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INTRODUCTION

According to Clark,\(^1\) the first attempt to raise funds for higher education occurred in 1641 when “Harvard College dispatched three preachers to England on a fund raising expedition.” Since then, libraries as a whole have developed and evolved to match current computer-driven technology. Today, libraries have endless possibilities to digitize and preserve materials. Chief among these possibilities are special collections. Special collections web pages in music libraries can display the scanned manuscript score, photographs, or even streaming movie or audio files containing interviews of a composer; these digital surrogates protect the original materials.

The unique sizes and mediums of music materials found in music special collections can pose a difficult and very expensive challenge when purchasing archival materials, audio or visual playback and editing equipment. Music librarians in charge of special collections sometimes find themselves shopping around for the best deals on archival materials. However, “special collections libraries have long provided leverage for larger institutional fundraising efforts by providing exhibitions, private viewings…”\(^2\) and other special events. If special collections are a money maker for the institution, who or what is making the money to preserve and digitize the special collections?

Even more unfortunate is the attitudes often held by librarians about fundraising. Little specific literature exists on fundraising, and even less training is offered. “Prior development experience” was listed in over three-fourths of job listings within a six

---

\(^1\) Charlene Clark, “Getting Started with Annual Funds in Libraries.” *Journal of Library Administration* 12, no. 4. (1990): 73.

month period on the Chronicle of Higher Education. Almost all library fundraising literature points back to Eaton’s 1971 study, in which was found that librarians often feel that fundraising is “a responsibility which primarily belongs to others.”

So if the librarians don’t feel responsible or knowledgeable enough to raise funds, and as is often the case in music libraries, they don’t have access to a development officer, who (and how) will money be raised? To get a further insight, a brief, informal survey was sent to random music institutions with special collections or archives (either print or sound). See Appendix A for the survey.

Initially, the survey was sent to all the members of the listserv for the Southeast chapter of the Music Library Association, or SEMLA. After several weeks with no response, the same survey was sent to all Music Library Association (MLA) chapters with listserv information available. Additionally, the terms “music library special collection” were entered into a Google search. Each returned website was checked for accuracy of results, and email addresses were gathered for directors, heads, music librarians, archivists, or special collections directors from said sites. The survey was also sent to these addresses. At the time of writing, only two responses had been collected. The unedited responses are in Appendix B.

---


LITERATURE REVIEW

There is no literature on fundraising for special collections in music libraries. In fact, there is very little literature for fundraising in music libraries as a whole. The sources used in this literature review primarily are made up of general library fundraising sources, academic library sources, and archives funding sources. Generalizations will be made so that the information can be applied to special collections in music libraries.

There are very few dissertations or theses in library fundraising. Most are the end products of extensive surveys, either in a very narrowed, specific area of fundraising, or a very broad, generalized, nation-wide search for information. Gene Crutsinger’s Master’s research paper on fundraising in Seminary Libraries represents the specific end of the spectrum. Crutsinger’s research names eight specific projects and improvements to be undertaken at the Winebrenner Theological Seminary Library, only one of which is applying for grants. The other suggestions offered by Crutsinger are public relations or intra-University related.  

Terry Latour takes an opposite approach in his library fundraising research. Latour developed extensive and highly detailed surveys which were mailed to Library Directors of Universities picked from a random sampling of Carnegie Classification institutions. Some of his research questions were:

1) To what extent do academic libraries initiate and engage in extra-institutional fund raising activities?
2) Are there significant statistical relationships between the types of fund raising programs engaged in, the sizes and types of institutions, the amount of staff

---

time and resources devoted to the effort, and success rates of the programs?\(^6\)

Latour found that “approximately two-thirds of all academic libraries” in his sample
fundraise.\(^7\) Most fundraise to bridge the gap between their current budgets and increasing
materials and equipment costs. These libraries are successful around 70% of the time, but
success depends on geographic area and type of institution.\(^8\)

The selection of books on this topic is just as varied as the research documents.
The bulk of the books published deal with public library fundraising. As public libraries
differ greatly from academic institutions, these books were disregarded. Books on
fundraising in academic libraries, archives or special collections were reviewed. The
Music Library Association is currently working on a book of music library fundraising,
but this book will not be available until late 2008.

