



SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In June of 2005, OCLC conducted an international survey on people's perceptions of libraries. When asked the question, "What is the first thing you think of when you think of a library?" roughly 70% of the 3,300 respondents answered "books."¹ However, those who work in libraries, especially research libraries, know that they contain a wide variety of types of materials, including large numbers of works of art and artifacts. Increasingly, the convergence of the missions of cultural heritage institutions such as museums, libraries, and archives, and the overlap in the materials they collect, is being widely discussed and debated by professionals in the field.

In 2006, the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries chose "Libraries, Archives, and Museums in the Twenty-First Century: Intersecting Missions, Converging Futures?" as its preconference theme. One participant stated: "[A]s the conference progressed it became abundantly clear that collection-based definitions of libraries, archives, and museums are not valid, have never been valid, and never will be valid. Everyone collects everything. Yet each has a unique method of classifying and working with each thing."²

In his essay based on a presentation at that conference, Bruce Whiteman writes, "...each of the three types of institutions normally owns many, if not thousands, of the objects-in-trade that are more characteristically associated with the others. What major library does not include paintings, drawings, prints, and archival collections?"³ At that same conference, Robert Martin, the Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services, argued that all of these

materials, are, in fact, documents, and that the boundaries between them—whether in the way they are collected, managed, or made available—are boundaries we have drawn and that we can also change.⁴ The digital environment, in particular, provides opportunities for a convergence in the way we process and present our collections to our audience.

Within this context, the library community has also emphasized the importance of exposing our "hidden collections."⁵ The significance of special collections as a major source of the richness of research library collections has great visibility in the recent dialog about the future of research libraries. Recognizing that there are many collections of significant research, cultural, and monetary value that are currently undiscoverable to researchers, efforts such as the CLIR hidden collections grant program⁶ and individual library prioritization have focused on this problem. The imperative to provide access to all special collections, including art and artifact materials, in our institutions raises questions about the current state of description and access.

In this survey, the designers were interested in exploring these issues, focusing on three major areas of interest. First, the survey was intended to explore the scale and scope of art and artifact materials held by ARL member libraries. A second goal was to determine which tools and techniques they currently use to manage these collections, including those used by library staff only and those used to make information about these collections available to the public. Finally, the survey attempted to determine if there is evidence of a convergence of library, archive, and museum practices in the management of these collections. Outcomes from the survey will inform strategy

for the continuing stewardship of art and artifact collections in our care.

The survey focused on the systems and techniques used to manage physical art and artifact materials in order to insure intellectual control over them. For the purposes of this survey, art and artifact materials were considered separately in order to determine if there are differences between the management of these types of materials. Art objects include paintings, works on paper, prints, art photographs, sculpture, decorative arts, or graphic design. Artifacts were defined as including historic photographs, historic objects, material culture, merchandise, archeological objects, natural history specimens, costumes, and architectural drawings, designs, and models. Of course, there are objects that might fall into either category, so respondents were asked to make a determination based on the nature and purpose of their specific collections. Recognizing that many institutions have multiple individually managed special collections, respondents were invited to submit a response for each one.

Sixty-eight libraries at 53 of the 126 ARL member libraries submitted a survey between April 16 and May 7 for a response rate of 42%. Data from these respondents confirms that ARL member institutions collect large numbers of art objects and artifacts, sometimes intentionally, but often incidentally. Practices for managing and providing access to these materials vary widely both within individual special collections and institutions and across the entire community, with no universally accepted standard, tool, or techniques.

Scale and Scope of Art and Artifact Collections

Fifty-nine of the 68 responding libraries (87%) reported holding art objects and 62 (91%) reported holding artifacts. The variety of the types of art and artifacts is broad: prints are included in 92% of the libraries' collections; paintings in 87%, works on paper in 83%, and sculpture and art photographs in 65% each. The most commonly mentioned type of art object for the category "other" was artists' books. When it comes to artifacts, respondents report similarly high numbers and variety: 97% of respondents' collections contain historic photographs, 84% historical objects, and 75%

contain material culture and architectural drawings, designs, and models. All the types of artifacts listed in the survey received positive responses; the smallest number was natural history specimens with 12 respondents (19%). The items cited under "other" indicate that almost anything can be found in a special collection somewhere, from the typical (ephemera, toys, souvenirs, medals) to the truly unusual and unexpected (locks of hair, condoms, death masks).

The quantity is also impressive. Although 40% of responding libraries said they have fewer than 500 works of art, over a third (22 respondents, or 37%) reported owning more than 5,000, with nine of those (15%) owning more than 25,000. Not surprisingly, artifacts were even more numerous, with only eight libraries (13%) reporting fewer than 500 artifacts in their collections, while over half (33, or 52%) have more than 5,000. The holdings of more than a third of those exceed 25,000 artifacts and, based on the comments received, several actually number in the millions. This data might suggest that most respondents collect art and artifacts intentionally, although four respondents commented that artworks were acquired haphazardly or incidentally as part of larger collections and one said the same for artifacts.

Tools for Managing Art and Artifacts

The authors considered several hypotheses about the tools that libraries might use to manage their holdings of art and artifacts. As libraries use their library catalogs to describe books, journals, and other resources at the item level, one speculation was that libraries might be using their integrated library systems (ILS) to describe art works, since these are typically described at the item level. On the other hand, the authors' experience suggested that artifacts often come to libraries in the context of archival collections; the hypothesis being that these materials would be treated as such, and probably described in finding aids. The authors also speculated that many institutions would use more than one tool.

The survey gave the following options for tools believed to be commonly used: MARC records in an Integrated Library System (library catalog); Museum collections management system such as PastPerfect; Archival management system such as Archivists'

Toolkit; Finding aids including EAD; Database developed and maintained by the library; or Spreadsheets such as Excel. Respondents were also given the option to name other tools. While other tools were mentioned, the options provided on the survey were the most widely used, particularly the ILS and finding aids.

Many institutions reported digital asset management tools in the “other (please specify)” category. CONTENTdm was the most frequently mentioned, along with some other image or digital resource management tools. This is interesting as the survey was intended to focus on the management of physical objects. Future work could delve more deeply into the connections between intellectual control of physical objects and their digital surrogates. Certainly there are important issues around description and access when physical objects are digitized. For the purposes of this study, the focus remained on comments and responses related to management of physical collections.

Tools for Managing Art Collections

Finding aids were the most frequently used tool for managing art collections (43 of 60 respondents holding art collections, or 72%). MARC records in a library’s catalog were used by 35 of the institutions (58%). Also frequently used were library-developed databases (26 respondents, or 43%) and spreadsheets (25, or 42%). This indicates libraries are using the available and familiar tools.

Systems designed for the purpose of managing collections were not widely used. Twenty respondents (33%) use archival management systems like Archivists’ Toolkit. Even fewer reported using a museum collection management system in order to catalog art (11 responses, or 18%). Nine of these use Past Perfect; two use TMS (Gallery Systems Inc.)

Several respondents specifically pointed out that the tools they use are no different from those they employ for their other materials. For example, “We are not using any special tool for art objects; we use the same tools as we use for archives, manuscripts, and books within Special Collections.” This response indicates another finding; that many institutions are using more than one tool. Only 12 of the 60 institutions (20%)

holding art works use only one tool; of these, four are using a museum collection management system and four a local database. Nine of the institutions (15%) are using five different tools. On average, institutions are using three different tools to manage art objects.

Within these tools, institutions are clearly describing art at both collection and item level. Collection records describe materials as a group. In comparison, item records describe one object. For example, 32 institutions (53% of the 60 respondents holding art objects) are using their ILS to describe art objects; all of them do so at the collection level, while 23 institutions also have item-level records in their library catalogs. Of the 55 total responses to the question about collection or item level descriptions, 94% of respondents create collection-level records and 93% create item-level records. Therefore, institutions are consistently providing both levels of description.

In the questions that explore why several tools might be used, the key issues fell into two categories: characteristics of the objects and the resources available. Over 70% make the determination of the tool to use based on the nature of collection; about half base the tool on the material type. For 57% of respondents, the staff and resources are a key aspect of this decision. Respondents commented, “Various tools have been available to us over time. Choices have been made regarding the best tool for the job at any given time” and “We have not had a systematic approach to this in the past.”

When considering variety of tools and levels of description, it is not surprising that a wide range of public access options are used. Significantly, 23% of respondents do not display any information about art collections to the public, and in 12% of cases the user must be on site to access a database. When information is available online, over 50% of respondents indicated they offer access through documents on websites and in library catalogs. For about 40% of respondents, a web-accessible public search of another type of tool is available.

Tools for Managing Artifact Collections

The overall distribution of tools used to manage artifacts was very similar to those used for art objects. Finding aids and MARC records remained the top two

choices; 48 use finding aids (76%) and 35 use MARC records (56%). Archival management tools were used at slightly higher rates for artifacts, with 40% of respondents, compared to 33% usage for art objects.

Like works of art, institutions are likely to be creating both collection and item level descriptions within these tools. Overall, 90% of the 60 respondents provide collection-level description, and 93% provide item-level description. Although there is a slightly higher prevalence of item-level description of artifacts than was the case with art, libraries are also describing artifacts at both collection and item levels.

Institutions are using many different tools to manage artifacts. Ten of the 60 respondents (16%) use only one tool. Of these, three institutions each use finding aids or a local database. One respondent uses seven tools; 11 institutions (18%) use five or more tools. The average number of tools used to manage artifacts per institution is three, the same as with artworks.

Nature of the collection, staffing and resources available for description, and material type were each cited by over 60% of respondents as factors in determining which to use in a particular case. Several comments pointed to limitations of systems as an underlying factor. One respondent said, "Some artifacts have large amounts of detailed information ... for which there is no room to efficiently input or display. Also need a system that allows managing and easy link to related ... materials."

Similarly, information about artifact collections is made available to the public in a variety of ways. Thirty-eight respondents (60%) indicated that the library catalog is the primary mechanism for the public to find records for artifacts; 33 (52%) distribute documents through a website. The same percentage of institutions offers a web-accessible database of some kind; the databases include archival management systems, museum collection management systems, and library-developed databases. Thirteen institutions (21%) indicated that no information is available to the public.

Factors in Choice of Tools

Looking at the aggregated data, the overall patterns for management of art and artifact collections were quite similar. These findings suggest that ARL members

are likely to use several tools to manage art and artifact collections, and that the ILS and finding aids are the most prevalent tools for both types of materials. Respondents also seem likely to describe materials at collection and item levels in all types of tools.

Looking at some subsets of the survey responses, some other notable patterns emerged. An identical number and percentage of institutions use a museum collection management system for artwork and for artifacts: 11 institutions or 18%. Nine use it for both types of material.

Another factor is the type of collection the institution considered their primary collection. Twenty-six respondents considered books/published material to be the primary collection; 28 indicated archives; 13 manuscripts. Looking at the art and artifact management tools broken down by primary collection did reveal some differences; although MARC records and finding aids were the most used tool, the distribution took on different characteristics.

Collections that considered books to be their primary collection used MARC records for art collections at a high rate, but used finding aids for artifact collections. Archival institutions were highly likely to use finding aids for both art and artifacts. Manuscript institutions used MARC records at about the same rate as book institutions and finding aids at about the same level as archival institutions. These findings are not surprising and are likely due to the descriptive and collecting practices of these types of collections, but it is interesting to see that there is a logical correlation with primary collection types.

