1

A Revival of the Music Conspectus: A Multi-Dimensional Assessment for the Score Collection

Katie Lai

Hong Kong Baptist University <katielai@hkbu.edu.hk>

Abstract

With an innovative use of the Music Conspectus, the Hong Kong Baptist University Library conducted a score collection assessment to identify not only the strengths and weaknesses of the collection, but also problems with the choice of score publishers and formats arisen in the acquisitions process. Because of its flexible application, this modified Music Conspectus can be easily adopted by libraries of all sizes and libraries that use any classification system. This article provides detailed description of the techniques used and highlights findings, benefits received and actions done following the project.

Introduction

The Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) is a medium-size public-funded tertiary institution with a full-time student enrolment of around 8,000 and is one of the three universities in Hong Kong that offers music programs. Serving a small student body of around 230 music students of undergraduate and graduate levels, the HKBU Library's music collection contained over 15,000 volumes of scores as of June 2007 in addition to books and audio-visual materials. In order to understand the current situation of the score collection in Western art music published in Western languages, an assessment was conducted between summer 2007 and spring 2008. With an innovative and modified use of the Music Conspectus initially developed by the Research Libraries Group (RLG), the Library was able to identify not only the strengths and weaknesses of the collection, but more importantly, problems with the choice of score publishers and score formats arisen in the selection and acquisitions process. Because of its flexible application, this modified Music Conspectus can be easily adopted by libraries of all sizes and libraries that use any classification system. This article provides detailed description of the preparation, techniques used and findings of the assessment, and highlights the benefits received and actions done following the project.

Collection Background

The score collection of Western art music in the HKBU Library comprises scores in all formats such as full scores, miniature scores, piano reduction scores, solo instrumental parts, etc. With a short collection history of about 50 years, the responsibility of selecting scores lied primarily on the music faculty members who would make decisions on what the Library should acquire based on the faculty's and students' teaching, research, study and performance needs. Faculty members are regularly sent "yellow slips" or approval plan notification slips, publishers' catalogs and new title announcements and will then forward their requests to the Library for placing orders. Consequently, the content of the score collection reflects to a large extent faculty's interests or what were presented to them in publishers' catalogs. Like what Henry, Longstaff and Van Kampen observed, the music areas in which the faculty members are more vocal tend to be better represented in the collection.[1] Also, there has been little input from the Library, and there is no effective approval plan to complement faculty's selection. Hence, the selection process lacks a systematic way to develop the score collection as a whole and is susceptible to holes and gaps in many areas.

Literature Review

Originally developed by the Research Libraries Group (RLG) in the late 1970s, the Conspectus was a tool that gave an overview and a comparison of the existing collections showing where the strengths lied and recording future collecting intensities among the RLG Conspectus participating member institutions.[2] As Ferguson, Grant and Rutstein explained, the goal was to "improve the stewardship of funds through better communication among those building collections to acquire, make accessible, and preserve the world's scholarly production for the national community."[3] By making the collecting activities a coordinated plan, unnecessary duplication of research materials could be avoided such that a larger scope of library materials could be made available to users through the interlibrary loan system.[4] The use of the Conspectus was soon adopted by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in 1983 for its North America

---

[1] Elizabeth Henry, Rachel Longstaff and Doris Van Kampen, "Collection Analysis Outcomes in an Academic Library," *Collection Building* 27, no. 3 (2008): 116.

[2] Nancy E. Gwinn and Paul H. Mosher, "Coordinating Collection Development: The RLG Conspectus," *College & Research Libraries* 44, no. 2 (March 1983): 129.

[3] Anthony W. Ferguson, Joan Grant and Joel S. Rutstein, "The RLG Conspectus: Its Uses and Benefits," *College & Research Libraries* 49, no. 3 (May 1988): 199.

[4] Jim Coleman, "The RLG Conspectus: A History of Its Development and Influence and A Prognosis for Its Future," *Acquisitions Librarian* 7 (1992): 25.

