

On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers NEWSLETTER
Volume 4, Number 3
September, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE CHAIR

MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE CATALOGING GUIDELINES NOW AVAILABLE

U of PITTSBURGH SLIS TO DO "MR. ROGERS" PROJECT

INTERDIVISIONAL COMMITTEE FORMING TO STUDY CIP FOR NONPRINT MATERIALS

NOTICE OF SUBMISSION DEADLINE

OLAC BUSINESS MEETING

FROM THE TREASURER

OLAC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS

OLAC's PROGRAM MEETING A SUCCESS

ACCESS TO SPECIAL FORMAT STATISTICS: AN ALA PROGRAM REPORT

RESULTS : OLAC MEMBERSHIP SURVEY - SPRING 1984

SOME COMMENTS ON "IN" ANALYTICS

SUBJECT HEADINGS FOR MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE : WHAT DO YOU SUGGEST?

OLAC OFFERS MEMBERSHIP CHOICES

FEAR OF MRDF?

CAN WE SELL YOUR NAME?

CATALOGING MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE AT FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

AREA 1-8 : A REFRESHER

MEET YOUR OFFICERS

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

FROM THE CHAIR

Sheila S. Intner

Hello, OLAC members. This column is my introduction to all of you as OLAC's new Chair. I hope it will be our two-way communication channel though it isn't yet online and interactive. Feel free to respond to the ideas and issues I discuss and -- equally important -- the ones you feel should be included that I may overlook.

While new to the office, I am not new to OLAC, being a founding member and Vice-Chair for the last two years. I teach online cataloging of all library materials at Columbia University's School of Library Service, where we have access to OCLC in our student laboratory and RLIN in the university libraries. (I can also be reached online through Columbia's BITNET node at LIB2.S-INTNER@CU20A)

Those of you who have been on board with OLAC for a few years know our organization is steadily adding activities and deepening interests along with our expanding membership. I expect to continue this pattern and, accordingly, am outlining the following areas in which work is proceeding for the forthcoming year:

- **CATALOGING POLICY** -- CAPC, headed by Verna Urbanski, had its organizational meeting in Dallas and is rapidly moving to study many changes to cataloging rules (and subsequently to formats) for NBM. The new MRDF guidelines are especially important.
- **CIP FOR AV** -- Dick Thaxter, our LC liaison and Nancy Olson, our RTSD-AV liaison, are working with Susan Vita, Chief of LC's CIP Division and representatives from ALA divisions to assess needs in the field for CIP for NBM.
- **MEETINGS, DISCUSSIONS, WORKSHOPS** -- A cataloging problem question and answer workshop is planned for the Midwinter meeting; following in the footsteps of the highly successful MOUG-OLAC meeting at OCLC (April, 1984), an invitation from UTLAS for an OLAC meeting in Toronto in 1985 is currently in the planning stages; a program focusing on MRDF is planned for 1985, chaired by Vice-Chair Katha Massey.
- **MEMBERSHIP** -- Plans to increase our visibility profession-wide, and provide more opportunities for you to interact and participate in planning and policy are being made.

I look forward to getting to know many more of you personally as the year progresses and we work together to make OLAC the most effective professional organization of its kind. Let's hear

from you. Contact me at: **Sheila Intner // School of Library Service // Columbia University // New York, NY 10027 // (212) 280-2294**

MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE CATALOGING GUIDELINES NOW AVAILABLE

Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software is now available. Write ALA Publishing Services, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611 for your copies. Price is \$4.50 each.

RTSD is to be congratulated for getting *Guidelines* out so promptly. There were many who feared a long delay in publication might ensue following CC:DA's approval of them at Midwinter. It is in the best library science tradition that the skeptics are proven wrong!! The booklet is 32 pages long with 14 pages of guidelines and examples and 18 pages of definitions. When combined with AACR2 and the soon to be released MRDF format, on-line access to standardized cataloging for microcomputer software is just around the corner. When you receive your copy of *Guidelines* be sure to spend a couple of minutes looking at the acknowledgments on page iii. Much effort has gone into producing these and many people deserve many thanks.

--- Editor

U of PITTSBURGH SLIS TO DO 'MR. ROGERS' PROJECT

Readers of the *Newsletter* would be interested to know of a Title IIC project at the School of Library and Information Science, University of Pittsburgh. The grant is to help provide access to the video record of the Pittsburgh based "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood". The project will also include development of an archive of Fred Rogers' thirty years work in television. Of interest to child development specialists as well as those interested in children and television, we hope this work will lead to a model for on-line access to video material for researchers.

The project is funded by the Office of Education for one year beginning October 1, 1984. They are now recruiting staff for the project. Anyone interest in working on this effort or knowing of such a project should contact: **Dr. Margaret Kimmel, SLIS, (412) 624-5234** or **Nancy Olson, Project Consultant, Mankato State University, Mankato, MN 56001.**

INTERDIVISIONAL COMMITTEE FORMING TO STUDY CIP FOR NONPRINT MATERIALS

Should the Library of Congress make a major effort to extend its CIP program to nonprint materials? A discussion sponsored by RTSD's AV Committee on this topic at the 1984 Midwinter Conference in Washington raised a host of issues involved in answering this question. Susan Vita, Chief of LC's CIP Division, asked members of the Committee to find out what was happening in the field with the cataloging of nonprint materials and help LC assess existing needs. She specifically wanted this to be done in concert with other ALA divisions, representing as broad a spectrum of libraries and librarians as possible to coordinate.

At the recent ALA conference in Dallas, a proposal to form an interdivisional committee to investigate the issues related to CIP for nonprint materials was passed by the Executive Boards of AASL, ACRL, LITA, PLA and RTSD. (Each of these divisions has had a committee or section devoted to AV within their divisions and sent liaisons to the RTSD AV Committee, though other divisions are welcome to participate, too.) RTSD's Cataloging and Classification Section also voted to appoint cataloging experts (two descriptive and one subject) to act as resource people on cataloging issues for the interdivisional committee.

RTSD AV Committee members Helen Cyr (Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore) and Bob Mead-Donaldson (Florida International University, Miami) are coordinating the initial effort and arranging a meeting of representatives from all participating divisions to the new committee at the 1985 Midwinter Conference. They will discuss logistics of operation and make next-step plans. Ms. Vita and others from LC will help direct the work.

