OLAC NEWSLETTER
Volume 5, Number 1
March, 1985

FEATURING:

MIDWINTER REPORTS
OLAC LOGO CONTEST
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CIP SURVEY
OLAC OFFICER NOMINATIONS
WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? TOPIC: CAPTIONING
CATALOGING MICRO SOFTWARE AT FIU, PART II
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR
Verna Urbanski

As you can see, we're trying a new look for the newsletter. We are generating the copy using an OCLC M300 and SSI's (Satellite Software International) WordPerfect. So your editor is being dragged kicking into the last quarter of the twentieth century. So far, so good. But, we have a ways to go to proficiency.

Besides the new generating method you'll notice a sturdier cover and ivory colored pages for easier coping. We plan to standardize the information found on the inside of the covers so you'll always find the same type of information in the same place.

At the risk of winning the 'Snake in the Grass' award, we are changing the title of the newsletter from *NEWSLETTER* to *OLAC NEWSLETTER* with this issue. It is a small change, but will better reflect how people refer to and think of the newsletter. Also, in keeping with the current trend to cease hyphenating on-line, we are removing the hyphen from our name. The organization will continue to use OLAC for its acronym since the best that can be said of the acronym "OAC" is that it fits our initials exactly!

The Editor would like to thank John Hein, head of Technical Services, and Robert Jones, head of Operations/Systems at the University of North Florida's Carpenter Library, for their support and guidance in the adoption of WordPerfect. Their technical advice and patience has been greatly appreciated by the Editor. Indeed, the Editor owes thanks in an ongoing way to the staff of the Cataloging Department who frequently lend a hand and offer encouragement.

We hope you will like the new look and the new name. Also notice that the expiration of your membership is now indicated on your mailing label. So if you "expired" 12-84, you're late in renewing (AGAIN!!??). Contact Cathy Leonardi for renewal.

FROM THE CHAIR
Sheila S. Intner

Let me bring you up to date on the progress made at Midwinter for the activities discussed in my previous column:

1. **CATALOGING POLICY:** Reports in this issue describe the specifics of CAPC's meeting under the outstanding leadership of Chair, Verna Urbanski. S Some of the pending issues were resolved by agreements made at the international level during meetings of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR held in the interim. The complex nature of cataloging and tagging nonprint requires that CAPC members do their homework carefully anyway. Those attending CAPC maintained a broad view of problems and were sensitive to the impact of proposed solutions.

   Our survey concerning GMD "machine-readable data files" received 34 replies. Responses were overwhelmingly in favor of a change from that term to "computer software." (Objections to "computer software" as a GMD focus on equating software only with programs and not with data files. Question: If data files can be construed also to cover programs, why not the reverse?) I hope CAPC will examine these results and decide whether to take action at their next meeting.

2. **CIP FOR AV:** The ALA interdivisional AV-CL-P Committee met with Bob Mead-Donaldson chairing the meeting. Proposals were made to survey the field for answers to questions LC wants to use for guiding development of CIP for microcomputer software. Micro software was decided to be the initial focus of AV-CIP. Susan Vita was made official LC liaison and I was appointed to the Committee, too, by RTSD. LC is developing a pilot project now and is moving swiftly to put it in place by the summer.
3. **MEETINGS, ETC.:** During the Cataloging Clinic at Midwinter, members posed tricky questions for clinicians, Ben Tucker, Dick Thaxter and Glenn Patton. They did a splendid job of providing answers. Moderator was Nancy Olson. Though the focus was on MRDF, question ranged over many topics.

   REMEMBER: When you come to an OLAC business meeting, bring your problem items with you and get assistance in both cataloging and coding them. The clinic is a regular feature of the meeting.

   Carmela DiDomenico and Vice-Chair Katha Massey are deep into plans for our information exchange on cataloging and tagging micro software, set for Tuesday, July 9th from 9 to 11 am in Chicago, during ALA annual conference. Put this in your calendar right away!

   Barbara Ritchie, Bo-Gay Tong and others are developing plans for an OLAC meeting at UTLAS to be held early in November, 1986. (**NOTE:** This is a date change. Plans were

originally to hold the meeting in 1985.) UTLAS is preparing to host 150 OLAC members and we hope to coordinate our plans with the Ontario Library Association, too.

4. **MEMBERSHIP:** Treasurer Cathy Leonardi reported our membership is still growing, topping 570. Suggestions on ways to attract new members and involve all more directly in OLAC are always welcome. Don't wait for a meeting to offer them, but write, phone or email your ideas RIGHT AWAY to me or other members of the Executive Board.

   One of our most important services to members is our *OLAC NEWSLETTER*, showing off its terrific new image with this issue, thanks to the creative ideas of Editor Verna Urbanski. Lend your copy to a colleague and encourge her/him to join us.

FROM THE TREASURER
Catherine Leonardi

Reporting period:
September 17, 1984 through January 14, 1985

Account balance June 11, 1984	**$5,648.54**
INCOME	
New memberships	**215.00**
Renewal memberships	**3,438.00**
Interest paid on account	**176.63**
Back issues	**162.50**
TOTAL INCOME	**$3,992.13**
TOTAL	**$9,640.67**
EXPENSES	
Newsletter v.4, no.4 (includes $50. editor stipend)	**413.73**
School library advertisement	**52.42**
Renewal notices	**69.65**
Treasurer's postage	**21.03**
Editor's postage fund	**20.00**
Tape of OLAC's Dallas program	**4.50**
NC intangibles tax	**5.72**
ALA Washington, DC	
Board stipends	**200.00**
Board dinner	**79.71**
TOTAL EXPENSES	**$866.76**
Nine-month CD at 10.05%	**$2,001.85**

TOTAL	**$2,868.61**
ACCOUNT BALANCE January 14, 1985	**$6,772.06**
CURRENT MEMBERSHIP 375	

CAPC VACANCY OCCURS

The Cataloging Policy Committee of Online Audiovisual Catalogers has accepted the resignation of one of its members and is now seeking to fill the vacancy. CAPC represents "the concerns of audiovisual catalogers in matters relating to the formation, interpretation and implementation of national and international cataloging standards and related matters." It is a standing committee of OLAC consisting of seven voting members and two ex-officio members. Members serve two year terms. Qualified candidates will either currently catalog av materials or have equivalent experience. Candidates should have three years of qualifying experience before appointment to CAPC. Candidates must be willing to commit time and funds as necessary to meet at midwinter and annual ALA conferences for the purpose of conducting CAPC business. Additionally, candidates should interact regularly with online cataloging systems or have a demonstrable knowledge of such systems.

Appointments to the committee are made by the Chair of OLAC following consultation and review of the applications by the Executive Board. If you are a member of OLAC and are interested in serving on CAPC, submit a recent resume and a cover letter which addresses the requirements indicated above. Send letters of application and resumes by **April 15, 1985**, to: Sheila Intner, OLAC Chair, School of Library Service, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.

HOW CREATIVE PEOPLE CAN EARN 25 BIG ONES

Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc., has struggled since its 1980 founding under the burden of living **"LIFE WITHOUT A LOGO."** The pressure has finally become too great, the stigma of logo-lessness too shameful!!! So we're asking you, our members and readers, to rescue OLAC from its perch over the abyss of creative obscurity by designing a fresh, unique, appealing and meaningful logo for the organization. The logo should be appropriate for use on the cover of the *OLAC NEWSLETTER* and the official stationery used by the officers of OLAC.

