Catalogers Group
March 18, 2004

Present: Gia Aivazian, Sharon Benamou, Beth Feinberg, Cheri Folkner (Recorder), Claudia Horning, Laura Horwitz, Janice Matthiessen, Renée McBride, Luiz Mendes, Joan LoPear, Nancy Norris, Louise Ratliff, John Riemer, Angela Riggio, Barbara Rudich, Rita Stumps.


Joan

Joan highlighted several sessions she attended from her report that is in Appendix A of these minutes.

- LCSH Workshop for Music Librarians. There were several speakers. Joan has a copy of Geraldine Ostrove’s presentation if anyone would like to look at it.
- American Music and the Jazz and Popular Music joint Roundtable on “Sondheim on Music: Mark Horowitz’s Video Interview.” She has a copy of his book if anyone would like to look at it.
- Small Academic Libraries/Musical Theatre Roundtable. Nancy Zavac gave a presentation on “The Larry Taylor-Billy Matthews Musical Theater Archive at the University of Miami.” URL of the School of Music is http://www.music.miami.edu/. Raymond White from the Library of Congress presented “There’s a manuscript I’m longing to see: the George and Ira Gershwin Collection at the Library of Congress.”
- Bibliographic Control Committee. Jennifer Bowen from the Eastman School of Music presented “Expressions in our Catalogs? FRBR and AACR2 Chapter 25.” (Renée has a copy of this report.)
- Descriptive Cataloging/Subject Access Subcommittee. Kathy Glennan read the report from ALA/CC:DA Liaison Nancy Lorimer. (Renée has a copy of this report.) There was discussion about the SMD proposals (see Joan’s Report for details).
- Poster presentations by Antonio Calvo and Kathy Glennan.
- MARC Formats/Authorities Subcommittees. A-R Editions presented “Music Cataloging Bulletin Online.” John reported that Andy has sent the IP addresses so that UCLA can have access to this since it only available online.
- Video Roundtable/Performing Arts Roundtable.
- Technical Services Roundtable. Overview session on OCLC’s Connection Client. This wasn’t a hands-on session so how to use the client is still foggy for Joan. Rita reported that she attended a full-day workshop on the client and will be ready to train us when it is time to change the client.
- Film Music Roundtable. Presentation by Leslie Anderson discussed that film scores are typically not published and the difficulties that this presents.

Renée

Renée highlighted several sessions she attended from her report that is in Appendix B of these minutes.

- Metadata Standards Working Group. Renée reviewed the charge of this group and pointed out there is a website on the work the group has completed. (http://unitproj.library.ucla.edu/music/metadata/docs.cfm) Currently the group is looking at existing metadata standards and those elements for which specific
recommendations for music materials would be appropriate. Renée is the lead of the subgroup looking at MODS. The group is also identifying elements for use in metadata applications and Renée will be looking at the contents elements. At the business meeting the group discussed:
  - the International Conferences on Music Information Retrieval and Related Activities which members attended. Librarians need to get in and work with the computer scientist who are moving forward on these.
  - Indiana University’s Variations2 (V2) Project: IU’s Digital Music Library Project (http://www.dml.indiana.edu/index.html). This project may help the music librarians get on track with the computer scientists.
- SAS business meeting. Discussed ideas for future programs.
- Ad-Hoc Recruitment Task Force. This group is focusing on ethnic minority recruitment.

**Sharon**

Sharon took advantage of several opportunities for new attendees: the new attendees reception, the New Members Forum, and the Mentoring Program. The Mentoring Program was quite helpful. She and her mentor corresponded before the conference and introduced her to folks at the reception and throughout the conference. She recommends all groups do this type of program; it made her feel very comfortable and welcome.

