

# **OLAC NEWSLETTER**

## **Volume 5, Number 3**

### **September, 1985**

---

#### **FEATURING:**

NEWSLETTER STAFF POSITION DESCRIPTIONS  
REPORTS FROM ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE:  
\* OLAC BUSINESS MEETING \*  
\* OLAC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING \*  
\* OLAC CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING \*  
\* REPORT FROM THE OLAC MARBI LIAISON \*  
\* CIP FOR AV INTERDIVISIONAL GROUP \*  
\* RTSD AV COMMITTEE \*  
LIBRARY SOFTWARE REVIEW-- A REVIEW  
SEARCHING CORPORATE NAMES FOR MUSICAL GROUPS  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

---

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

FROM THE EDITOR

FROM THE CHAIR

THREE-DIMENSIONAL MATERIALS

FROM THE TREASURER

FILM ARCHIVE DIRECTORY AVAILABLE

OLAC 1985 ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

OLAC 1985 ANNUAL EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

REPORT OF THE CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE OF OLAC

MARBI REPORT TO OLAC

RTSD/LITA/ACRL/PLA ... CIP FOR AV MATERIALS

CIP SURVEY RESULTS

RTSD AUDIOVISUAL COMMITTEE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD JULY 9, 1985

INFORMATION ON PCs IN AV CENTERS SOUGHT

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AMERICAN ART BEGINS SCULPTURE INVENTORY PILOT PROJECT

SEARCHING CORPORATE NAMES FOR MUSICAL GROUPS

*LIBRARY SOFTWARE REVIEW -- A REVIEW*

MARC DISTRIBUTION SERVICE -- VISUAL MATERIALS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

---

## **FROM THE EDITOR**

**Verna Urbanski**

It is time for this editor to pass the mantle to a new staff of writers. There are a number of other professional activities in which I would like to participate and the time consuming nature of the editorship simply leaves no time to develop other career aspects.

I am proud of what the newsletter has accomplished in the last four years. It has given me great satisfaction to see the newsletter become a vital information source. I have been reluctant to discontinue as editor until the nature of the newsletter was firmly established. I feared that the newsletter could become a glossy, academic publication filled with opinion and "research" rather than a source of information intended to help av catalogers on the front lines. I believe that the success of the newsletter is in part based on the practical approach we have consistently taken. I would sincerely hope and urge that the newsletter continue in this pattern.

I will continue as editor through the completion of volume 5, and would also help on volume 6, number 1 as needed. During discussions at annual ALA conference in Chicago, the Executive Board of OLAC accepted a proposal to split the several tasks now performed by the one editor into several positions. This decision recognizes the complexities and the time involved in creation of the newsletter. I will continue to work on an index for the newsletter and assist the new staff as needed.

Below are position descriptions for the editorial staff of the *OLAC NEWSLETTER*. OLAC members wishing to be considered for positions on the staff should write the current editor (address on verse of the cover). Indicate the staff assignment for which you wish to be

considered. Submit a complete resume, samples of your writing and a letter indicating your interest and abilities. Applications will be reviewed and circulated to the Executive Board of OLAC. The Executive Board will want to interview candidates for at least the editor-in-chief and production editor positions during ALA Midwinter in Chicago. The Executive Board will make all final decisions regarding appointments. If you have questions about serving on the editorial staff call the current editor for further information (Verna Urbanski 904-646-2550).

---

### **POSITION DESCRIPTION EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

---

The Editor-in-Chief for the *OLAC NEWSLETTER* is responsible for maintaining the quality of, and seeing to the overall organization of, the newsletter. S/he sets publication and submission deadlines for staff editors, insures that column editors deliver submissions following an agreed upon and disseminated set of deadlines, reviews and edits the final submissions by staff editors, and, in cooperation with the Production Editor, determines the article sequence and layout. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for the content of the newsletter, for maintaining its integrity and for assuring the continuance of the newsletter as a vital source of information to OLAC members. The Editor-in-Chief acts and speaks for the newsletter staff when giving reports and summarizing activities. The successful candidate for the position of Editor-in-Chief will have demonstrated abilities as a writer/editor. S/he will have demonstrated ability to deal tactfully with others. The candidate needs to have access to telephone service for long distance calling and to be able to attend Midwinter and ALA annual conference for the purpose of serving on the Executive Board of OLAC and keeping members and the Board informed regarding the operation of the newsletter. Knowledge of word processing on an IBM PC is very desirable.

---

### **POSITION DESCRIPTION PRODUCTION EDITOR**

---

The Production Editor for the *OLAC NEWSLETTER* is responsible for physically assembling the newsletter. This includes the following activities: inputting of the text on an IBM PC (or compatible machine) using WordPerfect, editing for input errors, physical layout of the text (in consultation with the Editor-in-Chief) including decisions of article sequence, spacing, margins, illustrations, etc. Locates a competent, reasonably priced printer and works with her/him to print the text appropriately. Applies for and maintains non-profit bulk rate mailing account with the postal service. Sorts and labels out-going newsletters following postal service requirements. Mails finished newsletter following established deadlines. Assembles all receipts and submits same to OLAC treasurer for reimbursement Keeps Editor-in-Chief informed regarding progress and problems. In the absence of the Editor-in-Chief can be designated to speak for the editorial staff during meetings. The successful candidate should have good organizational ability, access to long distance telephone service, and access to an IBM PC for word processing the text of the

newsletter using WordPerfect software. Familiarity with production techniques as evidenced by having worked in a similar capacity before is desirable but not mandatory. The candidate needs to be able to attend Midwinter and ALA annual conference whenever possible.

---

### **POSITION DESCRIPTION BOOK REVIEW EDITOR**

---

Identifies books which are appropriate to the interests of OLAC members. Consults with Editor-in-Chief as needed regarding the appropriateness of a text. Assembles a support staff of capable reviewers. Contacts publishers to request examination copies. Reads text and prepares review or assigns title to an appropriate reviewer and edits their submission. Submits a clean copy text of the reviews to the Editor-in-Chief and to the Production Editor following established deadlines.

Furnishes the publisher with two copies of the review for use in publicity releases. Maintains correspondence files.

---

### **POSITION DESCRIPTION CONFERENCE EDITOR**

---

Identifies meetings and programs during Midwinter, ALA and OLAC sponsored conferences which are of interest to OLAC members. Identifies members who are attending and are willing to prepare reports. Coordinates the schedule of reporters to the meetings to be covered. Sets deadlines for reporters to submit texts. Edits the submitted reports for accuracy and clarity. Contacts reporters to verify information as necessary. Submits a clean copy text of the reports to the Editor-in-Chief and to the Production Editor following established deadlines. Reports will usually be gathered from all OLAC sponsored or co-sponsored programs, all OLAC meetings (membership, Executive Board, CAPC), meetings of the RTSD AV committee, and other program and committee meetings as deemed appropriate by the Conference reports editor in consultation with the Editor-in-Chief.

---

### **POSITION DESCRIPTION QUESTION & ANSWER EDITOR**

---

Receives questions regarding cataloging and tagging of audiovisual materials and other appropriately related topics. Prepares an accurate response to the question based on the Editor's knowledge of AV cataloging and in consultation with acknowledged experts in AV cataloging and printed resources. Furnishes the questioner an appropriate answer in writing. Prepares

follow-up responses as necessary. Maintains files of correspondence. Distills the questions and answers into succinct units. Submits a clean copy text of the questions and answers to the Editor-in-Chief and to the Production Editor following established deadlines.

