. Sheila will also be meeting at Midwinter with Anne Moore (of the Conference Planning Committee) to finalize the publicity campaign for the Rochester Conference.
  5. Sharon Ahmquist led a discussion of the ALCTS/OLAC proposal for revision of AACR2R concerning activity cards and kits. The issue concerns some subtle changes in rule 1.1C1 and the glossary which appear to obscure the definitions of "kit" and "activity card". The current AACR2R wording states:

**1.1C1. Footnote (2.4)** Use kit for any item containing more than one type of material if the relative predominance of components is not easily determinable, and for a single-medium package of textual material (e.g., a "lab kit," a set of activity cards).

### **Glossary**

**Kit.** 1. An item containing two or more categories of material, no one of which is identifiable as the predominant constituent of the item; also designated "multimedia item," (q.v.). 2. A single medium package of textual material (e.g., a "lab kit," a set of activity cards).

The basis for our discussion was the memo from Bruce Johnson (ALCTS AV representative to CC:DA) which outlined the joint ALCTS/OLAC rule revision proposal. Concern was expressed over the possibility of broadening the interpretation of "a single-medium package of textual materials" to include things far beyond the intention of the "kit" definition. Bobby Ferguson spoke for many at the meeting when she said she had never encountered the term "lab kit" in her cataloging, thus using that term in the footnote did nothing to clarify the definition.

In order to explain the use of "lab kit", Ben Tucker walked us through the history of the term. While he and Jean Weihs were working on the first revision to AACR (mid 1970's), "lab kit" was the term used in Canada and part of the U.S. for those activity cards that have nothing but text. Since that time, "lab kit" has become increasingly obsolete and the term "activity cards" has taken its place. Ben will talk with Jean about whether "lab kit" is still a term used in Canada.

Verna noted that since activity cards are used like flash cards (which are cataloged using Chapter 8), why shouldn't they be thought of in the same way. A new GMD, "activity

card", is needed to prevent these items from being split between textual and non-textual activity cards. As it now stands, textual activity cards should be cataloged under Chapter 2 (AACR2R) with the GMD "kit"; visual cards, on the other hand, are pushed into Chapter 8 with a GMD "picture." Since this is not an acceptable situation, the following is being proposed:

1. Add the GMD activity card to List 2 of rule 1.1C1.
2. Change the definitions in the Glossary to:

**Activity card.** A card or other opaque material printed with words, numerals, and/or pictures to be used by an individual or a group as a basis for performing a specific activity. Usually issued in sets.

**Kit.** 1. An item containing two or more categories of material, no one of which is identifiable as the predominant constituent of the item; also designated "multimedia item" (q.v.). 2. A single-medium package of textual material (e.g., a "press kit"). c) Change footnote to:

**1.1C1. Footnote (2.4)** Use kit for any item containing more than one type of material if the relative predominance of components is not easily determinable, and for a single-medium package of textual material (e.g., a "press kit").

(The term "press kit" was offered as an alternative to "lab kit" and could well be omitted from this definition.)

6. In response to a question, Pen Tucker reviewed the LC proposal to discontinue the data sheet program. A task force is still exploring the issue and comment is welcome (write to Jeffrey Heynen, Chief, Special Materials Cataloging Section, Library of Congress, Washington DC., 20540). Ben said that LC's reasoning behind this idea is based on a desire to primarily serve the patrons who actually use the Library of Congress (not other libraries) and because budget cuts have taken their toll on the division responsible for the data sheet program. Verna reminded everyone that OLAC/CAPC members must contact LC immediately in an attempt to prevent this loss of standardization.
7. Verna reported that the Subject Analysis Committee (SAG) is going to reexamine the "Guidelines for subject analysis of audiovisual material." Among other issues under review is the use of GMD's as form add-ons to subject headings. Katha Massey is on SAC and will represent OLAC during the updating of this document. Verna will try to attend the SAC meeting and will report back to us on any pertinent developments.
8. John Attig gave us an overview of the activities of the CC:DA Task Force studying the concept of producer. Producer is used in three different contexts in the cataloging rules, a) in Area 1 as a possible statement of responsibility, b) in Area 4 as a type of publishing entity, or as qualifier to name of publisher, and c) in Chapter 7 as a possible note. The Task Force tends to be moving toward removing "producer" from the publisher concept and emphasizing that producers may serve as creators and/of authors (Area 1). They are also working toward modifying the Glossary definition of producer to distinguish

between producer as technician and producer as author. John said he hoped the specifics of the Task Force's activities could be shared with OLAC before this summer.

9. Glenn Patton reported on three items on the MARBI agenda of particular interest to OLAC. The first is a proposal to define a new 5xx field as an "awards" note (e.g., Caldecott, Academy Awards, etc.). Second proposal is to expand the use of the 521 field so that it can be used for age and reading level information. The final issue is a discussion paper about the use of the 753 field in the Computer Files format (Are multiple fields needed? Are additional subfields necessary? Should display requirements (CGA, VGA, etc.) be noted in a subfield? How is the 753 used by the library community?) (See Nancy Olson's report on MARBI elsewhere in this newsletter.)
10. Sheila Smyth said that she will be meeting this week with Karen Driessen and Katha Massey to discuss the "Physical processing of non-print material" manual. They will begin with compact discs, but would appreciate any examples OLAC members might have of local processing manuals. Examples can be sent to: Sheila Smyth, Nazareth College of Rochester Library, P.O. Box 10996, Rochester, NY 14610-0996. (See "Physical Processing Manual Alert" elsewhere in this newsletter for more information.)
11. There was no new business and the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 PM.

