Southern Illinois University Carbondale
OpenSIUC

Articles | Morris Library

2009

Music Score Approval Plans in Research Libraries: A Survey of Librarian Satisfaction With and Without Approval Plans

Elizabeth J. Cox
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, bcox@lib.siu.edu

Roger Cross
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, rcross@lib.siu.edu

John Ballestro
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, jballestro@library.tamu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/morris_articles
Article published in: Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services v. 33, no. 2-3 (2009): 80-94. Available online at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lcats.2009.08.011

Recommended Citation
Cox, Elizabeth J.; Cross, Roger; and Ballestro, John, "Music Score Approval Plans in Research Libraries: A Survey of Librarian Satisfaction With and Without Approval Plans" (2009). *Articles.* Paper 31.
http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/morris_articles/31

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Morris Library at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

Music Score Approval Plans in Research Libraries:

A Survey of Librarian Satisfaction With and Without Approval Plans

by

Elizabeth J. Cox
Special Formats Cataloger, Assistant Professor
bcox@lib.siu.edu

Roger Cross
Collection Development Librarian (Humanities), Assistant Professor
rcross@lib.siu.edu

John Ballestro
Acquisitions Librarian, Assistant Professor
jballest@lib.siu.edu

Southern Illinois University Carbondale[i]

ABSTRACT. In this study, the researchers submitted a music score approval plan survey to all ARL libraries. Two surveys were created, one for libraries with music score approval plans, one for those without. Forty-four surveys were returned. The authors' purpose was to analyze and discuss the survey results, incorporating elements of the scholarly work preceding this study. Discussions, roundtables, and listservs participated in by music librarians over the years formed the basis of the topic at hand. The goal was to ascertain whether these discussions and underlying assumptions of approval plans held true to the real world.

INTRODUCTION

Whether you love or loathe them, music score approval plans[ii] have been around for over fifty years as one of the major selection tools for Music Librarians. In spite of the longevity of approval plans, the adoption of such a plan is by no means universal or even dominant among libraries collecting scores. Indeed, anecdotal antipathy expressed by many music librarians was one of the motives for conducting this survey. We wondered if feelings really ran so strongly pro- or anti- approval plans. Were the opinions expressed reflective of actual experience with approval plans? Furthermore, did they reflect a budgetary striation whereby large institutions could afford the luxury of collecting everything, while schools with smaller budgets could not afford to opt into a system that might produce a surplus of marginal materials? Using a search-engine metaphor, were there simply too many “false returns” with an approval plan for a small budgeted school to absorb?

UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

We started with a set of working assumptions and hypotheses at the beginning of this study. Our literature review includes a variety of scholarly works dealing with approval plans that were essential to understanding the issues. But, we also were aware of an underlying, though anecdotal, discussion among music librarians about the benefits or drawbacks of having such a plan. It became our intention, therefore, to construct a survey that would incorporate elements of the scholarly work preceding this study with a set of questions informed by the discussions, roundtables, and listservs participated in by music librarians over the years.

One of our first assumptions was that there would be a correlation between the size of the library and the library's budget with the use of an approval plan. One could very well assume that a music library that had an extensive budget and a building separate from the main library would have a larger staff that used approval plans to ensure completeness of their holdings.

Another assumption that we pressed in the survey was the role of music department[iii] faculty in the decision-making process. We suspected that libraries having an approval plan would reflect a lesser need for faculty input or, conversely, those without an approval plan would have a closer working relationship in which library faculty shared more direct responsibility within the music department itself. We also suspected that those without an approval plan might be more dependent on music faculty requests, especially as the department evolved over the years.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on general monograph approval plans in general is vast and has been covered quite well by previous authors. In comparison, however, very little has been written about music score approval plans. In 1985 Michael Keller (1985, p. 160) noted, "As a means of providing the titles that most research libraries will need and of minimizing work in a time of increasing workloads but decreasing staff availability, approval plans and/or blanket orders, particularly for printed music, should be considered." In contrast, Stephen Luttmann (2004, p. 14) suggests that the selector should be cautious when establishing profiles for music score approval plans "when

they are less than certain that their collection is already reasonably balanced with regard to patron demand and, when applicable, curricular requirements."

Unlike the previous authors, R. Michael Fling (2004, p. 124) does not provide a direct opinion about approval plans. In discussing how approval plans can be justified, he states, "In music collections … the available music expertise is spread too thin to devote the many hours per week necessary to develop a collection and to provide music reference service, catalog new scores and recordings, train and oversee staff and part-time employees, maintain the playback equipment, and so forth."

As we have stated, most of the literature on approval plans applies to books. However, much of the information provided can also be applied to music scores, in particular the pros and cons of using approval plans. Some of the pros are the following:

- Once the profile is set, the approval plan saves the time and effort of the selector and the acquisitions staff.[iv]
- New publications are available more quickly.
- The approval plan provides systematic coverage.