Sharon attended several meetings. Some that others haven’t already covered were:
  - Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee. Matthew Wise, outgoing head of the Bibliographic Control Committee and CC:DA member, discussed AACR3 and the JSC’s plan to hire an editor for it.
  - MARC Formats Subcommittee. Discussed ways to make MARC 21 authority records more useful as tools for machine authority processing by adding information to records which indicates more specifically the type of heading represented.
  - Jewish Music Roundtable. Great presentation from Bret Werb on the music resources at the US Holocaust Museum. She has the handouts from the presentation if anyone would like to look at it. There is a tour on the museum’s website http://www.ushmm.org/museum/exhibit/online/music/

**Report on E-Resources Management System Planning Meeting, UC Irvine, Mar. 11-12**

**Angela**

This meeting was for UC campuses and CDL; each sending 3-6 representatives who were involved with e-resources management in some way. Angela and Sharon Farb attended to give presentations on the DLF Initiative. UCLA representatives were John Riemer, Cindy Shelton, Anita Colby, and Steven Schwartz. Angela was impressed by the unity of the campuses as they deal with this issue of e-resources management.

Goals of the meeting were to:
  - Educate participants on ERM issues and systems;
  - Assess state of the ERM tools in use throughout UC and CDL;
  - Identify challenges and priorities for a system to support consortial/campus needs;
  - Review the current state of ERM system planning;
  - Identify ways to move UC ERM planning forward; and
• Identify system-wide needs for ERM.

The first day was all presentations. Presentations covered:
  • Background
  • Innovative ERM product update
  • Systems and models for an ERM tool
  • Review of vendor products/involvement
  • SFX products and capabilities

The second was spent in break-out sessions in which the groups reviewed the draft functional specifications document, established priorities and ranking of features for a system. The priorities were very similar across the campuses.

John
John sees the group looking a three different options for ERM architectures:
  • Each campus has its own ERDb-like database and then the data is merged
  • Have a database that contains only the data that is common throughout the campuses and then each campus add specific campus data
  • Have a single communal database

It is a given that data in an ERM system must be coordinated with an ILS (5 different ones exist in 10 UC campuses). It would be beneficial to avoid the burden of also having to synchronize data across multiple ERMs.

During the meeting, there was much discussion regarding the terms each campus had negotiated for particular e-resource so John thought it would be beneficial to have a single communal database to aid campuses in their negotiations. Other benefits of a single file include knowing what titles are under consideration at other campuses and knowing what troubleshooting steps have already been undertaken elsewhere for a resource experiencing problems locally. Attendees devised a slogan in support of a single file: “One University, one Library, one ERM.”

For the future, it might be that UC uses ERDb as a systemwide tool until there are at least two viable products commercially available for comparison. Dora Loh, co-chair of SCAER with John, will be working at least 35% of her time for ARL by the summer. So the duties of SCAER may move to a system-wide level soon.

Announcements
Cindy Shelton will be meeting with the Catalogers Group on April 1. If anyone has an issue or question that he or she would like addressed, please let John know.

Next Catalogers Group meeting: April 1. [Plans for March 25 changed since this meeting.]
APPENDIX A:
Joan LoPear’s Report

Music Library Association 73rd Annual Meeting, February 11-15, 2004
Crystal Gateway Marriott Hotel, Arlington, Virginia


The presenters were Lynn El-Hoshy, Library of Congress, J. Bradford Young, University of Pennsylvania, and Geraldine Ostrove, Library of Congress. The moderator was Mark McKnight, University of North Texas. I took notes in English, instead of my regular Gregg shorthand so that you could use the white book if you need to. I made a copy of Geraldine’s presentation and placed it in the binder from the URL sent by Linda Blair after the session.

The MLA Opening Reception was that evening from 7-10 pm with Music from Mali with Cheick Hamala Diabate and Bruce Penner, sponsored by Smithsonian Folkways Recordings. The MLA Shop and Exhibits were also open and there was a feeding frenzy around the free CD’s table.

I attended the Thursday, February 12, 2004, 12:30-2:00 American Music and the Jazz and Popular Music joint Roundtable on “Sondheim on Music: Mark Horowitz’s Video Interview”. It was very interesting and I have a copy of his book if you’d like to look at it. Mark is from the Music Division, at the Library of Congress.

The Small Academic Libraries/Musical Theatre Roundtable was from 3:30-5:00 on “The Larry Taylor-Billy Matthews Musical Theater Archive at the University of Miami” by Nancy Zavac from the Music Library there. She mentioned the various versions of My fair lady in English, Spanish, Italian, German, Hungarian, and English and the importance of uniform titles. Their address is: http://www.music.miami.edu/ and their library catalog is: http://ibisweb.miami.edu/ . Then Raymond White from the Library of Congress presented “There’s a manuscript I’m longing to see: the George and Ira Gershwin Collection at the Library of Congress”. It was interesting to see on screen the Rhapsody in blue music score since February 12, 2004 was the 80th anniversary of the first performance of Rhapsody in blue.