If you are interested in helping with this effort or just in keeping up with the subject, consult your Midwinter Conference schedule for meetings of this interdivisional committee.

--- Sheila Intner, Immediate Past

Chair, RTSD AV Committee

NOTICE OF SUBMISSION DEADLINE

The next issue of the *Newsletter* will be the December 1984 issue, volume 4, number 4. Items or inclusion should be submitted no later than **October 26, 1984**. Early submissions are appreciated. If you have questions about the appropriateness of a topic, or want some feedback on an idea for an article you would like to submit, please contact the editor (904 646-2550).

MAIL NEWSLETTER CONTRIBUTIONS TO:

Verna Urbanski, Editor
Thomas G. Carpenter Library
University of North Florida
P.O. Box 17605
Jacksonville, Fl 32245-7605

**ON-LINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS, INC.
BUSINESS MEETING**

JUNE 24, 1984 DALLAS, TEXAS

The meeting was called to order just after 8:00 pm. The OLAC officers were introduced: **Sheila Intner**, current vice-chair who will assume her duties as chair for 1984-85 at the conclusion of this annual ALA conference; **Cathy Leonardi**, treasurer; **Verna Urbanski**, *Newsletter* editor; and, **Laurel Jizba**, chair of OLAC. Following the introduction of others attending, Laurel gave a brief history of OLAC and continued to the business portion of the meeting.

Treasurer, Cathy Leonardi, reported that our balance as of June 11th was \$6,424.63, with current membership of 486. [See complete treasurer's report elsewhere in this issue.--Ed.]

Sheila Intner, RTSD AV's liaison to CC:DA reported that CC:DA is increasingly focusing on non-book materials because most major book related issues have been settled.

Laurel Jizba reported on the results of the OLAC membership survey (see Laurel's complete report elsewhere in this Newsletter. --Ed.) Interest in joint meetings with other groups seemed to be strongest for ACRL (Association of College and Research Libraries) MOUG (Music OCLC User's Group) and HSOCLCUG (Health Sciences OCLC User's group).

Ed Glazier, liaison to OLAC from RLG, reported that RLIN should be loading LC new NAF tapes by July 2. They expect to soon load LC's music in MARC tapes. At present RLIN does not have a date for implementing the MRDF format, but is waiting for publication of the MRDF format by LC. RLIN is at work on specifications for non-book, maps and minimal level books. They have 25 new users of the archive and manuscript format.

Glenn Patton, liaison to OLAC from OCLC, indicated that OCLC hopes to have the LC NAF tapes available in August. Loading has been delayed by a lack of disk storage.

OCLC expects to implement the MRDF format this fall. They are negotiating to have the format released to libraries at the same time that it goes to the networks. OCLC is planning training sessions on the manuscripts and archival control formats for this fall. Staff at OCLC are working on loading music MARC. They are figuring out how best to match these new records to those already in the system. The *Cataloger's User Manual* has gone through its first major revision since 1979. The *Books Format* has also been revised. Both of these will be reissued soon.

Verna Urbanski, OLAC alternate liaison to the MARBI Committee reported that work is being finalized on the holdings format. LC should be issuing Update 9 to the MARC formats this summer. Update 9 will include the MRDF format designations. When Update 9 is published the utilities can then move ahead on implementing their formats.

Update 10 to the MARC formats will be a complete cumulation through 1983. Thereafter, there will be no "quarterly" updates, but one time purchases of changes, with a possibility of standing orders.

MARBI has passed a proposal to add a field 753 to the MRDF format to provide access points for the make and model of machines, the programming language and the operating system.

Verna also serves as Chair of the OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee and presented their report to the membership on the meeting this group held on June 22nd, 8 pm - 10:15 pm.

CAPC authorized the Chair to request that the Board appoint the seventh committee member. The Board has been searching for a school librarian to appoint. Since a six month search has not revealed a candidate from this constituency, the committee would like for another member from other groups to be appointed. The Chair so requests.

CAPC discussed the problems of cataloging microcartographic materials. There was general agreement that catalogers should use the format appropriate to the original and describe the micro version in a 533 note. Catalogers should be using the maps chapter of AACR2 and inputting as "Type: e". Pat Moore (University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign) will write an article for the *Newsletter* with:

1. problems with the current application of AACR2 to microcartographic materials by practitioners
2. proposed solutions to impose consistency.

The committee would intend to share this article with Map On-Line Users group and MAGERT (Map and Geography Round Table) to solicit input. We will consider this to be a first step toward CAPC producing guidelines/ or perhaps a simple manual for the non-specialist. Pat also suggests that JoAnn Rogers' chapter on maps is a very good guide to applying AACR2 to maps. (*Nonprint Cataloging for Multimedia Collections*. Littleton, Colo., Libraries Unlimited, \$21.00)

Martha Yee and Carmela DiDomenico will be working on a project to review the application of the holdings format to AV. Martha has several lines of investigation to pursue. One major one being the possibility of multiple physical descriptions as in the draft copy of White-Hensen's "Archival Moving Image Materials: A Cataloging Manual". Erlene Rickerson will serve as resource person to the project.

Verna will continue to gather information on the descriptive problems of cataloging materials for the blind. She will ask Nancy Olson to work on it too.

The committee will ask Sheila Intner for a status report on the CC:DA task force working on resolving conflicts in the ISBDS.

The Committee suggests that we put out a call for "how to manuals" to review them and see what is available with a possible eye to publishing a bibliography.

CAPC members attending were: Carmela DiDomenico, Dorian Martyn, Martha Yee, Pat Moore, Erlene Rickerson, Verna Urbanski.

Dick Thaxter, head, Audiovisual section at LC reported on developments there. MARC for music now has 4,200 records. They are working to get AV cataloging on-line. Dick introduced Susan Tucker of AECT (director of contracts and grants) and Jay Johnstone of NICEM.

Having no further business the floor was opened to two guests who discussed examples of difficult statistical problems dealing with AV. Karen K. Niemeyer, supervisor of Media Services, Carmel Clay Schools, Carmel, Indiana, and Roland Hansen of the School of the Art Institute of Chicago Library highlighted the difficulties of trying to be consistent. For Ms. Niemeyer it is especially difficult because the lack of clear definition of what materials fit into a category can muddy the usefulness of her statistics, when compared to other school systems. Niemeyer shared several examples of cataloging her shop had produced which illustrated the problems.