Some of the cons are the following:

- The approval plan requires a lot of work by the selector, the collection development librarian(s), and the acquisition librarian to establish and maintain the profile.
- The library gives up selection for efficiency.
- The collection can get unbalanced.

With budgets decreasing and staffing stagnant or decreasing, each library must decide whether the pros outweigh the cons for their institution.

METHODOLOGY

The authors created two surveys to determine usage of approval plans specifically for music scores, one survey for those libraries that do use approval plans and one for those that do not. Utilizing a standard web-based input form, including standard radio buttons, check boxes, and text blocks, responses were gathered in the Southern Illinois University Instructional Support Services' survey generator, provided under open-source licensing by Virginia Tech University.[v] We used a combination of the expertise of the authors (a collection development librarian, an acquisitions librarian (both with approval plan experience), and a catalog librarian with a music background) in determining the necessary questions. These questions were divided into 6 general areas: demographics (size of institution, budget, etc.), relationship with music department, general approval plan, benefits of having or not having an approval plan, pragmatics of approval plan and/or selection, and specific vendor questions. The survey questions can be found in the appendix.

In May 2008, members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) were contacted via e-mail with a request to participate in the survey. The e-mail, with a link to both surveys, was distributed to 115 individuals. The individuals who received the e-mail were one of the following as identified on each institution's web site: Music Department liaison or music subject specialist, Music librarian, or Collection Development librarian.

WHAT APPROVAL PLANS OFFER

Before turning to the survey results, it would be useful to clarify who the major music score vendors are and what services and selections they provide. Much like monograph approval plans, each company has its unique strengths and emphasis, but for music scores the distinct nature of coverage tends to be more pronounced than that found among well-known book vendors. Music score approval plan vendors in this study were limited to three major companies. This is not to suggest other approval plan vendors do not exist or lack worth, but for music score approval plans there are three that remain at the top of the field. Harrassowitz, with its headquarters in Germany, has become the major supplier of European music scores, while Theodore Front serves as the major proprietor of North American music scores. The other major distributor of scores, J.W. Pepper and Sons, offers a balance between European and North American scores while including a wider spectrum of music genres including jazz, world, and even rock music. Each approval plan service has unique features while sharing a similarity in purpose if not in area of coverage.

Though limited to music produced outside of the Americas, Harrassowitz's geographic distribution and level of refinement is impressive. It is possible to limit selection through the profile to only music from a particular area, such as France. Refinements can be made to receive only trio works or works that prominently feature keyboards, flute, or perhaps viola. Further refinements of the profile could even stipulate that the works sent by the vendor have never been publicly performed. On the other hand, it is equally possible for a library to open its profile so that it will include all works and critical editions of a particular composer.

One is immediately struck, when viewing their offered selections, at the depth and breadth of coverage Harrassowitz offers, while at the same time allowing extensive refinements that would restrict selections to very specific types of scores received. If the completeness and thoroughness of music holdings from those regions listed above is an important goal to a library, then Harrassowitz would be the obvious choice. If narrowness of selection to specific regions, time periods, forms, etc. of music is the goal, then Harrassowitz offers the tools that hopefully will produce the desired results.

In a similar way, what Harrassowitz offers for European collectors, Theodore Front does for the Americas. They describe their website as being the "primary resource for the serious musician, institution, and music lover."[vi] In addition to their general search engine and menus for book subjects and score instrumentation, they also provide a separate search engine specifically for women composers.

Meanwhile, J.W. Pepper and Sons, while not offering such catalog depth, does offer a greater overview of locations and styles. The distinguishing characteristic of Pepper is that they offer an approval/blanket order plan. They focus primarily on North American music and offer the flexibility of including in ones' profile both contemporary composers (post-1900), early composers (pre-1900), and popular music (Broadway, folk, western, rock, etc.).[vii]

The dilemma of all approval plans is that, while they can be created to ensure broadness and coverage depth to satisfy the institution's interest, the process of refining selection to specifics is problematic. While it is certainly possible to set up exacting criteria to ensure desired results, these results are possible only after a potentially long

period of initializing and fine-tuning. Not only must a profile be set up, which can be time consuming, but then the profile must be adjusted according to the ”returns” the profile generates. Furthermore, once established the profile will continue generating results based on the established criteria, even if the interests or needs of the receiving institution evolve in a completely different direction than when the plan was originated. The only way to ensure continuing relevant results is to periodically revisit and revise the selection criteria used to generate results. Once more, this adds time to the process.

