SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

There is growing demand from users, administrators, and donors to have manuscript collection information available on the Web. In their OCLC Programs and Research report "Shifting Gears: Gearing Up to Get into the Flow," Ricky Erway and Jennifer Schaffner state, "In a world where it is increasingly felt that if it's not online it doesn't exist, we need to make sure that our users are exposed to the wealth of information in special collections."[1] Their report speaks specifically to digitizing collections, but the philosophy holds true for information about manuscript collections as well as digital facsimiles of them. This study explores Web resources that provide information about these collections, rather than the facsimiles.

Many of those who are responsible for the arrangement and description of manuscript and archival materials suffer from chronic backlogs and often lament the lack of resources (staff and time) to deal with their workloads. How do libraries accomplish the task of getting information about their valuable resources online? This survey investigated how many manuscript collections are held in ARL member libraries; what percentage of these collections are represented on the Web; what types of information about the collections are available in finding aids and on the Web; what formats are used for finding aids on the Web; how many library staff are working on manuscript collections, the challenges and benefits of migrating collection information to the Web, and whether and how usage of manuscript collection information is tracked. It was distributed to the 123 ARL member libraries in February 2008. Seventy-two libraries completed the survey by the March 31 deadline for a response rate of 59%.

Background

Using the Society of American Archivists' (SAA) definition of a manuscript collection as a "collection of personal or family papers"[2], the survey first asked whether the library held manuscript collections. The majority of respondents (69 or 97%) answered, "Yes." Many of the respondents clarified how their answers may not reflect all of the manuscripts held at their institution since these collections are dispersed across several units.

Staffing

All 69 respondents identified the unit, department, or library that is responsible for arranging and describing manuscript collections; in some cases, there is more than one. Typically, it is an archive, special collections, and/or rare books department or library.

Sixty-seven respondents answered basic questions about the number and types of staff (including archivists, librarians, other professional staff, support staff, and students) in the unit. They reported a total of 1297 individuals: 584 student assistants, 265 support staff, 218 archivists, 152 librarians, 47 other professionals, and 31 other staff, such as volunteers. The FTE totals indicate that permanent staff largely work full-time and that there are about three students per FTE.

The total number of individuals per unit ranges from 4 to 95, with an average of 19.36. The number

of student assistants skews the average, though. The maximum number of permanent staff ranges from 5 (other professional) to 15 (support staff) while the student assistant maximum is an incredible 63 at one institution! The median number of professional and support staff per unit ranges from one to three, while the median for student assistants is six.

Staffing for Manuscript Collection Activities

Without arrangement and description there would be very little information to put on the Web for researchers to use, so the survey next asked how many of the total staff reported above actually perform arrangement and description tasks, how much time they spend on these activities, and how much time they spend adding manuscript information to the Web. The 68 respondents reported that 762 individuals perform these activities, 59% of the total staff in the department.

Archivists

Fifty-six respondents reported a total of 147 archivists who spend even a small percentage of time on arrangement and description. The number per institution ranges from 1 to 13, with an average of 2.63 individuals. The archivists spend anywhere from 1% to 100% of their time on these activities, averaging 41.17%. The two archivists who spend 100% of their time on arrangement and description were listed as a Project Archivist and Contract Processing Archivist, positions created specifically to focus on such activities.

On average, archivists spend 11% of their time adding information about collections to the Web. Therefore, the average archivist spends about 16 hours of a 40-hour work week on arrangement and description activities, plus another 4 hours getting information about these collections on the Web. In addition, they spend time on a variety of other areas including reference, instruction, preservation, acquisitions, records management, exhibits, management, professional service, digital projects, donor relations, collection development, and outreach. As one respondent succinctly put it, "The usual."

Department Head

Thirty-five respondents reported that the unit or department head spends some time on arrangement and description or on adding collection information to the Web. The maximum time for either activity is 50%. On average, slightly more time is spent on arrangement and description (12.32%) than on adding information to the Web (8.95%).

Librarians and Other Professionals

Thirty-five respondents reported a total of 69 librarians who spend time on manuscript collection arrangement and description or adding information to the Web. The range is 1 to 5 per institution, with an average of 1.87 librarians. They spend up to 100% of their time on arrangement and description, averaging 25%. As with department heads, librarians spend less time putting information on the Web, up to 65% of their time but only averaging 12%.

There are fewer other professionals involved in manuscript collection processing activities (20 institutions reported a total of 29 individuals), but the range per institution (1 to 5, average 1.45) and time commitment (arrangement and description average 27%, Web average 12%) mirror librarians.

Support Staff

Almost as many support staff as archivists spend time on arrangement and description and Web activities; 47 respondents reported a total of 139 individuals. The number of support staff per institution ranges from 1 to 15, with an average of 2.96. They spend up to 95% of their time on arrangement and description, averaging 44%, the highest for permanent staff. They also spend up to 75% of their time on putting information on the Web, averaging 11%.

Students and Other Staff

All but ten respondents report employing student assistants for manuscript collection arrangement and description work. Students account for the largest number of staff (317) and highest percentage of time devoted to these activities (64%). Although libraries depend heavily on students for arrangement and

description work, they do not depend on them for getting that same information on the Web. Student assistants spend up to 100% of their time in this capacity, but average only 9%.

Only 14 libraries reported employing other types of staff for manuscript activities. Typically, these are graduate assistants, student interns, grant-funded staff, or volunteers who work part-time. They spend about half their time on arrangement and description and less than 20% on Web work, on average.

Size of Manuscript Collection

Since institutions aren't required to keep these statistics in a standardized unit of measurement, respondents reported the size of their collections in linear feet, cubic feet, linear meters, and items, with the majority using linear feet. The size of processed and unprocessed manuscript collections varied widely. The total size of processed collections ranges from 385 to 32,839 linear feet, with an average of 8142.78 linear feet of material. The total size of unprocessed collections ranges from 150 to 22,038 linear feet, with an average of 4499 linear feet of material.

Levels of Description

When asked about the level of description in their print or other traditional finding aids, most (48 or 73%) responded that they include collection-level description with other elements such as scope and contents note, biographical note, series descriptions, and folder lists. Only 5% answered that their finding aids contained less information than that. Just under a fourth of the respondents report an "other" level of description. While their explanations were quite diverse, several answered that the level of description varies from finding aid to finding aid.

All but three of 66 respondents consider a collection to be fully processed when there is a multi-level finding aid that includes folder-level description. Twenty-five of these (40%) also selected both "multi-level with series-level description " and "multi-level with collection-level description." Nine others also selected one or the other. The respondent who answered "other" noted, "Never really fully processed. Currently considered such if multi-level description and box listed inventory." Other comments indicated that the level of description varies from collection to collection.

More than half of the responding institutions (35 or 57%) are using database management software to keep or organize their collection-level data. The most commonly used software is Microsoft Access (15 institutions), followed by FileMaker Pro (7 institutions). Only 13 (21%) are using open-source software; two are using Archon and five the Archivists' Toolkit. Smaller numbers of institutions use library or museum information management software. The highest percentage of respondents (62%) answered "other," including WordPerfect, Excel, NoteTab, ExLibris Aleph, and Sirsi Dynix Workflows.

When asked if their institutions have adopted, at any level, the "More Product, Less Process" approach to arrangement and description as discussed in the 2005 *American Archivist* article by Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner, 74% reported that they had done so.[3] The comments are very interesting, with various responses pointing out that Greene and Meissner did not invent the concept. Greene and Meissner themselves mention some of the earlier archivists and institutions who had advocated this and similar approaches.[4] Although they were not the first to suggest that archivists can't continue to process archival collections to a high level, their article, published in a widely-read and prominent archival journal, has resonated with the archival profession, more so than previous calls for this approach. The tone of their article, at times harsh, grabs the reader's attention and has perhaps caused this surge in interest.[5]

Description and Content Standards

Most of the respondents (43 or 70%) use the SAA standard *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS)*, for describing materials.[6] Of the eighteen (30%) who don't, seven are Canadian and have their own standard for description.[7] Of those who use DACS, 24 apply this standard to their legacy records.

Almost all respondents (60 or 92%) are creating MARC records for manuscript collections on some

level. A significant number (53 or 80%) are encoding finding aids in EAD, but not everyone is, yet. Those who are marking up their finding aids in EAD are doing so on a smaller scale than they create MARC records. For example, the average number of EAD files created is 530.58, versus 1560.18 MARC records.

Respondents' comments on whether the time and effort to create EAD records equals the benefits are worth examination. While many responses were short, positive answers such as "absolutely" or "yes, definitely," they were not all glowing recommendations. One of the negative responses from an institution that does use EAD was, "No. The payoff for the time and expense of creation is negligible." Another explained, "Since our finding aids have been available on the Web for quite some time, first as plain HTML documents and then as EADs, I don't think we've realized any particular benefit to changing the format, except perhaps that the finding aids look neater. Our researchers were finding our collections through search engines prior to the conversion."

Others indicated they just weren't sure yet. A few indicated that they didn't really know if it was worth it but felt "this is a standard we want to follow." Another even claimed, "There's no way to easily measure the 'benefits;' however it would be irresponsible to not encode our finding aids."

Among those who are using EAD, there seem to be divergent opinions about the ease of creating EAD finding aids. Several mentioned the ease with which their institution creates EAD finding aids, with one explaining, "The creation of new finding aids in EAD is no more complicated or time consuming than those created in any other format." Others indicated that the time and effort is substantial, noting that "the special knowledge required for creating EAD finding aids and making their presence on our Web site effective has been an impediment to us backing the effort fully." This is consistent with the findings of Elizabeth Yakel and Jihyun Kim, who listed "complexity of technology" as one reason for the lack of diffusion of EAD in the archival community.[8] Another interesting comment from the survey discussed how one institution takes advantage of a template for creating EAD "that does not require any added effort." But they fail "to see what, if any, benefit is derived from the EAD metadata. "

Those who do not use EAD were asked if they perceive any external or internal pressure to implement its use; the results were mixed. Even some of those who have implemented were compelled to comment. One respondent claimed that some staff members "can not see any advantage in using EAD over standard static HTML pages. We feel there are no justifications for increasing processing and description time and costs for minimal advantage… I believe that EAD is a labor-intensive throwback to library cataloging methods of the past." In addition to the increased description time and cost—whether real or perceived—there is another negative connotation to EAD. Some respondents detect the feeling that implementing the use of EAD is embracing change for change's sake, or, as one person put it, giving in to "a subtle 'keeping [up] with the Joneses' kind of internal pressure to adapt whatever is cutting edge and new."

Web Presence
All but one of the responding libraries have at least some information about individual manuscript collections on their Web sites. The types of information differ, but most include collection title, a brief description of the collection, inclusive dates, extent, biographical or administrative history, and a unique collection identifier for some collections. Although they might include these elements, they don't *always* include them for every collection; 54% report that the information varies by collection.

Manuscript Collection Information on the Web
When asked how many manuscript collections are represented on their Web sites, respondents' answers ranged from 1 to 11,000 collections. Two institutions proudly proclaimed that all of their collections were represented online. The average number was 831.59, somewhere between the average number of EAD files and MARC records created. A common approach among the responding institutions is to add the col-

lection information to their Web site as new collections are processed or there is some level of intellectual control over the collections, though some have different plans and procedures in place for legacy collections. The level of intellectual control varied among the responses. Some only add information after a collection has been fully processed; others add basic information about a collection, regardless of level of arrangement and description and completion of finding aid. Several institutions assess the "importance" of a collection and place information about it on their Web site accordingly.

Finding Aids on the Web

The vast majority of the responding libraries (60 or 94%) have finding aids—regardless of format or presentation—on their Web sites. The number ranges from 1 to 6000 with 655 on average. The criteria for getting them there are similar to the criteria for getting any kind of information about manuscript collections on the Web. Some libraries have established policies and procedures, while others report that staff simply adds them when they have time.

Finding aids are delivered online in a variety of formats. The largest number of respondents (35 or 58%) is delivering them in HTML with EAD encoding. Others are presenting them as HTML from a word-processor document and as PDFs. Fourteen libraries have finding aids online that were created in at least two different ways.

Many of the respondents' comments to questions throughout the survey mention the conversion of legacy finding aids. Depending on the institution, this conversion process could entail a great deal of work. Forty-eight libraries (77%) convert legacy finding aids to new styles for Web presentation. Although 71% of the respondents claim that all of their online finding aids reflect the same style, 13 of the institutions that convert legacy finding aids report their online finding aids don't reflecting the same style. One might assume that the same institutions that convert legacy finding aids would want all of their finding aids to look the same, but this survey did not ask further questions about this.

Hosting/Harvesting Finding Aids

Forty of the responding institutions (63%) participate in EAD harvesting or consortial programs. Besides the large state and regional consortia such as Online Archive of California (OAC) and ARCHEION, a number of respondents contribute their finding aids to RLG/OCLC's ArchiveGrid. Of those who do not participate in any such program, half are interested in doing so in the future.