Submit a final copy draft of your logo candidate(s?) by May 31, 1985. Each logo submission should be on a separate 8 1/2 x 11 sheet of white paper. Please do not indicate who designed the logo on its sheet. The Board wishes to maintain the anonymity of each creative genius until the final selection is made. Selection of the winning logo will be made by the Board at their meeting during annual conference in Chicago this July. The winner will be announced in the September issue of the *OLAC NEWSLETTER*. In addition to kilos of kudos the winner will receive $25.00 as a token of appreciation from the organization.

Please send submissions to: Verna Urbanski, LOGO CONTEST, Carpenter Library, U of North Florida, PO Box 17605, Jacksonville, FL 32245-7605.

GET INVOLVED ! ! !
RUN FOR AN OLAC OFFICE

Each year in the March issue of the *OLAC NEWSLETTER* you've seen a notice asking for nominations for one or more OLAC offices. It's time once again to volunteer your services.

There will be two vacancies as of the end of the ALA conference in Chicago, vice-chair/chair elect and treasurer. The current vice-chair, Katha Massey, becomes chair after annual ALA and current treasurer Catherine Leonardi's term of office expires.

If you wish to run for one of these positions please send your name and a brief letter describing your experience and interests to the chair of the nominating committee, Nancy Olson. Be sure to specify which office you're running for. Apply by March 29th. Send letters of nomination to: Nancy Olson, Memorial Library, Mankato State University, Mankato, MN 56001.

We are hoping to involve OLAC members who haven't been active yet. So don't be shy. We know there are many talented people lurking out there in the membership rolls. So **"COME ON DOWN"** and make your mark on OLAC!!! officers of OLAC automatically serve on the Executive Board. If you want to influence OLAC program planning or alter the direction of the organization this is your opportunity.

FACILITATORS NEEDED

OLAC is planning a MRDF cataloging information exchange to be held during Chicago annual conference and, if successful, to be repeated at New York annual. A time slot of Tuesday, July 9th from 9-11 am has been requested. Several experts will be available to give authoritative answers to questions about MRDF cataloging raised during the sessions. The format of the

program will involve forming small discussion groups of 10 to 15 people. OLAC will provide a group facilitator for each small group. The facilitator will moderate the discussion and formulate question from the small group to be asked of the experts in the second half of the session.

OLAC needs volunteers to act as facilitators during the small group discussion phase of the program. We are interested in recruiting persons who are familiar with the MRDF format and the ALA guidelines for cataloging MRDF. If you have had experience cataloging this material and are interested in being a facilitator please contact Carmela Di Domenico, the chair of the planning committee. Tell briefly what your experience includes. Please note that this is a good way to share your acquired expertise without needing to do a lot of preparation. After the program is over facilitators will be asked to supply a written account of questions and answers generated by their groups. Unfortunately, OLAC can not offer program facilitators any honorarium above the 'honor' of helping your fellow catalogers be better at what they do! Publicity for the program will emphasize that it is a non-rigid format with the participants really participating!!! Contact the chair before May 6 to be considered. Carmela Di Domenico, Health Sciences Library, U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27514, (919) 962-0500.

MARC HOLDINGS FORMAT USE

The Cataloging Policy Committee of the Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc., is investigating the nature of the use to which the bibliographic utilities and other networks are likely to put the MARC holding format, with particular attention to the approach taken to holdings in multiple physical formats. We would very much like to hear from those who anticipate a need to be able to maintain holdings in multiple physical formats attached to one bibliographic record. If you have comments relating to the nature of your needs in this regard, the services you would like to have made available from networks, etc., please write to the Cataloging Policy Committee, c/o Martha M. Yee, Cataloging Supervisor, UCLA Film, Television and Radio Archives, 1438 Melnitz Hall, 405 Hilgard, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

MRDF TYPE CODE CHANGES
Jay Weitz

Since the implementation of the MRDF format at OCLC, we have received numerous type code change requests for online records which include no indication that a computer disk is part of the item. Many publishers make available the same books and manuals both with and without a disk, even in cases where printed material seems to be the accompanying documentation for a disk. It is perfectly legitimate to catalog such disk-less documentation by itself in the Books format. Separate records for the documentation alone and for the disk with its documentation are not

considered to be duplicates, and type code changes should not be submitted for the former. Only records which have a clear and explicit indication that a computer disk is present are candidates for change to type "m."

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION?
TOPIC:
CAPTIONING
V. Urbanski

In a continuing effort to help AACR2 fit the needs of av users and catalogers, the Cataloging Policy Committee of OLAC is considering asking CC:DA to add provisions to handle captioning, closed-captioning and signing on av items. It seems to several members that the need to know if an item is captioned or signed is vital to the access provided a hearing impaired patron. Having the information routinely available, it is thought, could enhance a hearing impaired person's relationship to the library and raise awareness in general.

The question is, how best to provide this information in a catalog record? There are several options. At CAPC's Midwinter meeting members and guests reviewed rule revision proposals which would add the information to the "other physical details" section of the physical description area.

> **8.5C4.** For filmstrips with captions, add before the third sentence of 8.5C4: Indicate if the filmstrips are captioned. Add two examples:
>
> 1 filmstrip (60 fr.) : sd., captioned, col.
>
> 1 filmstrip (43 fr.) : captioned, b&w
>
> **8.5C12.** For slides, add before the last sentence of 8.5C12: Indicate if the slides are captioned. Add the example:
>
> 80 slides : captioned, col.
>
> **7.5C.** Some videorecordings are closed-captioned for the hearing impaired. A special attachment is needed for a television to decode the information and produce captions on the pictures. Both f ilms and videos can have captions or signing. Add as the last sentence of 7.5C3: If appropriate indicate if the material is captioned, closed captioned or signed. Add as examples:
>
> 1 videocassette (45 min.) : sd., signed, col.
>
> 2 f ilm reels (ca. 20 min. each) : sd., captioned, b&w
>
> 1 videocassette (55 min.) : sd., closed-captioned, col.

Another strong option is to put this information in the notes area rather than physical description area. Advocates of this solution suggest that this information is closely akin to language information and belongs in the notes area with 7.7B2 and 8.7B2 being appropriate locations. Putting this information in the notes area has the added "advantage" it is said, of not needing a rule revision to implement. CAPC could merely ask LC for a rule interpretation and provide examples to accompany it.

A third suggestion would add this as a category of description provided by the 007. This would facilitate retrieval while not burdening the descriptive cataloging.

As can be seen, each of these methods has its advantages and disadvantages, but anyone of them would allow for improved access to this information In at least some form. CAPC would appreciate hearing from OLAC members interested in this topic. We would like to know if members believe there is a need to record this information, how best to record it on the cataloging and whether or not it should be added as a coded f ield to the MARC formats. Please send responses to these questions to: Dorian Martyn, Louis Calder Memorial Library, University of Miami, School of Medicine, PO Box 016950, Miami, Fl. 33101. Dorian is a member of CAPC and has agreed to coordinate responses on this topic. A report will be presented at the Chicago meeting. Send responses by April 30th.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS MICROSOFTWARE SURVEY

The Library of Congress plans to conduct a one-year pilot which will include 1,000 microsoftware titles in the Cataloging in Publication program. School and public libraries, and to a lesser degree academic and special libraries, are collecting microsoftware and looking to LC for guidance in cataloging this material. In the area of microcomputer software, however, LC has thus far done no cataloging. This pilot is designed to gain experience in processing microsoftware for the nation's libraries and for LC's own collection.