	Books	Archives	MSS
MARC Records: Art	65%	42%	69%
Finding Aids: Art	61%	83%	92%
MARC Records: Artifacts	57%	44%	58%
Finding Aids: Artifacts	70%	85%	83%

Another factor correlated with tool selection is collection size. While in all cases finding aids or MARC records are the most used tool for descriptions, there are some differences based on collection size.

Collections with fewer than 500 objects are far more likely to use finding aids than any other tool

for both art and artifact collections, with about 60% selecting this tool and 30% selecting spreadsheets, the next highest. They are much less likely to use MARC records than the other categories, with only 33% use rate for art objects and 25% for artifact materials.

Collections of 500–1000 objects are far more likely to use databases developed and maintained by the library, with over 60% of collections this size using this tool.

Collections of 1,000–5,000 or 5,000–25,000 are most likely to use finding aids for either art or artifact collections, with over 80% with this size of collection indicating they use this tool. This compares to 77% use rate by larger collections and approximately 65% use rate by smaller collections. They are also most likely to use MARC records, with 79% of art collections this size represented in MARC records and 73% of artifact collections. For larger collections, the use rate dropped slightly to 67% and 59% respectively.

Collections of over 25,000 objects showed differences in treatment by types. For art objects, very large collections are even more likely to use a local database, with a 78% use rate. However, for artifact collections, institutions with very large collections have a significantly lower use rate of 41% for local databases. Instead, 77% of collections this size were managed with finding aids.

Museum Standards and Practices

Given that works of art and artifacts are traditionally the purview of museums, the survey designers wanted to determine if libraries had adopted museum collection management practices when cataloging them. Although we have seen that management practices vary widely, there seem to be minimal signs of libraries and archives consistently embracing standard museum practices in terms of how they manage art and artifacts.

In museum collection management, it is standard practice for each item (artwork or artifact) to be cataloged separately and to have a unique number, usually an accession number.⁷ Slightly more than half of the respondents to this survey said that they routinely separate art objects (59%) and artifacts (56%) from collections of books or archival materials for purposes of arrangement and description. However, only

25% always give art objects a unique number while only 21% do so for artifacts. The most popular type of numbering system for both art and artifacts is an archival identifier, such as a series, box, or folder number (61% for art and 66% for artifacts). Given that 46% of respondents indicated archives as their primary holdings and all respondents reported having some archival holdings, it makes sense that this approach is the most widely used. Accession numbers were the second most popular in both categories—more libraries use them for artifacts (64%) than for art (59%). Local numbering systems were also quite prevalent, with 54% employing them for managing art and 60% for artifacts.

Also notable is the number of special collections using more than one numbering system. Of the 33 institution using museum accession numbering for art, only five do so exclusively. Similarly, only four of 37 institutions using museum accession numbering for artifacts use only that numbering approach. Archival identifiers and local numbering were most commonly cited as the additional numbering practices in use. This finding is one of many that suggest that libraries are not managing all their art and artifact collections consistently.

Only 9% of the respondents report they use *Cataloging Cultural Objects*, a data content standard developed for the museum and visual resources community, for art objects and only 7% use it for artifacts. Similarly, only 11% use the Getty Union List of Names, also developed by and for the museum community, for art and only 9% for artifacts. The Getty Art & Architecture Thesaurus enjoys more widespread use: 35% of respondents use it to describe artifacts and 33% for art.

Instead, the institutions responding to this survey are looking to familiar standards for description of art and artifact collections. *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACs) is the most widely used; 47% report applying it to art and 60% to artifacts. *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition* (AACR2) is used as the descriptive standard by 46% of respondents for art and 50% for artifacts.

The museum community has less mature metadata standards, particularly for encoding, than the library community. Not surprisingly, survey responses

indicate that only a very few ARL special collections have adopted the museum community's metadata standards, VRA Core (9% for art; 4% for artifacts) and Categories for the Description of Works of Art (4% for both art and artifacts), for either category of object. Metadata standards are used nevertheless, particularly for artifacts; 82% of respondents indicated they use EAD, 62% use MARC, and 53% use Dublin Core. These standards are also widely used for art collections (67% EAD, 51% MARC, and 38% Dublin Core). Metadata standards are an area where libraries, archives, and museums have many opportunities to collaborate more closely in the future.

Challenges and Successes

The survey invited respondents to list up to three challenges and three successes in managing art or artifact collections. Several themes emerged, particularly for challenges. These themes are areas for further research and collaboration in our community.

The extent to which storage and other space concerns were expressed is remarkable. The survey designers specifically excluded questions about physical arrangement and storage in order to focus on intellectual access. However, of the 63 responses to this question, 49 (77%) noted proper and adequate space for storage, use, or processing as a challenge; moreover, 34 listed this as their first challenge. The second most mentioned challenge was preservation/conservation, with 34 institutions (53%) listing this. The comments in the survey suggest the potential broad scope of this problem, going beyond available square footage, to concerns like the challenge of storage in a space that was designed for books and archival materials to lack of exhibit capacity to conservators who are trained primarily for paper and books. A critical finding of this survey was the extremely high frequency at which ARL institutions noted the physical circumstances of their art and artifact collections as a challenge; the authors hope that additional work will be done to assess space and preservation/conservation needs.

Other themes that emerged in the challenges section were categorized as lack of resources (21 respondents), intellectual control (20), access (17), and training/expertise (13).

To group together aspects of resources and training/expertise, institutions expressed concerns about either the number of staff available to do the work or the knowledge of those staff to deal with art and artifact collections if their expertise was in other areas of librarianship or preservation, for example. The survey gathered data on staffing levels for the special collections responding and found a wide range. At the minimum, one institution reported a single individual at 0.4 full time equivalence (FTE); at the maximum, another institution employs 95 individuals at 87 FTE. The mean was 12.6 individuals at 10.4 FTE. Comments on staff suggest many institutions use student assistants and temporary employees for management of art and artifact collections. Many also indicated inadequate staffing to meet the processing description needs of these types of objects. Other resources, such as supplies, space, funding, and recognition were identified as important as well.

Of particular interest to this study were the challenges reported around intellectual control and access. In the category of intellectual control, many respondents mentioned that the lack of descriptive and metadata standards for art and artifacts makes it difficult to execute the work. A few noted that even if such standards came into common use, legacy data not based on standards would be a challenge. Several institutions noted problems with access, in that existing systems may make inadequate use of existing description or that potential users have no access to these systems. In some cases, access is also hindered by condition of the objects, lack of appropriate research space, or other concerns.

Respondents reported many successful strategies that are the counterpoints to the challenges that were raised. Digitization, proper housing, and successes of providing description in a variety of settings were all significant accomplishments. Both item and collection level description were mentioned as successes, but a more generalized conclusion could be that providing any intellectual access is better than none. Many respondents had success with providing thumbnail images with the metadata describing the physical objects, which made it easier for both staff and researchers to access and use the materials. Appropriate housing and clear labeling were also reported as a

good strategy to improve the management of three-dimensional objects. Another success to highlight is integrating processing of these types of materials into routine workflows.

The challenges and successes all suggest a major underlying issue. Many of the institutions responding to this survey have a primary focus on other material types, particularly books and published materials and archival collections. Through the challenges and successes, institutions expressed an understanding that these materials may require different management tools and techniques and are seeking appropriate ways to integrate them into daily practice. When asked how satisfied respondents were with their management of art and artifact collections, only one answered 5 “very satisfied.” Nineteen (34%) were somewhat satisfied (4 rating), while the largest number (22, or 39%) were neutral. Seven (13%) respondents were somewhat dissatisfied (2 rating) and an equal number were very dissatisfied (1 rating).

Conclusions

The scope and scale of art and artifact materials held by the institutions responding to this survey is stunning. The variety and research potential of these objects provide a glimpse into the rich collections that may be hidden due to lack of intellectual control. The survey data points to a lack of consistent practice within institutions. Just as individual institutions have made different decisions for art and artifact collections over time and in different circumstances, so does the library community lack a best practice for the management of these collections.

One of the problems identified is that many special collections do not collect art and artifacts intentionally, so they are not given the same priority as printed and archival materials. This is reflected in comments such as:

“Ours has been a slap-dash approach and trying to keep our head above water. Managing art objects is/has been secondary after traditional book/serial processing.”

“We attempt NOT to collect 3-D artifacts, and yet, we keep getting them. They are useful in exhib-

its and do often provide important historical or cultural information, but they come with many problems for a collection whose focus is on 2-D documents!”

“Because they are not integral to our mission (except occasionally in the University Archives) we have not made their care a priority in any way.”

Many comments indicated that libraries are struggling to manage this type of material, and seem to be doing so as lower priority efforts, without a sense that other institutions shared the same problems.

The survey found that libraries are using a variety of tools, but looking primarily to library catalogs and finding aids to provide intellectual access to art and artifact materials. However, these tools are not meeting their needs. Only about a third of respondents indicated satisfaction with their strategy for managing art and artifacts. The survey also documented a widespread practice of using multiple tools at a single institution. Moreover, at least one-fifth of art works and artifact objects are not discoverable through publicly available discovery systems, and when information is available it has inadequate levels of description for discovery and access or is only available to on-site researchers. Given the extent of art and artifact materials the survey responses indicate ARL members hold collectively, a strategy for providing better intellectual control and public access should be given attention.

While our community has great expertise in metadata and standards, we could collaborate with other communities of practice, particularly museums, to better understand the needs of these materials. In “Metadata for All: Descriptive Standards and Metadata Sharing across Libraries, Archives and Museums,” Elings and Waibel point out that in common practice, “Materials often receive their descriptions not on the basis of material type, but on the basis of the availability of local systems to house the description and the expertise to generate it.” So special collections that are primarily archives tend to manage cultural materials (art and artifacts) using EAD and DACS, while those that are primarily libraries use MARC and AACR2/RDA. Elings and Waibel suggest reconceptualizing standards as material-specific,

rather than community-specific. “For example, rather than conceiving of the suite of standards ... as the ‘museum way’ of describing objects, this combination of standards emerges as the appropriate form of description for cultural materials, regardless of whether they happen to be housed in a library, archive, or museum...The successful integration of digital images of material culture from library, archive, and museum collections hinges on the emergence of a more homogeneous practice describing like-materials in different institutions.”⁸

Achieving a standards matrix and establishing best practices for art and artifact collections would enable all types of cultural heritage institutions to become better stewards of these resources and increase the potential for sharing information. Libraries should collaborate further with archives and museums to create rich and shareable metadata based on standards; adopting a systematic approach to the management and description of art and artifact collections will advance the mission of all cultural heritage institutions and expose hidden collections.

Endnotes

1. *Perceptions of Libraries and Information Resources*. Dublin, OH: OCLC, 2005, p. 38–39.
2. Christian Dupont, “Libraries, Archives, and Museums in the Twenty-First Century: Intersecting Missions, Converging Futures?” *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 8, no. 1 (March 20, 2007): 16.
3. Bruce Whiteman, “Cooperative Collection Building: A Response to Gerald Beasley,” *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 8, no. 1 (March 20, 2007): 29–30.
4. Robert Martin, “Intersecting Missions, Converging Practice,” *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 8, no. 1 (March 20, 2007): 81.
5. Association of Research Libraries. 2009. *Exposing Hidden Collections*. www.arl.org/rtl/speccoll/hidden.shtml
6. Council of Library and Information Resources. *Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives*. <http://www.clir.org/hiddencollections/index.html>
7. Rebecca A. Buck and Jean Allman Gilmore, editors. *The New Museum Registration Methods*. Washington DC: American Association of Museums, 1998, p. 43–44.
8. Mary W. Elings and Günter Waibel, “Metadata for All: Descriptive Standards for Metadata Sharing across Libraries, Archives and Museums,” *First Monday* 12, no. 3 (5 March 2007): 8.

SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The SPEC Survey on Art & Artifact Management was designed by **Morag Boyd**, Head, Special Collections Cataloging, and **Jenny Robb**, curator, Billy Ireland Cartoon Library and Museum, at the Ohio State University. These results are based on data submitted by 68 libraries at 53 of the 126 ARL member libraries (42%) by the deadline of May 7, 2012. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

Research libraries and their parent institutions are increasingly highlighting special collections as the unique holdings that differentiate libraries from one another. Often these collections of distinction contain art works, historical artifacts, and other objects that are neither published works nor archival collections. Without clear protocols for management of these collections, libraries have adopted a range of practices to ensure intellectual and physical control of these materials.

The purpose of this survey is to examine the extent to which art and artifact collections are held in ARL member libraries and the tools and techniques libraries have adopted to arrange and describe these objects. The survey findings will assist libraries in shaping their strategy for managing art and artifact collections, increasing their ability to care for these unique materials, and fulfilling their stewardship responsibilities. By exposing the extent and type of these collections and examining the management of these collections, with a goal of advancing the development of better shared practices, the survey would help libraries provide more and better access to art and artifact materials, including re-purposing metadata for digitization. The data may also help focus collection development related to these collections, including opportunities for collaboration with other cultural heritage institutions.

Some libraries have multiple, distinct collections that may handle art and artifacts differently. So that we may get as complete an understanding of current policy and practice as possible, we will accept separate responses from as many distinct units or collections from an institution as wish to complete this survey. For example, an institution may have several separately managed or administered units with art or artifact materials that may wish to answer independently, but it is not necessary to provide a response for each collection within those units.

The main portion of this survey is divided into two sections: one focused on art and one on artifacts. In the first section, please include art objects such as paintings, works on paper, prints, art photographs, sculpture, decorative arts, or graphic design. In the second section, please include artifacts such as historic photographs, historic objects, material culture, merchandise, archeological objects, natural history specimens, architectural drawings, designs, models, or costumes. Some objects in your collection could be considered both a work of art and an artifact, so we ask that you use your judgment to decide which is the most appropriate section based on your specific collection and your reasons for collecting the materials.

REPORTING LIBRARY

1. Please enter the name of the library, unit, or collection on which you are reporting. N=61

2. In the first column below please indicate which categories of material are held in this library/unit/collection. Check all that apply.

In the second column please indicate which category describes the largest number of items in this library/unit/collection (Primary Collection). Pick only one category in this column. N=68

	Holdings	Primary Collection
Books/published material	63	26
Manuscripts	63	13
Artifacts	62	2
Archives	61	28
Art	59	4
Other type of collection	30	4

Please specify the other type of collection. N=26

Holdings

A/V materials, some sculpture, photographs, etc.

Artists' books.

Artists' books collection.

Audio-visual collection materials.

Audio-visual materials.

Audio-visual materials: audio tapes, cassettes, films, videos, CDs and DVDs.

Audio/video.

Audiovisual materials.

Digital materials.

Each Presidential Library and Museum (currently 13) holds original textual records, electronic (born-digital) records, audiovisual materials, and artifact materials related to the President's administration, career and life for President Hoover forward. Additionally, within the Center for Legislative Archives, there are electronic records, film, and still pictures of Congress.

Electronic/digitized resources.

Films.

Films, sound recordings.

Large collections of audio and video recordings.

Manuscripts, rare books, university archives, visual materials, architectural collections.

Maps, Digital, Photographs (non art).

Media materials.

Media, i.e., images, video, audio. Digitized Collections. Institutional Repository.

Oral histories and photograph collections.

Photographs, music recordings (records and other discs), video and motion picture film, DVDs, CDs.

Recordings, video recordings, electronic formats, microforms.

Sound and video recordings.

Time-based media (audio, video) in multiple formats. Ephemera.

Wood engravings (the actual carved blocks from which the art was printed).

Primary Collection

Audio-visual material (film, video, and audio); photographic formats; born digital records.

Combined collections of typescripts, letters, correspondence and designs.

Media including digital data, video, CD, DVD, cassette tapes.

Public health posters, portraits, slides (glass, 35mm, lantern).

Additional Comments

The primary collection is different for the four areas in this unit. For University Archives, archives are the primary collection; for the Music Library, books/published material; for Poetry Collection, manuscripts; for Rare Books, books/published material. University Archives also contains manuscript material; Poetry also contains archives and books/published material; Music Library also contains manuscripts and archives. Art and artifacts are contained in all areas except Rare Books, but they are not the primary collections.

True mix among books and archives/manuscripts.

If this library/unit/collection holds art objects, click Yes below to continue to the section on art object collections. If it does not, click No to jump to the section on artifact collections. N=68

If your objects could be considered both art and artifact (i.e., photographs), please include them in the section that is most relevant to your specific collection and your reasons for collecting them.

Yes, holds art objects	60	88%
No, does not hold art objects	8	12%

TYPES OF ART OBJECTS COLLECTED

3. Which of the following types of original art objects are represented in your collections? Check all categories that apply. N=60

Prints	55	92%
Paintings	52	87%
Works on paper	50	83%
Sculpture	39	65%
Art photographs	39	65%
Graphic design	31	52%
Decorative arts	28	47%
Other type of art object	15	25%

Please describe the other type of art object.

Additionally, within the Center for Legislative Archives, political cartoons

Architectural drawings, artists' books

Artists' books (4 responses)

Digital works

Ephemera

Fore-edge paintings, fine press books, artists' books include pop up and sculpture

Photographs

Pieces of destroyed murals; Mexican folk, Pacific ethnographic and pre-Hispanic art; materials documenting the art-making process, e.g., moulds for casting sculpture, printing blocks and plates

Probably a little of everything you could imagine, "hidden" in manuscript collections, especially.

Public art

Set models, stage properties

Silver (bowls, cutlery) medals, embossed plaque

4. To help us understand the scale of your collection, please indicate the approximate size of your art holdings. N=60

Fewer than 500	24	40%
500–1000	5	8%
1,000–5,000	8	13%
5,000–25,0000	13	22%
More than 25,000	9	15%

5. Please enter any additional comments about the scale of your art objects collection. N=19

Approximately 94,000 fine prints by over 2,000 modern American photographers along with the archives of 200+ photographers, dealers, organizations, and curators/scholars that contain photographic material: negatives, contact sheets, work prints (as opposed to fine prints).

Arts objects are acquired as an incidental part of desired collections; they are not sought on their own merits.

As an exceptionally large collection of artist's papers, saved by a man conscious of their historical and archival value, the Jean Charlot Collection holds: (1) materials documenting Charlot's life and work (e.g. his sketch books; a few oil paintings; master collection of prints with many proofs and progressives; drawings; cartoons for paintings including many fresco murals; original art for photo-mechanically produced publications including newspaper cartoons and book illustrations; examples of sculpture and ceramics); (2) collections of prints made by the artist for his own study, research and use in publication (e.g. Daumier, Posada, prints from Épinal, and European optical views); (3) art works in various media including art photographs, by over 100 artists, given to Charlot by his friends and those about whom he wrote; and (4) artworks and memorabilia inherited from his French and Mexican ancestors.

Even if artists' books are not considered art objects for this survey (because they are not technically unique), we still have about 5000 objects due to the extent of our print and photograph holdings.

It is a small component of our holdings and usually associated with a larger archival collection.

Majority of items in this category are in our photograph collections.

More than 400,000 works of art.

Often this material came in as part of a manuscript collection.

Our dean has an interest in growing our art collection, so I expect that it will grow larger. We have just begun processing a very large collection of botanical illustrations and that is not included in the numbers above because it's still not part of our processed holdings.

The library is the steward of the university's Art Properties collection which includes art works and heritage objects from all cultures, time periods, materials, and formats. In addition, each special collection includes art objects within their holdings; these are not represented in Art Properties inventories.

The majority of our art objects are part of archival collections. We do not have item level description for the bulk of these items. We believe we have over 500,000 items.

The majority of these holdings consist of the holdings of our graphic arts collection.

This collection has come to us with the closing of the Panama Canal Museum of Seminole, Florida. It includes over 500 number of Panamanian molas (pieces of indigenous textile art), and under 200 paintings or prints. There is also a large number of decorative objects such as commemorative plates. There are a large number of early 20th century photographs that are probably more appropriately considered archival materials (or artifacts) than art objects.

Vast majority are slides.

We are considering items like cartoons as art, therefore we have many items.

We collect material that ranges from fine art to the book as object.

We only collect art haphazardly as part of larger collections.

While notable photographs, such as vintage prints of Dorothea Lang's "Migrant Mother", may be collected or considered art, all documentary photographs in our collections are grouped with the historical photographs as artifacts.

Works on paper include approximately 125,000 original cartoon drawings and 10,000 illustration and documentary drawings. Prints include 100,000 posters; 100,000 artist prints; and 250,000 documentary (historical) prints. For this survey, all photographs will be covered as "artifacts," because all photos are handled in the same way.

6. Do you routinely separate art objects from collections of books or archival materials for purposes of arrangement and description? N=59

Yes	35	59%
No	24	41%

COLLECTION MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR ART OBJECTS

7. What tools are used to arrange and describe your art objects? Check all that apply (including legacy tools if the records have not been migrated to another tool). N=60

Finding aids including EAD	43	72%
MARC records in an Integrated Library System (library catalog)	35	58%
Database developed and maintained by the library	26	43%
Spreadsheets such as Excel	25	42%

Archival management system such as Archivists' Toolkit	20	33%
Museum collections management system such as PastPerfect	11	18%
Other tool	20	33%

8. Please list the specific software for each tool used to arrange and describe your art objects. N=48

Integrated Library System N=34

- Aleph (5 responses)
- Innovative Interfaces Inc. (4 responses)
- Millennium (4 responses)
- NEOS Catalogue
- OSUL and KnowledgeBank
- SirsiDynix Symphony (5 responses)
- Voyager (ExLibris) (14 responses)

Museum collections management system N=11

- Moving into PastPerfect
- PastPerfect (8 responses)
- TMS (Gallery Systems Inc.) (2 responses)

Archival management system N=20

- Archivists' Toolkit (10 responses)
- Archon (3 responses)
- DB/TEXTworks
- FileMaker Pro (configured for our needs in-house)
- Luna Insight
- MINISIS
- NARA's public catalog ARC (Archival Research Catalog)
- oXygen and RMOA EAD templates
- Yale customized version of Xmetal

Other Tool N=20

PDF files posted on department web page to create access via search engines.	Adobe
Access database	Access, Excel
Access database and Word inventory	Access and Word
Access databases, card catalogs, paper inventories and lists	Day CQ web content management system, OMEKA
Digital Asset Management system	CONTENTdm
CONTENTdm	Microsoft Access, MySQL, CONTENTdm
CONTENTdm	CONTENTdm
CONTENTdm, METS database	CONTENTdm, METS database
Described only in context of larger collection.	XTF for finding aids
Library website	Library website
Manuscript and published catalogues and lists	Microsoft Word and Excel, Apple iPhoto
MARC records in stand-alone databases	Minaret software (MARC-format records in standalone databases)
Media Manager, homegrown database by the College of Arts and Sciences	Media Manager
MS Access database	MS Access database
MS Access database, SCREAD (in-house developed processing and EAD tool), legacy finding aids	MS Access, SCREAD (local processing and EAD tool)
Non-MARC online system, Digital repository	WordPress, Fedora
oxygen XML Editor, Luna Insight Software	oxygen XML Editor, Luna Insight Software
Some listings exist, including a valuation / appraisal document in typescript form.	
Some of our holdings are described solely in finding aids and inventories in non-standard formats.	
Web pages with images of the artists' books	LibGuides

9. For each tool used to arrange and describe your art objects, please indicate whether you create collection-level or item-level records. Check all that apply. N=55

	Collection-level	Item-level	N
Finding aid including EAD	32	23	39
MARC records in an Integrated Library System	35	15	38
Spreadsheets such as Excel	7	27	28
Database developed and maintained by your library	6	19	22
Archival management system such as Archivists' Toolkit	13	7	14
Museum collections management system such as PastPerfect	6	8	10
Other tool	4	12	13
Number of Responses	47	51	55

10. Please enter any additional comments about your collections management tools for art objects.
N=16

Description level depends on the accession.

