

# Special Collections Repositories at Association of Research Libraries Institutions: A Study of Current Practices in Preservation Management

Tyler O. Walters, in association with Ivan E. Hanthorn

## Abstract

This article reports and interprets data collected from a 1995 survey of special collections repositories at Association of Research Libraries institutions. It covers part one of the survey—current practices in preservation management. One hundred thirteen institutions represented by 170 archives/manuscripts repositories were asked to participate, of which 143 institutions, or 84.1%, did so. This is the second largest sample of archives' preservation activities ever gathered in the United States. The goals of the study were, first, to create a base of data on the development of archival preservation programs in research institutions and interpret that data and, second, to understand the extent to which the archives and library preservation departments interact in their common mission to ensure the availability of research materials to present and future generations. The study is unique in its investigation of the interrelationships between the archival repository's and the library's operational functions. This article recognizes that there is potential for a certain amount of preservation program development and integration between libraries and archives.

## Introduction

The concept of preservation management has evolved to a point where it is immersed in every facet of the management of libraries and archives.<sup>1</sup> This process began in the 1970s when librarians broadened

<sup>1</sup> "Preservation: The totality of processes and operations involved in the stabilization and protection of documents against damage and deterioration and in the treatment of damaged or deteriorated

*The author thanks Ivan Hanthorn, Head of the Preservation Department at the Iowa State Library, for his early collaborations on this research project, as well as Paul Conway for initial assistance on the research design and for years of encouragement. This research was conducted as an independent study project through The University of Arizona School of Library Science with the support of the Iowa State University Library.*

their concepts of preservation to understand and promote its library-wide impact. By the 1980s archivists were following suit, adapting the concept for specific application to their field. The major perspective developing in both archives and library preservation management was each field's de-emphasis of ad hoc reactions to materials already in an advanced stage of deterioration, along with a new emphasis on planned and coordinated preservation programs featuring preventive measures. Today preservation management as a component of management in libraries and archives involves planning and implementing policies and procedures that either prevent further deterioration or restore accessibility to the research materials. Common elements of preservation programs in archives and libraries encompass environmental monitoring and management, storage, selection for preservation, condition assessment, format-specific care and use requirements, collections housing, handling and use of materials, micro-reproduction and reformatting, exhibition, disaster preparedness, security, and conservation treatment. Contemporary preservation management recognizes that preservation is an integral part of all functions involved in the identification, acquisition, preservation, access, and promotion of valuable research materials.<sup>2</sup>

---

documents. Preservation may also include the transfer of information to another medium." Lewis J. Bellardo and Lynn Lady Bellardo, comps., *A Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1992), 26-27.

The 1974 SAA definition for "preservation" is as follows: "(1) The basic responsibility to provide adequate facilities for the protection, care, and maintenance of archives, records, and manuscripts. (2) Specific measures, individual and collective, undertaken for the repair, maintenance, restoration, or protection of documents." Frank B. Evans, Donald F. Harrison, and Edwin A. Thompson, comps., William L. Rofes, ed., "A Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers," *American Archivist* 37 (July 1974): 427. Note the great emphasis on physical treatment of already damaged documents in definition (2) in 1974, as opposed to the 1992 definition which emphasizes "the totality of processes and operations" and "the stabilization and protection of documents" over "the treatment of damaged or deteriorated documents." The 1983 *ALA Glossary* definition of "preservation" also emphasizes physical treatment over preventive measures. In it, the glossary authors state that preservation is distinct from conservation because, while the latter focuses on physical and chemical treatments to damaged documents, the former, preservation, includes these treatments plus reformatting activities. There is no mention of establishing a preservation environment including the elements of a preservation management program as it is conceived of today. See *The ALA Glossary of Library and Information Science* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1983), 175.