---

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS  
BUSINESS MEETING  
ALA MIDWINTER MEETING, JANUARY 6, 1990**

**Reported by Ellen Hines, Secretary**

The meeting was called to order at 8:06 PM by Verna Urbanski, OLAC Chair. After some brief welcoming remarks, Verna asked that all Board members present (Cathy Leonardi, Dorian Martyn, Cecilia Piccolo, Ellen Hines, Glenn Patton, and Sharon Almquist) and guests attending the meeting, introduce themselves.

**1. Minutes -- Ellen Hines**

The minutes of the June 24, 1989 OLAC business meeting were approved.

**2. Treasurer's report -- Catherine Leonardi**

Cathy reported that as of December 11, 1989, OLAC membership stood at 663. The bank accounts currently have \$3,725.89 in checking and \$6,000.00 in the CD (at 8% interest, maturing in early March, 1990).

**3. Newsletter report -- Cecilia Piccolo**

Verna announced that Cecilia Piccolo has been selected to replace our long-time editor, Grace Agnew. Verna thanked Grace for all her work on the newsletter over

the years, and asked Cecilia to talk a bit about her ideas for the newsletter. Cecilia said that she is on a sort of "fact finding" tour designed to solicit information about how OLAC members feel about the newsletter. She hopes to expand Q&A-type issues into full articles. Any and all ideas are welcome and may be sent directly to Cecilia.

**4. CAPC report -- Sharon Ahmquist**

CAPC met Friday, January 5 and Sharon presented a summary of the meeting. For details, please refer to the CAPC minutes. (Please see CAPC Minutes elsewhere in this *Newsletter*.)

**5. 1990 Conference Report -- Sheila Smyth**

Sheila updated us on the activities of the 15 member conference planning committee. The conference is scheduled for October 17-19, 1990 at the Holiday Inn, Holidome, outside Rochester, NY. She distributed a handout listing the speakers, workshops, and a brief description of each topic.

The registration fee for the conference will be a little higher than in the past because some lunches will be included as part of that fee. Tours offered will include the Sibley Music Library, the George Eastman House (grounds and museum), and the Rochester Institute of Technology's Image Permanence Institute. Sheila also mentioned that OLAC members should make reservations directly with the Rochester Holidome in order to get conference rates (i.e., do not call the Holiday Inn 800 number). More information on all aspects of the conference will be appearing in upcoming issues of the newsletter. (Information on topics and speakers for the General Sessions and Workshops appears elsewhere in this issue. Registration information will be included in the June issue. -- Editor)

**6. Nominations Committee report -- J.O. Wallace**

J.O. asked for nominations for Vice-Chair/Chair Elect and Secretary. No nominations were received from the floor (although one nomination for Vice-Chair was respectfully declined). It was announced that anyone interested in placing a name in nomination should contact J.O. Wallace by January 31, 1990.

**7. OLAC Award Committee report -- Glenn Patton**

Glenn, and his fellow committee member Barbara Ritchie, have decided on a nominee for this award and will be making a recommendation to the Executive Board on Sunday evening. The official announcement of the recipient of this year's OLAC award will be made this summer at ALA.

**8. ALCTS AV program report -- Mary Konkel**

Mary discussed the program "More with Less: Minimal-level Cataloging of AV Materials" that OLAC will be co-sponsoring at this summer's ALA. The program will be held Saturday, June 23 from 9:30 AM -12:30 PM. Among the speakers are Karen Horney (Northwestern), Glenn Patton (OCLC), and Bobby Ferguson (State Library of Louisiana). The program itself will focus on a variety of different kinds of libraries in an attempt to appeal to a cross-section of AV catalogers. OLAC will be responsible for recording all questions and answers covered during the program and publishing them in the *OLAC newsletter*. Mary said that she and Ellen Hines will handle the recording and transcription of all questions discussed during the meeting and Verna will provide answers to questions that cannot be addressed during the actual program.

Mary also said that an attempt will be made to put together a list of programs of interest to the AV community scheduled for this summer in Chicago. If this list becomes available soon enough, it will be put in an upcoming *OLAC newsletter*. (This item is planned for the June issue. -- Editor)

**9. Liaison reports -- Bobby Ferguson (MARBI), Marilyn Craig (observer to CC:DA), Sheila Smyth (ALCTS:AV), Lowell Ashley (MOUG)**

Bobby Ferguson (substituting for Nancy Olson) began her MARBI report by discussing the postponement of action on proposals 89-14:15 dealing with the 006 field for archival materials. Proposal 90-2, to add field 586 as an "awards" note, was approved. (Thus, Academy Awards, Newbery and Caldecott awards can now be coded into our cataloging in a specific field.) Proposals to include an "audience-level" field and to address the subfields in the 852 field were deferred until the January 8th meeting. (Nancy Olson's report on MARBI appears elsewhere in this issue.)