Fedora repository.

For art materials that have been in the collections prior to ca. 2000 we track and manage these items using a simple Access database and Excel spreadsheet. For art materials accessioned after ca. 2000, these items tend to be processed along with archival collections and receive collection-level records (MARC, EAD).

Item level descriptions take place in the context of the collection description as part of the finding aid.

Level of description often depends on whether or not the items are associated with a larger archival collection.

Many of the art objects come in individually, not as part of a larger collection.

MARC records may be created either on a collection level for an archival collection that contains art objects, or occasionally for a single item acquired outside of an archival collection. For the latter we use the term "vertical files" to describe such items.

Non-EAD finding aids at collection or item level.

Scattered typescript listings exist for a small number of collections. A small number of art objects are described as part of collection finding aids.

The databases and spreadsheets are typically inventories of a collection, e.g., a checklist by artist name or a container list by type and size of material.

Tools no different from those used for archival materials.

We are just beginning to implement the Archivists' Toolkit for description and are considering using it to centralize item-level metadata about art objects.

We are not using any special tool for art objects; we use the same tools as we use for archives, manuscript and books within Special Collections.

We don't think of the art items separately as they are in so many of our collections, being an arts library.

We manage most art objects with PastPerfect, but we also have a supplementary image database developed and maintained by our library.

While we normally describe down to the folder level in EAD finding aids, art objects are often treated as individual "folders".

11. If you use more than one tool, how do you determine which one to use for an item or collection?
Check all that apply. N=49

Nature of the collection (e.g., objects that are part of a manuscript collection may be treated differently than objects in an art collection)	35	71%
Staffing/resources available for description	28	57%
Material type (e.g., photographs may be treated differently than sculptures)	24	49%
Size of collection	23	47%
Anticipated use	14	29%
Method of acquisition (e.g., purchase, donation, transfer)	5	10%
Other method	5	10%

Please specify the other method.

Artists' books appear in the online catalog and on the web page.

As noted above, we use the simple spreadsheets to track orphans/items disassociated from their larger collections.

Inherent value or uniqueness. Also, condition and preservation costs.

Value (monetary) for audit issues.

We are in a period of transition, but are moving towards using AT for all materials. All collections get EAD and MARC records.

Please enter any additional comments about choice of tools. N=9

All collections received have accession records in the AT and receive a collection-level MARC records; more granular description occurs in finding aids.

Almost always a matter of expediency and availability/knowledge of personnel (usually temporary and short-term).

Art and artifact materials are treated in a similar way. We rely on MARC records for description in order to integrate information about visual material collections with the Library's other holdings, although a Prints & Photographs Online Catalog also combines MARC records in standalone databases with MARC records from the library's ILS. For a particular collection or acquisition, we plan for processing and cataloging by assessing the "Use, Value, and Viability." We have at least a summary description for each collection, increasingly supplemented by a container list that outlines broad contents or provides an index. Material that is inherently fragile or difficult to handle safely is likely to receive item-level listing or at least item-level tracking through a unique identification number, e.g., original drawings and photographic negatives.

The collection is insufficiently documented. Over the years a little of everything has been used to keep track of it. The most important tools are still the artist's own manuscript inventories, old published lists and a catalogue raisonné of prints. Volunteers and students have created non-EAD inventories and finding aids for a few very small parts of the

collection using Excel and Word. CORC records were added some years ago to the online public catalog for selected individual photographs but are clearly inadequate, ditto the material on the Collections' website. We have not "chosen" a preferred tool, but hope we will be able to use museums collections management software for the next step as we have tried other methods (we just tried Dublin core) and they fall short. The library has just begun to use Archivists' Toolkit which should help with the Charlot Collection's 400+ feet of manuscripts and archives, and perhaps for as yet uncounted documentary (including some historic) photographs, but the collection has not tested it for use with art works and artifacts that require item level description and management of images. Many have large amounts of detailed information that comes with them (narratives, technical descriptions, conservations reports, exhibition and publication notes) for which there is no room to efficiently input or display. Also need a system that allows managing hierarchical arrangements (e.g., multiple proofs and the finished print, or prints within a portfolio series), and easy linking to related audiovisual materials like photos, films and audio, and bibliographic records.

Various tools have been made available to us over time. Choices have been made regarding the best tool for the job at any given time.

Very small collections (.5 linear feet or less) typically do not get finding aids; they are only given a MARC record.

We have not had a systematic approach to this in the past. We are working on developing a decision matrix to improve consistency about the metadata we create and where we store it.

We hope to adopt Archivists' Toolkit in the near future.

Whatever is more practical.

12. How do you display information about the art objects to the public? Check all that apply. N=60

Static website or other documents available on the web (e.g., finding aid, inventory list, etc.)	33	55%
Library catalog	32	53%
Web-accessible front end to archival management system	12	20%
Web-accessible front end to internal database	7	12%
Onsite access to internal database	7	12%
Web-accessible front end to museum collection management system	4	7%
No information is displayed to the public	14	23%
Other	14	23%

Pease specify other method.

CONTENTdm

CONTENTdm is used to house the only descriptive information for a small number of items.

Discovery Tool (summon), in development

EAD published through the Online Archive of California

Email spreadsheets in response to patron inquiries; objects in public view.

For some collections, typescript list is available, or listed in online finding aid for a small number of art objects.

Online galleries of reference photographs of items in the collection

Paper finding aid that captures information from in-house spreadsheets.

Post class list of materials used for instruction on department web page.

Searchable finding aids database

Through a number of OP publications e.g., a comprehensive catalogue raisonné of prints, available through libraries and book dealers. Through temporary exhibition of art works within the library; exhibition through loans to other institutions, both national and international; inclusion of images of items from the collection in their published catalogues and other art books.

VuFind search and discovery layer

Web accessible finding aid database (including ArchivesGrid access)

Web accessible front end to Media Manager

NUMBERING SYSTEM FOR ART OBJECTS

13. Does each art object have a unique number? N=60

Always	15	25%
Sometimes	38	63%
Never	7	12%

14. What numbering system do you use for art objects? Check all that apply. N=56

Archival identifier (i.e., series, box, folder, etc.)	34	61%
Accession number (i.e., 2009.1.4)	33	59%
Local numbering system	30	54%
Library of Congress Classification	6	11%

Dewey Decimal Classification	2	4%
Other numbering system	7	13%

Please specify the other numbering system.

- Accession number plus a local number
- Finding number based on location of object
- If part of processed MSS, artworks may have collection-level accession number
- No identifier
- Record Group Number
- Special collections call number
- We are still developing workable numbering systems.

DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS FOR ART RECORDS

15. Please indicate which content standards you use to describe your art objects. Check all that apply.
N=57

Describing Archives: A Content Standards (DACs)	27	47%
AACR2	26	46%
Getty Art & Architecture Thesaurus	19	33%
Library of Congress Thesaurus for Graphic Materials	14	25%
Getty Union List of Artist Names	6	11%
Cataloging Cultural Objects	5	9%
ICONCLASS	—	—
Other content standard	19	33%

Please specify the other content standard.

- Archival Research Catalog (ARC)
- Graphic Materials: Rules for Describing Original Items and Historical Collections (a supplement to AACR2)
- LCSH

Library of Congress Name and Subject Authority for artist's names and descriptions of subjects
 Library of Congress Name Authority, Library of Congress Subject Headings
 Limited use of CCO
 Local description conventions
 Local internal format
 Locally developed standard, this practice is under review.
 No official content standards have been used to describe our art objects.
 Nomenclature 3.0 for Museum cataloging
 None (2 responses)
 Only minimal description
 Rules for Archival Description (3 responses)
 Various
 We do not currently have a standard.

16. Please indicate which metadata standards you use to describe your art objects. Check all that apply. N=55

Encoded Archival Description (EAD)	37	67%
MARC	28	51%
Dublin Core	21	38%
VRA Core	5	9%
Categories for the Description of Works of Art (CDWA)	2	4%
Other metadata standard	9	16%

Please specify the other metadata standard.

Archival Research Catalog (ARC)
 Local description conventions
 Locally developed standards. This practice is under review.
 MODS/METS
 None (3 responses)

Rules for Archival Description

The revised Nomenclature for Museum Cataloging—authorities and lexicons

ARTIFACTS COLLECTIONS

17. Does your library/unit/collection hold artifacts? N=68

Yes	64	94%
No	4	6%

TYPES OF ARTIFACTS COLLECTED

18. Which of the following types of artifacts are represented in your collections? Check all that apply.
N=63

Historic photographs	61	97%
Historic objects	53	84%
Material culture	47	75%
Architectural drawings, designs, models	47	75%
Costumes	30	48%
Merchandise	23	37%
Archeological objects	21	33%
Natural history specimens	12	19%
Other type of artifact	16	25%

Please describe the other type of artifact.

Awards, trophies, historical clothing, mementos

Cuneiform tablets, scrolls, manuscripts

Ephemera (postcards, stamps, pins, flyers, advertisements, patent medicine cards, comics)

Graphic novels, artist books, T-shirts and jackets containing recorded music

Historic sound recordings, musical instruments

Locks of hair

Medals, plaques, political ephemera, posters, banners, postcards (with no correspondence), condoms, clay tablets, bullets, coins, models

Memorabilia, e.g., artist's supplies, family jewelry, childhood toys, souvenirs collected on travels, religious items like crucifixes

Music Instruments, objects pertaining to music performances (props, machines, etc.)

Numismatics

Playing cards, medals (numismatics and awards), death masks, architectural fragments, cylinder seals

School letter jackets, sport uniforms, band uniforms

Stage props

The artifact collections are almost unlimited in the types of artifacts and art included among the thousands of public and state gifts given to a President, plus a wide range of personal and political memorabilia that are privately donated to the collections.

We have large holdings of posters in a number of areas, e.g., AIDS/HIV campaigns in Africa, African political movements, 60s/70s era American counterculture.

