On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers NEWSLETTER
Volume 3, Number 2
June, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR
Verna Urbanski

We could declare this to be a major microcomputer issue! Nancy Olson has furnished three articles on these materials. Note especially her article "The Problem With Chapter 9". William Caine (Southwest Texas State University) has also written an article focusing on the problems of trying to apply chapter 9. RTSD CC:DA will be talking about cataloging microcomputer materials during ALA so these are very timely articles.

This issue also provides as much information as was currently available on meetings for ALA.

We are proud to reproduce an edited version of the recent OCLC *Technical Bulletin* (123) on handling of locally produced and reproduced videorecordings. OLAC considers this solution to be far preferable to the early one. Thanks are due to LC's Richard Thaxter, and OCLC's Glenn Patton, and several OLAC members who provided input.

We encourage members to submit articles for the *Newsletter*. There is so much that needs to be shared and said about cataloging AV. Mail contributions, questions, requests, and comments to:

VERNA URBANSKI, EDITOR, ON-LINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS
NEWSLETTER
THOMAS G. CARPENTER LIBRARY,
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
P.O. BOX 17605
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32245-7605

For membership and renewal information contact:

CATHERINE LEONARDI TREASURER, OLAC
3604 SUFFOLK
DURHAM, NC 27707

NOTICE OF SUBMISSION DEADLINE

The next *Newsletter* will be the September issue, vol. 3, no 3. Items should b submitted no later than **August 1, 1983.** Early submissions are greatly appreciated by the editor.

MEETINGS TO WATCH FOR AT ALA
V. Urbanski

Below are meetings which will be of interest to our members. The information is from a variety of sources. In the case of the MARBI and CC:DA, two issues are of importance to OLAC members. The MARBI committee will be discussing additions to the films format for two dimensional materials. CC:DA will discuss cataloging of microcomputer software and videogames. There are no agendas available yet, but if you're attending the OLAC meeting (Saturday, June 25th, 8-10 pm) we can announce then when the committees anticipate discussing these topics.

Saturday June 25

9:00 am - 11:30 am : "The Future is Now: Poster Sessions on Technology and Non Print Media."

9:30 am - 11:00 am : "The Movies: organization of film libraries

and libraries about film." Co-sponsored by RTSD AV Committee, ACRL AV Committee and OLAC. To be held in the Los Angeles Hilton, Los Angeles Room.

9:30 am - 11:00 am : MARBI (RTSD / LITA / RASD Representation in

Machine Readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee)

11:30 am - 12:30 pm : MARBI

2:00 pm - 4:00 pm : CC:DA (RTSD:Cataloging Committee Section:

Description and Access)

8:00 pm - 10:00 pm : On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. business

meeting and discussion period.

Sunday June 26

9:00 am - 11:00 am : ACRL AV Committee

9:30 am - 12:30 pm : CC:DA

11:30 am - 12:30 pm : RTSD AV Committee information session and

clinic on editions, copies and reproductions of AV works. To be held in the Los Angeles Hilton Assembly Room Center. [Following the program the Chair would like as many committee members as possible to have a "working lunch" together.]

2:00 pm - 4:00 pm : MARBI

Monday June 27

9:30 am - 12:30 pm : CC:DA

9:30 am - 11:00 am : MARBI

11:30 am - 12:30 pm : MARBI

Tuesday June 28

8:00 am - 9:00 am : MARBI

9:30 am - 11:00 am : MARBI

9:30 am - 12:30 pm : "Film/TV Resources in Los Angeles." Co-sponsored

by ACRL Cinema Librarians Discussion Group and Theatre Library Association.

2:00 pm - 6:00 pm : "Film/TV Resources in Los Angeles" Tours.

Limited availability, advanced reservation necessary. Write: Monica Burdex, Reference Department, California State University Library, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, CA 91324

Check the final conference schedule for location of these meetings. OLAC is listed at the back of the program with "Meetings of Other Groups".

FROM THE CHAIR
Laurel Jizba

By the time you receive this issue of the Newsletter, you should have just about two weeks prior to the Los Angeles ALA annual conference to send in your vote for or against the latest amendment to the OLAC bylaws. The deadline for mailing it to Katha Massey is Monday, June 20, 1983. This amendment was proposed at the Midwinter meeting as a compromise measure in an effort to find a solution to the concerns held by some members that the length of office for chair (now a five year stint as vice-chair+chair elect / chair / immediate past chair) and the lack of continuity between one board and the next would be better handled by the current amendment rather than by the present reading of the bylaws. For further details, please see the Midwinter minutes, *Newsletter*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 8.

I am happy to let you know that as of this writing, OLAC has an official liaison from the WLN office. Her name is Earlene Rickerson, the bibliographic services librarian for WLN. She has

written the MARC tagging manual for WLN users and provides training for new members. Earlene has already been at work on behalf of OLAC. Mid-April she made an announcement about OLAC via the WLN electronic information board. Thank you, Earlene! We're hoping that she or another WLN staff member will be attending our meeting on Saturday the 25th at 8:00 pm. I am also attempting to get a liaison established with RLG and UTLAS. With any luck, they'll be at our meeting in LA too.

Not forgetting OCLC, Glenn Patton, OCLC's instructional coordinator, has cheerfully confirmed that he will be on hand to give us the latest information from OCLC affecting AV catalogers. Nancy Olson will also be glad to bring us up-to-date on work in progress.