The necessity of profiling and fine-tuning music score approval plans is even greater and more complex than the monograph approval plan. This is due to a number of factors among which is the endless varieties and versions of scores available for the same composition, especially for the works that have passed into public domain and have had centuries of performances and studies associated with them. The multiplicity of scores is driven by the emphasis sought from the work according to the needs and emphasis of the receiving institution.

An example might be useful to clarify this situation. Theodore Front offers Aaron Copland’s *Appalachian Spring Suite*. This work was originally written as a ballet for 13 instruments (*Ballet for Martha)*, then scored as an orchestral piece, but this does not exhaust the possibilities. Front also offers *Appalachian Spring Suite: Transcribed For Solo Piano* by Bryan Stanley [New York: Boosey & Hawkes, 2007. ISBN: 1423454766] which states that “Copland originally composed this Suite for chamber ensemble, and also arranged it for orchestra. This piano version is based on both, but follows the musical form of the orchestral version.” Front also offers *Suite From Appalachian Spring, In Six Movements : Transcribed For Violin And Piano* by Bryan Stanley [New

York: Boosey & Hawkes, 2007. ISBN: M051105250]. There are also selections such as *Variations On A Shaker Melody : From Appalachian Spring*, arranged for piano, 4 hands. The latter work itself is also offered as a "band arrangement."

This is just a minor example of the available permutations for a composition and does not include issues of score format or size (is it to be played or studied), annotations, critical editions or facsimiles, all of which may be offered by and received as part of a music score approval plan.

SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

General

Survey responses were received from 44 individuals, a return of 38%. Twenty-four respondents used an approval plan at the time of the survey, while 20 did not.

Libraries with an approval plan

The majority of these libraries (71%) have their music scores located in a music library outside of the main library. The remaining libraries house their collections in either the main library or in a music library within the main library. The majority of these institutions (96%) have only 1-2 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff involved in music score selection. Eighty-eight percent of these libraries have more than 30,000 scores titles in their collection and spend over $10,000 annually on scores. (Tables 1, 2) All respondents order over 150 scores titles per fiscal year.

These libraries also rely on faculty requests (100%) and collection development or liaison suggestions (88%). Some noted other sources of recommendations, such as patron requests and publishers' catalogs. Respondents were asked how important it is

for their institution to receive critical analyses, introductions, and other elements of interpretation along with the scores. For those with an approval plan, 88% responded *important, very important,* or *essential*.

Libraries that currently have an approval plan were asked some basic questions about their approval plans. Seventy-five percent of these libraries have had an approval plan for seven years or more. When asked what percentage of their total score budget is used by the approval plan, 21% responded over half and 4% responded with 10% or less. The remainder was divided almost evenly between 11% and 50%. The libraries were also asked if they believed their approval plan meets the needs of their faculty and students. While the majority (88%) replied *yes*, 13% replied that it did not meet their needs. (Table 3) The following are some of the comments of those who replied *yes*:

- "Approval plan catches new publications that otherwise might be missed by the subject selector."
- "We worked closely with the faculty when developing our profiles."
- "Covers contemporary authors thoroughly."

Some of the comments of those who replied *no*:

- "We receive too many obscure contemporary composers whose works never get checked out."
- "The profiles haven't been kept aligned with School of Music priorities."
- "The approval plan cannot always be finessed to meet our needs."

Libraries were also asked if they use more than one approval plan vendor and why. All but one use more than one vendor. Some responses:

- "Lack of availability from one vendor of all needed materials."

- “For the best coverage possible of music of all periods, countries.”
- “One for North American Publishers and one for European Publishers.”

Libraries without an approval plan

Forty-five percent of libraries without an approval plan house their scores in the main library while 45% are housed in a music library in another building. The remaining 10% house their scores in a music library within the main library or in a branch library. Comparable to those with an approval plan, the majority of libraries (95%) without an approval plan have only 1-2 FTE staff involved in collection development. Libraries without an approval plan have a much wider range in the size of their scores collection: 50% have less than 30,000 titles and 50% have over 30,000. The size of their budget is also split: 55% spend less than $10,000 per year, while 45% spend over $10,000. (Tables 4,5) Thirty-five percent of these respondents purchase fewer than 150 titles per fiscal year, and 65% purchase over 150. These respondents were also asked what they consider the most important element for selecting scores at their library. One half chose a balance of coverage (i.e. composer, time period, country, etc.) and flexibility, while the other half chose complete flexibility in which they receive materials from a wide range of time periods and multiple genres.

Of those libraries without an approval plan, 85% rely on both faculty requests and collection development or liaison suggestions. Some other noted sources include The Music Library Association’s *A Basic Music Library* (2007), standing orders, publisher’s catalogs, and student requests. Seventy percent of libraries without an approval plan

responded *important*, *very important*, or *essential* when asked about receiving critical analyses, introductions, and other elements of interpretation with scores.