Current plans are to begin the pilot in January 1986. Lead time will be used to do internal development work which will enable LC to create and distribute records in the MRDF (Machine Readable Data Files) format, to recruit software publishers, and to establish guidelines for participation in the pilot.

Many questions must be answered before such a project is undertaken. Defining the scope of the materials to be included, determining which bibliographic elements to include in the CIP data, and deciding where, physically, the CIP data will appear, are among the most pressing questions.

Moreover, the task will not be accomplished without the cooperation of the software manufacturers. It is expected that the manufacturers will want to know how these materials are being used in libraries before they commit themselves to cooperation in the pilot.

With the following questionnaire LC is attempting to gather the information necessary to define the scope of the pilot and to answer publishers' questions about the value of the program for libraries and publishers alike. No attempt has been made to achieve a statistically selected sample; respondents will be self-selected. Primitive though this method may be, it is thought that the information received will be sufficient for the purposes of beginning the pilot.

Your cooperation in photocopying the questionnaire, answering the questions, and promptly returning it to the Library will be greatly appreciated. If you presently do not collect software, but you plan to do so in the near future, your input is also invited. Please return completed questionnaires to: Susan H. Vita, Cataloging in Publication Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC 20540

****

Circle **y** or **n** as indicated. For longer comments, please attach extra sheets and indicate clearly what question you are answering.

1. What type of library do you represent? Circle one:
   Academic Public School (grade level__?)
   Special (subject specialty is_____?)
2. Do you acquire software? y / n
   Do you plan to acquire it in the near future? y / n
3. What is the size of your current software collection, e.g., number of titles?

   How much do you expect to spend on software in 1985?
   $_____ In 1986? $_____

4. What kinds of software do you acquire?

   Applications programs, e.g., spread sheets, word processing packages, data base managers? y / n
   Arcade games? y / n
   Educational games? y / n
   Curriculum supporting courseware? y / n
   Computer aided instruction programs? y / n

   What types of the above do you collect?
   For what age level?
   What other types do you acquire?

5. Do you limit your purchases to certain hardware? y / n
   Or, to certain operating systems? y / n
   If yes, what types do you buy?

   If no, how do you decide what to purchase?

6. Which producers' products do you purchase most frequently?
7. How do you find out about what is available?

   How do you determine which of two similar programs to purchase?

8. What do you do with software once it is acquired?

Do you loan it? y / n
For home use? y / n
For classroom use? y / n
Or, is it used only in the library? y / n

Is it used in any other way?

9. How do you store and house software?

   Are the containers kept? y / n
   What sort of accompanying materials come with the items you purchase?

   Are they ever separated from the piece? y / n
   How do you shelve software?

   In a classed arrangement? y / n
   By Dewey number? y / n
   By LC number? y / n
   How else?

10. How do your patrons ask for software?

    By specific name? y / n
    By operating system or hardware? y / n
    By subject? y / n

    How else?

11. Why exactly do you want CIP for software?
12. Do you catalog software? y / n
    Why do you need to catalog it?

    For inventory? y / n
    For retrieval? y / n
    Other reasons?

13. What are the greatest problems that you encounter in cataloging it?

    The details of description? y / n
    The content? y / n
    Determining the main entry? y / n
    Making the subject determinations? y / n

    Other cataloging problems?

14. Do you currently integrate catalog records for software into your general catalog? y / n

Into both author/title catalog and subject catalog? y / n

15. Where would the CIP information be most useful to you?

    As part of the program? y / n
    On the container? y / n
    In the accompanying material? y / n
    As a separate card inserted in the package? y / n
    On the MARC tapes? y / n

    Where else?

16. What information do you find you need most on a catalog record for software?

    The normal descriptive cataloging information, e.g., author, title, publisher? y / n
    The physical description, e. g., the format, the disk size, etc.? y / n
    The operating system or hardware on which it runs? y / n
    The subject information? y / n
    Other information?

If there are other points you would like to make, please do so. Thank you for taking the time to give the Library of Congress the benefit of your experience in this area.

ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS, INC.
BUSINESS MEETING
JANUARY 5, 1985

The business meeting of online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. was called to order by Chair, Sheila Intner at 8:05, in the Rockville Room of the Sheraton Washington Hotel in Washington, DC. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as published in the September 1984 issue of the *NEWSLETTER.*

Catherine Leonardi, treasurer, presented the following financial and membership report as of December 19, 1984:

```
          1) Bank account                  $6,375.40 (8.4% varies)
             Certificate of Deposit        $2,000.00 (10.05% fixed)

             Current balance               $8,375.40

          2) Membership ( 12/20/84) : 585  (291 personal, 291 institutional,
3 exchanges)
             Membership (12/27/83):   474
```

**** Approximately 73 members had already taken advantage of the discount given for multiple year renewals.**

Carmela Di Domenico reported on the microcomputer software cataloging workshop originally proposed for the 1985 summer meeting in Chicago. Because of problems in obtaining a Sunday or Monday time-slot through RTSD AV (since OLAC is not an ALA organization, it cannot be granted a time between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm on Saturday-Monday during ALA conferences), the meeting is now tentatively being planned for either Sunday or Monday at the New York meeting in 1986. Carmela presented the following outline on behalf of the planning committee consisting of herself, Dorian Martyn and Verna Urbanski (Katha Massey, a fourth member of the committee was not able to attend the planning meeting):

1. Format:
    1. A moderator (Sheila Intner)
    2. Resource people (experts) from the Library of Congress, OCLC, RLIN, UTLAS, WLN
    3. Small group facilitators (ask for volunteers and also actively recruit)
    4. Proposed agenda: Moderator introduces the resource people and small group facilitators and orchestrates the breaking up into small groups; small groups provide an opportunity for discussion and information exchanges with facilitators moderating the discussion, helping formulate questions, and acting as recorders for the group; in the reconvened large group, facilitators ask the recorded questions of the resource people; the moderator wraps up discussion and concludes the program.
2. Time - approximately 2-2 1/2 hours.
3. Audience - plan for 100 people.
4. Registration? No preregistration or fee required.
5. Co-sponsors - will look for these. Possibilities: PLA Cataloging Needs of Public Libraries and RTSD Audiovisual Committee.

Barbara Ritchie, program chair for the proposed OLAC conference in Toronto at UTLAS, gave a progress report. Preliminary arrangements with UTLAS for supplying meeting rooms, coffee breaks, etc., have been confirmed. In addition, she has written to the Ontario Library Association about possibly holding the meeting in conjunction with its annual conference scheduled for November 1986 in Toronto, but she has not yet received a reply.

A report on CAPC activities was presented by the chair, Verna Urbanski. The committee met Friday, January 4, 1985, from 8:00 pm to 10:00 pm and discussed several rule revision proposals and other concerns. (See a separate report in this issue -- Editor).