Only a little more than half of the respondents (58%) replied that they have some mechanism that allows users to search across fields within the online finding aid; lack of an easy way to take advantage of the tagged elements in EAD is a common complaint. Institutions are using a variety of programs and special software to make this possible, including Orpheus, DLXS, Aleph, DB/TextWorks, Tamino, and PRIMO.

Usage Tracking

Only nine libraries track the use of in-house finding aids. Some of the tracking comes from user-registration records. One person commented, "Well, we don't track use of finding aids, we track use of collections." It's often easier to track use of online finding aids. Several of the 28 who do track their use mentioned a specific tool for this, such as Urchin. Others simply described the frequency with which they or a technical support person does this, and the answers describe varying levels of information they capture.

One respondent, whose institution can gather this information, explained why they don't track it: "Since our finding aids have been harvested by any number of search engines and other projects, however, I doubt there is a realistic way to gather much useful information about how and by whom they are used." When asked about the differences in frequency of use between online and in-house finding aids, 81% answered that online finding aids are "used" more. Since the survey did not define "use," these numbers can only be interpreted in a general sense, as "use" might mean "accessed" and/or actually referenced or used in a reference request. Several responded that they no longer have anything other than online

finding aids, while others indicate that patrons use the online finding aids on computers in their reading rooms; some institutions provide access to both in the reading room.

Training for Online Manuscript Activities

Not surprisingly, most manuscripts staff are simply learning as they go. Clearly, some are learning more than others. When asked what kind of training or education opportunities staff use, 98% checked "on-the-job training." Other popular answers included peers, professional association-sponsored workshops, library school, electronic discussion lists, conferences, and professional journals and readings.

Organization for Online Manuscript Activities

When asked if their library had reorganized to provide manuscripts information online, the majority (52 or 84%) said they had simply incorporated these activities into their existing areas without making any name changes to the unit, department, or library. Only two libraries (3%) actually changed the name of their department to reflect these changes. A large number (35 or 57%) answered that job descriptions were adjusted to include these activities even if the organization did not make any formal changes. Twenty-seven (44%) also indicated that their staff members receive assistance from other departments to complete these tasks.

Respondents' comments about online manuscript activities that are distributed across the institution indicate that manuscripts staff are working with people in other units or departments, which may or may not be part of the same administrative structure, to get information onto the Web. These include departments or units whose functions include cataloging, metadata services, systems, IT, and digital services. One respondent said it this way:

> Primary responsibility for the organization and description of manuscript collections resides in Special Collections & University Archives, and we routinely create and move online essentially all html finding aids. We coordinate closely with a Central Technical Services (CTS) Department when record-building intersects with the general library OPAC, and we coordinate closely with the Digital Library Services (DLS) unit when undertaking CONTENTdm initiatives. All of these activities can be properly thought of as 'manuscript activities.' Depending on the specific project, CTS, DLS, and/or Special Collections staff may be involved in scanning and providing metadata. It is a much more fluid world than it used to be!

Challenges of Getting Manuscript Collection Information Online

When asked to provide three challenges faced in getting manuscript information on the Web, most respondents gave what were expected and unsurprising answers. One person's replies sum up these answers: "staff: not enough;" "time: not enough;" and "money: not enough." Many of the responses were similarly succinct. Others, however, provided more specific information about just what suffers from this lack of resources. Without sufficient resources to meet modern demands, respondents find that they sometimes have to choose between processing collections, new and old, and making information available on the Web. With only one or two people available to work on these projects, both may suffer. They are forced to make a choice: process collections or make something available on the Web. Which is more important, processing collections or providing access to them? There is no clear answer to this question.

Archivists face a recurring problem in making realistic and useful decisions regarding their legacy finding aids; answers to this survey show this to be a big problem for some respondents. There are several potential challenges in dealing with these legacy finding aids. One challenge is that they do not follow the current content standards. Should they go up anyway so that at least there is information about the collections available to researchers? Not only do respondents report that their legacy finding aids don't adhere to standards like DACS, but they also report that their legacy finding aids provide item-level information that makes it difficult to convert to modern

standards and styles. Some institutions have dealt with this problem through grant-funded initiatives.

In addition to the traditional lack of resource issues libraries have always faced (not enough time and staff to process collections), respondents also report that technological problems are challenging their efforts to get materials on the Web. Many of the responses indicate that staff lack the technological expertise to make the most of what a Web presence has to offer, and they lack the technical support from other departments within their institutions to make it happen.

Another challenge is the added reference work resulting from more access via the Web. One survey answer explained, "As we put up more finding aids, we are seeing increased use of the collections. Our electronic reference service particularly reflects this use. A challenge is to keep our reference service at a level to meet this added demand, from both in person and electronic researchers."

Benefits

Certainly the most beneficial result of putting information about manuscript collections online is increased access to collections. Not only does this get the information out there, but it makes the collections easier for researchers to use. Respondents agree that another by-product of this increased access is increased reference activities. Several comments, however, indicate that patrons come to the reference room armed with more information about collections, i.e., box numbers, and therefore are easier to help.

Conclusion

The respondents are all managing to get at least some information about their manuscript collections onto the Web. Most of the comments indicated that they want to get more there, but are unable to do so for a variety of reasons. A select few have all their manuscript collections represented on the Web in some way, either as a MARC record, a brief blurb in HTML, or an EAD finding aid.

Almost all respondents are creating MARC records for their collections; fewer are creating EAD finding aids. These simple statistics, however, are deceptive because as one looks further one finds that libraries aren't necessarily creating large numbers of finding aids in EAD, or any other format, or putting information about large numbers of collections on the Web. The overall numbers for creating MARC records for collections are more impressive. Why is it easier to create and use MARC records than to create and use EAD? This has been explored by others, such as Yakel and Kim, and the results of this survey appear consistent with their findings. For various reasons there is a range of attitudes and opinions relating to the ease, usefulness, and value of EAD.

The survey discovered a lot of information about who is doing the arrangement and description tasks necessary before the information is published on the Web. Librarians and archivists—those who are trained and educated professionals—squeeze these duties in between a multitude of other responsibilities. They are not the only ones in these institutions who perform arrangement and description tasks, but they do spend larger percentages of their time than anyone else in actually getting information on the Web. Although 74% of respondents report they have started to implement the "More Product, Less Process" approach to arrangement and description as suggested by Greene and Meissner, as a whole libraries are still reporting large unprocessed backlogs. Not surprisingly, 85% of the respondents report they only consider a collection fully processed when there is a finding aid with folder-level description.

The challenges in placing manuscript collection information on the Web were not surprising. The prevailing challenges relate to a lack of available resources, as well as the technological abilities in getting the information there. If libraries do not see an increase in resources, then how will they manage to get everything done? This lack of resources may not ever change. What might change, however, is the uneven level of technological ability and support across institutions that allows some to place more information on the Web than others. What does unite all of us is our belief that access to our collections is critical, and increased Web presence provides that access.

Notes

1. Ricky Erway and Jennifer Schaffner, "Shifting Gears: Gearing Up to Get into the Flow. " www.oclc.org/programs/publications/reports/2007-02.pdf, 2

2. Richard Pearce-Moses, *Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005).
 http://www.archivists.org/glossary/

3. Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing," *American Archivist* 68, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 2005): 208–63.

4. Karen T. Lynch and Helen W. Slotkin. *Processing Manual for the Institute Archives and Special Collections M.I.T. Libraries* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1981). Ruth B. Bordin and Robert M. Warner, *The Modern Manuscript Library* (New York, 1966).

5. One comment regarding this was seen in response to the entry "Notes from Spring MARAC meeting: MPLP, Friend or Foe?" in the popular blog ArchivesNext. On May 9, 2008, a commenter named Paul wrote that Greene and Meissner are "innovative thinkers that aren't afraid to rattle cages." Here is one example of this: "An unfortunate tendency on the part of processing archivists is to use the preparation of these text notes as an excuse to demonstrate their own knowledge (of both collection and historical context) and writing ability. Perhaps this is an attempt to demonstrate professionalism but, if so, it is a misguided one that further reduces processing productivity." Greene and Meissner, 247.

6. Society of American Archivists, *Describing Archives: a Content Standard* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004).

7. Bureau of Canadian Archivists, Planning Committee on Descriptive Standards, *Rules for Archival Description* (Ottawa: The Bureau, 1996).

8. Elizabeth Yakel and Jihyun Kim, "Adoption and Diffusion of Encoded Archival Description," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 56, no. 13 (2005): 1427–37.

SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The SPEC survey on Manuscript Collections on the Web was designed by **Donnelly Lancaster Walton**, Archival Access Coordinator, W.S. Hoole Special Collections Library, University of Alabama. These results are based on data submitted by 72 of the 123 ARL member libraries (59%) by the deadline of March 31, 2008. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

Most of those in the archival profession have heard the casual yet emphatic question from patrons, "Why isn't this information on your Web site?" In the 1990s, simply posting hours of operation, basic policies, contact information, and a digital image or two may have been enough to keep patrons, staff, and top-level administration content. In 2008, however, this minimal information is not enough for anyone on any level. Now more than ever, staff in archival repositories feel pressure from administrators, colleagues, and patrons to increase the amount and types of information they make available on their Web sites for public consumption.

A casual review of Web sites for various libraries and other cultural institutions shows a wide range of materials in their collections and an equally wide range of approaches to describing collections, including collection surrogates, and presenting visually interesting pages. One repository's Web site may offer an appealing appearance with digital exhibits and links to large digital projects, descriptions of the types of materials available at the repository, and a few finding aids marked up in Encoded Archival Description (EAD). Another Web page may have rather plain themes and appearance, offer few or no digital surrogates of its materials, and no finding aids marked up in EAD, but have descriptions of ALL of its materials and finding aids available in some format. Other archival repository Web sites have a variety of combinations of description, surrogates, and appearance.

Administrators often look to the more visually interesting Web sites with digital images and large numbers of collection lists and finding aids as an ideal their institution should strive to reach. What these Web sites do not always reveal is how representative of the manuscript collections the sites really are, how much work was required, and how much help the processing archivists had in getting the information out there.

This survey will investigate how many manuscript collections are held in ARL member libraries; what percentage of these collections are represented on the Web; what types of information about the collections are available in finding aids and on the Web; what formats are used for finding aids on the Web; how many library staff are working on manuscript collections, the challenges and benefits of migrating collection information to the Web, and whether and how usage of manuscript collection information is tracked.

According to the Society of American Archivists' "A Glossary of Archival Terminology," a manuscript collection is "a collection of personal or family papers." Different institutions and archivists themselves, however, often have varying definitions of archives and manuscripts. For this survey please use the term "manuscript collection" to include any archival materials at your institution that are not university records or part of your records management program.

BACKGROUND

1. Does your library hold manuscript collections? N=72

Yes	69	96%
No	3	4%

Selected Comments from Respondents

"Archives & Special Collections (at the Thomas J. Dodd Research Center) is a unit of the Library but is located in a separate building adjacent to the Library. The Dodd Center was constructed specifically to hold archival/mss collections."

"In addition to SCARaB's manuscript holdings, the Western Historical Manuscript Collections department, a unit of the University of Missouri SYSTEM, and the State Historical Society of Missouri, a state agency, both on the MU campus, hold manuscript collections. I can not speak for these two separate repositories."

"Medieval, early modern European, Latina American and US colonial through 19th century are in the library. Most 20th century modern manuscripts are in the University Archives, which is not part of the library system."

"Most manuscript collections at University of Montreal are held by the University Archives, not the Libraries. The answers provided in this questionnaire cover only the Library part, i.e., the manuscripts held by the Rare Books Library. This Library has one manuscript collection and many single manuscripts, dispersed in its main collection and in other smaller collections."

"Special Collections and University Archives has 4 units: Manuscripts, University Archives, Rare Books, and Photographs. Included in University Archives (in addition to standard administrative records of UO), are manuscripts (particularly faculty collections), photographs, and many other media that are typically found in manuscripts collections."

"Survey response is for Manuscript Division collections; smaller numbers of manuscript collections are held by the Music Division, American Folklife Center, and several other divisions."

"The answers provided herein are submitted by and reflect information concerning ONLY the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, on behalf of all UT Austin Libraries."

"The Manuscripts Unit is part of the Special Collections Research Center, which also includes Rare Books, the University Archives, and the University Art Collection."

"The Rare Books & Special Collections Division holds both archives and manuscripts. Basic records exist for most

of this material and in some cases more detailed inventories and finding aids have been created. Some of the manuscripts have records in the libraries online catalogue. However, except for one or two experiments, there has been no programme for creating electronic records for this material. The Library is aware that this issue must be addressed soon. Osler Library in the History of Medicine: some similarities to the Rare Books Division. The Library is addressing the issue of electronic records."