Wood engravings (the actual blocks)

19. To help us understand the scale of your collection, please indicate the approximate size of your artifact holdings. N=63

Fewer than 500	8	13%
500–1000	6	10%
1,000–5,000	16	25%
5,000–25,000	11	18%
More than 25,000	22	35%

20. Please enter any additional comments about the scale of your artifacts collection. N=17

Across the Libraries as a whole, there are currently around 600,000 objects, with individual library collections ranging from 10,000 to 150,000 objects.

As with art objects, artifacts are often part of larger archival collections.

Extensive collections of historical photographs, glass plates, etc., primarily from East and West Africa, also postcards, airline and railroad menus, etc.

Extremely limited in scope—most are textiles.

Largest number of items is numismatics.

Majority of artifacts are historic photographs.

Most are historic photographs and architectural drawings, except for artifacts in the University Archives, which are more varied.

Most artifacts are related to the history of the institution, with the exception of architectural drawings, designs, and models (collected as a subject discipline).

Mostly historic photographs.

Number of photographs and historic objects is unclear; historic recordings range considerably depending on definition, but the estimation in the response is based on 100 cylinder recordings.

Our architectural drawings collection is more than 1.5 million items; our photography holding across collections are not fully inventoried but are likely more than 20,000 items.

Over 1/3 of the items are related to numismatics.

Photographs include approximately 13.75 million negatives, transparencies, and prints. Architectural, design, and engineering drawings are approximately 500,000 items.

Plastics collection is over 10,000 objects; historical photographs are in the thousands, as are architectural drawings.

Very broad estimate as neither a large collection of documentary (historic) photos nor the artifacts have yet been counted.

We have a large collection of historic brass and woodwind instruments.

We have over 6 million photographs. For most items we do not have item level control.

21. Do you routinely separate artifacts from collections of books or archival materials for purposes of arrangement and description? N=64

Yes 36 56%

No 28 44%

COLLECTION MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR ARTIFACTS

22. What tools are used to arrange and describe your artifacts? Check all that apply. N=63

Finding aids including EAD	48	76%
MARC records in an Integrated Library System (library catalog)	35	56%
Spreadsheets such as Excel	28	44%
Archival management system such as Archivists' Toolkit	25	40%
Database developed and maintained by your library	24	38%
Museum collections management system such as PastPerfect	11	18%
Other tool	22	35%

23. Please list the specific software for each tool used to arrange and describe your artifacts. N=48

Integrated Library System N=31

Ex Libris

Ex Libris Aleph (4 responses)

Ex Libris Voyager (11 responses)

Innovative Interface Inc. (3 responses)

Millennium (5 responses)

Sirsi/Dynix (5 responses)

Sirsi/Dynix Horizon

Sirsi/Dynix Symphony

Museum collections management system N=10

Currently 'iO' (Selago Designs), in the process of migrating to TMS (Gallery Systems).

Moving into PastPerfect

PastPerfect (7 responses)

TMS, Gallery Systems

Archival management system N=23

- Archivists' Toolkit (11 responses)
- Archon (4 responses)
- DB/TextWorks
- FileMakerPro (designed for local needs)
- In-house using MS-Access and oXygen.
- Local customized version of Xmetal
- Luna Insight
- MINISIS
- Various, under review

Other Tool N=22

A portion of the artifact collection resides in a digital image database.	Digitool
Access database and Word inventory	Access and Word
AskSam	AskSam
Basic paper checklisting for all those not kept with their original collections.	Word processing software for museum objects checklists
Card files and paper lists	oXygen Editor (for EAD), OMEKA
CONTENTdm	Microsoft Access, MySQL, CONTENTdm
CONTENTdm	CONTENTdm
CONTENTdm	
CONTENTdm	
CONTENTdm, METS database	CONTENTdm, METS database
Digital library	CONTENTdm
DSpace, A digital asset management system called Canto Cumulus	Canto Cumulus
In-house Access database to inventory and track orphaned pieces	Access database, Excel
Locally developed standards, this practice is under review.	
LUNA insight records for digitized historic photographs	LUNA insight records for digitized historic photographs
MARC records in stand-alone databases	Minaret software
Media Manager, home grown by College of Arts and Sciences	Media Manager
Microsoft Word documents.	Microsoft Office
MS Access, SCREAD (in house description and EAD tool)	MS Access, SCREAD, legacy finding aids
NARA's public catalog ARC (Archival Research Catalog)	ARC was designed and built internally for the National Archives.
oXygen XML Editor	oXygen XML Editor
Xmetal, FACT	Xmetal, FACT

24. For each tool used to arrange and describe your artifacts, please indicate whether you create collection-level or item-level records. Check all that apply. N=63

	Collection-level	Item-level	N
Finding aid including EAD	43	29	49
MARC records in an Integrated Library System	38	11	38
Spreadsheets such as Excel	13	31	32
Database developed and maintained by your library	11	23	25
Archival management system such as Archivists' Toolkit	20	13	22
Museum collections management system such as PastPerfect	6	8	9
Other tool	11	15	17
Number of Responses	54	56	60

25. Please enter any additional comments about your collections management tools for artifacts. N=17

PDF files of materials used for instruction.

Description level depends on the accession.

Exploring Archivists' Toolkit.

I have only listed tools used for what we would define here as an artifact, which would not include photographs, architectural drawings, and other archival elements.

Level of description depends on relation to archival collections.

Non-EAD finding aids at collection or item level.

Our artifacts are described by provenance, and as such are part of a finding aid of the collection. We also try to acquire paper records that provide a context for the artifacts so that's how it all comes together in a finding aid.

Photographs may be described at the collection level or at the item level; other artifacts are described at the item level.

Practices are currently being centralized with an expectation that more standardized, interoperable metadata will be adopted depending on the type of material.

Some finding aids are simple Word documents.

The primary item-level descriptions are maintained in the museum collections management database, and some additional excel formats used for specific projects and materials pending a signed deed of gift. NARA's public catalog ARC, includes series (collection) level descriptions for the Presidential Library museum collections, and a handful of item-level descriptions.

There is an item level checklist for most museum object, but only on paper.

We are in the process of phasing out the database.

We are just beginning to use the Archivists' Toolkit for centralizing archival description. Will likely use for item level description.

We are still at an early stage—identifying, creating preliminary inventories, archivally re-housing and developing numbering and labeling systems as we go. We have not “chosen” a preferred tool, but hope we will be able to use museums collections management software for the next step as we have tried other methods and they fall short.

We use CONTENTdm to provide item-level access to some of our collections.

We use the same tools for art as we use for artifacts.

**26. If you use more than one tool, how do you determine which one to use for an item or collection?
Check all that apply. N=53**

Nature of the collection (e.g., objects that are part of a manuscript collection may be treated differently than objects in an art collection)	39	74%
Staffing/resources available for description	34	64%
Material type (e.g., archaeological objects may be treated differently than merchandise)	33	62%
Size of collection	26	49%
Anticipated use	23	43%
Method of acquisition (e.g., purchase, donation, transfer)	4	8%
Other method	5	9%

Please specify the other method.

All collections receive collection-level MARC records. All finding aids are generated directly from database; some artifacts receive only folder-level description, others item-level.

Historical approaches vary by unit.

Inherent value or uniqueness. Also, condition and preservation costs.

Transitioning to Archivist’s Toolkit. Some tools are no longer used, but still maintained. All collections get EAD and MARC records.

Value (monetary).

27. Please enter any additional comments about choice of tools. N=7

Art and artifact materials are treated in a similar way. We rely on MARC records for description in order to integrate information about visual material collections with the Library’s other holdings, although a Prints & Photographs Online Catalog also combines MARC records in standalone databases with MARC records from the Library’s ILS. For a

particular collection or acquisition, we plan for processing and cataloging by assessing the “Use, Value, and Viability.” We have at least a summary description for each collection, increasingly supplemented by a container list that outlines broad contents or provides an index. Material that is inherently fragile or difficult to handle safely is likely to receive item-level listing or at least item-level tracking through a unique identification number, e.g., original drawings and photographic negatives.

Like our art works, some artifacts have large amounts of detailed information that comes with them (especially narratives) for which there is no room to efficiently input or display. Also need a system that allows managing and easy linking to related audiovisual materials like photos, and bibliographic records.

My answer here is the same as for art objects—the variety and types of tools that have been available to us has evolved over time. Choices on which system to use involve the best choice at the time.

Our library hopes to adopt Archivists’ Toolkit in the near future to improve our efforts at creating detailed finding aids.

Same as for art objects. We don’t differentiate between art and artifacts in treatment.

The museum collections management system (iO/TMS) is the primary tool used to describe and manage artifact collections. In some libraries, artifacts such as books, photographs, or AV materials that were originally acquired by the museum are often transferred to the libraries’ archives or AV collection based on their anticipated use. By the same token, oversized or framed archival materials are often transferred from the archives to the museum collection to support optimal care and access.

We haven’t been systematic in the past, but we are working a standard protocol for artifacts.

28. How do you display information about the artifacts to the public? Check all that apply. N=63

Library catalog	38	60%
Static website or other documents available on the web (e.g., finding aid, inventory list, etc.)	33	52%
Web-accessible front end to archival management system	18	29%
Web-accessible front end to internal database	11	18%
Onsite access to internal database	6	10%
Web-accessible front end to museum collection management system	3	5%
No information is displayed to the public	13	21%
Other method	17	27%

Please specify the other method.

Catalog records only for those that remained in archival collection. Otherwise only onsite access to paper records.

CONTENTdm

CONTENTdm

Currently, public access to is through NARA's ARC system; a web-accessible front end will be included in the new TMS system.

Discovery Tool (Summon), under development.

Exhibitions in Reading Rooms.

Finding aids are published to the Online Archive of California.

Images and data for portion of one large collection available in digital image database.

MS Word documents with box/folder/item detail on hard drive.

On-line galleries of reference photographs of items in the collection.

Paper printout of in-house finding aid.

Searchable finding aids database.

Temporary exhibitions within the library occasionally include artifacts.

VuFind search and discovery layer.

We are awaiting integration of our EAD finding aids into Primo, but for technical reasons having to do with this software, this has not yet succeeded.

Web-accessible front end to Media Manager.

WordPress installation; Fedora repository (at least theoretically).

NUMBERING SYSTEM FOR ARTIFACTS

29. Does each artifact have a unique number? N=63

Always	13	21%
Sometimes	42	67%
Never	8	13%

30. What numbering system do you use for artifacts? Check all that apply. N=58

Archival identifier (i.e., series, box, folder, etc.)	38	66%
Accession number (i.e., 2009.1.4)	37	64%

Local numbering system	35	60%
Library of Congress Classification	6	10%
Dewey Decimal Classification	1	2%
Other numbering system	4	7%

Please specify the other numbering system.

As assigned for digital display.

Group Record Number.

NARA's public catalog ARC (Archival Research Catalog).

Special collections call number.

DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS FOR ARTIFACT RECORDS

31. Please indicate which content standards you use to describe your artifacts. Check all that apply.
N=58

Describing Archives: A Content Standards (DACS)	35	60%
AACR2	29	50%
Getty Art & Architecture Thesaurus	20	35%
Library of Congress Thesaurus for Graphic Materials	17	29%
Getty Union List of Artist Names	5	9%
Cataloging Cultural Objects	4	7%
ICONCLASS	—	—
Other content standard	14	24%

Please specify the other content standard.

