OLAC Newsletter
Volume 16, No. 1
March 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEW

- Video Acquisitions and Cataloging: A Handbook

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

FROM THE EDITOR
Sue Neumeister

A new *OLAC Newsletter* Editor is being sought, so that I will be able to devote more time to the OLAC Web Page. A description of the duties and requirements of being Editor can be found on p. 34.

Our Treasurer, Johanne LaGrange, has completed an interesting comparative analysis of OLAC's finances from the last 3 years. Also in this issue is the preliminary information about the OLAC Conference in October in Denton, Texas. You will find the workshop topics and some tours that are being scheduled. For the first time at an OLAC Conference, there will be poster sessions. The OLAC Board has approved a Scholarship Fund for a member to attend the OLAC Conference. A form is also included for those who wish to apply.

As always in the March issue there is the Meet the Candidates section. Personal membership ballots will be mailed in early April (first class). Diane Boehr would like to thank Pat Thompson for taking minutes of the CAPC meeting on January 19, since OLAC secretary, Cathy Gerhart, was stranded in the Denver airport due to poor weather conditions. Conference reports of ALA Midwinter and of MOUG are also included. There is information on a new publication from Haworth Press *Journal of Internet Cataloging* and a review of the James C. Scholtz's *Video Acquisitions and Cataloging: A Handbook* by Jeffrey Holland.

Forthcoming

A cumulative index of v. 11-15 of the *OLAC Newsletter* will be mailed separately in a few weeks. In the June issue, you can expect to see the registration form and information for the October OLAC Conference. It will also include the Business and Board meeting minutes from ALA Midwinter, as well as the ALCTS AV meetings.

Please note: I have a new e-mail address -- neumeist@acsu.buffalo.edu

---

DEADLINE FOR THE JUNE ISSUE: MAY 1, 1996

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Heidi Hutchinson

ALA Midwinter came a little early this year, but not a moment too soon for our colleagues from the Cold North, who used the days in sunny San Antonio to thaw out from the Blizzard of '96. From what I hear, at this writing, those same folks are now back in the Deep Freeze of '96. I send my sympathies from Southern California, where at least it rained today--the local manifestation of winter.

San Antonio was not only sunny, it was friendly and very conducive to conference-going. By the end of the conference, I had indeed figured out the twists and turns of the Riverwalk and was an old hand at finding the shortest path between the Hyatt and the Hilton Palacio Del Rio ...

The latter was the site of both OLAC's CAPC meeting and the Saturday night ("Social Life, What Social Life?") OLAC Business meeting. So much information was shared at that meeting, it boggled the mind. Look for some of the reports and the minutes later in this Newsletter. And in addition to the myriad reports by liaisons and representatives, we found a few minutes to return to our venerable Question and Answer session. I've noticed a remarkable consistency in our panel of experts down through the years (thanks, once again, to Sheila Intner, Ann Sandberg-Fox, Nancy Olson, Glenn Patton, and Ed Glazier). These admirable people continue to make it their business to be on top of the latest formats and their cataloging problems, er, challenges. Whereas in 1986, when I attended my very first OLAC meeting, we were preoccupied with whether to make an 043 for a dubbed foreign language film, this session's questions were on the order of "Is screen-saver a genre term?" and "What do we call those videos that are made specifically to create an atmosphere (waterfall, crackling fire) or to entertain our cat?" Not to mention the really new challenges of multimedia, Internet cataloging and, coming soon, the new DVD format.

On a completely different note, here is another opportunity for OLAC members to serve their organization. We are looking for a new ALCTS AV Liaison, effective immediately, and for a new Newsletter Editor for the end of the year. Detailed calls for volunteers can be found elsewhere in this issue.

OLAC Conference, coming your way on October 3-5, is really taking shape. Workshop leaders and keynote speakers are being lined up and plans made for new features such as poster sessions and NACO Funnel training. And this year we will be offering a scholarship for one OLAC member to attend his/her very first OLAC Conference. Watch this Newsletter for further information and application forms for these exciting new prospects. The OLAC Conference promises, as always, to be an excellent opportunity for all of us to learn about the very latest advances in nonprint cataloging. So start making plans to come to Denton, Texas in October!

FROM THE TREASURER
Johanne LaGrange

```
Reporting period:  October 1, 1995 through December 31, 1995

Membership:    663
  Institutional  -  287
  Personal       -  376

ACCOUNT BALANCE:  Sept. 30, 1995

  Merrill Lynch WCMA Account               27,129.45

INCOME

  Back Issues                     14.00
  Dividends--WCMA Account        368.22
  Memberships                  1,213.00
  Royalties
      Lib. Mgr. Guide            668.29

  TOTAL INCOME                              3,263.51

EXPENSES

  Banking Fees
      Activity Fee                 .15
  OLAC Newsletter (v.15, no. 4)   762.75
  Publication/Printing
      OLAC Directory            1,237.25

  TOTAL EXPENSES                           (2,000.15)

ACCOUNT BALANCE: Dec. 31, 1995

  Merrill Lynch WCMA Account               28,392.81
```

SECOND QUARTER
COMPARATIVE REPORT
Johanne LaGrange

	1993	1994	1995
Membership:	734	718	663
Institutional		305	287
Personal		413	378

ACCOUNT BALANCE:

```
Merrill Lynch WCMA Account   12,182.37      26,476.69    27,129.45
CNB, Baton Rouge              3,437.00
CD at 7.20% 7/94            10,000.00

INCOME
Back Issues                    190.50          51.00        14.00
Dividends--WCMA Account        115.95         311.14       368.22
Memberships                  4,640.00       5,501.00     1,213.00
Royalties
  Lib. Mgr. Guide                                          668.29
  TOTAL INCOME               4,946.45       5,863.14    13,263.51

EXPENSES
Banking Fees
  Activity Fee                  17.05          16.65          .15
OLAC Newsletter                699.85       1,357.35       762.75
Photocopies                     37.50          66.17
Postage/Permit                  72.78         109.19
Publication
  Lib. Mgr. Guide               50.00
  OLAC Directory                                         1,237.25

  TOTAL EXPENSES          (   906.02)     (1,669.36)   (2,000.15)

ACCOUNT BALANCE:

Merrill Lynch WCMA Account  19,659.80      30,670.47    28,392.81
CD at 7.20% 7/94            10,000.00
                           29,659.80
```

THE AUDIOVISUAL COMMONS AND THE ELECTRONIC FUTURE
October 3-5, 1996
Denton, Texas

Come and join your colleagues in Denton, Texas, October 3-5 for the 7th Conference of the Online Audiovisual Catalogers to be (Are not golf clubs realia?)

Denton is located about 35 miles NW of Dallas and is the home of the University of North Texas (a stone's throw from the Conference Hotel) and Texas Woman's University, both of which have library science programs. Are there aspiring audiovisual catalogers out there?

The Conference program proves to be an exciting one and kicks off Thursday, October 3rd with keynote speakers Dr. Barbara Tillett, Chief of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office at the Library of Congress and Erik Jul, Library Resources Management, OCLC. Dr. Tillett's remarks will feature LC's role in the development of the audiovisual "commons" and its future directions. Mr. Jul will share highlights and project results from the DHEW funded OCLC project "Building

a Catalog of Internet Resources," as well as OCLC's directions in the electronic future. Keeping with OLAC tradition, Dr. Sheila Intner, Professor of Library Science at Simmons College, will provide the Conference wrap-up in her remarks which will summarize the programs and workshops offered throughout the Conference.

A full array of cataloging and other pertinent workshops will be offered throughout the 2 1/2 day Conference including:

- Toys, Kits, Games, Realia
- Prints, Photographs
- Format Integration
- Interactive Multimedia
- Videorecordings
- Maps
- Computer Files
- Sound Recordings
- Internet Resources

For those arriving Wednesday October 2nd, there will be a guided tour in the afternoon of the Amon Carter Museum (19th century Americana and Western art, including the collections of Remington and Russell), or a guided tour of the library operations of the Dallas School District. We are also planning transportation to downtown Fort Worth for those wishing to visit on their own the Fort Worth Museum of Science and History, the Kimball Art Museum, or the Modern Art Museum of Fort Worth which are all within walking distance of each other. Short tours of the University of North Texas' library collections and services will also be available during the Conference.

The University of North Texas will be sharing some of its fine musicians with us in an evening of entertainment which we will be bringing to the Hotel. Also, a new feature of the Conference will be poster sessions in which presenters can share their audiovisual and technological research, projects, and library operations.