Marilyn Craig reported that CC:DA approved the GMD "activity card" and deferred action on the related issues of the footnote (1.1C1.) and definition of "kits". Bruce Johnson and Janet Swan Hill will work together to come up with revised wording that will be presented to CC:DA this summer. CC:DA supported a position paper written by Elizabeth Stephenson that detailed how adequately Chapter 9 (Computer Files) dealt with the physical description of optical/digital media. Finally, CC:DA approved use of the GMD after the first title in collections without a collective title. Specific examples and exact wording were worked out by a task force and the accepted proposal will be going forward to the Joint Steering Committee in the fall.

Sheila Smyth began her ALCTS AV update by thanking Mary Konkel for her thorough review of the upcoming "minimal level" cataloging program (see notes above). Sheila also said that Bobbie Ferguson, current Chair of the Producer/Distributors Library Relations Subcommittee of ALCTS, would appreciate any examples of discrepancies between AV title screens, packaging &

cassette itself, etc. (Sheila Smyth's ALCTS AV report appears elsewhere in this newsletter.)

Lowell Ashley reported that Jay Weitz is now the OCLC liaison to MOUG. Lowell then discussed MOUG's reaction to LC's announcement that it was considering discontinuing the coding of the 045, 047, and 048 fields for scores and musical sound recordings. Jerry McBride of Middlebury College did a survey of local practice with regard to these fields and discovered that most libraries coded these fields simply to comply with LC practice and that few indexed (or plan to index) these fields. Jerry recommended some changes in how these fields are used in order to make their use more critical. All those concerned about this issue should make their feelings known immediately to LC. The 3rd edition of the "Best of MOUG" has been published and is now available. (See order form in November *MOUG newsletter*, and in Lowell Ashley's MOUG report elsewhere in this issue.) MOUG will be publishing its first membership directory this year.

#### 10. Utility reports -- Ed Glazier (RLG), Glenn Patton (OCLC)

There was no official report from the Library of Congress, but Verna reiterated the need to let LC know how OLAC feels about the discontinuation of the data sheet program. Letters should be written promptly and addressed to Jeffrey Heynen at LC.

Ed Glazier discussed the fact that all RLIN services are now handled directly through RLG. Service hours were increased with the addition of several "search only" hours (now available Midnight PST-5:00 AM PST). A few modifications to the RLIN user interface were introduced this past fall which specifically targeted the "non-library" user (e.g., faculty). Four art museum libraries (Metropolitan Museum of Art, Museum of Modern Art, Brooklyn Museum, and Museum of Fine Arts in Boston) have been given a grant to do a major retrospective conversion project in RLIN for publications in art, architecture, and archeology. Work continues on the implementation of the *Art and Architecture Thesaurus* as a third authority file (target date mid-1990).

Glenn Patron encouraged all to visit the OCLC booth. He then reported that new revision pages are now available for all format documents through MARC update 1. The EPIC service (which allows reference- oriented access to the Online Union Catalog) became available on January 2, 1990. Basically, the entire MARC record is indexed and can be searched by keyword and/or phrase. Our networks should be mailing out authorization details for EPIC very soon. Another new service, GOVDOC, has just been introduced and is designed to provide automated cataloging capability for publications of the GPO (i.e., depository libraries can get card and/or tape products for all GPO publications).

Next, Glenn discussed the status of the New Online System. OCLC has signed a contract with Sprint/Telenet to begin the conversion of OCLC's current

telecommunications system to today's standards. This changeover will affect local users (especially dedicated line users) when their modems need to be replaced. These conversions will be occurring gradually over a period of 15 months (beginning in fall 1990) and must be completed before a library can access the "New" System. More information about OCLC's timetable should be available in February or March 1990.

#### **11. New business**

None.

New business was followed by the traditional question and answer session. The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 PM.

---

## **ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING ALA MIDWINTER MEETING, JANUARY 7, 1990**

**Reported by Ellen Hines, Secretary**

The Board meeting was called to order at 8:03 PM by Verna Urbanski, OLAC Chair. Board members present were Catherine Leonardi, Ellen Nines, Dorian Martyn, Sharon Almquist, Glenn Patton, and Cecilia Piccolo. Guests included Bobby Ferguson, Sheila Smyth, Mary Konkel, Anne Moore, J.O. Wallace, Catherine Gerhart, and Johanne LaGrange.

#### **1. Minutes -- Ellen Hines**

The minutes of the June 25, 1989 Executive Board meeting were approved with two clarifications, 1) Dorian Martyn (as Vice Chair/Chair Elect of OLAC) should have been listed as a Board member, and 2) Nancy Olson is replacing Dick Thaxter as our MARBI representative. An updated phone/address list of Board members was passed out and they were asked to let the Secretary know if they had Fax numbers that might be added to the list.

#### **2. Treasurer's report -- Catherine Leonardi**

Cathy reviewed OLAC's current financial and membership status. For details, please refer to Cathy's semiannual treasurer's statement (elsewhere in this issue). Cathy said that she has been reinvesting our CD as it comes due and always attempts to find the most advantageous interest rate available at the time.

#### **3. Newsletter -- Cecilia Piccolo**

Verna officially introduced our new newsletter editor, Cecilia Piccolo. Cecilia would prefer that her work address be used for OLAC correspondence and added that people planning to send her material on floppy disks can use WordPerfect or an ASCII file.