Chenhall classification system, CHIN data dictionary, CIDOC, UK Spectrum

Graphic Materials: Rules for Describing Original Items and Historic Collections (Supplement to AACR2)

In-house descriptions

Internal checklist if not part of a larger archival collection

LCSH

Local content standard for Dublin Core, based on the CDP Standards

Local standards based on LOC subject headings; some Dublin Core.

Locally developed standards. This practice is under review.

No content standards are used.

None (2 responses)

Rules for Archival Description (2 responses)

We do not currently have a standard.

**32. Please indicate which metadata standards you use to describe your artifacts. Check all that apply.
N=55**

Encoded Archival Description (EAD)	45	82%
MARC	34	62%
Dublin Core	29	53%
VRA Core	2	4%
Categories for the Description of Works of Art	2	4%
Other metadata standard	9	16%

Please specify the other metadata standard.

Above (EAD & MARC) only used for artifacts within an archival collection.

Dublin core, CIDOC core fields, CDWA, LIDO, etc. are built into the TMS system.

In-house descriptions

Locally developed standards. This practice is under review.

MODS/METS

Nomenclature

None (2 responses)

Rules for Archival Description

STAFFING

33. Please indicate how many individuals work in this library/unit/collection (enter a whole number, e.g., 4) and the total FTE of these individuals (enter a whole number or a two-digit decimal, e.g., 3.25). N=63

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Individuals	60	1.00	95	12.60	7	15.96
FTE	57	0.40	87	10.41	6	13.83

Total individuals	Total FTE	Comments/Other category of staff
1	.40	Administrative Assistant helps with research.
1	1	Graduate student assistant 10 hours per week; volunteers and student interns, hours vary, depending on the project.
1	1	
1	1	
2	1	
2	1.50	
2	2	
2	2	
2	2	Administrative & professional.
3	1	
3	1.25	1 f/t faculty, 1 p/t student, 1 volunteer.
3	2	
3	3	1 support staff, 1 librarian archivist.
4	3.50	
4	4	We also employ numerous student assistants who help w/ processing.
4	4	Students, interns and volunteers.
4		We currently have one full-time temporary contract position, one full-time student assistant position, and one post-doctoral fellow working in the unit in addition to the permanent staff noted above.
5	4	
5	4.475	
5	5	Student employees (3 FTE).
5		With assistance from Metadata colleagues who provide copy cataloging and rare book cataloging.
6	4	Six student assistants.
6	5	
6	6	This includes museum curators and archives curators.

Total individuals	Total FTE	Comments/Other category of staff
6	6	Student Assistants and temporary project archivists.
6	8	Student assistants.
7	4.50	Includes students and a one-year contract employee.
7	5	Student GTAs.
7	6	
7	6	
7	7	
7	7	
7	7	Number only refers to archives/special collections staff. The Music Library has 4 staff involved with the special collection in the Music Library (not included in the number above) and no FTE was given.
8	3	Graduate assistants, undergraduate employees.
8	7.50	Includes 1 FTE temporary special project worker; not all people in this unit work with art.
8	8	
8	8	
8	9	8 staff and 1 FTE student workers or practicum students.
9	7	
10	7	Students, volunteers, interns.
12	6	
12	9.50	2.5 FTE are student assistants, which changes seasonally.
12	12	Graduate students.
15	2	
15	12	
15	12	Work/Study student assistants.
15	15	Additionally, there are student staff (est. 10 FTE).
15	15	We also have student interns on a regular basis.
18	17	Not including students.
20	15	Student workers.
20	20	
23	21.75	Also hire student assistants, interns, and volunteers.
27	24	
30		
32	22	A combination of full time staff and student workers.
38	37	
40	38	
42	39	
60	24	We employ full-time curators, part-time paraprofessionals, and students.
95	87	Also staffed by term-based/part-time workers, including graduate student assistants and interns.

There is at least 1 FTE Curator and 1 FTE Registrar at each library. Additional FTE Museum Technicians, Exhibit Specialist, Exhibit Technician, and PT student hires vary for individual libraries. Some of these positions (FTE or PT) are paid for by the library's Trust Fund or Foundation. Across all of the library museums, there are usually around 75–80 FTE. In addition, there are 20 individuals and 18 FTE in Center for Legislative Activities, and 17 individuals in Presidential Materials and 15 FT in the same office.

Various individuals from different library units spend some time on this collection, but none is specifically assigned to this collection.

CHALLENGES OF MANAGING ART OBJECTS AND ARTIFACTS

34. Please briefly describe up to three challenges of managing art objects and/or artifacts. N=63

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
Amount of space they require.	Unusual size and shape often requires unique non-standard shelving and/or boxes.	Description standards do not apply to many of the objects in our collection, making it difficult to adequately describe or represent them in catalogs and databases.
Appropriate storage and space.	Appropriate housing and preservation.	Continued development of staff expertise in this area.
Art objects/artifacts consume enormous amounts of space, especially if properly housed.	Preserving and curating art objects/artifacts often requires a knowledge of conservation techniques that are not in the standard repertoire of library preservation departments. Just knowing the science of inks and pigments represents a huge departure from standard paper-oriented techniques.	Although they can lend important accents to library exhibits, artifacts tend to be overlooked by librarians unless their curators push for discovery and inclusion.
As library collections, we do not have proper and sufficient storage and display facilities.	Our librarians are not curators in the art sense--and perhaps not the best people to arrange/describe/make useful our collections of art and artifacts.	No funding or staffing support for these collections.
Cost of supplies to house items.	Cost of staff time to house items.	Limited expertise in dealing with some kinds of art (e.g., pastels) or preservation issues unique to paintings (e.g., cracking paints on deteriorating canvas).
Describing and providing access in a cost-effective manner; lack of certainty about information the public needs in order to locate artifacts.	Collection management issues in a collection geared toward archives and manuscripts (appraisal standards, value of objects, etc.)	Knowing when (or if) to apply museum standards in a collection geared toward archives and manuscripts.

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
Description on how the object was used and its significance to the collection--its story.	Preservation.	Access--allow access to original artifact or digital surrogates.
Differing views of the purpose of the collections. Are they for discovery and use or are they for preservation and exhibit.	Determining and applying appropriate standards for description.	Developing a discovery strategy that promotes "hidden" collections to novice users and allows expert searchers in-depth manipulation of results.
For years we have not used an established content standard. If we were to do that now, we would have thousands of records to update.		
Funding for staff to process collections.	Space.	Funding for digitization.
Having adequate specialized museum staff to manage artifact collections stewardship responsibilities and to sustain the Library's exhibit and program goals including appropriate formats.	Having sufficient and appropriate space for storing and processing/preparing artifact collections, with appropriate furnishings and equipment.	Competing for preservation resources in an institution where textual, audiovisual and (increasingly) electronic records are prioritized.
Historical objects often pose particular storage problems due to unusual proportions, shape, or material construction.	We typically receive art objects and artifacts as part of larger archives/ manuscript collections. This poses a challenge in that we don't want to separate these items from the rest of the collection - we want to preserve context, which even a separation sheet fails to do on some level - but often these materials need a different environment than the rest of the collection.	It is difficult to give art objects, in particular, the attention they deserve since we are not a museum. However rarely they might be exhibited in a museum, they have even less chance of being displayed in our archives, since we do not have a gallery. Since they were considered by the donor or creator to be part of their archives, we hold on to them, but it is difficult for us to do justice to them. The best we could do it offer digital versions online.
Housing artifacts and art.	Long-term preservation concerns.	
In process of building collection development policy for special collections materials; the university art collection, some of which is in our custody, has no plan.	Need adequate and adequately trained curatorial staff.	Need storage facilities and appropriate housing.
Lack of expertise on staff for processing.	Space and security.	Preservation.
Lack of experience relating to such objects.	Diversity of objects.	Lack of resources.
Lack of funding for staff and equipment.	Lack of staffing to preserve artifacts.	
Lack of space.	Lack of staffing.	
Lack of storage space.	Need for climate controls for photographs film and negatives.	

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
<p>Making PastPerfect database available for public use.</p> <p>Need for recognition! Without adequate documentation, it is difficult to convey to the library, the campus and the world in general the importance of this collection for research, teaching and learning. Many patrons find us by accident, random searching on the net, by word of mouth, or through the publications of others. Also, the unrecognized but high monetary value of some of the items is an in-house issue for security, appropriate housing and storage, and proper inventorying /appraisal.</p>	<p>Rehousing for physically fragile objects.</p> <p>Need to post "it" on the web! The size and diversity of the collection makes it impossible for one person to manage to the level we have come to expect in this era, or to have the necessary expertise in all the areas required. Piecemeal patron demand for digital images and metadata creates a just-in- time, on-the-fly mentality that runs ahead of coordinated collection-wide decisions on standards for management, identification, numbering, proper description, and handling of images. There is a pervasive expectation that the whole(?) collection will be posted on the library website. Our current website has been dead for years. I have not faced revising it without some better foundation in place for presenting the collection. No other collections in the Library have these problems on this scale, so there not much willingness to initiate serious discussions.</p>	<p>Need for conservation work on fragile sculptures.</p> <p>Need for support! The expectation is that we should "go for a grant" to do all we need. This is an obvious solution, but would probably involve several large grants over a period of time. Before we can ask for such support and manage any kind of grant, (1) we need to count or specify how many items are involved, (2) the library needs to make decisions on collection management and standards and guidelines for digitizing collection in general, so we can describe what we propose to do, and (3) support for a big web re-design in available.</p>
<p>Our institution had some art/artifact pieces that were not fully documented when they arrived and current staff have created an artificial "art/artifact" collection to track and inventory these pieces. The information about these pieces is fragmentary. Currently, as pieces arrive they are accessioned as part of the collections they arrive with and their records are more robust.</p>	<p>Rehousing is on the item level, and we wish we had better framed art, artifact, art storage.</p>	<p>Presenting art collection information to researchers.</p>
<p>Physical housing and care, including conservation, restoration.</p>	<p>Some categories are low priority. Description and access are labor intensive.</p>	<p>Research value is not always apparent. Treatment such as digitization and creation of metadata can increase the usefulness and research value of the materials, but such treatment is costly and is not obviously justifiable to funding agencies.</p>
<p>Physical storage.</p>	<p>Accessibility along with related material in more traditional/accessible formats.</p>	<p>Usefulness of finding aids and descriptive language.</p>

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
Poor physical control (storage options not ideal).	Sporadic intellectual control (some parts well constrained, others not at all).	
Preservation and conservation are particularly challenging, given the breadth of materials in the collection and limited lab facilities for specialized processes.	Developing adequate descriptive cataloging standards for the variety of materials in the collection.	Storage space, particularly for physical objects with different storage and shelving requirements.
Preservation and storage of unusual material.	Making sound acquisition decisions for media unfamiliar to our professionals.	Ensuring monetary appraisal is carried out appropriately.
Preservation issues.	Storage issues.	Access issues.
Preservation of various formats, especially things like architectural drawings!	Size: we have *millions* of historic photographs.	Digitization pressures: item-level versus collection-level access and attendant staffing resources!
Proper housing.	Access.	
Proper storage.	Curator does not have formal education/ training in management of art objects/ artifacts so therefore unprepared to describe materials as effectively as someone with, say, museum training.	
Proper storage and preservation: art and artifacts do not generally fit standard library and archival shelving.	Use by researchers: reading room space not geared for these genres of material.	
Proper storage conditions.	Proper housings.	Limiting any physical damage when used in exhibitions or by researchers.
Proper storage for preservation: Oversize items, such as posters and prints often require specialized storage. 3D objects, including historic military uniforms and clothing, also require storage and care that can present challenges in an archival setting.	Level of description: User access to art and artifacts can often benefit from item-level description, possibly with the addition of digital photographs or surrogates. We rarely have staff time available to produce description at this level and often rely on traditional archival collection or fonds-level description, possibly with a folder or basic item list. Instances of detailed item level description are more rare.	
Proper storage.	Access to, and reproduction of, oversized and/or fragile items.	Identification of works and description of unidentified pieces.
Resources: i.e., more professional, support, and student staff.	More time to work on materials.	Appraisal: some items/collections do not belong and should not stay with the repository.