Reports by liaisons from the bibliographic utilities were given as follows (the UTLAS representative was unable to attend):

1. **WLN** (Gwen Culp reporting for Erlene Rickerson)

1. WLN is not yet doing anything with the MARC Holdings Format since the Biblio Technique System has a detailed holdings component which WLN will incorporate.
2. WLN plans to implement the two-dimensional aspects of the Visual Materials Format by April 1985.

2. **RLIN** (Ed Glazier)
    1. RLIN has just finished installing an Ahmdal computer in place of IBM equipment in anticipation of a need to increase capacity in 1985. It was a major conversion which went smoothly. The system was available for searching on January 5 and was supposed to be available for input on January 7, 1985.
    2. Recent new members: SUNY Buffalo, SUNY Albany, SUNY Stonybrook, University of Southern California.
    3. RLIN will implement MARC update numbers 9 and 10 (MRDF and 2-dimensional materials) as a package in spring 1985.
    4. LC's minimal level cataloging records (MLC) were ready to be loaded just as the machine conversion began and had to be deferred. They should be loaded very soon. Loading of LC's music MARC records is also imminent.
    5. The State Historical Society of Wisconsin will begin to use the new Archives and Manuscript Control Format; other historical societies and archival repositories will be eagerly awaiting the results of its experiences.
3. **OCLC** (Glenn Patton)
    1. OCLC implemented the MRDF format on October 1, 1984, and it seems to be working well. Since October OCLC staff have participated in many training workshops. The format was produced using a computer layout on facilities available inhouse. Conversion to the new format of MRDF records input before October using the Audiovisual or Books format is continuing by OCLC staff.
    2. OCLC implemented the Archives and Manuscript Control Format at the end of October 1984, and it also is going well.
    3. A new edition of Bibliographic Input Standards, due at the end of January 1985, will include some minor changes to "K" level records to accommodate MLC records.
    4. A system enhancement due in the next few months is universal upgrade capability for "K" level records. In essence, these records will be unlocked.
    5. OCLC is currently receiving applications for the second round of ENHANCE authorizations - deadline is January 25th. Interested institutions should contact their networks. No institutions were given ENHANCE authorizations for audiovisual materials in the first round. This time OCLC will be looking specifically for institutions applying for audiovisual and map authorizations.
    6. During Christmas, OCLC did a total regeneration of all indexes to the OLUC and the NAF which took approximately 72 hours of uninterrupted computer time.
    7. OCLC is moving ahead with indexing of the 028 field and hopes to implement this capability by late spring 1985.
    8. OCLC has not set a date for implementation of the two-dimensional aspects of the Visual Materials Format.
    9. OCLC has no staff available at present to make the software changes needed to load Music/MARC and MLC/MARC records from LC. There is no estimate on

when these records might be loaded. The earlier MLC/APIF records will cause the most problems and require much conversion work to load. Since OCLC has not yet seen any of the newer MLC/MARC records, they cannot say definitely, but it is hoped they will cause fewer problems.

In answer to a question from Sheila Intner about when OCLC might be able to have the system up 24 hours a day, Glenn made these comments: Right now for four days a week, the system is up at 4:00 am because of users in UK and France. This factor has cut down significantly on processing and maintenance time for the system and is causing real constraints. OCLC is now in the middle of the Oxford Project, a complete re-design of hardware and software for the entire OLUC which will eventually mean replacement of all equipment. The DCP is "sort of" a first step in that process. When this is completed in a couple of years, 24-hour availability of the system will be more possible than now, but many problems will still remain.

Under old business, Sheila reported from CC:DA on the formation of a task force to examine and respond to two British MRDF proposals: 1) LA/BL pamphlet which corresponds to ALA/RTSD's published guidelines for the cataloging of microcomputer software, 2) LA/BL proposal to revise Chapter 9 of AACR2 to incorporate rule changes.

Ben Tucker (LC) talked about a proposal to the Joint Steering Committee by the publishers of AACR2 to do a consolidated reprinting incorporating all text changes - probably in 1987 (they would need at least a year of lead time) . This is being very carefully described so there will be no talk of coming out with AACR3! In discussion of the proposal when it was presented, there was concern raised about the need to incorporate new changes - many of these proposed changes have to do with nonbook materials.

No report from Chris McCawley, OLAC's liaison to MARBI.

An announcement was made of the first meeting of the newly formed Interdivisional Group to Promote Cataloging in Publication for Audiovisual Materials (AV-CIP) which was to be held Sunday, January 6, 1985. Bob Mead-Donaldson and Helen Cyr, RTSD representatives, are currently co-chairing the group.

In the interest of saving time, copies of the proposed OLAC Conference Planning Guidelines were distributed, and everyone was encouraged to send comments and suggestions about the guidelines to the Chair.

Verna Urbanski, *NEWSLETTER* editor, distributed the 1985 publication schedule. She also announced that she will begin adding membership expiration dates to mailing labels for the *NEWSLETTER.* In addition, she is planning to produce an index to volumes 1-4 of the *NEWSLETTER* and hopes to have it ready by September.

The Chair reminded everyone of the elections to be held before the summer meeting in Chicago for vice-chair/chair-elect and treasurer. She asked that anyone interested in serving on a

nominating committee give her their names before the OLAC Board meeting scheduled for Sunday, January 6, 1985, at 8 pm.

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM! The business meeting was followed by a MRDF cataloging clinic from 9:00-10:00 pm.

Submitted by
Katha Massey for
Antonia Snee

ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS, INC.
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 6, 1985

The Executive Board meeting of OLAC was called to order by Sheila Intner at 8:20 pm. Because some members had to leave early the Board agreed to deviate slightly from the published agenda.

The treasurer, Catherine Leonardi, reported an OLAC balance of over $8,000 with 585 current members as of 12/20/84. Leonardi raised several question with the Board:

1. It has been suggested by Laurel Jizba that OLAC purchase two copies of the Dallas program, with one copy going to the OLAC archives and one to Martha to show our appreciation. The tapes cost $4.50 each. The motion was made and carried.
2. Concern was expressed about the number of back issues of the *NEWSLETTER* the treasurer should keep. Verna Urbanski told the Board that she keeps 2 copies of each issue as OLAC archive copies. Sheila asked Board members to consider making an on-line copy of all the back issues rather than relying on paper copies. Nancy Olson suggested that we might be able to distribute issues through ERIC. Nancy will send the Board information for their consideration. Motion was made and carried that further discussion be deferred to Chicago.
3. In the upcoming meeting with UTLAS, should OLAC require payment in US funds? It was moved and carried to accept payment in Canadian currency equal to US rate.
4. OLAC lost money while Cathy waited to hear from the Board on purchase of a CD. Verna suggested that we allow Cathy to open such accounts without asking Board approval. Motion was made and approved.

Sheila moved to the discussion of committee matters.

Nancy Olson will continue as OLAC's audience representative to RTSD/CCS/CC:DA. Currently, Sheila who is the RTSD AV liaison to CC:DA xeroxes copies of the CC:DA documents and sends them to Nancy. Martha Yee suggested that OLAC subscribe to CC:DA documents and have them sent to OLAC's audience representative. Motion was made and carried.

Sheila asked Nancy Olson and Martha Yee to help write the needed justification for representation to CC:DA. Martha responded that she would be glad to send a letter of support but felt that an OLAC Board member should write the justification. Verna Urbanski agreed to write a justification draft for the Board. Sheila will send Board members a copy of the final justification before submitting it to CC:DA.