On Friday the 13th, we had the beginning of back to back cataloging meetings. Starting at 9:00 am with Bibliographic Control Committee’s powerpoint presentation by Jennifer Bowen from the Eastman School of Music “Expressions in our Catalogs? FRBR and AACR2 Chapter 25.” Once again I made notes in English so that you could look at it is you wish. I thought she gave a very clear outline of FRBR entities, etc.

Then on to the Descriptive Cataloging/Subject Access Open Committee meeting from 10:00-12:00. Nancy Lorimer, the incoming Chair of the Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee was ill,
so Kathy Glennan read Nancy’s report. The CC:DA home page: http://www.al.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/ccda.html with JSC for the revision of AACR home page: http://www.nlm-bnc.ca/jsc/index.htm. Conventional terminology update with an ALA Canadian proposal, addition to SMDs, some ok, a proposed Digital audio tape, DAT-tape. No direction on SMDs that overlapped. MLA’s proposal of new SMDs must be general enough to avoid changes to legacy data. Basic disagreements on rule 6.5C7 and some comments from Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC). Move that ALA NOT approve CDC proposal. Current SMDs will remain; but options need to be added to chapters 6 and 7 with similar wording to that in chapter 9. There should be option for terms in common use like in option 9. “Crisis cataloging” is not good in the world of standards. AACR3 is going to try to devise principles for cataloging rules. Proposal to add systems requirements in chapters that don’t currently require it. Then there is another powerpoint presentation on SACO: an introduction on Who, When, How, Where, & Why Propose Subject Headings for LCSH.

There were poster sessions from 12:30 pm-2:30 pm that attended to take some pictures of presentations by some of our Music Library Association Southern California Chapter. “Consolidated: Arts, Media and Reserve at the California State University, Northridge Library, by Antonio M. Calvo. The “Distance Employment: Pioneering Cross-Country Telecommuting, A Cataloger’s Tale, by Kathy Glennan, University of Southern California. Kathy was one of my interns from UCLA’s library school, and even though she now lives and works in Maryland, she is still our Southern California Chapter’s webmaster because she still catalogs for USC part time telecommuting.

The MARC Formats/Authorities Subcommittee’s Open session was from 1:00-3:00 and Michelle Koth from Yale University and James Zychowicz from A-R Editions presented “Music Cataloging Bulletin Online”. We’re still waiting to obtain the access passwords, etc. here. Other items of interest were the usual complaints that local online systems all have problems with music authority control and ALA only has an “Interest Group” not a “Discussion” group. Unicode planning and implementation at LC with a new “initial” policy (22.11D for initial articles) but my notes give 25.5B which covers conflict resolution for uniform titles. LC said no to author/title cross references to joint authors/composers.

Afterwards (between 3 and 4), I stopped briefly into the Video Roundtable/Performing Arts Roundtable on “Publisher/distributor sources for dance and performance videos” where the main complaint was that the region the video could be played in wasn’t usually included in the cataloging.

Then from 7-9 pm there was the Left Coast Mixer—Pacific Northwest, Northern California, and Southern California Chapters joint meeting.

On Valentine’s Day, Saturday, February 14, 2004 from 10:30-12:00 The Technical Services Roundtable topic was “The Connection Client: An introduction to OCLC’s newest cataloging interface” by Ann Harrison from the Library of Congress.

The Film Music Roundtable from 2-3:30 was presented by Leslie Andersen, California State University, Long Beach, on “Selected Bibliography of Film Music Sources, or, How do I find this
stuff?” First question was what is film music? Score or underscore, background, newly composed or adaptation? It is important to note that film scores are not published, are mainly “work for hire”, and not intended for concert performances. There are LC subject headings for motion picture music; but Sears has none. Film music is classified in LC under M176 Instrumental music for motion pictures and M1527-M1527.2 for Motion picture music. Dewey classes it in 781.542. If a patron comes in asking how to find the score for Lord of the Rings? — the answer is “not available.” Or I want to perform this score with my local symphony — the answer is “not for performance”. However some suites or excerpts might be available for rental. Another question might be “How do I contact John Williams”? Most composers have a web presence but getting an actual contact address might be difficult. Then Leslie introduced Kevin Levin who talked about “Film Music Collections in the Library of Congress.” He mentioned some of the early items, music for silent films, etc. Then he said about 1920 composers started making original scores to accompany motion pictures. He described the possibility of searching the preservation microfilming project of printed cue sheets, etc. and a few other special collections.
APPENDIX B: Renée McBride’s Report