Conference programs, workshops, and workshop leaders will be in the June issue of the *OLAC Newsletter*. Contact Sharon Almquist at 817-565-4702 or e-mail: salmquis@library.unt.edu, Ralph Hartsock at 817-565-2860 or e-mail: rhartsoc@library.unt.edu or Mary Konkel at 216-972-6257 or e-mail: marykonkel@uakron.edu if you need more information or would be willing to assist with the Conference. We look forward to seeing you in Denton.

CALLING FOR POSTER SESSION SUBMISSIONS

Applications for poster sessions for the 1996 OLAC Conference to be held in Denton, Texas, October 3-5 are now being accepted. Poster sessions are a fun, collegial opportunity for you to

share the results of a research study, a successful workflow, a unique processing or packaging method, or a practical problem-solving effort with fellow AV catalogers. We provide the bulletin board and display table--you provide the poster, graphic materials, and/or handouts which capture the essence of your presentation. Your colleagues will stroll by to chat with you as you point out the highlights of your presentation. Remember science fair days?

The deadline for receipt of abstracts is June 1, 1996. Applicants will be notified by July 1, 1996 whether or not their poster sessions have been accepted for presentation. Poster sessions are scheduled for Friday October 4th.

Applications may be submitted by FAX: 817-565-2599, by e-mail: salmquis@library.unt.edu or via traditional mail to: Sharon Almquist, Media Library, Box 5188, University of North Texas 76203-0188.

Please include the following information in your application:

- TITLE OF POSTER SESSION
- AUTHOR(S) NAME AND INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION(S)
- E-MAIL, TELEPHONE AND FAX NUMBER
- AN ABSTRACT OF NO MORE THAN 150 WORDS

Direct questions to Sharon Almquist at the above address or by phone at 817-565-4702. Deadline for receipt of applications is:

JUNE 1, 1996

1996 OLAC CONFERENCE SCHOLARSHIP

The OLAC Conference Scholarship is an award to a member of Online Audiovisual Catalogers which will enable one person to attend the biennial OLAC Conference to be held at Denton, Texas, October 3-5, 1996.

What is the size of the OLAC Conference Scholarship?

> The 1996 OLAC Conference Scholarship will be sufficient to cover reasonable travel expenses, registration, meals and lodging for one person for the duration of the Conference, not to exceed $1,000.

Who is eligible for the OLAC Conference Scholarship?

> Any person who, at the time the award is made, is a member of OLAC and has never attended an OLAC Conference, is eligible for the OLAC Conference Scholarship.

The recipient will be required to attend the full Conference, including the Business meeting at which s/he will be formally presented with the award, and to write a brief report on the Conference and what s/he gained from the experience.

How does one apply for the OLAC Conference Scholarship?
Applicants must submit a completed application, vita demonstrating the applicant's interest in nonprint cataloging, and a statement describing why the applicant wishes to attend the Conference, how receipt/nonreceipt of this scholarship will influence his/her ability to attend the Conference, and potential applications to her/his present and future job responsibilities.

Deadline for applications for the 1996 OLAC Conference is June 1, 1996.

1996 OLAC CONFERENCE SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION FORM

(Please type or print clearly)

```
Name:
              (First)          (M.I.)              (Last)

Mailing Address:

City, State, Zip:

Daytime telephone:

Place of employment:

Position title:

Brief description of job responsibilities/related nonprint
involvement/experience:



Member of Online Audiovisual Catalogers since:  19_____
```

Applications should include this completed application form, current resume, and a cover letter describing why the applicant wishes to attend the Conference, how receipt/nonreceipt of this scholarship will influence his/her ability to attend the Conference, and potential applications to her/his present and future job responsibilities.

This application and supporting materials must be received no later than **June 1, 1996.** The award will be announced no later than July 15, 1996.

Send this application and supporting materials to:

Virginia M. Berringer
Chair, OLAC Scholarship Committee
Bierce Library
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44306-1712

For further information contact Virginia Berringer at 216- 972-7244 weekdays or via the Internet at vberringer@uakron.edu.

MEET THE CANDIDATES

CANDIDATES FOR VICE PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT ELECT

JOHANNE LAGRANGE
Catalog/Serials Librarian
Columbia University Health Sciences Library

Background Information:

Johanne provides full original cataloging in all formats, including AV materials, computer files, serials and rare books. Prior to her position at Columbia University Health Sciences Library, she was the AV cataloger at the Sterling C. Evans Library at Texas A&M. She has received national and local awards for her accomplishments.

- **OLAC ACTIVITIES:** Member; Treasurer (1993 to date); Member, Cataloging Policy Committee (1991-1993); Conference Reports Editor (1992-1993).
- **ALA ACTIVITIES:** Member; Member, ALCTS AV Committee (1993-1995), Consultant (1995 to date); Member, ALCTS AV Standards Committee (1990 to date); Chair, ALCTS AV Standards Committee (1992-1995); Presented two Poster Sessions at ALA (1989).
- **OTHER AV ACTIVITIES:** Reviewer, *ABC-CLIO Video Rating Guide for Libraries.*

SUE NEUMEISTER
Head, Bibliographic Control
Central Technical Services, SUNY at Buffalo

Background Information:

Besides her duties related to the pre-order process for monographs and serials in all formats, Sue also coordinates the copy cataloging functions in the Acquisitions Dept. From 1986-1991, she was a monographic and audiovisual cataloger in the Cataloging Dept. She is the local project liaison and chair of a 12-member group of librarians at the

University at Buffalo who are participating in the OCLC project "Building a Catalog of Internet Resources."

- **OLAC ACTIVITIES:** Member; Member, OLAC 1990 Conference Planning Committee; Member, Cataloging Policy Committee (1991-1993); OLAC Newsletter Editor-in-Chief (1992-1996); Creator/Maintainer, OLAC Web Page (1995 to date)
- **ALA ACTIVITIES:** Member; Member, ALCTS; Speaker, "Cataloging Internet Resources: A Practitioner's View," Heads of Cataloging DG (1996)
- **REGIONAL ACTIVITIES:** Second Vice President/Program Chair, SUNY Librarians' Association's 1996 Annual Conference.
- **OTHER AV ACTIVITIES:** Editorial Board Member, *MC Journal: The Journal of Academic Media Librarianship* (1992 to date); Reviewer, *ABC-CLIO Video Rating Guide for Libraries* (1990-1993); Speaker, "Cataloging of Videorecordings," WNY Library Resources Council, AV Resources Committee Workshop (1989)

CANDIDATES FOR SECRETARY

MARLYN HACKETT
Technical Services Librarian
Cook Memorial Public Library

Background information:

In her present position, Marlyn catalogs art prints, microfilm, genealogy materials and adult videos as well as both adult and children's sound record- ings. She is responsible for the training and supervision of cataloging and data entry staff, pages and volunteers working in the Technical Services Dept. and for preparing the documentation for the departmental cataloging and data entry procedures. Her selection areas include adult videos and cookbooks.

- **OLAC ACTIVITIES:** Member; Member, Cataloging Policy Committee (1995 to date); Secretary, OLAC/MOUG Planning Committee, 1994 Conference.
- **ALA ACTIVITIES:** Member; Member, ALCTS; Intern, ALCTS AV Committee (1995 to date); Intern, ALCTS AV Standards Committee (1995 to date).
- **OTHER AV ACTIVITIES:** Former reviewer, *ABC-CLIO Video Rating Guide for Libraries.*

PATRICIA THOMPSON
Technical Services Librarian
University of the South

Background information:

Pat currently catalogs a variety of formats and manages copy cataloging operations at the University of the South's duPont Library in Sewanee, TN, where she has been for 2 years. Prior to this position she spent 5 years as Non-Book Cataloger at Southwest Texas State University, where she cataloged all types of audiovisual materials, music, and computer software, including interactive multimedia. In 1992, she participated in OCLC's first Internet resources cataloging experiment.

- **OLAC ACTIVITIES:** Member; Intern, Cataloging Policy Committee (1993-1995); Newsletter conference report contributor; CC:DA Audience Observer (1994-1996); Member, OLAC Conference Scholarship Committee (1995-1996).
- **ALA ACTIVITIES:** Member; Member, ALCTS; Teaching Assistant for the 1995 ALCTS Institute on Cataloging Interactive Multimedia.
- **OTHER AV ACTIVITIES:** Member, Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG) and Music Library Association (MLA).

ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS (OLAC)
CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE
SAN ANTONIO, TX
January 19, 1996

Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Diane Boehr, CAPC Chair, at approximately 8:00 p.m.

CAPC members present: Diane Boehr, Susan Bailey, Virginia Berringer, Ann Caldwell, Mary Beth Fecko, Marlyn Hackett, Nancy Rodich-Hodges.