Verna reported that CAPC reviewed several rule revision proposals at their Midwinter meeting. Two will be sent to CC:DA for consideration, one was taken by Ben Tucker to include in a LC rule revision packet, three had already been handled adequately by JSC and were not acted on. Of those remaining, either further discussion or future action is pending.

Chris McCawley, OLAC liaison to MARBI, reported that the MARBI review committee may recommend to ALA that MARBI become an ALA committee rather than a joint committee of three different divisions.

Sheila proposed to the Board that a nominating committee be formed to present a ballot before the meeting in Chicago. There are two positions that need nominations: vice-chair/ chair-elect and treasurer. A nominating committee of Nancy Olson, Ed Hall and Toni Snee was appointed by the Board. It was requested that the membership be notified in the next *NEWSLETTER* to submit nominations by March 15th.

We have run into problems with the 2-5:30 time slot for the workshop in Chicago. Apparently there is a misunderstanding between various levels of ALA as to the number of programs any single group can be asked to co-sponsor at a conference. Sheila will clear up the misunderstanding and try for a 2-4 time slot on Sunday or Monday at the conference in New York.

Barbara Ritchie reported that she contacted UTLAS about sponsoring a joint meeting with Ontario Library Association in 1986 but so far has not had a response. She will contact them again after Midwinter. Barbara asked for suggested topics. The Board moved to table discussion of topic until it was clear what UTLAS would be able to supply. [Members with suggested topics for the conference should contact: Barbara Ritchie, Catalog Dept. , U of Texas -- El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968-0582 or call (915) 747-58311.

OLD BUSINESS

Verna moved the adoption and use of the OLAC Conference Planning Guidelines for the next year. Motion carried with the understanding that they may be revised in the future.

Verna proposed some changes to the format of the *NEWSLETTER* and furnished several samples for the Board to consider. The Board selected a heavier cover of the current color and a lighter color interior of the current weight.

It was suggested that we initiate a logo contest for OLAC. Details will appear in the next *NEWSLETTER.* A discussion to change the name of the *NEWSLETTER* was tabled until Chicago.

Verna reapplied for the H.W. Wilson prize and sent copies of the 1984 issues to be considered. Sheila and the rest of the Board thanked Verna for her efforts for the *NEWSLETTER.*

The Board agreed that the upcoming index for the *NEWSLETTER* should be cumulative and that we should charge for it. A discussion of how much to charge for the index was tabled until Verna could see its size and get cost estimates from a printer.

NEW BUSINESS

Last piece of business was to have been a discussion with the various networks on how OLAC interacts with each of them. Unfortunately, not all the network representatives were able to attend the meeting. Glenn Patton of OCLC was able to attend and briefly reviewed the nature of the relationship between OCLC and OLAC. Glenn sees the *OLAC NEWSLETTER* as a major contribution to the dispersing of information to AV catalogers.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm.

Submitted,
Antonia Snee, Secretary

Board members and guests attending: Martha Yee, Barbara Ritchie, Cathy Leonardi, Sheila Intner, Nancy Olson, Katha Massey, Glenn Patton, Verna Urbanski, Toni Snee.

MINUTES OF THE OLAC CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE

Held January 4, 1985 8-10 pm
Sheraton Washington Hotel
Washington, DC

Submitted by Verna Urbanski, Chair

RULE REVISION PROPOSALS

The Committee and their guests (see list of attendees below) reviewed the rule revisions submitted by Committee member Nancy Olson. OLAC member and LC Chief of Descriptive Cataloging, Ben Tucker, had had access to the proposals prior to the meeting and was on hand to offer suggestions. The Chair furnished the Committee with copies of Mr. Tucker's written comments on Ms. Olson's proposals.

Three of the proposals had already been dealt with by the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) at their September, 1984 meetings. The Committee therefore did not pursue discussion of these proposals. These were: 1) 1.4B10, area 4 for unpublished materials, 2) 6.2B2, playing time of sound recordings, and 3) 1.5D2 (nee 1.5F1 in the Olson proposals), addition of "in container" to physical description. Concerning 1.5D2, Mr. Tucker furnished the following JSC approved text:

> **1.5D2.** Optionally, if the item is in a container, name the container and give its dimensions either after the dimensions of the item or as the only dimensions.

Tucker also indicated that LC is preparing a packet of proposals for JSC regarding certain changes needed for videodisc cataloging in AACR2. He offered to include Olson's 7.5C6 proposal, playing speed of a videodisc, in the LC packet. CAPC members approved this action. (Other concerns to be looked at in this LC packet include: no playing speed for videodiscs, how to handle extent of item for motion and still images combined on a videodisc, the need to have a standard description of terms for the technical specification for videodiscs (optical, CED, VHD, etc.) and how to handle interactive videodiscs).

Proposals for 6.5B1, 7.5B1 (smd for sound records and motion picture/videorecordings) and B.5D1, 10.5D1, 6.5D1 (to provide for a range of sizes) were approved by the Committee in the form submitted by Olson. The Chair will submit these to CC:DA with a courtesy copy to the Music Library Association's Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging.

Proposals for 8.5C4, 8.5C12, 7.5C3 (indicating captioning in the physical description), garnered mixed reactions. The Chair will write a brief article for the *NEWSLETTER* asking for input. The Committee will reconsider this proposal at Chicago annual, in light of OLAC member response.

Proposals for 10.4G2 also got mixed reactions. The Chair distributed copies of a rewrite prepared by her. Tucker expressed reluctance to try to restrict or prescribe the application beyond the present wording. Several expressed concern that the current 10.4G2 was confusing. Mr. Tucker volunteered to review the Olson proposal with the possibility of LC providing a rule interpretation to clarify the application of 10.4G2 rather than asking for a rule revision. Dick Thaxter expressed some concern regarding LC doing a rule interpretation for material it doesn't catalog. No further action was taken. Discussion of 10.4G2 will be finalized at Chicago annual.

The proposal to create a new definition for MRDF was tabled until CC:DA can examine and react to the LA/BL (Library Association/British Library) MRDF guidelines. The Committee will revisit the issue in Chicago.

Discussion of the rule interpretation questions was postponed until the question session at Saturday's OLAC meeting.

HOLDINGS FORMAT REPORT

Martha Yee reported on the project she has been working on to solicit information from the utilities and others on the ramifications of implementing the holdings format if multiple physical descriptions such as are in the new Archival Moving Images Materials: a Cataloging Manual begin to be used in online systems. The response indicates that all concerned are moving slowly on adopting the holdings format. Many expressed grave reservations about the implementation of a monographic holdings format especially in view of the confusion in interlibrary loan which could result from multiple formats being attached to one record. Dick Thaxter suggested that Martha write a summary of her findings to give Sheila Intner for her *RTSD NEWSLETTER* column and that Martha indicate her desire to be contacted by people with ideas on the topic.

MICROCARTOGRAPHIC MATERIALS REPORT

No report.

DISCUSSION OF THE OLAC MANUAL PROPOSAL

Members of the Committee have expressed reservations about the necessity of yet another cataloging manual. The type we would like to do, i.e., one which integrates AACR2 clarifications and utility clarifications, would be very complex because of all the variations involved. It was suggested that guidelines on how to create cataloging guidelines inhouse would be helpful. John Lashbrook and Dorian Martyn will begin working on this project.