Following these presentations there was lively discussion on several points, The meeting adjourned at 10:10 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Verna Urbanski

from notes furnished by
B. Mead-Donaldson and Laurel Jizba.

Those attending included: Glenn Patton, Verna Urbanski, Cathy Leonardi, Ed Glazier, Bob Mead-Donaldson, James O. Wallace, Sheila Intner, Patricia Moore, Barbara Ritchie, Richard Thaxter, Martha Yee, Karen Niemeyer, Roland Hansen, Melissa Nasea, Dorian Martyn, Camela DiDomenico, Susan Tucker, Jay Johnstone, Laurel Jizba.

FROM THE TREASURER
Catherine Leonardi

Reporting period:
April 17, 1984 through June 11, 1984

Account balance April 17, 1984
\$5,385.47

INCOME

	New memberships	
251.00		
	Renewal memberships	
107.00		
	Back issues	
47.50		
	Gross profits from conference with MOUG	
1,270.00		
	Interest paid on account	
92.16		

TOTAL INCOME
\$1,767.66

TOTAL
\$7,153.13

EXPENSES

	Newsletter v.4, no. 2	
428.25		
	MOUG/OLAC conference expenses (partial)	
274.74		
	Postage	
25.51		

TOTAL EXPENSES
728.50

ACCOUNT BALANCE June 11, 1984
\$6,424.63

CURRENT MEMBERSHIP 486

\$

**ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS, INC.
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS**

Minutes

June 23, 1984

1. Convened at 6:1-5 p.m. at Fairmont Hotel, Brasserie Room, with Laurel Jizba presiding.
2. Set Sunday from 8-10 p.m. as the time slot for the Executive Board Meeting at ALA Midwinter (1985).
3. Asked Cathy to check periodically on the availability of money management accounts at her bank. Her convenience will be a major factor in making any changes.
4. Cost of the OLAC mailing list
 1. Should we sell and, if so, how much should we charge? Various suggestions were made: same price to everyone, 40% discount to non-profit organizations, 20% discount to non-profit organizations, free to bibliographic utilities, etc. No decision was reached; the last schedule discussed was: \$40 to profit organizations, \$30 to non-profit organizations, free to utilities.
 2. What the legal ramifications of selling members' names without their permission? Do we have to give people a choice? If so, this could create problems with the software which produces the mailing labels for the *Newsletter*. Consensus: Place notice in the *Newsletter* asking members who do not want their name sold as part of a mailing list to notify the editor. In addition, put a box to check on membership notices. Perhaps, the software could be updated fairly simply with the addition of a yes/no code.
5. Staggered rate schedule for dues

The Board agreed to Verna's proposal with revised figures suggested by Cathy for domestic members. The rates will be published in the *Newsletter*.

6. Decisions on reimbursements by OLAC
 1. CAPC chair and members - no annual reimbursement
 2. *Newsletter Editor* - \$50.00 per issue for a one-year period. Reevaluate finances at summer 1985 Board meeting.
 3. Board members doing their jobs at;
 - 1) ALA meetings - \$50.00 and cost of dinner meeting if one is held;
 - 2) special conferences or meetings - registration fee waived.
 4. Speakers, workshop leaders, etc.

- 1) at ALA - no reimbursement
- 2) at special conferences or meetings - some reimbursement should be made. Decide on amount for each occasion separately.

5. Treasurer - no special reimbursement aside from attendance fees from ALA and Midwinter.
6. MARBI - The liaison will continue to receive \$100 per meeting toward expenses, maximum of \$400 per year
7. Taping of the program meeting

Laurel brought a sound cassette recorder to tape the program. She can get duplicates made for a very reasonable amount if people want to buy them. It was proposed that OLAC sell tapes for the cost of the cassette plus postage.

Adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Katha D. Massey
Secretary

June 24, 1984

7:45 a.m. - 9:20 a.m.

4:30 p.m. - 5:45 p.m.

1. Board voted to co-sponsor a program with LITA/RTSD AV in Chicago, summer 1985 annual conference.

The purpose of the program is "to provide a state-of-the-art review of the media aspects of academic library automation along with the identification of present and future needs in this rapidly developing area." Media refers to "materials booking, media room reservations, equipment distribution, production control, and similar concerns of many academic libraries."

2. Discussed program planning policies & guidelines suggested for OLAC.

Some points were reworded and the document was discussed but no action was taken in the morning. In the afternoon, it was agreed that the proposed document would be retyped, incorporating the rewording and added sections (Laurel will do) and that the document would be published in the September *Newsletter*. Further, the proposal will be brought up for general membership discussion at the meeting in Washington, January '85. A vote will be taken to adopt it or not (just a vote of those present at the midwinter meeting).

3. Discussed a possible meeting in Toronto with the Ontario Library Association.

Laurel read the response to an exploratory letter regarding this meeting. Mary Magrega of UTLAS was optimistic that UTLAS could do much to help make the meeting a reality, and awaits further word from OLAC.

All Board members were in favor of this proposed meeting taking place at some time. No further action was taken pending the appointment of an OLAC conference program chair for this event, and the need for more information, including the need for an exploratory letter with the Ontario Library Association. This topic will also be brought up at the 1985 Midwinter meeting in Washington.

Laurel Jizba
Chair

OLAC'S PROGRAM MEETING A SUCCESS

Verna Urbanski

OLAC's program meeting, "Chapter 21, AACR2, and Choice of Access Points for Nonbook Materials, or, How Did We Get From There to Here?" held June 23rd during the ALA convention was very much a success. Many of those who attended are the current luminaries of the cataloging world. The report below attempts to capture the major points of the program speakers, Jean Weihs and Michael Gorman. The report is based on notes taken by Verna Urbanski and Katha Massey. An audiocassette of the program is available. See the end of this article for details on how to purchase it.

Jean Weihs, author of *Non-book Materials: the Organization of Integrated Collections*, and current chair of the Joint Steering Committee (the body charged with overseeing the upkeep of AACR), spoke of what she discovered back in 1967 when she began investigating how people were cataloging non-book materials. Her interviews revealed that everyone did things differently and everyone had the same advice: "Don't do it my way!" This nearly unanimous response led Weihs to decide to do a manual to bring some uniformity to non-book cataloging.