Liaisons present: Molly Brennan (ALCTS AV Liaison), Martha Yee (AMIA Liaison), Pat Thompson (CC:DA Audience Observer), Richard Baumgarten (MOUG Liaison), Harriet Harrison (Library of Congress contact).

Guests: 40 guests were present.

1. Members and guests introduced themselves.
2. The minutes of the June 23, 1995 meeting as published in the *OLAC Newsletter* 15 (3) were approved.
3. Old Business
   a. Update on National Library of Medicine (NLM) AV Cataloging Policy

      D. Boehr reported that NLM had reconsidered their decision to cease contributing authority records through NACO, and are once again contributing.

b. Update on ALCTS AV Proposal on Uniform Titles for Videorecordings

Sheila Smyth, Chair of ALCTS AV, reported that a letter had been received from Robert B. Ewald of the Library of Congress in response to the request from ALCTS AV that LCRI 25.5B be rescinded to allow uniform titles to be applied to moving materials whether or not there is a conflict. The letter, dated 12-29-95, stated that the LCRI would not be rescinded. ALCTS AV will discuss this at their meeting on Tuesday and will let CAPC know what they decide to do as the next step.

c. Update on the OLAC/CAPC/NACO Funnel Project

Ann Caldwell, coordinator of the project, reported that she had completed her NACO training and was determining how to proceed with selecting participants and conducting training sessions for them. She passed around a sign-up sheet for those at the meeting who were interested. Training may possibly be held during ALA in New York and/or during the OLAC Conference in October 1996. Details will be worked out in conjunction with the OLAC Board. In response to audience questions, it was explained that there are no minimum requirements for the number of records a participant must contribute, but the level of contribution should be enough to justify the costs of the training and to maintain the participant's level of expertise after being trained.

d. Update from the Audience Characteristics Subcommittee

Mary Beth Fecko, Chair of the Subcommittee, reported that they had contacted some media specialists and determined that there is definitely a need for some kind of searchable term or code in the bib record for grade level and possibly for specific disabilities. There was also some interest in indicating performance rights for educational or public audiences. The 658 field (Index term-- specific curriculum objective) list of terms is only established at some state levels and is not a standardized vocabulary at this point. The 521 field (Target audience) could possibly be modified to include audience characteristics instead of utilizing a new field, but it would also be desirable to have the field be searchable. The language used would need to be uniform so that terms such as "intermediate" would mean the same whenever they are used. The CAPC Chair asked the Subcommittee to come up with a discussion paper on this issue that could be submitted to MARBI at the next ALA meeting in July.

4. New Business
   a. Refining/Redefining the 028 Field

   This issue was brought to CAPC by Karen Little, Chair of the Music Library Association's Subcommittee on MARC formats. This Subcommittee is looking at the possibility of using the 028 field for books published by music publishers who assign book numbers that are similar to those used for scores. Currently this field

is not defined for books, and these numbers must go into the 037 field, which is not indexed. Some suggestions were to expand the 028 to include stock numbers issued by publishers of music or to combine the 028 and 037 into a single field for all kinds of publishers' numbers. It was also learned that LC will not use the 028 for numbers found in books published by imprints usually associated with printed music.

The Subcommittee wanted input from CAPC as to whether video numbers should be included in this discussion.

By means of an informal show of hands, it appeared that most of the group present have been using the 028 nearly exclusively for any kind of video publishers' numbers, even if they were catalog numbers that probably should go into the 037, partly because the 037 is not searchable. Glenn Patton (of OCLC) mentioned that the 037 was originally created for books, and that the indexing of this field has never been requested. It was pointed out that there are no standards as to how to transcribe these numbers in either field, and this would affect the searching capabilities for either field.

The CAPC consensus was that we see a need to better define the use of the 028 and the 037 for video numbers, and include guidelines on how they should be transcribed. CAPC will work in cooperation with the MLA Subcommittee to write a discussion paper on this issue to be submitted to MARBI.

b. MARBI Proposals and Discussion Papers

Glenn Patton reported for John Attig, OLAC MARBI Liaison, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Proposal no. 96-1 proposes 2 changes to the 856 field (Electronic location and access). The first suggests the addition of a first indicator value 8 for "other" to be used when a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) is recorded in subfield $u. This would eliminate having to code redundant data. The second is a redefinition of subfield $q to File format type, which would indicate what mode of transfer is necessary. Glenn Patton explained that the 856 was defined on a provisional basis and is evolving as its use becomes more common.

Discussion paper no. 92 explores the issue of changing the definition of computer file in Leader/06 (Type of record). Currently, the definition of the computer file (type m) format covers all kinds of computer files that are covered in AACR2R Chapter 9--including text, data, sound, executable programs, etc. This paper suggests that type code "m" be used only for executable software. For other kinds of digital files, the type code of the content would apply. This would allow digital reproductions of monographs, serials, maps, etc. to be coded and described as what they were before they were reproduced in digital form. This is analogous to the way we catalog microform reproductions, and, most recently, the

way digital maps are coded as type "e" (maps) instead of type "m". This issue was raised by the serials community, where there is a strong desire to treat computer file serials as serials rather than as computer files. A major problem in implementing this suggestion is that it is often difficult to separate out executable files from non-executable ones. It would be relatively easy to apply this to simple cases of digitized images or an ASCII-text electronic journal, but the more complicated types are what is becoming more and more common. Many new e-journals include interactive multimedia characteristics. Also, many text files come with indexing or browsing software built-in.

Glenn Patton explained that this would be a "piecemeal" solution to the whole issue of content vs. carrier. We are working with cataloging rules that start with the carrier, and our revisions need to start with the rules themselves. It would not be smart to head down a road that leads to increasing separation of the MARC format from the cataloging rules.

CAPC decided that there was no need to take a formal stand on this issue because it is still at the discussion paper stage and not a formal proposal that MARBI could approve or defeat.

c. ISBD (CF)

The International Standard Bibliographic Description for Computer Files is in the process of being revised to provide bibliographic guidance for dealing with the changing nature of this medium. It provides a new model of description that incorporates aspects of both AACR2R Chapter 9 and the interactive multimedia guidelines. Laurel Jizba, member of the ISBD (CF) Working Group, reported that the draft is 104 pages long and that they were working on getting feedback from CC:DA by April 1. She also mentioned that the guidelines for cataloging interactive multimedia were still just guidelines, and she would appreciate any comments on them. Her e-mail address is 20676lj@msu.edu.

d. Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)

Eric Childress, Chair of the PCC Task Group for Defining the Core Bibliographic Record for Audiovisual Materials, led a discussion of the elements proposed for the core records for moving image materials (Chapter 7) and graphic materials (Chapter 8). Among the highlights of the discussion were:

CAPC agreed with the Task Group that the 007 field should be part of the core record, since OCLC and some local library systems make extensive use of this field. It was suggested that it could contain more useful information,such as closed captioning. It is relatively easy to add to the end of the string, but difficult to add or delete a code in the middle, since when this is done, all existing 007s need to be converted. Eric raised the possibility of this field being used in a workstation as a record builder, where codes in the 007 would automatically

cause other fields, such as the 300, 538, or other note fields, to be supplied. This drew a favorable response. Members felt that consideration should be given to including the 024 field (Other standard identifier-- commonly used for UPC codes) in the core record, since it can be used for acquisitions.

It was recommended that the 044 (Country of publishing/producing entity) field be eliminated or changed to the country of publication instead of producing entity to make this similar to other formats.

A lengthy discussion about whether the 520 field (Summary) should be required led to a final consensus that it need not be required if the title is self-explanatory. It was pointed out that although use of the core record should require less judgment on the part of lower level staff who use the records, it requires more judgment on the part of the cataloger who creates the record. The core standards have to allow room for this judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Thompson (with the assistance of Marlyn Hackett, in the place of OLAC Secretary Cathy Gerhart, who was stranded in the Denver airport and could not attend.)

CONFERENCE REPORTS
Ian Fairclough, Column Editor

Report from Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA) Cataloging and Documentation Committee

Submitted by Martha M. Yee
OLAC Liaison to AMIA

At the Toronto conference in October of 1995, the Cataloging and Documentation Committee discussed its two projects from the past year: the survey and report regarding recommendations for revising *Archival Moving Image Materials: A Cataloging Manual* (AMIM), and the Committee's participation in the interorganizational group recommending principles for revision of *Moving Image Materials: Genre Terms* (MIM).

The AMIM revision report has been submitted to the Library of Congress, survey participants, and the Committee's liaisons. The Committee is currently waiting for the Library's response to the report. At the conference, Committee members expressed interest in contributing to any revision process.

