**University of California, Los Angeles**     **Indiana University, Bloomington**

# Planning the Next Generation
# Sheet Music Consortium

# Music Library Association Focus Groups,
# February 24, 2008
# Final Report

**Compiled by Michelle Dalmau, Digital Projects & Usability Librarian**
**Indiana University Digital Library Program**
**November 29, 2008**

## Table of Contents

**Planning the Next Generation Sheet Music Consortium**
**Music Library Association Focus Groups, February 24, 2008**

## I. Introduction

The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and Indiana University, Bloomington (IU) are two of the founding members of the Sheet Music Consortium (http://digital.library.ucla.edu/sheetmusic/), a metadata harvesting service originally launched in 2002, designed to provide searching of sheet music collections hosted by diverse institutions in a single interface. The service operates by harvesting metadata via the Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH). The vision of the Consortium service was, from the start, to be a union catalog of sorts for sheet music, to be *the* place to go to discover online sheet music, pulling together significant collections in one virtual location. However, the Sheet Music Consortium (SMC) service exists today with only minimal updates since its initial launch, with most functionality largely experimental in nature. To move beyond this experimental phase towards a more robust, sustainable, and user-centered service, the University of California, Los Angeles, the lead institution in the grant application, and Indiana University, the partnering institution, have requested and were granted funding from the IMLS for a National Leadership Grant, Planning Grant.  Part of the planning process outlined in the grant calls for the development of user studies to help better define the necessary services we will need to implement for an improved Sheet Music Consortium.

The user studies were conceived in phases: 1) diary study, 2) focus groups, and 3) surveys, all of which were based on a probing session conducted as part of the SMC Fall Planning Meeting held in Bloomington, Indiana on January 15, 2008.  This report will cover the diary study and focus groups with special emphasis on the latter as well as recommendations for the third and final part, the user and data provider needs surveys.  The report outlines the: methodology employed, participant profile, and findings.  The finding section is organized by recurring themes emerging as part of the focus group discussion.  The report concludes with a section entitled, "Further Investigation," that highlights issues that require additional input from users. This section should serve as the basis for the surveys and user-centered activities pursued in future grants.  Instruments used for this study such as consent forms and scripts will be included in the appendices.

## II. Methodology

This section highlights the methodology employed for phase 1 and 2 user studies, the Diary Study and Focus Groups, with an emphasis on the Focus Groups study.  Both studies are qualitative in nature, relying on free-form responses to questions.

Initially, it was anticipated to share the findings from both these studies more widely so human subjects approval was sought at Indiana University, Bloomington and University of California, Los Angeles.  The applications were routed to the respective institutional review boards and received the following approval: exempt from UCLA (study no. 08-042) and expedited from IU (study no. 08-12769).

## A. Diary Study

An initial diary study was conducted the week of February 11-18, 2008 to gather feedback for the topics of discussion for the focus groups, scheduled on February 24, 2008 as part of the Music Library Association annual meeting that took place in Newport, Rhode Island. A diary study consists of participants keeping a diary, or journal, of their interactions with a computer system, any significant events or problems during their use of a system, or other aspects of their working life. A diary typically asks a user to record the date and time of an event, information about the event of significance, and opinions about their experiences.

This approach is often used when it is difficult or cost-prohibitive to observe people in their everyday environment interacting with web sites, work tools, materials, etc.  For this particular diary study, participants were asked to log their daily interactions with sheet music.  The following kinds of information were recorded: patrons' sheet music needs, sheet music-related searches, key aspects in managing sheet music collections, etc. in a standard log provided by the researcher (see Appendix B). A total of four diary entries were submitted.  The contents were analyzed for recurring themes, patterns, and issues that emerged, which informed the concrete scenarios and discussion topics for the focus group sessions.

## B. Focus Groups

Two focus group sessions were held on February 24, 2008 as part of the all-day Sheet Music Consortium meeting hosted by the Music Library Association Annual Meeting, which took place in Newport, Rhode Island.  The initial focus group, scheduled from 9:00-10:30 AM EST, explored end user needs and potential services that could be improved or newly provided by the Sheet Music Consortium, and the following focus group, scheduled from 10:30-12:00 PM EST, explored data provider services that could be supported by the SMC in an effort to increase aggregated content.

Each focus group was facilitated by domain experts, and guided by a script (see User Services, Appendix C and Data Provider Services, Appendix D).  Michelle Dalmau, Digital Projects and Usability Librarian from Indiana University, led the user services session, and Jenn Riley, Metadata Librarian from Indiana University, led the data provider services session.  Two dedicated note-takers were present for each session.

Because of the size of the group (approximately 40 participants; see section below) and the hour and a half time constraint, some of the questions that were originally part of the focus group script for each session were skipped or collapsed accordingly.

## III. Participants

Approximately 40 participants were present for both focus group sessions.  Two of the four participants who completed the diary study were present at the focus groups.  The majority of the participants were librarians (public services, collection development and cataloging) from academic libraries or large public libraries; however a handful of scholars, including librarians involved in scholarly pursuits, were also present.  Two vendor representatives from Alexander Street Press were present, but did not participate actively in the discussions.