The officers would like to see as many of our members on the evening of June 25th as possible, especially librarians from western states who can't make it to meetings in the eastern part of the country. We'd like to get to know you, find out how you heard about the On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers, and if you'd like to actively participate in OLAC's activities, as a contributor to the *Newsletter,* liaison to MARBI or another group, or even by volunteering to run for an OLAC office.

OCLC ISSUES NEW GUIDELINES IN CATALOGING LOCALLY MADE VIDEORECORDINGS

V. Urbanski

In February of this year OCLC and LC came to an understanding on how best to catalog locally made videorecording. The issue evolved from OLAC inquiries into how to input videorecordings of 16 mm films. (see OLAC *Newsletter*, v. 2. no. 1, page 13 and v. 2, no. 2, pg. 17.) Many OLAC embers objected to LC's desire to extend microforms policy to videorecordings. The current policy has been formulated after consultation between LC, OCLC and OLAC. OLAC members who provided input to the decision can be justifiably proud of the outcome. Below is an edited version of OCLC's guidelines published as *Technical Bulletin* no. 123. OCLC members should acquaint themselves with the full version of *T.B.* 123 which contains helpful examples. See also *Cataloging Service Bulletin* no. 19, p. 2 for LC's notice on this topic.

OCLC Guidelines:

This provides guidelines for creating Online Union Catalog records for several kinds of locally made videorecordings:

- Locally produced videorecordings, such as university lectures, class projects, local historical events, theses and dissertations in videotape form, etc. These unpublished videorecordings may exist either in a unique copy or in multiple copies for local or limited distribution.

- Locally reproduced videorecordings, that is, videotape copies of motion pictures, other videorecordings, or other audiovisual media made with permission of the producer or distributor. These copies might be made, for example, to preserve a deteriorating film or to serve as a circulating copy.
- Off-air recordings, that is, licensed copies of television broadcasts.

These guidelines are the result of discussions with the Office for Descriptive Cataloging Policy and the Audiovisual Section, Special Materials Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress, and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers.

LOCALLY PRODUCED VIDEORECORDINGS

Locally produced videorecordings should be treated as unpublished materials. Transcribe title and statement of responsibility information (field 245) from the piece, or, if the videorecording lacks a title, supply one as instructed in AACR2 rule 7.1B2. The publication, distribution, etc., area (field 260) should contain only the date of recording in subfield $c unless the date already appears in field 245.

LOCALLY REPRODUCED VIDEORECORDINGS

For locally made videotape copies of motion pictures, other videorecordings or other audiovisual media, you may wish to treat the videotape copy as a copy. Add to the bibliographic record for the original a local note (field 590) to indicate the existence of the copy and to describe it briefly: e.g., "Motion picture noncirculating, videocassette (Beta) available for loan".

An institution that wishes to input a new record for the videotape copy may do so. Transcribe the title and statement of responsibility (field 245) and publication information (field 260) for the original. Use the general material designation (GMD) "videorecording" in field 245 subfield $h, and give the physical description of the video copy in field 300. Make any necessary notes related to the intellectual content, cast, credits, etc. Add a note (field 500) indicating the original format, e.g., "Originally issued as super 8 mm film cartridge". Also add a note indicating that the copy was made with permission and give the date of recording.

Code the country of producer (fixed field element 'Ctry') for the original. Code other fixed field elements and the 007 field for the videorecording. For a video copy of another videorecording, the date type (fixed field element 'Dat typ') should be "r" (with DATE 1 containing the date of the copy and DATE 2, the date of the original), unless the date of the copy is uncertain, in which case date type "q" takes precedence. For a video copy of a motion picture or another audiovisual medium, date type should be "p" (with DATE 1 containing the date of the copy and DATE 2, the original), unless the date of the copy is uncertain, in which case date type "q" takes precedence.

If a bibliographic record exists for a locally made video copy in the same physical format (e.g., VHS videocassette or 112 in. videoreel) as the piece in hand, use that record even if the date of the copy differs. Edit the record to reflect the differences.

Note: Making an unauthorized copy of a published item may be an infringement of copyright. Bibliographic records for such items should not be entered into the OCLC-Online Union Catalog.

OFF-AIR RECORDINGS

Videorecording copies made directly from television broadcasts should be considered as unpublished materials because broadcasting does not constitute publication in a legal sense or from the standpoint of cataloging theory.

If a record exists in the Online Union Catalog for a commercially available video version of the television program, a user may edit that record for local use.

Or, the user may input a new record for the off-air copy. Transcribe the title and statement of responsibility information (field 245) from the title and credits of the recording. The publication, distribution, etc., area (field 260) should contain only the year of the recording in subfield $c. The physical description (field 300) should reflect the video copy. Notes should be added indicating that the copy was made under license and should name the television station that broadcast the program.

Code the fixed field and 007 for the copy.

If a bibliographic record exists for an off-air copy in the same physical format (e.g., VHS videocassette or 1/2 in. videoreel) as the piece in hand, use that record even if the date of the copy and the name of the television station that broadcast the program differ. Edit the record to reflect those differences.

Note: Making an unlicensed copy of a television broadcast may be an infringement of copyright if the copy is to be retained by the library. For further information about "fair use" copies for temporary use, see "Guidelines for Videorecording of Broadcast Programming for Education Purposes" available from the Copyright Office, The Library of Congress, Washington DC 20059.