#### 4. **OLAC Award Committee -- Glenn Patton**

The Committee (Glenn Patton and Barbara Ritchie) met and put the name of a nominee before the Executive Board. The Board unanimously approved their recommendation and the announcement of the 1990 OLAC Award winner will be made this summer in Chicago. The plaque will be acquired by the Committee and Verna will be working on the wording to be inscribed on the award.

#### 5. **Appointments**

Sharon Almquist (CAPC Chair) reviewed the 11 resumes that were received for the three open CAPC positions. She also brought up the idea of whether some sort of "internship" positions might be established within CAPC, in order to make the most of all this interest. The Board discussed issues such as the exact definition of "intern", what should be the requirements for internship (e.g., number of years cataloging AV? number of years in OLAC?, etc.), and how long would they serve. The idea of setting up two internship positions on CAPC was accepted and Sharon will be writing up some specific requirements for these positions.

The Board appointed the following people to CAPC (starting summer 1990):

Katha Massey (two year term)  
John Attig (two year term)  
Sharon Almquist (one year term)

Two CAPC "interns" were also chosen to serve one year terms (starting summer 1990):

Diane Boehr (Costabile Associates, Inc.)  
Brian McCafferty (Lilly Library, Wabash College)

Jean Weihs will be asked to be a "special consultant" to the Committee.

Glenn Patton reported that Catherine Gerhart (University of Washington) has expressed an interest in the position of CC:DA audience observer (to fill out Marilyn Craig's term). After some discussion, Catherine was appointed to serve through 1991.

Verna said that the issue of who will replace Dick Thaxter as the LC representative to OLAC remains unresolved. She has written Jeffrey Heynen at LC about this vacancy, but has not yet received a response.

**6. Nominations Committee -- J.O. Wallace**

J.O. reminded us that applications for the positions of Vice Chair/Chair Elect and Secretary are due by January 31, 1990. Interest has been indicated in both positions and ballots will appear in the March issue of the newsletter. (See announcement elsewhere in this issue. -- Editor)

**7. 1990 Conference report -- Sheila Smyth**

Sheila passed out a handout describing in detail the speakers and workshops scheduled for the October 17-19th Rochester Conference ("Technology: Friend or Foe"). The Board also discussed, edited, and approved a draft "press release" that will be passed out at Annual this summer. Announcements about the Conference should also appear in the OCLC log-on messages and will be sent to many of our network offices for distribution in their bulletins.

Sheila then passed out a tentative schedule for Conference activities, which was approved after minor revisions. The registration fee will be \$65 (including 3 lunches) for OLAC members paying on time. Cathy Leonardi will be putting together some suggestions for non-member, late registration, etc., fees and these will be discussed later.

**8. ALCTS AV program report -- Mary Konkel**

Mary reviewed the program OLAC is co-sponsoring with ACRL and PLA at Annual this summer (on June 23rd, 9:30 - 12:30). The topic is "More with Less: Minimal Level Cataloging of AV Materials." The program is aimed at a cross-section of libraries and attendance is projected to be around 300. OLAC will be responsible for covering the question and answer session and publishing the responses in our newsletter. Any questions that cannot be addressed during the program itself will be forwarded to Verna, who will answer them and include them in the newsletter, too.

**9. Membership list and directory -- Leonardi/Patton**

Glenn and Cathy reported that they have been unable to make use of the existing membership database information. Glenn will investigate the software programming issues involved and Cecilia Piccolo will also join the effort. She will be contacting Lowell Ashley to ask about the progress of MOUG's new membership directory.

**10. Officer's handbook -- Leonardi**

Cathy will be completing this document right after Midwinter and will send copies to the officers for their review. J.O. Wallace put forward an idea for future consideration that would have the Vice Chair/Chair Elect act as a sort of auditor

on the Treasurer's report. (This would allow an incoming Chair to know more about the business aspects of OLAC and would provide a back-up to the Treasurer should one ever be needed.)

## **11. New Business**

There was no new business and the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM.

---

### **PHYSICAL PROCESSING MANUAL ALERT**

Karen Driessen and Sheila Smyth are doing research in preparation for a definitive volume describing the physical processing of non-print materials for the shelf and need your help.

If you are using printed instructions or manuals for the physical processing of non-print materials (including computer software) for the shelf and are willing to share them, please send them to:

Sheila Smyth  
Lorette Wilmot Library  
Nazareth College of Rochester  
P.O. Box 10996  
Rochester, NY 14610-0996

---

### **OUTLINE OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND WORKSHOPS 1990 OLAC CONFERENCE IN ROCHESTER, NEW YORK TECHNOLOGY: FRIEND OR FOE?**

**Submitted by Sheila Smyth**

#### **GENERAL SESSIONS:**

##### **1. Do We Catalog for Other Catalogers?**

Presenter: Dr. Beatrice Kovacs, University of North Carolina

To answer this question, one needs to understand the nature of the job of cataloging and the requirements for and responsibilities of audiovisual catalogers. This includes examination of the development of the cataloger's role in libraries over the decades and the impact of technology in changing that role over time. Finally, it is important to examine the traditions on the provision of access to information and materials today and in the future.

2. **Technology and AV Cataloging: Relationship?**

Presenter: Jean Weihs, Technology Services Group

This presentation will explore the relationship between technology and audiovisual cataloging. We should expect to receive information which will help us find our own answers to the following questions:

- How do I know which technology meets my needs?
- What is available now?
- What does the future hold?
- What are the problems when introducing new technology?