Because of the unexpected and rather large size of the focus group, we did face a few logistical challenges.  Although not everyone was able to respond to the questions posed, enough people did so that patterns and themes were able to emerge.  However, establishing an understanding, consensus or even engaging in friendly debate, unless it happened naturally, was otherwise difficult and not something any facilitator could do effectively with nearly forty people in the room and in the short time span allotted for each session.

## IV. Findings

Both the Diary Study and Focus Group sessions are qualitative in nature; no effort was made to quantify responses.  The data collected by way of notes were analyzed according to recurring themes and categories.  The findings section summarize responses, and when possible, asserts a claim that may or may not need further investigation.  The final section of this report, "Further Investigations," explicitly addresses the areas that require additional inquiry.

### A.  Diary Study

The Diary Study logs were not systematically analyzed, but information recorded provided the basis for the user and data provider services scripts.  Information gleaned from the diary study ranged from general to specific and included: nature of sheet music interaction (e.g., reference request, cataloging, etc.), consultation of online and offline resources, key aspects of the discovery process, and general sheet music elements of interest (based on user requests, cataloging objectives, etc.).

### B.  Focus Groups

**User Services Focus Group**
The responses and emergent issues are organized according to the major themes explored in the order they were covered according to the user services script (see Appendix C).

   a.  **Describe the essential attributes and strengths of the collection (found compelling by users and your institution)**
   The responses to this question varied from describing the nature of the collection (e.g., arrangement, focus on musical or visual content, thematic emphasis of the collection) to descriptive practices (access points, levels of description, metadata standards employed) and from provenance (donated by collector, maintaining original description and organization of collection) to physical characteristics of the sheet music (bound volumes, binders, digital form).  Many of these discussions concerning arrangement, descriptive practices, etc. often hinted at the need to define "sheet music[1]:" as is more explicitly noted by the following question posed by a participant: "Can conservatory and sheet music both go in [to the Sheet Music Consortium portal]?"

---

[1] Dedicated discussion about defining sheet music emerged in response to the final question posed, and was later further explored by Stephen Davison in the latter part of the meeting.

i. **Non-musical content is important, too, but how important?**
Many indicated that along with providing access to the nature of the musical content to their end users, access to the cover art is also important. A couple of people mentioned access to advertisements and one to incipits as well.

ii. **Key access points: All the known ones (e.g., title) and "subject"**
Arrangement by title seems fairly common, and it was implied and occasionally emphasized that many users know beforehand the title or even name of composer for sheet music they wish to access. However, topical and "subject-related" (genre/form/style, topical, etc.) access points seem to also be key especially in support of research and instruction (e.g., "Musicology faculty researching Asian stereotypes"). But later discussions revealed issues with providing richer description: expense, lack of standard or common vocabularies, idiosyncratic subject description practices (e.g., up to twenty subject headings in a record, descriptive information in MARC notes fields, etc.). So, there's clearly a tension (an age-old one) between richer description and the time and resources required to provide such descriptions.

iii. **Maintaining collectors' descriptive practices**
Sheet music collections in libraries are often inherited from a collector who has imposed his or her own physical arrangement and descriptive practices. This topic out of all that surfaced in response to "nature of collection" was probably the most explored by the participants. Overall, keepers of sheet music found it important to preserve in some way the collector's idiosyncratic descriptive practices, but struggled occasionally with also applying standard library descriptive practices, which do not necessarily mirror that of the typical collector. Maintaining the collector's description requires the curator of the collection to know it well and serve as a key intermediary for users. Someone raised the point that perhaps it is worth the effort to examine and compare the ways in which collectors describe their own collection, and if these access points are indeed more accessible to researchers. In general, as a compromise, a collector's description isn't discarded. Instead, collections may be rearranged or enhanced with existing library-centric description.

b. **Describe how you support instruction/research using sheet music**
It is clear that most everyone in that room supports sheet music-based instruction and research, and that not only do they support instruction and research, they play a critical role in doing so because of their familiarity with the collection, which is often the only reliable way to access the contents due to idiosyncratic or minimal description of sheet music. In particular, librarian/faculty partnerships are essential, and can provide the SMC with a direct avenue of further investigation in terms of services that will benefit faculty/scholars and students. Since most of the focus group participants are librarians and regularly serve as intermediaries, their responses were helpful, but do not provide the complete picture for possible services the SMC can offer in this area. However, these very librarians can help us identify

faculty/researchers, students and specific members of the general public (collectors, genealogists, etc.) who are regular sheet music users so they can participate in the third phase of data gathering, the survey.

i. **Discovery mechanisms range from sifting through boxes to searching the catalog**
   Participants mentioned a range of discovery mechanisms presented to users for locating sheet music, from sifting through boxes to searching a specialized database or a MARC catalog. Discovery is intrinsically dependent on description, so the various mechanisms for uncovering sheet music are very much impacted by descriptive practices. Some reported MARC-based description of sheet music implying that users have access (unclear if item-level or collection-level or both) via the standard library catalog. Add to the spectrum custom databases, spreadsheets, finding aids, and Google, where applicable, and it is apparent users encounter a variety of mechanisms for exploring sheet music. However, some also reported deficiencies in MARC as a standard for describing sheet music (especially with regards to "subject" access points and iconographic description).