<sup>2</sup> See Pamela W. Darling, "Creativity v. Despair: The Challenge of Preservation Administration," *Library Trends* 30 (Fall 1981): 179-88; Pamela W. Darling, "Planning for the Future," in *The Library Preservation Program: Models, Priorities, Possibilities*, edited by Jan Merrill-Oldham and Merrily Smith (Chicago: American Library Association, 1985), 103-10; Pamela W. Darling, with Duane Webster, *Preservation Planning Program: An Assisted Self-Study Manual for Libraries*, edited and revised by Jan Merrill-Oldham and J. Reed Scott (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries Office of Management Studies, 1993); Norvell M. M. Jones and Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, "Implementing an Archival Preservation Program," in *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions*, edited by James Gregory Bradsher (London: Mansell Publishing Limited, 1988), 185-206; Anne R. Kenney, editor, *American Archivist* Special Preservation Issue 53 (Spring 1990); Sherelyn Ogden, editor, *Preservation of Library & Archival Materials: A Manual*, revised and expanded (Andover, Mass.: Northeast Document Conservation Center, 1994); Jan Merrill-Oldham, Carolyn Clark Morrow, and Mark Roosa, *Preservation Program Models: A Study Project and Report*, Association of Research Libraries, Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1991); Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, *Preserving Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1993); Tyler O. Walters, "Thinking About Archival Preservation in the '90s and Beyond: Some Recent Publications and Their Implications for Archivists," *American Archivist* 58 (Fall 1995): 476-



The author conducted an extensive survey of preservation planning and program implementation to, first, measure the application of modern preservation management in archives.<sup>3</sup> Second, the survey project aspired to discover the extent of integration between archives and library preservation management programs that belong to the same institution, given the parallel and sometimes overlapping development of preservation management between these two cultural institutions. To do so, an institutional setting conducive to archives/library cooperation needed to be identified. The institutional setting decided upon was the research institution, specifically those with libraries that are members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The survey population is comprised of archives and manuscript repositories, of which about 80% are administratively placed in the research institution's library. One of the most frequently offered reasons for why these two organizations are placed together is the notion that both have similar preservation missions and functions. But are they really one organization, or is it a case of the larger library dominating the smaller archives, isolating the latter within the complex library organization? More can be learned about how libraries and archives are interacting through an examination of archival preservation planning and operations. This research survey project measures the development of archival preservation management programs in particular institutional settings and reveals whether archives are benefitting from their organizational placement by collaborating with the libraries' preservation departments.

The broader perspective on the issues above involves concepts of what research libraries collect and to which materials they provide access. When research libraries were contacted about the possibility of holding archives and manuscript material, virtually every ARL-member library indicated that they operate an archives, manuscripts, or special collections unit that collects, preserves, and provides access to archival materials. This overwhelming response substantiates the fact that modern research libraries are much more than traditional libraries managing collections of published material. They are even more comprehensive than libraries that have updated themselves to include collecting published electronic resources. Today, research libraries also include paper-based archival records and manuscript collections, film archives and libraries, media collections, photographic materials, cartographic materials, audio/visual collections, recorded sound collections, elec-

---

92; and Peter Waters, "Phased Preservation: A Philosophical Concept and Practical Approach to Preservation," *Special Libraries* 81 (Winter 1990): 35-43.

<sup>3</sup> There is a second part of the survey addressing the same archival repositories' automated access practices. The findings for this portion of the survey are presented in "Automated Access Practices at Special Collection Repositories of Association of Research Libraries Institutions," *Archival Issues* 22 (Fall 1997): forthcoming. Together these two articles provide an extensive view of the nature of archival collections management practices as well as their interactions with library collections management practices in the research institutional setting.

tronic records, and more. The modern research library has become a melting pot where new "centers of information management" are cast. Surely the potential exists for this to be true, but are research libraries recognizing this new dynamic? Are they making changes in workflow and internal operations accordingly, or are they becoming segregated battlegrounds where isolated programs fight over limited resources? This article will delve into the shared aspect of preservation to see in which direction research libraries are moving. But first, a brief overview is given of the findings of some major predecessor preservation surveys conducted in archives to provide some context and perspective on the current study. The overview will be followed by a review of the current research project, its methodology and interpretations of the data gathered, and conclude with some general observations.

#### **Review of Past Archival Preservation Survey Studies**

The previously conducted major archives preservation surveys were performed by the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators (NAGARA) and the Society of American Archivists (SAA).<sup>4</sup> *Preservation Needs in State Archives* (1986), conducted by Howard P. Lowell under contract to NAGARA, focused on the fifty state government archives in the United States, and included the National Archives and Records Administration as well. The report's introduction states that it will "discuss and document the nature and dimensions of the preservation problem in state archival agencies, explore alternatives for meeting it, and provide an estimate of resources required."<sup>5</sup> Forty-three state archives participated in the NAGARA survey. Ten state archives were selected for follow-up site visits "to study specific preservation problems and program efforts; to estimate collective resources available and needed; and to define program approaches that might begin to meet state archives preservation requirements."<sup>6</sup> The NAGARA survey studied state archives' budgets, FTE of staff dedicated to preservation activity, the existence of environmental controls, disaster plans, fire detection and suppression systems, security systems, shelving space, amount of holdings, formats of holdings, volume of records that had been treated through encapsulation, lamination, deacidification and/or fumigation, and information about micro-reproduction programs.