Collections Inventory Project (NCIP), and later by other regional consortia such as the Library and Information Resources for the Northwest (LIRN) and the New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO).[5] The Music Program Committee of the RLG also began to create the Music Conspectus in the early 1980s, and in 1986, the Music Library Association proposed to use the Music Conspectus to gather information from libraries of all sizes and types to form the National Music Collection database.[6]

Much literature has been published on the topic of the Conspectus methodology. With regard to the Music Conspectus in particular, Gottlieb put together a book titled *Collection Assessment in Music Libraries* which included papers originally presented in the 1991 Music Library Association annual meeting.[7] In it, Davis provided guidelines on evaluating the collection using the Music Conspectus in their METRO project,[8] and Daub wrote a very detailed paper about its application, brief results of and benefits received by various institutions.[9] In Daub's survey, most of the music librarians who had used the Music Conspectus agreed that the Conspectus values had accurately represented their collections. Some indicated that they were able to identify the weak areas in their libraries and help them write their collection development policy, and others opined that knowing the Conspectus values of other peer institutions aided them make justifications for increased funding.[10]

Yet, music librarians also criticized about the challenges in using this assessment tool. In the same survey, Daub revealed that music librarians found the Library of Congress (LC)-based subject lines did "not represent useful categories that would be used in collection evaluation and development" but were only quantitative shelflist measurements that were to give quick overview of the music collections.[11] This argument was also echoed by librarians using the Conspectus in other non-music fields. For example, Wood stated that the LC classification numbers on the Conspectus worksheets failed to embody the total collection,[12]

---

[5] Larry R. Oberg, "Evaluating the Conspectus Approach for Smaller Library Collections," *College & Research Libraries* 49, no. 3 (May 1988): 188.

[6] Jane Gottlieb, ed., *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries* (Canton, MA: Music Library Association, 1994), 2-3.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Elizabeth Davis, "Guidelines for Evaluating Music Collections as Part of a Regional Assessment Plan," in *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries* (see note 6), 25-49.

[9] Peggy Daub, "The RLG Music Conspectus: Its History & Applications," in *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries* (see note 6), 7-24.

[10] Ibid., 18.

[11] Ibid., 20.

[12] Richard J. Wood, "A Conspectus of the Conspectus," *Acquisitions Librarian* 7 (1992): 12-13.

and Oberg also pointed out that the gaps between the LC-based Conspectus lines had made it one of the problems of the Conspectus.[13] In the survey conducted by Munroe and Ver Steeg, their respondents also complained about how imprecise any classification scheme was in their Conspectus studies.[14]

This deficiency of the Conspectus was in fact even more prominent in the music field where music publications are quite unique compared to materials in other disciplines. As Underwood expressed, in the subject of music, "real differences in content do tend to accompany differences in format … [and] the different formats are created and collected for different purposes."[15] Yet, little attempt has been made to examine this aspect in the Music Conspectus. Similarly, Coral argued that the LC classification scheme in the Music Conspectus did not provide the kind of detail that would describe the actual music collecting activities nor would it clarify which composers' works, which editions, which genres, or which periods or geographical areas one collected.[16] So, the Music Conspectus has indeed left many important areas untouched.

Though the use of the Conspectus was quite popular in the 1980s and 90s, many librarians found its conducting laborious and time-consuming. Thus, variations of the Conspectus methods were sprung out. In 1995, White created the "Brief Test" which was designed based on the idea of the Conspectus with the goal to simplify the entire process by assessing only as few as 40 titles selected by subject experts. These 40 titles were grouped into 4 different Conspectus levels (with 10 titles for each level) from level 1 to level 4 (with level 0 "out of scope" and level 5 "comprehensive" excluded) based on the ranking of the holdings counts retrieved in the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC). The library collection was then checked against this final Conspectus value-ranked title list, and the library could claim the highest Conspectus level in which at least 50 percent of the titles were owned. [17]

Later, the "Brief Test" was evolved into the "Coverage Power Test" which was "to test the entire collection of each library against the entire literature" and was

---

[13] Oberg, "Evaluating the Conspectus Approach," 195.

[14] Mary H. Munroe and Jennie E. Ver Steeg, "The Decision-Making Process in Conspectus Evaluation of Collections: The Quest for Certainty," *Library Quarterly* 74, no. 2 (2004): 200.

[15] Kent Underwood, "Developing Supplemental Guidelines for Music: A Case Report," in *Collection Assessment: A Look at the RLG Conspectus*, ed. Wood J. Richard and Katina Strauch (New York: Haworth Press, 1992), 161.

[16] Lenore Coral, "Evaluating the Conspectus Approach: Problems and Alternatives," in *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries* (see note 6), 80.