Relationships with Music Department and Faculty Requests

Constructive working relationships between library faculty and staff and the university's music department play a significant role in determining bibliographic instruction, research schemas, and collection development. Even though approval plans for music scores can be a narrow focus, those with an approval plan and those without seem to agree that communication and respect need to go both ways in order to make the right choice for the library's score collection.

Libraries with an Approval Plan

The working relationship between the library and the music department appears to be solid with 96% of the respondents rating their interactions *average, good,* or *excellent*. Although the portion of score purchases that come from faculty requests is small, the respective requests are deemed a high priority.

Based on our survey results, this relationship is heavy on the front end when creating or tweaking the approval plan profile, and most faculty are interested in the composer aspects of the plan. Almost two-thirds of the respondents with an approval plan say teaching faculty have had input on approval plan profiles. However, more than one comment focused on faculty being too narrow in their view, focusing on their own areas of expertise and interest and not a comprehensive multi-disciplinary view. One comment made to help foster a relationship between faculty and the library was to take the approval plan profile over to newly hired faculty, discuss their needs, and leave the

door open for more communication. One can infer from these comments that while faculty input is essential, it can lean toward self interest within their own expertise rather than collecting for a broader perspective.

Once the profile is set, the relationship drops off considerably. Out of the 24 respondents who had an approval plan, not a single one had faculty review the materials. The reasons were multi-faceted, but the main comment was, “That’s a librarian’s job.” Other main concerns raised were time and logistics. Eight out of the twenty-four comments mentioned that reviewing materials was not high on the music faculty’s list of priorities and that they had no time throughout the year to come in on a consistent basis. Several respondents mentioned that collections were processed away from the main libraries, and the areas for review were within staff only areas of the library that might compromise the security of library materials.

While the relationship appears to be solid between the music department and library faculty and staff, 83% said that having an approval plan makes them less dependent on the faculty. However, the results were evenly split when asked if an approval plan serves as a better selecting guide than faculty requests, referencing the comments that faculty may be too narrow and self absorbed in making a request for their own area/expertise. The data only allow for an educated guess, though, as those who answered that approval plans make better selectors had not collected data or statistics to support this conclusion. Librarians, however, can take advantage of individual faculty members’ needs by supplementing the approval plan with firm orders to achieve a balanced and well-rounded collection.

Libraries without an Approval Plan

Libraries that do not carry an approval plan seem to have the same level of communication and relationships with the university faculty as libraries with approval plans, with 95% of the respondents rating the closeness as *average, good,* or *excellent*. The weight placed on a faculty request is just slightly lower with 90% of the respondents saying they place a high priority on or automatically purchase everything the music faculty request. One possible reason for the slight downturn is the average budget for those without a plan is lower, and they may be forced to turn down more requests and be more selective in their purchases.

The data show that not having an approval plan makes a library more dependent on faculty requests. Fifty percent of the libraries without an approval plan rely more on faculty requests, as opposed to 17% of those with an approval plan. However, both groups agree that there is no need for faculty to review the scores before they are added to the collection; 85% of those without an approval plan said faculty do not need to come in and view the incoming materials. As a side note, there was no animosity toward faculty reviewing materials. Some comments mentioned that if teaching faculty happened to be in the building when new scores arrived, they showed an interest in perusing the new acquisitions.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents were confident that their selection methodology meets the broad needs of the music department and university in general. While most are confident in what they are buying, 55% seem to want more avenues in which to purchase. Why is this? Unfortunately our survey did not ask for further

clarification but we can surmise a few areas of concern from the comments: lack of vendor choices, budget, and time. While the three major companies may cover most scores in their profiles, the lack of competition could create a black hole in web interface technology, profiling, and customer service. The budget could constrict a librarian's ability to order scores that continue to supplement the strengths of a collection and bolster the weaknesses. With one to two faculty and/or staff dedicated to score collection, there may not be adequate opportunities to perform a collection analysis to even identify what their respective collection's strengths and weaknesses truly are.

Vendor Issues

Libraries with Approval Plan

As mentioned above, the two major players in the music score approval world are Harrassowitz and Theodore Front. Harrassowitz generally is the foreign provider, while Front handles domestic items. J.W. Pepper, on the other hand, is used by 38% of libraries as they try to encompass and deliver U.S., European, and world music. All but one respondent who have an approval plan use more than one vendor for better coverage. Only one library who responded carries a third vendor.

Once a library has chosen a vendor, they usually stay with them; 19 out of 24 (79%) have never changed a vendor. The survey suggests that the majority of those who are satisfied with their approval plan have also maintained this relationship for over ten years. This is either the result of long term collection assessment consistency or periodic review and revision of the institution's profile. Those who have changed cite

three reasons: poor service, lack of materials, and the need for a solid database in which to browse materials.