<sup>4</sup> See National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators, *Preservation Needs in State Archives* (Albany, N.Y.: NAGARA, 1986); Paul Conway, "Archival Preservation Practice in a Nationwide Context," *American Archivist* 53 (Spring 1990): 204-22; and Paul Conway, *Archival Preservation the United States and the Role of Information Sources* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1991).

<sup>5</sup> *Preservation Needs in State Archives*, ii.

<sup>6</sup> *Preservation Needs in State Archives*, ii.



The NAGARA study concludes that "no state archives approaches the goal of providing total preservation care."<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the study calls for nationwide funding and advocates a national strategy to address the state archives' common preservation challenges. While the purpose of the NAGARA study was to dramatize the nationwide problem and instigate funding initiatives, it does give us some data on a number of preservation program elements. It specifically points to weaknesses in facility controls, holdings maintenance, and conservation treatments. The study recommends improved preservation planning, staff enhancements, the development of regional conservation centers, and further research and development in preservation.

There are some noteworthy statistics reported by NAGARA in support of these findings. For instance, 37.2% of holdings were housed in acid-free boxes. But four of the reporting state archives indicated that while 80% of their holdings were in acid-free boxes, only 14% of this material was housed in acid-free folders.<sup>8</sup> The study's consultant estimated that "more than 80% of the records accessioned into state archives each year. . . will never receive adequate preservation attention."<sup>9</sup> Only 9 (21%) of the 43 archives reported that they had developed preservation policy statements, and only 23 archives (53%) had conducted holdings condition surveys. The NAGARA study indicates a general lack of budgetary resources, adequate facilities, staffing and staff expertise, planning and policy development, and collection information gathering activities necessary to conduct preservation activity in state archives.

The comprehensive 1986 Lowell/NAGARA study has been partially updated in two studies conducted for the Council of State Historical Records Coordinators (COSHRC). The first, *Recognizing Leadership and Partnership: A Report on the Condition of Historical Records in the States and Efforts to Ensure Their Preservation and Use* (April 1993), reports on preservation practices in "Preservation and Conservation," in section 12 of the study. The most recent NHPRC-funded COSHRC study (1995) was released in April 1996, the same year as the study presented in this article. *Maintaining State Records in an Era of Change: A National Challenge* reports on state archives' preservation policies and services in the areas of preservation planning, staffing, disaster preparedness, conservation treatment services, and the completion of NEH-supported statewide preservation plans. These two studies document essentially the same preservation management inadequacies as described in the 1986 Lowell/NAGARA study. Neither the 1993 nor the 1996 COSHRC study discovered any trends in preservation management that were a radical departure from what Lowell found in 1986. However, due to the timely nature of the second study printed in April 1996, data from it will be presented in other

<sup>7</sup> *Preservation Needs in State Archives*, 7.

<sup>8</sup> *Preservation Needs in State Archives*, 23.

<sup>9</sup> *Preservation Needs in State Archives*, 24.

areas of this article to draw comparisons with the current study of archives and manuscript repositories of ARL institutions.

The SAA study, conducted by former SAA preservation officer, Paul Conway, yielded more detailed information about the nature of preservation planning and practice in archives. Data from the SAA study will also be compared to the findings of the study presented in this article in an attempt to detect trends in preservation practice. In 1989 Conway conducted a survey of the participants in the SAA Basic Conservation workshops which took place between 1980 and 1987. The survey was sent to the 400 repositories that enrolled 544 participants in the workshops, resulting in 320 completed surveys for a response rate of 80%. This preservation survey covered a diverse group of institutional settings, including academic, local government, religious, museum, state government, corporate, and federal government. The academic archives group comprised 40% (129 respondents) of the institutions surveyed. Conway developed indices to evaluate the data. These are the Intensity of Care Index (volume of holdings per FTE of staff), Environmental Care Index (temperature stability, monitoring equipment, fire protection, and disaster planning) and the Care of Collections Index (holdings maintenance, conservation treatments, and reformatting). Other aspects of the reported data are the size of the archival unit in terms of FTEs, volume of holdings, and institutions with specific budgets for conservation supplies and services.