As part of Weihs research, she experimented with different shelving methods and discovered that circulation rose with intershelving. Nonreaders were enticed to use books by using the non-book materials sitting beside the book. She also determined that AACR1 could not be used to create a fully integrated collection because the different rules for entry for different materials, makes them stand in different places on the shelf. Likewise, the AECT cataloging rules, *Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials (rev. ed.)* were not satisfactory because they advocated entry under title for everything. This also resulted in things not standing together on the shelf and had the additional disadvantage of producing many non-distinctive titles.

Weih's finally decided to write rules which would treat books and non-book materials the same, applying the same criteria to each so that her rules would be compatible with AACR1, but form a cogent method for treating non-book materials.

The preliminary edition of her guidelines was adopted by ALA and CLA with the provision that a committee would be formed to issue a joint first edition. It was in this first edition that the concept of entry under performer was introduced, a concept which carried over to AACR2. Weih's guidelines were user oriented and pragmatic. They were tied to book cataloging for practical reasons.

Michael Gorman, co-editor of AACR2, spoke on the concept of authorship and main entry. To Gorman, the concept of main entry was valid 2 or 3 technologies ago, but increasingly is of little value as a distinction. Gorman pointed out that, "If you look under an added entry, that is the main entry for you." The concept of main entry is valid today only in cataloging theory. No practical reason exists to maintain main entry.

Though some would say that main entries are needed to help with cutting, Gorman believes that we could find a way to arrange things on shelves without knowing a main entry. In this regard, he introduced "Gorman's Third Law" ---"The longer the number, the smaller the spine!!" Gorman pointed out that while entry under main entry is desirable from the view point of providing some name access on minimal level cataloging, if main entry were given up, it would be logical and reasonable to require that one name access point always be given when available in MLC. Gorman sees the concept of main entry to be too frequently a time consuming snag in cataloging.

Regarding the concept of authorship, Mr. Gorman emphasized that the library community has yet to come to grips with a clear idea of what constitutes authorship. He asked the audience if Homer was an author and cited the need to distinguish between author and bibliographical entity. For example, Agatha Christie vs Mary Westmacott, or, Lewis Carroll vs. Charles Dodgson. And there still remains the question, "Can a corporate body be an author?"

Entry under performer was adopted for AACR2 because it is common sense. Gorman gave as examples albums of Frank Sinatra or the Rolling Stones. On Frank Sinatra's album, it is his performance that is the focus not the songwriter. Likewise, it is the performance of the Rolling Stones not the author of the first track on the album that is important. As always the dilemma for cataloging is the conflict between the philosophical concept of authorship vs. the practical approach to access.

Mr. Gorman noted that this ALA marks almost to the day the 10th anniversary of the beginnings of AACR2. It was ten years ago that the Joint Steering Committee held its first meeting during ALA in New York to begin the examination of AACR1. One of the guiding principles to the structure and content of AACR2 was a desire to provide an integrated approach and not provide different rules for different materials. They sought for what Sanford Berman termed "fairness of treatment" for all materials and wanted to avoid treating things that were not books as "deformed books."

In part 2 of AACR2 the JSC tried to make rules relating to the concept of authorship consistent across the board and applicable to all. The concept of a "work" can cover any physical manifestation. The only special rules are those called for by particular, practical aspects of the medium. Further, the old concept of corporate authorship gave way to a new concept of "emanation" which included aspects of authorship such as performance. Why wasn't the concept of main entry dropped from AACR2? The Decision not to drop main entry was purely political and was not decided on a philosophical level. And, as a political decision, it was, according to Gorman, a wise decision.

One of the by-products of the decisions made in part 2 of AACR2 is to effectively increase the number of title main entries. While this can be viewed as a cop-out, Gorman predicts that increasingly it will not be necessary to preserve a distinction between main and added entries. The practical advantages of the concept of main entry are slowly disappearing and will disappear completely as we move to the computer catalog. He pointed out that even the distinction between entries and references are disappearing in machine catalogs. As a closing remark, Mr. Gorman observed that "the Golden Age of Cataloging is coming to a close."

Anyone interested in obtaining a cassette recording of this program should send \$4.50 to Laurel Jizba / Automated Processing Dept. / Indiana Univ. Libraries / Bloomington, IN 47405. Please enclose an envelop self-addressed and stamped with 37 cents. A receipt will be supplied with the cassette. Purchasers should be aware that while both speakers can be heard clearly, the sound is not of high quality since a portable tape recorder was used and it was not directly connected to the speaker's microphone.

ACCESS TO SPECIAL FORMAT STATISTICS: AN ALA PROGRAM REPORT

by Katha Massey

In 1983 newly revised ANSI Z39.7 Standard for Library Statistics was approved and issued. On June 25, 1984, at the ALA Annual Conference in Dallas, a program entitled "Access to Special Format Statistics: ANSI Z39.7 Standards and Problems of Implementation" was held. Since the standard was implemented without field testing, this program represented the first public report on its actual use. Speakers focused on describing the problems encountered in using the standard and making recommendations for needed changes. The program, which dealt with several types of special format materials, was sponsored by the LAMA Statistics Section / Statistics for Nonprint Media Committee and co-sponsored by the LAMA Statistics Section / Statistics for College and University Libraries Committee and the RTSD Audiovisual Committee. Mary Kaye Donahue, program chair, served as moderator.

The keynote speaker was Deanna Marcum (Program Officer, Council for Library Resources), who addressed the use of statistics as a management tool and the importance of the standardization of statistics reporting. Management uses of statistics mentioned by Ms. Marcum included:

1. measuring success in meeting goals and objectives
2. projecting future requirements
3. planning for anticipated changes
4. demonstrating profitability (private sector)
5. justifying budgetary needs
6. establishing comparability between similar organizations, collections, etc., by the use of a common, standardized language.

Statistics are, therefore, important to any library manager-especially in these days of networking and cooperative efforts. Ms. Marcum also pointed out the dangers which can result from defensive statistics-keeping and lack of analysis or interpretations of statistics which are compiled. She emphasized the need for libraries to have reliable statistics on their entire collections including special formats. She also issued a warning: Statistics are often used competitively, and we all tend to think that bigger is better (for example, the ARL rankings are based on size). Libraries need to begin to rank on the basis of services provided. Statistics compiled in a standard way will still be needed to do this.