[Editors note: Notice in the *T.B.* 123 examples that the fixed field element CTRY is xx[blank] and the 260 contains only the date of recording for "Locally produced videorecordings" and "Off-air recordings".]

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON CATALOGING MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE USING AACR2

by William C. Caine

I have been cataloging microcomputer software at Southwest Texas State University for several months and have encountered three particular problems with Chapter 9. The first is probably inherent in the material; the third can usually be solved by using good judgment and applying Hobson's Choice. The second, however, occurs because the rules do not match up the items we are cataloging.

9.2. The edition is a variable for any given **copy** of a piece of firmware. While the accompanying documentation may give an edition statement like "Version 2.0" with a copyright date of 1981, the file itself may say "Version 2.5, copyright 1982" because publishers change firmware more readily than paperwork. Once a copy is cataloged and the edition statement nicely recorded on a card, the program may be updated and suddenly need a new edition number. This may be accomplished by trading an old disc for a new one, much like withdrawing an old book and processing a new one. But there are several processes by which the user may convert a copy of Version 2.0, copyright 1981, into a copy of Version 2.5, copyright 1982. Some programs allow a copy of the new version to "clone" itself onto a copy of the old one: 2.5 reads itself onto 2.0, and you have two copies of 2.5 and **no** copy of 2.0. In a card catalog, this implies a lot of card-pulling and re-cataloging.

9.5B. The terms "data file," "program file," and "object program" are very misleading when applied to firmware sold for microcomputers. A disc usually contains several different files (if not hundreds), often of several different types. Apple Writer II, for instance, comprises four object programs and a number of text files. Other discs may contain Basic programs, text files, and object programs, all working together: *Softdisk Magazette* may be anything and everything. Rather than saying "1 object program" or "3 text files," we often need to be saying "1 diskette ; 5 1/4 in." with notes on the number and types of files. I would hope to see this part of AACR2 revised or expanded before OCLC implements the machine-readable data file format.

9.7B18. "Contents" may have several meanings when applied to software. The contents displayed on the menu may or may not correspond to the files on a disc or tape. The menu tells the user what he/she can do with a particular piece of software. The command "]CATALOG" (or its equivalent) will cause a computer to show the user a list of files actually recorded on the piece. The menu contents are probably more useful to most of us, but a menu is not always provided. For the contents notes I would suggest using the menu, the contents given in the documentation, and the]CATALOG contents in that order of preference, but it would help if some guidelines were added to Chapter 9.

THE LAST WORD ON COUNTING FRAMES IN FILMSTRIPS

V. Urbanski

As you may remember *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 13 had a rule interpretation which expanded the times when one would count unnumbered frames (8.5B2). In vol. 2, no. 1, I suggested that Maxwells' interpretation of the rule could be helpful. (M. Maxwell, *A Handbook for AACR2*, p. 191-192). However, in vol. 2, no. 2 of the *Newsletter*, Nancy Olson pointed out some problems with Maxwell's interpretation.

Since there were several points I wanted to clarify about the *CSB* RI, I wrote Dick Thaxter at LC to get the "last word" on what the RI meant by a content frame, what a test frame was, and what optional content frames are. Below is a slightly edited version of his answer. I am also including the *CSB* 13 RI to which Thaxter refers.

> **8.5B2 [New].** When counting unnumbered frames, generally do not consider any number too numerous to count. Begin counting with the first content frame and end with the last content frame, thereby counting any noncontent frame interspersed, but excluding noncontent frames which precede the first content frame or follow the last content frame. Give the number resulting from this count as the total, within brackets. (Small groups of unnumbered optional content frames may be ignored.)
>
> As with separately numbered title frames, give separate totals of test frames.
>
> 60 fr., 4 test fr.
>
> --(*CSB* 13)

Dick Thaxter comments:

> "I must confess that the major part of RI 8.5B2 was lifted directly from the appropriate rule (228D1) in AACR 1 chapter 12, revised. We offered this rule interpretation because AACR 2 did not give any guidance on counting filmstrip frames, and we decided that we could just count them as we did previously. The definition of content frame, I'm afraid, excludes title frames. The definition we would follow would again be that included in AACR 1 chapter 12, revised: 'A filmstrip frame which presents subject matter, rather than title, credits, etc. (If titles, credits, etc., are superimposed on a frame which presents subject matter, the frame is considered as a content frame).'
>
> Since we catalog very few filmstrips 'from scratch' at LC, the issue of frame counting does not loom so large on our list of cataloging problems. I will say that the old AACR 1 rule never presented any controversy in the past so we simply extended it in the absence of any guidance in AACR 2. I do like Margaret Maxwell's simple solution, i.e., count from the first frame to the last, regardless of whether they are title, credits, or 'content' frames. But the definition as worded leaves a problem which I believe Nancy Olson has pointed out, namely, that the first title frame may appear many frames after the beginning

of the filmstrip (similar to many modern motion pictures where the credits are almost at the end of the first reel) .... I have never thought that the number of frames on a filmstrip is as crucial in identification as, for example, the pagination of a book.

'Optional content frames' are review frames, etc., that generally follow the main part of the filmstrip and are really supplementary in nature. A few major producers use this technique and this is why the rule interpretation mentions them. Many filmstrips, particularly the self-tutorial variety used in nursing education, etc., contain 'test frames' at the end, which present a quiz on the preceding material."