[17] Howard D. White, *Brief Tests of Collection Strength: A Methodology for All Types of Libraries* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995).

aimed to rectify some issues like the possible inconsistency problem[18] and the sensitivity of results[19] due to the small number of sample titles chosen for each Conspectus level. Instead of having a subject expert prepare the 40-item title list, a list of titles in the "entire literature" of a specific subject were retrieved in OCLC based on a certain call number range and this list would be ranked from high to low according to the holdings counts. Similarly, the same process would be done for a list of titles in the same call number range for the library collection being assessed. Comparisons would then be made between the holdings counts of the "entire literature" and those of the library collection assessed, and the Conspectus values would be assigned to the library collection based on the percentage coverage of the entire literature in the subject.[20]

In recent years, the OCLC has also offered a service called WorldCat Automated Analysis (WCA) which allows libraries to analyze their collections according to size, coverage, publication date, language, format and audience based on the data found in WorldCat. It also facilitates peer comparison with two to five libraries and checks for collection overlap and uniqueness. Because the whole WCA process is automated, librarians with little knowledge in the subject area studied can still easily carry out the assessment, and worries about biases in compiling the core list like those happened in the Conspectus or Brief Test methods are now eliminated.[21]

However, when looking back at the music scene, not much development or application of new assessment tools has been found in recent music literature besides those projects done using circulation statistics, interlibrary loan statistics, or preservation conditions of scores. Although there were heated discussions on the Brief Tests and the WCA, Beals in fact commented that they might be more suitable for monographs than serial or multimedia materials.[22] They are rather impossible to be used in a music score collection. First, since both the Brief Tests and the WCA rely on the accurate reporting of data and holdings in OCLC, libraries who do not have a consistent practice in doing so will find the 2 methods non-feasible. Second, especially for music scores, numerous cataloging records were created for bibliographically-like editions and each has its own OCLC accession number. So, the fact that the WCA performs the analysis by matching

---

[18] Howard D. White, "Better Than Brief Tests: Coverage Power Tests of Collection Strength," *College & Research Libraries* 69, no. 2 (March 2008): 158-159.

[19] Jennifer Benedetto Beals, "Assessing Collections Using Brief Tests and WorldCat Collection Analysis," *Collection Building* 26, no. 4 (2007): 106.

[20] Ibid., 106.

[21] Ibid., 106.

[22] Ibid., 107.

accession number only is prone to produce doubtful results when reporting collection uniqueness and overlap.[23] Third, according to Orcutt and Powell, a lower institutional reporting rate to OCLC was found for videos and other non-book format, thus making the results of the Brief Tests and the WCA less reliable.[24] Fourth, although the WCA does provide such details as the age and language of the collection, this information does not seem to be of too much use as the publication year of scores is often ignored by music users and the fact that scores are usually cataloged as items with "no linguistic content" has also made such language examination meaningless. Music users, on the other hand, are generally more concerned about the edition or the publishers of the score.

Therefore, to overcome the shortcomings of the Music Conspectus and all the other assessment methods, the HKBU Library has created a tool that would allow it to be used in a more comprehensive way when assessing the score collection. By modifying the RLG Music Conspectus and dividing the collection hierarchically, it has facilitated a less complicated application of the Music Conspectus for internal assessment purposes. Furthermore, it is also hoped that this new multi-dimensional approach to music assessment will make librarians re-think the benefits of the Music Conspectus and what it can do while others cannot.

Assessment Preparation

Before commencing the project, many decisions were made with respect to the scope and the methodology.

Defining the scope

Because of the small number of students studying Chinese music in HKBU, the scope of this assessment covered music scores published in Western languages only. Thus, music published in Chinese or other Asian languages was excluded. In addition, only those music categories that the HKBU Music Department mostly needed for its curriculum and research were considered. Hence, wind band music on which the Department did not have an individual course, for instance, was left out in the project. The Complete Editions which are sets of volumes each containing a comprehensive collection of works by specific composers were also treated separately using a simple benchmarking exercise to compare holdings

---

[23] Darby Orcutt and Tracy Powell, "Reflections on the OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis Tool: We Still Need the Next Step," *Against the Grain* 18, no. 15 (November 2006): 44.

[24] Ibid., 44.

against other local academic music libraries and have been excluded from discussion in this paper.