Within the available texts, several format themes appeared. First, some of the
books are a survey of different types of fundraising approaches. Among these are James
Swan’s Fundraising for Libraries: 25 Proven Ways to Get More Money for Your
Library,\(^9\) Lee and Hunt’s Fundraising for the 1990s The Challenge Ahead: A Practical
Guide for Library Fundraising: From Novice to Expert,\(^10\) Victoria Steele and Stephen
Elder’s Becoming a Fundraiser: The Principles and Practice of Library Development\(^11\)
and a few others. These books feature chapters ranging from the basics of fundraising to
development, public relations, physical building funds, retail shops, Friends groups,

---

\(^6\) Terry Stephen Latour, “Study of Library Fund Raising Activities at Colleges and Universities in
the United States” (PhD diss., Florida State University, 1995), 14.
\(^7\) Ibid., 231-2.
\(^8\) Ibid., 232-4.
\(^9\) James Swan, Fundraising for Libraries: 25 Proven Ways to Get More Money for Your Library
\(^10\) Hwa-Wei Lee and Gary A. Hunt, Fundraising for the 1990s The Challenge Ahead: A Practical
\(^11\) Steele and Elder, Becoming a Fundraiser.
grants, and black-tie, or other special events. While giving a great beginner’s overview, these books often lack specifics. Generalizations can be made from these books for music libraries as a whole, but are often rarely applicable to special collections, much less music special collections fundraising.

Second, case studies of actual fundraising projects undertaken by academic libraries are commonly found resources. Meredith Butler’s *Successful Fundraising: Case Studies of Academic Libraries* \(^ {12} \) and *SPEC Kits 193* \(^ {13} \) and *297* \(^ {14} \) from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) are highly specific facsimiles of documents used by institutions in (successful) pursuit of funding. To the novice fundraiser, these documents can be intimidating and bewildering. These resources should not be used at the start of one’s fundraising research. The documents will not make much sense until some basic terms and processes are understood. However, once the researcher feels comfortable studying processes and examples of prior fundraising attempts, these resources become invaluable. The *SPEC Kits* give the to-be-fundraiser an insight to formats, correspondence, public relations, surveys, and other information easily adaptable to music special collection fundraising, or any other institutional fundraising.

Third, a handful of resources on a specific fundraising topic or sub-topic were available. Included here are Corson-Finnerty and Blanchard’s *Fundraising and Friend-Raising on the Web* \(^ {15} \), Sally Gardner Reed’s *Making the Case for Your Library: A How-

---


To-Do-It Manual, and Grabowski’s chapter in American Archival Studies: Readings in Theory and Practice. These resources vary greatly. Fundraising and Friend-Raising on the Web deals strictly with fundraising via library websites and includes a CD-ROM. Although the source is outdated by today’s technology standards (it was published in 1998), some of the information is applicable and viable for music library websites, and especially the special collections pages within said websites. “Keepers, Users and Funders” and Making the Case for Your Library are more public relations tools than direct fundraising resources. However, many experienced fundraisers and development officers will agree that libraries and librarians need to “communicate not just what their library is doing, but why it matters….When you focus on ‘why it matters,’ you expand your public relations reach beyond potential users to potential supporters….“ Reed elaborates by stating that:

This book will show you how to use traditional promotional materials and techniques to make your library and its services matter to everyone in your community, public or academic, whether they use your library or not. If you garner more users in the process, you will have expanded your support base and will have made your library more directly meaningful to more people.

Also available are chapters on fundraising within library, preservation or other resources. These include Nancy Gwinn’s report in To Preserve and Protect: The Strategic Stewardship of Cultural Resources and Judy Hohmann’s “Money Talk”

---

18 Reed, Making the Case for Your Library, xiii.
19 Reed, Making the Case for Your Library, xv.
These chapters are often include good information, but are not directed at the fundraising-only audience. While both of the books are specifically directed at those who care for archives and special collections, the information included is generally a broad overview or sometimes a case study of a selected library’s efforts.

There are an overwhelming amount of journal articles on fundraising. Searching for fundraising articles can be difficult at best. Some authors and databases use the term “fund raising” instead of “fundraising,” while some only use the term “development.” Once the articles are located, one will see how diverse and extremely varied the content can be.