One of the purposes of Conway's research was to find any direct correlation between the training provided in the Basic Conservation Workshops and the nature of subsequent preservation program development. On this topic, Conway writes, "although archivists now understand the significance of their preservation efforts and have absorbed information on basic prevention and treatment techniques, they have only partially integrated into their professional practice the set of innovative approaches that together have come to be defined as archival preservation management."<sup>10</sup> Thus there was not as much of a positive correlation between training and program development as was hoped. From his analysis of the data on archival preservation program development, Conway concludes that "archivists take a piecemeal approach to preservation, picking and choosing from among the possible activities, instead of working through a planning process that sets priorities for the unit and for the parent organization."<sup>11</sup> He cites such troubling findings as: of the archives surveyed about their collections storage areas, 56% could not control the relative humidity, 73% did not have at least one recording hygrothermograph and 62% did not have fire detection equipment in place and could not suppress fires after business hours.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Conway, "Archival Preservation Practice in a Nationwide Context," 220-21.

<sup>11</sup> Conway, "Archival Preservation Practice in a Nationwide Context," 221.

<sup>12</sup> Conway, "Archival Preservation Practice in a Nationwide Context," 218-19.



Another issue addressed by Conway provides some direction for this current study of preservation in archival repositories at Association of Research Libraries institutions. Conway states that "archival units are isolated from the organizations of which they are a part, playing a far more limited role in supporting the institution's mission and purpose than they should. Archivists need to integrate their programs more fully into the institutions that support them."<sup>13</sup> In at least one specific institutional setting, archivists share the mission of preserving research collections with another unit, the institution's research library. Many research libraries operate a preservation unit charged with ensuring the availability of the collections for present and future use. As mentioned earlier, many archival repositories are also administratively part of the research library organization. These circumstances present an obvious opportunity for collaborative practices in library and archival preservation between these two units. Even for the university-based archives outside of the library, the same potential exists for them to communicate with the library's preservation department on a wide range of relevant issues. But are archives benefitting from being part of the library and are they sharing preservation resources and expertise? Along with an analysis of preservation program development in archives and manuscripts repositories of research institutions, this article, stemming from a comprehensive survey project, will seek to answer these questions.

#### **Research Project Description and Review of Methodology**

This study of archival preservation management utilized sound survey research techniques to query 170 archival repositories about the extent of preservation program development and integration in research libraries. The goals of the preservation study were: 1) to create a base of data regarding the development of archival preservation programs in North American research institutions and interpret that data, and 2) to understand the extent to which the archives and library preservation departments interact in their common mission to ensure the availability of research materials to present and future generations. The study is unique in its investigation of the interrelationships between the archival repository's and the library's operational functions. This interrelationship was not within the scope of previous archival preservation surveys nor any published interinstitutional library preservation surveys.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Conway, "Archival Preservation Practice in a Nationwide Context," 222.

<sup>14</sup> For examples of recent academic library preservation practice surveys, see Joanne Schneider Hill, "An Ounce of Prevention: Preservation Organization and Practice in College Libraries," in *Collection Development in College Libraries*, edited by J.S. Hill, et al. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1991); and the 1995 survey by the Commission on Preservation and Access' College Library Committee. This survey's results are available at <<http://www.clir.org/programs/leadership/surveys/index.html>>.

**Table 11: Library/Archives Integration:  
Microfilming**

	Yes	No
Microfilming During the Past Two Years (n=135):	97 (72%)	38 (28%)
Responsibility for Performing Microfilming (n=97)		
External Microfilm Service Vendor:	67 (69%)	
Library Preservation Dept.:	18 (19%)	
Archives Dept.:	14 (14%)	
Other:	18 (19%)	

ments. While the numbers indicate a higher amount of library preservation involvement in this most traditional of library preservation functions (higher than holdings maintenance activities), the very low number of archives drawing upon the knowledge and skills resident in the library preservation department for training purposes is unfortunate. It once again indicates a lost opportunity for the two units to share resources and benefit from one another.

Another traditional area of activity for library preservation operations is microfilming. Here is the one area where the archival repositories do not necessarily engage in preservation activity from within, cooperate with, or outsource to the library preservation department. Instead, the majority of repositories, 67 (69%), report working directly with external microfilm service vendors (Table 11). Nineteen percent stated that the library preservation department carries out microfilming procedures and 14 (14%) of the archival repositories reported that they complete this function in-house, a relatively equivalent split between the two units. The high incidence of relationships between archival repositories and external vendors raises the issue about who oversees quality control and negotiates contract specifications. Previously reported survey data found that approximately 87% of the repositories reported that they have no written procedures for selecting materials for microfilming (see Table 6). This also raises concerns over whether or not quality control checks such as post-film inspections of the microfilm for accuracy are being conducted and whether or not technical preservation microfilming specifications are being adhered to and verified once the work is done.<sup>22</sup> While these specific questions were not part of the survey instrument, one must wonder how much effort goes into these concerns if repositories do not set criteria for determining which collections will and will not be microfilmed. These are the kinds of activities library preservation departments do during preservation microfilming of published materials and could presumably perform on behalf of the archival repository. There is no evidence of this type of collaboration in microfilming processes.