Libraries without Approval Plans

Most of those without an approval plan would like to stay that way (70%); the two main reasons are flexibility and budget. Without a large enough budget, approval plans become ineffective, which in turn means more time devoted to tweaking and narrowing the profiles. Having an approval plan does take away some of the guess work in core selection, but most feel that their budget does not allow for unwanted materials that may show up in the plan. Faculty requests do take a high priority so money needs to be set aside for that necessity. Most want to ensure completeness and comprehensiveness that only firm ordering can accomplish. Libraries that are pondering a move to approval plans state time as the major factor. As staff numbers diminish, there are fewer staff or faculty hours dedicated to a narrower focus such as music scores, and these respondents believe that approval plans can save them time and allow them to move on to other projects.

The Approval Plan Decision

Libraries with an approval plan

Considering the extensive catalogs and the richness of coverage each approval plan vendor offers, one could *prima fasciae* assume choosing to have an approval plan would stem from the desire for completeness. After all, with the appropriate profile in place, the librarian can be sure that all works of interest to the music department will arrive in a timely fashion. Nonetheless, the majority of respondents cited time as the

primary advantage for having an approval plan. (Table 6) Actually, this might not come as such a surprise since, as noted before, the majority of users spend over $10,000/year on scores and order over 200 scores each year while maintaining a staff of no more (and probably less) than two FTE selectors. This finding is also borne out by the rating of answers to the question “What are the advantages to having an approval plan?” The answer “staff time saved” was noted as *very important* to *essential* by 87% of the respondents. When given the chance to describe the one benefit above all others, time was the major factor in 8 of the 13 comments. The comments in this field are equally telling and suggest that the score selectors not only have many other duties but also find themselves stretched thin. Comments included: “…we only have one music librarian responsible for many other responsibilities besides collection development” and “not only does it save me time doing selection but it saves Acquisitions a huge amount of time.” One respondent wrote, “I cannot imagine a librarian who has enough free time not to have an approval plan” and directly tied approval plans to other time saving procedures by adding “that is like saying subscriptions or standing orders are not necessary.”

Yet the idea that completeness of coverage as the primary advantage of approval plans is still apparent when time as a factor is removed, and the discussion centers solely on the question of which is preferred, completeness or flexibility. In this regard, completeness is the selected advantage over either balance or flexibility, which is noticeably different from those without an approval plan. Other surprising results were that, in terms of having an approval plan, cost savings, return policy, and ease of use, though important, are rated lower on the survey than time and completeness.

This raises the issue of approval plan disadvantage and dissatisfaction with approval plan results. Respondents were almost universal in answering *yes* when asked if they are satisfied with their approval plan and answering *no* when asked if they are considering discontinuing their approval plan. However having a plan has its own disadvantages. First, it is evident that having an approval plan often requires having more than one approval plan – an unremarkable finding when the two major providers have such geographic striation. Since each plan would require its own profile and maintenance, significant time and input would be required for each provider. Of the responders who commented on the disadvantages of approval plans, two factors dominate. On the one hand approval plans were often faulted for being inflexible, sometimes leading to “missing important items” because they do not fit into standard profiles, while on the other hand, and by far the greater demonstrated concerns, was the inclusion of “obscure” or “marginal” works that never will be used, or the frequent arrival of duplicate items. While profile management should minimize the number of obscure or marginal works and duplicates, there will always be some that slip through, requiring someone to continually monitor and fine-tune the profile.

Theoretically each of these disadvantages could be rectified through profile adjustments, but some users suggested this was not always possible because “the approval plan cannot always be finessed to meet our need.” It is easy to imagine that the more specific the needs of a library the harder the task might be especially when there is the need to target different area groups with a varied selection of works. One responder complained that such exactness “would be almost impossible to achieve with an approval plan.” Yet even with these disadvantages plans in place were retained,

perhaps because when time is such an important factor in the decision to adopt an approval plan, unresolved dissatisfaction can be attributed to a cost analysis of time/effort versus the reception of unneeded scores.

Libraries without an approval plan

It is obvious that institutions which do not have an approval plan have complete flexibility in their score selection, and among responders who do not have an approval plan, this is indeed the greatest perceived benefit cited, even though the use of approval plans would be within their budgetary means. One responder summed up this point best when s/he defined the greatest benefit of not having an approval plan as ”completeness – ability to select titles that most reflect interests/needs at our institution.”