In the winter of 2000, Library Trends devoted an entire issue to fundraising. The articles within covered a wide range of topics including public relations, organization and process of beginning fundraising efforts, annual funds, online fundraising, surveys, and other topics. These articles range in complexity from novice-level information to rather complex, advanced level facts and figures. Overall, this journal issue includes the best “all-around” information for all levels of fundraisers, and should not be overlooked.

Within the journals, there are a few recurring themes: technology, digitization,
and websites; traditional fundraising overviews; fundraising for preservation; and other
tips. Technology, digitization and websites is a very lose categorization that includes
Brenda Hazard’s survey of fundraising on ARL websites,\(^26\) Nancy Gwinn’s article on
funding for digitization projects,\(^27\) Stephanie Gerding and Pam Mackellar’s article on
technology grants,\(^28\) and Jeanie Welch’s article on marketing and public relations via the
academic library website.\(^29\) All of these articles discuss using the most up-to-date
technologies to assist the library in getting funds.

Traditional fundraising overviews include Martin’s academic library director
article,\(^30\) McCune’s tips,\(^31\) and Alexander’s small shop advantage.\(^32\) As expected, these
articles include information on traditional funding routes: using a development officer,
writing grants, annual funds, partnerships with other institutions, Friends groups, and
gifts. Also included is good information on the use of library staff, donor relations and
organization to begin the fundraising process.

Fundraising for preservation includes only two articles: Paustenbaugh’s\(^33\) short

\(^28\) Stephanie Gerding and Pam Mackellar, “Wishing Won’t Work: 10 Things you Need to KNOW and DO When Applying for Technology Grants,” \textit{Computers in Libraries} 26, no. 7 (July/August 2006).
\(^33\) Jennifer Paustenbaugh, “Fundraising for Special Collections.” \textit{The Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances} 15, no. 4 (December 2002).
overview, and Shoaf’s even shorter case study. Paustenbaugh generally writes on special collections funding, while Shoaf considers traditional preservation tactics along with digitization “for future use of preservation technologies not yet fully developed.”

Though seemingly on the same topic, Paustenbaugh’s article deals with funding via donations and donors, and Shoaf’s article deals with grants instead. Paustenbaugh stresses all forms of communication as key to gaining and keeping donors, along with building “a history of … excellent care to [the library’s] collections and professional stewardship….This includes following best practices for processing, preserving and making accessible existing collections and knowing how much these activities cost.”

Conversely, Shoaf alludes to somewhat disguising information: Brown University wrote a grant proposal based heavily on traditional preservation methods, but with the additional digitization to the occasional item. Disguising (although Shoaf never directly says this was his intention) the digitization aspect made Brown University more likely to get the grant they had applied for.

There are a few articles that offer other fundraising suggestions outside grants, development, annual funds, Friends groups, and other traditional ways. Janet L. Balas’s article is a good primer in web-based resources for funding. Balas’s list of 12 web-based resources on library fundraising are discussed in detail. While mostly geared toward public libraries, a few of the resources can be helpful for music librarians in charge of fundraising. Especially applicable to music librarians fundraising for special

35 Ibid., 2.
36 Paustenbaugh, “Fundraising for Special Collections,” 1.
collections are the TechSoup website and the American Library Association (ALA) resources listed.

Another article with different options for fundraising is by Andrew Pace.\(^{38}\) Pace’s article is markedly different than any others reviewed. Pace starts off by saying that he is not interested in writing grants, nor is he interested in “any kind of fundraising, period.”\(^{39}\) Pace then goes on to suggest that instead of grant writing or fundraising, librarians should: have higher pay for systems or information technologists (IT) negotiate with vendors until “it hurts,” and finally, charge patrons for printing, librarian-led research, and rental fees for audio or visual materials. While negotiations with vendors do not effect special collections, IT salaries and charging patrons can possibly effect the use and/or finances of special collections if implemented.