---

## **POSITION DESCRIPTION ARTICLES & NEWS EDITOR**

---

Receives unsolicited articles for review. Arranges for writers to prepare manuscripts on assigned topics. Reviews and edits articles for readability, grammatical errors, accuracy and appropriateness to OLAC's audience. Consults with authors regarding needed rewrites as necessary. Consults with the Editor-in-Chief regarding article projects. Receives news releases. Reviews material for appropriateness to OLAC's audience. Consults with the source of the news release for further information as appropriate. Identifies news worthy trends or problems and in consultations with the Editor-in-Chief prepares reports on these. Maintains files of correspondence regarding submitted news items. Submits a clean copy text of articles and assembled news items to the Editor in-Chief and to the Production Editor following deadlines.

---

## **FROM THE CHAIR**

**Katha D. Massey**

As the incoming Chair of OLAC, I want to express appreciation to all the Executive Board members from the last year for all their creativity, hard work, and persistence in making 1984/85 a great year for the organization. And, I want to extend special thanks to outgoing Chair, Sheila Intner, for the super job she did as our leader for the past year. The recent membership and Executive Board meetings in Chicago were stimulating and well-attended. CAPC, under Verna's able leadership, is diligently pursuing cataloging concerns relating to audiovisual materials on behalf of all of us.

One of the highlights of the conference in Chicago was the OLAC-sponsored program on MRDF cataloging held on Tuesday, July 9. Over 100 people from all kinds of libraries participated in this unique session. Especially effective was the combination of comments from a panel of experts and small group discussions "facilitated" by knowledgeable practitioners--a very rewarding experience for all concerned. Carmela DiDomenico, program chair, and her committee deserve a round of applause for the excellent planning that made this program such a success. Barbara Ritchie and her committee members are continuing their work on plans for the proposed OLAC conference in 1986--more about this later. All in all, OLAC's presence was felt at ALA in a most positive way.

I look forward to working with the Board, including the new Vice-Chair, Richard Thaxter and newly re-elected Treasurer Catherine Leonardi, on new and challenging projects in the coming year. In order to make OLAC as effective as possible for all of us, we need advice and suggestions from you, the membership. Please write me (Cataloging Dept., U of Georgia Libraries, Athen, GA 30602; Telephone 404 542-1002) or any of the other Board members (addresses on verse of cover) with your ideas and comments. **Do let us hear from you!!!**

---

### **THREE DIMENSIONAL MATERIALS**

The LC Network Development and MARC Standards Office has been working on identifying additions/changes needed to the USMARC visual materials format so as to accommodate three-dimensional artifacts and realia. The Office would like to ensure that the new specifications will meet the needs of those inputting cataloging data for such materials into machine-readable form. It therefore is interested in having those who have worked with three dimensional artifacts and realia read and comment on the specifications. If you would like to comment on the documentation, please contact: Phyllis Bruns, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress, 20540 (telephone: 202-287-5767).

---

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

**Reporting period:**

April 24, 1985 through July 16, 1985

Account balance April 24, 1985 \$5,017.30

**INCOME**

New memberships	277.00
Renewal memberships	531.00
Interest paid on account	60.06
Back issues	60.00
Selling membership list	30.00

**TOTAL INCOME** \$ 958.46

**TOTAL** \$5,975.76

**EXPENSES**

Newsletter v.5, no.2

(includes \$50. editor stipend)	809.82
Tape recorder ALA Chicago	120.27
Board stipends	300.00
Marbi stipend	100.00
OLAC dinner	182.93
	-----
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$1,513.02</b>
Account Balance July 16, 1985	\$4,462.74
Nine-month CD at 10.05%	\$2,000.00
Twelve-month CD at 10.00%	\$2,000.00
<b>TOTAL OLAC ASSETS</b>	<b>\$8,462.74</b>
<b>CURRENT MEMBERSHIP</b>	<b>526</b>

---

## FILM ARCHIVE DIRECTORY AVAILABLE

The RTSD Audiovisual Committee has copies of the *Directory of Archival Collections of the History of Film in the United States* available for purchase. The directory was compiled by Richard A. Matzek for a program sponsored jointly by the ACRL and RTSD Audiovisual Committees and OLAC at the Los Angeles ALA annual conference in 1983. The booklet is 50 pages and includes 54 detailed descriptions of collections located in 19 states of the United States and Washington, DC, plus additional checklists and bibliographies.

To obtain a copy send a \$5.00 check or money order payable to ALA-RTSD for to Sheila Intner and the directory will be posted by return mail.

- Until September 10, 1985 - PO Box 53, Monterey, MA 01245
- After September 10, 1985 - c/o Graduate School of Library & Information Science, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024

---

## ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS 1985 ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

Minutes of the Midwinter business meeting were approved as they appeared in the *OLAC Newsletter*.

**TREASURER'S REPORT (Catherine Leonardi)**

There are currently 500 members of OLAC, the breakdown of the membership is: 243 personal, 254 institutional and 3 exchanges.

The balance of the regular checking account is \$4,699.51 and the balance of the two CD accounts is \$4,000.00.

## **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### 1. CAPC (Verna Urbanski)

Complete committee activities will be reported in the September newsletter. The committee has asked that any cataloging questions be forwarded to Verna for dissemination to the committee. Members of the committee are working on a manual of how to do cataloging manuals. Preliminary drafts may be available for discussion by Midwinter.

### 2. MARBI (Chris McCawley)

MARBI is meeting in Chicago after not meeting for a year. McCawley reported that OCLC will be implementing MARC Update 10 (revisions for adding 2-dimensional materials to the Visual Materials Format formerly the Films format) sometime this fall. During this conference, MARBI will be considering changes to the Visual Materials format to accommodate the needs of the archival films community.

### 3. CC:DA audience observer (Verna Urbanski)

CC:DA has asked Ben Tucker to write an option for the ordering of notes on cataloging. CC:DA is forwarding to JSC (Joint Steering Committee) two rule revision proposals which concern av material. The first adds the term analog or digital to the 300 field for sound recordings and appends definitions for these terms. The second concerns the handling of playing speeds for video materials.

### 4. Logo contest (Verna Urbanski)

The Newsletter Editor announced that she had received approximately 50 entries for the logo contest. She invited the OLAC members present at this membership meeting to attend the Executive Board meeting the following evening to vote for their favorite logo.

## **OTHER REPORTS**

### 1. Nominating Committee

Ballots for positions available on the OLAC board (vice-chair/chair-elect and treasurer) were mailed to Nancy Olson Chair of the Nominating Committee. The election results were announced by Chair Sheila Intner: Richard Thaxter, LC, is our new vice-chair/chair elect, and Catherine Leonardi, Duke University, was re-elected to serve another term as our capable treasurer. Both expressed their pleasure at being elected. Dick briefly described some of his goals for the coming year.



2. Toronto Conference (Barbara Ritchie)

Ms. Ritchie reported that plans were well in hand for the OLAC conference to be held as a pre-conference to the annual meeting of the Ontario Library Association. The theme will be **FORMATS OLD AND NEW**. Current plans call for a November 6th and 7th, 1986, to be the dates of the conference.

3. Report from the chair

Sheila opted to save her comments till the Executive Board meeting so that OLAC members could hear a report by Mary Keelan of the Mid-Hudson Library System on the systems union list of films and videos. Called the New York State Union Catalog of Film and Video (NYSCAT), the union list contains 17,500 titles and 39,000 location hits. There are 29 institutions participating in the creation of the list as well as 30 3 R' s institutions throughout New York state.