REPORT OF THE MARBI LIAISON

Chris McCawley reported that all MARBI meetings were cancelled for this Midwinter. Hearings are being held to examine the nature of MARBI and how it might operate more efficiently.

REPORT FROM CC:DA AUDIENCE LIAISON

Nancy Olson reported that CC:DA had received from the Library Associationa draft of a set of guidelines for cataloging MRDF "British style".

REVIEW OF PROJECTS LIST

Rule 7.1B1. There has been discussion about expanding the LCRI for 7.1B1 to other chapters and even changing 7.1B1 to allow for transcription which manipulates the title. Ben Tucker urged the Committee not to propose this. He said that the LCRI for 7.1B1 was prompted by the high percentage of film titles which have information preceding the "real" title and the fact that LC has a large body of information available on this type of AV because they have cataloged it for many years and can therefore comment with confidence on it. It is not known whether or not other forms of AV have as high an incident of this phenomenon as do films and videorecordings.

It was decided that each CAPC member should reread Martha's article on problems in chapter 21 of AACR2 and review possible actions CAPC could take in regards to some of the problems Martha pointed out.

Meeting adjourned 10:20 pm.

Committee members: Dorian Martyn, Carmela DiDomenico, John Lashbrook, Nancy Olson, Chris McCawley, Martha Yee, Verna Urbanski.
Guests: David Thompson, Cathy Leonardi, Sheila Intner, Richard Thaxter, Ben Tucker, Judith Wing, Mary Keelan, Barbara Ritchie.

RTSD AUDIOVISUAL COMMITTEE
Business Meeting Minutes
Washington, DC
Jan. 8, 1985

The business meeting of the RTSD AV Committee was called to order by the Chair, Martha Yee, at 2:00 pm on January 8, 1985, in the Virginia Room of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, DC. Members of the Committee and observers introduced themselves, and corrections to the Committee roster were made. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed.

1. The first item of business was reports from several related groups:
    1. The first meeting of the Ad Hoc Interdivisional Group to Promote Cataloging in Publication for Audiovisual Materials (AV-CIP) was held Sunday, January 6, 1985, with the following representatives of ALA divisions present: Janice Woo (LITA), Peggy Johnson (ACRL), Tom Hart (AASL), Scott Parsons (PLA), and co-chairs Bob Head-Donaldson and Helen Cyr (RTSD). Approximately 20 people attended the meeting. Nancy John, Chair of RTSD/CCS, is to be asked to designate three CCS members as liaisons to the group. Representatives from the Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Division talked about the evidence of need which would be required for LC to begin an AV-CIP program. Susan Vita announced the funding of a pilot project at LC to catalog 1,000 microcomputer software titles beginning January 1986. This would be in line with the previous agreement of the AV-CIP group to ask that top priority for AV-CIP be given to microcomputer software. Ms. Vita gave out copies of the previously used CIP survey form which can be updated and distributed. All committee members agreed it would be good to send the survey form to the widest possible audience using division newsletters and other means. Bob Mead-Donaldson will do a survey of his area in Florida. Martha asked Bob and Helen to write a report of the meeting to be sent to all RTSD AV members. The group will meet again at the ALA conference in Chicago.
    2. There was no MARBI report.
    3. Janice Woo, liaison from ACRL Audiovisual Committee, reported on its program scheduled for the Chicago meeting on Monday, July 8, 1985, 9:30-12:30, entitled "Media Services in Integrated Systems." RTSD Av will be co-sponsor. Two speakers will present papers with questions and answers to follow.
    4. Sheila Intner, CC:DA liaison, mentioned CC:DA activities of particular interest to RTSD AV committee members.
        1. British proposals related to microcomputer software:
            1. LA/BL guidelines for cataloging microcomputer software (very similar to those published by ALA.)
            2. LA/BL proposal for rule revisions in chapter 9 of AACR2. CC:DA will probably not join the British in support of this proposal before

the Joint Steering Committee because CC:DA agreed to give a year's trial to the newly published guidelines, and that period is not yet up.

2. Reorganization of the rules for music uniform titles.

5. As OCLC's liaison to the Committee, Sheila Intner reported that there is some uncertainty about when OLAC's program on microcomputer software cataloging will be held. It may be at the Chicago 1985 meeting or could possibly be postponed until New York in 1986. She will inform the Committee when the date is firm.

2. Old Business.
    1. The major topic of business was planning for the program on "Subject Access to AV Material" to be held at the 1986 meeting in New York:
        1. Topic - the following points were covered:
            1. It would be good to look at new directions for subject access for media (new formats, new technology, etc.)
            2. Perhaps have someone on the program who could provide an overview of what is currently available.
            3. LITA liaison -- LITA would be especially interested in a program incorporating new and emerging technologies.
            4. The new search capabilities of online catalogs and the impact of these on subject access would be an especially interesting topic.
        2. Speakers
            1. Aim for four speakers and a moderator.
            2. Find speakers with general, special amd general/special expertise in these ares. Several names were suggested.
            3. After discussion, it was agreed that the Chair would contact some of the speakers.
        3. Time frame - will try to change from two hour to three hour time slot.
        4. AV equipment

            Speakers will be encouraged to use AV equipment. We need to know requirements by Chicago 1985 meeting, so the cost can be included in the program budget request.

        5. Co-sponsors
            0. RTSD/CCS Subject Analysis Committee
            Martha brought this program up at the SAC meeting, and they agreed with some reservations. Julie Beall volunteered to work as SAC's liaison to the program.
            1. ACRL Audiovisual Committee - agreed to co-sponsor.
            2. Another possibility - YASD Audiovisual Producers and Distributors Liaison Committee.
        6. ALA taping - We will need to investigate. Need to decide early in the process whether we want to request. Martha will be ready at Chicago to delegate responsibility for publicity ALA taping, meeting room, audiovisual facilities and equipment, etc.

2. New appointees after ALA Midwinter - Martha will let us know who these are.
3. Other liaison reports
    1. Richard Thaxter, LC
        0. AV catalogers at LC will go totally online later this year. Will be converting the approximately 70,000 records in the current system to the online database, and the records will be distributed with minor revisions.
           Two additional units will go online as part of this project, and their records will also begin to be distributed: archival films and prints and photographs. This whole project is known as Visual Materials Online.
        1. LC is also working on the planning to get the AV-CIP Pilot Project ready to go in January 1986.
        2. Janice Woo, ACRL Audiovisual committee and LITA liaison
            1. ACRL AV Committee has decided against pursuing a new edition of *Nonprint Media in Academic Libraries.* The Committee has begun work on the revision of ACRL's *Guidelines for Audio-visual Services in Academic Libraries* (1969) with a first draft set tentatively for Chicago, 1985.
            2. LITA - the position of AV interests in LITA is still uncertain.
        3. Hugh Durbin (unofficial report from AASL)
            1. AASL is undergoing "soul-searching" about its structure including whether or not it should remain within ALA.
            2. Interest in media remains high on the part of several AASL committees.
        4. Alice Jacobs (unofficial report from NLM)
           NLM is hoping to distribute its AV records in MARC format in early 1985.