3. **KEYNOTE: Mastering Technology**

Presenter: Dr. Sheila Intner, Simmons College Graduate School of Library and Information Science

An overview of conference activities. Suggestions about how participants can employ the knowledge they gained at the conference in becoming masters of technology rather than pawns in a technological struggle. A brief examination of the structure and politics of control, and its application to the world of technology.

**WORKSHOPS :**

1. **Informed Processing Decisions: Controlling the Technology Once It Arrives**

Presenter: Karen Driessen, University of Montana

A hands-on practical session that will provide a variety of packaging and labeling options for today's audiovisual collections, and help you make the best processing decisions for your library.

2. **Cataloging Videorecordings**

Presenter: Glenn Patton, OCLC

A presentation focusing on cataloging rules and MARC format problems for video recordings, including videodiscs and music videos. A packet of examples will be provided and there will be opportunities for questions.

3. **Retrospective Conversion and the AV Cataloger**

Presenters: Bobby Ferguson, State Library of Louisiana

Cynthia Whitacre, OCLC

This discussion of non-print retrospective conversion will cover the use of technology-based applications in the planning, preparation, and activities of retrospective conversion and clean-up of non-print items. It will include information on staffing, time, and costs for both in-house and vendor-contracted projects. The pros and cons of each approach will be considered, and non-print

conversion projects will be contrasted and compared with print conversion projects. All non-print formats will be included.

4. **Audio Recordings and AV Cataloging**

Presenters: Joan Swanekamp, Eastman School of Music

Jennifer Bowen, Eastman School of Music

A presentation and discussion on the cataloging of sound recordings including LP's, CD's and digital audio tapes and the vagaries in the MARC format for each of these media. A review of LC practice and rule interpretations and options will be given. The issue of access to similar works in different formats will be examined.

5. **Workflow, Technology, and AV Catalogers**

Presenters: Liz Bishoff, OCLC

Dorian Martyn The Upjohn Company

The interaction between technology and workflow from an administrative and practical perspective will be discussed. The interdependence of these will be explored as well as the need for procedural change necessitated for cost effective and efficient use of the new technology in AV cataloging.

6. **Cataloging Computer Software**

Presenter : Ann Fox, Library of Congress

This presentation will identify how technology affects the cataloging of computer software, what problems/solutions are created and will discuss some shortcuts.

7. **Authority Work and Audiovisual Cataloging**

Presenter : Laurel Jizba, Michigan State University

This workshop will consider the importance of authority work when cataloging for an online system as well as a manual system. Discussion will be designed to aid those preparing for online automated authority files.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT**

Sheila Smyth  
Lorette Wilmot Library  
Nazareth College of Rochester  
P.O. Box 10996  
Rochester, NY 14610-0996  
716/586-2525, Ext. 455

---

**ALCTS AV COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES  
ALA MIDWINTER MEETING IN CHICAGO, JANUARY, 1990**

**Reported by Sheila Smyth**

The Ad Hoc Committee on 538 reviewed the US MARC Format Proposal Change Form. The change involves broadening the Technical Details Note to validate system requirements for videorecordings.

ALCTS AV Producer/Distributor-Library Relations Committee chaired by Bobby Ferguson met on Tuesday, January 9. It was reported that the variant title problems received from libraries were reviewed, attached to explanatory letters and sent to the "offending" publishers. Ten percent of these publishers responded to our letter. The committee reviewed the form and redesigned it to be format specific. Watch for examples in future *OLAC Newsletters*. The Committee reviewed the problems of licensing and contracts accompanying audiovisual material. Examples of these are being collected from both libraries and producer/vendors.

ALCTS AV is sponsoring a program at the ALA 1990 Annual Conference on minimal level cataloging. It will be held on Saturday, June 23, 9:30-12:30. Speakers include Steve Bregman (Nassau County Library), Gary Handman (U.C. Berkeley), Bobby Ferguson (State Library of Louisiana), Karen Homey (Northwestern U.), Glenn Patton (OCLC), and Katherine Garland (LC).

A motion to add a liaison from CCS to ALCTS AV was approved.

The meeting time for ALCTS AV was extended to include a one hour time slot on Sunday mornings from 8 to 9.

---

**MARBI REPORT  
Nancy B. Olson**

MARBI met four times during the ALA Midwinter meeting for a total of twelve and one-half hours. As I could not come until Sunday evening Bobby Ferguson attended the first two sessions and I the last two.

**PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION FORMAT**

The major item on the agenda was discussion of the proposed classification format. This format is being designed to accommodate data from classification schedules, including the Library of Congress Classification, Dewey Decimal Classification, and National Library of Medicine Classification. The first proposal was discussed at the January 1989 MARBI meeting and at an internal LC review. The proposal was rewritten and discussed

in detail at a meeting held in October. The revised proposal was distributed for discussion by MARBI in Chicago.

The format is being developed as a standard format for communication of the data contained in various types of classification schedules. It is being developed as a generic format, one designed to be used for any type of classification. It is not being designed as an authority format. An extensive discussion on the possible uses of the format took place on Sunday. Classification numbers given in the schedules will be included, and the tables will be included, but all the possible combinations will not be specifically input.