Martha Yee, the Committee's representative to the genre terms interorganizational group submitted a packet to Committee members that included two drafts for a report recommending areas for MIM's revision. However, one week prior to the conference, the Library of Congress sent Committee Chair Linda Tadic a letter describing a new moving image materials genre and form list project being undertaken by the Library. While the new list would not replace MIM, it effectively terminates the interorganizational group's project. The Committee discussed LC's genre list, and expressed support for it. Linda Tadic will respond to LC's letter and state that support.

Martha Yee, in her capacity as liaison to OLAC, described the OLAC name authority "funnel project." She was asked to survey our field to see if there is interest in starting a similar project.

The Committee sponsored a panel discussion at the conference that compared descriptive cataloging rules for moving image materials.

AMIA's next annual conference will be in Atlanta, Georgia, Dec. 3-7, 1996. If anyone is interested in joining AMIA, please contact Greg Lukow at:

<div align="center">

Association of Moving Image Archivists
c/o National Center for Film and Video Preservation
The American Film Institute
P.O. Box 27999
2021 N. Western Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90027

</div>

<div align="center">

Report from CC:DA
Committee on Cataloging:
Description and Access
1996 ALA Midwinter Conference

Submitted by Patricia Thompson
OLAC Audience Observer to CC:DA

</div>

CC:DA met twice in San Antonio, on January 20 and 22. The following agenda items are those most pertinent to the AV cataloging community.

Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Multimedia (GBDIM)

> Laurel Jizba, who chaired the task force responsible for creating the guidelines, reported that since GBDIM was published in June 1994, over 2000 copies have been sold. She reminded the group that GBDIM was meant to be experimental, and that the next step should be a comprehensive evaluation of them based on user feedback. Up to now the

task force has received very little in the way of formal written comments. A request for such feedback will be made in appropriate newsletters and electronic discussion lists, and catalogers who have used GBDIM are urged to send comments.

International Standard Bibliographic Description for Computer Files (ISBD CF)

The International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) has drafted a revised version of ISBD (CF), which is now available for comments. The new ISBD (CF) provides a new model for describing computer files that combines Chapter 9 of AACR2R and GBDIM. Lynn Howarth, the Chair of the CC:DA Task Force to Review ISBD (CF) reported that they must submit their final report by April 1, 1996, and they would like to receive wide feedback from the cataloging community before then. The document has been distributed to all CC:DA members for them to solicit feedback from their constituents. Because of the document's length (104 pages), the Task Force is planning to post summaries to electronic mailing lists such as AUTOCAT, INTERCAT and any others that are appropriate. They will review it in comparison with AACR2R, GBDIM, OCLC's *Cataloging Internet Resources: A Manual and Practical Manual*, CONSER cataloging policies, *Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Reproductions,* and any other relevant documents. Areas of particular concern are the sources of information, the GMD, the statement of responsibility, the edition statement, the file characteristics in Area 3 of the description, the system requirements/mode of access notes, and the glossary. The authors of ISBD (CF) are open to suggestions, and the Task Force encourages the suggestion of additional or alternative terms for Area 3.

ALCTS Task Force to Define Bibliographic Access in the Digital Environment

Jennifer Younger, the Chair of this Task Force and recently appointed to the ALCTS Board of Directors, reported on the group's first meeting which had taken place that morning. The Task Force has been given the following charge: to lead the way in defining access and bibliographic control mechanisms for information in electronic form and communicating that mechanism to the users of the electronic information. The eleven-member group is expected to make a preliminary report at the ALA Annual Conference in New York City and to complete its work by the Midwinter meeting in 1997. Among other things, they plan to address their findings to policy makers who direct the allocation of resources to activities such as cataloging. They also want to identify the relationships necessary to maintain networks and databases outside the library community. More information about the work of the Task Force can be found on the Web page they have set up at URL: http://www.lib.virginia .edu/alcts. Instead of having liaisons from various groups they encourage participation via comments and correspondence using this Web address.

Task Force on Rules for Music Moving Image Materials

At the last CC:DA meeting in June of 1995, this Task Force was appointed to address problems posed by the Music Library Association (MLA) concerning the main entry for music moving image materials, and to decide what the rules as currently written say to do. The Chair of this Task Force, Daniel Kinney, summarized the entire issue and reported that, so far, they have determined that AACR2R has no rules for entry that specifically deal with moving image materials. Their discussions kept coming up against theoretical concepts of authorship and the problems of AACR2R. They believe that the MLA guidelines come closest to a working document on how to interpret the rules. Other members of CC:DA suggested that if the Task Force makes a formal finding that the

rules as written do not support the cataloging of this type of material, then CC:DA will have to deal with the issue on a deeper level.

Library of Congress (LC) Report

Barbara Tillett of LC gave a lengthy report on recent activities at LC. Only a few highlights can be mentioned here. A year-long internal investigation of quality in cataloging resulted in a final report that defines quality in cataloging as "accurate bibliographic and authority information that is as complete as is appropriate, and is consistent according to standard practices and policies, and is available in a timely fashion." LC is working on a discussion paper to be submitted to CC:DA to look at the general material designations (GMDs) in AACR2R, with an aim to sort out what role GMDs were intended to perform, and to perhaps revise the GMD lists to avoid the current mix of modes of expression and physical formats.

With regard to format integration, the next phase is to be implemented in March 1996. For field 006, Fixed-Length Data Elements - Additional Material Characteristics: LC does not plan to use it in records for books except in unusual circumstances. For field 007, Physical Description Fixed Field, LC does not intend to expand its use beyond current practice (for microforms, sound recordings, and some cartographic materials). In field 008, LC will restrict adding the additional information to materials cataloged by the Children's Literature Cataloging Team; and missing digits in dates will now be represented by u's instead of giving a range and using a date type code "q". The use of code "s" will increase and the treatment of dates with missing digits is simplified. And finally, LC is planning to automate its 12 million card shelflist and is looking at getting a new integrated library system!

Electronic AACR2R

Representatives from ALA Publishing gave an update on the status of the electronic version of AACR2R. They plan to use Folio Views software, although the archival master will be coded in Standard Generalized Mark-up Language (SGML). The Folio version will be compatible with LC's Cataloger's Desktop, and will be made available to all interested vendors at the same time. No negotiations have been made with any vendors yet, and the price of licensing is not yet resolved. The publishers hope to have at least one electronic AACR2R product commercially available by the end of 1996.

Future Directions of CC:DA

The Chair, Joan Swanekamp, reserved the final time slot of the meeting to discuss the future directions CC:DA. Many different groups are discussing ways to describe and provide access to digital resources, and there is a possibility that if CC:DA is not active in coming up with solutions to some of the cataloging problems that digital resources pose, that the cataloging community may not wait for rule revisions and will accept de facto rules or guidelines in place of the code. CC:DA has spent the recent past discussing the minutiae of rule revision instead of having any overall discussion of cataloging. We are increasingly coming up against the limitations of AACR, such as that it was written for a card catalog environment, that it does not address any indexing issues, and that it perhaps needs to be totally revised. Also, we have lost the ability to control the display in local systems, and we may need to devise standards that intrude into the software of those local systems. To more fully examine these issues, CC:DA has decided to hold an open

cataloging forum at ALA in New York (July 1996). Between now and then, CC:DA members will be holding moderated discussions on their own (closed) electronic distribution list to further clarify the issues that will be addressed at the July forum.

Report from MARBI
Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
1996 ALA Midwinter Conference

Submitted by Karen Little
University of Louisville, Ky.

MARBI and the USMARC Advisory Group met in three sessions during the ALA Midwinter. Priscilla Caplan (University of Chicago) chaired the sessions.

Several discussions were of interest. The first approved use of a linking code to mark fields comes with the approval of Proposal 95-6. Proposal 96-4 presents another official use of the linking code. Discussion Paper 93 contains a list of fields that must be altered in order to have the CAN/MARC and USMARC formats in agreement. Proposals 96-2 and 96-3 are of interest as well: 96-2 because of the uniqueness of a "generic" author concept and 96-3 because of the number of systems and users affected by the change.

The Library of Congress reported that the authority and classification updates are now available, with changes through June 1995. The next bibliographic and community information updates will be out soon and will include changes through January 1996. Format integration is proceeding on schedule at the Library of Congress with implementation set for March 1. Catalogers will begin submitting records that utilize the final phase of format integration on March 15.