Ms. Marcum was followed by five speakers who presented case studies on the use of the Standard to compile data on collections of different special format materials. Hal Hall (Texas A & M University Library) presented the results which he and Michael Nyerges found in using the standard to count a large (over one million pieces) microfiche collection. In addition to the time required to do the counting (app. 158 hours of student time and 40 librarian hours), he mentioned variations (in thickness of individual fiche and individual protective jackets, having protective jackets or not, using divider cards or not, etc.) which contributed to distortions in the count. Other possible sources of variation are not using a standardized measuring plate and/or reporting sheets and lack of thorough training for students involved in a counting project. Even taking all of these factors into account, Texas A & M took fourteen sets of seven samples and never achieved the rigorous accuracy called for in the draft standard.

One of the biggest problems with the standard remains how to figure Bibliographic counts and title equivalencies. The speaker stated that it was fairly well established that neither cataloging nor publishing count statistics were adequate in this area. The lack of guidelines for making these intellectual judgments could lead to wide variations in such statistics. Hall and Nyerges reached the conclusion that for the present the physical piece count is the most meaningful measure of a microfiche collection, all other systems are too derivative.

Jim Coombs (Southwest Missouri University Library) reported on the use of that part of the Standard dealing with cartographic materials. He used an interesting melange of slides and transparencies to illustrate types of cartographic materials left out of the

Standard and to point out the exact areas in the Standard which need changes. He explained the need for a revision of Table 3 to show cartographic materials as a separate type of material with subcategories to include manuscript maps, microform maps, cartographic material on magnetic tape, classroom display maps, remote-sensing imagery, etc. Similar omissions appear in the Collection Resources report on expenditures, the Appendix C listings, and the definition part of section 4.5. In addition, Mr. Coombs called for changing the principle of measuring only in terms of linear feet since it is not an adequate measurement for all types of cartographic materials.

In contrast, Roland Hansen (Art Institute of Chicago School Library) found the Standard adequate for counting (in terms of physical pieces) the Museum Library's collection of approximately 300,000 art slides. He did not attempt to go back to the collection and look at bibliographic counts and title equivalencies. For the School Library's purposes, he found the Standard useful, relatively easy to use, and is hoping to implement more of the Standard for other audiovisual materials in the collection in the future.

Karen Niemeyer (Carmel Clay (Indiana) Schools) reported on the use of the Standard in counting media collections. She focused on audio, motion pictures and video, multi-media kits, and three dimensional materials. Ms. Niemeyer found that the Standard has a set of definitions which are generally useful and can help to achieve comparability between collections. Additional definitions for puzzle, sculpture, and art original are needed. The problems she encountered using the Standard dealt with deciding where certain items in the collection fit. For example, does digital audio belong under the audio category? Do programmed instruction machines and contents belong under three dimensional materials? What about flash cards? Where should one count spirit masters? In addition, she advocated the use of examples to illustrate physical vs. title counts. She pointed out that the definition for multi-media kit (one or more media none of which is dominant) differs from the definition used in her library and in many other libraries. This required extra work in counting retrospective collection and would mean redefining the term in her library if she were to continue using the Standard in the future.

Sara Beth Allen (Dallas Public Library) spoke on the use of the standard to count machine-readable data files. While she encountered few problems with counting the files themselves, she experienced some difficulty in counting related items such as computer equipment, cooperative relationships, online database services, etc.

In particular, she pointed out the rapidity with which this information changes. Ms. Allen emphasized the need for a reporting mechanism to keep up with counts on this material. As it was, it required many phone calls and much patience to compile the count for the first time for a large public library system. In addition, the budgets of many public libraries are allocated by agency and then by subject or age group; there is no breakdown by format. If such information is going to be needed, it must be planned for ahead of time.

The speakers brought up interesting points pro and con in relation to using the new ANSI Standard. It is hoped that the recommended changes can be kept in mind when the Standard comes under future review.

RESULTS

OLAC MEMBERSHIP SURVEY - SPRING 1984

Survey prepared and analyzed by Laurel Jizba

More OLAC members filled in and returned this survey than have ever voted in an OLAC election. 111 responses were received, representing approximately 25% of the membership. This high response rate is encouraging and may be due to the fact that four and a half months were allowed for returning the questionnaire, which is a longer period of time than that allowed for returning any of the OLAC mail ballots. 99% of the respondents thought placing a periodic questionnaire of this type in the *Newsletter* was a good idea.

The membership was asked which other library organization meetings they would most likely attend if OLAC could arrange for a jointly sponsored event. Members could vote for more than one organization. Five organizations each drew an affirmative response from 25% or more of the responding members. In descending order of attraction, they are: ACRL (Association of College and Research Libraries.) 36.9%; MOUG (Music OCLC Users Group) 30%; Health Sciences OCLC Users Group, 28.8%; Medical Library Association 28.8%; and, ASIS (American Society for Information Science) 27%. A much smaller number were interested in meeting with the Map Online Users Group (9.9%); Art Libraries Society of North America (6.3%); Online School Libraries Users Group (6.3%) and the American Association of School Librarians (4.5%).

In terms of program topics, enthusiasm was most often indicated for motion pictures and videorecordings (90.1%), then microcomputer software/ MRDFs (87.4%), graphic materials (65.7%) and last three dimensional artifacts and realia (50.4%). This same over-all ranking held true for those whose focus was academic, music or health sciences, the three largest subgrouping of respondents.

The kinds of libraries of greatest interest to the OLAC membership were academic (72.9%) and health sciences (42.3%) libraries. Those interested in the Music OCLC Users Group checked off academic library orientation 85% of the time, undoubtedly owing to the lack of a specific music library category. As a subgrouping the MOUG respondents represented a quarter of all those interested in academic librarianship. Of next interest, and far below the interest level shown for the academic and health science libraries were public (21.6%), art (14.4%), school (10.8%), special (6.3%) and other

(11.7%). Other included hospital, agricultural, community & technical colleges, historical societies, religious, theatre, film archives curriculum material and law libraries.

95.5% of the responding members were most concerned with audiovisual cataloging within the context of the OCLC system. However, there was indication of interest for other systems: 16.5% for RLIN, 11.7% for WLN and 9% for UTLAS.

Reassuringly, meeting programs featuring general audiovisual question and answer sessions met with the approval of nearly three-fourths (73.9%) of those returning the questionnaire.