Finally, the title of Winston and Dunkley’s article (“Leadership Competencies for Academic Librarians: The Importance of Development and Fund-raising”)\(^{40}\) may be a bit misleading, but the article is certainly worth reviewing. This article isn’t so much about character traits of librarians as it is a hefty review of literature and survey of job titles as posted on The Chronicle of Higher Education. The literature review addresses some key foundations for the purpose of this paper and recommendations for the future:

Of the extensive body of literature on development and fund-raising in academic libraries, the research literature does not address the knowledge and the skill set that librarians need to be effective fundraisers for their organizations….It appears that the educational preparation offered in most graduate library and information science (LIS) programs does not address issues of development and fund-raising to a large extent.\(^{41}\)

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 2.
\(^{41}\) Ibid., 2.
STRATEGIES FOR FUNDRAISING

Although the authors of the selected resources approached their writings about fundraising in different manners, many had the same observations. Throughout all the reviewed fundraising literature, four major themes appeared: writing grants, development officers and tactics, annual funds and Friends groups, and other strategies.

Grants

All sources reviewed agree on two basic things to prepare grant writers-to-be: planning and team building. For music librarians in charge of special collections, planning should consist of two parts: a preservation plan, and a technology plan. A preservation plan is derived from the institution’s mission statement, policies, and priorities, includes:

A statement of need that describes and qualifies the preservation challenge, definitions of preservation concepts and terms, discussion of institutional preservation priorities, strategies for selection for preservation, an outline of the preservation program…, and a discussion of consortial and cooperative relationships and opportunities with other libraries.42 Included within the parts of the preservation plan are: goals of the preservation program, the activities necessary to reach the goals, designated responsibility for each activity, resources required to carry out the activity, and a time schedule of each activity.43

If the preservation plan does not include technology, then a separate technology plan must be made. The technology plan will follow the same outline, but is “a method to prioritize and to budget for the technology tools that are most important for achieving the

library’s goals.” When requesting funds for computers, a technology plan is often required to be sent in along with the grant paperwork.

Once the plans have been developed, a team must be built. Some sources state that members of the community, selected library staff, and business people should be involved; other sources state that the library’s development office along with the head librarian and special collections director (if not the same as the head librarian) should compose the team. Either way, once the team is put together, the next step is to develop a project.

Putting together the project requires looking “carefully at the goals, objectives, and activities in all parts of your library….“ Once potential projects have been identified, outcomes, goals, objectives, steps and a timeline must be clarified. During this period, research must be completed through case studies and similar projects. According to Dewey:

It is often more effective…to read examples of successful grant applications. Funded grant applications are public documents and should be available from the funding agency or the institutions receiving the award. Studying funded proposals reveals not only how a successful application is constructed, but also confirms the type of projects the agency chooses to fund.

These documents are available, along with numerous case studies and SPEC Kits, all which provide facsimiles of actual grant documents.

Once the details of the project have been agreed upon, finding a grant to apply for is the next step. Grants come from either government sources, or private sources. A few granting sources that are key for humanities with special collections to know about are

---

45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
Writing Your Grant

Every grant has different guidelines and requirements for application. However, a few components of grant applications are frequently seen. These include a cover sheet with summary, objectives and justification, institutional information, methodology (including personnel and plan for implementation), budget, outcome reports, and sometimes publicity.49

Regardless of the grant applied for, all documents should be clear, concise and realistic. Merrily E. Taylor wrote about grant writing briefly in Successful Fundraising: Case Studies of Academic Libraries. Taylor stated that:

A [grant] proposal should describe a project or program that can actually be implemented. It must be realistic in terms of projected resources, timelines, staff capacities and outcomes….The best proposals will speak to the heart of a funding agency’s mission and excite agency staff, as well as the panelists who serve as readers for the program.50

Development

Steele and Elder defined development as the following:

Library development is a carefully orchestrated, purposive effort to raise substantial sums of money by identifying and cultivating potential donors and by soliciting gifts from them when their goals and wishes are congruent with the

49 Dewey, Raising Money for Academic and Research Libraries, 60-64.
50 Butler, Successful Fundraising, 40-41.
library’s goals and priorities.\textsuperscript{51}

There is a widespread debate within the library community about who should do the fundraising. Some sources state that fundraising should only be done by development professionals. These professionals should have the right temperament and training, and their sole focus is finding and courting resources for your library. However, most music libraries do not have their own development officer. Often the main library will have an available development officer; the downfall here is that they are not familiar with the special needs of the music library and its special collections.

The other side of the debate says that “money wants to talk to power.”\textsuperscript{52} This side of the debate says that major donors do not want to talk to a lower-level staff member, or any development officer. Donors want to work with library directors to ensure their gift will become a success.