Proposal 95-4: *Merger of the 27X Fields in the Community Information Format (Approved)*

> This paper proposed the merging of fields 271 (Additional Address) and 270 (Address Associated with Title) with field 270 (Primary Address) as well as the defining of two new subfields, $v Hours and $z Public note. In addition, the first indicator was proposed to indicate address level information and, as an amendment to the proposal, the second indicator was defined to indicate type of address. The proposal was approved as amended.

Proposal 95-6: *Linking Code for Reproduction Information in the USMARC Bibliographic Format (Approved)*

> This proposal called for the use of a code to mark fields pertaining to a reproduction that are added to a record for an original when creating the record for the reproduction. Although lengthy discussion ensued regarding the desire of some to attach more than one reproduction to the record for the original, the challenges presented when attempting to communicate holdings information when multiple reproductions are attached to an original led the group to disallow the communication of more than one reproduction per

record. The proposal was approved with one change, that being that there be no prescribed order of numeric subfields except for $6.

Proposal 96-1: *Changes to Field 856 (Electronic Location and Access) in the USMARC Formats (Defeated)*

The first of two proposed changes in this paper suggested the addition of first indicator (Access method) value 8 for Other, to be used when a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) is recorded in subfield $u. The second change proposed was a redefinition of subfield $q (File transfer mode) to File format type. Both changes were viewed as unnecessary and the proposal was defeated.

Proposal 96-2: *Define a Generic Author Field in the Bibliographic, Authority, Classification, and Community Information Formats (Approved)*

This paper proposed defining a new, repeatable field for names of authors not necessarily formulated according to cataloging rules or contained in an authority file or list. The group approved the new 720 field (Uncontrolled Name) and the use of the first indicator (Type of name).

Proposal 96-3: *Changes to Personal Name First Indicator Values in the Bibliographic, Authorities, Classification, and Community Information Formats (Approved)*

In an effort to facilitate the sharing of authority records with the British Library under the cooperative NACO program, this paper proposed making obsolete value 2 (Multiple surname) in the first indicator (Type of personal name entry element) of the X00 (Personal Name) fields and renaming value 1 (Single surname) to "Surname." The proposal was approved with the understanding that the Library of Congress will be able, by working with the utilities, to change all value 2 indicators for their entire authority file.

Proposal 96-4: *Defining a Constituent Unit Entry Field in the USMARC Bibliographic Format (Approved)*

This paper proposed defining a constituent unit as a bibliographic item that is a part of another item and which may be physically separate from the parent item. The field tag approved was 774. In addition, a link code (c) was approved for use with subfield $8.

Proposal 96-5: *Enhancement to Field 007 in the Community Information Format (Approved)*

This proposal suggested defining a new character position (/10) for handicapped parking information in field 007. The proposal was approved as written with the stipulation that if heights defining "high clearance" are prescribed they be included in the character position's description.

Proposal 96-6: *Definition of Existing Bibliographic Data Elements in the Community Information Format (Approved)*

This paper proposed defining field 658 (Index Term-Curriculum Objective) and field 856 (Electronic Location and Access). These fields were approved without discussion. Also approved was a new across-format adoption procedure for use in cases when no changes to the elements are required. The procedure involves a posting of the proposal on USMARC-L for a period of six weeks. If no indications of negative impact are received, the proposed change will move through the normal proposal process.

Discussion Paper 91: *Machine Generation Flag in USMARC Authority Records*

This paper presented options for flagging USMARC authority records that were originally generated by machine. The group was unable to answer basic questions regarding this flag such as what function the flag would serve and whether this

information needed to be communicated or if it was only needed locally. It will be referred back to the Cooperative Cataloging Council, its source, for clarification.

Discussion Paper 92: *Change in Definition of Computer File in Leader/06 (Type of record) in the USMARC Bibliographic Format*

> This paper presented issues on coding MARC records for computer files in Leader/06. Discussed was how Leader/06 is currently being used and whether or not it would be possible to define code "m" for executable software only. The concept of coding for content versus carrier was briefly touched upon. The discussion was to continue at the summer meeting.

Discussion Paper 93: *CAN/MARC Changes for MARC Format Alignment*

> This paper listed the changes that the CAN/MARC users have suggested be made to USMARC to facilitate the alignment of the bibliographic and authority formats. Utilities and local vendors have been asked to provide impact statements to the Library of Congress by April 15. Full alignment with CAN/MARC and UKMARC is expected to be completed by the end of 1998 with implementation of CAN/MARC alignment occurring first. Proposals addressing CAN/MARC alignment are expected at the July 1996 and January 1997 USMARC Advisory Group meetings.

Discussion Paper 94: *Proposed Changes to FTP Label Specifications for Electronic Files of USMARC Records*

> This paper discussed changes and additional fields deemed necessary for exchange of records in a variety of MARC formats. The deadline for discussion on this paper is the end of February. A proposal is expected at the July meeting.

Report from ALCTS CCS Heads of Cataloging Discussion Group
Cataloging Internet Resources: Two Viewpoints

Submitted by Ian Fairclough

On Monday January 22, 1996 from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. the Heads of Cataloging Discussion Group (HCDG) of the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services, Cataloging and Classification Section (ALCTS CCS) met at the San Antonio Convention Center. The topic for discussion was "Cataloging Internet Resources: Two Viewpoints." Two presenters, Cecily Johns (Deputy University Librarian and Associate University Librarian for Technical Services, University of California, Santa Barbara), and Sue Neumeister (OLAC Newsletter Editor and Head, Bibliographic Control, State University of New York at Buffalo) made presentations presenting respectively the view of an administrator and of a practitioner. Johns discussed the issues that an administrator faces in justifying the need for providing access to electronic resources through the library catalog rather than relying on the Internet user's ability to navigate without such assistance. Neumeister's talk was complemented by a 17-page handout of examples and was instructional in nature.

The presentations were concise and stimulated many questions and comments during the 50-minute discussion period which followed. These remarks were aptly fielded by HCDG Chair Ivan E. Calimano (Head, Copy Cataloging, Bibliographic Control and Access Dept., Doheny

Memorial Library, University of Southern California). The questions and comments served to illuminate the state-of-the-art of the thought of practicing catalogers with respect to cataloging remotely-accessed electronic resources today. One of the first topics to arise was the ethics of cataloging materials that the cataloging agency itself does not own. This was followed by a consideration of what electronic resources one should select for description and access in the bibliographic database - an issue of collection development which is to be understood in the context of the local situation and the library's mission. A related consideration (particularly in the case of copy cataloging) was the addition of the cataloging agency's holdings to an OCLC master record. It was disclosed that OCLC has plans to automatically track such records and the holding libraries so that they can be notified and updated when, for example, an electronic link (such as a Uniform Resource Locator for a World Wide Web document) has been changed. One inquirer asked whether a live link was currently available from data in MARC field 856; sad to say, in most libraries, the user must write down the information, copying it from field 856 or 538 (Mode of access). In a Windows environment, a user is able to "cut & paste" the information from the OPAC record to Netscape (or other browser). One respondent pointed out that "Web" pages, in a sense, are a kind of analytic, in that an analytic provides a greater detail of bibliographic analysis and a Web page allows access to the document itself, carrying the principle of further detail one step more. Eventually, it is expected that the catalog itself will be able to provide the kind of direct access that Web pages do; but not for now.

Other questions included authority control and order records (are these issues to be handled similarly to print materials?); classified access through call numbers (will your patrons wind up looking for an electronic source on the shelf?); holdings of journals that have ceased publication in print format and are now available only electronically; and analytics. Finally, you may wish to note that, although the group is designated "Heads of Cataloging," no check is conducted of the official credentials of attendees; anyone may attend.

**Report from ALCTS Pre-Order/Pre-Catalog Search Discussion Group
Mapping the Road to the Shelf:
Cartographic Materials Past, Present and Future**

**Submitted by Barbara Albee
IUPUI University Library
Indianapolis, IN**

The group met on January 22nd at the ALA Midwinter meeting. Mahnaz Moshfegh, Acquisitions/Serials Librarian, Indiana University School of Law and Chair of the Discussion Group opened the meeting and introduced Barbara Albee, Vice-Chair, and Session Moderator Michelle Drozdowski, Serials Librarian, Western Michigan University.

David Cobb, from the Harvard University Map Collection, spoke on "Early Map Acquisitions." He noted that early map collections require a lot of money to acquire, store, and preserve. One

important question to ask before acquiring a map is: how do you know if you already own it. Maps can be found in books and atlases and are not cataloged. It is very labor intensive cataloging and it is just not done.

Cobb reviewed a list of his top ten sources for maps. E-mail him at cobb@fas.harvard.edu for a copy. These sources talk about the cartographer, map maker, editions, printer, engraver, color, etc. (which are not given as access points for modern maps). He announced that Harvard is digitizing its collections. Access will be available through Harvard's Web site upon request. Users may contact them by phone or e-mail and ask for a map to be loaded on the Web. The map will remain on the Web for a specific time and then removed. This service is available to anyone.