Given the response to earlier questions about choice of a co-sponsoring organization for a conference and focus by type of library, it was not surprising to discover that the speakers OLAC members would most like to hear from would come from academic (78.4%) and health sciences (35.1%) collections. The respondents oriented towards MOUG most often checked off the academic speaker category (85% of the time), as music was unfortunately not one of the options. To a lesser extent, members would also be interested in listening to speakers from these collections: special (25.2%), public (22.5%) and art (21.6%).

And last but not least, the two most common factors affecting OLAC members' ability to attend OLAC meetings were lack of funding and lack of time needed to travel, 87.4% and 66.6% respectively. Slightly over one-third (35.7%) indicated an inability to leave library duties and 15.3% were not interested in attending meetings.

Probably the best part of studying the survey results was to find 34 individuals who were willing to write articles for the *Newsletter* and 16 who were willing to run for an OLAC office at some future time. I have typed up the names, addresses and interests of these volunteers and distributed them to the OLAC Board. Undoubtedly the Board will be contacting some of these members for further information, particularly those who volunteered to run for OLAC office.

I would like to thank everyone who returned the questionnaire. It was interesting to see the post marks coming from all over the country and abroad. I was very glad to read the notes from those of you who added personal comments about OLAC and your interests. I hope that the membership will respond as splendidly the next time an OLAC membership survey appears in the *Newsletter*. -- LJ

SOME COMMENTS ON "IN" ANALYTICS

Verna Urbanski

Along with Dorian Martyn (University of Miami) and Glenn Patton (OCLC) we have been looking into applying recently published guidelines for "In" analytics to AV

material. (For OCLC users, these appeared as *Technical Bulletin*, no. 147). "In" analytics for AV aren't mentioned specifically in AACR2 chapter 13. Dorian needed to apply the new guidelines to NCME (Network for Continuing Medical Education) videorecordings. These are produced with one to three unrelated programs on each tape, thereby making them prime candidates for "In" treatment. In the past, medical libraries have handled the NCME series in two ways: 1) catalog each title individually, using a with note; or, 2) catalog as an item without a collective title (AACR2 1.1G). Both of these continue to be valid cataloging alternatives to "In" analytics. What follows are some considerations to keep in mind when applying "In" analytic procedures.

260

AACR2 13.5A subsection 4 indicates that elements of the publication, distribution area are included only if the individual title data for this area is on the component part itself and differs from that of the whole, i.e., the information furnished in the 773. That is why "the 260 field is generally not used in a record for a component part." (TB 147, p.7). If the individual component part does have an individual place, publisher or date, it should be recorded in the 260. The fixed field areas would then be coded in accordance with the 260 data, rather than the 773 data.

300

Glenn suggests using the phrase "on 1 cassette" or "on 1 videocassette" to imply that there is more than one program on the cassette.

For example:

on 1 videocassette (21 min.) : \$b sd., col. : \$c 3/4 in.

773

If there is no date associated with the 773 and no 260 has been included, it may be necessary to include a 500 note containing pertinent dates so that **Dat tp** and **Dates** fixed field units can be completed. This also would allow easier identification by other system users.

Remember, when analyzing component parts of a serial, the host item is not traced. Also notice that field 773 is not indexed on OCLC. As Dorian points out:

If a serial is withdrawn from the collection, or a particular tape is missing and has to be withdrawn, there is no way to know which records for analytics need to be canceled and with- drawn from the card catalog. I can't think of any way other than keeping a separate entry file by host item to keep track of the analytics that have been made ... This is a broader problem than AVs ... In the meantime, we are entering the record properly, by recalling it to add uniform title tracings for the host item.

For collections which classify their serials, the shelflist also provides a collocation point. Glenn comments:

.... when one produces a set of cards for an "In" analytic, one gets a shelflist card just as you would for any other item. Since the "In" analytic must by definition, bear the same call number as the host item, that does bring together, at least in the shelflist, a record of what "In" analytics are made. If one does want access to the information in the 773 for the catalog, then the only option does seem to be Dorian's suggestion of reformatting the record to add an added entry.

To look beyond card catalogs, libraries moving toward online catalogs will certainly want to account for the indexing of the 773. It's designed for machine manipulation and retrieval - that's the whole point of the coding in \$7.

We would also point out that for agencies that do not classify their serials the collocation in the shelflist will not be available, so it will definitely be necessary to produce an extra added entry if one wants this sort of access.

For examples of "In" analytics on OCLC see records 10763936, 10763814 and 10763850.

SUBJECT HEADINGS FOR MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE: WHAT DO YOU SUGGEST? Verna Urbanski

The Resources and Technical Services Division, Cataloging and Classification Section, Subject Access Committee, Subcommittee on Subject Access to Microcomputer Software, conducted a hearing during the recent ALA in Dallas. They were seeking suggestions on how to best supply subject headings for microcomputer software. To follow up on that, Joan Mitchell, Chair of the Subcommittee, has provided the Editor with some key points under consideration. Ms. Mitchell wants **INPUT** on these issues and who better to provide that input than those in the forefront of cataloging these materials, **US**, the members of OLAC.

When considering the points below, note that the MARBI Committee on June 24th approved the addition of a 753 field "Technical Details Access to Machine-Readable Data Files" to the MRDF format. This field will have three non-repeatable subfields: \$a = make and model of machine; \$b = Programming language; \$c = Operating system. While it is unclear the degree to which this field will be indexed by the utilities, it could be indexed in local systems. One consequence of indexing this field would be to eliminate the need for using the subject fields to access this information.

The Subcommittee is trying to design a model for subject headings that will give the best access. In addition to establishing this model, the Subcommittee is also looking into the adequacy of present computer science subject headings and linkages among those headings. They are asking

the question: "Are there the proper hierarchical relationships among the current computer science headings in LCSH?"

POINTS TO CONSIDER AND RESPOND TO:

1. What access points ought to be available?
2. What needs to be brought out in subject cataloging?
3. Is the form "topic--subdivision--machine operating system" effective?
4. What form subdivisions should be used? (e.g., computer software, computer programs (currently free-floating , etc.)?)
5. Are there other appropriate subdivisions besides these?
6. What about using the name of the machine the software runs on as a subject heading?
Consider: a) software can often run on more than one machine; b) doing this in an on-line system would only consume storage space, but in a manual catalog, could create unwieldy files quickly.
7. What about using programming language as an access point? (see 6b above)
8. What about using the disk operating system as an across point? (see 6b above)
9. Should these materials be mainstreamed or segregates in classification?
10. Should the two major classification schemes provide a form subdivision in their schedules for microcomputer software? (e.g. a special cutter for LC, a standard subdivision in Dewey)

The Subcommittee is interested in hearing from anyone with something to say on these questions. They are especially interested in hearing from *anyone* who is already cataloging these materials for their collections. The sooner they hear from you the better!!