## **REPORTS OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC UTILITIES**

1. OCLC (Glenn Patton)

Current statistics as of June 1985

- o 298,806 audiovisual records in OLUC
- o 913,000 holding symbols attached to these records
- o 4,000 MRDF records (input began 10/1/84)

OCLC will be implementing the remainder of the LC updates (9,10,11) sometime this fall.

Patton announced that there were two major changes in formats used on OCLC. The first change concerns the AV Format. OCLC will be doing a retrospective conversion project of type "n" records (special instructional materials). Type "n" records are obsolete. There will be two new codes to replace it. The second change concerns local subject headings. On serial records the 69X fields will be converted to appropriate 6XX fields. For all other records, the 69X fields will not be retained on the master record. OCLC will be issuing two *Technical Bulletins* on these changes in the near future.

2. RLIN (Ed Glazier)

RLIN will also be implementing LC Updates 9,10,11 sometime in the fall. RLIN is currently loading LC Name Authority tapes, music tapes and LC minimal-level cataloging tapes.

3. WLN and UTLAS did not have liaisons present.

Meeting adjourned 9:30 pm.  
Submitted, Antonia Snee, Secretary

Attendees: Mary Keelan, Robert Mead-Donaldson, Melissa Nasea, Julieanne Beall, Barbara Ritchie, Ed Glazier, Susie Koch, Dorian Martyn, Carmela DiDomenico, Richard Thaxter, Christina McCawley, Marilyn Craig, Verna Urbanski, Glenn Patton, Bo-Gay Tong, Catherine Leonardi, Toni Snee, Sheila Intner, David Hedrick.

---

## **ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS 1985 ANNUAL EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Minutes of the Midwinter Executive Board meeting were approved as they appeared in the OLAC Newsletter.

### **TREASURER'S REPORT (Catherine Leonardi)**

Leonardi repeated her figures from the Business meeting (see elsewhere in this issue).

Ms. Leonardi asked the Board to discuss whether to raise dues in the future. After a lengthy discussion, Board members voted to table the discussion until Midwinter meetings.

The Treasurer asked for and received permission to extend her power of attorney until the end of Midwinter meetings.

### **NEW OFFICERS AND APPOINTMENTS**

Chair, Sheila Intner introduced the newly elected officers for the coming year.

Verna Urbanski asked to be replaced as the upcoming OLAC liaison to MARBI due other committee appointments. Katha will appoint a replacement. Appointments to other committees were discussed and approved.

The Board discussed a proposal to establish a liaison between OLAC and MOUG (Map Online Users Group). Most members of the audience and the Executive Board thought it was a worthwhile idea. There was some discussion regarding where best to liaison with MOUG, i.e., with the cataloging section of MOUG or with the group as a whole. The same decision is needed for a relationship with the Music Online Users Group, should the contact be with the cataloging section of Music Online or with the cataloging section of Music Library Association? A motion was made and amended to investigate the establishment of liaisons between these two groups. The Chair appointed Ms. Leonardi to investigate and report at Midwinter.

## **RESIGNATION OF THE NEWSLETTER EDITOR**

Chair Intner announced with great sadness the resignation of Verna Urbanski as editor of the *OLAC Newsletter*. Verna cited professional reasons for her resignation. During a business dinner Saturday evening the Executive Board had discussed the ramifications of the resignation and had accepted an outline for reorganization of the newsletter to a more broadly based staff. The Board will seek resumes and writing samples of interested OLAC members for positions on the newsletter staff. The Executive Board will plan to review these and interview perspective staff for these positions during Midwinter meetings. Any OLAC member is welcome to apply (see information elsewhere in this *OLAC Newsletter*).

## **REPORT ON THE TORONTO CONFERENCE**

Barbara Ritchie outlined general information about the conference. Ritchie has approached the keynote speaker but needs Board approval before firm commitments are made.

Elizabeth Black, UTLAS liaison to OLAC, was present. There is some confusion regarding what service UTLAS is willing to provide. The Board asked Ms. Ritchie to resolve these problems quickly before contacting the speakers. The Board discussed possible workshops for the conference.

## **OLAC LOGO CONTEST**

Newsletter editor, Verna Urbanski, passed around the entries for the logo contest. Members of the Board and audience voted on the candidates. A design submitted by Ms. Rosarynde Cowdrey of the University of North Florida was selected. It features a film reel and ribbon spelling out the organization's initials. Ms. Urbanski will have the design finalized and will have stationery produced for the use of the Board. Ms. Cowdrey will receive a letter of thanks and a check for \$25.00 from OLAC.



## **OLAC AWARD**

Chair Sheila Intner appointed a committee of three (Toni Snee, Laurel Jizba and Sheila Intner) to create guidelines for the OLAC awards for discussion by the Board at Midwinter.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm.  
Submitted, Antonia Snee, Secretary

---

## REPORT OF THE CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS

The meeting was held in the Chicago Hyatt Regency July 5, 1985, 8-10 pm. Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

The proposal for revision of AACR2 rules 6.5D1, 8.5D1 and 10.5D1 was discussed. It was agreed that **10.5D1** is appropriately ambiguous as is, and should be left unrevised. There were objections to adding **or smaller**. Giving the range of sizes will not be helpful as it will be for 8.5D1.

### **8.5D1.**

It was determined that 8.5D1 should be submitted for consideration by CC:DA in the form proposed on the 7/5/85 rule revision proposal, i.e., asking for **or smaller** to be added. When addressing this topic Ben Tucker (LC) indicated that this had purposely been left ambiguous because the Joint Steering Committee felt that the important thing was to give an indication of size of shelving needed for the collection rather than actual dimensions of the item.

### **6.5D1.**

Rather than using **or smaller**, some felt it would be better to give a span of smallest to largest for sound discs. It is more specific and precedent exists for it in **2.5D3**. LC representatives present felt more comfortable with this approach. It was determined that 6.5D1 should be revised to call for recording a span of sizes for sound disc. The proposal will be withdrawn from current consideration by CC:DA and will be redrafted and resubmitted.

Dorian Martyn reported on the survey regarding captioning information in cataloging records. Several proposals were discussed for adding information about captioning to cataloging records for chapter 7 and chapter 8 materials. One proposal suggested addition of this information to the physical description and another suggested the information should go in a note. After discussion it was agreed that the note area was preferable and that an LCRI would be adequate. Ben Tucker agreed to write an appropriate LCRI. It was recommended that the note take the following form: "Closed captioned for the hearing impaired."

The LC proposal for revision of **7.5C6** (re: playing speed of videodiscs) was approved by CAPC with no changes and little discussion.

### **10.4G2.**

Continuing the discussion from Midwinter, Ben Tucker thought an interpretative statement might be appropriate here to emphasize that the decision should hang on whether or not the entity's name is present, not on whether or not the place is present. Ben agreed to write a rule interpretation which would add positive and negative examples to help clarify application of this rule.

### **GMD for MRDF.**

Sheila Intner's survey indicates dissatisfaction with "machine-readable data file" but shows a lack of consensus on a better term. Two proposals for GMDs for microcomputer software were discussed: 'computer material' and 'computer software.' Ben Tucker offered two arguments against sending either of these forward:

1. Chapter 9 must cover more than microcomputer software, so a GMD for the other Chapter 9 material ought to be proposed at the same time;
2. LC did a literature search (of cataloging literature) and determined that 'machine-readable' is more widely used than 'computer' in this context. The possibility was raised of splitting Chapter 9 in two: Could computer software be distinguished from machine readable files clearly enough that rules for GMDs and physical description could be written for each? (The question was not resolved and no specific proposal was put forward) A subcommittee was appointed to examine popular and scholarly computing literature to see if the terminology has stabilized enough to support proposals for better GMDs for Chapter 9. Members of this subcommittee are: Sheila Intner, Susie Koch, and Bob Mead-Donaldson.