"The Russell Library is one of three special collections departments at UGA. My responses will cover only the Russell Library."

"The UCR Libraries Special Collections & Archives Department houses 279 individual manuscript collections. Each collection is designated as part of either the UCR University Archives or the Special Collections Archives."

"Three areas of the University Libraries hold manuscript collections. The answers to the survey reflect the largest area, University Archives."

"We have manuscript holdings in 4 units: Manuscripts, University Archives, Modern Graphic History Library, and Film and Media Archive (archive of a documentary filmmaker, so the collection is a mix of paper and media—only the paper materials are represented in our responses). The manuscript-related answers on the survey cover all 4 areas."

"We hold manuscript collections (original, unpublished materials not part of official University records)."

"We interpret 'manuscript collections' as all of our archival holdings that are not part of the University Archives."

If yes, please complete the survey.

If no, please submit the survey now.

STAFFING

2. Please indicate which unit/department/library is responsible for arranging and describing manuscript collections. N=69

Archives & Manuscripts Department/Burns Library/University Libraries

Archives & Manuscripts; Asia Collection; Special Collections (three separate departments)

Archives & Special Collections (5 responses)

Archives & Special Collections unit/Digital Initiatives & Special Collections Department

Archives & Visual Materials Cataloging

Archives and Manuscripts

Archives and Manuscripts/Department of Special and Area Studies Collections

Archives and Modern Manuscripts Program

Archives and Records Management

Archives Service Center

Cushing Memorial Library and Archives

Department of Rare Books and Special Collections

Division of Archives and Research Collections

Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections

Historical Collections and Labor Archives

Institute Archives & Special Collections

Library Services/Collections and Services/Manuscript Division

Manuscript Unit, Rare Book & Manuscript Library

Manuscripts and Digitization, Center for Southwest Research, University Libraries

Manuscripts and Special Collections Unit/Public Services

Manuscripts Division/Department of Special Collections

Manuscripts Unit/Special Collections Department

Manuscripts, Archives, and Special Collections

Non-book Unit/Department of Special Collections and Archives

Rare Book & Manuscript Library (2 responses)

Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library

Rare Books and Manuscripts, Special Collections Library

Rare Books and Special Collections (Manuscript Collections) and University Archives (2 separate units)

Rare Books & Special Collections Division

Rare Books and Special Collections Library

Special Collections (12 responses)

Special Collections & Archives (3 responses)

Special Collections & University Archives (3 responses)

Special Collections and Archives and Special Collections Cataloging

Special Collections and Digital Programs

Special Collections and University Archives: Manuscripts unit and University Archives unit

Special Collections Library (4 responses)

Special Collections Research Center (2 responses)

Technical Services Department

These responsibilities are shared by 3 units in the Library.

University Archives (2 responses)

University Archives Staff and the Libraries Catalog Department

University Archives, Special Collection, Photographic Archives

Western Archives

3. For each category of staff below please indicate how many individuals work in this unit/department/library (enter a whole number, e.g., 4) and the FTE of these individuals (enter a whole number or a two-digit decimal, e.g., 3.25). Also enter the total number of staff in the unit/department/library in all categories and their total FTE. N=67

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Archivist, individuals	57	1	14	3.83	3	2.90
Archivist, FTE	56	1	14	3.60	3	2.86

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Librarian, individuals	45	1	12	3.38	3	2.32
Librarian, FTE	45	0.75	11.50	3.10	3	2.22

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Other professional, individuals	32	1	5	1.47	1	0.80
Other professional, FTE	30	0.50	4.75	1.37	1	0.79

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Support staff, individuals	62	1	15	4.27	3	3.50
Support staff, FTE	61	0.25	15	3.81	3	3.17

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Student assistants, individuals	62	1	63	9.41	6	9.77
Student assistants, FTE	58	0.20	21.50	3.02	2	3.67

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Other staff category, individuals	17	1	5	1.82	1	1.33
Other staff category, FTE	15	0.50	2	1.17	1	0.52

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
Total number of individuals	67	4	95	19.36	15	14.72
Total FTE	66	1.25	50	12.19	9.5	8.45

Please describe the other category of staff. N=20

"Cataloging."

"Digital Projects Manager."

"Exhibit coordinator."

"Exhibitions Coordinator; Conservation Assistant."

"Five staff from the Library Technical Services unit spend a portion of their work week arranging and describing manuscript collections."

"Graduate Assistants."

"Graduate Assistants — Non Teaching."

"Graduate half-time students working on one project; other students work 10 or less hours a week."

"Grant-funded processing archivist who is working on the archives of the Space Telescope Science Institute."

"Head Librarian."

"Judaica Curator, Exhibit Developer."

"Manuscripts Curator."

"Occasional student archivist interns or temporary grant positions (not on the permanent staff)."

"Oral historian; project staff."

"'Other Professionals' refers to the half-time Head of Special Collections (administrative position)."

"Staff responsible for EAD encoding, editing, uploading & maintenance of online finding aids only (not archival processing)."

"Temporary hourly project staff person."

"University co-op student placement for 4-month term, January–April 2008."

"Volunteers."

"Volunteers, many of whom are retired faculty."

Respondent	Archivist, individuals	Archivist, FTE	Librarian, individuals	Librarian, FTE	Other professional, individuals	Other professional, FTE	Support staff, individuals	Support staff, FTE	Student assistants, individuals	Student assistants, FTE	Other staff category, individuals	Other staff category, FTE	Total number of individuals	Total FTE
1					1		3	0.25		1.00			4	1.25
2	1	1.00	1	1.00			1	1.00			1	1.00	4	4.00
3	1	1.00	1	1.00			1	1.00	2	1.00			5	4.00
4	3	3.00					2	1.50					5	4.50
5	3						1		2				6	
6			1	1.00			3	2.50	2	0.25			6	3.75
7			1	1.00			4	4.00			1	1.00	6	6.00
8	3	3.00			1	1.00			3	1.50			7	5.50
9	2	2.00			2	2.00			3	1.50			7	5.50
10	3	2.50					1	0.50	4	1.00			8	4.00
11			2	2.00	1	1.00	3	3.00	2	0.50			8	6.50
12	3	3.00							6	3.25			9	6.25
13	1	1.00			1	1.00	1	1.00	6	1.25	1	1.00	10	5.25
14	1	1.00	4	3.00			1	1.00	4	1.50			10	6.50
15	4	4.00			2	2.00	1	1.00	3				10	7.00
16	4	4.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	2	2.00	2	0.20			10	8.20
17	2	2.00			2	1.50	4	2.25	3	1.00			11	6.75
18	2	2.00	3	3.00			1	1.00	6	2.00			12	8.00
19	4	2.00					2	1.00	6	6.00			12	9.00
20			8	6.75			3	3.00	1	0.50			12	10.25
21	3	1.00					2	2.00	7	1.00	1	0	13	4.00
22	4	3.75					1	1.00	8	2.00			13	6.75
23	3	3.00					2	2.00	8	2.00			13	7.00
24	1	1.00			1	0.50	4	4.00	7	2.50			13	8.00
25	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	3	3.00	5	1.13	2	1.00	13	8.125
26	3	2.50	2	2.00	2	2.00	2	2.00	4	1.00			13	9.50
27	4	4.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	3	3.00	4	0.50			13	9.50
28	5	5.00			1	1.00	3	3.00	4	1.00			13	10.00

Respondent	Archivist, individuals	Archivist, FTE	Librarian, individuals	Librarian, FTE	Other professional, individuals	Other professional, FTE	Support staff, individuals	Support staff, FTE	Student assistants, individuals	Student assistants, FTE	Other staff category, individuals	Other staff category, FTE	Total number of individuals	Total FTE
29	1	1.00	3	3.00	2	1.25	2	1.60	6	1.50			14	8.35
30	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00			9	3.41	2	2.00	14	8.41
31	3	2.25	3	2.10	1	1.00	3	2.10	4	1.50			14	8.95
32	3	3.00	3	3.00			1	1.00	6	1.50	1	0.50	14	9.00
33			4	2.50			3	2.00	8	2.50			15	7.00
34	1	1.00	4	3.25			3	3.00	7	1.25			15	8.50
35	2	2.00	4	3.25			3	2.50	6	3.00			15	8.75
36			2	2.00			7	7.00	6	1.50			15	10.50
37	3	1.75	3	3.00	1	1.00	3	3.00	3	0.75	2	2.00	15	11.50
38	2	2.00					3	3.00	6	0	5	0	16	5.00
39	1	1.00	3	3.00	1	1.00	2	1.50	10	5.00			17	11.50
40	5	4.50	2	2.00			1	1.00	10	3.00			18	10.50
41	3	3.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	5	5.00	8	1.50			18	11.50
42	1	1.00	3	3.00	2	2.00	6	6.00	6	2.00			18	14.00
43	7	7.00			1	1.00	1	1.00	10	3.50			19	12.50
44	4	4.00	4	4.00			5	5.00	6	1.90			19	14.90
45	8	7.50					6	3.20	6	1.50			20	12.20
46	4	4.00					4	4.00	14				22	8.00
47			4	4.00	2	2.00	2	2.00	14	2.50			22	10.50
48	7	7.00					2	1.50	13	4.13			22	12.63
49			7	5.50			3	2.50	10	6.00	2	1.50	22	15.50
50	8	7.25	2	0.75	1	1.00			12	2.80			23	11.80
51	5	5.00	2	1.75			9	7.58	8	3.00			24	17.33
52	5	4.30	4	2.25			5	4.00	10	3.25	1	0.50	25	14.30
53	6	5.50	2	1.20	1	0.50	10	7.33	6	1.20			25	15.73
54			6	6.00			10	10.00	10	2.50			26	18.50
55	2	2.00	4	3.75	1	1.00	5	4.00	15	5.00			27	15.75
56	2	2.00	5	5.00			15	8.00	6	1.70			28	16.70

Respondent	Archivist, individuals	Archivist, FTE	Librarian, individuals	Librarian, FTE	Other professional, individuals	Other professional, FTE	Support staff, individuals	Support staff, FTE	Student assistants, individuals	Student assistants, FTE	Other staff category, individuals	Other staff category, FTE	Total number of individuals	Total FTE
57	10	9.00	5	5.00	2		3	2.00	10				30	16.00
58	14	14.00					5	4.50	11	2.00			30	20.50
59	14	13.50	1	1.00			15	15.00					30	29.50
60	6	6.00	7	7.00	2	0.80	10	9.00	6	0.50			31	23.30
61	1	1.00	4	4.00	2	1.75	5	5.00	20	7.50	1	1.00	33	20.25
62	5	5.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	5	5.00	25	15.00	1	1.00	38	28.00
63	8	8.00	4	4.00			11	10.50	17	5.00	1	1.00	41	28.50
64	2	2.00	4	4.00	2	2.00	11	10.10	30	7.80			49	25.90
65	3	3.00	4	4.00	5	4.75	9	8.50	31	12.50	3	1.50	55	34.25
66	4	2.75	12	11.50			6	6.00	34	2.50	1	0.50	57	23.25
67	6	5.50	8	8.00	1	1.00	12	12.00	63	21.50	5	2.00	95	50.00
Total	218	202.00	152	140.00	47	40.10	265	232.00	584	175.00	31	17.50	1297	804.00

STAFFING FOR MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION ACTIVITIES

4. For each category of staff listed below, please indicate:

- The title(s) of the staff in this unit/department/library who have responsibility for arranging and describing manuscript collections;
- The number of staff in each category (enter a whole number);
- An estimate of the percentage of their time that is spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections (enter a whole number, e.g., 100, 50, 10);
- And an estimate of the percentage of their time that is spent on adding manuscript collection information to the Web (enter a whole number, e.g., 100, 50, 10).
- If less than 100% of their time is spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections and/or adding manuscript collection information to the Web, please briefly describe their other duties.