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
Resources to describe and digitize.	Physical housing and preservation.	Providing training & tools for researchers, e.g., visual literacy tip sheets, media identification, collection background documents for context.
Size and materials - they don't fit in readily with the rest of the archival collections.	Staffing to process or describe.	Many materials were left out of finding aids in the past, and are lurking in unprocessed storage.
Some artifacts are shelf hogs, especially since they are sometimes off shapes and don't stack well.	The intersection of access and technology is a problem. We have ideas on how to improve it, but it is very cumbersome under the current system.	
Space constraints.	Subjective nature of art material (description).	
Specialized metadata standards, which don't map well to standard archival and library descriptive tools, and that require specialized knowledge on the part of the archivist.	Physical challenges of serving oversize, three-dimensional, and odd size materials to researchers.	Housing materials of various sizes.
Standards: We lack a common set of data standards and protocols for cataloging non-bibliographic or manuscript content such as art/artifacts.	Cataloging: A standards-based networked data entry environment for cataloging these material types is not available. In addition, staff are not trained in standards for cataloging non-book/manuscript materials and/or do not have enough subject expertise to develop metadata.	Space/housing for storage, display and use. In several units, specialized storage, reading room, and display areas for art/artifacts are not provided for. Most collections are intershelved with book/archival manuscript materials. The architectural drawings and art properties collections do have specialized storage.
Storage.	Conservation.	Creating records in a system that accommodates print and archival holdings.
Storage.	Preservation.	Use.
Storage, both in terms of adequate space but also appropriate space that is temperature controlled and secure.	Keeping up the inventory and updating appraisals.	Funding for managing the collections.
Storage: creating appropriate storage containers and finding adequate space is always a challenge.	Maintenance: Repairing historic musical instruments is expensive and there aren't many qualified luthiers in the area.	
Storage and handling of objects.	Description of objects.	
Storage issues given the fact that we are primarily a books and manuscripts collection.	Access.	Digital delivery.

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
Storage of strangely shaped objects.	Helping researchers understand that art objects and artifacts are included in archival collections.	
Storage space.	Lack of staff trained specifically in describing and conserving art.	Appropriate public interface.
Storage space.	Preservation/conservation.	Difficulty describing art/artifacts.
Storage, conservation, and display issues in a facility build for book & manuscript collection storage and use.	Ownership issues, a higher proportion of are art collection appears to be undocumented, making it difficult to assume clear ownership.	Outreach and marketing: if we see value in keeping / collecting art and artifacts, what do we *do* with this materials to justify that effort.
The finding number system that we use for our art objects is based on the location of the object, so it is difficult and resource-intensive to physically reorganize our storage or move objects.	Artifact storage is a challenge because of varying sizes and shapes of the objects.	The description of artifacts in finding aids is a challenge because they cannot always be found easily.
The UF Latin American Collection is mainly a circulating academic library specializing in books and serials on Latin America. We do not have experience with this kind of museum collection and are trying to learn the best techniques for management.	Space is an issue, especially as off-campus storage is increasingly important and this makes access difficult for processing. Also, because of space (and staffing) issues at UF, the collection was more accessible to its donors/ supporters when housed at the now-defunct Panama Canal Museum (PCM) in Seminole.	The work done by PCM volunteers to accession objects is very admirable. We are now looking at their inventory from the perspective of wanting to make it useful as an archival finding aid for researchers, and trying to negotiate that change. For example, a variety of terms have been used to describe objects, and some parts of the collection have been described more thoroughly than others.
Time: not enough of it.	Lack of training to work with art and artifacts.	Lack of appropriate storage.
To convey their unique qualities to users.		
Volume is an issue, for examples 2 million photographs and thousands of items of ephemera.	Intellectual property issues, including rights to reproduce for publication or for online finding aids.	Insufficient resources for preservation, arrangement, and description of analog materials; or for presentation through exhibition or publication.
We are really not trained or well set up to manage arts objects (things are slightly better for artifacts). For instance we feel like much of our storage of these items tends more to the "make do" than what is preferred.	We have no conservation staff to treat art objects and artifacts, so some condition issues are never addressed adequately.	We're chronically understaffed so usually working with these types of collections is added on to someone's already too full plate.
We do not have adequate storage facilities for many types of artwork and artifacts.	We do not have a preservation budget or personnel to adequately preserve and maintain artwork and artifacts.	We often question the historical and research value of some of these materials (particularly artifacts), but donors and researches often assume they have intrinsic value as objects.

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
We self-limit in acquisitions by size of art object due to archival lack of space. Some collections are acquired and stored offsite at Walnut Warehouse.	Staffing to create finding aids and conduct archival processing on the hundreds of unprocessed manuscript collections in both Archives and Special Collections. The new reorganization should help--it's just slow going right now.	Funding. At times we have to pass on material because our pockets aren't that deep.
Western Archives: Size and shape often require special containers/storage arrangements. Music Special Collections: Staffing to create proper finding aids, includes skills set and time to create them.	Western Archives: Have to be maintained physically separate from rest of fonds/ collection. Music Special Collections: Proper display and housing for collection.	Music Special Collections: Patron accessibility would likely be solved if challenges 1 & 2 were addressed.
While art and artifacts are housed separately, whenever appropriate they are described in the context of the collection to which they belong. While not a challenge per se, this aspect wasn't addressed in the arrangement and description question.	We focus very little time on artifacts, somewhat more on art, as it is a significant component of our children's literature collections. It's hard enough to keep up with description for our primary collections (archives and rare books)-there is little time left for artifacts particularly.	
Working with several different systems (Archivists' Toolkit, MS Access, SCREAD, legacy finding aids) makes it difficult to manage. We are getting closer to having all of our collections documented in AT.	For the most part we do not have item level description/control of our art and artifact collections. Materials are treated archivally. Some collections contain several thousand boxes, such as the papers of architect Richard Neutra and A. Quincy Jones or the LA Times Photograph Archive.	Space and storage of larger items.

SUCCESSFUL STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING ART OBJECTS AND ARTIFACTS

35. Please briefly describe up to three of your most successful strategies for managing art objects and/or artifacts. N=55

Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
Accompanying descriptive text with a scanned image, when possible.	Using a database such as PastPerfect that is designed specifically for a wide array of objects. (Although it still doesn't adequately address all of our needs as a theatre special collection.)	

Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
An on-going project for physical re-organization and re-housing with appropriate materials and storage containers is indirectly demonstrating the number and diversity of art works and artifacts in the collection just through the quantity and expense of such supplies, and the space occupied.	Presentations to classes (e.g., library and information studies, museum studies, art dept, French and Spanish classes) attract interns and volunteers.	A string of visiting doctoral students, and requests from prestigious institutions that borrow our items for exhibit or to include images of our holdings in their publications help draw attention to the collection when the resulting dissertations and catalogues are given to the collection. This creates a positive attitude when it comes to requests for student help and supply purchases...
Arranging and describing them as part of archives and manuscript collections		
As much as possible itemize and house as one would other archival materials	Designate a particular space for oversized materials.	
At one point, many of our university-related historic objects were simply not described, either in a finding aid or in the OPAC. Since their research value is minimal, we did not want to expend the resources to catalog them individually. We created an artificial collection of university-related realia, which is described in a MARC record in our OPAC. This allows us to offer intellectual access as well as maintaining some physical control over these items without cataloging each one individually.		
Centralization of collection processing and description.	Implementation of a web-scale discovery tool.	Construction of an appropriate storage facility.
Collection level records	Standardized naming conventions	Accessioning as processing
Collection-level access with thumbnails for coherent collections using EAD	Item-level access based on MODS records, derived from the EAD records (typically enhanced)	
Conversion of legacy finding aids and bringing all electronic finding aids into AT (still a work in progress, but we have come a long way).	Our collections of cuneiform tables are the best example of how we have been able to process this type of material. Item level description and translations of texts were used. Digitized version are on the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (CDLI).	

Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
Creation of a position for Curator of Cultural Properties that works with the Office of Gift Planning to review and guide in the gift acceptance process for museums and non-museum collections through policies, procedures, to responsible review of gifts in kind art works to the university (not all art is worth the gift).	For the museums, using the same collection management guidelines, procedures, and forms	For art objects - merging all the standalone databases into one.
Creation of digital facsimiles for access in order to protect originals.		
Descriptive work: combination of item and collection level	Consultation with preservation and conservation experts	
Digital initiatives and online exposure of collections.	Negotiating (albeit infrequently) endowments or gifts of cash to support particular collections.	Exposure of collections through exhibitions and publication motivates moving collections higher in processing priority list.
Digitization	Climate control	
Digitization of photographs, with the creation of robust metadata, has made them more discoverable and useful, and has reduced the need for staff intervention for most use.	University art gallery assumed responsibility for some art objects.	
Donor-funded temporary expertise for processing.	ArtSTOR	
Focusing acquisitions and limiting the number of artifacts accepted to the extent possible.	Still experimenting, but folding artifacts into the regular workflow to the extent possible.	
For our "orphans," creating a simple, easy to use in-house database.	Incorporating pictures of the art/artifacts in the finding aids and inventory systems.	
Good collecting focus so that we only acquire art and artifacts essential to our mission.	Partnership with campus museums for loan/display of some materials.	Deaccession policy
In addition to an item number, we have a photograph of each item on the outside of the wrapping material or storage carton speeds up identification.	We have created an oversized storage area for storing framed, wrapped works of art.	

Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
Including them in the finding aids for the collections to which they belong at least gets some mention of their existence out to the public. We do not have the resources to devote to art and artifacts exclusively.		
Incorporating Archivists' Toolkit. It has streamlined our management of collections and access.		
Incorporating them into the description of the archival or manuscript collection of which they are a part.	Providing thumbnails of art objects to facilitate easy identification and management.	Background research on provenance, donor info, and condition assessment of portraits done by an intern.
Individually numbering and classifying objects.	Making finding aid available to public.	Description of objects.
Integrate the collection management and access with existing library systems—more likely to receive support when not the sole user a database or procedure.	Providing basic housing and description when the material first arrives, and making those records available to the public to avoid perception of hidden collections.	Publicize the collections in ways that demonstrate their research value to varied user communities.
Investment in professional museum staff.	Investment in a suitable museum collections management database with adequate and manageable metadata that includes new descriptive practices.	Highlighting and optimizing the ability of artifact holdings to attract audiences through exhibits and loans.
Item level description of untitled works of art for ease of retrieval.	Digitizing two dimensional items and putting box/folder listings in the metadata, and affixing thumbnail images of contents on the outside of flat file drawers.	Creating a visual shelf-level map of the stacks in Excel. This helps us determine locations as well as extent of collections.
Maintaining control of objects through numerical system.	Storing framed items through handing system throughout archival space.	Determining some general guidelines for access and description.
Maintaining in-house checklists for individual artifact holdings removed from archival collections.	Maintaining collection level finding aids for selective photograph collections.	Finding more appropriate homes for museum objects that don't belong in the repository.
Making use of the PastPerfect inventory (migrated into MS Access) has been very important.		
Materials are separated from the main manuscript collection and placed in a high security area.	Some of the art and artifacts are on permanent loan to other institutions that can display them.	

Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
Moving item-level description of historic campus photos "downstream" to maximize productivity. We move much more through with staff and students than we used to, and rely less on archivists/curators.		
N/A at this point		
Objects are photographed as part of the accession, improving access to materials prior to full-processing.	A robust exhibition program in Special Collections has increased visibility of collections, extended viewers' understanding of what library collections can be, and supports donor relations.	Art and artifact collections have great potential as a presence on the web as well, improving visibility, creating access and reducing wear and tear on the physical object.
Online reference photographs of the art and artifacts in the collections, coupled with item level descriptions, provides easy patron access to the collections and reduces the paging of items from storage, thus helping with preservation issues.		
Out of necessity, we treat many art/artifact collections very similarly to archival collections.		
Posting .pdf files on the department web page so that students and patrons can find things via search engines.	We are grateful that our cataloging colleagues are attentive and want to collaborate but the impact is for collections that require copy cataloging. They don't have the expertise in visual resource cataloging.	
Provide digital surrogates imbedded into an EAD finding aid.	Access to information via CONTENTdm as well as Archon.	Work with university museum on appropriate home for artifact.
Select specific collections to catalog at the item level, create EAD finding aids housed on a consortium server.	Create metadata templates to manage digital access for specialized collections.	
Separating artifacts from paper-based collections.	Artifacts have a separate RG numbering system.	Storing artifacts in separate area from books and paper-based collections.
Single site access through online catalog.		
Stepped processing that publicizes records quickly, followed by more detailed finding aids and other records supplied later.	Close relationships w/ other librarians/curators and university faculty to promote use of our materials.	
Treat in a manner similar to manuscript collections—don't worry about item level accession or description.	Store creatively.	

Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
Treat in the same manner as any archival collection, but with special housing needs.		
Treating art and artifacts as integral parts of larger collections they come in.		
Try to only acquire such objects in the context of an archival collection, not as one offs that end up "orphaned."	Consult with appropriate professionals to ensure we are practicing good storage and preservation techniques.	
Used a practicum student to document our artifacts/art objects. Student photographed the items, uploaded them to the Media Manager system, and created metadata for the objects.	Only now is the Polar Archives using EAD encoding for finding aids. My intention is to link to these records in the Media Manager from the EAD finding aids, once the finding aids have been encoded.	
Utilizing volunteers, students, and staff, we have nearly 100% of our artifacts cataloged in PastPerfect.	All of our artifacts are rehoused in acid-free storage containers.	Our artwork is also completely rehoused.
We are very fortunate to have a fully equipped conservation lab at the library. The staff are supportive and understanding of our needs and go the extra mile for us when we need it.	We manage our collections as a whole, not at the item level, so it helps that they blend with the archives collections from a management/arrangement/description perspective.	
We do the best we can trying to tie them into our collecting policy.	Keeping them with the collection provides context for the material.	
We have written a set of guidelines for cooperation between three of our special collections departments pertaining to collecting, storage, and record-keeping.	We are currently working on a CONTENTdm database that will allow researchers to learn about many of the artifacts we hold.	
We unhesitatingly invest in proper housings and rehousings. The expense is considerable, but the rewards are great: above all, easy and safe storage, retrieval, and transport.	We deliberately and planfully integrate non-book objects into our exhibits. This not only better "animates" these exhibits, but also draws attention to the fact that although we are largely a library, we also have a museum component.	We collaborate actively with the campus art museum, and their curators are in our reading rooms all the time, seeking out material for their exhibits and researchers.
We use PastPerfect collections management software to manage our art objects and their metadata, which has been a successful strategy for us. It also allows us to track donors and accession information about each donation.		
Western Archives: Describe as integral part of the fonds/collection.		

Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
Work with conservation unit to properly box and store diverse materials on shelving designed for books and document boxes.	Experimenting with web applications (custom databases, inventory tools, and web sites, or OMEKA) to provide access pathways for selected materials and collections.	Partnering with other institutions/ organizations to provide access to selected materials and collections, such as papyri, clay tablets, medieval manuscripts, and architectural archives.

36. Please indicate how satisfied you are overall with your strategy for managing art objects and/or artifacts using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very dissatisfied and 5 is very satisfied. N=56

1 Very Dissatisfied	7	13%
2	7	13%
3 Neutral	22	39%
4	19	34%
5 Very Satisfied	1	2%

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

37. Please enter any additional information that may assist the authors' understanding of your library's experience with managing art objects and artifacts. N=28

Arts Library Special Collections is a newer department in the Yale library structure. It is approximately 15 years old and developed all of its current policies and procedures in that time.

Because they are not integral to our mission (except occasionally in the University Archives) we have not made their care a priority in any way.

Books and things used to share the same spaces in both libraries and museums, but were segregated into their separate spaces by the late 18th century, which is the way they have been treated since. (Michel Foucault made this a focus of his book, *Les Mots et les choses*, in 1966.) We are gradually moving back toward a more liberal view of museal objects being appropriate for us as a research library to collect, in part because of the growing prominence of special collections in all libraries the result not only of the growing value of unique holdings in light of their potential for digital projects, but also of the steady advance of computing speed and storage, which makes image (both still and moving), sound, and other media databases an increasingly realizable (and affordable) medium for preservation and access.

Collection of arts/artifacts is not our primary collecting objective. Often items come in as additions to manuscript collections. We have worked to add these items to our collection in a balanced effort to respect donated items.

I have only recently joined the library, and will be working with others to develop a more systematic way of handling these collections.

I love working in this collection. It is more frustrating than dissatisfying. Our patrons would find so much more of relevance to their research if the collection were adequately inventoried, fully managed and digitized. For my part, I am working on identifying and describing broad groups of materials--whether archival series of photographs, or categories of art works and artifacts--and then working down to folder or item levels as much possible, using Excel spreadsheets in the hope of being able to upload them into a comprehensive collection management system. I am an "organization and content" person but need technical support. Our art and artifacts collection is of equal value to and complements the books and archival collections but it is not given equal treatment with regard to software. I have a clear idea of where we need to go, and how the collection could look on the web, but very little chance of getting there or initiating discussion within the library on how to integrate the three types of system! I have been searching for other academic libraries that use or have tried to use a museums collections management system parallel to bibliographic and archives software and would like to join a discussion group if there is one available.

I think we are doing this in the most rudimentary way.

I'm afraid I don't really have any further comments — we are, basically, a standard music and performing arts library with printed and audio/visual materials.

In most cases, art objects have come to us as part of an archival collection. They are not items we have sought to collect. They are valuable in that context. Some pieces have value extrinsic to the collection of which they are part. Artifact mostly come to us as part of an archival collection but in the case of photographs, the digitization and description of them raise the profile and attract donations of related collections of photographs. That is the rare example of acquiring a collection of artifacts that is not part of a mixed archival collection.

Lack of adequate space to process and store large items is a huge challenge.

Most artifacts are within large collections and remain unidentified and uncataloged in any form.

Most of our artifacts are related to the university's history. We are not systematically building a collection of artifacts (with the exception of architectural records and drawings). The library does own a few art objects, but these are primarily decorative. We do not systematically collect art objects.

Our current strategy involves drawing on the willingness and knowledge of volunteers who were connected with the museum before it closed. Successfully taking advantage of these qualities will involve a high degree of diplomacy, planning and coordination. Bringing in someone who can coordinate volunteers, library staff, etc. will be crucial to making this work.

Our expertise is music rather than art; so many prints and other artworks are not adequately described.

Ours has been a slap-dash approach and trying to keep our head above water. Managing art objects is/has been secondary after traditional book/serial processing.

Privilege (and expectation) of multiple aspects for each staff member's work means that everyone multi-tasks and no one has collection management as his/her primary responsibility. We do not have dedicated catalogers or preservation people.

The Center has an extensive travelling exhibitions and loans program. In the currently fiscal year we have already shipped 297 photographs to eight museums in the US and Europe. The staff includes 2 FT curators, 3 FT professional registrars plus an exhibits designer/senior preparator and two registration assistants. 5,000 SF exhibition gallery where the curators present three exhibitions annually drawn from the Center's collections.

The history collections at the health sciences library is basically a paper-based collection, so dealing with art and artifacts prove to be a challenge. We do not have good storage for these items, although the area does have fairly

constant temperature and humidity. Some of the art is on display throughout the library proper, thus are exposed to light, etc., but many were donated or purchased for that purpose. Artifacts need better storage and more detailed descriptions. My position, which was previously .25 FTE, was empty for six years. When I began, I was .20 FTE for ten years, only becoming .4 FTE in the past three years. This position needs to be full-time.

The university archivist's satisfaction with our strategies varies by material. She is satisfied with the management of historic photographs and historic objects. She is less satisfied with the management of art. Fortunately, art represents a very small proportion of holdings.

We also communicate with the museum staff at the university's two other museums (art museum and world culture museum) so whenever we've needed advice we have local expertise we can rely on.

We are just one year in to a campaign to provide adequate support for all types of collection in LCR, through centralized metadata, system, and collection management support. Much of what we are doing is still learning.

We attempt NOT to collect 3-D artifacts, and yet, we keep getting them. They are useful in exhibits and do often provide important historical or cultural information, but they come with many problems for a collection whose focus is on 2-D documents!

We collaborate closely with the university art gallery. However, it is not always clear what objects should be a part of their collection and what should remain a part of ours. The best example here would be cartoons. Both units collect original cartoon art, but we treat them as part of an archival collection, they treat them as individual art objects. I would also say that we actively collect artifacts for our history of plastics collection and hold to the belief that material culture objects can be as valuable for research as written or printed materials.

We collect artists' books (housed in Special Collections), and although these could be considered "art objects," we catalog them and treat them as books. I will provide the link to the section of the Fine Arts collection development policy that deals with artists' books.

We do not actively collection art and artifacts and make a strong effort to find other homes for these materials or suggest to donors where these materials could be better housed, i.e., museum or historical society.

We do not currently have a standard. It has been left up to the person entering the data to come up with it. We are moving toward using our university library's data dictionary which pulls metadata from the Library of Congress and other places, but this will happen slowly, and as we are able to digitize and provide online access to these materials.

With new leadership and a new structure, we are just beginning to put a plan for these materials in place.

With the exception of photographs and posters, we do not actively collect art and artifacts. We receive them through donations.

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

University at Albany, SUNY
University of Alberta
University of Arizona
Boston College
Brigham Young University
University of British Columbia
University at Buffalo, SUNY
University of Calgary
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of Chicago
University of Colorado at Boulder
Columbia University
Duke University
University of Florida
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
Johns Hopkins University
University of Kansas
Kent State University
Library of Congress
University of Louisville
McMaster University

University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
National Archives and Records Administration
National Library of Medicine
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
University of New Mexico
New York University
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
Ohio University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
Rutgers University
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Syracuse University
Temple University
Texas Tech University
University of Virginia
Washington University in St. Louis
University of Western Ontario
Yale University
York University