The Subcommittee has scheduled two meetings during Midwinter in Washington:

Sunday January 6, 2 - 4 pm

Tuesday January 8, 2 - 4 pm

The *Newsletter* will announce the times and places in the December issue. At present locations are not available.

CONTACT:

Joan S. Mitchell
AT&T Bell Laboratories
Room 2G-110
Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel , NJ 07733

OLAC OFFERS MEMBERSHIP CHOICES

Many of our members already pay their membership for multiple years. This is much appreciated by the OLAC treasurer. In order to encourage this practice, the Executive Board of OLAC has created the following price schedule. Though the savings are admittedly small, the Board hopes that the convenience of paying dues only once every two or three years will be an additional incentive to submit multiple year memberships.

MEMBERSHIP RATES:		1 year	2 years	3
years				
	US membership			
	personal	\$5.	\$9.	
\$12.				
	institutional	\$10.	\$19.	
\$27.				
	NON US membership*			
	personal	\$7.	\$13.	
\$18.				
	institutional	\$12.	\$23.	
\$33.				

*Non US rate includes \$2.00 / year for postage outside the US

FEAR OF MRDF? Glenn Patton

Over the past few weeks, OCLC staff have encountered users who have expressed fears that the new MARC format for Machine-Readable Data Files (MRDF), which will be implemented this fall, will be very difficult to use. As a result of the work done recently on specifications for implementation of the new format, it has become clear that catalogers who are already familiar with the AV Format and who will be primarily interested in creating bibliographic records for microcomputer software will have little trouble adjusting to the new format.

There are few 0xx fields -- there is no 007 field, for example. Others, such as the 020 and 041 are already familiar to MARC format users. The 1xx, 245, 260 and 300 fields are defined almost exactly as they are in the AV Format.

Only two 4xx fields (440 and 490) are used. A number of specialized note (5xx) fields are being defined but most of them will be appropriate for larger machine-readable files rather than for microcomputer software. One new note field will be heavily used: field 538 will be used for the "System requirements," "Disk characteristics," and "Also runs on" notes which will be called for

in the soon-to-be-published cataloging guidelines. 6xx, 7xx and 8xx fields are defined in the same way as in other formats.

Most of the elements of the Fixed Field are the same as in other formats -- Type, Bib lvl, Lang, Ctry, Desc, Dat tp, Dates, etc. -- and will be coded the same way. Two new elements will appear but should cause few problems. In one case, "Type of Machine," the default value supplied in the blank workform will be appropriate for all microcomputer software; in the other case, "Type of File," coding will be straight-forward.

Serials catalogers will also recognize two Fixed Field elements. Since provision is being made in the MRDF Format for serial machine-readable data files, "Frequ" and "Regul" will appear in the Fixed Field. Workform defaults will be those values appropriate for non-serial items; other coded values are parallel to Serials Format. Other variable fields for serials -- field 362, for example -- will also be provided.

CAN WE SELL YOUR NAME?

From time to time OLAC receives requests to buy our mailing list. To assure everyone's privacy and right to chose not to have their name given out, the next membership form will ask members to indicate if they do not want their name given out as part of the mail list. In the past requests have come from RTSD and from persons conducting AV workshops. Any current member who would prefer to not be included on the mailing list when it is sold, should contact the *Newsletter* editor: **Verna Urbanski, Carpenter Library, University of North Florida, P.O. Box 17605, Jacksonville, Florida 32254-7605**, or, check the box when renewing your membership.

CATALOGING MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE AT FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY Bob Mead-Donaldson

We are cataloging the software, using Nancy Olson's *A Manual of AACR2 Examples for Microcomputer Software and Video Games*, and Steve Dodd's *Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files*, and whatever surfaces in the *OLAC Newsletter*.

We maintain a separate card catalog for each of the two campuses collection of software, and a union card catalog for the items which are legally duplicated at both campuses.

Program files which are intended for use with another program file, are described as accompanying material. An example of this is "The Reading Machine" by Marley W. Watkins.

There is a Picture disk which really must be used with the Reading machine, or more accurately, the Reading machine cannot be effectively used without the Picture disk.

Some things are unique to software. Edition statements appear to be dates (Version 9.19.83) we are arbitrarily altering the dates of production when this occurs. We have found that the disk label is not to be trusted for edition statements, and/or dates of production. We always look at the internal title using the computer.

We make contents notes when the number of titles on a disk is within reason or they seem distinctive. The title which forms the basis of the bibliographic description is the internal title. The documentation is being cataloged as accompanying material, although some of the manuals are being cataloged separately. We use the gmd machine-readable file.

Subject headings are assigned according to our regular procedures, using LCSH, subdivided by -Computer programs, or --Computer assisted instruction. We are not tracing the machine or making subject headings for the specific programs, i.e. WordStar (Computer program).

We still wrestle with things like "Blue level edition" appearing on the programs. Depending on the given title, we take these statements to be designating a particular grade or intellectual level and to therefore not be a statement of variant editions. Generally, in such cases, we include the level statement in area 7 and not in area 2.

The software are housed in notebook-type folders along with the documentation and guides, etc. in a large filing cabinet near the computer. Call numbers are sequential:

CS	CS etc.
1	2

When the MRDF format is operational in the OCLC system, the bibliographic records from the shelflist can be transferred to workforms and then input without a lot of changing and reworking.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION: How would I catalog "Harvey" an animated manikin? Harvey is an electromechanical Cardiac Patient Simulator programmed to behave in a real-life manner in order to simulate the signs of a variety of cardiac diseases. The accompanying materials include stethophones, blood pressure cuff, magnetic tapes, and slides. Harvey was developed at the University of Miami School of Medicine. I believe that there are only 17 Harveys throughout the world.