    N=68

Archivist N=56

There is not an archivist or the archivist does not have responsibility for manuscript collections. N=9

Number of individuals who arrange and describe manuscript collections N=56

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	13	2.63	2	2.01

Percentage of time spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections N=56

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1%	100%	41.17%	30%	26.57

Percentage of time spent on adding manuscript collection information to the Web N=55

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	50%	11%	5%	12.70

Position Title	Number of individuals	Arranging and Describing	Adding MSS Information to Web	Other duties
University Archivist	1	2%	0%	Administer University Archives program
Coordinator, Acquisitions and Processing	1	5%	5%	Rare Books cataloging, selection for digitization, dealer and donor relations, operations supervisor
Curator	1	10%	5%	Reference, administrative tasks, curatorial tasks, records management
Archivist and Processing Coordinator	1	20%	50%	.3 Reference, collections management, research, service
University Archivist (Librarian rank)	1	20%	5%	Administrative; public services
University Archivist	1	25%	0%	
Archivist	1	25%	50%	

Head, Special Collections & University Archives	1	25%	0%	Manage department, supervise staff and students, committee work for library and university
University Archivist	1	25%	25%	Management, electronic records, coordinate with campus administrators
Curator of Collections	1	30%	5%	65%
Archivist	1	30%		Reference, Teaching, Supervision, etc.
Archivist, Special Collections	1	50%	0%	Reference (book & archival collections), training & supervision of student/contract positions
University Archivist / Manuscripts Curator	1	50%	10%	Acquisitions, reference, exhibits
Archivist	1	50%		
Access Archivist	1	55%	35%	Working with student assistants and reference services
Collections Archivist	1	60%	30%	Reference (10%)
Technical Services Archivist	1	70%	20%	Computer support and Web site duties
Project Archivist	1	70%	25%	Reference
Processing Archivist	1	75%	5%	Meeting, reference, correspondence, other
University Archivist; Digital Collections Archivist	2	6%	3%	See full description (sent via e-mail)
Archivist, Curator	2	20%	20%	Reference, Assessment, Management
Processing Archivist	2	30%	50%	Reference, supervision of students, exhibitions, outreach
Associate and Assistant Archivists	2	30%	10%	Acquisitions, reference services
Assistant Archivist	2	50%	5% to 10%	Reference, collection acquisition and appraisal, instruction, stack management, preservation, project coordination
Archivist for Collections and Records Management	2	50%	5%	Acquisitions and records management; other duties
Archivist	2	70%	10%	20%
Archivist for Manuscript Collections, Archivist for Local History, Associate Director, University Archives	2	80%	10%	Reference, donor relations, accessions, cataloguing, oral history, digital projects
University Archivist and Assistant Archivist	2	20%, 40%	0%, 30%	Outreach, donor cultivation, exhibits, policy making
Manuscript and Photograph Archivist; Collections Manager	2	50%, 15%	25%, 10%	25%, 75%
Descriptive and Technical Services Archivist/ Research Services Archivist	2	60%, 10%	10%, 0%	Reference, research, professional service

University Archivist, Technical Services Archivist	2	65%, 90%	Not tracked	Donor relations, supervision and training, reference, teaching, finding aid review, meetings
Associate Curator; Contract Processing Archivist	2	75%, 100%	0%	Associate Curator: Accessioning, administrative support
Ethiopian Manuscripts Archivist; Sontag Archivist; Holling Archivist	3	1%	0%	
Archivist	3	20%	5%	Reference, outreach, donor cultivation, exhibits, supervision
Archivist	3	25%	10%	Reference, digital work, exhibitions
Archivist	3	25%	10%	Various, including administration
Manuscripts Processor	3	50%	5%	Reference, Exhibits, Donor Relations, Office Management, Committees, Supervise Students
Archivists	3	50%	20%	Reference; accessioning; preservation
University Archivist, PNC-Riggs Project Archivist, Jack Anderson Papers Project Archivist	3	75%	25%	Donor relations, reference, outreach
University Archivist & Assistant Director; Head of Records Management and Modern Politics Resources Curator; Africana Resources Librarian/Curator	3	<10%, 75%, 25%	0%, 0%, 0%	Administrative; reference; collection development
Archival Access Coordinator; Processing Archivist; Project Archivist	3	30%, 80%, 100%	10%, 0%, 0%	Archival Access Coordinator: reference and administrative duties; Processing Archivist: reference and administrative duties
Head, Arrangement and Description; Project Archivist; Media and Oral History Archivist	3	75%, 90%, 5%	0%, 0%, 0%	Administrative and preservation tasks; collection development; arranging and describing other formats; managing oral history projects
Archivist	4	20%	5%	Public service, records management, and acquisitions
Archivist	4	30%	5%	60%
Archivist	4	30%	5%	70%
Archivist	4	50%	25%	25%
Viterbi Family History Archivist; Feuchtwanger Curator; Shoah Visual History Archivist; Processing Archivist	4	60%	0%	Reference, creation of finding aids, accessioning, working with donors, collection maintenance
Archivist	4	75%	25%	

University Archivist and Associate Professor	4	20% each	10% of 1 FTE	Reference, encoding, digitizing, collection management, supervision of students, reviewing metadata, copyrights and fees information
Curator or Archivist	4	5%, 20%, 2%, 20%	5%, 10%, n/a, 5%	Unit management, user services, outreach, acquisition of collections, planning
Archivist for Records and Collections Management, Curator	4	~25%	~10%	Field collection, book selection, reference duty, records management, exhibit development, reference inquiry responses, preservation administration, arrangement and description of university records
Archivist	5	50%	15%	Reference, exhibits, instruction, collection development
Assistant Archivist, Student Assistants	5	55%	5%	The usual
Curator	6	20%	5%	Acquisitions, reference, professional development, creative works
Archivist	7	50–75%	25% or more	Varies; public services; exhibitions and programs; supervisory
Senior archives specialist; automations operations archivist; classified documents officer	13	80%	10%	Reference; miscellaneous

Head of unit/department/library N=35

The head of the unit/department/library does not have responsibility for manuscript collections. N=29

Percentage of time spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections N=35

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	50%	12.32%	10%	11.99

Percentage of time spent on adding manuscript collection information to the Web N=35

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	50%	8.95%	5%	11.78

Position Title	Arranging and Describing	Adding MSS Information to Web	Other Duties
Associate Director	0%	5%	Administration, management, reference, instruction, cataloging, donor relations
Head, Special Collections	1%	0%	Personnel management, supervision, and evaluation, division planning, donor relations, project management, meetings, reference desk, teaching
Head of Technical Services, Lilly Library	1%	2%	97%
Director	2%	0%	Administration, collection development, public services
Director	2%	0%	Collections development; donor relations; outreach; administrative tasks
Head, Special Collections and Archives	2%	5%	Administer and oversee all functions of the department
Curator	3%	0%	Reference and administrative
Department Head, Special Collections	5%	0%	Administrative duties as department head
Head, Archives & Special Collections	5%	0%	Administration
Director	5%	2%	Reference, digital work, exhibitions, administrative work, grant applications, meeting donors and booksellers, professional organizations
Head of Special Collections	5%	5%	
Department Chair	5%	5%	Manage the department
Head, Special Collections and University Archives	5%	7%	88%
Interim University Archivist	5%	0%	Administrative
Associate Dean for Collections and Services and Director	<10%	0%	Administrative; collection development; fund raising
Head and Congressional Papers Archivist	10%	5%	Management, correspondence, meetings, planning, etc.
Manuscripts Librarian	10%	5%	Acquisitions, donor relations, committees, exhibits, organizing symposia/events, supervise staff

Department Head	10%	10%	Donor relations, strategic planning, collection development
University Archivist	10%	15%	Reference, outreach, collection development for the university archives, and supervisory, administrative, and budgetary duties.
Head, Special Collections & University Archives	10%	20%	Administration, reference, instruction, collection development
Curator of Rare Books and Manuscripts	10%	20%	Reference, instruction, collection development, outreach, public service, supervision
Director of Special Collections, Archives & Rare Books	10%	25%	Administering the archives and the other department in the Division
Head of Rare Books and Special Collections	15%	15%	Administrative, bibliographer, collection development
Program Manager	15%	25%	60%
Curator of Manuscripts	15%	30%	Acquisitions, reference, teaching
Head, Archives & Visual Materials Cataloging	20% or less	25% or more	Administrative; supervisory; training; policies and procedures; quality control; database management; grant-writing
Director	20%	0%	Administration
Head of Historical Collections and Labor Archives	20%	10%	.7 FTE Administrative supervision, collection development, reference, research, service
University Archivist (and unit 2 Head, Rare Books & Special Collections)	25%	0%	Administration
Head, Special Collections & University Archives	25%	0%	Manage department, supervise staff and students, committee work for library and university
Head of Special Collections	25%	5%	Administration, acquisitions, development, reference, exhibits
Curator	25%	50%	Supervising archivists' processing; collection development; digital projects/architecture development; cataloging; institution-wide committees
Head, Archives & Manuscripts Department	30%	0%	The usual
Head, Collections Processing and Visual Materials Section	45%	30%	Supervision, training
Head Special Collections	50%	10%	

Librarian(s) N=35

Number of individuals who arrange and describe manuscript collections N=35

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	5	1.87	1	1.13

Percentage of time spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections N=34

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	100%	25%	15%	27.07

Percentage of time spent on adding manuscript collection information to the Web N=34

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	65%	12%	5%	16.09

Position Title(s)	Number of individuals	Arranging and Describing	Adding MSS information to Web	Other Duties
Assistant Professor of Digital Projects	1	0%	50%	Teaching, manuscript editing, Web site editor, student project coordinator
Librarian	1	0.05%	25%	Catalog manuscripts, reference, supervise students, create metadata; administer book collection
Special Collections Librarian	1	0.25%	0%	
Head, Technical Services for Special Collections; Curator and Assistant Head; Digital Programs Librarian; Exhibits and Outreach Librarian	1	2.50%	2.50%	

Special Collections Cataloger	1	5%	0%	Cataloging other materials, reference, etc.
University Archivist	1	5%	0%	95 %
Print Collections Librarian in Special Collections	1	10%	0%	Reference, exhibit preparation, teaching classes
Assistant Rare Book Curator	1	20%	0%	Public services, exhibitions and outreach
Librarian	1	25%	0%	Rare books, public service, acquisitions
Archivist/Librarian	1	25%	3%	Reference, meeting donors and booksellers, exhibitions,
Manuscripts Librarian	1	25%	25%	Reference, collection development, teaching, preservation
Assistant Head, Archives & Special Collections	1	25%	25%	
Rare Book/Special Collections Cataloger	1	25%	50%	Reference; cataloging; acquisition
Senior Cataloging Specialist	1	25%	65%	Miscellaneous
Special Collections Cataloging Librarian	1	30%	0%	Book cataloging
Assistant Curator of Manuscripts	1	90%	0%	Reference
Manuscripts Librarian	1	30%	10%	
Senior Librarian	1	30%–50%	5%–25%	Reference desk, public relations, cataloging, ordering and picking up supplies, etc.
History of Medicine Librarian	1	As time allows	As time allows	Managing library
Librarian/Bibliographer	2	10%	10%	
Librarian	2	15%	0%	Field collection, book selection, reference duty, exhibit development, reference inquiry responses, preservation administration
Manuscripts Librarian	2	15%	5%	Reference, instruction, collection acquisition and appraisal, project supervision and coordination, cataloging, preservation, outreach
Special Collections Librarian; Curator of Sports and Americana	2	30%	25%	Reference, collection development
Special Collections Librarians	2	57%	15%	Reference, Class Presentations, Acquisitions, Supervisory

Manuscripts Cataloger; Head of Collection Development and Description	2	100%; 5%	0%; 5%	
Curator, Special Collections; Curator, Burroughs Collection; Digital Initiatives Librarian, Director of Operations, Special Collection	2	15% total	20% total	Selection donors/gifts, reference, teaching, exhibitions, public programming, preservation, editing, digitization, administration, operations
Head, Special Collections Technical Services, Pacific Northwest Curator, Book Arts and Rare Books Curator	3	10%	0%	Donor relations, collection development and management, teaching, liaison with faculty, training and supervision, reference desk, meetings
Special Collections Librarian, Special Collections Cataloger, Fashion and Special Collections Librarian	3	10%	5%	Provide public service, catalog books and other materials, process archival collections, respond to off-site requests
University Archivist/Manuscripts Librarian, Regional History Collection Librarian, Latin American & Iberian Librarian	3	10%	10%	Reference, instruction, collection development, outreach
Curator	3	20%	5%	Reference, exhibits, instruction, collection development
Science Fiction Resources Librarian/ Curator; French Resources Librarian/ Curator; Coordinator of Research Services	3	15% 33% 10%	0% 0% 0%	Reference; collection development; outreach
Processing Projects Librarian; CFPRT* Coordinator; Head, Manuscripts Division	3	100% 100% 5%	10% 10% 40%	*Center for Primary Research & Training (CFPRT)
Librarian/curator or associate curator	4	10%	5%	Supervise, outreach, reference, exhibits
Librarian; Curator	4	25%	5%	Administration, acquisitions, reference, cataloging, exhibits
(1) University Archivist, Archivist; (2) Asia specialists; (3) Curator, Hawaiian Collection; Curator, Pacific Collection; Hawaiian Specialist, Pacific Specialists-2	(1) 4 (2) 1 (3) 5	(1) 5% (2) 10% (3) 5–10%	(1) 0% (2) 10% (3) <1%	(1) Management, correspondence, meetings, planning, etc. (2) Management, collection development, public service duties. (3) Management, collection development, public service duties

Other professional(s) N=20

There are not other professionals in the unit/department/library or they do not have responsibility for manuscript collections. N=37