The proposal will be rewritten and discussed much more before approval and implementation. A practical concern was expressed by the Library of Congress about the amount of staff time needed to input all the data contained in the 44 volumes of schedules (and their supplements) making up the Library of Congress Classification.

Much discussion revolved around the treatment of numbers and their captions. The earlier document put the numbers and their captions in separate fields. This document put them in separate subfields within the 153 field. That presented other problems. The amount of information making up a complete caption was also discussed, with LC captions having "as many as 17 levels of hierarchy."

Subfielding of an LC classification number was discussed at some length. In the bibliographic records, we use subfields "a" and "b." In this proposal several more subfields are used for sorting purposes. It was pointed out that a number of us with online catalogs are successfully sorting the LC classification numbers as presently subfielded, though there are problems with embedded dates and ordinal numbers such as "23rd" or "5th."

Two possible methods of treating cross-references were also discussed as were all parts of the format, from the leader and directory through the 008, 01X-04X, 6XX notes, and 7XX access and number building fields.

## **OTHER MATTERS**

A proposal relating to code "b" in leader byte 6 in the bibliographic format was discussed, but will be acted on in the summer along with a related proposal. There was some question about its use for mixed collections, and about what would be defined as mixed collections.

A proposal dealing with values for safety base film in byte 12 of the 007 was discussed.

Several proposals and discussion papers were related to concerns of the school and public library communities. Many of them are using microcomputers, and need a MARC format appropriate for microcomputer disks (a leader is not applicable to a disk).

These communities would like a specific note field in which to record awards. There was discussion as to whether an awards and exhibition field would be repeatable or would have repeatable There was also discussion of possible indicators for this information.

Also presented by this community of users was a proposal to record reading, grade, and interest level in the 521 of bibliographic records for books. This was referred back to LC for revision. There were concerns about the "labeling" of material, and whether the information should display or be used only for retrieval. This proposal will re-appear in a revised version this summer.

A discussion paper on subfielding the 538 and/or making the 753 or subfields within the 753 repeatable was tabled for reconsideration in the summer. This proposal was to provide additional access for computer files.

Another discussion paper requested that geographic names established in direct order also be added in indirect order. The discussion addressed the question of who would do a conversion of these records, how to indicate which headings were valid, and what would be done with geographic subdivision records. LC will prepare a proposal based upon the document and the discussion.

## **MULTIPLE VERSIONS**

The Saturday meeting began with a report by Sally McCallum on the Multiple Versions Forum held in December at Airlie House. This topic was referred to repeatedly during the MARBI sessions, as well as during CC:DA and OLAC meetings.

The forum participants recommended a two-tiered hierarchical approach to the handling of originals and their reproductions. The original would be handled in a bibliographic record; the reproduction in a separate holdings record. The discussions were in the content of serials and their reproductions in microform, and monographs with microform reproductions. A CC:DA task force is looking at the effect on audiovisual materials, such as films with their video reproductions. This entire concept will be addressed in greater detail this summer.

There was discussion concerning the coding of country of publication for the country of the original rather than for the reproduction, and using dates 1 and 2 for the dates of an original serial rather than for the date(s) of the reproduction. It was suggested these two concepts could be implemented soon.

---

## **MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP**

### **Report on MOUG Activities 1989 given to OLAC at ALA Midwinter**

**Lowell E. Ashley**

Jay Weitz, OCLC Quality Control Librarian, is the new OCLC liaison to MOUG, replacing Joan Schuitema.

Last year the Library of Congress announced that it was considering discontinuing coding the 045, 047, and 048 fields in records for scores and musical sound recordings. There were a few who have expressed strong opposition to this proposal, and Jerry McBride of Middlebury College undertook a survey in the August issue of the *MOUG newsletter* to determine what local practices were in regard to these fields. The results were reported in the November *MOUG newsletter*.

Thirty-eight people responded, and the results suggested that most people were coding the fields just to follow a standard, that is, to comply with Library of Congress cataloging practice. Very few local systems were indexing these fields or were even planning to do anything with them.

In his comments about the survey, Jerry pointed out several problems with the way that these fields are currently being coded and suggested that some changes need to be made very soon which could make their potential use of sufficient value to strengthen support for continuing to code them. It seems that if nothing is done, the Library of Congress will probably discontinue the coding and the whole concept and potential usefulness of these fields is likely to be gone for all practical purposes.

Reprints of some questions and answers from the *OLAC newsletter* have recently appeared in the *MOUG newsletter*.

MOUG formed a Reference Task Force which has tested a new music-related CD-ROM product from OCLC.

MOUG is preparing its first membership directory to be published sometime this year.

The 3rd edition of *The Best of MOUG*, edited by Judy Weidow, has been published. It must be ordered prepaid from

Judy Weidow, Cataloging  
PCL 2.300  
The General Libraries  
The University of Texas at Austin  
P.O. Box P  
Austin, TX 78713-7330.

Make checks for \$6.50 (includes postage and handling) to "Music OCLC Users Group."

The MOUG NACO-Music Project has progressed well, and 1,395 new authority records were contributed to the LC Name Authority File during the 1988-1989 federal fiscal year. Participating libraries are Eastman School of Music, Sibley Library; Indiana University Music Library; and, recently, the Northwestern University Music Library.