ANSWER: I would catalog "Harvey" as a mock-up. The two main choices seem to be model or mock-up. AACR2's glossary defines model as "a three-dimensional representation of a real

thing, either of the exact size of the original or to scale." At first blush this seems to fit Harvey. But, Harvey is interactive. Users are to do more than merely look at Harvey. AACR2's definition of mock-up, while not settling the matter outright, does give an idea that we do need to consider the interactive nature of the item. It defines mock-up as, "a representation of a device or process that may be modified for training or analysis to emphasize a particular part or function; it usually has movable parts that can be manipulated."

To further clarify the issue I turned to Margaret Maxwell's book, *Handbook for AACR2* (published in 1980 by ALA). Maxwell comments:

"A mock-up is a teaching device that should involve interaction with the user A mock-up (q.v.) is one kind of a model, generally one with moving parts. A model may have moving parts, but it differs from a mock-up in that it is basically noninteractive; it is simply an artifact to be examined, not a training tool" (p. 204-5).

The gmd would be model and the smd mock-up. Harvey would be cataloged using chapter 10 of AACR2. Accompanying material can be included in the physical description area. If you feel they are too numerous for this area, include them in a note.

--- Verna Urbanski

QUESTION: Can the 028 of the Sound Recording Format be used for non-musical sound recordings?

ANSWER: Yes. The title given the field in the format is really a misnomer. It is appropriate to both musical and non-musical sound recordings.

--- Glenn Patton

QUESTION: Recently, I have cataloged several laser videodiscs that were composed entirely of still frames. Another combined still frames with a few motion sequences. Neither AACR2 nor OCLC's AV format seems to make any provision for describing a videorecording in terms of frames instead of duration. Has this problem been addressed yet?

ANSWER: Duration as applied to other video forms is meaningless in this case. On one such title ("Apollo on the moon" 83-706407) LC has done the extent of item as: 1 videodisc (laser optical). The summary clarifies the nature of the item: "Presents approximately ten thousand still photographs..." The LENG fixed field unit is left uncoded. This seems an appropriate way to handle this situation. If you wish to pursue the question, you might contact CC:DA and ask them to include the issue as part of the AACR2 revision process.

--- Verna Urbanski with Dick Thaxter

QUESTION: When do I bracket title information?

ANSWER: Essentially under AACR2 LC advocates a practice of not bracketing title information unless the cataloger makes it up. This is based on a "common sense" approach to bracketing. Using this method "we treat something other than the chief source as the chief source, we do not bracket title information taken from this-new chief source. We do note the

source of this title information." (quoted from a 11/11/82 letter written by Nancy Olson)
--- Verna Urbanski with Dick Thaxter

QUESTION: We have a question about the cataloging of garment patterns. What type should be used when cataloging garment patterns and what GMD would be appropriate? How should OCLC record #9276236 be altered?

ANSWER: I have no problems at all with the record as it exists. Type "n" is certainly the correct type code and I believe "z" is the right "Type mat" code...I think that IWU made a wise choice in not using a GMD since there, in my mind, is no GMD that applies.

...Changes to the MARC format. . . will make some slight changes in the record. A new type code defined as "two-dimensional, non-projectable graphic materials" will be defined and garment patterns will certainly go in this type. The appropriate "Type mat" code will still be "z". I don't believe we could justify an explicit code for these materials--there just aren't enough cases--but we certainly could mention garment patterns as one of the kinds of materials in the "other" categories.

--- Glenn Patton

GOT AN AV CATALOGING QUESTION ?

W R I T E:

Verna Urbanski
Thomas G. Carpenter Library
University of North Florida
P.O. Box 17605
Jacksonville, Florida 32245-7605

AREA 1-8: A REFRESHER **Verna Urbanski**

One of the benefits of attending ALA conventions regularly is not just being exposed to people who think differently from oneself, but also people who talk differently, that is, they use different terms to mean the same thing. I am still struggling to disassociate myself from "collation" in favor of physical description. The cataloging jet set now merely say "area 5" and woe unto those who didn't start out using AACR2 by memorizing the area numbers.

For those of you out there who haven't memorized them either, here are the area numbers. Remember, they are the same for all chapters and immediately follow the period ("full stop") in

the rule citation. For example: 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 9.1 are all "title and statement of responsibility areas" following the pattern established in chapter 1.

Area 1 - Title and statement of responsibility AREA

Area 2 - Edition AREA

Area 3 - Material (or type of publication) specific details AREA

Area 4 - Publication, distribution, etc., AREA

Area 5 - Physical description AREA

Area 6 - Series AREA

Area 7 - Note AREA

Area 8 - Stand number and terms of availability AREA

So there they are, Memorize this and you too can impress your fellow professionals by calling the collation (oops!) AREA 5.

MEET YOUR OFFICERS

CHAIR

Sheila Intner
School of Library Service
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

TREASURER

Catherine Leonardi
3604 Suffolk
Durham, NC 27707

VICE-CHAIR/CHAIR ELECT

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

SECRETARY

Antonia Snee
Owen D. Young Library
St. Lawrence Univ.
Canton, NY 13617

PAST CHAIR

Laurel Jizba
Automated Processing Dept.

Library

Indiana Univ. Libraries

Florida

Bloomington, IN 47405

32245-7605

NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Verna Urbanski
Thomas Carpenter

Univ. of North

P.O. Box 17605
Jacksonville, FL

**PLEASE FEEL FREE TO CONTACT ANY OF THE OFFICERS FOR
INFORMATION, OR WITH SUGGESTIONS.
WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU !!!!!**

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 the quarterly *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

RENEWAL FORMS WILL NOT BE SENT. PLEASE XEROX THIS FORM

**

Cross out the incorrect information:

I wish to (renew my membership in // join) On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers

I am enclosing dues of (\$5. // \$7. // \$10. // \$12.) for calendar year 1985

I am enclosing dues of (\$9. // \$13. // \$19. // \$20.) for calendar years 1985 & 1986

I am enclosing dues of (\$12. // \$18. // \$27. // \$33.) for calendar years 1985, 1986 & 1987

CHECK HERE IF YOU **DO NOT** WANT YOUR NAME ON THE MAILING LIST TO BE SOLD ___

NAME:

ADDRESS:

On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc.
Thomas G. Carpenter Library
University of North Florida
P.O. Box 17605
Jacksonville, Florida 32245-7605

ISSN: 0739-1153 Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged.

Last modified: December 1997