ii. **"Subject" access is primary for researchers**
   The participants consistently reported anecdotes in which faculty members requested sheet music on a particular topic as it applied to both the music and cover art: "World War I topic for history professor," "minstrel covers," "works with faculty with specific topical interests," ethnic and racial stereotypes and so on. While some reported instances of known-item needs, (e.g., "score for a silent film"), by and large, the anecdotes reflect topical interest across various disciplines (film, history, musicology …). Many recognized that subject-related searches, especially for instructional purposes (e.g., racial stereotypes), are typical (and often recurring), and the SMC could provide a benefit to users if results are "canned" for easier access.

iii. **Accompanying materials are important for researchers/faculty**
   Some reported that faculty often request accompanying materials along with sheet music. In one anecdote, the history professor who needed sheet music about World War I also needed historic audio recordings of the same period. As further uncovered later in the discussion, in particular when discussing reference materials, integration with reference works was mentioned as were accompanying bibliographies. Linking sheet music to audio recordings was mentioned again several times when discussing the relationship of a particular piece of sheet music to primary and secondary materials: "multi-layered, link to recordings," "want to find a recording by a particular performer," etc. While examples of other projects that link recordings or other projects that may serve as a model that include integrated reference components like the Moving Image Collections (http://mic.imtc.gatech.edu/), many recognized the added effort in providing such connections and questioned the practical value. Someone responded with a more lightweight

solution like a "tree diagram" so that researchers can follow various suggested paths without the repository or the SMC portal actually providing the additional content.

### iv. Copyright questions impact access, use and digitization
While the discussion did not center long on copyright dilemmas, the issue was raised a few times with specific examples that most probably experience, especially those working in public services, when dealing with access, use and digitization of sheet music. For those who receive requests like a user needing a score for a silent film, having better access to copyright renewal records is important. Agreed upon, shared cataloging guidelines may also help in addressing this issue if copyright information, when known, is added to the record. A larger copyright issue is linking to recordings, which may serve as yet another deterrent for this type of linking service provided by the SMC.

### v. Faculty/librarian partnerships drive digitization
Some reported that selection of sheet music to be digitized is often informed by faculty needs, whether they are research or instruction oriented.

### c. Describe how you answer reference questions related to sheet music
The participants who answered this question often consult a variety of reference resources. A few participants listed key resources (some illegible in the notes), and why they are particularly good or bad. Resources by Kinkle and others are cited as being useful to ascertain copyright information. Secondary resources (illegible in notes) to learn more about illustrators and engravers were also cited as being important. Allmusic.com was cited as a good example of an encyclopedia-style resource while Grove Music Online was cited as a bad example (unclear as to why). For those seeking sheet music directly, along with the SMC portal, others emphasized that a significant number of sheet music is cataloged using MARC so OCLC would be a good resource.

### d. Provide anecdotal or other evidence that supports sheet music usage at your institution
The answer to this question varied from general (personal) to specific (research) uses; from songs for weddings to a researcher interested in the Spanish-American war, and, specifically, sheet music covers with images conveying American imperialism. A couple of participants mentioned the need for high-resolution images for exhibitions. The conversation then centered on how researchers in particular are frequent users of sheet music. In response to that, someone emphasized the need of documented user studies in this area. Another person mentioned the descriptive benefits gained from a researcher's work. For example, a doctoral dissertation was used as the basis for collecting metadata about a particular sheet music collection.

e. **How would SMC portal support your research needs or your patron's research needs in light of our discussion here today**
This concluding question brought to the surface the lingering issue of "what is sheet music" that had been an undercurrent in the discussions up until now. It is clear there was no agreed upon definition among the group. Most understood the standard bibliographic description of sheet music, but a few felt that the definition is completely meaningless to everyday users. And as librarians who serve as intermediaries, it becomes meaningless in practice, especially when aiding discovery (less so for cataloging purposes).

One person stated that it was dependent on how sheet music is handled; "it's the stuff that did not go in the OPAC." One mentioned music from film and Broadway shows ("dramatic music") as not really sheet music, but users may not know the distinction. Some stated that if the music is printed, users consider it sheet music. Others want a broader definition to include binders' collections. Some mentioned they would include classical scores if they could. And, finally, someone summarized that sheet music collections tend to include a variety of items, and that the SMC should be inclusive, yet provide helpful (not stringent) standards and guidelines that will help serve the primary function of such a portal – expose musical content. A few others agreed upon "American imprints" as a filter so records harvested by the SMC portal would only take such records. And yet someone else stated that even with a narrow definition of "American pop songs with American imprint," the descriptive (and assumedly digitization) work before them is still great. All this discussion about what is sheet music still provided at least one unified answer to the original question. In order to support users, the SMC will need to establish a balance between robust description and number of records harvested. Preference was not necessarily given to one or the other; however, participants did emphasize the *ability* to add rich description (at any stage in the workflow: cataloging, post-digitization, etc.). However, in order to focus on item-level cataloging, be it minimal or complete, developing a framework, which includes an agreed upon definition of sheet music, will help librarians with processing the mounds of sheet music they maintain.