<sup>22</sup> See Nancy E. Elkington, ed., *RLG Archives Microfilming Manual* (Mountain View, Calif.: The Research Libraries Group, Inc. 1994).



**Table 12: (n=135) Library/Archives Integration: Position Responsible for Maintaining the Archives' Preservation Planning and Monitoring**

Library Preservation Dept. Representative:	8 (6%)
Designated Preservation Officer from Archives Staff:	22 (16%)
Archives Dept. Head:	58 (43%)
Other Archives Staff:	23 (17%)
Other:	24 (18%)

After inquiring about specific preservation program elements and the nature of archives/library preservation interactions, a general inquiry was made about the overall responsibility for maintaining preservation planning and monitoring of conditions in the archival repository. The purpose was to test the perspective that library preservation departments are responsible for all preservation programs in the library, including any archival programs, and if not, to learn how the archival repositories are delegating this duty among their staffs (Table 12). There are only eight cases (6%) where a library preservation department representative possesses this overarching responsibility. In 103 (76%) cases, it is the archival repository that maintains the total preservation program oversight for the facility or unit. Of the 103 repositories, 58 retain overall program responsibility with the archives department head, 22 of them have designated a preservation officer from within the archives staff, and 23 spread preservation program responsibilities among other archives staff. This is not to say that one arrangement should take precedence over the other, but the responses do once again indicate a very low level of interaction between the two units. Only in the fewest of instances does a library preservation department representative play a major role in the archives' preservation program.

There is further evidence of the lack of involvement with the library preservation department on the part of the archival repository. Question #17a asked for information regarding the array of staffing in the library preservation department. Thirty-four percent of the responding repositories did not answer this question. This one-third nonresponse rate is significant. Supplying this information required only a little amount of effort. An archives staff member could have simply placed a phone call to the preservation department asking for the staffing numbers. The archives staff member could have also consulted the annual published ARL Preservation Statistics which supplies these numbers. In only one case did a respondent write in the margin that the responses to question #17a came from the recent ARL Preservation Statistics volume.

Question #17 asked the archival repository if their library has a preservation department, a preservation staff but not an organized department, or if there are some other arrangements. Twenty-two percent of the respondents

stated that their library does not engage in preservation functions at all. This is at odds with the ARL preservation statistics which show that all member libraries perform some array of preservation functions. Apparently, 22% of the archival repositories responding are uninformed or not sufficiently connected to the preservation functions in their institution's library. They may not know of the ARL volume's existence and that their library has preservation staff functions. Clearly, there is a lack of communication between these two units and their professionals who share several common agendas. The survey instrument did not provide any information on the lack of communication directly. A better understanding of this condition must be left to future inquiries.

### Conclusions

Given the results of the survey, we are left with some general impressions. Certain aspects of preservation practice are improving. This is confirmed when comparing the data from the 1989 Conway/SAA study with the surveys of 1995 on state archives from COSHRC and the survey that is the subject of this article. Even though selective improvement exists, still only a little more than half of the responding repositories possess the capability to control both temperature and relative humidity levels. While environmental monitoring is occurring in more archives than not, it is being done in an improper or inadequate fashion. The vast majority of archives do not have sprinkler systems in place to protect collections on a repository-wide basis. Planning activities are very low. Archives generally are not benefitting from the expertise found in library preservation departments, even though about 80% of the reporting archives reside within the library organization.

Two questions that required subjective answers were included in the survey to gauge archivists' perceptions of these existing conditions. When asked in question #18, "How serious are the preservation problems that you confront in your daily work?" on a scale from 1 (minimal) to 5 (severe), the composite repository response measured 3.19, slightly above the moderate problems level. As a follow-up, question #19 asked, "How successful and satisfied are you with the preservation management and activities in your archives?" On a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (great), the composite repository response was 2.92, just below the moderate satisfaction level. In juxtaposition to the relatively mild composite scores of the subjective question responses, the objective survey results confirm basic, systemic inadequacies throughout the majority of archival preservation programs that will lead to compromising the archival holdings' existence.