### **257 field.**

The Committee voted to support the including of a 257 field in the MARC format for visual materials, to hold area 3 (country of production) for Chapter 7 materials, as long as it is defined as an archival field. A precedence exists because there is an area 3 in place for maps, serials and music. Martha Yee felt it was a very useful device for bringing together foreign films in archival collections.

The Committee expressed no interest in investigating the implications of revising or interpreting the rules to allow inclusion of performers in statements of responsibility for films. The issue was not resolved, but Martha Yee was invited to prepare a draft of a proposal to make this change if she so desired. OLAC/CAPC would then consider it more fully.

John Lashbrook and Dorian Martyn gave a report on their investigation into the possibility of developing a microcomputer based template for the development of audiovisual cataloging policy manuals. They passed out draft copies and asked those present to review and send comments to Verna, John or Dorian. There will be follow up reports at the next meeting.

The MARBI and CC:DA reports were deferred until the membership meeting Saturday night.

Verna Urbanski was re-elected to chair the Committee for the upcoming year.

Verna asked Committee members to review the projects list by August 31 and let her know what they want to work on next.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.

Attending were: Richard Thaxter, Glenn Patton, Lidia Heretz, Robert Mead-Donaldson, John Attig, Judith Wing, Carmela DiDomenico, Dorian Martyn, Martha M. Yee, Susie Koch, John E.

Lashbrook, Verna Urbanski, Edward Swanson, Ben R. Tucker, Katha Massey, Mary Goss, Chong Yoon, Christina McCawley.

---

## **MARBI REPORT TO ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS**

The MARBI Committee (RTSD/LITA/RASD Representation in Machine-readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee) had not met for a year and the agenda was very tight at the three MARBI meetings held this year during the annual conference of ALA. The following items will be of interest to OLAC members.

### **Two-dimensional materials:**

MARBI's new Visual Materials Format was included in MARC Update no. 10 issued in December 1984. OCLC plans to have the implementation documentation for its new AV format (to include two-dimensional materials) available by fall.

### **Three-dimensional materials:**

Phyllis Bruns has forwarded LC's notes on the addition of three-dimensional materials to the format to Nancy Olson to examine. When these are returned, LC plans a meeting of DC-area AV catalogers to go over the document. Then, they plan a one-day meeting of AV catalogers from a larger area to discuss the document. Phyllis Bruns agreed to invite OLAC's MARBI representative to this meeting. After this meeting, the document will go out to MARBI members and then will be put on the agenda for a future MARBI meeting.

### **MARBI Review Committee:**

Susan Martin gave a report to the RTSD Board. The report needs to be word processed, needs criteria for MARBI membership, and will probably not be ready for public consumption before Midwinter, according to Henriette Avram, who reassured the MARBI Committee that "MARBI is here to stay" and "you will all still have jobs next year."

### **Format integration:**

Format integration, or combining the several formats into one integrated format, has been discussed by MARBI for the past two years, being advocated principally by John Attig of Penn State and Walt Crawford of RLG. Henriette Avram paid a visit to the MARBI Committee on Monday and the thrust of her remarks was to put a damper on format integration. She said it would be too expensive and she encouraged MARBI to abandon the idea. She felt that format integration would prove to be a format-AACR3. She said that directors do not really understand all that format integration would involve, but if they did, they would oppose the idea as being too expensive, just as they would have opposed AACR2 if they had fully understood what it involved and the costs that would accrue from implementation of AACR2.

Avram stated three main problems with format integration.

1. It would have major implications for fixed fields;
2. It would mean major changes with some tags;
3. It would run afoul of the problem of seriality (e.g, what to do with maps and av in serial form) In addition, there is the problem of what to do retrospectively.

John Attig and Walt Crawford explained their viewpoints on format integration and then bowed to Henriette's opinion.

#### **Changes to Visual Materials Format:**

A few changes to the Visual Materials Format were approved by MARBI on Saturday. Martha Yee and Dick Thaxter were present to speak for several of the proposals.

1. Make obsolete field 517 (categories of films note (archival)). The information to be recorded in this field will be recorded in field 655 (Genre/Form Heading).
2. Addition of subfield 3 (materials specified) to field 300 (physical description) to accommodate the needs of archival moving image materials.
3. Make obsolete field 009 (physical description fixed field for archival collections) and addition of bytes 08-22 to field 007 (physical description fixed field) for use by archival motion picture collections.
4. Addition of field 257 (country of producing entity).
5. Addition to 007, Byte 6 (medium for sound). Addition of code g -- optical and magnetic sound track on motion picture film.

These changes will appear in MARC Update 12 to be issued in the Fall.  
Reported by Christina McCawley, OLAC liaison to MARBI

---

## **RTSD/LITA/ACRL/PLA ... CIP FOR AV MATERIALS INTERDIVISIONAL GROUP MEETS AT CHICAGO**

Susan Vita (LC) discussed results from the software questionnaire. She reported that there had been a computer failure, so a detailed analysis wasn't available. She will send one to the Committee when it is available. Vita distributed a manually tabulated compilation (see chart at end of this report) . She noted this is a self-selected survey which may bias the results to some extent. The survey indicates a low percentage lent for home use; more lent for faculty and classroom use. This is encouraging because publishers might resist participating if they feared home reproduction of software. The project needs to include all types of software, excluding arcade games. Vita was pleased to note over 200 responses. A high percentage were academic institutions. This helps to justify LC involvement in the project. Respondents came from a wide geographic distribution. Sheila Intner asked Vita how respondents to the survey were presently cataloging these materials and why they wanted CIP. Vita said that people were making do with current rules and available information. Many shelve software separately from manuals. Software is removed from manuals and texts because of local circulation systems and fear of

book drop return damage. People want CIP for the standardization, better utilization of staff, better use of institutional money, and to move items to the user more rapidly.

Helen Cyr reported on her efforts to distribute the survey. She could not get it into PLA publications, so sent it to 55 state and regional associations. She was disappointed in the number of responses and hoped that many had gone directly to LC. Those responses which she received directly were very similar to those tabulated by Susan.

Robert Mead-Donaldson reported on his survey in Florida. He sent the survey to 44 libraries and received 20 responses. The responses were also similar to those at LC. He noted that several respondents said they might consider acquiring software if LC were cataloging it. Most want CIP information displayed on the accompanying material.

There was some discussion about subject analysis of computer software. The recommendation is to assign subject by genre. The survey asked about arcade games, but did not distinguish between arcade games and interactive games. The assumption is that respondents consider interactive games to fall into the educational category.

Dick Thaxter reported on progress with the cataloging rules and guidelines. CC:DA is considering their response to the British proposal presented at Midwinter. The proposal is not complete at present and until it is, CC:DA prefers deferring consideration of its suggestions. It was noted that the Canadians want a unified set of rules. They don't want to break Chapter 9 into parts. There are 4000 MRDF records in the OCLC database already. RLIN will mount MRDF format in the fall.

Dick also discussed the progress of MRDF at LC. The data dictionary is going to the programmers. He noted the important point that they will try to support everything valid, i.e., all the traditional elements plus a few others, in MRDF. He hopes the format will be ready in the spring of 1986. Records will not appear on tapes until some months after that.

Susan Vita distributed three handouts regarding data elements for CIP:

- Sample CIP records using full, moderate and minimum levels of data.
- Draft of data sheet for the publishers to use.
- Draft of an information sheet to accompany the data sheet from the publisher.

This material will go to selected publishers for testing and can be revised. These elements are the optimum. LC will settle for less if necessary.