**Data Provider Services Focus Group**
The responses and emergent issues are organized according to the major themes explored in the order they were covered according to the data provider services script (see Appendix D).

a. **For those who manage or process sheet music collections, what is your workflow for creating descriptive metadata**

  i. **Creating descriptive metadata is a multi-step process**
  Sheet music description is often a two-step process with hired students performing the initial pass of description (mostly transcription) followed by a professionals completing authority control.

**ii. MARC is commonly used for the description of sheet music**
Some participants reported using MARC for cataloging sheet music, but other metadata formats are also utilized. One uses a flavor of MARC (as a result of original Dbase database structure). One mapped from custom database to MARCXML. One is replacing MARC records with EAD Finding Aids. Some transform MARC into Dublin Core (DC) for specific content management systems such as ContentDM, which are then further enhanced.

**iii. Gaps in name authority control and controlled "subject" access**
Authority control is in the domain of the professional, and is therefore, a costly endeavor. Yet the participants recognize the importance of both name and subject-related access. It is unclear from the notes to determine what the community is willing to sacrifice: authority control or volume of minimally cataloged sheet music.

**b. How can the SMC help with your metadata creation workflow and creating shareable metadata**

**i. Establish shared guidelines for cataloging sheet music**
Provide cataloging guidelines reflecting levels of description (e.g., what is a minimal record?) that facilitate the harvesting of metadata by the SMC, but also a more consistent descriptive practice of sheet music for content managers. Participants would like the guidelines to cover non-musical content (graphics, advertisements, etc.) well as musical content. Guidelines for handling "local" information (e.g., handwritten notes) are desired, but this practice varies greatly from institution to institution and is copy-specific as well. This topic also arose at various times during the user services focus group in which emphasis was placed on flexible (not stringent) yet consistent descriptive guidelines.

**ii. Clustering may help with identifying multiple copies**
Participants agreed that some form of clustering of records could help both users and contributors to the SMC. For users, clustering can reveal unique items (e.g., different printing, annotations) that may impact research or other uses. For contributors, clustering may help with their local selection process (focus on unique items instead of duplicates) thereby reducing duplicates harvested by the SMC.

**iii. SMC may be able to assist in authority control**
Discussion centered on programmatic ways the SMC could assist with authority control. Ways to programmatically "temper" data were discussed such as normalizing dates, names and, more complex and many admitted perhaps not practical, normalization of "subject-related" access points by

utilizing cross-reference scheme (as employed by thesauri) that provides options for preferred terms or linking synonyms.

Also discussed was a way for the SMC to host name authority records that can be enhanced by others.  SMC participants could reference these authority records to enhance existing records even if they weren't the original contributors.

### iv. SMC can serve as a source for cataloging
Many reported using the SMC as a reference tool when cataloging sheet music especially when description is incomplete; it helps fill the gaps.

### v. External metadata contributions need to be vetted in some fashion
The notion of user-contributed metadata (with the "user" needing a more refined definition – domain experts, SMC partners/contributors, the general public) was both intriguing and frightening to the group as a whole.  Most seem willing to explore this as a service the SMC can provide, but many suggested a review/approval mechanism for externally added metadata.

Later, a discussion about opening the SMC to collectors was entertained. Some suggested opening the SMC for collectors to contribute metadata directly so long as they follow the cataloging guidelines.  But some felt while collector contributions could really expand the SMC, their contributions need to be vetted somehow.

### vi. Exporting SMC-enhanced records back to native system
If records are opened up for additional metadata contributions (unclear if it would be open to all users or SMC partners) or are automatically normalized for the sake of more shareable records, some requested the ability to "harvest back" these additional contributions for their native systems.  However, the participants did not want records to be overwritten automatically.  Some proposed a way to select the data of interest (e.g., only subjects), and others expressed uncertainty about others, in general, updating records.  Many recognized that native systems vary so providing an export format that will accommodate everyone is challenging.

## c. Do you have access to digitization services at your institution that could be used to digitize sheet music?

### i. Cataloging first; Digitizing first
Digitization and descriptive workflows vary from place to place.  Sometimes cataloging is done from digitized images and sometimes cataloging happens before digitization.  One person reported that selection of pieces for digitization is completely dependent on what has already been cataloged.

**ii. Most institutions represented have a central digitization unit**

Although many who answered this question have a central digitization unit at their respective institutions, some would like to digitize locally since the descriptive and digitization workflow are tightly coupled. Others mentioned that the central digitization unit also contributes some level of metadata (by student workers?). All agreed that no matter where digitization happens, having a shared set of digitization best practices to reference is helpful.

**iii. Technical metadata may be worth sharing**

A brief discussion ensued about whether capturing and sharing technical metadata for digitized sheet music is a worthy pursuit. Some felt it might be helpful for management and preservation of the digital object (image + metadata). Someone suggested it could be helpful to expose technical metadata if the SMC or others are developing technology for displaying sheet music. For example, it was cited that obtaining resolution information would help establish an optimal viewing size. Others also mentioned as part of this conversation the importance of displaying copyright information, which falls under rights or administrative metadata.

**iv. SMC should not harvest content!**

There seemed to be general consensus that the SMC should not focus on harvesting content (e.g., images, accompanying materials, etc.) along with metadata. Providing thumbnails for the cover art was briefly entertained, but most felt this is not a sustainable model. Participants did entertain ways data providers could provide a middle layer, by way of Web Services for instance, whereby they provide consistent access to images or other content that the SMC can then leverage.