Flexibility was the most important benefit to institutions without an approval plan or who do not think an approval plan would benefit the library. (Table 7) The two main factors raised in remarks about flexibility were the ability to tailor score selection to the changing interests and needs of the school (“score purchases are sporadic and difficult to predict”) and concerns over budget instability. Therefore the prospect of setting up an approval plan with budgetary uncertainty discourages even those who believe having one is within their means and who see the potential benefit. This cost analysis evaluation is more than monetary since the investment in time required to set up and run a profile will always be a factor in selecting an approval plan. These concerns are only heightened when it is not clear that the library could continue to afford one in the future, or when the approval plan would be perceived as taking up so much of that budget that any future cuts in funding would allow for only the coverage of the approval

scores. Given the option of reducing the work load in the long run by adopting an approval plan or maintaining selectivity with an eye to fiscal uncertainty, most librarians choose to maintain the flexibility or selectivity of not adding an approval plan. This concern, as well as the sense of being flexible towards score selection according to the changing environment of the music department, underscores the comfort most music selectors have in not adding an approval plan.

Future variations on score access

It will be interesting in five or ten years to review the purchasing of music scores and approval plans in light of the growth of digital providers. Already we see increasing availability of online music scores, and the number of scores digitally available will probably grow. A further benefit offered by providers such as Alexander Street Press is the coupling of the score with actual performances of the piece. Users have the potential not only to read but hear a work performed in real time. The comments in the survey show that some librarians are moving in this direction to at least supplement their holdings.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that the issue of “false returns” mentioned in the introduction is not viewed as a dominating focus by the users of approval plans. Indeed, the issue seems more a concern to those without an existing approval plan than to those with one. Most of the responding libraries seemed perfectly comfortable with the results produced by their approval plan, and counted on the plan to ensure relevant coverage of numerous areas and genres. The one area, however, where a library could expect larger numbers

of optional or unwanted items is during the necessary fine-tuning of the approval profile on start-up, or after significant changes in the Music department's interests. Time, then, becomes the dominant determinate of adopting or not adopting an approval plan. Time saved by an approval plan's successful operation is its overwhelming lure by those with plans, since the number of library staff dedicated to score selection does not vary significantly between those with or without an approval plan. Once an approval plan is in place, it generally remains in place for years. Rather than creating profiles from scratch, the selectors have the chance to tweak the existing plan(s) to reflect the changing interests and needs of the music department. The set up and fine-tuning of an approval plan is a major factor in the cost analysis facing any music-selecting librarian without an approval plan who is considering setting up one. With the same number of staff as those with existing approval plans, it is no wonder so many refrain from adopting approval plans. Without question the effort required would impinge on the flexibility of music selectors who cannot afford to drop their daily duties to set up an institutional profile.

Love them. Loathe them. Vendors, relationships with university faculty, physical space, and budget all play important factors when deciding when or how to incorporate an approval plan. One thing is clear; librarians are the ultimate deciders on how their music scores are ordered. For some, approval plans mean time is saved and work that may not necessarily be done can now be completed. For others, approval plans mean inflexibility, loss of control, and the inability to bring in local, obscure, or out of print materials to the collection. No matter what side they sit on, librarians have heeded the

call of “that’s my job” and made steps to assure that the collections are geared towards their patrons’ needs and strengths.

Bibliography

Chapman, L. (2004). *Managing Acquisitions in Library and Information Services* (Rev. ed.). London: Facet.

Ellison, J. W., & Coty, P. A. (Eds.). (1987). *Nonbook Media: Collection Management and User Services*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Fling, R. M. (2004). *Library Acquisition of Music*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Flood, S. (1997). *Evolution & Status of Approval Plans: A SPEC Kit*. Washington: Association of Research Libraries.

Horava, T. (2006). A concurrent pilot project approach to approval plans. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services, 30 (1-2)*, 69-76.

Jacoby, B. E. (2008). Status of approval plans in college libraries. *College & Research Libraries 69 (3)*, 227-240.

Kalyan, S. (2003). Library Materials Budget Allocation Strategy for a Mid-Size Academic Library: A Case Study. *The Acquisitions Librarian 29*, 119-131.

Luttmann, S. (2004). Selection of music materials. In Audrey Fenner (Ed.), *Selecting Materials for Library Collections* (pp. 11-25). New York: Haworth Press.

Keller, M. (1985). Music. In Patricia A. McClung (Ed.), *Selection of Library Materials in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences* (pp. 139-163). Chicago: American Library Association.

Magrill, R. M., & Corbin, J. (1989). *Acquisitions Management and Collection Development in Libraries*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Zager, D. (2007). Essential Partners in Collection Development: Vendors and Music Librarians. *Notes 63 (3)*, 565-575.

Appendix

Survey Questions – *with* an approval plan

Where are your music scores located?

- Main library
- Music library within the main library
- Music library in another building
- Other

Approximately how many titles are in your scores collection?

- 0 – 5,000
- 5,001 – 15,000
- 15,001 – 30,000
- 30,001 – 60,000
- Over 60,000

What is your annual budget for purchasing music scores?