THE PROBLEM WITH CHAPTER 9
Nancy Olson

AACR 2 9.0A "A machine-readable data file is defined as a body of information coded by methods that require the use of a machine (typically a computer) for processing."

This definition is to include machine-readable data files, and microcomputer software of all kinds. It also could be interpreted to include videorecordings of all types, digital audio discs, and other types of material now being developed.

0.24 "... the starting point for description is the physical form of the item in hand..."

We catalog videorecordings using chapter 7 rules. If a videodisc has individually accessible graphic materials on it we can borrow rules from chapter 8 as needed for description, but we do not catalog it beginning with the chapter on content; we begin with the chapter on physical form.

The new digital audio discs are sound recordings, although they use a machine containing a microprocessor for playback. Videotapes can also be used to record sound only, and videodiscs frequently contain music as the predominant component, with pictures added to "illustrate" the music. These are all to be described according to their physical form, so the video materials are cataloged according to chapter 7, even if the material on them is identical to that found in chapter 6. The digital audio discs are sold as a new kind of sound recording, so I believe they should be cataloged according to chapter 6. The way information is stored, or the type of information stored, is of secondary concern in making the decision on which chapter to begin cataloging with.

Chapter 10 "game" is a term that is not as clear as some others, but most AV catalogers have little trouble identifying games. All games have directions and playing materials, and most have some kind of playing surface. For some games this surface is on a television or microcomputer

screen. I think we could catalog all games by chapter 10 borrowing from other chapters as necessary for notes.

I believe allowing chapter 9 to contradict this principle was wrong, and will cause increasing problems as technology advances. We should either begin all cataloging with the decision on physical form, or we should begin all cataloging with some kind of decision on content, but we cannot mix those two in one set of rules.

We need to consider adding another chapter to AACR2 for microcomputer software, with the physical format being the determining factor as to whether an item belonged in that chapter or not.

I would also suggest narrowing the definition in chapter 9 to:

> "A machine-readable data file is defined as a body of information coded by methods that require the use of a main-frame computer for processing."

I'd also hope we can get the term changed to "machine-readable file" as the British use in the SOCCS interim reported dated February 22, 1983.

MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE CATALOGING TASK FORCE MEETS AT OCLC

Nancy B. Olson

The Task Force on Cataloging of Microcomputer Software, appointed by the ALA RTSD Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), met February 16-18 at OCLC. Task Force members are: Chair, **Ben R. Tucker**, Chief, Office for Descriptive Cataloging Policy, Library of Congress: co-chair, **Arnold Wajenberg**, University of Illinois, Champaign; **Nancy Olson**, OCLC Visiting Scholar and Assoc. Prof., Mankato state University; **Sue A. Dodd**, Social Science Data Library, University of North Carolina; and **Donna Cranmer**, Lewis & Clark Library System, Edwardsville, Illinois. Invited to the meeting as consultants were **Ann Fox**, Library of Congress Audiovisual Cataloging Section: **Elizabeth Heman**, University of California, Los Angeles; **Donald Adcock**, School District no. 41, Glen Ellyn, Illinois; **David Bullers**, Cedar Falls (IA) school media director; **Sally Hambridge**, Research Library, Atari, Sunnyvale, California. Also participating in the meeting, which was funded by OCLC as part of its Visiting Scholar project, was **Glenn Patton**, OCLC instructional coordinator. Representatives from RLIN and WLN were invited, but did not attend.

The Task Force was formed because microcomputer software did not exist when AACR 2 chapter 9 was written. The field has grown so fast that an early 1982 survey by the National Center for Educational Statistics found 27,500 schools had microcomputers available for use by their students. These materials, and the microcomputers, are now found in libraries of all types.

The group examined a selection of microcomputer software, videogames, and electronic toys. Mark Bendig of the OCLC Office of Research demonstrated the use of a microcomputer, and Sally Hambridge demonstrated a videogame system.

Mr. Tucker explained the charge to the task force, and the plan to develop guidelines that could be used by catalogers until such time as rules could be developed and approved by CC:DA and the Joint Steering Committee which coordinates cataloging rules for the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia.

The task force report will be presented to CC:DA in Los Angeles in June as recommended guidelines. CC:DA may choose to accept, accept in part, modify, or reject these recommendations. Guidelines, when accepted by CC:DA, will be published by LC in *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, at which point they may be used by catalogers. OCLC will publish the guidelines in a technical bulletin at the time the related MARC format is implemented.

Chapter 9 of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, second edition (AACR2) was examined for areas presenting problems in the cataloging of microcomputer software. Problem areas include: the definition of machine-readable data file, and what was, or was not, to be included in chapter 9; the chief source of information for these new materials; the general material designation (gmd) for these items; the edition area; and area 5 (file description vs. physical description). Notes would depend on decisions made in other areas.

The task force decided microcomputer software and videogames were machine-readable data files, but that self-contained electronic toys, even those including microprocessors, should be cataloged using rules of AACR2 chapter 10.

Mr. Tucker reminded the group that use of the gmd was optional, so those feeling the term machine-readable data file would not be understood by their users, or would confuse users of microcomputer software and videogames, could choose to omit the gmd. He also explained the gmd "game" could be brought over from chapter 10 and used where appropriate.