Defining the purpose and choosing the appropriate assessment method

Due to the small collection size and the many collection gaps anticipated, it was deemed not worthwhile and too costly to use the automated evaluation analysis services (e.g., WCA by OCLC). As a result, a Conspectus project was considered. However, unlike the early projects which aimed to obtain an overview of a national collection or to compare holdings among a group of libraries, the assessment conducted this time mainly targeted to comparing the HKBU Library's score holdings against a core list so that the results could serve as an internal guideline for future collection development.

Adopting and Modifying the Music Conspectus

Although many libraries have used the Music Conspectus successfully, it was quite difficult for the HKBU Library to carry out such a task. In the original Music Conspectus, the M schedule of the LC classification for scores was divided into over 50 Conspectus lines according to the subjects for the purpose of comparison and analysis between each music group (see Table 1).[25] Though this LC-based Conspectus was theoretically usable in libraries that used other classification systems, the employment of the Music Conspectus in the HKBU Library which used the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) was not easy. Because of the major revamp of the music section of the DDC in the past years, most of the older scores were not retrospectively re-classified to mirror the changes. So, scores of the same music genre might be classed in different places, making it rather impossible to do the assessment following strictly the classification numbers of the Conspectus lines.

Also with the small score collection size, the meticulous division of the classification schedule in the Music Conspectus was considered to be too complex. Hence, all these lowered its usability.

Nonetheless, the concept of the Music Conspectus was adopted. Rather than splitting up the classification schedule into numerous segments like the original Conspectus did, a few broad music categories were identified instead based on the music types alone, namely "Orchestral," "Concerto," "Chamber music," "Instrumental," "Voice/Choral," "Opera/Musical," and "Anthology." Each music

---

[25] Gottlieb, *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries,* 82-84.

8

category was then subdivided by the music genre (see Table 2). For instance, under the "Orchestral" category, it was further broken up into "Symphonies," "Overtures, suites, tone poems, etc.," "String & chamber orchestra," and "Ballet." Then, for some music genres that were especially important to the HKBU music users, they were split further into smaller subjects according to their instrumentation or ensemble type (see Table 3) in order to allow for a more refined analysis. By using this strategy, the application of the Conspectus was not bound by the classification system or the call number attached to the score, but was based on the genre of the music itself. Therefore, not only could this modified Music Conspectus be used in non-LC libraries, this could also solve the problems caused by the inconsistent use of the classification numbers as a result of the re-design of the classification schedule.

Once the framework of the modified Music Conspectus was completed, the Western score collection was checked against a core list. Two numerical values from the scale of 0 to 5, with 0 being "out of scope" and 5 being "comprehensive level," were assigned to each music genre assessed. The first value was the Existing Collection Strength (ECS) which described the collection level of a particular portion of the collection at the time of assessment, and the second value was the Desired Collecting Intensity (DCI) which indicated the desirable level which the collection should ultimately achieve to adequately support users' needs. While the scores of the ECS were assigned by the music liaison librarian, the DCI scores were given by a music faculty member who was the conductor of the university orchestra and was one of the people overseeing the performance activities in the Music Department. By involving a faculty member, this enabled the Library to gather a more objective opinion about how the collection should develop from an expert who worked with music students and professors on a daily basis and knew their musical needs the best.

Compiling the Core Title Lists and Checking Holdings

Similar to other assessment projects, a core title list was compiled based on standard bibliographies such as *A Basic Music Library: Essential Scores and Sound Recordings* (BML) published by the American Library Association in 1997[26] and other sources including audition lists of major music schools or professional orchestras, repertoire requirements of important international music competitions, and curriculum and course syllabus. The music faculty was also consulted and a list of the major works of 38 contemporary composers was as a result added to complement the core list to ensure an adequate coverage of

---

[26] A new edition (the 4th edition) of the *Basic Music Library* is currently being compiled and should provide a more up-to-date listing of repertoire essential to building a music collection.

contemporary and 20th century music in the assessment. The Western score holdings were then checked against this core list by the music liaison librarian or a part-time student worker studying in the Music Department.

More than a Conspectus Exercise: Publisher and Format Evaluation

While many Conspectus studies primarily or solely involved a yes-or-no title check against a core list or the holdings of other institutions, the HKBU Library has further employed a multi-dimensional technique to identify not only what (or the number of titles) the Library owned, but to also see if the score publishers and the score formats (whether they are full scores, miniature scores, piano reduction scores, etc.) available were indeed sufficiently fulfilling users' needs.