- $0 - $3,000
- $3,001 - $6,000
- $6,001 - $10,000
- Over $10,000

On average, how many scores do you order per fiscal year? (titles)

- 0 – 50
- 51 – 100
- 101 – 150
- 151 – 200
- Over 200

On a scale of 1-5, how close is the working relationship between the Music Liaison/Collection Development Librarian(s) and the Music Department Faculty?

- 1 = Non-existent
- 2 = Poor
- 3 = Average
- 4 = Good

- 5 = Excellent

On a scale of 1-5 what portion of your score purchases come from faculty requests?

- 1 = None
- 2 = Little
- 3 = Half
- 4 = Many
- 5 = All

How do you purchase scores? (please select all that apply)

- Faculty requests
- Approval plan
- Collection development/Liaison suggestions
- Other

On a scale of 1-5, how much weight do you place on faculty requests for music scores?

- 1 = it plays no role in our selection
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 = we automatically buy everything they ask for

On a scale of 1-5, how important is it for your institution to receive critical analyses, introductions, and other elements of interpretation along with scores?

- 1 = Not important
- 2 = Somewhat important
- 3 = Important
- 4 = Very important
- 5 = Essential

How many full-time equivalent (FTE) library faculty and/or staff are involved in music score selection?

- 1-2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- Over 10

Does your library use J.W. Pepper as a music score approval plan vendor?

- Yes
- No

Does your library use Harrassowitz as a music score approval plan vendor?

- Yes
- No

Does your library use Theodore Front as a music score approval plan vendor?

- Yes
- No

If you use another music score approval plan vendor, please provide the name here.

How long have you used an approval plan for scores?

- Less than 1 year
- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10 years or more

What percentage of your total score budget is used by the music scores approval plan?

- 0-10%
- 11-20%
- 21-30%
- 31-40%
- 41-50%
- Over 50%

Do you believe your approval plan meets the needs of your faculty and students?

- Yes
- No

Why or why not?

Do music faculty have, or had in the past, input on the approval plan profile?

- Yes
- No

Why or why not?

Do music faculty review approval scores before they are added to the collection?

- Yes
- No

Why or why not?

Does the library use more than one vendor?

- Yes
- No

If yes, why?

In your experience, having an approval plan saves your library more …

- Time
- Money
- Other

What do you consider the greatest advantage of approval plans?

- Complete coverage of a composer, time period, country, etc.
- Balance of coverage and flexibility
- Complete flexibility in which you receive materials from a wide range of time periods and multiple genres

In your selection of approval plans, consider the next six topics. Please rate these from 1-5 as to what you consider to be the benefits of an approval plans.

- Cost/discounts
- Return policy
- Staff time saved on selections based upon approval plan's institutional profile
- Flexibility: ability to cover a wide range of periods, genres, geography, composers, instrument selections, etc.

- Completeness: ability to specify and limit selection to specific periods, genres, geography, composers, instrument selection, etc.
- Ease of use
    - 1 = Not important
    - 2 = Somewhat important
    - 3 = Important
    - 4 = Very important
    - 5 = Essential

Of the choices listed above is there one benefit that you consider to stand above the rest in importance? If so, please explain.

Do you believe having an approval plan makes you more or less dependent on the music faculty?

- More
- Less

In your experience do you believe approval plans serve as better selecting guides than faculty requests?

- Yes
- No

If you answered yes, have you collected statistics that lead you to this conclusion?

- Yes
- No

Does the music faculty review approval plan scores before they are added to the collection?

- Yes
- No
- Other

What other services do you receive from your vendor(s)?

- Catalog records
- Binding
- Marking (i.e. labelling, barcoding)
- Other

On a scale of 1 to 5, rate your overall experience with your music scores approval plan. If you have more than one approval plan, please use the next question(s) for the others.

- 1 = Extremely dissatisfied
- 2 = Rather dissatisfied
- 3 = Satisfied
- 4 = Very satisfied
- 5 = Extremely satisfied

What has been the greatest disadvantage of a music scores approval plan?

Are you satisfied with your music scores approval plan profile?

- Yes
- No

Are you considering discontinuing your music scores approval plan?

- Yes
- No

If so, why?

Have you at any time changed vendors?

- Yes
- No

If so, why?

Overall, would you recommend the use of a music scores approval plan?

- Yes
- No

Would you be willing to be contacted with further questions? (If yes, please enter your e-mail below.)

Would you like to receive the citation for this article when it is published? (If yes, please enter your e-mail below.)

Additional comments

Survey Questions – *without* an approval plan

Where are your music scores located?

- Main library
- Music library within the main library
- Music library in another building
- Other

Approximately how many titles are in your scores collection?

- 0 – 5,000
- 5,001 – 15,000
- 15,001 – 30,000
- 30,001 – 60,000
- Over 60,000

What is your annual budget for purchasing music scores?