A discussion followed regarding the trend to publish books with microsoftware inserted and how to treat these from the cataloging perspective. Are these to be treated as software with accompanying text or vice versa? This is a current problem with CIP for books--it frequently doesn't indicate a disk in a pocket. LC is trying to address this in the instructions to the publishers and hopes it will be less of a problem when AV CIP is in place. LC could catalog each separately. The Committee was asked to let Vita know of any problems seen in the distributed documents.



The question was raised regarding use of a generic record for cases when different versions of the same software are issued to run on different machines This has not been decided. It may not be a major issue because there do not appear to be as many versions being published as previously. A Bowker survey shows less than 10% had four or more versions. LC intends to catalog separately if the title is distinct. The Committee recommended strongly for separate records for each version. There will be fewer errors and less time involved in creating records.

Susan Vita announced that publishers have been targeted, but not contacted wholesale. This is not a problem because there are to be changes in the data fields. LC will use publishers currently in the CIP program and publishers identified in the survey. She will include the list of publishers for the Committee when she distributes the survey results. Vita doesn't know how the idea of CIP for software will be received by publishers. Current CIP participating publishers have been positive. This Ad Hoc Committee may be useful in bringing pressure on reluctant publishers. This will be discussed further at Midwinter. Scholastic, Wiley have agreed; Simon and Schuster haven't yet replied. Some publishers have made inquiries. Vita has been working with Bowker so far. It was noted that there are fewer titles being published. There is a software publishers trade association, though it is not yet very well organized. Sheila Intner suggested that the Committee should try to get someone from that group on the Committee.

There was some discussion regarding budget considerations at LC. The software project will go forward, despite the proposed funding reductions at LC. No one could say what will happen after the first of the year. The Committee may want to become involved in lobbying and/or pursuing outside funding. The Committee will be asked to be active in evaluating the project. There is the problem of timing. There is a lag of several months between the creation of CIP and when the title actually appears. It may be difficult for LC to evaluate fairly the effectiveness of the CIP program for microcomputer software when little time will separate the initiation of the program and need to do the evaluation. Publishers will be approached in September.

There was further discussion of possible budget problems and possible sources of funding. Such bodies as NEA, NEH, Council of Library Resources were mentioned. Apple was suggested, too.

Committee representation was reviewed. Jean Kreamer was suggested as YASD liaison. Edward Swanson attended as CCS representative. Janice Woo has served as LITA representative but will be taking on other responsibilities, so is seeking a LITA representative. Sheila Intner and Peggy Johnson both noted a need for further and continuing coverage of the project in the various division and section publications.

Submitted by Peggy Johnson.

---

## **CIP SURVEY RESULTS**

**ISSUE**

**ACADEMIC**

**PUBLIC**

**SCHOOL**

**SPECIAL**

TOTAL RECEIVED	100	47	37	13
% ACQUIRING SOFTWARE	95%	79%	97%	92%
% LENDING FOR HOME USE	1%	26%	32%	8%
	TYPES OF SOFTWARE ACQUIRED			
EDUCATIONAL GAMES	42%	70%	86%	15%
CAI	62%	53%	51%	62%
APPLICATIONS SOFTWARE	88%	74%	86%	85%
DATABASE MANAGERS	72%	53%	73%	69%
ARCADE GAMES	1%	26%	8%	0%
	TYPES OF EQUIPMENT IN LIBRARY			
APPLE	61%	62%	86%	23%
IBM	61%	36%	16%	62%

---

## RTSD AUDIOVISUAL COMMITTEE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD JULY 9, 1985

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Martha Yee, at 2 pm in the Burnham Room of the Hyatt Regency Hotel, Chicago, IL. Members of the Committee (including new appointments) and observers introduced themselves, and corrections to the committee roster were made. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed.

1. The first order of business was reports from several related groups.
  1. Sheila Intner reported for Bob Mead-Donaldson on the meeting held Sunday, July 7, of the Ad Hoc Interdivisional Group to Promote Cataloging in Publication for Audiovisual Materials (AV-CIP). Susan Vita, Head of LC's Cataloging in Publication Division, presented preliminary results from the approximate 200 responses to the microcomputer software survey distributed in spring 1985 (see full report elsewhere in this *OLAC NEWSLETTER*). These figures do not include those from separate surveys done for some states and for school libraries. Information gained from the surveys will be used in decision-making for LC's pilot project to gather data from microcomputer software publishers and use it to

provide CIP data from approximately 1,000 titles. The project is scheduled to begin in spring 1986. LC staff are working out which publishers to include in the pilot project and are designing a data worksheet. What the CIP entry will look like has not been fully decided. Examples were shown of a full, "ideal" record, a moderately abbreviated record, and an extremely abbreviated record. It is hoped that the entry can at least reflect the middle ground between the two extremes.

2. Dick Thaxter, Library of Congress liaison, reported that the Visual Materials Format is now scheduled for implementation in August after the Linked Systems Project is operational. When it is implemented, online records will be created for the first time for archival prints and photographs and archival moving image materials. The scope of materials covered by the Audiovisual Section's cataloging will not change except that the staff will be able to see their records online. Next year they plan to go online with MRDF format as part of the CIP pilot project. He announced the appointment of Catherine Garland as the new Operations Coordinator for the Special Materials Division. The publication of coding and input manuals for music and visual materials is planned. In response to a question, Dick clarified that serials MRDFs at LC will be handled by the Serial Record Division. The Audiovisual Section will do software cataloging only for monographic materials in the CIP project.
3. OCLC's liaison, Glenn Patton, reported that implementation of the remainder of the Visual Materials Format changes (*MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data*, updates 9-11) is in the planning stages (includes 73 new language codes). In conjunction with this, OCLC will be doing conversion of type "n" records as appropriate. OCLC *Technical Bulletins* documenting the changes should be out soon. The Visual Materials Format will be the next to be totally revised and re-issued, but the title will remain *Audiovisual Media Format* for OCLC. Five libraries were named Enhance institutions for audiovisual materials during the second round selection. In the third round ending in September 1985 MRDF will be added to the list of formats covered by enhance libraries.
4. Martha Yee, CC:DA liaison, mentioned the following CC:DA activities of particular interest to the RTSD Audiovisual Committee:
  1. Videodisc proposals written by Ben Tucker were approved.
  2. Ben Tucker was asked to prepare a rule revision proposal to revise 1.7B to make order of notes optional.
  3. Analog and digital definitions prepared by Ben Tucker were adopted.
  4. The MRDF Task Force recommended not going along with the British proposals for rule revisions in Chapter 9 of AACR2. The same task force has been asked to come up with specific recommendations for revision of Chapter 9 for the re-issue. Both Sheila Intner and Glenn Patton are members of the Task Force.
  5. OLAC/CAPC proposals were approved:
    1. Text added at end of 8.5D1 (patterned after 3.5D1) covering how to state dimensions for graphic items of different size in a collection.
    2. SMD for Chapters 6 and 7 was made more flexible: If the term is not on the list, use another concise term.

5. Martha also reported on developments affecting AV at MARBI meetings. The following were approved:
  1. Addition of 257 field (area 3) for country of publication to the Visual Materials Format.
  2. Deletion of 517 field.
  3. Deletion of 009 field.
  4. Addition to 007 field of data formerly in 009 field.

All the above are intended mainly for use with archival materials.

Henriette Avram, LC, spoke at MARBI about format integration. She is concerned about the economics of achieving this and about problems it would cause for the bibliographic utilities. She will talk to directors of the utilities about naming representatives to a group to work on problems and costs associated with format integration.