The edition area was discussed at some length. Terms found on the software examined included edition, version, update, and enhanced. Some packages indicated users could choose to buy additional data disks which would increase or replace the data available to the user. OCLC users in the group also discussed which concepts would require a separate bibliographic record to be created, in terms of user needs, ILL, and resource sharing.

Area 5 caused considerable controversy. Some felt chapter 9, as written, was perfectly acceptable. Others felt the new materials should be treated in the same manner as all other audiovisual materials, or as all other media based on AACR2 0.24 "...the starting point for description is the physical form of the item in hand..." An attempt to allow users to choose from one of these two alternatives failed.

The task force would like to know which of the following three options would be preferable.

- Emphasis on program:
  -- 1 microcomputer program (Apple II, 48K, DOS 3.3)
- Emphasis on carrier:
  -- 1 microcomputer disk (Apple II, 48K, DOS 3.3)
- Compromise:
  -- 1 microcomputer program (Apple II, 48K, DOS 3.3) on 1 microcomputer disk

Based on literature searches done by Ms. Dodd and Mrs. Olson, the term **diskette** was rejected in favor of **disk**.

Terms to be used in describing the physical form of the items include: microcomputer disk, microcomputer cartridge, microcomputer tape cartridge, microcomputer cassette, and microcomputer module. Other terms could be used as appropriate.

A recommendation by Mrs. Olson to make an added entry for make and model number of the microcomputer, based on AACR2 21.29D, was accepted by all. This would provide an access point for all card and online catalogs. The added entry would be of the form:

> Apple II (Microcomputer)
>
> Comments on area 5 or on any part of the report, should be sent to Ben Tucker. Copies of the report may be obtained from him, or from anyone present at the meeting. (Mr. Tucker's address is: **Ben R. Tucker Chief, Office of Descriptive Cataloging Policy, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540** --ed.)

RESULTS OF MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE SURVEY OF OLAC MEMBERS

Nancy B. Olson

Survey forms were sent with volume 2, number 4, of the OLAC *Newsletter* to 381 members living in the United States. 79 of these members responded by February 2, 1983. 73 of the respondents were OCLC users, 2 were WLN members, and 4 were not users of any bibliographic utility. The responses came from 32 states. 47 were from community college, college, or university libraries, 11 from public libraries, 2 from K-12 libraries, 16 from special libraries (health, law, archives). The other 3 were from state libraries and networks. Some respondents did not answer the questions but did make comments so the total answers to the following questions are not equal to the total number of surveys returned.

The terms used in the survey, machine-readable data files and microcomputer software, were deliberately used without definition to see if respondents made a distinction between these terms. From the responses to the questions, and from the comments, it was

obvious that most respondents do indeed differentiate between machine-readable data files and microcomputer software.

In response to the question "Does your library have any machine-readable data files? microcomputer software? 21 answered yes and 79 answered no to the machine-readable question. Many of the yes respondents indicated their OCLC archive tapes were their only such file.

34 answered yes, 32 no, to the microcomputer software question. Of those answering no, 18 expected to begin buying these, and most of those indicated materials were on order or shortly would be. Therefore, 66 percent of the respondents already have microcomputer software, or will be buying it in 1983.

The question about number of items owned was answered with numbers from 1 to 1000, with no discernible pattern. Several stated they already had "too many to count". The question about how many items they expected to buy in 1983 was answered with numbers from 1 through 300 to "many".

The third question was "Since these are not to be cataloged on OCLC, how are you letting your patrons know what you have?" (NOTE: OCLC has not yet implemented the MARC format for these materials, but plans to do so late in 1983, Guidelines for cataloging the microcomputer software are being prepared by a CC:DA task force. See report elsewhere in this *Newsletter*.) Responses to this question, and general comments added on the bottom of the questionnaire, were especially interesting, and may be helpful to those faced with similar problems. These responses are summarized below.

- Anchorage School District is using a data base management file and compiling a bibliography for district distribution.
- Hampshire College (MA) has most on reserve for use in specific courses or they are purchased for library staff use. Reserve materials are listed in a separate reserve catalog. They would like to know what policies libraries have for making copies and for circulating the microcomputer software. They also question how these are being packaged for circulation and what happens when the software goes through theft detection systems.
- At Howard University (DC), the software is currently only used by staff members.
- Nomandale Community College (NM) has a title card file of their software.
- The San Diego City Schools developed their own cataloging rules early in 1982. They are not on OCLC.
- Georgetown University Medical Center Library has developed their own integrated library system with all circulating books and about 10 percent of the AV collection.
- Huntington Beach (CA) Public Library lets patrons know what they have through publicity releases.
- At the University of Alabama in Birmingham, the faculty are notified by the reference-bibliographer for the related subject area, and cards are typed for the catalog.