Elizabeth Mangan, Head Data Preparation and File Maintenance Unit, Library of Congress, spoke on "What are Maps? Problems With Searching." Mangan described a variety of unusual maps and discussed the many problems with identifying and searching maps. For example, where did the map come from, what is the title information if no cartouche exists, how to identify superseded editions, etc. She announced that the newest edition of *Cartographic Materials* is under review, no due date. When it becomes available it will be placed on LC's Cataloger's Desktop. ALA is interested in publishing the title and it may be out sometime in 1997. Mangan is currently working on the 99,000 geographic cutters for the G schedule. The G schedule should be ready for release and used on the Classification Plus by this summer.

John A. Stevenson, Senior Assistant Librarian, University of Delaware Library, spoke on "Marcive Shipping List Service as It Relates to Maps." He described the service and its relation to GPO maps, comparing the service to an approval plan with special rules, and discussed the advantages of the service for the future user of maps in our collections. He provided a handout with a sample of the Marcive SLS record and a GPO cataloging record (processed by Marcive). In addition, a sample of temporary and permanent cataloging records was provided. For more information and a copy of the handout contact him at John.Stevenson@mvs.udel.edu.

Drozdowski led a question and answer session following the presentations, and concluded the meeting with a call for topics for ALA Annual.

Report from MOUG
Music OCLC Users Group
February 6-7, 1996
Seattle, Washington

Submitted by Richard Baumgarten
OLAC/MOUG Liaison

MOUG's Annual Conference in Seattle was held at the Westin Hotel in conjunction with the meeting of the Music Library Association (MLA). After opening remarks by A. Ralph Papakhian

(MOUG President) and Laura Gayle Green (Continuing Education Coordinator), Cynthia Whitacre, Stan Szalewicz, and Sean Ferguson from OCLC's TECHPRO talked about the work there. They mentioned the growth of the department, working conditions, and customizing records for each client. There are now 40 catalogers working at TECHPRO and they are expected to be at the terminal 80% of the time unless they are supervisors.

The next day, the first session featured H. Stephen Wright talking about Northern Illinois' experiences using OCLC's MICROCON. He described the process and the problems that occurred, including the mistakes the library system made. The meeting broke up into two program sessions. One was a primer on constructing series authority records presented by Alice LaSota and Joy Pile. They attended a three-day workshop at LC last July and condensed the workshop into 75 minutes. The response was so good that the workshop may be expanded to a full-day one at another meeting. Alan Green made a presentation comparing three electronic versions of RILM: NISC Muse on CD-ROM, OCLC's FirstSearch and EPIC Online Service. In the afternoon, two more program sessions ran concurrently. Linda Gabel, from OCLC, gave a presentation on phase 2 of format integration. Her presentation was clear enough that I think that I understand it. Meanwhile, Martin Jenkins, Phil Vanermeer and Holly Borne talked about other electronic sources for music reference. At the MOUG Business meeting, all the officers and liaisons gave reports, including Jay Weitz from OCLC and Deta Davis from LC. Ralph Papakhian gave a second plug for OLAC's Conference. The new President of MOUG is Karen Little. After the Business meeting, there were two concurrent programs. RuthAnn McTyre chaired the first Reference Interest Group meeting. Mark Scharff gave a presentation on constructing name/title authority records.

NEWS FROM RLIN
As Reported at the OLAC Business Meeting
January 20, 1996
Submitted by Ed Glazier, RLG

RLIN INPUT/UPDATE HOURS EXTENDED:
In November RLIN input/ update hours extended by 8 hours per weekday. Current service hours, Pacific Time, are:

Public Service (Searching)midnight to 9 p.m. Mon.-Fri. 8 a.m. Sat. to 10:30 p.m. Sun. Technical Services (Input/Update) Central Database midnight to 9 p.m. Mon.-Fri. Special Databases, Tables, ILL midnight to 9 p.m. Mon.-Fri. 8 a.m. Sat. to 10:30 p.m. Sun.

FORMAT INTEGRATION:
The final phase of format integration will be installed March 3, 1996. This includes changes to input and display of 006, 007, and 008 fields.

DIOGENES:
The Research Libraries Group and Retro Link have developed a new service to streamline local system-based technical services. Diogenes (tm) has been developed to eliminate repeated manual searching for source copy item by item, by fully automating the search and selection of source copy.

Diogenes uses existing machine-readable records from a library's local system, stored on an FTP server, to generate batch searches of the RLIN bibliographic files and automatically delivers to an FTP server matching cataloging records, based on the library-defined profile, including local information from the original user record. An option of Diogenes is to repeat searches automatically for items not found at an interval set by the library. Diogenes includes electronic reports for matches that do not meet the library's profile, and reports of non-matches.

BOOK VENDOR REWARDS IN RLIN:
With records from Casalini Libri, RLG has inaugurated a new program of providing central access to a wide range of book vendors' in-process records. Valuable as citations for new and recent publications, vendor records can be transferred by bibliographers and acquisitions librarians to create order records in their local systems. Libraries that have already received these materials can transfer RLIN vendor records to use for local cataloging. Contracts have also been signed for records from Puvill and BNA-BHB.

NEW CITADEL FILE -- CHICANO DATABASE FROM UC BERKELEY'S CHICAGO STUDIES LIBRARY:
Now available for campuswide online searching, only through RLG's CitaDel citations and document-delivery service, is Chicano Database--the most comprehensive, single bibliographic resource for information about Mexican-American topics.

Created and added to by the Chicano Studies Library at the University of California, Berkeley, Chicano Database increases CitaDel's already strong support for Hispanic and Latino studies--the Hispanic American Periodicals Index, Handbook of Latin American Studies, and Index to Hispanic Legislation (World Law Index, part 1).

ENHANCED 2ND RELEASE OF RLIN FOR WINDOWS:
RLG has introduced the second release of its RLIN Terminal for Windows software which enables users to search, catalog, and do interlibrary loans in RLIN at the same time they are working with other, complementary online resources.

Now, version 2 opens up the East Asian script resources of the RLIN database more broadly than ever before, by enabling both catalogers and public services librarians and their users to search for and display the actual Chinese, Japanese, and Korean (CJK) characters in RLIN records for materials published in those languages. Other new features include support for multiple sessions on the same PC (e.g., a cataloging session and an authorities session), user-configured command buttons, and compatibility with Windows95.

NEW RECORDS IN SCIPIO:
This fall over 53,000 records for auction and dealers' catalogs were added to the SCIPIO file of

arts sales catalogs. These records are from libraries belonging to PACSCL -- the Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries.

For additional information about any of the above topics, please contact the RLIN Information Center, 1-800-537-RLIN (bl.ric@rlg.stanford.edu).

REPORT FROM OCLC
As Reported at the OLAC Business Meeting
January 20, 1996
Submitted by Glenn Patton, OCLC

DATABASE:
At ALA Midwinter, OCLC is launching a year-long celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Online Union Catalog. Part of that celebration is an essay contest "What the Online Union Catalog Means to Me." Information about entering the contest can be found on the OCLC home page (http://www.oclc.org).

As of January 1, 1996, there were about 869,000 AV records, 1,044,000 sound recordings and 68,000 computer files records. Sound recordings have, thus, become the first type of nonprint material to cross the "million-record" mark. While growth of AV and sound recordings remained at about 10% compared to last January, computer files growth was over 17%!

DATABASE QUALITY:
Progress also continues on database scans that result from format integration, phase 1, as well as planning and coding for scans in preparation for phase 2.

ACCESS:
PASSPORT for Windows has been released and is being demonstrated at ALA Midwinter. In association with OCLC's migration to the Windows world, we've recently announced a Workstation Replacement Program that will provide grants of up to $1000 to encourage member libraries to trade in old workstations.

PRISM SERVICE:
Work continues on format integration, phase 2. Installation is expected to occur in early March. A technical bulletin describing changes will be distributed in late January. In addition to implementing changes specific to format integration, we have taken the opportunity to rearrange the Fixed Field displays to make them more compact, but still readable. We are also making indexing changes to allow the secondary "type of material" specified in field 006 to be used as a search qualifier. Support for the Program for Cooperative Cataloging will also be included in this installation.

In September, PRISM service hours were extended so that it is available 24 hours a day Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, 23 hours on Thursday and 14 hours on Sunday.