Number of individuals who arrange and describe manuscript collections N=20

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	5	1.45	1	1.00

Percentage of time spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections N=20

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	100%	27%	20%	28.51

Percentage of time spent on adding manuscript collection information to the Web N=20

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	100%	12%	0%	23.76

Position Title(s)	Number of individuals	Arranging and Describing	Adding MSS information to Web	Other Duties
Digital Manuscripts Librarian	1	0%	100%	*An 18-month limited appointment - provides digital object metadata
Librarian/Cataloger	1	1%	5%	
Curator	1	5%	0%	Head of division
Coordinator, Special Collections	1	10%	0%	Reference, managing the photograph collection, supervising students, assisting with exhibit preparation
Special Collections Assistant	1	20%	0%	Reference, records management, site management

Visual Materials Curator	1	20%	0%	Donor relations, permissions review, collection development and management, training and supervision, teaching, reference desk, meetings
Curator of Manuscripts	1	20%	5%	Supervise non-book unit; collection development; outreach to faculty; teaching; liaison activities to History Dept
Archives Specialist	1	20%	5%	Reference, student supervision, collection maintenance, accessioning, exhibits
Manuscripts Curator (Rare Books & Special Collections)	1	25%	0%	
University Records Manager	1	25%	0%	Records management, public services
Assistant Curator	1	30%	20%	Reference, Class Presentations, Collection Development, Misc.
Library Information Specialist I	1	50%	0%	Filing, pulling boxes, simple reference, stack management
Oral historian; project director	1	50%	40%	Administration
Accessing and processing archivist	1	90%	None yet	Accessing incoming manuscripts and archives collections; Public services
Electronic Resources Coordinator	1		10%	
Visual Materials Archivist and Digital Collections Archivist	2	55%	35%	Processing visual materials and digital collections; reference services
(1) Archivist (2) Japan Specialist	2	75% 5%	5% 5%	As before
Archival Assistants	2	20%	60%	Reference, technical support, collections management
Manuscripts Cataloger	3	100%	0%	
1) Collection Management Lecturer; 2) Hispanic Resources Lecturer/Curator; 3) Outreach Curator; 4) Administrative Coordinator; 5) University Records Manager	5	10% 10% 10% 0% 0%	0% 0% 0% 10% 0%	Administrative; collection management; reference; collection development; outreach; cataloging

Support staff N=47

There are not support staff in the unit/department/library or they do not have responsibility for manuscript collections. N=15

Number of individuals who arrange and describe manuscript collections N=47

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	15	2.96	2	2.86

Percentage of time spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections N=47

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	95%	44%	45%	27.59

Percentage of time spent on adding manuscript collection information to the Web N=46

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	75%	11%	5%	14.54

Position Title(s)	Number of Individuals	Arranging and Describing	Adding MSS information to Web	Other Duties
Senior Library Specialist - Manuscripts	1	3%	1%	Reference, clerical, accessioning, supervising students.
Archives Assistant	1	5%	0%	The usual and as Reading Room Assistant
Secretary	1	10%	5%	Clerical duties
2 Assistants & 2 Clerks	1	10%	10%	
Senior Library Associate	1	15%	0%	Order supplies, copy cataloging, general office duties

Assistant Access Archivist	1	20%	10%	Developing Web resources; instruction; providing access to other formats
Assistant Curator of Manuscripts and Archives	1	25%	5%	Archives processing; exhibit coordination; retrieving student files; special projects
Archives Assistant	1	25%	25%	
Library Clerk/Secretary	1	30%	0%	Clerical/secretarial support for department
Library Information Assistant I	1	50%	0%	Stack maintenance, paging, refiling, simple reference
Library assistants	1	50%	0%	Reference, preservation, collection management, book processing
Manuscript Specialist	1	50%	20%	Reference, donor relations,
Clerk	1	75%	0%	Acquisitions, reference
Manuscripts Cataloger	1	80%	10%	10 %
Archives Technician; Library Technician	2	0% <2%	0%	Monitor reading room, manage student help; circulation, collection development
Archives Associates	2	10%, 10%	30%, 5%	Reference, exhibits, digitization, metadata creation, assisting with copyright permissions, CONTENTdm metadata
Library Specialist I; Library Specialist III	2	10% 10%	0%	Cataloging; reference; preservation; computer support
Archives Assistant	2	20%	0%	Public service
Archives Technician or Administrative Assistant	2	25%	10%	Accessioning, records management, Web master...
Archival Collections Assistant	2	30%	5%	Reference, teaching
Library Associate	2	40%	15%	Coordinate acquisitions, supervise students, reference duties, patron scanning
Library Technical Assistants/Office Manager	2	50%	10%	Reference; ordering supplies; digital projects
Paraprofessional processor	2	50%	15%	Reference, digital support, committee work
Library Assistants	2	50%	50%	
Library Assistant IV; Library Assistant II	2	60% 40%	0% 0%	LA IV—university records processing, reference; LAII—university records processing, Tech Services liaison, reference

Library Archivist/Original Cataloger	2	65%	35%	Barcoding
Library Technician	2	75%	10%	Various
Special Collections Assistants	2	75% 25%	75% 5%	User services
Description Specialist, Acquisitions Specialist	2	90%	Not tracked	Donor acknowledgement, authority verification, training and supervision, finding aid problem review and solving, meetings
Collections Rehousing Technicians	2	95%	0%	Shelf maintenance
Manuscript Processors	2	95%, 95%	0%, 0%	
Office Manager; Associate Curator; Imaging Manager; Program Assistant; Clerk	3	30%	0.15%	Open record work, managing the office, record management, cataloging, metadata work, presentations, reference, print/image service, exhibition preparation, gifts, reproduction rights
Manuscripts Processor	3	50%	5%	Reference, Exhibits, Donor Relations, Office Management, Committees, Supervise Students
Literary Mss Specialist; Visual Materials Specialist; Visual Arts Collection Specialist	3	50% 50% 30%	0%	Reference, conservation, exhibit research
Senior Library Technician II; Library Technician I	3	70%	0%	Reference, student supervision; supply officer; special projects; exhibit research, preparations and mounting; library committee work; financial officer for department; tracking hours and wages for student assistants
Staff assistants to archivists	3	70%	4%	Reference, collection management
Manuscripts processor	3	90%		Reference/public services
Library Specialist Senior; Library Specialist	4	40%	10%	Reference service, responding to reference inquiries, exhibit development, collections maintenance, preservation
Archival Assistant	4	60%	10%	
Librarian Assistant	5	25%	5%	Reference, shelving, processing print materials
Library Assistants; Fellows	5	35%	15%	Public contact, Clerical Routines, Reader Assistance, Student supervision.

Collections Assistant	5	75%	25%	Public services
Library Assistants	6	50–75%	25% or more	Support for archivists; public service and curatorial support; conservation and preservation housings;
Assistant Curators; archival assistants	9	20%	5%	Supervise students, reference
Manuscripts Processing Specialists; Library Associates; Collections Support Technician; University Archives Specialist; Public Services Specialist; Processing Assistants; Digitization Assistants	9	60%	20%	
Assistant archivist; assistant curator	11	70%	20%	Reference, instruction
Senior archives technician	15	90%	5%	Miscellaneous

Student Assistants N=59

There are not student assistants in the unit/department/library or they do not have responsibility for manuscript collections. N=7

Number of individuals who arrange and describe manuscript collections N=59

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	20	5.48	4	4.36

Percentage of time spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections N=58

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
10%	100%	64%	70%	29.82

Percentage of time spent on adding manuscript collection information to the Web N=56

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	100%	9%	0%	17.58

Position Title(s)	Number of Individuals	Arranging and Describing	Adding MSS information to Web	Other Duties
Student Assistant	1	10%	0%	Collection maintenance, reading room monitoring
Graduate Assistant and Interns	1	13%	0%	Reference, collection management, inventory, preservation
Student Assistants (Archives or Special Collections)	1	30%	0%	Simple reference, stack maintenance, book processing
Student Assistant (Archives)	1	50%	0%	Labeling containers, preservation, initial processing
Undergraduate Intern	1	50%	0%	Preservation
Student Assistant	1	100%	0%	
Student Assistant	1		100%	
Research Assistants	2	25%	0%	Photocopying, reference.
Casual Assistants	2	40%	0%	
Student Assistant	2	50%	0%	Administrative assistance to Manuscripts Division
Student Archival Assistants	2	75%	0%	Preservation tasks
Student Assistants	2	100%	0%	
Library Assistant	2	100%	0%	0%
Student Assistants	2	100%	25%	Pulling and shelving collections; reference photocopy
Graduate Assistant; Intern	2	90%, 90%		Other random duties as assigned
Student Assistants	3	10%		Cleaning and removing staples/paperclips
Student Workers and Voucher Employees	3	50%	0%	Reformatting, ...
Student Assistant	3	66%	7%	Photocopying, exhibits, research
Professional Worker I	3	90%	10%	Materials retrieval, shelving
Student Assistant	3	95%	5%	Reference services
Library Aide	3	100%	0%	

Student Assistants	3	100%	0%	
Student Assistant	4	10%		
Graduate Student Assistants	4	20%	0%	Public service, responding to reference requests, other office duties
Student Assistant	4	25%	5%	Clerical duties and digital work
Student Assistant	4	50%		Paging, shelving, photocopying
Student Assistant	4	75%	0%	Paging, reference, photocopying
Student Assistants	4	75%	25%	Paging, photocopying and scanning, stacks maintenance
Student Assistant	4	80%	20%	
Student Assistant	4	100%	0%	None
Student Assistants	4	15% 65% 65% 65%	0% for all	User services
Student Assistant	5	50%	0%	Reference, book collection, preservation, exhibit assistance, gift book processing, shelving & retrieving materials, housekeeping,
Student Assistants	5	60%	40%	
Student Assistant	5	90%	25%	Photocopying, reference assistance
Student Assistant III	6	50%	0%	50%
Graduate Fellows	6	70%	30%	
Student Assistants	6	95%	0%	Photocopying, clerical
Student Assistants	6	100%	0%	
Student Assistant	6	15 hours per week per student	0%	
Student Assistant	6	50–75%	25% or more	Support for archivists and library assistants
Student Library Assistant	7	70%	10%	Reference duties, exhibit work
Student Technician, Student Specialist	7	95%	Not tracked	Reshelving
Student Assistants/Archives Assistants	7	1.65 FTE	25%	
Student Assistants	8	100%	0%	

Student Aide	8	15%	0%	Retrieval, photocopying, preservation projects, collections maintenance
Student Assistant	8	70%	0%	30%
Student Assistant	8	75.15%	0%	Clerical support, collection maintenance, imaging, database entry, cataloguing preparation
Student Assistant	10	90%	10%	
Student Assistants	10	100%	30%	
Student Assistants	10	Varies from 5% to 100% for different individuals	2% for one or two students	Reference, shelving, collection inventories, photocopying
Student Assistant, Student Processor	13	80%	5%	Reference, research projects
Student Assistant	15	25%	0%	Reference, shelving, processing print and a/v materials
Student Assistants	15	35%	55%	Routine clerical, errands, misc. chores as assigned.
Student Assistant/Graduate Assistant/Intern	15	90%	0%	
Library Assistant	17	90%	10%	
Student Assistants	20	50%	2%	Copying; reference room supervision, paging
(1) Student Assistant (2) Student Assistant	(1) 2 (2) 3	(1) 50% (2) 10%	(1) 0% (2) 0%	(1) Pulling and reshelving materials (2) Pulling and reshelving materials, other
Student Interns, Contract Staff	2 to 10	up to 80%	10%	Various
Student Assistant	Varies, depending on if there is money to pay them	100% of time up to 20 hours per week	0%	0

Other staff N=14

There is not any other category of staff in the unit/department/library or they do not have responsibility for manuscript collections. N=39

Number of individuals who arrange and describe manuscript collections N=14

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	5	1.80	1	1.15

Percentage of time spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections N=14

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	100%	53%	50%	41.24

Percentage of time spent on adding manuscript collection information to the Web N=14

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0%	90%	18%	5%	28.50

Other Staff Category	Number of Individuals	Arranging and Describing	Adding MSS information to Web	Other Duties
Graduate Library Assistant (GLA)	1	10%	25%	Reference
Library Technical Services Staff	1	15%	5%	Library acquisitions, serials, and cataloging.
Volunteers	1	25%	0%	
Student Archivist Interns; temporary grant positions	1 (occasional half time position)	50%	50%	
Grant-funded processing archivist; 8 month part-time position; responsible for one collection	1	85%	15%	

Temporary project staff	1	100%	0%	None
Library Clerk	1		5%	Preservation scanning of historic images
Library Assistant; Computer Resource Specialist	2	0%	75% 90%	Reference, graphic design, administrative duties
Graduate Assistants	2	80%	20%	
Graduate Student Assistants	2	95%	0%	Preservation and reference
Volunteers	2	100%	0%	
Volunteers	3	50%	0%	Abstracting oral history transcripts
Graduate Assistant Non-Teaching	3	10% 100% 100%	0%	Outreach (GANTS work 20 hours per week)
Graduate Assistants	5	75%	10%	Reference

Additional comments about staffing for manuscript collections. N=26

"All titles in a given category are listed on the first line. The numbers assigned to them are used to demonstrate which titles are processing. All professional staff are expected to process. Most support staff will process something at some point in time. The numbers given reflect current processing arrangements."