Phyllis Bruns, LC, is working with Nancy Olson (Mankato State University) on additions to the Visual Materials Format for three-dimensional materials; this work is in the beginning stages.

6. Martha noted that the RTSD/CCS Subject Analysis Committee's Subcommittee on Subject Access to Microcomputer Software has finished its guidelines document which was passed by SAC after editorial revisions. There remain two other levels of review before approval is final. SAC also is discussing the question of liaisons--whether to form and with what organizations? OLAC was mentioned. Although it is uncertain whether RTSD Audiovisual Committee will want to pursue such a relationship if SAC decides to go forward, we can at least monitor developments.
7. The ACRL Audiovisual Committee liaison, Janice Woo, reported that the Committee is in the (hopefully) final stages of revising the previous edition of *Guidelines for Audiovisual Services in Academic Libraries*. The Committee plans to hold hearings on the revision at the annual conference in New York. In addition, Janice asked for tentative support as co-sponsor if ACRL/AV Committee develops a program for the San Francisco conference. Subject to review of the plans and active representation on the program committee if required by the RTSD Board, RTSD Audiovisual Committee agreed to co-sponsor.
8. As LITA liaison, Janice Woo stated that a number of new interest groups are being formed in LITA, but whether audiovisual concerns will be covered is not clear. LITA is also discussing liaison relationships in general and may net continue the one with RTSD/AV Committee.
9. Jean Kreamer attended the meeting for the first time as the representative of YASD Audiovisual Producers and Distributors Liaison Committee. Her Committee had sponsored a very successful program Tuesday morning. She also briefly mentioned problems she experienced while compiling a list of films because the films' cataloging records lacked information she needed. In order to

find the missing data, it was necessary to get in touch with many producers and distributors. It was suggested that she provide a list of the problems to both Sheila Intner and Martha Yee so that discussion and action leading to any necessary rule revisions could begin. Ms. Kreamer agreed to do this.

10. On behalf of Online Audiovisual Catalogers Inc., (OLAC), Sheila Intner talked about its Tuesday morning program on the cataloging of microcomputer software. There was a full house (over 100 participants ) and quite interesting give-and-take between several experts on the national scene and local practitioners. OLAC voted at its meeting in Chicago to ask the bibliographic utilities for status as the official MRDF user group.
  11. No representative from AASL attended. One of the new committee members, Jane Terwillegar, is a member of AASL and indicated willingness to serve as the group's liaison. Martha will pursue having her officially appointed by the AASL Board.
2. Old Business
1. Progress on the New York program
    1. Title: "New Directions in Subject Access to Nonbook Materials."
    2. Confirmed speakers: Donald Bidd, National Film Board of Canada; Karen Markey, OCLC Office of Research; Susan Nesbitt, Hennepin County Public Library; Elizabeth Betz Parker, Library of Congress.
    3. Moderator: No answer yet from Arnold Wajenberg.
    4. Time slot: Saturday, June 28, 1986, 9:30-12:30.
    5. Co-sponsoring organizations and their representatives on the Program Committee: Martha Yee (Chair), RTSD AV Committee ; Julie Beall, RTSD/CCD Subject Analysis Committee; Dick Matzek, ACRL AV Committee ; Jackie Dooley, ACRL/RBMS Standards Committee.
    6. Martha asked for a volunteer to work on the Program Committee to monitor equipment needs; Bruce Johnson volunteered.
  2. Possible tours to be sponsored by RTSD AV Committee during the New York conference--Verna Urbanski and Janice Woo will work on these.
    1. Sheila suggested a tour of the Museum of Holography.
    2. Museum of Modern Art Film Collection--Verna had Information from Ann Morra about a "condensed" tour of the collection which would take approximately three hours and cover such topics as history of the collection, how it is serviced, cataloging using microcomputers, and preservation. We would need to set up pre-registration for these tours with a limit of about forty participants. The Committee decided to pursue both tours with a suggested date of Friday afternoon, June 27, 1986. Martha said although we are somewhat late in planning these activities in terms of the ALA conference schedule, she would take the proposal to the WTSD Board asking permission to go ahead.
  3. There was not much discussion about whether RTSD AV Committee needed two-way liaison relationships. In general, the Committee thought its energy should focus on getting liaisons appointed to it and wait for other organizations to indicate interest in establishing relationships in reverse.

4. Since Nancy Olson was unable to attend the Chicago conference, discussion of her AV glossary was postponed until a later time.
3. New business
  1. Because there was little interest in pursuing further the placing of performers on sound recordings and moving image materials in the statement of responsibility area, the matter was dropped.
  2. Suggestions of new projects.
    1. Verna suggested the Committee consider sponsoring tours on a regular basis. There was much interest in this.
    2. Sheila suggested having a promotional campaign to sell the remaining copies of the *Directory of Film Archives* compiled for the Los Angeles (1983) program and published by the Committee. Two suggestions for doing this:
      1. Verna will place a notice in the *OLAC Newsletter*.
      2. Janice will contact Pat Scarry about selling them in the ALA store.
    3. Karen Driessen asked the Committee to consider ways to work with audiovisual producers and distributors to make them think "bibliographically, e.g., having a title is a great idea!"
    4. Martha asked Committee members to be thinking of program ideas, etc., for San Francisco annual conference. Must discuss at Midwinter meeting since eighteen months lead time is required.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 pm.

Submitted by Katha Massey

---

## INFORMATION ON PCs IN AV CENTERS SOUGHT

Steven M. Wooldridge, Audiovisual Librarian with the Loyola/Notre Dame Library in Baltimore, has recently acquired an IBM PC for his college audiovisual center and is interested in receiving information on experiences of other librarians as they have integrated such technology into the daily operation of their center. Wooldridge would also be interested in learning about software suited to applications in a college av center for functions such as booking facilities and equipment, producing printed catalogs, etc. Anyone who has had experience handling non-print formats in a public service context and is willing to share their insights can contact Wooldridge. Write: **Steve M. Wooldridge, Audiovisual Librarian, The Loyola/Notre Dame Library, Inc., 200 Winston Ave, Baltimore, Maryland 21212** or call **301-532-8788**.

---

## NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AMERICAN ART BEGINS SCULPTURE INVENTORY PILOT PROJECT

The Office of Research Support, National Museum of American Art, has recently undertaken a pilot project to compile an inventory of all known American sculpture in public and private collections around the country. Indexed on a computer, the essential information would include artist, title, execution date, subject, medium, dimensions, foundry identification, cast numbers, owner and location. The Office hopes to adapt the MARC format for data entry. The Office of Research Support would be interested in hearing from anyone else currently utilizing a MARC format for fine art materials (especially sculpture). Please contact: **Christine Hennessey, Office of Research Support, National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560 202-357-2941.**

---

### SEARCHING CORPORATE NAMES FOR MUSICAL GROUPS

A recent *Solinet Memorandum* contained the following information provided by Glenn Patton of OCLC:

A user recently reported problems in searching a sound recording titled *Leftoverture* performed by the rock group "Kansas." The record could be retrieved by title search but name and name/title searches seemed not to work.

Several points need to be kept in mind. The parenthetical qualifier "musical group" will frequently be added to headings for performing groups (see the LC rule interpretation for AACR2 rule 24.4B published in *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, no. 18 (Fall, 1982) Since these parenthetical qualifiers are not separately subfielded, they must be considered in the formulation of the search key. For example:

Heading: ABBA (Musical group)

Search key: =abba,mus,g

In addition, the corporate name stoplist must be considered in formulating the search key. A number of popular and rock groups have names which consist of state name or other words commonly associated with corporate names, e.g., Alabama, The Association, Kansas, etc. The user searching for *Leftoverture* had not realized that the word "Kansas" would be disregarded by the online system.