3. New business
    1. Nancy Olson's av glossary.

       Drafts were distributed when possible to committee members at ALA before this meeting so comments could be made here. Nancy mentioned that there may be some potential for conflict with the newly published *ALA Glossary* because the latter conflicts with definitions in the AACR2 glossary. Committee consensus indicated that Nancy should definitely continue with the document, that new terms should be included wherever possible, and that the "compilation of definitions" approach was a good one to follow including some indication of which definitions are outdated and the use of a general, updated definition to hold all the definitions for one term together. Nancy will be on the summer meeting agenda to report further work.

    2. The second edition of Nancy's av cataloging book is proceeding well, and she plans to have it to the publishers by the end of February. It will be much bigger than the first edition!

3. Brief discussion about new approaches we should be trying and/or new issues we should be bringing up. One possible new issue: liaison with media producers.

   Some approaches:

   1. Try to establish contact with Educational Film Library Association in New York.
   2. Perhaps see if tours of media producers could be added to publisher tours planned for New York meeting by RTSD/AAP Committee. Also might arrange visit to the Museum of Modern Art's film collection.

   These possibilities will be placed on the agenda for the Chicago meeting to see if members of the committee are willing to volunteer to work on them.

4. Let Martha know business items to place on the meeting agenda and/or discussion topics.
5. The Committee will keep the same meeting time (Tuesday, 2-5:30) for Chicago.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Submitted
Katha D. Massey

CATALOGING MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE AT FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY --- BEFORE AND AFTER THE MRDF FORMAT

Robert Mead-Donaldson

Before the MRDF format was available in OCLC, Florida International University had been manually cataloging its collection of software (see NEWSLETTER (OLAC) v. 4, no. 3). FIU began collecting and cataloging Apple and TRS-80 software in September 1983.

Until *Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software* was published in June 1984, each revision or change in cataloging was incorporated into the cataloging procedures, but no attempt was made to go back and recatalog. The plan was to wait publication of *Guidelines* and MRDF format. In August of 1984, staff typed up workforms from the manual shelflist, leaving plenty of space on the workforms for new fixed and variable fields. The MRDF format documentation reached us September the 25th. The new fixed fields were added, and the 538 and 753 fields. The only real problem was what policy to follow with the 753 fields. The SOLINET workshops were still over a month and a half away and a decision was needed within a week. It was decided to use the 753 and to derive the information from the 538 field, just the make and model of machine and the DOS. After the SOLINET workshops in

November, this policy was amended to just the make and model of machine available in FIU libraries for patron use. Rather than Apple II or II+ the added entry became: Apple IIe. The subfield for the DOS was dropped. The 753 field was not entered on the OCLC master record but was added after the record was updated into the system for our own database. CLSI, our FIU local system, was not profiled for the new fields, so new boards were requested. After this modification the two new fields will be entered from OCLC through the interface into the CLSI database. We decided to use the 753 since subject access for the software is not provided by machine, yet. The subject headings are still topical, and subdivided by --Computer programs or Computer-assisted instruction, but no mention is made of the machine in the subject heading.

The call numbers for software were restructured to separate the shelflist by Apple, TRS-80 and IBM-PC. Odd numerical prefixes were added to the accession type number with the CS prefix for "computer software."

The old number was:

```
CS     CS    CS
 1      2     3    etc.
```

The new numbers are:

```
CS     CS    CS
1-1    1-2   1-3,  etc. for the Apple software

CS     CS    CS
3-1    3-2   3-3,  etc. for the TRS-80

CS     CS    CS
5-1    5-2   5-3,  etc. for the IBM-PC
```

Records are increasingly available through OCLC for software. However, considerable editing is necessary in order to integrate member contributed records into FIU catalogs. It is helpful to find examples, though, and different ideas and solutions to certain problems.

In summary, before OCLC made the MRDF Format available, software cataloging at FIU was done manually, with no examples to follow, either from the Library of Congress, or from member libraries using OCLC. After implementation of the MRDF format, copy was available, but rarely for the precise version or edition of our software, so most of our titles required inputting a new record. Originally we used the repeatable 753 field to tell all microcomputers the software could conceivably run on, but this created complicated files subject to error and to question from knowledgeable microcomputer users. After attending a SOLINET workshop in November, we decided to use only the in-house model of machine in the 753 field. To quote Indiana Jones in "Raiders of the Lost Ark:" "I don't know, I'm making this up as I go."

SUBJECT ACCESS TO MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE: the discussion continues

The RTSD/CCS/SAC Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Subject Access to Microcomputer Software met during Midwinter. Major progress was made towards finalizing guidelines for subject access to microcomputer software. The Subcommittee, chaired by Joan Mitchell with members Robert Boyer, Susan Nesbitt and Pat Luthin, has narrowed their work to three objectives:

1. to insure that the bibliographic record as a whole will provide adequate access
2. to apply sound principles of classification and subject heading assignment so the resulting guidelines can be applied across all types of software
3. to review the adequacy of the syndetic structure in LCSH to support software subject analysis

Strong support for mainstreaming microcomputer software in the assignment of both classification and subject headings was apparent. Consequently, the subcommittee favored using topical headings subdivided by a form subdivision. The Subcommittee proposed "software" as the form subdivision.

In general, the Subcommittee does not favor using the name of the machine or operating system as a subject heading since this not only could create large and eventually confusing files, but violates basic, traditional principles of subject analysis. It was pointed out that field 753 in the MRDF format will provide access to the make of machine, the programming language and operating system. Another stumbling block to using machine names for subject headings is the lack of a standardized list of machine names and the increasing number of software packages which can be used on several machines. A local option to add the machine or operating system following the form subdivision may be included in the final report.

The Subcommittee recommends classifying software by topic just as one would a book. LC may not fully classify during its CIP project on cataloging microcomputer software. LC representatives present at the meetings were encouraged by those attending to assign a basic class number (i.e., [LC287]) as part of the CIP cataloging project. Users of DDC may want to assign an abridged number, but the Subcommittee recommended assignment by topic and possibly the addition to DDC of a standard form subdivision which could be used to collect the software on one topic at one location.

In general, LCSH is seen as not having adequate subject headings for microcomputer software. For example, in addition to subject headings like "computer games," types of computer games, i.e., adventure games, arcade games, interactive fiction games, educational games, and subtypes of these (for example, subtypes of educational games like counting games, reading games, alphabet games) would be useful. Additionally, some users would like to have access by application, for example, mailing labels, data base managers, spread sheet programs, debugging, etc.

The Subcommittee presented its interim report to the RTSD Subject Analysis Committee at Midwinter. They hope to win endorsement at the annual conference and produce a spiral bound

set of guidelines shortly thereafter. The Subcommittee will also be forwarding a letter of recommendations to LC.

For a full review of the issues involved see, Joan Mitchell's article regarding the Subcommittee's work in the January/March issue of *Library Resources and Technical Services,* p. 66-72.

--- by V. Urbanski

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION: For a MRDF title we're cataloging the order of the names of the authors varies each time the system is booted. How do we determine the real main entry?

ANSWER: Presuming there are either 2 or 3 authors so main entry at author is appropriate, enter the cataloging at the first name which appeared the first time you booted the system. Add a note similar to: "Order of the authors varies with each presentation."
--- V. Urbanski

QUESTION: For videodiscs of operas how do you describe the conductor?