**d. Who in your institution would help you setup a data provider for sharing metadata?**

Many from the larger institutions felt this task could be accomplished in collaboration with technical staff. Some mentioned collaboration would be across multiple units, and others mentioned that while the technical staff may be accommodating, they do not know exactly what to request. It was suggested that the SMC could also provide guidelines for setting up data providers, but more importantly, play a more active role in helping smaller institutions setup data providers by way of OAI-PMH gateway services. The SMC could also provide mapping guidelines and examples in support of shareable metadata.

**V. Further Investigation**

The above findings have significantly informed the SMC planning team, and will provide the foundation by which to pursue additional grant funding in hopes of actualizing some of the basic end-user and data provider services uncovered as well as explore others. The final phase of the user studies proposed as part of the IMLS Planning grant consists of two surveys to be released once classes commence in January 2009; one targeted at end-users and the other at data-providers. The

surveys will help clarify some of the questions raised as a result of the focus groups, and serve as the basis for needs assessment required by most federal grants.

Below are high-level questions, grouped by user services and data provider services, worth exploring, both as part of the upcoming surveys and also as dedicated user studies that will be part of the next round of SMC development.

**A. User Services**

1. End-users need to be specifically targeted – faculty/scholars, students and the general public as part of the next round of funding/development.

2. When users seek sheet music, are they primarily interested in musical content or non-musical content?  Answering this question may help the SMC manage the scope of the services provided.

3. How often is an information need shared or duplicated across disciplines (cover art reflecting stereotypes, historical assessment of WW I songs, etc.) and is a "canned" search or "showcase" then helpful to users?

4. Assessment and cross-comparison of how collector's organize sheet music.  Does a collector's arrangement and descriptive practices better support research-oriented access to sheet music?

5. Instead of hosting additional content related to sheet music such as audio recordings, bibliographies, etc., are there complementary resources the SMC can provide links to as a starting point, at the very least, for users?  If so, how do we identify these resources?  And how do we overcome the prospect that many may have restricted access due to licensing agreements?

6. Are copyright services (instruction?) beyond the scope of the SMC?  Is there existing sheet music-related copyright research the SMC can leverage as a service for data providers and end-users?

7. Investigate ways a researcher's own work (annotations, data collection, etc,) can provide descriptive foundations or enhance existing descriptions of sheet music in a feasible manner.

**B. Data Provider Services**

1. Are there ways the SMC can support richer description, especially the application of descriptive headings by way of user-contributed metadata, programmatically by offering suggestions based on a cross-referencing underlying structure or by providing a true copy cataloging platform?

2. Additional exploration of levels of descriptive practices for shared cataloging guidelines needs to be addressed.

3.  Need a better understanding of native technical capabilities to determine levels of contributions and the precise role of the SMC when dealing with institutions whose technical infrastructure varies from non-existent to robust.

4.  Explore various models in support of user-contributed metadata – from tightly controlled (vetting process) to wide open. Is this indeed a value-added service? Is there a compromise in the spectrum? If the open method is sought because of minimal overhead, are there ways we can present this information in the interface that differentiates public tagging from expert cataloging?

5.  We need to better understand the nature of "locally captured" information about sheet music, and whether the SMC wants to leverage that despite the risks of apparent duplicates. Need to investigate ways uniquely captured information about a piece of sheet music can be displayed in the SMC interface.

6.  Do we want to explore the issue of web services at the data provider end that will allow the SMC access to content (by way of persistent links for instance) without directly harvesting content along with the metadata?

# Appendix A: Consent Form

Study # 08- 12769

## INDIANA UNIVERSITY - BLOOMINGTON
## INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT
### Sheet Music Consortium: Diary Study and Focus Group Discussion

You are invited to participate in a research study.  The purpose of this study is to learn how you interact with sheet music over a two-week period by way of keeping a diary and participating in focus group discussions in an effort to help us define new and improve existing Sheet Music Consortium services.

**INFORMATION**
The University of California-Los Angeles and Indiana University have received funding from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) for a 1-year project to plan the "Next Generation Sheet Music Consortium," an updated and enhanced version of the current Sheet
Music Consortium service (http://digital.library.ucla.edu/sheetmusic/). From October 2007 to September 2008, we will investigate ways to both improve the services the Consortium provides to users of sheet music, and make it easier for libraries to include their sheet music collections in the Consortium's search. By the end of this project, we expect to develop a five-year plan for improving and sustaining the Consortium, including obtaining further grant funding in the short term and planning for long-term sustainability in the absence of grant funding.

To help us identify and prioritize end-user and data-provider services for the Sheet Music Consortium, we are asking attendees of the Sheet Music Consortium meeting that will be held as part of the Music Library Association meeting to participate in a two phase research study: a diary study followed by focus group discussions.  Approximately 15-20 participants will partake in both studies.  The diary study will occur over a two-week period, January 28 – February 11, and take no more than 15-20 minutes a day.  The focus group discussions will be scheduled for a two-hour slot during the morning portion of the Sheet Music Consortium meeting to be held Sunday, February 24 from 9:00 AM to 2 PM.