---

## CD-ROM DISC MAINTENANCE AND CARE

Reprinted with permission from the *NELINET Newsletter*

The audio CD industry and its consumer market continue to endorse the compact disc as a virtually indestructible medium for audio distribution. Compared to audio tape and vinyl LP's, the CD seems to approach perfection. CD-ROM users, however, need to be more aware of the less-than-perfect nature of compact disc technology. Most crucially, both manufacturing and user-created errors are unacceptable in CD-ROM when it is used as an information distribution medium. These errors are more tolerable with audio CD's as they are often undetectable to the human ear.

Compact disc technology uses highly sophisticated error detection and correction devices that solve most manufacturing errors. CD-ROM systems are naturally more complex than audio CD systems, as the cost difference attests. CD-ROM drives are capable of recreating (not just approximating) corrupt data strings up to 4,000 bits long. These error correction devices become even more important when the retrieval software itself is stored on the CD. As we proceed to discuss CD maintenance and care, remember that most of the problems are being handled by the CD system itself. And, the better the source data, the less that is required of your system on top of correcting user-created errors.

When a CD-ROM disc arrives at your library, it becomes your responsibility to protect the disc against uncorrectable damage. A word about disc construction will help to identify potential problems. A compact disc is read from its bottom, unlabeled side. The digital code with its aluminum reflective layer, however, is directly under the top surface's protective acrylic layer and printed label. More graphically, the top 1% of the disc's entire thickness accounts for everything from the label to the digital code. The remaining 99% is made up of the polycarbonate substrate layer which gives substance to the disc. Contrary to what we might have thought, the top of a disc is therefore more vulnerable to damage than the bottom. Simply marking a disc on its top surface with normal pressure can irreparably damage a disc's data.

Data loss can also occur from damage to a disc's bottom side. Small scratches are not problematic as they are out of focus to the drive's laser lens. Larger scratches, however, can cause uncorrectable data loss, especially when they are parallel with the data tracks. A scratch perpendicular to the spiral tracks will cause fewer uncorrectable errors. For this reason, always clean your discs with a soft, dust-free cloth by gently wiping the disc from the center out to the edge. Never clean a disc with a circular motion. Avoid disc cleaning devices from audio CD stores that operate in a circular fashion. Though practiced by a leading Boston area musician, we are not ready to endorse dish washers as a suitable method of compact disc cleaning.

General recommendations for disc care include handling discs by the edges and storing discs in their jewel cases when not in use. Particularly when discs are frequently swapped, it is tempting

to lay them aside unprotected. Before long they are being slid around and covered with books, manuals and other items. A half-height drive with caddy cartridges will minimize many of these problems.

Many of the newest and upcoming CD-ROM drives are including features which help to reduce the problems caused by dust build-up. Some vendors are redesigning drive doors and ventilation flow so that dust is not pulled through the disc chamber. The forthcoming Hitachi 3600/3650, for example, will also include a lens cleaning device that is automatically activated when the laser system deteriorates due to dust build-up. Laser lens cleaning devices are also available from most audio CD stores. Usually costing under \$20, these cleaning discs are loaded into your drive and clean the lens with their attached brushes on the bottom side.

Each library should determine its own policies regarding the handling of its compact discs. For some libraries, the end-users may exercise proper care with the discs. In other libraries, this same practice may mean disaster. It is a wise policy to have the CD-ROM staff periodically check discs for data errors and encourage end-users to report any text or software problems.

CD-ROM technology, with all of its sophistication, is still vulnerable to simple misuse. The above recommendations are easy ways to help insure the value of your investment.

---

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

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

**QUESTION:** Our school media system purchases quite a few tape cassettes with accompanying books. The books, as separates, are entered under personal author, but is there a standard operating procedure for entering sound cassettes? According to AACR2R 21.1A2, entry should be under personal author. But when I consult 21.0B1 and 6.0B1, I become confused. Is it legitimate to enter under a personal author if the author is not named on the cassette label? Or, should all entries of this kind be under author, or under title?

**ANSWER:** Sound cassettes like those you mention can present an awkward situation, but we must also use common sense for part of the answer. A cassette label can be hard to work from just because it is so small and the producer is often more interested in fancy graphics to display producer/distributor information than in author information. There are a lot of variables to consider so let me just give you a few suggestions that may be helpful. I assume the recordings you refer to are spoken recordings so that corporate entry under a performing group is not an issue.

In my experience a sound cassette which accompanies a book is often "by" the same person and if cataloged separately would receive the same entry point as the book. How sound cassettes are entered should be determined from the chief source of information. If the chief source (usually the cassette and label) does not provide the information needed, take the information from a

substitute chief source of information. In the case you mention this could be the "accompanying textual material," that is, the book.

If the sound cassette is intended as accompanying material to a text [such as relaxation tapes that accompany texts on relaxation techniques, short excerpts to illustrate the sounds of musical instruments discussed in a text, etc.], catalog it as accompanying material on the same catalog record and keep the two pieces together. In many cases the content of each is enriched by using the two together so it really does a disservice to separate the two parts by cataloging them separately.

--- VU

**QUESTION:** Help me with how to introduce format into the subject headings. Many librarians want to be able to call up a videocassette on sailing or a compact disc of Beethoven's symphonies. Do libraries put this under the 650 tag so it is traceable?

```
Examples:      650    0    $a Sailing    $x Videorecordings
                650    0    $a Symphonies $x Compact disc
                650    0    $a Symphonies $x Sound recordings
```

Doing this helps our librarians quickly trace sailing video tapes or Beethoven symphonies on CD. I would be interested to know how other libraries handle this.