A 1993 study showed that a total of $126 billion was raised in private contributions to non-profit institutions. Of this $126 billion, 87\% came from individuals, 7.3\% came from private foundations, and 4.7\% came from corporations.\textsuperscript{53} All sources state that development is difficult to learn and master, and requires a long-term commitment. Key to mastering development is a basic understanding of people. Hood cites Harold Seymour’s “Design for Fundraising” and his three underlying principles:

1) To be asked to participate (people want to be sought)
2) To feel he or she is a member of a worthwhile group (people want to belong)
3) To be responsible for continuity (people want to be remembered)

The key to unlocking this third aspect is putting the “emphasis on the needs that exist in

\textsuperscript{51} Steele and Elder, \textit{Becoming a Fundraiser}, 22-23.
\textsuperscript{52} Steele and Elder, \textit{Becoming a Fundraiser}, 15.
\textsuperscript{53} Clark, “Getting Started with Annual Funds in Libraries,” 73.
the society, not the emphasis on the organization’s needs.”\textsuperscript{54} This emphasis is preservation of special collections materials already held by your music library, and digitization of the same materials so that patrons (both physical and virtual) can make use of the materials.

Once you understand the basic needs of people, you can apply these to your development tactics. “The four key words in fundraising: identification, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship.”\textsuperscript{55} Identification is simply that: identifying potential sources of income for your library. Cultivation is a multi-part task that involves inviting the potential donor into your library, educating the potential donor about your library, and getting the donors involved in your library. This can be done with a library visit or even a visit to the library’s website. This is when you show the potential donor that you are seeking out help; you are asking them to participate in your organization. Once they have agreed to participate, you may move on to solicitation. Solicitation involves asking the donor for a gift, but only after enough time and participation has occurred with you and your library. Stewardship is the continuing relationship between you and your donor. This includes communication on how the gift is being used, and possible communications about additional gifts at a later date.\textsuperscript{56}

According to Hood, there are three ways of asking for donations. First is by a “written appeal” to the potential donor. Second is through phone communications, and third is by personal visits. The larger the potential gift, the more one-on-one time should

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
be required.  

Annual Funds via Friends Groups

Annual funds differ from major giving in a few key ways. First, there is a division of labor between major gifts prospecting and organizing annual funds through a Friends group. There is also a division of time invested, and the amount of the gift to be received.  

Clark states that “the bread and butter of fundraising in higher education today is the annual fund…” These annual funds are commonly developed by Friends groups. “Many academic Friends groups were established specifically to assist in raising support for manuscript and rare book collection typically in the humanities…” Friends groups encourage donations to libraries by creating a social network for the donors. Friends groups typically have regular meetings and create a purpose statement. Unfortunately, there is often an unclear nature found in many Friends groups purpose statements. Clark reviewed the purpose statements of many different library friends groups. She found that most groups have a primarily social nature, and do not mention, or indirectly mention fundraising. This unclear purpose statement can be traced back to the friends and librarian’s mutual ambivalence, uneasiness, or fear of disappointment about their fundraising efforts. Clark also reviewed a work by Michael Haeuser, who details the necessary criteria for successful friends groups.

57 Ibid.
58 Steele and Elder, Becoming a Fundraiser, 25-26.
60 Ibid., 76.
The Friends group should be a fairly autonomous group with strong and highly visible leadership from volunteers who possess fund raising experience. Leaders should also be enthusiastic, visionary, and well-connected. Library staff…should not dominate the group….Although the primary purpose of the group may be fund raising, a social component…is indispensable.  

So how exactly does a Friends group equal annual funds for your library? Two ways: membership and events.  

Membership fees to join the friends group are the basis of annual funds. Leadership donors and major gift prospects are likely to come from [a friends of the library] group.” The rule of thirds helps you develop an estimated gift table from the membership of your Friends group. To further explain, Clark cites Jerold Panas: “One third of your money comes from about your top ten donors, and the next third from about the following one hundred donors.” With a broad base of low-level memberships, a large amount of money can be raised in a small amount of time.  