"Another Lilly Librarian, Curator of Manuscripts, not in Technical Services Department, spends 30 % of her time arranging and describing manuscript collections."

"Ephemera collections are included in manuscript reporting."

"In brief: virtually all of the A&D is done by students."

"Manuscript Curators are primarily responsible for dealing with our manuscript collections. They make decisions on how the collections will be processed and to what level. They also decide what should be digitized. They are assisted by paraprofessionals and students who do most of the actual manuscript processing."

"Most processing supervised by the University Archivist who also adds the information/materials to the Web. Curators prioritize processing projects and answer questions about content."

"Not all Web support is done by staff involved in arranging and describing collections. The Computer Support Analyst and the Digital Initiatives Specialist both provide support for our digital presence."

"Note: The Special Collections Cataloging Librarian works only 20 hours per week. The Student Assistant (Archives) currently works 12 hours per week (varies each quarter depending on class schedule, but does not exceed 19 hours per week)."

"Of the staff included in the survey above, currently one Archivist and one .5 FTE Library Assistant are temporary hires for special projects."

"Our staffing draws from other departments: cataloguers, librarians, and other support staff. To a certain extent they assist us in making archives and manuscripts accessible either by descriptions or digital sites."

"Our students engage in tasks related to arrangement and description, but only under the close supervision of their archivist supervisors."

"Percentage of time spent on arranging and describing manuscript collections varies for all categories, depending on other immediate demands."

"Rare Books & Special Collections: The Curator of Manuscripts has for many years been responsible for Acquisitions and Collections Development for the Division and more recently has been the Head of the Division. Osler Library of the History of Medicine Student Assistants: Archival Assistant during summer, 28 hours per week; winter/fall/spring, 10 hours per week, 25%."

"Records of our manuscripts and special collections are included in the New York State Library's online catalog. For the purpose of this survey we included time spent on adding information to the online catalog as time spent adding information to the Web."

"Special collections are in 5 different buildings on campus, each with its own reference room and stacks. Thus, the number of staff is dispersed."

"Student assistants/archives assistants: students from the Master of Archives Program, School of Library Archival and Information Studies. Sometimes also project archivists (grant-funded)."

"Student Interns and contract staff are hired for specific projects."

"The full-time Project Archivist is being paid with soft money and is only working on a small subset of the Manuscripts collection. The student assistants spend their time refoldering and reboxing collections, creating folder inventories, and writing brief descriptions of the materials on which they are working. Their work is helping us implement 'More Product, Less Process' but they are not arranging and describing manuscript collections in the traditional sense of the work. The Library Technical Services staff perform the majority of the arrangement and description that takes place with the manuscript collections. Three of these staff arrange and describe. Two work together as a team (one primarily processes while the other does the EAD). These Library Technical Services staff are still learning how to process manuscript collections after spending many years only working with library material. They are doing a great job but training is ongoing."

"The majority of our positions have multiple responsibilities, among them manuscript collection processing and adding web content. The latter takes at least two forms: creating and loading finding aids in html format and creating database records in CONTENTdm. We are currently running a grant-funded project that employs a .5 FTE supervisor and 1.5 FTE student assistants, all of whom are 100% adding CONTENTdm records. Processing and adding content have highly variable time requirements, of course. Processing may grind for weeks with a resulting data load that takes a couple of hours; on the other hand, we often are adding online data in real-time."

"The Project Archivist spends 100% of her time on arrangement and description, but she is grant-funded and can only work on two specific large collections. Her efforts are certainly worthwhile, but she can not contribute to the larger arrangement and description efforts."

"The staffing totals do not include one professional and four support staff who work in the archives storage facility, which also doubles as a book depository and records centre."

"There are librarians and staff working on archives within the Libraries but outside of Special Collections. Responses here do not reflect this work."

"Two additional Support Staff have reference duties only and do not work on processing manuscripts or making resources available online."

"We do not have the information in the form requested. The Special Collections Library has 1 full-time archivist and 1 full-time paraprofessional archival assistant involved in Archival Processing and Cataloging, in addition to the various librarians and curators whose main responsibilities lie elsewhere. Additionally, our Digital Library Production Service has staff involved in adding finding aids to the web: a librarian loading files and making corrections, another with interface responsibilities, and programmers who occasionally make changes to the middleware. These combined add perhaps a .1 FTE, for a total of 2.1 for University Library."

"We occasionally have interns from the university's MLS program who process collections."

"When there are multiple individuals, we added up the total hours and determined collectively how many hours were spent on arrangement and description and gave that as a percentage of the total. This unit has many part time positions with multiple responsibilities."

"Workflows for arranging and describing manuscript collections are combined with arranging and describing University Archives collections. They Usually receive equal attention."

SIZE OF MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION

5. Please provide an estimate of the size or extent of your library's manuscripts collection. Describe both processed and unprocessed collections and include the unit of measurement (e.g., linear feet, cubic feet, items, volumes, etc.). N=63

Linear Feet

Respondent	Processed	Unprocessed
1	385	763
2	400	3,900
3	500	200
4	500	1,400
5	1,250	12,085
6	1,316	1,471
7	1,682	500
8	2,000	1,000
9	2,000	6,200
10	2,100	900
11	3,000	150
12	3,444	1,528
13	3,500	2,500

14	3,675	3,739
15	3,946	8,406
16	5,000	2,000
17	5,000	5,000
18	5,005	369
19	5,100	1,700
20	5,200	2,800
21	5,215	1,410
22	5,794	491
23	5,800	1,200
24	5,872	5,737
25	6,000	2,000
26	7,467	14,546
27	10,000	5,000
28	10,000	15,500
29	10,289	2,282
30	11,927	300
31	12,398	3,000
32	12,664	660
33	12,743	7,257
34	13,000	4,000
35	13,571	6,310
36	21,541	22,038
37	22,075	14,716
38	24,513	4,277
39	27,000	8,120
40	32,839	
41	3,580 linear feet processed and unprocessed together	

Processed collections

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
385	32,839	8,142.78	5,207.50	7,869.85

Unprocessed collections

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
150	22,038	4,499.00	2,500.00	5,072.00

Cubic Feet

Respondent	Processed	Unprocessed
42	2	4
43	300	25
44	4,000	9,338
45	5,911	5,404
46	8,000	4,000
47	25,714	27,000
48		8,000

Processed collections

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
2	25,714	7,321.00	4,956.00	9,536.00

Unprocessed collections

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
4	27,000	7,681.57	5,404.00	9,240.82

Linear Meters

Respondent	Processed	Unprocessed
49	4,000	1,000
50	535	356

Other Units

Respondent	Processed	Unprocessed
51	1 collection of 1517 manuscripts & 116 other single manuscripts	
52	344 collections	904 collections
53	7,708,464 items	100,000 items
54	17,000,000 items	Depends on definition of processed. Information on all holdings is in catalog.

Unspecified Unit

Respondent	Processed	Unprocessed
55	71	>76
56	1,000	4,000
57	1,500	800
58	5,700	3,000
59	10,000	3,000
60	11,863	
61	27,000	4,500
62	15,000,000	400,000
63	59,000,000	8,800,000

LEVELS OF DESCRIPTION

6. What level of description is included in a print or other traditional finding aid? N=66

Collection-level description	2	3%
Collection-level description with additional items such as scope note, bio note, and series description	1	2%
Collection-level description with additional items such as scope note, bio note, series description, and folder lists	48	73%
Other	15	23%

Please describe other level of description.

"All collections have an inventory and collection level information. A small percentage also have scope and bio/history notes."

"All of the above, depending on the collection."

"All of the above; it varies from one collection to another."

"All of these apply. It varies with the collection. We sometimes have box lists in an inventory, not folder lists."

"Collection level with additional items such as scope note, bio note, and series description; collection level with above plus folder list, and collection level with above plus item level (varies depending on unit and collection)."

"Collection-level description and brief scope note, bio note and series description and box inventory."

"Collection-level description with additional items such as scope note, bio note, and folder lists (no series descriptions). Some collections are described on an item level."

"Finding aids vary from collection to collection and may be any one of the levels described above."

"Includes folder-level descriptions."

"Level of description varies with each archives or manuscript collection."

"Multi-level description at the fonds, series, and folder level."

"No print finding aids. EAD finding aids contain collection-level description with scope note, bio note, and container list."

"The level of description included in our finding aids varies. Most of our legacy finding aids have collection-level descriptions and folder or item lists, but lack scope notes, bio notes, and series descriptions. Current finding aids have collection-level descriptions including scope notes, bio notes, series descriptions, and folder or item lists."

"Varies by collection. All of the above applies."

"We use all three levels of description, depending on the size and complexity of the collection, the level of processing performed, and the level most appropriate for access based on an evaluation of the collection's significance and potential for use."

7. When is a manuscript collection considered fully processed? Check all that apply. N=66

When there is a multi-level finding aid that includes folder-level description	63	96%
When there is a multi-level finding aid that includes series-level description	33	50%
When there is a finding aid with collection-level description	29	44%
Other	1	2%

Please describe other.

"Never really fully processed. Currently considered such if multi-level description and box listed inventory."

Additional Comments

"All of the above, depending on the collection."

"All three may be used to determine when a collection is considered fully processed, based on the level of processing we decide to use for any given collection. This is usually determined when we create a processing plan, but sometimes at accessioning. Some collections or parts of collections merit folder-level arrangement and description. Typically, processing levels are determined by considering the size and complexity of the collection, its existing condition (in terms of organization and preservation), its potential for use and research, and the available resources."

"At minimum, it includes collections with an inventory and collection level information."

"Catalogued."

"Collection-level description with a box and folder inventory."

"Depends on the collection. It would definitely have a multi-level finding aid, with series (if needed) and with a box or folder list."

"'Fully processed' is at the discretion of the curator and varies according to size, content and expected research use/potential."

"Item level in some cases."

"Item-level description."

"Level of processing/description depends on requirements of collection and resources available."

"MARC collection level record in Library Catalog."

"MARC collection-level cataloging record (finding aid not necessary—i.e., single items, small homogeneous collections)."

"Not all collections, of course, are 'multi-level,' and particularly not all manuscript collections, where 'hierarchy' is generally an imposition. As manuscripts curators have done for many years, we consider some collections fully processed at the series level, others not until folder level."

"Of course, level of processing needed depends on the collection. Some of our small collections are considered fully processed at the collection level."

"Single-item collections are cataloged, and the catalog record is the equivalent of a finding aid. The figure of 2000 (below) reflects single-item records."

"This depends on the collection, anticipated needs of researchers, and when the collection was processed (older finding aids tend to have more detailed descriptions)."

"This (multi-level finding aid that includes folder-level description)is the usual case."

"This varies with the collection. The multi-level finding aid might include a box level description instead of folder-level description."

"This varies. Sometimes it is folder-level description, and sometimes series-level."

"Varies by collection."

"When there is a multi-level finding aid that includes folder level description with a MARC catalog record and an EAD instance online. Note that we also make collections available by appointment on the basis of preliminary inventories."

"When there is a bibliographic record in our online catalog with a link to the finding aid."

"When there is a collection-level record in the UCLA OPAC (Voyager) and in OCLC; finding aid is on the OAC described to level of specificity appropriate to that collection; and collection is properly rehoused. Then it is ready to be made available for research."

"When there is either a catalog record and one of the levels of finding aids described above OR, in some cases, only a catalog record."

8. Please indicate how many collections have been processed at each of the following levels. N=47

Collection-level description N=34

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
20	10,852	1,244.74	421.00	2,377.21

Series-level description N=22

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
4	2,500	421.96	237.50	554.02

Folder-level description N=39

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	2,000	571.92	481.00	563.41

Other level N=13

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
5	2,000	442.39	200.00	640.27

Respondent	Collection-level	Series-level	Folder-level	Other level
1	20	20	10	
2	25	4	151	
3	50	50	300	
4	100	500	1,500	900
5	100		260	
6	108	7	6	5
7	127		1,142	
8	150	450		
9	200		300	
10	216	126	126	
11	220		124	
12	250		242	2,000
13	260	25	35	
14	300	1% of collections	90% of collections	9% (item-level)
15	386		782	59
16	400	246	259	10
17	406	229	306	
18	436		65	
19	470	470	427	400
20	533	498	493	5
21	573	0	900	0
22	690	690	690	
23	722	7	42	27
24	764	600	507	
25	900	200	60	
26	1,000	100	2,000	
27	1,000	850	600	200
28	1,460	900	1,500	
29	1,703		481	
30	1,800	800	500	
31	3,000	2,500	2,000	300
32	4,100			
33	9,000		2,000	
34	10,852		960	15
35		11	380	330
36			520	1,500

37			486	
38			50	
39			1	
40			641	
41			950	
42			4,500 linear feet	500 linear feet
43			509	
44	30%	20%	30%	20%
45	75%	35%	15%	
46	95% +		75%	
47	100%	60%	50%	

9. How is collection-level information organized/kept? Check all that apply. N=61

Database management software such as Microsoft Access	35	57%
Open source software such as Archon or Archivists' Toolkit	13	21%
Library/museum information management software such as Past Perfect	8	13%
Other software	38	62%

Please list the specific software used.