**ANSWER:** There is no consistent LCSH way to do this. The usage you propose is seen on some OCLC records. It is a nonstandard approach and would fall outside usual subject heading maintenance routines in most libraries. I understand the problem, but would encourage catalogers and public service personnel to work together to select local systems that can combine media elements from the fixed field and/or \$h with subjects to gain this approach. If libraries wish to add media names to their subject headings, they should not do so on the permanent records they are contributing to the national databases. Though your organization may not now maintain subject headings through online verification systems, this could be in your future. To fully take advantage of these automation "improvements" nonstandard subject heading use should be kept to a minimum .

--- VU

**QUESTION:** In the *OLAC NEWSLETTER* , v.6, no.2, June 1986, there were varied answers on how to catalog a VHS hi-fi sound recording on a videocassette without pictures. Has there ever been a resolution to that issue?

My first memory of this type of recording was demonstrated at a chapter meeting of the Music Library Association, mainly to exhibit the high quality of sound one experiences in seventh generation copies, or any generation for that matter. We also were able to "watch" the digital signals of the work recorded, Igor Stravinsky's *Petrouschka*. The "image" on the CRT was not unlike a National Geographic Special about a Pioneer/Voyager spacecraft as it passed near Jupiter, the Red Spot, and hurricanes!! Today's digital tape has a series of barcodes as the visual, if one uses a television set for the medium of "listening/viewing." However, if one is not

watching, but merely listening to the music, then a Digital Pulse Code Modulator is required. Sound recorded on the visual portion of a videocassette is said to be of higher quality if a modulator is used.

To call this a videorecording for playback purposes would be accurate, because a modulator or TV set is required. But without a note designating that this recording is only audio, the user would clearly be misled. The definition of sound recording seems to fit more, since these are "sound recordings on film (other than those intended to accompany visual images...)" (*AACR2R* 6.0A1). The purpose of watching a videorecording of a certain performer(s) is to learn the performer's moves, stage presence, and observe visual mannerisms. The purpose of a sound recording, whether on audiotape or videotape is to gain an understanding of the music composed, the style of the performer and musical (sound) nuances employed, to enjoy the listening experience just as one would with LP or CD recordings.

**ANSWER:** " ... Consider that the basic question is already answered by Chapter 6. During the discussions 1974-1978, there were several types of sound recordings outside the mainstream, and even now I occasionally hear of one. For all these that we didn't mention under 6.5B1, and for all those to come later (such as video), we put in the provision "if none of these terms is appropriate give the specific name of the item as concisely as possible." Because what is contained or held by the package **is** a sound recording, it must be cataloged under Chapter 5, regardless of the physical package, which is mentioned only in the area for physical description. Using the provision I quoted, one would quickly come up with " sound videocassette" as the specific material designation. Some slight inventiveness is needed for the remainder of the area, but the example of sound track film should make it clear that the other details appropriate to the area can come from other chapters. Finally, a note would be necessary, primarily to make it crystal clear that while the term "videocassette" has been used in the description, don't expect any pictures, moving images, or whatever you call the normal main component of a videocassette. All this seems too simple to require rule additions or interpretation -- if you accept the main point that a sound recording is a sound recording, no matter what its physical nature.

--- Ben Tucker (LC)

After considerable thought, I believe that this is in fact the proper solution. It does pose some practical problems in transcribing information that is helpful to users of the material. Use the GMD "sound recording". The SMD that Ben suggests seems appropriate "1 sound videocassette". Since my library exercises the option to give the format note as the first note for videocassettes, I would construct a first note along the lines of:

"Recorded on a VHS videocassette for playback on a VCR with pulse code modulator or CRT."

The 007 of the sound recording format should be constructed with the videocassette format treated as "other" not as "cassette" in the subfield "b" since cassette in the 007 means specifically sound cassette. Jay Weitz at OCLC suggested the following codes for the 007:

\$a s sound recording ,br> \$b z other sound medium  
\$d z other speed  
\$e s stereo (if given)  
\$f n no grooves  
\$g z other dimensions  
\$h o 1/2 in.  
\$i z other tape configuration

--- VU

**QUESTION:** I have been cataloging CD-ROM reference sources, most of which appear serially, that is, with cumulative, usually quarterly, updates. When you subscribe to, say, ERIC on Silverplatter, or AGRICOLA, you commit yourself to sending back an outdated CD-ROM each time a new one is sent to you from the vendor. Definitely a serial, right? I am finding instances on OCLC where the cataloging agency has cataloged only the archival disks, not the updates and has done them as monographs. On the MRDF format, it takes only a keystroke to change the Fixed Field Bib lvl: from m to s. Does this warrant a new record for different treatment?

**ANSWER:** I would probably put in a new serial record rather than recoding a monographic record. If you input a serial record the numerous notes that are needed to explain the life of a serial will be there permanently so that each new user of the record will not need to do the m to s fixed field conversion plus keying in the needed serial notes. This treatment will be true to the nature of the item, more efficient for the numerous libraries using the record in a national utility, and can be essential for libraries with automated acquisitions systems.

--- VU

---

Last modified: December 1997