In the music industry, a work in public domain, such as a Mozart's piano sonata can be published by many companies. While some offer "urtext" edition or include critical commentary in the performance scores, some provide reprints of others or add heavy editorial notes or interpretation marks onto the music. Though there is no hard-drawn line of good and bad, musicians generally have preferences over different editions or publishers for certain composers/types of works. Thus, having the right editions by the more highly regarded publishers for users is an important matter in good music collection management.

Apart from the quality of publishers, it was also of interest to look at the availability of score formats in the Library. Music publications are different from other library materials in many ways, and music scores may come in many manifestations, with each serving a different purpose.

Therefore, with all the above putting into consideration, an additional step was taken to record the name of the publisher of each score assessed and the score format found for each title. Such a careful scrutiny allowed the Library to know whether scores produced by the "preferred publishers" have been correctly purchased. Through this extra effort, the Library was also able to obtain a distribution of all the score formats acquired for each type of music.

Analysis Results

With only one music liaison librarian working on and off on this project while engaging in other duties such as cataloging and library instruction and with one part-time student helper working in the summer, this project has taken about 9 months before its completion. After checking holdings against the core list and

examining the publishers and formats of each score in the Library, many valuable findings were obtained.

Strengths and weaknesses

Like other Conspectus studies, the strengths and weaknesses of the collection were identified. It was evident that the strongest parts of the HKBU Library's Western score collection went to the orchestral and opera/musical areas and the weakest part lied in the chamber music section. The breadth and depth of various collections also occurred to differ a great deal. There was a broad coverage on orchestral works, but contrarily, there appeared to be an imbalanced collection of solo works for different instruments (e.g., more core titles available for piano and few for percussion or brass).

Variety of score publishers

With a multi-angle inspection, the analysis results also uncovered issues relating to the choice of music score publishers. By jotting down the name of the publisher of each title assessed, it was learned that a significant portion of the scores held were published by the "less preferred" publishers when better alternatives were available. For example, the Library owned two sets of score and parts of Franz Schubert's piano trio no. 1. While the highly preferred editions by music users would be the urtext ones published by Bärenreiter or Henle, neither of them was acquired. Other reprint editions carrying substantial amount of interpretation markings, on the other hand, were purchased instead. Though it would not be possible now to know the history or cause to such acquisitions decisions, this showed a need for a better quality control and a clearer guideline in the selection process.

Suitability of score formats acquired

When studying the score formats, hidden phenomena which were unknown in the past were revealed. For chamber music works, it was found that oftentimes only scores were available without their corresponding performance parts. Over 70% of the chamber music items were full/study/miniature scores and merely 30% were performance parts. With this finding, it was a good indicator that the Library should start buying the missing instrumental parts which are crucial in chamber music study. Moreover, there also seemed to be a pattern for buying miniature scores rather than full scores, as demonstrated by the fact that 62% of the orchestral items were miniature scores and only 31% were full/study scores. Again, the reasons behind these acquisitions would remain to be a mystery. Yet,

it has raised the question whether this result was a reflection of the faculty's selection bias or real users' needs. Other important findings in the score examination included the obscure presence of a few number of score & parts sets for large orchestral works, and the absence of the corresponding full/study scores of concerto works for which piano reduction score & solo part sets were bought. By looking at these, it became apparent that a revised collection development guideline may be needed so that the appropriate or preferred formats of scores would be acquired for certain types of music. The acquisitions and collection scope may also need to be re-defined. For instance, some formats such as the score & parts set of large orchestral works which often contain over 60 instrumental parts should perhaps be housed in a separate performance library where direct supervision and proper management of the parts would be done by the orchestra staff.

Discussion and Recommendations

After the assessment, the Library began to have more knowledge on what the Western score collection contains from different perspectives. By knowing the strengths and weaknesses of the collection, the Library is now able to accommodate changing needs more quickly. The effort spent on evaluating the score publishers and formats also proved to be worthwhile without requiring much extra time, for the final all-rounded picture produced was instrumental in detecting flaws during the selection and acquisitions process. As Pankake, Wittenborg and Carpenter stated, librarians needed to know the causes of weak selection practices and act upon them.[27] Therefore, drawing on these findings, areas for improvements were identified and two sets of follow-up actions were performed as a result.