From January 28 – February 11, we are asking you to log your daily interactions with sheet music such as documenting: sheet music needs, sheet music-related searches, aspects of managing sheet music collections, etc. You will be provided with a standard log form for recording aspects of sheet music needs and interactions on a weekly basis for a total of two submissions. Diary entries will be submitted at the end of each week via e-mail as document attachments to the researcher for analysis and to help ground the focus group discussions. We anticipate your logging activity to take no more than 15-20 minutes a day.

On February 24, we will facilitate a focus group discussion to explore user needs for the discovery and use of sheet music, and what tools libraries need to prepare their collections for inclusion in the Consortium's search service. The focus group is scheduled for a two-hour block during the morning portion of the meeting.

Before we can commence this research study, please review this consent form and type your name in the signature area below if you are in agreement with the information presented.  Once I receive the completed form, I will send you the diary logs and accompanying instructions including additional information about the time and location the focus group will take place.

**RISKS**
There are no known risks associated with this kind of study.

**BENEFITS**
The results of the study will benefit all future users of and contributors to the Sheet Music Consortium. Participating in this study will ensure that other potential users and contributors to the Sheet music

Consortium have available the features, functionality and services needed to support sharing of sheet music content, discovery, teaching and research.  Participants have an opportunity to share their experiences and impressions, which will directly and positively impact the sustainability and success of the Sheet Music Consortium.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**
All the data collected as part of the diary study and focus group discussions will be done so in confidentiality. You should <u>not</u> write your name or any other identifier on the diary log form.  During the focus group, your comments will be noted. The diary log you will complete is identified with a participant number, e.g. # P5, not your name or any other unique identifier such as Social Security Number. Reports of the study will be made using aggregated information.

No one except the research team will have access to the completed diary entries and focus group notes. All the data collected will be kept in restricted access.

**CONTACT**
If you have any questions about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher Michelle Dalmau, at the Digital Library Program, Indiana University-Main Library, 1320 East 10th Street, Room W501, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, 812-855-1261, mdalmau@indiana.edu.

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research has been violated during the course of the project, you may contact the office for the Human Subjects Committee, Indiana University, Carmichael Center L03, 530 E. Kirkwood Ave., Bloomington, IN 47408, 812/855-3067, iub_hsc@indiana.edu

**PARTICIPATION**
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may refuse to participate without penalty.  If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.  If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

**CONSENT**
I have read this form and received a copy of it.  I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction.  I agree to take part in this study.

Please type your name and date in the signature and date area below, and send the completed consent form to mdalmau@indiana.edu.  After I receive the completed form, I will send you the materials for the diary study and confirm the time/meeting room location for the focus group discussions.

Subject's signature _____          Date _____


Consent form date: January 23, 2008

IRB Approved
Approval Date: January 25, 2008
Expires: January 24, 2009

**Appendix B: Diary Study Log**

**Overview**: Thank you for participating in our one-week diary study, February 11 – February 18.  Your daily diary entries concerning your interactions with sheet music, for example, your information needs, research needs, reference work, and key aspects that pertain to managing, digitizing or cataloging sheet music collections, will help us determine and prioritize services for a sustainable and successful Sheet Music Consortium.  This log form will be sent to a wide variety of sheet music users from researchers to reference librarians.  Please note aspects relevant to your job or information needs.

**Instructions**: Please complete a diary entry for each day of the one-week period.  No activity can be likewise logged as "N/A."  We estimate diary entries to take approximately 15 minutes per day.  You can write as much or as little as you'd like, but please do fill out as much as you can about your experiences.  Diary entries are due at the end of the week (February 18) and can be submitted via email (mdalmau@indiana.edu).  I will send friendly email reminders leading up to the due dates.  If you have any questions about these instructions or the diary log below, don't hesitate to contact Michelle Dalmau (mdalmau@indiana.edu, 812.855-1261).

**Examples:** Possible interactions you might log include: searching a sheet music web site, browsing through boxes of sheet music, annotations about sheet music, research collaborations concerning sheet music, cataloging sheet music, helping patrons with sheet music needs, digitizing sheet music, creating shareable metadata for OAI harvesting, and all other things sheet music!

---

**Daily Diary Log**

---

**February 11, 2008**
1. Please describe the nature of your interaction or need for sheet music today.
2. If your interaction involved cataloging or digitization, please explain your workflow.
3. If your interaction involved a particular web resource, please tell us:
   a. What you were searching for?
   b. What was your discovery procedure?  List search terms, strategies for searching.
   c. Whether or not you found what you were looking for?
   d. Whether you encountered any difficulties
   e. Whether you were pleased with aspects of the online resource
4. If you interaction involved handling actual pieces of sheet music, please explain why you handled the pieces, what kinds of information you recorded about the pieces and how you recorded the information.
5. If searching for sheet music to meet an information need, please explain your information need in some detail and provide examples of ways you might of shared the information (notes, annotations, collaborations, etc.)
6. Were you or your patron primarily interested in the musical content, cover art or other features that are commonly found in sheet music?  Why?
7. Anything else?