- Austin Community College (TX) is assigning classification numbers and storing the items in the academic department requesting the item. This is an interim decision. They would like to know circulation restrictions placed on this material by other libraries; whether any special storage conditions are needed; and whether the LC classification scheme will be expanded to allow for these materials. (Note: I would not expect any change in the LC schedules.)
- At the University of North Carolina (Charlotte) the material is for in-house staff use only, as it is also in Omaha at the University of Nebraska.
- Nazareth College of Rochester (NY) contacts the faculty in the appropriate subject areas.
- The University of Miami School of Medicine informs users through a library newsletter.
- The Oregon University Health Sciences Library is building a catalog on a microcomputer of their AV materials and microcomputer software.
- Another respondent thinks the public is more ready for microcomputer software than the libraries are.
- Aquinas College (MI) is doing their own off-line cataloging of software.
- Jackson (MS) Metropolitan Library System sends out brochures and public service announcements from reference librarians.
- Babson College (MA) has a sign: Check at circulation desk for microcomputer software. They no longer have a card catalog, but have a COM catalog produced from OCLC archive tapes, so they have no way to get bibliographic records to the public except through OCLC.
- At Kent State University (OH) publicity is sent to the student newspaper, a weekly faculty bulletin, and press releases.
- The University of Mississippi School of Education handles this through outreach and correspondence.
- The University of Texas Health Science Center lets users know what is available through the library newsletter and diskographies, and has the disks in notebooks through which patrons can browse.
- At Gettysburg College (PA) the software is kept in the computer center.
- At another institution, the items are cataloged on OCLC using the AV format.
- Northern Illinois University produces cards on their local computer.
- The University of Minnesota Technical College has an in-house key word listing, enhancing the titles with LC subject headings as necessary.
- At the Edgar Dale Media Center of Ohio State University, main entries are being prepared but are not duplicated (single card access in the card catalog). They also have a separate shelf list for quick access.
- At the School of Education in Madison (WI) software is available in their separate microcomputer facility, with publicity about availability filtered through professors.
- Instructors of special classes at Siena Heights College (MI) notify their students as to what is available.

I would like to thank all who took the time to respond to this survey. (Note: those who responded and indicated they have microcomputer software were sent the draft report of

the CC:DA task force on cataloging of microcomputer software with a request they comment on the recommendations.)

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

If your address changes please notify Catherine Leonardi, OLAC's treasurer. Write:
Catherine Leonardi, 3604 Suffolk, Durham, NC 27707

---

033 AND 045
V. Urbanski

MOUG Newsletter (Music OCLC Users Group) April 1982 issue, had two items of interest to AV catalogers. Reporting on a basic tagging workshop conducted by Robert Cunningham (NELINET) and Glenn Patton (OCLC) the following information on the 033 and 045 was noted.

> **033:** Use only when a 518 note is present. Code for the information available. It is permissible to code only for date, or only for place.
>
> **045:** Use either chronological code or specific date/time codes, but not both. OCLC does not expect catalogers to go outside the piece in hand in order to determine this information unless they wish to do so.

I wrote to ask Glenn if these applied to the AV format and in the case of the 033 if this interpretation was to apply mainly when only one piece of information was available? That is, the 518 would have only a date or place. Glenn's response:

> First, let me answer your two questions about information from the MOUG Newsletter. Yes, the instruction about the 033 also applies to the AV format. It is primarily aimed at the situation where only a date or place is available. It may also apply if an institution does not have the resources available to code subfields 'b' and 'c' -- e.g., a library using Dewey classification may not wish to mess around with the LC G schedule.
>
> With regard to the 045, the intent here is to encourage the use of the most specific date possible and, in considering coding for a specific date or range of dates, to discourage redundant coding. If, for instance, you are coding for a film about the attack on Pearl Harbor, you should use:

```
045 0    $b d19411207
not,
045       x4x4
or
045 0    x4x4  $b d19411207
```

Remember that the 045 is optional in all formats and cataloging agencies have to balance the time invested in formulating optional fields against how the institution plans to use the information. LC currently uses the 045 in two formats, maps and music. Because the $b area will allow for specific dating, LC does not routinely use the more general $a area of the 045.

A MODEST PROPOSAL AGAINST REINVENTING WHEELS
by Susan P. Besemer

The 1980's may well go down in library history as the decade that began to take resource sharing seriously. Sharing online bibliographic information to improve access perhaps began the serious consideration of the need for libraries to become more fiscally responsible while improving users' access to information and materials. The increase in interlibrary loan activity is an indicator of the tenor of the times. From 1974 to 1977 (the most recent statistics available) the number of ILL transactions nationwide increased 60%*. Media librarians are now looking more closely at the need for sharing the resources themselves, as well as the cataloging, to simultaneously improve access and save money through selective collection development.

One area of special interest and some concern to online AV catalogers is the proliferation of small, local data bases which are built to provide limited bibliographic access to the materials which are being shared within a region. As those who have worked to build a data base, or maintain one know the amount of time and effort which goes into the project bears a strong, positive relationship to the subsequent usefulness of the resulting data base. Funding for such projects needs to provide not only for the establishment of the data base, but also for maintaining the viability of the base over time. Frequently, these details are not adequately foreseen in the short-term grant which provides for the establishment, but not the continuance of the project. One hears, "We want to get started; we'll see about those problems down the road."

Cooperation is, of course, laudable, and the sticky problems of adequate access not only now, but also in the future are not sufficient reason for foot dragging or for failing to consider resource sharing. But, alternatives to home made data bases built on "personal" microcomputers are already in place and they can provide better access without the need to reinvent the wheel. The protocols required by AACR2, while mind-bending in their demands on catalogers, do, when used to construct cataloging records on one of the

national databases produce online records which consistently have the complete publication data, physical descriptions, summaries and notes. Such cataloging records are truly elegant when compared with the "title only" or key word in context type of entry found on the average home grown data base. On-line AV catalogers have much to be proud of in their work. They contribute on a daily basis to establishing what might be called "mediagraphic control" over those maverick AV items libraries collect and promote even though they are more troublesome than their print relatives.