Heading: Kansas (Musical group)

Search key: =musi,gro,

The name/title search key would also be influenced by the corporate name stoplist. The search key would be "musi,left" not "kans,left."

Nancy Olson (Mankato State University) also points out that the same problem occurs with corporate producers with which AV catalogers constantly must cope. She furnishes as an example "Softape (Firm)." Other recent examples from current cataloging done locally at the

editor's library include three which came up as a group in response to the authority file search [desi,fir,. The editor was searching for California Design (Firm) and received that response plus Design/Communigraphics (Firm) and DeSilver (Firm). Look out people---it is a tricky world out there!!!

--- Verna Urbanski

---

***LIBRARY SOFTWARE REVIEW***  
**A REVIEW**  
**by Sheila Intner**

With the 1985 volume, *LIBRARY SOFTWARE REVIEW* (LSR) is bigger and better than ever, with larger-sized, double-columned pages and two additional issues per year. The 1985 issues contain an average of between seven and eight software reviews, from a low of two in the year's opening issue to a high of twelve in the May-June issue--the latest one examined. Two reviews were highlighted as "feature" reviews, of *dBase III* and *FYI 3000*, appearing closes to the front of the magazine and having lengthy, detailed descriptions (seven + and five + pages, respectively) The rest were part of the software review department which, together with a hook review section, closed each issue. These departmental reviews were about two pages in length, though shorter and longer examples could be found. Illustrations, particularly of screens encountered when using the software, were often included. This reviewer believes seeing the screens is tremendously useful to a program's potential buyer. Also extremely important are the reviewer's evaluative comments with full descriptions of the software's flaws as well as virtues given.

Many of the several articles which took up most of each issue' s pages were, in their own ways, reviews of individual applications of the software packages, e.g., "Development of a Periodicals List in *dBase II*," and "Creation of a Book Order Management System Using a Microcomputer and a DBMS," or brief compilations of information about software, e.g., "Fifty 'Best' Database and File Management Packages for Academic Libraries." (I hope LSR doesn't overdo the type-of library articles/reviews or aim at one or another type-of-library audience. So far, sophistication with software does not seem to reside in any one kind of information agency.) But some of them could also be perceived as How-we-do-it-good-in-our-library-using-this-software articles and their authors were not under a reviewer's obligation to point out the weaknesses as well as the strengths of the software being discussed. Moreover, not all the articles focused on software, and other topics were as far-ranging as "Dialing for Data," an account of one library's foray into remote access by clients of their CLSI LIBS 100 database, with clients using their home computers, and "Cataloging Microcomputer Software: Rules, Guidelines, and Trends," an explanation and illustration of cataloging according to AACR2. The focus of the former was not the software used to link people with the library's database, but the problems of putting the service in place, background, history and publicity, coupled with an assessment of its use. The latter was a good description of the cataloging rules for microcomputer software, but nothing more. That each article in the magazine should contain something we can interpret as a review of



a software item might be too stringent a requirement, but it would prevent LSR from dissipating its energies in peripheral areas (no pun intended) and make its impact more distinctive.

Several of the departments and columns, aside from the reviews were interesting, too. One "Vendor's Corner" article described a dbms vended by CLASS, while another covered UTLAS' microcomputer products. The book reviews were signed and evaluative, and the titles chosen for review were mostly concerned with library software, though a few seemed much too general to this reviewer, e. g., *Library Technical Services: Operations and Management* is a perfectly good book, but **very** marginally related to software.

An interview department and tutorial sections offered material at different levels for a varied readership. The sample of issues seen contained one interview--with an officer of a company producing software protection programs. This was a good choice and others would be welcome provided the interviewees continue to be people closely related to software who are not necessarily known very well in the library world.

Editor Nancy Jean Melin has assembled a good staff of editors with regular jobs in all kinds of information settings. Graphics are well-done, and not just in the advertisements. I spotted several typos, however, in the four issues I examined. This is something an attractive periodical like LSR should make every effort to eliminate. Advertisements were tasteful and attention-getting without being totally distracting. LSR seems to succeed at striking a good balance between the attractions of slick commercialism and the serious business of a professional journal. The writing in it is, for the most part, clear and easy to read.

On the whole, this is an appealing and useful magazine. I recommend it for purchase if your institution is now buying or planning to buy software, either for internal use or for client use. Its language is more familiar than some of the computer journals that provide in-depth reviews and the illustrations are invaluable. The issues are getting bigger, but so far the focus appears to be firmly on target. It would be a shame if LSR tried to be all things to all people, covering the whole library automation scene. As it is, it does a fine job of investigating library software in depth. I hope it continues to grow and prosper in that direction.

Reviewed by Sheila Intner, Visiting Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Library & Information Science, UCLA.

*LIBRARY SOFTWARE REVIEW*, Mickler Publishing (11 Fery Lane West ; Westport, Conn. 06880), 1984- Continues *Software Review*, 1982-1984, ISSN: 0278-2634)

ISSN: 0742-5759 \$69.50 per volume year; add \$5.00 for foreign subscriptions and \$20.00 for airmail international postage; individual issue; \$15.00.

Bimonthly beginning with v.4, 1985. (Previously quarterly)

Indexed in *Computer Literature Index*, *Consumers Index to Computer Project Evaluation and Information Sources*, *Legal Information Management Index*, and *Lamp*. Abstracted in *Cambridge Scientific Abstracts*.

---

## MARC DISTRIBUTION SERVICE--VISUAL MATERIALS

*Cataloging Service Bulletin*, no.28 (Spring 1985) contained the following notice which will be of interest to online catalogers:

In April 1985 the Library will begin implementing the MARC Visual Materials format as described in the *MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data*, Update no. 10. As a result of this implementation, the Cataloging Distribution Service expects that there will be an interruption of service for a period of two or three months while new systems and procedures are being established. However, once these modifications are made, regular service will be resumed and all records created during this period will be distributed.

The implementation of this format will allow the distribution of records for several kinds of materials not previously distributed. The scope will now include projected media (motion pictures, videorecordings, filmstrips, transparencies, slides); pictures, designs, and other two-dimensional, non-projectable graphic representations; archival films; and kits. As a result of this expansion of scope, the name of the service will be changed to MARC Distribution Service--Visual Materials. Any records originally distributed prior to the implementation of the Visual Materials format which are redistributed with corrections or revisions will be in the new format.

---

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**QUESTION:** I have many sets of filmstrips with 2 filmstrips and 1 sound cassette. Each side of the cassette is for one of the filmstrips. How do I do the subfield e of the physical description?

**ANSWER:** If I read 5.5B3 correctly, I would think that you would say:

1 filmstrip (48 fr.) : col. ; 35 mm. + 1 side of 1 sound cassette (17 min.)

This treatment will allow you to show that the physical item carrying the sound is shared by two titles. There is probably nothing wrong with just saying "1 s." either, since the information may be of more use to those caring for and inventorying the material than those who use it. "1 s." would undoubtedly be understood by the library staff. Do not include running time for the accompanying sound as part of the extent of item. For filmstrips, the extent should include only frame information.

--- Verna Urbanski

**QUESTION:** We have several questions concerning the cataloging of posters according to AACR2 and through OCLC. How would the fixed field "type mat" be coded? Would code "z" be a possibility? Would a 007 field be used? What kind of GMD would be best, "graphic"? Or, does LC use a GMD in this case at all? Can we input a poster using AACR2 chapter 8 into OCLC? Is there a specific MARC format for posters?