Something must be done to improve the areas in which there are disappointing preservation practices and to foster mature, complete archival



**Table 13: (n=124) Education of Person(s) Responsible for the Archives' Preservation Management and Implementation**

Specialized Graduate Preservation Degree:	8 (6%)
Graduate-Level Preservation Courses within Graduate Degree Program:	31 (23%)
Workshops/Seminars:	100 (75%)
Internship:	12 (9%)
Other Training:	23 (17%)
None of the Above:	14 (10%)

preservation management programs. One step toward improvement is the use of educational programs to create preservation expertise and encourage collaborations between library preservation programs and archives/manuscripts repositories. In question #21 of the survey, respondents were asked "has the person(s) responsible for overseeing preservation management and implementation in your archives received any specialized preservation training?" (Table 13). The results show that 100 (75%) respondents have received specialized preservation training through workshops and seminars, 12 (9%) have received such training through internships, 31 (23%) received graduate level preservation courses within their graduate degree program, eight (6%) employ staff with specialized graduate preservation degrees, 23 (17%) have received training through other arrangements, and 14 (10%) have received no training at all. This compares favorably to Conway's data on availability of conservation expertise. The two sets of data may not be directly comparable, but it would appear that training and education is on the rise. For instance, in the current study 75% of archives claimed to have received specialized preservation training through workshops and seminars, while 54% of archives in Conway's study claimed to have no access to conservation expertise at all. However, when data from the COSHRC (April 1996) study is factored in, the improving trend of staff expertise in preservation is not so clear: only 48% of state archives had the position of preservation officer and an even lower 37.5% had the position of conservator. Perhaps limited, short-term continuing education offerings are more readily available, but all this activity has not translated into additional preservation and conservation positions in archives and their parent institutions.

Professional demographics show that the trend for individuals entering the archival profession is through graduate archival education programs.<sup>23</sup> Ensuring that these programs are adequately addressing archival preservation management knowledge is one long-term way to improve the situation for the generations of archivists to come. However, when the workshops, seminars, and internships are combined into one category called "continuing

<sup>23</sup> Of the 819 archivists surveyed who had attended SAA continuing education programs, 56% had a master's degree that included coursework in archives. *SAA Newsletter* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, July 1993): 16.

education," then we learn that 84% of the responses indicate that archives staff have received some sort of specialized preservation training through continuing education programs. Clearly archivists are attending preservation-related continuing education offerings. Perhaps this form of education can be better utilized to draw the connections between library preservation and archival management closer together.<sup>24</sup>

The professional education of archivists, library preservation professionals, and library administrators must address several issues to foster collaborations in preservation management. For instance, archivists need to learn how to function in the larger worlds of modern research library administration generally, and library preservation specifically. Library preservation professionals need to learn about archival preservation management and its similarities to and differences from library preservation. They also need to learn how and when they can appropriately integrate archival preservation concerns into the total library preservation program. Library administrators must understand that integrating their archival and library preservation programs will save valuable resources. Duplicate functions will be eradicated, preservation policies and procedures will be made similar whenever possible, and the library will produce better preservation management solutions with more expert staff collaborations. The result will be more research materials receiving professional attention with the same base of resources under the new and improved umbrella of preservation management.

There are several areas of similarity between library preservation and archival preservation management. The primary concern of any preservation program is program planning and evaluation. Formal continuing education offerings as well as in-house library training should focus on how to make library planning processes inclusive of library-wide preservation management (including archives), and bringing library and archival preservation management together. Next, collaborating in the basic program elements of preservation management should be the focus. Elements such as environmental management and monitoring, pest management, disaster preparedness and recovery, and reformatting and conservation treatment for the archives/manuscripts repository can easily be incorporated into a mature library preservation program. Other program aspects lend themselves well to a shared, cooperative approach to management, such as collections housing and storage systems, exhibition and loan policies, and staff training in collections care and handling. Examples of preservation elements best handled by archives/

<sup>24</sup> For descriptions and analyses of the latest major continuing education initiative in archival preservation, see Christine Ward and Evelyn Frangakis, "Archival Preservation Education—An Overview of the Society of American Archivists' Programs and New Directions for the Future," in *Advances in Preservation and Access*, volume 2 (Medford, N.J.: Learned Information, Inc., 1995), and Tyler O. Walters, "Breaking New Ground in Fostering Preservation: The Society of American Archivists' Preservation Management Training Program," *Library Resources and Technical Services* 39 (October 1995): 417–26.



manuscript repositories are use policies, staff training in specific areas, workspace design, preservation considerations in appraisal decisions, and overall policy development.<sup>25</sup> In any case, there are sufficient grounds for collaboration that should be addressed by libraries and providers of relevant continuing education.