While online AV catalogers are already contributing tremendously in the effort to maximize the effectiveness of AV materials through improved bibliographic access, it is important to realize that there is more that they can do to help promote improved access through shared resource networking. Right now small data bases are being built, funded through grant applications. If you know of a better, more comprehensive data base than is possible on the small "personal" microcomputer, please visit with your department head, your library director, your public services media librarian, and the ILL librarian in your library. See if there is an effort being made to cooperate for AV resource sharing, and encourage it if there is. Suggest using the data base to which you are presently contributing cataloging as a finding guide to these resources. Show them the resources which are online right now. Some may be unaware of non-printing fields. Show them the summary and the contents note. Demonstrate that there is already a data base which is richer than any which might be built on a microcomputer.

While micros are attractive and nearly indispensable in modern libraries, without going to a hard-disk system of considerable size, they simply cannot store enough data to provide really complete bibliographic entries on more than a relatively few items. While this limited capacity may be enough to use to begin the resource sharing, librarians must look down the road to the expenses involved in maintaining the data base and changing entries if new items are purchased, made available to be loaned, lost or weeded. An AV collection cannot be considered to be any more stable than a book collection. It may be even less so.

Sue Besemer is the Head of the Independent Learning Center, The AV department of E.H. Butler Library, State University College at Buffalo.

*_The Bowker Annual of Library & Trade Book Information._ 27th ed. New York: Bowker, 1982. p.335.

VISITING SCHOLAR FINAL REPORT
by Nancy Olson

In January I was one of the fortunate librarians attending ALA in San Antonio. The weather was wonderful and the setting unbelievable; I kept feeling I was on vacation in some tropical tourist paradise. ALA Midwinter was never like this!

One evening the OLAC board members and others met in my hotel room for several hours of discussion and examination of microcomputer software cataloging examples. I was very pleased to have the comments and criticism of other catalogers, since I rarely have the chance to submit my work to people who have even the vaguest idea what I'm doing.

One morning was spent in a meeting of the Joint Advisory Committee on Nonbook Materials. This committee was originally formed to advise the authors of the Canadian publication *Nonbook Materials*. Nancy Williamson is chair, and Sheila Intner and I are the RTSD representatives to the committee. The committee discussed offering help to authors of all books about audiovisual cataloging. It also discussed the number of AV books on the market. Members agreed that AV books such as the Canadian one by Jean Weihs, and the one published by AECT each have a specific audience, and those books should continue to be updated and published. (Doris Clack is now working on the 5th ed. of the AECT *Standards*, and Jean Weihs is working on the 4th ed of *Nonbook Materials*.)

I had lunch with Richard Smiraglia one day as we discussed the music cataloging manual he is preparing for publication this spring by Soldier Creek Press (I now have his 150 p. draft. It looks excellent).

January 20 I attended the AECT convention in New Orleans which was held in the Superdome. Imagine, if you can, the entire floor and most of the first balcony of the Superdome filled with exhibits - music, lights, and movement. Half the exhibits were microcomputer related; hardware, software, or using microcomputers to run other things. It was a dramatic display of the fact that microcomputers are here. Anyone who wants the microcomputer field to "stabilize" before deciding how to catalog the software should have seen that exhibit area. The field is not stabilizing; it's moving lots faster than we are. I spent most of my time going through the exhibits, since I wanted to know as much as possible about commercially-available software in preparation for the CC:DA task force meeting.

On February 4 I met with a group of OCLC staff members about the proposed revisions to the MARC films format to accommodate two-dimensional materials. (Three-dimensional materials will be added in a later draft). The last *Newsletter* (v. 3, no. 1 , p. 7) showed some of the changes proposed. This discussion helped prepare me for a later meeting.

I went to Chicago February 9 for a two-day meeting at ALA to plan an AV cataloging roadshow which will be sponsored by RTSD. It will be much like the one done by ALA

and LC when AACR2 came out. Those on the planning committee are Hugh Durbin, Columbus (OH) school media services director; Sheila Intner, Columbia University School of Library Service; Richard Smiraglia, University of Illinois music library; Liz Bishoff, Ela (IL) area public library; and myself.

We have planned a series of workshops tentatively scheduled for 1984: February in San Diego, April in Boston, September in Seattle or Vancouver, and Chicago and Washington D.C. in October. These will include general sessions on topics such as access, resource sharing, management decisions and user needs, and small sessions on cataloging cartographic materials, motion pictures and videorecordings, graphic materials, three-dimensional artifacts and realia, sound recordings and music, machine-readable data files, and microcomputer software. You will be hearing more about these events.

From Chicago I was scheduled to go to Washington D.C., the evening of February 11. 24 inches of snow in D.C. delayed me. However, I did get there the following evening and was able to enjoy Sunday dinner at Ben Tuckers, and the play She Stoops to Conquer at the Folger Theatre. (If any of you are going to D.C. for a meeting at LC, I recommend the Capitol Hill Hotel. It is across the street from the Library. They have special rates for those of us coming in to meetings at LC.)