**ANSWER:** When OCLC adopts the newest version of the Films Format (which is called "Visual Materials"), OCLC users will be able to catalog posters and other two dimensional materials online. At present, we cannot do so (see "type of record" AV FF:30 for the type of materials which can be input now). Page AV 0:1 of the OCLC audiovisual format tells what materials can have an 007. It is limited to projected graphic, motion pictures and videorecordings. *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 10 has an LC rule interpretation for 8.5B1 which shows that they would use "picture" for the GMD when cataloging a poster. In AACR2 1.1C1, the two lists of possible GMDs are mutually exclusive, i. e., British libraries use list 1 and North American use list 2. So, unfortunately, we cannot use "graphic." When OCLC implements the Visual Materials Format this fall, OCLC users will apply chapter 8 for guidance on cataloging posters.  
--- Verna Urbanski

**QUESTION:** Is it really necessary to say "1 teacher's guide" in the accompanying materials section of the physical description? Why not just "teacher's guide"? Everyone can see that guide is singular.

**ANSWER:** Using numbers for the accompanying material was discussed during code revision because we were faced with disagreements about "guide" vs. "1 guide," due to the fact that many people felt that if "guide" is singular, then it was sufficiently obvious that it had to be "1," i. e., nothing in front of "guide" meant "1," while many others felt that "nothing meaning something" was bad. The latter point of view won out, because on its side were those who set a tremendous store on uniformity, not liking "guide" / "3 guides," besides being enemies of "nothing meaning something." We knew there would be cases in which a number would be absurd, and thus we inserted the example "teacher's notes" without a "1." What this phrase refers to is obviously a set of notes, but the phrase doesn't say "set," and so "1" wouldn't make sense because it would seem to contradict "notes."  
--- Ben R. Tucker

**QUESTION:** Is it all right to call accompanying material by the name it has on it rather than just using "guide" or "manual" or some generic term?

**ANSWER:** I agree completely on naming the accompanying material according to the words on the material. Don't try to change a succinct, specific phrase that would do in the accompanying material statement to another term you consider more generic. Not all wording on material, however, are succinct and usable as accompanying material statements, and they may not be named at all. LCRI 1.5E1 is not intended to require that a generic term be used. We only mention general terms as being one of the criteria applied when catalogers are trying to decide whether or not to use the accompanying

material position, and this LC advice is qualified by "generally."  
--- Ben R. Tucker

**QUESTION:** In the accompanying materials section of the physical description, should a cataloger leave 3 blank spaces for the number of accompanying items when we know that more is going to be issued on a regular basis?

**ANSWER:** You are correct that these spaces are as "open" as the SMD beginning the physical description is. But who is going to keep track of these during the life of the serial, or go back at the death of it and count them all up????!! If a library wishes to keep track of numbers in these statements some blank space may be left for the numbers; otherwise blank space is not necessary pro forma.  
--- Ben R. Tucker

**QUESTION:** I am cataloging a 1984 videocassette that is a reprocessing of a 1926 silent film. The video version has a modern performance of the original score, i.e., what the organist would have played in the movie house. How do I code the 007 and what should the 300 say?

**ANSWER:** What you have is a sound videocassette and it should be cataloged accordingly. In the 007 subfield f should be "a"; subfield g should be "h." The physical description will show "sd." rather than silent. In situations like this, catalog for the form you have in hand, not the original form. Even though no dialogue is present there is still sound.  
--- Glenn Patton

**QUESTION:** What should I use for a GMD for sculpture that is not an original work of art?

**ANSWER:** I believe that "model" would be the correct GMD. The AACR2 glossary defines model as: "A three dimensional representation of a real thing, either of the exact size of the original or to scale." The choice seems between this and nothing. Nancy Olson comments in her *Cataloging of Audiovisual Materials*, 2nd ed.: "It may be better to omit the GMD for those items that are not accurately represented by one of the permitted GMD's." (p.202)  
--- Verna Urbanski

**QUESTION:** I am writing about a kit with 4 cans of film, 4 cassettes and an instructor's manual. The item is not on OCLC but in searching for similar titles a kit with 4 rolls + 4 cassettes + manual was located. What is the proper GMD for such a kit and how can items be described in the 300 field? Since the title was not a collective title, I used "filmstrips" for a GMD although there are two types of media involved. Secondly, the word "rolls" does not appear in AACR2. I wondered why this was used and if proper for this kind of media? What is the meaning of "rolls" as used in OCLC cataloging?

**ANSWER:** The correct GMD to use is "filmstrip." The lack of a collective title is not what determines when the GMD kit is used. If the set should be cataloged as a unit, and it lacks a unifying title, the cataloging title should be transcribed following AACR2 1.1G2 (latest revision of this rule is the 1983 one approved by the Joint Steering Committee.) "Rolls" is out of date terminology. It is an acceptable usage in pre-AACR2 cataloging, so you will still see it on old cataloging. If you catalog the four filmstrips as a unit, the 300 would be:

4 filmstrips (120 fr.) : col. ; 35 mm. + 4 sound cassettes + 4 manuals.

--- Verna Urbanski

**QUESTION:** We are a small library with considerable AV materials for its size. Do you know anything about cataloging a carousel of 100 slides with a cassette? I presume 300 description should be 100 slides + cassette and a 508 note for information on carousel: slides in two carousel trays.

**ANSWER:** The 300 should indicate the number of slides. For example: 100 slides : col. + 2 sound cassettes. I use as a 500 note "Issued in 2 carousels" if the manufacturer sent it that way, or, "In two carousels" if we locally put the slides into carousels.

--- Verna Urbanski

---

## MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

Membership in Online Audiovisual Catalogers is available for single or multiple years. The membership year is from January 1 through December 31. Membership includes a subscription to *OLAC Newsletter*. Membership rates are:

<b>single year</b>	<b>- US</b>	<b>- \$5.00 personal ; \$10.00 institutional</b>
	<b>Non-US</b>	<b>- \$7.00 personal ; \$12.00 institutional</b>
<b>two year</b>	<b>- US</b>	<b>- \$9.00 personal ; \$19.00 institutional</b>
	<b>Non-US</b>	<b>- \$13.00 personal ; \$23.00 institutional</b>
<b>three year</b>	<b>- US</b>	<b>- \$12.00 personal ; \$27.00 institutional</b>
	<b>Non-US</b>	<b>- \$18.00 personal ; \$33.00 institutional</b>

Payment in US funds only, please. Make check payable to ONLINE 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 December issue  
is October 25, 1985.

Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the  
source is acknowledged.

## OLAC OFFICERS

### CHAIR

Katha Massey  
Catalog Dept.  
U of Georgia Libraries  
Athens, GA 30602

### TREASURER

Catherine Leonardi  
3604 Suffolk  
Durham, NC 27707

### VICE CHAIR/CHAIR ELECT

Richard Thaxter  
Head, Audiovisual Section  
  
Special Materials Cat. Div.  
Library of Congress  
  
Washington, DC 20540

### SECRETARY

Antonia Snee  
Ventress Memorial  
  
2033 Ocean Rd.  
Marshfield, MA

Library

02050

### PAST CHAIR

Sheila Intner  
Grad School of Lib & Info Science  
120 Powell  
U of California, Los Angeles  
405 Hilgard  
  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

### NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Verna Urbanski  
Carpenter Library  
U of North Florida  
PO Box 17605  
Jacksonville, FL

32245-7605

\*\*\*\*\*

Where do I send it? Who do I call?

\*\*\*\*\*

For general Information about OLAC contact, Katha Massey.

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