Once archivists and library preservation professionals have learned more about their shared concerns and program elements, they will be ready to work together more closely. The priority item on their agenda should be identifying opportunities to improve library processes and administrators' perceptions so that collaborative preservation management is supported and encouraged. Opportunities abound in modern library management to provide input on its policies, procedures, and services. Academic libraries are frequently subject to strategic planning, internal self-studies, accreditation reviews, and external program reviews. These planning exercises can be turned into vehicles carrying arguments for integrated library/archives preservation management. Other occasions can be used to assert preservation needs and the benefits of collaboration such as annual and project-based reporting, through committees, and during personnel changes. Archivists and library preservation professionals must find ways to educate their resource allocators on the benefits, savings, and improved services of integrated preservation programs. Cooperation and resource sharing is more obtainable than professional staffing additions in either library unit. In the end, the library preservation professional can be a great ally in collaborating on archival objectives within the library.<sup>26</sup>

This article began with a view of research libraries as functional organizations that carry out processes in relation to a great diversity of research materials. Research libraries manage much more than just books, yet the survey results demonstrate that library preservation departments focus almost exclusively on the needs of published materials, and spend little, if any, time and resources on unpublished, archival materials. While there are many areas of program similarity, the respective preservation programs appear to be moving along parallel tracks, rarely touching. In the realm of preservation management, archives, by and large, are not benefitting from their association with the research library. This is unfortunate given the range of benefits to be derived from closer collaboration.

<sup>25</sup> Walters, "Breaking New Ground in Fostering Preservation," 424-25.

<sup>26</sup> Susan Bigelow, "Duels or Dialogues?: The Relationship Between Archivists and Conservators," *Archivaria* 29 (Winter 1989-90): 51-56.

**Appendix: ARL Archives & Manuscripts Repositories  
Preservation Activities Survey—Tabulated Results**

1. Is the storage area of your archives equipped to provide controlled temperature and humidity ( $\pm 3^{\circ}\text{F}$  and  $\pm 5\%$  relative humidity)?

N=133

Temperature	93	yes	40	no
Relative Humidity	78	yes	55	no

2. Have any of the following types of equipment been used in the past year to monitor the environment of the storage areas of your archives?

N=135

Thermometer	63	yes	72	no
Hygrometer	38	yes	97	no
Recording				
Hygrothermograph	84	yes	51	no
Sling Psychrometer	38	yes	97	no
Temperature/Humidity				
Data Logger	33	yes	102	no
6 Other				

3. Within the past two years have you conducted a holdings survey of the majority of your archives to identify potential preservation problems?

N=136

38	yes	98	no
----	-----	----	----

- 3a. If yes, have any of the findings from the survey resulted in actions such as rehousing or reformatting deteriorated items?

N=38

33	yes	5	no
----	-----	---	----



4. Please indicate which of the following holdings maintenance actions are *routinely* carried out (Circle all that apply).

N=136

- 133 Place holdings in acid-free folders or containers
- 118 Remove, copy, or segregate newsprint or highly acidic papers
- 117 Remove or segregate photographic media
- 127 Remove or replace rusted or damaged fasteners
- 119 Copy deteriorated items
- 35 Other action

5. Please indicate which ONE of the following selections best describes which unit is principally responsible for carrying out the holdings maintenance actions mentioned in question 4.

N=135

- 1 Library preservation dept.
- 121 Performed internally by archives staff
- 7 Archives staff trained by library preservation dept.
- 0 Contracted, external preservation service vendor
- 6 Other

6. Does your archives have a written disaster preparedness and recovery plan in case of fire, flood, or other disaster?

N=134

77 yes    31 no    26 in process

7. Please indicate which fire detection/suppression systems are present in your main storage areas.

N=135

1. Smoke Detectors	111	yes	24	no
2. Fire Detectors	74	yes	61	no
3. Fire Extinguishers	123	yes	12	no
4. Wet Pipe Sprinkler System	42	yes	93	no
5. Dry Pipe Sprinkler System	14	yes	121	no
6. Halon Gas System	23	yes	112	no
7. Other	12	yes		

8. Does your archives have written policies and procedures regarding any of the following? (Circle all that apply).

N=123

- 95 Document handling procedures
- 98 Photocopying procedures
- 96 Reading room monitoring
- 94 User identification procedures
- 13 Other

9. How is any instruction in handling documents given to users of your archives? (Circle all that apply).

N=136

- 59 Briefly during use
- 118 Briefly before use
- 25 In workshops/classes
- 30 Other
- 4 None of the above

10. Does your archives have written procedures for selecting documents for any of the following conservation processes? (Circle all that apply).