The second half of annual funds created by Friends groups comes from special events. These types of events can range from 5k run-walk events; to book, art, or record appraisal clinics; to book or bake sales; to high-end picnics; to surf-a-thons (where members are sponsored to see how long they can consecutively “surf” the internet) or other “-a-thon” activities. These activities reinforce the fun aspect of helping the library. “While contributing of themselves, [participants] become more aware of the library’s services and what it means to the community….An event that generates positive publicity for the library can also serve to make friends among those whose interest and support previously seemed elusive.” Special events held once yearly are usually successful in raising a moderate amount of money (depending on the size of the Friends
group and amount of time invested in preparing the event).\textsuperscript{68} Keep in mind that the size of your Friends group isn’t as important as its age. Well-established groups (of ten years or more) donate more than groups with large memberships.\textsuperscript{69}

Other Sources

One major type of fundraising outside of the above methods is planned giving. This includes bequests (also known as deferred giving), gifts-in-kind, and many more sophisticated options. Pamela Bonnell defined deferred giving as: “a mechanism that allows a donor to bequeath money or stock [sometimes even property] according to his or her will upon death. Because of tax laws, it is highly recommended that an attorney and financial planner be involved.”\textsuperscript{70}

Gifts-in-kind make up the majority of charitable giving, and can be the backbone of support for a burgeoning music special collection. Gifts-in-kind are items given to the library, and can range from manuscripts, recordings, entire collections, photographs, notebooks, and many other item types.\textsuperscript{71}

There are endless possibilities for non-traditional funding sources. Not all of these are appropriate or fully applicable for special collections fundraising. A few of these are bake sales, memorial gifts, special events, and gift shops. The librarian or special collections director must decide what is appropriate and feasible for his or her library and collections.

\textsuperscript{67} Winning the Money Game, 39-40.
\textsuperscript{68} Clark, “Getting Started with Annual Funds in Libraries,” 81-82.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 77.
\textsuperscript{71} Dewey, Raising Money for Academic and Research Libraries, 94-95.
CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

The International Council on Archives met in Haarlem, Netherlands in 1991 to produce recommendations on how to finance archival services. Of these recommendations, a few were key:

1) Archives of a public nature should be financed principally by public funds, and at no time should it require private funding for its core operations.
2) Development of new products and services will enhance the status of the archive and bring in additional resources and funding.
3) “Archivists must develop expertise in financial management…” and should improve and monitor their cost-effectiveness.
4) Fundraising for archives is an “urgent necessity” and archives should “develop a definite policy” and guidelines on fundraising. Research on fundraising is also integral.  

There is no question that more research must be done on the fundraising habits of music libraries, including detailed surveys on the types and formats of special collections held, and types of funding pursued. Included in these surveys should be information about the library staff, especially as to whether or not partnerships occur between the head librarian, special collections director, and university development officer (if available). More literature must become available, as more music libraries and developing their own special collections. Music libraries with special collections have the highest need to preserve, but will also have some of the highest funding issues due to diverse formats and technology requirements. Copyright is also an issue in music library special collections, and few case studies are available to show how music libraries elude troubles with it. As technology progresses, the economy continues to fluctuate, institutional financial support continues to be cut, and the technological needs of the

---

library’s patrons become more savvy, music libraries (and their librarians) will have to supplement funds somehow.
APPENDIX A:

1) Name:
2) Education:
3) Institution:
4) Job title:
5) Number of years at this institution or in current position:

6) Does your institution have archival, rare or special manuscript collections? If yes, please briefly describe.

7) Tell me about your staff. Specifically, who is responsible for preservation/conservation, digital activities, and fundraising (if applicable)?

8) Has your institution decided to enter into any fundraising activity in the last year? If yes, what activity or activities did you pursue?

9) What was the purpose or need for pursuing fundraising? What was your end goal?

10) How would you rate the success of your recent fundraising activities?

11) What activities (if any) were attempted by your institution for fundraising efforts in the past?

12) What percentage or your preservation, conservation and digitization efforts, if any, were funded by fundraising opportunities?

13) Have you used your University’s or Library’s development officer to assist in the fundraising process? If so, were these efforts successful?

If you have any comments on fundraising, or specifically fundraising for preservation or digitization, please list them here:
APPENDIX B:

1) Name: Alec McLane
2) Education: M.M., DMA, MLS
3) Institution: Wesleyan University
4) Job title: Music Librarian / Director of World Music Archives
5) Number of years at this institution or in current position: 9

6) Does your institution have archival, rare or special manuscript collections? If yes, please briefly describe.