MLA Report for Catalogers’ Group
March 18, 2004

Cataloging related activities

I. Metadata Standards Working Group

CHARGE: To examine the descriptive, structural, and administrative metadata elements currently being used to control music materials, including, but not limited to, those elements employed in the projects identified by the International Music Metadata Projects Working Group; formulate a schema of required elements for music metadata applications, along with recommendations for their standardized use; develop "best practices" with regard to the use of, extension of, and/or transmission of data between the new schema and the other major metadata schemas; by May 2005.

We’ll try to incorporate all types of music, not just Western art.

MEMBERS:
Stephen Davison, Chair (University of California-Los Angeles)
Antonio Calvo (CSUN)
Marcelyn D’Avis (University of Colorado at Boulder)
Brad Eden (University of Nevada, Las Vegas)
Ralph Hartsock (University of North Texas)
Harriette Hemmasi (Indiana University)
Constance Mayer (Harvard University)
Renee McBride (University of California-Los Angeles)
Clay Redding (Princeton University)
Lois Schultz (Duke University)

Variety of experience in cataloging, public service, digitization, and computer science.

WHAT WE’VE DONE SO FAR:
Website (Stephen): http://unitproj.library.ucla.edu/music/metadata/docs.cfm

Music Library Association
Metadata Standards Working Group
Action Plan
2/23/04

Charge (1): To examine the descriptive, structural, and administrative metadata elements currently being used to control music materials, including, but not limited to, those elements employed in the projects identified by the International Music Metadata Projects Working Group.

Action items:
Identify metadata elements of the following standards for which specific recommendations for music materials would be appropriate:

MODS (Metadata Object Description Schema) (Renée, Ralph, Marcy, Lois, Brad)
Dublin Core (Brad, Marcy, Antonio, Stephen, Harriette)
EAD (Encoded Archival Description) (Lois, Clay, Marcy, Stephen)
MPEG (Moving Picture Experts Group) (Clay, Stephen)
METS (Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard) (Stephen, Clay, Brad, Connie)

For each element:

Describe issues that are specific to music materials
Identify vocabularies where appropriate
Recommendations re content

Also, provide a brief account of:

The purpose of the metadata standard
General issues relating to music materials that seem to present themselves

NOTE: MODS = The Library of Congress' Network Development and MARC Standards Office, with interested experts, has developed a schema for a bibliographic element set that may be used for a variety of purposes, and particularly for library applications. As an XML schema, the "Metadata Object Description Schema" (MODS) is intended to be able to carry selected data from existing MARC 21 records as well as to enable the creation of original resource description records. It includes a subset of MARC fields and uses language-based tags rather than numeric ones, in some cases regrouping elements from the MARC 21 bibliographic format.

I've subscribed to the MODS listserv and am reading about MODS and metadata in general. After covering reasonable ground on my own, plan to contact a couple of people with experience in MODS and music.

Charge (2):

Formulate a schema of required elements for music metadata applications, along with recommendations for their standardized use

Action items:

Identify the appropriate elements for use in music metadata applications using the following general categories:

Title elements (Connie, Marcy)
Creator elements (Antonio)
Content elements (Renée)
Format elements (Marcy)
Analytical elements (Ralph)
Subject analysis
Genre analysis
Other?
Structural elements (Harriette, Connie, Stephen)
Other descriptive elements
Rights, responsibilities, etc. (Stephen)
Construct recommendations re content, vocabularies, etc.

**NOTE:** So far, I’ve come up with the following MARC fields (my starting place for thought) as being related to content elements. I decided the 300 (publication info) is really a descriptive element.