December 1995 saw the installation of a set of PRISM enhancements. Included were improvements allowing the use of "forward" and "back" in the bibliographic and authority save file lists, the ability to create a "new" record across formats, additional online error reporting functions, and broader capabilities for changing serial records.

In early 1996, OCLC will introduce PRISM Usage Stats, a monthly electronic statistical report. The report contains a section for Cataloging, Interlibrary Loan and Union List and provides detailed information for each authorization number. Reports will be delivered electronically via the Product Services Menu.

Work continues on moving CAT CD450 to the Windows platform, with CAT ME Plus to follow that. PromptCat and PromptSelect continue to attract interest. For both services, OCLC is interested in incorporating nonprint materials. We're particularly interested in tools that your institutions may use in selection and verification of nonprint items.

OCLC is also working cooperatively with Academic Book Center to upgrade CIP records more quickly. OCLC staff, working at Academic's offices in Portland, upgrade records online as soon as items are received from the publishers. The upgraded records are immediately available to all OCLC users. We hope to expand this upgrading service in cooperation with other vendors.

INTERNET RESOURCES:
Interest in the Internet Cataloging Project continues to be high. There are currently more that 200 participating institutions who have created nearly 3000 records.

The InterCat database is available via the OCLC home page or more directly at its own URL (http://orc.rsch.oclc.org:6990/). We also have announced an experimental system of Persistent URLs (PURLs) in an attempt to gain some control over rapidly changing URLs.

We also have plans to make records from NetFirst available to PRISM cataloging users so that they use information from that abstracting and indexing service as the basis for full bibliographic records.

OCLC USERS COUNCIL REPORT
Submitted by Mary S. Konkel

The 2nd meeting of the 1995/96 OCLC Users Council was held February 5-7 in downtown Columbus. The focus of this meeting was "The Users of Electronic Information."

Dr. Karen Drabenstott, Associate Professor of Information and Library Studies at the University of Michigan, delivered a presentation on the "Evaluation of Library Systems and Services." How do we know that people are better persons for having used our services? Dr. Drabenstott believes that evaluation is a crucial operation in our libraries. We need to evaluate in order to justify the importance of our library services to those responsible for funding them, and in order to be adequately prepared to compete for limited financial resources. The lack of time and staff expertise in evaluation techniques are problems, but in seeking outside assistance through consultants or partnerships with your business or university community, evaluation can become a reality.

Marilyn Mason, Director of the Cleveland Public Library and member of the OCLC Board of Trustees, gave us some background on Cleveland's efforts in creating the electronic library. Clevenet offers an online catalog, dial access, full-text retrieval when available, OCLC's FirstSearch, and World Wide Web access via Netscape for its users. Their Web home page is one of the top 5 in the country--beating out New York Public Library. Their electronic offerings are serving those who never thought the library had anything of use for them. Their electronic resources have not replaced, but instead have stimulated in-house library use. Issues of copyright, preservation, training, standards of measurement (circulation transactions, collection size, etc.), equity and censorship become even more difficult to address in an electronic environment, but are key issues for success.

Ellen Waite, Vice President for Academic Services and member of the OCLC Board of Trustees, described the users of electronic information at Loyola University of Chicago. Based on survey information, the library learned (or had confirmed) that 1) students are using the libraries, 2) students do not find the libraries easy to use, 3) students rely first on electronic resources when starting their research, 4) students rely on the electronic resources they are most familiar with, and 5) students do not ask librarians for help. Faculty are also experiencing problems as they find it difficult to keep up with the changing resources and methods for accessing them. Electronic resources require more training--both one-on-one and classroom instruction, and require librarians to take more risks and become even more flexible. We are building two libraries, the physical library and the virtual library. Both need tending and both need resources.

The Technical Services Interest Group, which I elected to attend discussed several issues including the tapeloading of government documents, bibliographic enrichment for OCLC records lacking classification and/or subject data, and table of contents record enrichment. These preliminary discussions assist OCLC in planning future directions. Erik Jul announced that the NetFirst (Internet resources) database will be available in March through the FirstSearch service, including a PRISM interface which will allow a NetFirst minimal record to be "derived" for full cataloging. OCLC has also developed the PURL, or Persistent URL to be used in Internet cataloging records to assist in tracking the organic nature of Internet addresses.

The Task Force on Original Cataloging Credits has been formed and met during this Council meeting. A preliminary report will be available for next Users Council meeting in May.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor

Journal of Internet Cataloging
The International Quarterly of Digital Organization, Classification & Access

Co-editors:

Ruth C. Carter, Assistant Director for Automated and Technical Services, University of Pittsburgh Libraries, PA
Robert Brisson, The Pennsylvania State University Libraries, State College, PA

The forthcoming *Journal of Internet Cataloging* is an international journal focusing on the organization, access, and bibliographic control of Internet resources. It explores practical and theoretical issues in making electronic data available through remote access using the Internet. In recognizing the need to organize Internet resources, the journal will publish articles specific to their organization and control in a networked environment.

In considering cataloging and classification broadly defined, the *Journal of Internet Cataloging* recognizes that in the digital environment these traditional fields may be applied in novel ways. Articles may treat enhancing access to resources such as electronic texts, software programs, data files, bibliographic databases, or graphic files, found on a wide variety of platforms such as the World Wide Web, Gopher, or via FTP. The *Journal of Internet Cataloging* publishes full- length research and review articles, along with descriptions of new programs and technology. Appropriate topics include aspects of subject analysis and classification specific to Internet resources; managerial or administrative issues dealing with policy or planning; and organizational issues treating methods for accessing networked electronic resources. The journal also encompasses contemporary research on user behavior and on social theories of information organization and access.

Prospective authors are invited to request an "Instructions for Authors" brochure from Ruth C. Carter, PhD, MA, MS, Co-Editor, *Journal of Internet Cataloging*, Assistant Director for Automated and Technical Services, University of Pittsburgh Libraries, 271 Hillman Library, Pittsburgh, PA 15260; Phone: 412-648-7710; FAX: 412-648-7887; E-mail: rcc13@vms.cis.pitt.edu

OLAC Newsletter Editor Vacancy

The OLAC Executive Board is seeking applicants for the position of Newsletter Editor. The new Editor will assume the responsibility for the Newsletter beginning with the first issue of Volume 17 (March 1997).

The Editor of the *OLAC Newsletter* is responsible for maintaining the quality of, and seeing to the overall organization and production of, the Newsletter. S/he sets the publication and submission deadlines for staff editors (Book Review Editor, Conference Reports Editor, News and Announcements Editor, and Questions & Answers Editor); insures that those editors deliver submissions following an agreed upon and disseminated set of deadlines; reviews and edits the final submissions and determines the article sequence and layout.

S/he also is responsible for the actual process of publication and distribution of the Newsletter, including input of text, editing and proofreading, selection of a printer, assembly, and mailing. The Editor acts and speaks for the Newsletter staff when giving reports and summarizing activities.

The successful candidate for the position of Editor will have demonstrated skills as a writer/editor. S/he will have demonstrated ability to deal tactfully with others. The candidate needs to have e-mail access and to be able to attend ALA Midwinter and Annual meetings and OLAC conferences for the purpose of serving on the Executive Board of OLAC and keeping members and the Board informed regarding the operation of the Newsletter.

Access to an IBM (or compatible) PC is essential, as is knowledge of PC-based word processing. Familiarity with production techniques is desirable.

The Newsletter Editor receives a $50.00 stipend for each issue published as well as a $100 stipend for attending OLAC Business meetings during ALA conferences as a member of the Executive Board.

OLAC members wishing to be considered for the position should write to the OLAC President (**Heidi Hutchinson, Rivera Library, P.O. Box 5900, University of California, Riverside, CA 92517-5900**). Please submit a letter indicating your interest and abilities, a complete resume and recent samples of your writing. Applications will be circulated to the Executive Board of OLAC.

If you'd like more information regarding the position, please contact: **Sue Neumeister, SUNY/Buffalo, Lockwood Library Bldg., Buffalo, NY 14260.** E-mail: neumeist@acsu.buffalo.edu ; Phone: 716-645-2305; FAX: 716-645-5955.

Opening for ALCTS AV Liaison

Following the resignation of Molly Brennan, OLAC is seeking a new liaison to ALCTS AV to fill out her term, which will expire at the end of ALA Annual Conference in 1997. The successful candidate must be willing to attend ALA in New York this year (1996) and attend and report on the ALCTS AV meetings there and at the two following ALA meetings. The position could be renewed for an additional 2-year term.