- $0 - $3,000
- $3,001 - $6,000
- $6,001 - $10,000
- Over $10,000

On average, how many scores do you order per fiscal year? (titles)

- 0 – 50
- 51 – 100
- 101 – 150
- 151 – 200
- Over 200

On a scale of 1-5, how close is the working relationship between the Music Liaison/Collection Development Librarian(s) and the Music Department Faculty?

- 1 = Non-existent
- 2 = Poor
- 3 = Average
- 4 = Good
- 5 = Excellent

On a scale of 1-5 what portion of your score purchases come from faculty requests?

- 1 = None
- 2 = Little
- 3 = Half
- 4 = Many
- 5 = All

How do you purchase scores? (please select all that apply)

- Faculty requests
- Approval plan
- Collection development/Liaison suggestions
- Other

On a scale of 1-5, how much weight do you place on faculty requests for music scores?

- 1 = it plays no role in our selection
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 = we automatically buy everything they ask for

On a scale of 1-5, how important is it for your institution to receive critical analyses, introductions, and other elements of interpretation along with scores?

- 1 = Not important
- 2 = Somewhat important
- 3 = Important
- 4 = Very important
- 5 = Essential

How many full-time equivalent (FTE) library faculty and/or staff are involved in music score selection?

- 1-2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- Over 10

In your experience, *not* having an approval plan saves your library more …

- Time
- Money

What do you consider the most important element for selecting scores at your library?

- Complete coverage of a composer, time period, country, etc.
- Balance of coverage and flexibility
- Complete flexibility in which you receive materials from a wide range of time periods and multiple genres

Consider the next six topics. Please rate these from 1-5 as to what you consider to be the benefits of not using an approval plan.

- Cost/discounts
- No need to return unwanted scores that may arise with an approval plan
- No need to rely upon an approval plan's institutional profile
- Flexibility: ability to cover a wide range of periods, genres, geography, composers, instrument selections, etc., without needing to review and return unwanted vendor selections
- Completeness: ability to thoroughly select titles by specific periods, genres, geography, composers, etc., that most reflect the interest and needs of the music faculty at your university
- Complexity of approval plan profiles and potential for unsatisfactory results
    - 1 = Not important
    - 2 = Somewhat important
    - 3 = Important
    - 4 = Very important
    - 5 = Essential

Of the choices listed above is there one benefit that you consider to stand above the rest in importance? If so, please explain.

Do you think an approval plan is within the means of your budget, even though you do not employ one?

- Yes
- No

Why or why not?

Do you believe your selection methods meet the needs of your faculty and students?

- Yes

- No

If you have created a specific score selection profile for your library, who was involved in the creation?

- Library faculty/staff
- Music department faculty
- Both library faculty/staff and music faculty
- Other

Has your institution employed a music scores approval plan in the past?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what were your reasons for discontinuing the plan?

Have you considered or are you currently considering adopting a music scores approval plan?

- Yes
- No

Why or why not?

Do you believe a music scores approval plan would be of benefit to your library?

- Yes
- No

Why or why not?

Do you think that not having an approval plan makes you more or less dependent on the music faculty for purchasing decisions?

- More
- Less

Does the music faculty review selected scores before they are added to the collection?

- Yes
- No
- Other

In your experience do you believe that faculty requests serve as better selecting guides than having an approval plan(s)?

- Yes
- No

On a scale of 1 to 5, how satisfied are you with your library's music score selection?

- 1 = Extremely dissatisfied
- 2 = Rather dissatisfied
- 3 = Satisfied
- 4 = Very satisfied
- 5 = Extremely satisfied

Overall, are you complete satisfied with your current score selection methods?

- Yes
- No

Would you be willing to be contacted with further questions? (If yes, please enter your e-mail below.)

Would you like to receive the citation for this article when it is published? (If yes, please enter your e-mail below.)

Additional comments

---

[i] The authors would like to thank Mickey Soltys and Steve Mitchell for their assistance with data analysis and table creation, and Kitti Canepi, Philip Howze, and Leslie Czechowski for their editing assistance.

[ii] For the remainder of this article, we use the phrase "approval plan" to represent music score approval plans, unless clarification in context is needed. Statements regarding all approval plans or monograph approval plans will be so noted.

[iii] While we use the term "music department," this could also refer to a School of Music within an academic institution.

[iv] Throughout this article, we refer to library "staff." In this situation, we intend this term to encompass all appropriate library employees.

[v] For more information, see: Southern Illinois University Library, "ISS DIY Survey Generator." Southern Illinois University Carbondale. http://lib.siu.edu/departments/iss/surveypanel

[vi] http://www.tfront.com/info/about.php

[vii] http://www.jwpepper.com/sheet-music/servicemenu.jsp