Externally, a score enhancement project was initiated immediately after the assessment, and 10 weak music areas were selected for prioritized development with the approval and financial contribution from the Library and the Music Department. Informal discussions with the music faculty and students also took place to see if music users have preferences over the use of full, study or miniature scores. This created a more casual channel for users to freely express their opinion and reasons for certain predilections. A formal music user survey was also conducted to gather statistical information about music users' library use behavior, their perceived importance of music materials, and their collection development preferences. The survey results obtained were invaluable in helping understand the library use patterns of each music user groups and their real

---

[27] Marcia Pankake, Karin Wittenborg and Eric Carpenter, "Commentaries on Collection Bias," *College & Research Libraries* 56, no. 2 (March 1995): 114.

musical needs.[28] By doing all these, it allowed the direct involvement of users in collection building which also facilitated the creation of a truly user-centered collection.

As for the follow-up actions done internally, a list of "preferred" music publishers for different types of music or composers was created by the music liaison librarian for the technical services staff to follow in the case when order details were not provided by the faculty requesters. A training workshop was also given to the staff to introduce to them the physical differences and purposes of various score formats so that they would understand the logic why certain materials should be chosen over others. This way, staff would not simply follow the guidelines provided blindly but would be able to make sensible judgment based on music users' needs. Furthermore, music orders submitted to the Acquisitions Section will now be glanced quickly by the music liaison librarian before sending out to vendors to ensure that the best possible or necessary score formats and music publishers have been picked. A plan to fully update the collection development policy is also underway, aiming to provide clearer guidance on the consistent selection of appropriate materials that support the research, teaching, study and performance needs of the music users.

Conclusion

Music publications are special, and the existence of a diverse range of scores for the same musical works goes beyond a mere plain reproduction. The variations in formats, publishers or editions make a whole difference to music users. Hence, the assessment of a score collection should not be just a title checking procedure, but should employ a more qualitative approach that can actually guide collection development activities.

Tailor-made for music scores, this new modified Music Conspectus turned the collection inside-out and revealed many selection and acquisitions loopholes that one would easily miss in the daily work. Its detachment from the classification schedule also enhanced its usability in non-LC settings, and its application can be straightforwardly extended to libraries that have not been able to keep up with the changes in the classification system. And since it is genre-based, libraries will have the flexibility of doing a simple broad assessment based on a few large music categories and genres that are particularly needed by users, or a comprehensive in-depth analysis by adding more refined music categories to the

---

[28] Katie Lai and Kylie Chan, "Do You Know Your Music Users' Needs? A Library User Survey that Helps Enhance a User-Centered Music Collection," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 35, no. 1 (January 2010): 63-69.

Conspectus or further subdividing each music genre into smaller subsets according to the instrumentation or the ensemble type. Consequently, the conducting of the Conspectus project is no longer the luxurious event for large universities or consortia, but can also be carried out in smaller libraries where money and manpower are limited.

There may be many ways to evaluate a score collection, but this is the first attempt to incorporate the multi-dimensional concept in music collection assessment and there can be more to explore. Music users are very specific about what they need in regard to formats, editions and quality, and so should be the assessment tool.

Appendix

Table 1. Excerpt of the Conspectus lines of the original Music Conspectus

ID	LC Class	Subjects
MUS14	M217-285	Piano & one other instrument
MUS15	M286-298	Duets without keyboard instruments
MUS16	M300-986	Chamber ensembles: trios-nonets & larger combinations
MUS17	M300-986	Chamber music for early instruments
MUS18	M1000-1075	Orchestral music
MUS19	M1100-1160	String orchestra music
MUS20	M1200-1270	Band music

Source: Jane Gottlieb, ed., *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries* (Canton, MA: Music Library Association, 1994), 82.

Table 2. Worksheet of HKBU's modified Music Conspectus

Category	Genre*	Collection level		Titles owned (a) / Titles compared (b)	% of holding = (a) / (b) x 100	Overall library's holding against the core list (by music category) = Total (a) / Total (b) x 100
		ECS^	DCI+			
Orchestral	Symphonies					
	Overture, suites, tone poems, etc.					
	String & chamber orchestra					
	Ballet					
Concerto	Piano					
	Strings					
	Woodwinds					
	Brass					
	Percussion					
	Mixed instruments					
Chamber music	Ensemble with piano					
	Strings					
	Woodwinds					
	Brass					
	Percussion					
	Mixed without piano					
Instrumental (solo & duo)	Piano & keyboard					
	Strings					
	Woodwinds					
	Brass					
	Percussion					
Voice & choral	Voice					
	Choral					
Opera & musicals	Opera					
	Musical & stage works					
Anthology						