ANSWER: Performers are cast. Use the cast note (511). The situation is confused because of the format. Videodiscs are treated under chapter 7 even though this one contains chapter 6 material.
--- OLAC Q&A Midwinter session

QUESTION: Lots of catalogers do not have access to microcomputers so they can "see" the "title page" of micro software. The title there can vary quite a bit from disk title and accompanying material titles.

ANSWER: Use as the title the best, most descriptive of the variants. In a note give the source of the title chosen. Also, give a note regarding variant titles if they are sufficiently unique. Make added entries for variant titles if they provide useful retrieval points.
--- OLAC Q&A Midwinter session

QUESTION: on some micro software "authors" names may be present only in a copyright statement. Do you create an author main entry from copyright information?

ANSWER: Traditionally, we would not tend to treat a person cited only in the copyright statement as an author unless there were additional supporting evidence of authorship. Better to catalog as a title main entry.
--- OLAC Q&A Midwinter session

ANSWER: Although I didn't check this with the experts at the Q&A session, it would seem reasonable in this situation to add a 500 note to title main entry cataloging for the "author's" name if you want to provide an added entry for that name. For example: "John C. Ross, author (?) ." Or, if you don't even feel comfortable using the term author, perhaps: "John C. Ross, copyright holder."
--- V. Urbanski

QUESTION: How do you catalog the floppy disks that accompany a videodisc to provide access?

ANSWER: Catalog as accompanying material.
--- V. Urbanski

QUESTION: How do you spell videodisc? With a "c" or "k"? My supervisor prefers "k."

ANSWER: AACR2, chapter 7, uses videodisc with a "c" so that would be the standard spelling. For microcomputers use the "k" spelling used in *Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software*, i.e., floppy disk, hard disk, computer disk, etc.
--- V. Urbanski

QUESTION: In rule 10.4C2-10.4F2 what is the meaning of "artefacts not intended primarily for communication"?

ANSWER: First, it is necessary to understand that "artefacts not intended for communication," as the question phrases it, is not the point: the words "not intended for communication" also apply to "naturally occurring objects." The words "not intended for communication" mean nothing more than "not published," or "not issued in an edition," etc., all terms that mean there would be no place of publication, no name of publisher, and no date of publication to record. More direct language was not employed because of the great concern for using book-centric terms that jar audiovisual ears. Another term that might have served is "not commerciallly available in multiple copies," if it had not been thought that "commercially" and "multiple copies" raise even further questions. In routine situations I should think the difference is obvious between "homemade" and "storebought."

To round this off I might add that "artefacts" means human-made or human-manipulated, i.e., whatever is not covered by "naturally occurring objects"; it is actually not necessary to distinguish between them for the purposes of this rule, since the provision is the same for both.
--- Ben R. Tucker

QUESTION: 6.7B6, 7.7B6. These notes are used for similar purposes. 7.7B6 says "Preface each name or group of names with a statement of function." 6.7B6 has no such instruction. The 6.7B6 example has "name comma function." The 7.7B6 example has "function comma name." It would be better if they were consistent. Chapter 8 has one example: Narrator: Rod Serling.

ANSWER: The difference in the notes is not really significant. One needs to note that the difference has been in place for several decades. To change either rule solely for the sake of

consistency would cause more heartburn to many more people than those now troubled by this "inconsistency." I see some sense in both cases: screen credits usually give function first; music credits tend to put the name in primary position, probably because normally the names are rather well known. The notes we make are more or less copied from what appears, as far as order is concerned, and there are differnt conventions for order from one kind of material to another.
--- Ben R. Tucker

QUESTION: Can we, or can we not, borrow from one chapter of AACR2 for use in another?

ANSWER: Normally, it is not possible to generalize about borrowing from one chapter to another. There certainly are cases of legitimate borrowing and indeed the rules mandate the borrowing in the case of combining chapter 1 with one of the other chapters in Part I, and in the case of combining chapter 12 with other chapters. It would not be possible to say, however, that **any** borrowing is OK.
--- Ben R. Tucker

QUESTION: We need a hierarchy when a game is involved; if something is a mrdf and a game, which GHD do we use; if a kit and a game? a videorecording and a game?

ANSWER: It seems best to restrict the use of the GMD "game" to those items that fit the definition in Appendix D: "A set of materials designed for play according to prescribed rules." Wouldn't a videorecording or MRDF that is also a game fit more closely into the appropriate definitions in Appendix D as well? "A recording on which visual images ... designed for playback on a television set" is a better description of a videorecording/game item then is the definition of a game. The GMD's function then is to serve as an early warning to the user that this "game" requires playback equipment, i.e., a computer or a VCR. In the case of the choice between kit and game, I would decide which GHD provided the closest description of the item in hand. A game, by the AACR2 def inition, really is a special kind of kit, i.e., "a set of materials ..."
--- Ben R. Tucker

QUESTION: What do we do with laser videodiscs that are not intended to give the illusion of motion, but are a series of still pictures? The thing looks like a videodisc, but has chapter 8 material.

ANSWER: A note can always be made to call attention to still images that are incorporated with otherwise moving-image material. In such a case, the note should also include extent information (in terms of playing time for the one and number of frames for the other,). [LC is currently working on proposed rule revisions to present to CC:DA concerning cataloging of videodiscs.--Editor]
--- Ben R. Tucker

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

Membership in On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers is available for single or multiple years. The membership year begins January 1 and expires December 31. Membership includes a subscription to *OLAC Newsletter*. Membership rates are:

single year - US - $5.00 personal ; $10.00 institutional
Non-US - $7.00 personal ; $12.00 institutional

two year - US - $9.00 personal ; $19.00 institutional
Non-US - $13.00 personal ; $23.00 institutional

three year - US - $12.00 personal ; $27.00 institutional
Non-US - $18.00 personal ; $33.00 institutional

Payment in US funds only, please. Make check payable to ON-LINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS and mail to:

Catherine Leonardi
OLAC Treasurer
3604 Suffolk
Durham, NC 27707

* *

TO APPLY FOR MEMBERSHIP IN OLAC OR TO RENEW YOUR MEMBERSHIP
XEROX THE FORM BELOW

* *

Circle the correct information:

I wish to (renew my membership in // join) OLAC

I am enclosing dues of	**$5**	**$7**	**$10**	**$12**	**for 1985**
I am enclosing dues of	**$9**	**$13**	**$19**	**$20**	**for 1985/1986**
I am enclosing dues of	**$12**	**$18**	**$27**	**$33**	**for 1985/1986/1987**

CHECK HERE IF YOU **DO NOT** WANT YOUR NAME ON A MAILING LIST WHICH IS SOLD ___

NAME:
ADDRESS:

OLAC NEWSLETTER is a quarterly publication of Online Audiovisual Cataloger, Inc. appearing in March, June, September, and December.

ISSN: 0739-1153

Editor: Verna Urbanski

Materials for publication in the *OLAC NEWSLETTER* should be sent to the Editor. Articles should be typed, double spaced. The submission deadline for the June issue is April 29, 1985.

OLAC OFFICERS

****
Where do I send it? Who do I call?
****

For general Information about OLAC contact, Sheila Intner.

For membership and renewal information, change of address, missing or defective issues of the newsletter, contact Catherine Leonardi.

For AV cataloging questions, editorial decisions, newsletter errors, ideas for submission, CAPC problems or someone to blame for whatever is wrong in your life contact, Verna Urbanski.

Last modified: December 1997