---

**February 12, 2008**
1. Please describe the nature of your interaction or need for sheet music today.
2. If your interaction involved cataloging or digitization, please explain your workflow.
3. If your interaction involved a particular web resource, please tell us:
   a. What you were searching for?
   b. What was your discovery procedure?  List search terms, strategies for searching.
   c. Whether or not you found what you were looking for?
   d. Whether you encountered any difficulties
   e. Whether you were pleased with aspects of the online resource
4. If you interaction involved handling actual pieces of sheet music, please explain why you handled the pieces, what kinds of information you recorded about the pieces and how you recorded the information.
5. If searching for sheet music to meet an information need, please explain your information need in some detail and provide examples of ways you might of shared the information (notes, annotations, collaborations, etc.)

6. Were you or your patron primarily interested in the musical content, cover art or other features that are commonly found in sheet music? Why?
7. Anything else?

---

### February 13, 2008

1. Please describe the nature of your interaction or need for sheet music today.
2. If your interaction involved cataloging or digitization, please explain your workflow.
3. If your interaction involved a particular web resource, please tell us:
   a. What you were searching for?
   b. What was your discovery procedure? List search terms, strategies for searching.
   c. Whether or not you found what you were looking for?
   d. Whether you encountered any difficulties
   e. Whether you were pleased with aspects of the online resource
4. If you interaction involved handling actual pieces of sheet music, please explain why you handled the pieces, what kinds of information you recorded about the pieces and how you recorded the information.
5. If searching for sheet music to meet an information need, please explain your information need in some detail and provide examples of ways you might of shared the information (notes, annotations, collaborations, etc.)
6. Were you or your patron primarily interested in the musical content, cover art or other features that are commonly found in sheet music? Why?
7. Anything else?

---

### February 14, 2008

1. Please describe the nature of your interaction or need for sheet music today.
2. If your interaction involved cataloging or digitization, please explain your workflow.
3. If your interaction involved a particular web resource, please tell us:
   a. What you were searching for?
   b. What was your discovery procedure? List search terms, strategies for searching.
   c. Whether or not you found what you were looking for?
   d. Whether you encountered any difficulties
   e. Whether you were pleased with aspects of the online resource
4. If you interaction involved handling actual pieces of sheet music, please explain why you handled the pieces, what kinds of information you recorded about the pieces and how you recorded the information.
5. If searching for sheet music to meet an information need, please explain your information need in some detail and provide examples of ways you might of shared the information (notes, annotations, collaborations, etc.)
6. Were you or your patron primarily interested in the musical content, cover art or other features that are commonly found in sheet music? Why?
7. Anything else?

---

### February 15, 2008

1. Please describe the nature of your interaction or need for sheet music today.
2. If your interaction involved cataloging or digitization, please explain your workflow.
3. If your interaction involved a particular web resource, please tell us:
   a. What you were searching for?
   b. What was your discovery procedure? List search terms, strategies for searching.
   c. Whether or not you found what you were looking for?
   d. Whether you encountered any difficulties
   e. Whether you were pleased with aspects of the online resource
4. If you interaction involved handling actual pieces of sheet music, please explain why you handled the pieces, what kinds of information you recorded about the pieces and how you recorded the information.
5. If searching for sheet music to meet an information need, please explain your information need in some detail and provide examples of ways you might of shared the information (notes, annotations, collaborations, etc.)

6. Were you or your patron primarily interested in the musical content, cover art or other features that are commonly found in sheet music? Why?
7. Anything else?

---

## February 16, 2008

1. Please describe the nature of your interaction or need for sheet music today.
2. If your interaction involved cataloging or digitization, please explain your workflow.
3. If your interaction involved a particular web resource, please tell us:
   a. What you were searching for?
   b. What was your discovery procedure? List search terms, strategies for searching.
   c. Whether or not you found what you were looking for?
   d. Whether you encountered any difficulties
   e. Whether you were pleased with aspects of the online resource
4. If you interaction involved handling actual pieces of sheet music, please explain why you handled the pieces, what kinds of information you recorded about the pieces and how you recorded the information.
5. If searching for sheet music to meet an information need, please explain your information need in some detail and provide examples of ways you might of shared the information (notes, annotations, collaborations, etc.)
6. Were you or your patron primarily interested in the musical content, cover art or other features that are commonly found in sheet music? Why?
7. Anything else?

---

## February 17, 2008

1. Please describe the nature of your interaction or need for sheet music today.
2. If your interaction involved cataloging or digitization, please explain your workflow.
3. If your interaction involved a particular web resource, please tell us:
   a. What you were searching for?
   b. What was your discovery procedure? List search terms, strategies for searching.
   c. Whether or not you found what you were looking for?
   d. Whether you encountered any difficulties
   e. Whether you were pleased with aspects of the online resource
4. If you interaction involved handling actual pieces of sheet music, please explain why you handled the pieces, what kinds of information you recorded about the pieces and how you recorded the information.
5. If searching for sheet music to meet an information need, please explain your information need in some detail and provide examples of ways you might of shared the information (notes, annotations, collaborations, etc.)
6. Were you or your patron primarily interested in the musical content, cover art or other features that are commonly found in sheet music? Why?
7. Anything else?