Liaisons report to the OLAC membership on the activities of their respective groups via brief presentations at the OLAC Business meetings and reports in the *OLAC Newsletter*. Presentations are made at those Business meetings which are held during the ALA Midwinter meetings and Annual conferences. For liaisons whose groups do not meet at ALA, liaison reports will summarize either past discussions and decisions, or future meeting plans, as appropriate. Reports are submitted to the *OLAC Newsletter*'s Conference Reports Editor summarizing matters relevant to OLAC areas of interest.

The OLAC Executive Board will consult and appoint the new ALCTS A V liaison prior to ALA Annual. Please express your interest in this position by **May 1, 1996** to:

> Heidi Hutchinson
> Rivera Library
> P.O. Box 5900
> University of California
> Riverside, CA 92517-5900
> 909-787-5051
> HEIDI@CITRUS.UCR.EDU

BOOK REVIEWS
Vicki Toy-Smith, Column Editor

Video Acquisitions and Cataloging: A Handbook
by James C. Scholtz

A Review

James C. Scholtz has written a very useful "how-to" handbook for librarians dealing with the vagaries and unfathomable pricing structures of video acquisitions. Mr. Scholtz has written a couple of books and many articles on videos in libraries, and displays a

thorough knowledge of the video industry and the problems librarians will encounter in building video collections. The book's title is a bit misleading as it is heavily weighted on the acquisitions side and only one chapter is devoted to special considerations in cataloging videocassettes. Nevertheless, this is a valuable handbook.

The first three chapters give an overview of the history of the video industry (with a timeline of events which especially pertain to the selection and acquisition of videos by libraries), an overview of the development of different videocassette markets, and a detailed study of vendors and distribution routes. These three chapters give the librarian an insight into how videos are priced, how to shop around for the best deal and how to make the system work for the library. Most useful is the information on how different vendors' marketing strategies work and how the libraries can tailor their video acquisitions policies to get the most for their money. Copyright and use rights are dealt with in chapter 5 in a manner that librarians who are not well versed in these subjects will find easy to understand and helpful. Chapter 4 deals with the acquisitions process and has little that pertains specifically to videos. Chapter 6 provides guidance to special problems inherent in cataloging and providing access to videocassettes. The book has many useful examples of processing forms, copyright agreements, etc. which could be adapted to individual libraries' needs.

Although most of the examples used in the book come from public libraries, the information can be translated to any kind of library. This book will be most useful to a librarian or acquisition department that is new to video acquisitions or looking to rationalize an ad hoc policy. The author's detailed knowledge of the video industry and his practical advice to librarians will be most appreciated.

Published in 1995 by: Greenwood Press, Westport, CT (184 p.) $55.00 ISBN: 0-313-29345-7.

Reviewed by Jeffrey Holland (University of Nevada, Reno)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Verna Urbanski, Column Editor

QUESTION: I have a video of an old silent film. The video has music on it. How do I code the 007 subfield $f and $g and what do I say in the subfield $b segment of the physical description?

ANSWER: Glenn Patton answered this exact question in v.5, no. 3 of the Newsletter (September, 1985) and since his answer is still accurate and the information still needed, I'll just let Glenn say it again!

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

QUESTION: What subject access and notes should be added to records for videos which are audio described? Anything special or just a note saying that it is an audio described video? Also, does the fact that it is a described video call for an edition statement?

ANSWER: LC established two subject headings one of which should be added to cataloging as appropriate: Video recordings for the visually handicapped (sh93-3552) or Films for the visually handicapped (sh93-6068). I would treat a statement as an edition statement if it used the word "edition" --for example, "Audio described edition." I would also routinely add a note, such as, "Audio enhanced for the visually impaired." I believe there is a proposal with the Joint Steering Committee to use a short form of this ("audio enhanced") but I haven't yet heard if the proposal was accepted. I believe the same proposal shortens "closed captioned for the hearing impaired" to "closed captioned. " For now, I'm still using the longer form of the note. --- VU

QUESTION: I recently encountered my first "open captioned" video. Should I transcribe the information just as it appears on the label or use the standard format "...for the hearing impaired" that is, "Open captioned for the hearing impaired"?

ANSWER: I would probably use "Open captioned for the hearing impaired." Remember to add a subject heading, too (Video recordings for the hearing impaired, etc.) since open or closed, it is still material that can be used by special needs patrons. (NOTE: "open captioned" means no interpreter is needed to view the captioning). --- VU

QUESTION: On recent LC cataloging for a book with an accompanying CD, I was surprised to see the compact disc described as a compact disc in the accompanying materials area of the physical description rather than as a sound disc. AACR2R indicated in 1.5E1d to use "when appropriate, a specific material designation." But, the LCRI states: "when recording materials at the end of the physical description, always use a generic term in English." Do these two instructions contradict one another?

ANSWER: Your first guide should be the instruction in AACR2R. When there is a suitable smd, use it. In the case you cite, compact discs are described as sound discs in bibliographic records and that is the term that should appear in the accompanying materials area of the physical description. The LCRI's suggestion to use a generic term is useful when the material to be described doesn't have a standard smd. For example, if the accompanying material is a "parent's workbook," instead of saying "+ 1 parent's workbook," use just the generic term "+ 1 workbook" or perhaps "+ 1 booklet." The instruction in the LCRI is intended to make the cataloger's job easier, not to contradict AACR2R 1.5E1d. --- VU

QUESTION: I am putting together a set of basic instructions to be used by paraprofessionals cataloging videorecordings. I am having trouble describing how to treat producers, publishers and distributors. Videos aren't really published like a book is. Aren't they just distributed? In addition, there is confusion over the role of the producer. If the producer is a corporate body, is it also the publisher? When can we assume that to be true? Does the presence of a distributor alter the perception of the function of a producer?

ANSWER: Part of cataloging nonprint materials is a willingness to accept certain, shall we say, ambiguities. Some of the difficulties you cite are because sometimes the item in hand only has one body mentioned in the credits and on the item. In that case, I usually put that one body both in the area of responsibility and the publication, distribution, etc. area. If a body is mentioned in the credits--often as a preliminary screen to the main credits--and I suspect that they are repackaging (distribution?) the item in hand, I provide a bracketed "[present ed by] ... " in the area of responsibility and transcribe them as the distributor in the publication/distribution area as well.

Sometimes the credits read: "a presentation of Films for the Humanities and Sciences ; a Yo-Yo-Bill Bo production in association with Channel 4 TV, IVRS and WGBH Boston." Who did what to whom and how often can become completely confusing and it gets nasty if one begins to obsess over the "right" combination. As a matter of practicality, I transcribe information as found on the item--even going so far as to put the human producers, directors, writers in the area of responsibility as indicated by the LCRI (7.1F1)--a nicety many avoid, opting for a 511 or 508 instead.

It isn't very helpful to worry about terminology--publisher vs. distributor. The activity is comparable. Producers usually have participated in developing and overseeing the content of the item. A distributor or publisher may have done that too, but not always. In my own catalog records, my object is always to include people/companies that are associated with the item and indicate what role I think each played in the production/creation/distribution of it when the item does not say specifically. I usually only have one company that I identify as being a distributor. The rest get nestled away either in the area of responsibility or as a note if the relationship to the item is just too vague.

What catalogers are trying to do is provide the item in hand with a unique bibliographic identity. The practice of providing added entry access for the corporate bodies associated with a nonprint item, while initially irritating, becomes increasingly relevant as a media collection grows, both for collection development and for helping to do away with some of the anxiety over who to include and who to exclude.

I would encourage you to incorporate the practice of actually viewing the credits to gather information. That is the only way to reconcile the information that actually describes the item with what the container says. Bottom line, if you provide names in your catalog record, especially when inputting a new record, it will help people identify the item even if they don't agree with a function label you provide. --- VU

QUESTION: How should I treat an imprint by a new distributor who may have added or modified slightly the original information in the imprint or credits of a video and added new labels to the cassette and container or maybe even provided a whole new container? Should I create a new bibliographic record or just add notes to clarify that it is the same content with a new distributor?

ANSWER: Typically, I do create a new record when the distributor makes changes for a video. But, there are a number of variations that can cause a person to suffer significant pauses on the way to deciding what to do. Many years ago there was a general tradition that if you could "tell" that it was the same item just relabeled, you used the existing record and changed the distributor's name. Catalogers now describe the item in hand as a unique item. Catalogers can think of distributors of media in the same way they think of a publisher in print material. For many years, we have tortured ourselves trying to decide if a certain company was reeeeeeeeallllllllly the publisher or merely the distributor. That has ceased, at least for me, to be an efficient way to operate. It is more accurate to describe what you have without the burden of ceaseless second guessing and speculation which can consume inordinate amounts of time and energy. --- VU

Last modified: December 1997