N=134

- 17 Reformatting on microforms
- 14 Replacing deteriorated originals
- 7 Deacidifying paper documents
- 18 Encapsulation
- 14 Dry clean surface of documents
- 3 Lamination of paper documents
- 12 Other conservation treatments
- 101 None of the above



A STUDY OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN PRESERVATION  
MANAGEMENT

11. Please indicate which of the following conservation processes are *routinely* carried out (Circle all that apply).

N=136

- 51 Dry clean surface of documents
- 65 Basic mending and minor repairs
- 22 pH testing
- 28 Deacidifying paper documents
- 71 Encapsulation
- 3 Lamination
- 24 Other conservation treatments
- 40 None of the above

12. Please indicate which ONE of the following selections best describes which unit is principally responsible for carrying out the conservation processes listed in question 11.

N=124

- 35 Library preservation dept.
- 62 Archives dept.
- 4 Archives staff trained by library preservation dept.
- 4 Contracted, external preservation service vendor
- 19 Other

13. During the past two years has your archives reproduced any holdings on microformats?

N=135

97      yes      38      no

- 13a. If yes, please indicate which of the following units carry out reformatting procedures onto microforms.

N=97

- 67 External microforms service vendor
- 18 Library preservation dept.
- 14 Archives dept.
- 18 Other

14. Does your archives have a specific annual budget for the purchase of preservation supplies/services?

N=133

69      yes      64      no

15. Please indicate which ONE of the following persons are principally responsible for maintaining preservation planning and monitoring in your archives.

N=135

- 8 Library preservation dept. representative
- 22 Designated preservation officer from archives staff
- 58 Archives dept. head
- 23 Other archives staff
- 24 Other

16. Please indicate the administrative placement of your archives within your university (who do you report to).

N=136

- 16 University administration (president, vice president, provost)
- 36 Library director
- 38 Assistant library director
- 26 Library dept. head
- 19 Other

17. Does your university library include a department or individual staff dedicated to managing and implementing a library preservation program?

N=133

Preservation dept.	84	yes	49	no
Preservation staff, but not organized into separate dept.	20	yes	113	no
10 Other				

- 17a. If yes to any portion of Question 17, what is the total full-time equivalent (FTE) of the following classifications of staff in the library preservation department/unit?

N=69

1. Preservation professionals	235.58
2. Paraprofessionals	380.68
3. Clericals	112.50
4. Student assistants	132.45
5. Volunteers	10.3
6. Other	112



18. How serious are the preservation problems that you confront in your daily work? On the scale below, please circle the number that best expresses your personal judgement.

N=135

Minimal		Moderate		Severe
1	2	3	4	5

(3.19 average response)

19. How successful and satisfied are you with the preservation management and activities in your archives? On the scale below, please circle the number that best expresses your personal judgement.

N=138

Poor		Moderate		Great
1	2	3	4	5

(2.92 average response)

20. What is the total full-time equivalent (FTE) of the following classifications of staff in your archives?

N=129

1.	Archivists	485.71
2.	Paraprofessionals	243.26
3.	Clericals	124.20
4.	Student assistants	264.55
5.	Volunteers	80.87
6.	Other	40.30

21. Has the person(s) responsible for overseeing preservation management and implementation in your archives received any specialized preservation training? (Circle all that apply).

N=134

- 8 Specialized graduate preservation degree
- 31 Graduate level preservation courses within graduate degree program
- 100 Workshops/seminars
- 12 Internship
- 23 Other training
- 14 None of the above

THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST

22. Please indicate the total volume and number of paper-based archival and manuscript collections in your archives. For reporting purposes, one cubic foot equals one linear foot. Please estimate the requested figures if you are not sure.

1,995,744 Cubic/Linear feet (N=120)

157,572 Collections (N=109)

23. Please indicate the total volume of microfilm and microfiche holdings in your archives.

252,063 Reels of microfilm (N=101)

888,809 Microfiche sheets (N=71)