---

## February 18, 2008

1. Please describe the nature of your interaction or need for sheet music today.
2. If your interaction involved cataloging or digitization, please explain your workflow.
3. If your interaction involved a particular web resource, please tell us:
   a. What you were searching for?
   b. What was your discovery procedure? List search terms, strategies for searching.
   c. Whether or not you found what you were looking for?
   d. Whether you encountered any difficulties
   e. Whether you were pleased with aspects of the online resource
4. If you interaction involved handling actual pieces of sheet music, please explain why you handled the pieces, what kinds of information you recorded about the pieces and how you recorded the information.
5. If searching for sheet music to meet an information need, please explain your information need in some detail and provide examples of ways you might of shared the information (notes, annotations, collaborations, etc.)

6. Were you or your patron primarily interested in the musical content, cover art or other features that are commonly found in sheet music?  Why?
7. Anything else?

**If sheet music activity was slight this week, please describe in a few sentences your typical interactions with sheet.**

## Appendix C: User Services Focus Group Script

I.      Introduce me and review of Study Information Sheet

II.     Overview

    **a.**  Series of user studies culminate in a survey to help us identify end-user and data-provider services that the Consortium should support; help develop the long term planning of the SMC as well as secure additional funding

    **b.**  Focus end-user services so please consider wearing different hats and distinguishing between the various roles of you as users of sheet music, you as intermediaries for patrons and your patrons' needs.

III.    Introductions

    **a.**  State name, role, institutional affiliation and quick overview of your involvement with sheet music (point out note takers)

IV.    Discussion

    **a.**  For those who manage, process or are "users" of your institution's sheet music collections:

        **i.**  Describe the essential attributes and strengths of the collection (found compelling by users and your institution)

            **1.**  [size of collection]

            **2.**  [coverage: temporal, geographical, etc.]

            **3.**  [thematic coverage]

            **4.**  [ephemera, advertisements, back covers, etc.]

        **ii.**  Describe how you support and conduct instruction using sheet music

            **1.**  [bibliographic instruction]

            **2.**  [classroom instruction – subject matter]

        **iii.**  Describe how you answer reference questions related to sheet music

            **1.**  [Consult primary and secondary sources?  Where do you look? Why?]

        **iv.**  Provide anecdotal or other evidence of you support sheet music usage at your institution

            **1.**  [prepare exhibitions; compile bibliographies or pathfinders; prep for performances]

    **b.**  Think of your most recent experiences with searching sheet music resources

        **i.**  What was the content of interest and what did you do with the information or content once you found it?

            **1.**  [Which resource(s) – offline or online -- did you utilize?]

        **ii.**  How did you use the resource?  Any flexibility in discovery or features that enhanced access (e.g. sheet music viewers, share sheet music, etc.)

        **iii.**  What did you most and least like about the resource(s) you were consulting?

        **iv.**  How could you improve upon the resource(s) you were using to support workflows, search needs, or teaching and research needs.

            **1.**  [Audio files, annotation, citation managers, contextual information such as essays or bibliographies …]

    **c.**  For those who use sheet music for scholarly or teaching purposes:

        **i.**  Describe your research or teaching needs concerning sheet music

        **ii.**  Describe how you currently locate sheet music for your research

            **1.**  [Personal mechanisms for enhancing access; your own "cataloging" or annotations]

        **iii.**  How you make use of the sheet music once you find it

    **d.**  Imagine a one-stop shop for sheet music online (Summarize)

        **i.**  How would this online resource support your research needs or your patron's research needs in light of our discussion here today?

            **1.**  [Highlight needs, features, etc. discussed and how we can integrate them in an aggregated environment]

V.     Wrap up

## Appendix D: Data Provider Services Focus Group Script

Items [in brackets] are probing questions to ask if discussion needs moving along or the topic is raised naturally in conversation.

- I.    Current workflows:
    - a.    For those who manage or process sheet music collections, ask each to briefly discuss their workflow for creating descriptive metadata.
        - i.    [What metadata formats/systems do they use?]
        - ii.   [How happy are they with their current procedures?]
        - iii.  [Do they describe musical content, graphical content, other content such as advertisements, or some combination of these?]
- II.   Potential SMC assistance:
    - a.    Where are the weakest points in your current metadata creation workflow?
        - i.    [Need for content standard/cataloging guidelines]
        - ii.   [Need for specialized metadata format for sheet music]
        - iii.  [Need for tools for metadata creation customized for sheet music]
        - iv.   [Is copy cataloging a needed service?]
        - v.    [Is metadata enrichment/mediation a needed service?]
    - b.    [[2-sentence introduction to OAI and what it does]] What do you need from the SMC to help you share metadata, via OAI or by some other way?
        - i.    [Who has an OAI provider already running at their institution?]
        - ii.   [Who from your institution would need to be involved in getting an OAI provider up and running?]
        - iii.  [How realistic is it for your institution to set up and actively manage its own OAI provider?]
        - iv.   [Do we need to support means of sharing other than OAI?]
        - v.    [How much technology support for metadata sharing can your institution provide?]
    - c.    Do you have access to digitization services at your institution that could be used to digitize sheet music?
        - i.    [How important is it to your institution to digitize this material?]
        - ii.   [Do you need detailed digitization specifications?]
        - iii.  [Can you get on the priority list of a unit that does this, or will you need to digitize yourself?]
- III.  Summarize and wrap up