The library has a Special Collections department for print materials, but I’m not involved with that, so I will describe our sound recording archives. It is a collection of around 6000 recordings on reel, cassette, DAT, and CD. These are mostly original unpublished field recordings made all over the world, or else recordings of concerts on campus. Most recordings have been duplicated as both master and listening copies.

7) Tell me about your staff. Specifically, who is responsible for preservation/conservation, digital activities, and fundraising (if applicable)?

I have two .75 FTE staff. Both have been involved in cataloging the Archives, but one in particular is completely devoted to preservation (analog and digital) and occasional fundraising. In addition, there are graduate student workers totaling ca. 1.5 FTE who do most of the preservation work.

8) Has your institution decided to enter into any fundraising activity in the last year? If yes, what activity or activities did you pursue?

Yes. We submitted a Grammy Foundation preservation grant proposal and an NEH preservation assessment grant proposal.

9) What was the purpose or need for pursuing fundraising? What was your end goal?

We have a donated collection of ca. 3000 tapes and haven’t the resources to process this collection in our current situation. We were hoping to partner with other institutions and put parts of the collection online.

10) How would you rate the success of your recent fundraising activities?

No success at all yet (but still awaiting word on the NEH proposal).

11) What activities (if any) were attempted by your institution for fundraising efforts in the past?
The Archives began with back-to-back NEH grants in the early 1990’s to preserve and catalog the original collection of recordings.

12) What percentage of your preservation, conservation and digitization efforts, if any, were funded by fundraising opportunities?

In the beginning, all of it. Since 1995 none at all.

13) Have you used your University’s or Library’s development officer to assist in the fundraising process? If so, were these efforts successful?

For the recent proposals we used the University’s Foundation and Corporate Relations office. It was successful only in that they helped us compile the grant proposal and get it out in time, although we have twice been turned down.

If you have any comments on fundraising, or specifically fundraising for preservation or digitization, please list them here:
APPENDIX C:

1) **Name:** Peter Munstedt
2) **Education:** BA, MA, MLS, PhD
3) **Institution:** MIT
4) **Job title:** Music Librarian
5) **Number of years at this institution or in current position:** 15 years

6) Does your institution have archival, rare or special manuscript collections? If yes, please briefly describe.

   MIT has a special collections for the entire school. The Music Library has its own small special collections.

7) Tell me about your staff. Specifically, who is responsible for preservation/conservation, digital activities, and fundraising (if applicable)?

   The MIT Libraries employs people that work on all three of these areas.

8) Has your institution decided to enter into any fundraising activity in the last year? If yes, what activity or activities did you pursue?

   MIT has a large development office. The Libraries employ 2.5 staff members who work in library development.

9) What was the purpose or need for pursuing fundraising? What was your end goal?

   The goal of the Lewis Music Library fundraising efforts has been to obtain funding for special projects (such as the music library renovation, funding to staff the Music at MIT Oral History project) and to supplement the collections budget.

10) How would you rate the success of your recent fundraising activities?

   The music library has been successful in obtaining money for projects and general library support. We have increased the size of our mailing list and our donor base significantly during the past ten years. The major gift we obtained was one to renovate our library 11 years ago.

11) What activities (if any) were attempted by your institution for fundraising efforts in the past?

   MIT has completed a major capital campaign. The music library has attempted to raise money from individuals rather than seeking grant money. Working with private donors has resulted in a few large gifts as well as many small donations mostly from MIT alums.
12) What percentage of your preservation, conservation and digitization efforts, if any, were funded by fundraising opportunities?

I do not have percentages, but the MIT Libraries obtained a large gift to renovate its preservation lab (see newsletter article in: http://malgosia.mit.edu/about/news/newsletter/05-02.pdf. The music library obtained donations from alums to support the reformattting of 72 MIT Symphony Orchestra concerts from reel-to-reel tape to CD.

13) Have you used your University’s or Library’s development officer to assist in the fundraising process? If so, were these efforts successful?

Yes, I am in contact very often with the Library’s development officer. We have been fairly successful. The latest success was the support of a half-time staff position in the music library to work on the Music at MIT Oral History project. Funding for this project will last at least 5 years.

14) If you have any comments on fundraising, or specifically fundraising for preservation or digitization, please list them here:
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