The next two days were filled with a meeting at LC on the MARC films format changes. The attendees were a mixture of AV and museum people. Present were: Phyllis Burns, LC MARC Standards Office; Elisabeth Betz, LC Prints and Photographs Division and author of *Graphic Materials*; Georgia Baumgardner, American Antiquarian Society; Andrew Eskind, International Museum of Photography at George Eastman House; James Kopp, National Library of Medicine, History of Medicine Division; Michael Moss, West Point Museum; Richard Thaxter, LC Special Materials Cataloging Division, Audiovisual Section; Jean Weihs, Seneca College (Canada) Library Technicians Program and author of *Nonbook Materials*; Nancy B. Olson, Mankato State University/OCLC Visiting Scholar and author of *Cataloging of Audiovisual Materials*.

This meeting could have been difficult, but everyone worked together in the very best professional spirit. We compromised on many points. I hope MARBI approves what we recommended. The changes are too numerous to list here, but I'd be happy to discuss them with anyone. I really enjoyed meeting and working with this group of people.

Then back to Columbus for the CC:DA task force meeting February 16-18, my last days as Visiting Scholar. (See report in OCLC newsletter, or write me for a copy of the task force draft report). This meeting did not go smoothly. It was a frustrating end to the fantastic experience of being Visiting Scholar. Many of the people on the committee were not familiar with the range of audiovisual materials we catalog daily, so they did not realize how similar to these items are the commercially produced and packaged software titles.

I met with Rowland Brown February 16, and recommended to him that OCLC take a leadership role in the audiovisual materials/nonbook materials area, including cataloging

policy, rule interpretations, and MARC interpretations for those items LC does not catalog, and that OCLC make more use of user-specialists in this role.

I enjoyed everything about my time at OCLC. While I have not yet produced the AV glossary, I did accomplish more than I planned. I am grateful to Neal Kaske and the Office of Research at OCLC for giving me this opportunity.

FROM THE TREASURER
Catherine Leonardi

Reporting period:
January 5, 1983 through April 1, 1983

Account balance 1-5-83	**$2,604.48**
Income	
New memberships	**190.00**
Renewal memberships	**761.70**
Miscellaneous	**67.50**
Interest paid on account	**35.17**
Total Income	**$1,054.37**
TOTAL	**$3,658.85**
Expenses	
Newsletter vol. 3, no. 1	**395.54**
100 reprints of vol. 2, no. 1	**125.00**
Postage	**90.00**
Miscellaneous	**33.16**
Bank charges	**12.45**
Renewal notices	**32.03**
Stationery	**22.71**
ALA expenses	**230.00**
Total Expenses	**$ 940.89**
ACCOUNT BALANCE 4-1-83	**$2,717.96**

CURRENT MEMBERSHIP 446*

***Includes 196 memberships not yet renewed for 1983.**

NONPRINT CATALOGING FOR MULTIMEDIA COLLECTIONS : A GUIDE BASED ON AACR2
By Joann V. Rogers

A REVIEW

The first chapter is intended to set the stage for the rest of the book. It briefly covers many aspects of bibliographic control of nonprint. While little that is new is discovered by reading this section, it summarizes some historical items of interest and provides a context for AACR2 which would be useful to the uninitiated.

Chapters 2 through 9 deal specifically with application of AACR2 to various types of nonprint materials. With the exception of the chapters on cartographic material and microforms, both of which are extremely brief, Rogers conveys useful information and provides some very sensible interpretations. The author includes those Library of Congress rule interpretations which affect nonprint cataloging and were available at her press time. This is a helpful feature, especially for libraries which may not subscribe to *Cataloging Service Bulletin.*

Rogers seems to be particularly aware that terminology can be a real problem in AV cataloging. She provides a good discussion of AACR2 definitions and thorough descriptions of types of av. At the end of each separate media chapter (3-8) Rogers provides a number of cataloging samples for the material covered by that chapter. This is a strong aspect of the book. There are rarely less than half a dozen examples and usually there are more. In addition, the author comments on the cataloging samples as needed.

Potential users of this book need to be alerted to some shortcomings. The book is occasionally dogmatic in its presentation and states as fact interpretations which could well be argued by knowledgeable catalogers. For instance, transparency masters are relegated to the gmd of "picture" without discussion as to the pros and cons of this practice and without dealing with the fact that not all transparency masters are picture materials, some are text.

Rogers has misinterpreted AACR2 in such a way that kits are handled as chapter 10 materials. This practice is unique and unwarranted, and, for an inexperienced cataloger or a student of cataloging, would lead to incorrect cataloging of kit material. Kit materials are provided for in AACR2 in chapter one, and the various media chapters refer one back to 1.1C1 and 1.10 for handling of multimedia or kit materials. Even chapter 10 under which Rogers handles kits says to see 1.10 (10.1C2) for kit materials. This is a very misleading interpretation of AACR2 and seems counterproductive in the context of the ongoing struggle to standardize AV cataloging. One would expect the text to justify this interpretation or explain it in some way so that the unwary could be alert to alternatives.

Overall this is a strong book which offers helpful information. It is particularly useful when used in conjunction with other manuals as cataloging adjuncts. It may be too brief on some materials but it is well organized and offers a full complement of attractive and useful appendices. One final comment: this reviewer hopes that Libraries Unlimited will trade in their current typeface for one which is easier to read. The current one is attractive on pages where a lot of white spaces break up the page, but it is deadly on full prose pages.

Available from: Libraries Unlimited, Littleton, Colorado, $21.00, ISBN 0-87287-284-X 198 pages.

-- Verna Urbanski

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

ISSN: 0739-1153

Last modified: December 1997