* "Genre" can be further subdivided based on the instrumentation or ensemble type for detailed analysis. See Table 3 for an example.
^ ECS = Existing Collection Strength
+ DCI = Desired Collecting Intensity

Table 3. Further subdivision of the genre "Chamber Music"

Genre	Ensemble type	Titles owned (a) / Titles compared (b)	% of holding = (a) / (b) x 100	% of titles owned in the music genre = Total (a) / Total (b) x 100
Ensemble w/ piano	Piano trio			
	Piano quartet			
	Piano quintet			
	Piano sextet & up			
Strings	String trio			
	String quartet			
	String quintet			
	String sextet			
	String octet & up			
Woodwinds	Wind trio			
	Wind quartet			
	Wind quintet			
	Wind sextet			
	Wind octet			
	Wind septet & up			
Brass	Brass trio			
	Brass quartet			
	Brass quintet			
	Brass sextet & up			
Percussion	Percussion ensemble			
Mixed w/o piano	Mixed ensemble w/o piano – trio			
	Mixed ensemble w/o piano – quartet			
	Mixed ensemble w/o piano – quintet			
	Mixed ensemble w/o piano – sextet & up			

Bibliography

Beals, Jennifer Benedetto. "Assessing Collection Using Brief Tests and WorldCat Collection Analysis." *Collection Building* 26, no. 4 (2007): 104-107.

Coleman, Jim. "The RLG Conspectus: A History of Its Development and Influence and A Prognosis for Its Future." *Acquisitions Librarian* 7 (1992): 25-44.

Coral, Lenore. "Evaluating the Conspectus Approach: Problems and Alternatives." In *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries*, edited by Jane Gottlieb, 74-81. Canton, MA: Music Library Association, 1994.

Daub, Peggy. "The RLG Music Conspectus: Its History & Applications." In *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries*, edited by Jane Gottlieb, 7-24. Canton, MA: Music Library Association, 1994.

Davis, Elizabeth. "Guidelines for Evaluating Music Collections as Part of a Regional Assessment Plan." In *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries*, edited by Jane Gottlieb, 25-49. Canton, Mass.: Music Library Association, 1994.

Ferguson, Anthony W., Joan Grant, and Joel S. Rutstein. "The RLG Conspectus: Its Uses and Benefits." *College & Research Libraries* 49, no. 3 (May 1988): 197-206.

Gottlieb, Jane, ed. *Collection Assessment In Music Libraries*. Canton, MA: Music Library Association, 1994.

Gwinn, Nancy E. and Paul H. Mosher. "Coordinating Collection Development: The RLG Conspectus." *College & Research Libraries* 44, no. 2 (March 1983): 128-140.

Henry, Elizabeth, Rachel Longstaff and Doris Van Kampen. "Collection Analysis Outcomes in an Academic Library." *Collection Building* 27, no. 3 (2008): 113-117.

Munroe, Mary H. and Jennie E. Ver Steeg. "The Decision-Making Process in Conspectus Evaluation of Collections: The Quest for Certainty." *Library Quarterly* 74, no. 2 (2004): 181-205.

Oberg, Larry R. "Evaluating the Conspectus Approach for Smaller Library Collections." *College & Research Libraries* 49, no. 3 (May 1988): 187-96.

Orcutt, Darby and Tracy Powell. "Reflections on the OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis Tool: We Still Need the Next Step." *Against the Grain* 18, no. 15 (November 2006): 44-48.

Pankake, Marcia, Karin Wittenborg, and Eric Carpenter. "Commentaries on Collection Bias." *College & Research Libraries* 56, no. 2 (March 1995): 113-118.

Underwood, Kent. "Developing Supplemental Guidelines for Music: A Case Report." In *Collection Assessment: A Look at the RLG Conspectus*, edited by Wood J. Richard and Katina Strauch, 157-168. New York: Haworth Press, 1992.

White, Howard D. "Better Than Brief Tests: Coverage Power Tests of Collection Strength." *College & Research Libraries* 69, no. 2 (March 2008): 155-174.

White, Howard D. *Brief Tests of Collection Strength: A Methodology for All Types of Libraries*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995.

Wood, Richard J. "A Conspectus of the Conspectus." *Acquisitions Librarian* 7 (1992): 5-24.