A New Approach to Gift Processing in Music Libraries

Casey A. Mullin

28 April 2008

Gifts in Music Libraries
Why we love them

1) Retrospective collection development
   1) Out of print items
   2) Lacunae in sets and series
2) Replacement and added copies
3) Free to acquire

Gifts in Music Libraries
Why we hate them

1) Space issues

2) The "junk" factor

3) Expectations of donors

   1) Ownership

   2) Representation in library

4) Cost of labor for processing and cataloging

Gifts Processing
The "old" way

1) Inductive method: "start with what you have"
2) Is item desirable
   1) Is it a duplicate?
   2) Is it part of a series?
   3) Is it a good edition?
3) Physical processing
   1) Cataloging
   2) Bindery processing
4) Repeat steps 2 and 3 for *all* items

Gifts Processing
The "new" way

1) Deductive method: "start with what you need"
2) Determining criteria:
    1) Heavily used items
    2) Lost/missing items
3) Use of circulation data to establish benchmarks
4) "Mine" gift collections for high-priority titles
5) Process *only* those titles (at first)
6) Immediate improvement in availability

Peter Brown Collection
The test bed

Peter Brown Collection

The test bed

1) Robust (3,828 items)

2) Diverse (books and scores)

3) High-quality

4) Areas selected for test

    1) Miniature scores (748 items)

    2) Composer biographies (793 items)

Methodology
Circulation data – determining "high priority"

1) Option 1: availability profile over time
2) Option 2: items which have been recalled
3) Option 3: raw circulation data
   1) At least 3 charges
   2) Has circulated since Jan 1, 2007
   3) Is charged to a carrel, Reserves or "Ask staff"
   4) Is lost or missing

Methodology
Applying the data

1) Harvesting the collection

2) Double-checking in Sirsi

3) Earmarking items for priority processing

Results

- Miniature scores
  - 94 items selected (out of 748)
- Composer biographies
  - 219 items selected (out of 793)

Limitations

- Does not account for items *not* held by the library
- Does not assess priority for processing "low-priority" items
- Circulation benchmarks determined impressionistically
- Scalability:
  - Analyzing reports is time-consuming
  - Assumes a large backlog of unprocessed gifts

Conclusion

- Benefits:
  - Badly needed copies will enter the collection right away
  - Data can be used to aid in processing other gift collections
- Questions/comments??
- Thank you!!