500: Any general notes having to do with content
501: "With" or "Issued with" note
504: Note about bibliography, filmography, discography, webliography
505: Contents note
520: Summary note
521: Target audience
700 _2: Personal name added entry (ae)
710 _2: Corporate name ae
711 _2: Conference name ae
730 _2: Uniform title ae
740 _2: Uncontrolled title ae

The above added entries are used when the item being described contains the work that is represented by the added entry.

Charge (3):

Develop "best practices" with regard to the use of, extension of, and/or transmission of data between the new schema and the other major metadata schemas

Action items: Deferred until the second half of 2004!

**AT OUR BUSINESS MEETING:**

ISMIR (The International Conferences on Music Information Retrieval and Related Activities), Baltimore, Oct. 2003: 4 people attended; saw lots of projects directed by computer scientists, not librarians; were concerned that computer scientists don’t understand how people search for music, e.g. they don’t just hum a tune, they ask questions about, say, different editions. Music librarians need to follow what computer scientists are doing in the field of music metadata.

Harriette Hemmasi reported on Indiana University’s Variations2 (V2) Project: IU’s Digital Music Library Project: [http://www.dml.indiana.edu/index.html](http://www.dml.indiana.edu/index.html). New way of accessing IU music library’s collection (very incomplete at this point); currently contains ca. 262 recordings and 20 scores. With the newest release of Variations2, version 2.1.1, you can:

- search for music by entering such search criteria as the name of a work, a performer’s name, the key of a work, or preferred media format;
- bookmark places within a recording or online score and reuse those bookmarks next time you run Variations2;
- export your bookmarks to a web page from which you can link directly to a spot in a recording or score;
- view online scores as you listen;
• analyze musical form using "bubble diagrams" with the Timeliner tool;
• select a measure number and simultaneously listen to audio and view the correct score page within the Opus Window;
• experience audio playback over lower-bandwidth connections, e.g., 56kb.

Went through V2 elements, giving us a good starting point for our thinking and work. Their basic question, as is our group’s: What do we want to know about every work? A V2 record allows for good scholarly research.

II. Descriptive Cataloging/Subject Access Subcommittee (SAS) session

Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee report (given by Kathy Glennan)
I have a copy of Kathy’s notes if you’re interested. Mentions changes/issues in cataloging rules affecting music.


III. FRBR and AACR2 Chapter 25 (Jennifer Bowen, Eastman School of Music)
Didn’t attend, but have handouts if you’re interested.

IV. SAS business meeting (my last after 4 years on subcommittee)
Discussed SAS-planned preconference at LC about music subject cataloging. I was sorry to miss it after having served on subcommittee, but had to be at board meeting.

Ideas for future programs:
* music and moving images/subject access to music in film
* music classification
* FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology) as applied to music; a simplified LCSH-based vocabulary; simplified syntax makes LCSH easier to understand, control, apply, and use; compatible with LCSH; info on OCLC site at: http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/fast/default.htm; FAST authority file is available on OCLC website: http://fast.oclc.org/.
Faceting = deconstructing: e.g.
Architecture, Modern $y 20th century $z United States $v Bibliography.

becomes

4 FAST headings:
Architecture, Modern
United States
1900-1999
Bibliography

Don’t have to understand how to string together elements of LCSH.

I have an article about it if you’re interested.
Non-cataloging related activities

I. As board member-at-large, serve as liaison in several capacities: to program committee for next year’s meeting; to roundtable coordinators; to committee planning special events for 2006 meeting, which is MLA’s 75th birthday; to statistics subcommittee about administering a survey to the MLA membership.

II. Ad-Hoc Recruitment Task Force (member as a result of having served as placement officer from 2001-2003)

CHARGE: To effect greater visibility of the Association, recruitment and outreach to under-represented populations, including younger people involved with or interested in music librarianship, and people involved in parallel or similar activities.

Focused on ethnic minorities, and hoping to establish a scholarship fund. Need to reach out early on to high school/college students about music librarianship as a career option. Use MLA chapters to broaden our reach; are already 3 chapters with programs in place for sending members to library schools. (Our group is awfully white.)

III. Last year as liaison to the International Alliance for Women in Music. Enjoyable aspect has been writing the summaries of the Women and Music Roundtable for the MLA Newsletter and IAWM Journal.

IV. Tourism! Banquet! Dancing! Friends! Fun!