Database management N=29

Access

Access, Filemaker Pro

Ex Libris, CONTENTdm

Excel spreadsheet of unprocessed collections

Excel

FileMaker Pro (4 responses)

FileMaker Pro, Microsoft Excel

FileMaker Pro, soon to migrate to MS Access

GAMMS = Georgetown Archives and Manuscripts Management System = in-house database

Innovative Interfaces

Microsoft Access (11 responses)

Microsoft Access (locator guide)

Microsoft Access, Filemaker Pro

Oracle platform with customized Cold Fusion interface

Voyager OPAC

Library/museum information management N=8

Advance (GEAC)

DLXS

PastPerfect (primarily to manage _collection location_ information

Re:Discovery

SIRSI (2 responses)

Voyager ILS (2 responses)

Open source N=11

Archivists' Toolkit (4 responses)

Archivists Toolkit (in testing stage only)

Archon (2 responses)

DLXS (EAD)

HTML

HTML pages on the Web

SQL

Other N=31

All processed collections have records in the on-line catalog.

Ariadne (Fox Pro application)

Database management software such as Microsoft Access

DBTextWorks (InMagic)

Descriptive EAD enabling system, applies XML tags to database.

DreamWeaver or hard code

Excel Spreadsheet

Excel spreadsheets, 7 Word documents

Excel; Aleph OPAC

ExLibris Aleph; Cocoon

GAMMS (in-house)

Have been using Wordpress as public Web interface.

HTML coded Web documents indexed by Google Enterprize software

In house product based on Sybase

In-house database

Innovative Interfaces; Ixiasoft TextML

Library catalog; Locally created location guide catalog; Web site

Microsoft Excel and Word

Microsoft Excel; Microsoft Word

Microsoft Word

Microsoft Word

Millennium

OCLC cataloging, WordPerfect finding aids

Online catalog (SIRSI)

Sirsi Dynix Workflows, NoteTab

Voyager

Word (for inventories)

Word, WordPerfect

WordPerfect, Microsoft Word, HTML, Dreamweaver

WordPerfect; XMetal

XMLmind; MAVIS; Excel

10. In their article, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing," *American Archivist* 68, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 2005): 208–63, Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner advocate a lower level of processing that, among other things, calls for archivists to forgo the traditional, labor-intensive arrangement and description practice of arranging materials to the folder-level and providing unnecessarily detailed finding aids.

Has your library begun, at any level, to adopt this approach? N=66

Yes	49	74%
No	17	26%

If yes, please describe your level of processing.

"Box level."

"Box level is appropriate for materials that are consistent and are filed either by date or item identification numbers. Most of the collections filed by identification numbers are agricultural related publications cataloged in the on-line catalog but stored by their individual identification number which is all that is needed for retrieval. Some are described by box because of low priority."

"Box-level or box-folder level when appropriate—primarily for faculty papers."

"Collection level to the series description, including a general box description."

"Collections are evaluated by the curator and processing adjusted accordingly. In any one collection, series can be 'processed' at different levels (inventory, series, folder)."

"Conceptually only. We have yet to begin implementation."

"Each collection is treated individually by the subject curator. Some require or merit more detailed description than others."

"Every collection is represented online by at least a brief collection-level description. Essentially all legacy print finding aids and card files have been converted to online documents. The quality and completeness of legacy data is, however, variable, and a substantial part of our current effort is moving toward the creation of digital objects for which we are providing item-level metadata. So we have dual goals: enhance and refine finding aids for collections that have only collection-level records; and develop selected databases of digital objects, generally with item-level metadata."

"For most new accessions, we arrange and describe to folder level, then describe in a preliminary inventory with only scope note and folder list."

"In fact we invented it. See MIT's 1981 Processing Manual, quoted in Greene Meissner. However, the current nature of records organization, with its numerous restricted materials (personnel and/or student information) interspersed, limits the usefulness of what is practical to do."

"In the University Archives some collections are initially described at series level, and done later at folder level if time permits."

"Initially, a brief collection-level record of the collection and assignment of collection number. Secondly, a box inventory, followed by recording folder headings."

"It depends on the collection. Most collections will be processed to the folder level while many if not most photograph collections are processed at the item level. Some small collections are only processed at the collection level. Decisions are made based upon age, importance, and demand for using the collection."

"It's at the discussion and theoretical phase, but we are definitely interested and heading that way."

"Less refoldering, less rearrangement within folders, less photocopying of clippings, briefer and more standardized descriptions at folder level, briefer scope and content notes, quicker collection level descriptions mounted on Web."

"Level of processing varies, depending on importance of collection, preservation needs, received order, patron requests, donor relations, or other considerations."

"Meissner and Greene also say that "not all series and all files in a collection need to be arranged at the same level of intensity…. By selectively arranging individual collection components, rather than rearranging everything, we can often achieve the greatest labor and access efficiencies focusing attention on a few real problems or needs so as to achieve a uniform accessibility throughout the materials." (p. 243). We follow this aspect of the Meissner and Greene approach and process flexibly and selectively. We do not process all collections or all parts of collections at the same level. Some collections or parts of collections deserve folder-level arrangement and detailed finding aids, but some do not. While Meissner and Greene have encouraged us to process less intensively (e.g., some collections are not refoldered, some photographs are not sleeved, newspaper clippings are not photocopied, etc.), we do not believe in a one-size-fits-all approach to processing. So, we are not currently engaged in an effort to make all collections known through collection-level descriptions, whether unprocessed or processed. We currently do not routinely provide access to unprocessed collections; however, this is under discussion and reconsideration right now."

"Minimal level processing practical finding aids."

"Minimal processing is nothing new; our predecessors used it generally to process collections. 'More Product, Less Process' simply codifies or standardizes this approach."

"Minimal processing with collection level records online except for priority collections which are fully processed with finding aids and container lists, encoded in EAD and cataloged in MARC."

"Only in a sense. Their approach is far too limiting and lacking in ambition for us to apply uniformly. I prefer to see their minimal processing as merely the first stage in processing, and gauge the eventual level of processing on the factors outlined years ago by Bob Warner (and many others). Nearly all of our collections have already reached this first "minimal" stage, and there are only a small number of collections for which we believe 'minimal' is all the collection will ever receive. In other words, Greene and Meissner articulated one limited version of principles that were established long before… I believe we follow more in the spirit of a Bob Warner."

"Please note that Greene and Meissner did not provide any new ideas on processing; also their tone was sometimes rude. We process at all levels. Now we are doing a large collection at the series level."

"Processing for collections varies greatly, so much so that 'unprocessed' is not meaningful. What Greene and Meissner have proposed has been happening here for years, partly because of the volume of acquisition vs the resources for processing."

"Same as it has been expect that we focus more on correspondence files. We decided this because of our findings with placing 100 HTML finding aids on the Internet in 1999."

"Since we have container lists for many of our larger, unprocessed collections, we are writing only the briefest of finding aids and doing little if any physical rearrangement of the collection."

"Still describing to folder level, in most cases. But we're not doing as much preservation photocopying."

"The degree of minimal processing varies with each collection."

"This varies with the collection. Some small collections might have item level description; others may retain the arrangement in which they were received and our description may use lists supplied by the dealer or donor."

"This was being done well before Greene's & Meissner's article."

"Traditionally a collection was considered processed when it was arranged into series and a folder-level inventory created. However, due to the large backlog, we are redefining fully processed. Now, students are refoldering the collection as arranged in the boxes, creating a box/folder inventory and writing a brief description of the collection. We are spending little time physically arranging collections into series. We are still working on fully implementing MPLP. The hard part is selling it to staff who are use to the traditional methods of processing. We also need to create procedures to help implement MPLP. We are not following every recommendation outlined by Greene and Meissner but variations that essentially achieve the same result. While we normally refolder due to the condition of most folders, we no longer remove staples and other fasteners (with the exception of rubber bands) unless they are rusty and presenting a preservation concern. We also rebox collections into the acid-free records center boxes because our Collections Annex does not accept other types. As for description, we are creating collection-level MARC records that include at least a scope and content note and some subject headings and indicate the existence of a box/folder-level inventory when applicable."

"Under serious discussion, this will be the approach of our next collections, but to date on the Online Archive of California, our collections are processed to the box and folder level."

"University Archives collections are being processed at the series level and other collecting areas are investigating the same possibility."

"Varies depending on collection size and content."

"We adopted a flexible, four-level system that allows the unit head to determine the level required based on expected use, access, and retrievability."

"We are conducting a pilot project with minimal physical process, brief scope and content info, and basic folder listings."

"We deem cataloging at a high level detail at the folder-level desirous so researchers will know exactly what is in each folder. Both staff and researchers are able to use our collections more efficiently when detailed descriptions are provided. We even include a book-like index at the end of each finding aid pointing researchers to particular box numbers/folder numbers, and the index aids the researcher tremendously."

"We have adopted the Greene/Meissner approach by creating access to all collections through the OPAC and through the University Archives Web site. Adoption of the Greene/Meissner approach to processing is planned for the near future."

"We have adopted this mindset for our modern collections (20th century), but feel that the folder-level (or in some cases, item-level) description is more appropriate for the bulk of collections, which date from the 19th century. We also use the Greene-Meissner mindset when creating finding aids for collections that currently have only a collection-level record in our card catalog. These finding aids do not contain information beyond the basics (little to no biographical or scope note, container-level description, etc.)"

"We have always used this approach to some degree. Each collection is evaluated and a level of processing determined by the Manuscripts Cataloger and Processor."

"We have moved toward a more flexible system that allows unit heads to choose the level of processing, based on use predictions, access, donor relations, and space concerns."

"We have occasionally done finding aids at box-level control. Finding aids are rarely done now for groups/collections of 1.0 cu.ft. or less; a detailed catalog record suffices."

"We have revised item-level preservation activities eliminating some routine procedures such as removing staples."

"We have three processing levels. These are listed in the processing manual as such: Level 1: Preliminary finding aid generation: • Intellectual control: Complete collection, file unit, and most likely item level records in Re:discovery. Most time is spent on the narrative description and subject headings and little time on item level. Enough information is desired to provide the researcher basic guidelines for using the material, but must be balanced with how much time is available for this task. • Physical control: the material is not refoldered and only reboxed if the boxes do not conform to off-site storage standards or if the boxes are damaged. Based on the time constraint, the Re:discovery number may or may not be written on the folders. Almost no preservation work is done. Level 2: • Intellectual control: the collection will be cataloged in Re:discovery with complete collection, series, file unit, and item level records. • Physical control: the material will be reboxed, but primarily not refoldered, and almost no preservation work will be done. Level 3: • Intellectual control: the collection will be cataloged in Re:discovery with complete collection, series, file unit, and item-level records. • Physical control: the collection will be reboxed, refoldered, and preservation such as fastener removal will be completed for each folder and item."

"We used similar methods and practices long before MPLP, codified in 2000 but in existence as practice long before. Various processing levels are defined and applied from accessioning through final processing."

"When a collection is accessioned, the Acquisitions Specialist rehouses and describes the collection at the collection and sometimes the container level, and creates a preliminary online finding aid and bibliographic record for the collection."

"Yes, but to a limited degree, and usually relating to organizational records or portions of collections. Most processing is still done to the item level and description to the folder level."

"Yes, but we have used this 'new approach' for decades. As most of our professionals have had experience in archives and especially government archives rather than in manuscript collections we use the same methods that were described by T.R. Schellenberg and others at NARS/NARA in the late 40s and 50s."

"Yes, MPLP involves selecting a range of possible levels of description given the materials in hand. We have established minimal EAD encoding standards so we may begin loading brief EAD records describing materials at the collection level. Many collections are made available on the basis of folder level preliminary inventories as well."

DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

11. Does the library create MARC records for manuscript collections? N=65

Yes	60	92%
No	5	8%

If yes, how many discrete collections currently have MARC records? N=45

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
16	14,170	1,560.18	453	3,101.25

Discrete Collections	N
<100	4
100–199	5
200–299	5
300–399	4
400–499	6
500–599	3
600–699	5
700–999	—
1000–1999	6
2000–2999	2
3000–3999	—
4000–4999	2
>5000	3

12. Does the library use DACS as its content standard? N=61

Yes	43	70%
No	18	30%

If yes, did you make this standard apply to your legacy records? N=43

Yes	24	56%
No	19	44%

Yes

"All collection level information will be entered into the database in DACS standard form over the next five years. Legacy records are part of this process."

"APPM used for legacy records, revised per DACS as additions, edits are made and finding aids reuploaded to the OAC."

"As we convert legacy records to EAD or revisit them, we have attempted to apply DACS when possible."

"Gradually, we are bringing all legacy finding aids up to the DACS standard."

"In progress."

"Legacy record conversion done by student assistants and when staff must update a record. Student conversions are reviewed and edited as time allows."

"Legacy records are made to conform to DACS only when they are being revised for some other reason such as adding additional material to the collection."

"Legacy records are part of the process of entering collection-level information into the database over the next five years."

"Ongoing process as records are reviewed."

"Sometimes. We have not revised all of our legacy records, but we have an active campaign to do so."

"This process ongoing, but slowly."

"We are currently in the process of ensuring that our older records comply with DACS. This project is not yet complete."

"We are in the midst of a retrospective project to bring our legacy finding aids up to compliance with an EAD best practice guide and DACS."

"We are still working on the legacy records, but they are being made DACS compliant."

"We do not have an ongoing project to address the legacy records, but have applied DACS when we did address the few that we have addressed."

"We will, as records need to be updated."

"Yes, but only as we revisit those records, on a case-by-case basis."

No

"However, when legacy records require work, they are updated to DACS."

"Not yet. We might do some retrospectively."

"There are no legacy finding aids."

"We formerly used APPM. The differences were not major enough to warrant editing records."

"We will apply it selectively to legacy records that are significantly updated."

"When legacy records have to be rekeyed, DACS is applied using the information provided in the legacy record. For those records that already existed in a digital form (usually a Word document), information was maintained as is."

13. Are any of your finding aids marked up in EAD? N=66

Yes	53	80%
No	13	20%

If yes, how many finding aids currently are marked up in EAD? N=48

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
5	4,100	530.58	254.50	931.70

Finding Aids in EAD	N
<10	3
10–49	7
50–99	7
100–199	6
200–299	3
300–399	5
400–499	5
500–599	3
600–999	4
>1000	5

If finding aids are being marked up in EAD, please comment on whether the time and effort to create EAD records equals the benefits of such records. N=51

"Absolutely."

"Absolutely. User access/awareness of the collections' existence and content has resulted in increased use of and questions about materials in the collections. The potential for improved searching is vastly increased. The effort has also brought with it a standardization of approach and application across the areas of the Libraries that process manuscript collections."

"Although we have taken advantage of EAD and XML to represent finding aid information in a variety of ways that would not have been possible otherwise, we need better tools for both markup and user deliver (including search) to achieve even greater benefits."

"Because we are part of an important consortial project that requires contributed finding aids to be marked up in EAD, yes."

"Can't tell yet."

"Currently, we mount our EAD records to the Online Archive of California's (OAC) Web site for which usage statistics are kept. Based on this information, I would have to say that the time and effort to create EAD records equals the benefits. Numerous reference requests are received each month for the collections with EAD finding aids on OAC and users tend to include information from the container lists with their requests."

"Definitely."

"Done as part of using ARCHON."

"Encoding requires little effort and results in a product that is both more accessible to researchers and more in keeping with professional standards."

"Even though we have not been able to determine if researchers have found the EAD records on the Web, this is a standard we want to follow."

"Grant-funded mark-up; not much cost to us, so yes."

"Most definitely. The fonds are picked up by Web crawlers and they turn up in Yahoo and Google."

"No. The payoff for the time and expense of creation is negligible."

"Not so sure, given existing and future search engine capabilities."

"Not yet, our records are available through ArchiveGrid. We do have some enquiries from that interface, but probably more through word of mouth and Google searches which would not require EAD."

"Online finding aids are used by patrons and by library staff. They are an invaluable resource and worth the time spent."

"Partnership between Special Collections and Library School."

"Probably not as we are duplicating effort by having both EAD and HTML versions of the finding aids. We are working to remedy this, but it takes time."

"Right now, we have some finding aids marked up in EAD, but we aren't using the EAD versions to provide access online for a variety of reasons. The special knowledge required for creating EAD finding aids and making their presence on our Web site effective has been an impediment to us backing the effort fully. We are considering implementing Archivists' Toolkit with XTF as a means for serving up the EAD finding aids online, but this hasn't happened yet."

"Since our finding aids have been available on the Web for quite some time, first as plain HTML documents and then as EADs, I don't think we've realized any particular benefit to changing the format, except perhaps that the finding aids look neater. Our researchers were finding our collections through search engines prior to the conversion."

"The benefit definitely equals the time and effort. We have seen increased access, and more specific questions for those collections with online finding aids."

"The benefits definitely outweigh the time and effort required to tag documents in EAD. We are currently developing an in-house tool to streamline the gathering of information about manuscript collections and one of the components will be the automatic generation of EAD tagging (for more information see http://www.lib.byu.edu/indi)."

"The creation of new finding aids in EAD is no more complicated or time consuming than those created in any other format. We have found the potential for searching and multi-purposing, ease of mounting on the Web (when we started word processed documents were not Web-accessible) and subsequent tracking to have been of great benefit."

"The searchability of the finding aids along with the potential for sharing across repository lines makes EAD worth the time and effort. Through the creation of a basic template, we are able to let student workers write their finding aids in EAD, meaning that they are taking little more time than it would have taken to type the information into a word processing document."

"There's no way to easily measure the 'benefits;' however it would be irresponsible to not encode our finding aids."

"Time and effort surpasses the benefit for both researchers and staff of SCUA."

"To researchers, yes!"

"We are experimenting with EAD at the present."

"We create EAD programmatically. We do not mark-up 'by hand.'"

"We currently use an EAD template that does not require any added effort. However, I have yet to see what, if any, benefit is derived from the EAD metadata. All of our finding-aids are posted on the Web in html and that's what the patrons find. EADs are submitted to a statewide database that gets virtually no use."

"We experimented very briefly about 10 years ago with EAD markup and maintain only a few legacy documents from that period. No recent effort has been made to EAD finding aids."

"We feel it will be very beneficial and has helped us to make our finding aids more uniform in structure."

"We have only marked up about five collections in EAD on a limited basis as a test project."

"We plan on moving forward with EAD using collection management software, most likely the Archivist Toolkit, to ease the creation of EAD-XML."

"We think that the time and effort is worthwhile because researchers are finding collections that have finding aids marked up in EAD. When we begin fully implementing MPLP, I believe that we will mark up less folder inventories but definitely mark up collection-level info into EAD."

"While our current search software does not yet fully utilize all of the tags available in our finding aids, we remain optimistic that the time and effort spent creating the EAD records is worthwhile."

"Yes, definitely."

"Yes, especially as we integrate EAD encoding into the creation of new finding aids and can generate online and print copies from the encoded version. Using archival standards to describe, encode, and disseminate our collections contributes to the quality and longevity of our finding aids."

"Yes, especially when brief EAD records are created or when box and folder lists can be exported from Access to EAD."

"Yes, it adds to the searchability of collections, and helps make descriptions more uniform. It allows us to meet professional standards."

"Yes, it allows us to place the collections on the Online Archive of California, where there is increased access by scholars and the public."

"Yes, the standardization is helpful."

"Yes, we feel it is beneficial to mark the records in EAD, and the Archivists' Toolkit and our IT support helps in this matter."

"Yes. EAD promotes accessibility through delivery in the Online Archive of California. As access to materials is one of our primary goals, the creation of EAD finding aids is a focus of our processing activities."

"Yes. EAD has greatly improved discovery of our collections."

"Yes. Enormously improved discoverability of specific materials for local and remote users as well as public services and reference staff."

"Yes. Use local database for EAD creation/master finding aid data. EAD record is basis for all other descriptive products—MARC records, Web finding aids, paper finding aids."

"Yes. Discovery through our Web site and Archive Grid, links from our catalog records in WorldCat, Archive Grid, and NUCMC, and our OPAC to the EAD finding aid."

If finding aids are not being marked up in EAD, please comment on whether you perceive any internal or external pressure to do so in the future. N=22

"Aids created since July 2004 are EAD ready."

"EAD Markup is not done for all finding aids. In many cases, EAD has been used for grant-funded projects that may have required or encouraged use, or for which EAD markup made our proposal more competitive. We expect

granting agencies to continue to push EAD. In addition, a planned consortium tool is likely to be a driver for expanded EAD implementation."

"No internal; some external."

"No pressure."

"No pressure at this point. We looked into EAD some years ago. We're able to get the same access through other means. We've exported MARC records into EAD for external union lists on the Web."

"No. Library uses RAD (rules of archival descriptions)."

"Our professional staff and Catalog Department staff can not see any advantage in using EAD over standard static HTML pages. We feel there are no justifications for increasing processing and description time and costs for minimal advantage. Our manuscripts are linked by logic to the records of the institution. I believe that EAD is a labor-intensive throwback to library cataloging methods of the past."

"Self-imposed pressure to create EAD finding aids by virtue of participation in consortium, Northwest Digital Archives."

"Some internal, by people who do not understand the process or its requirements. In turn, they have received external pressure."

"The matter has been discussed, but no policy has been implemented."

"The question is discussed from time to time, but so far there is a consensus (at least a weak consensus) that the potential advantages of EAD encoding clearly warrant the substantial expense of markup. Until/unless that balance clearly tips, I don't think markup is likely. We are, however, discussing the possibility of moving item-/folder-/series-level data to a database structure to allow us to separate the data from its delivery appearance. The idea here is that we would put descriptive data in just one place, then create templates that would pull that data into a delivery format (that might look like a finding aid, an index, etc.). Depending on the database field structure, EAD might, in effect, be built in — or surpassed."

"There is a subtle 'keeping up with the Joneses' kind of internal pressure to adapt whatever is cutting edge and new as well as a substantive external and internal pressure to provide container lists with our current html finding aids which could be accomplished with EAD or just straight html."

"There is internal pressure to use EAD. That will continue to hold true for the immediate future."

"We are looking at XML markup in TEI (P5) as an alternative for some collections, with EAD as an option for other collections."

"We may obtain a new database system, and we would like it to include EAD functions."

"We will begin to use EAD this spring with the availability of the new OhioLINK EAD finding aid creation tool (Web-based application)."

"Yes, the department head and library administration places a high priority on mounting our collection finding aids on the Online Archive of California. We want more access and visibility for our collections."

"Yes, we are required to at this time by a grant, but we have not begun the EAD portion yet. In addition, we feel pressured by upper-level administration and the profession as a whole. Articles and conference presentations all

seem to assume that everyone is using EAD, even though studies show they aren't."

"Yes, we currently have a working group on EAD."

"Yes, we have been working towards encoding our finding aids by converting them into the DACS format and by completing training on EAD."

WEB PRESENCE

14. Is there any information about individual manuscript collections on the library's Web site? N=66

Yes	65	98%
No	1	2%

If yes, what type of information is included? Check all that apply. N=65

Collection title	64	99%
Brief description of the contents of the collection	61	94%
Inclusive dates	61	94%
Extent	60	92%
Biographical/administrative history	54	83%
Unique collection identifier	48	74%
Creator information	35	54%
Other	36	55%

Please describe other information.

"A very few have photographs or images."

"Access points using LC subject heading, related collections in repository, use guidelines."

"Added entries, links to finding aids and other e-resources, images (selected)."

"Container list."

"Digital surrogates with item-level metadata provided for select collections on OAC and UCLA Digital Library site."

"EAD finding aids are also available through the Libraries Web site."

"Exhibit information."

"Extent, restrictions, if there is a finding aid, and custodial history."

"File-level description."

"File-level description of contents."

"Finding aid."

"Finding Aids full text. Links to finding aids full text."

"Folder lists."

"Folder lists when applicable."

"Fonds-level description using all appropriate elements required by RAD."

"For most collections there is also a container list."

"For some, abstracts of content."

"Formats, topics, contact information."

"Full finding aids."

"General collection overview before making EAD, and after EAD linked to EAD."

"Inventories."

"Inventory list."

"Item listings, in HTML and PDF formats, are present for some collections. MARC records through the library's OPAC with collection descriptions for 108 collections."

"Other fields as required by the Rules for Archival Description."

"Restrictions."

"Scope and contents, bio info, container lists, series info, subject headings."

"Scope note, digitized images in some cases."

"Some collections have been scanned and mounted on the Web with full searchable transcriptions and commentary."

"Some EAD finding aids include detailed collection contents."

"Sometimes inventories."

"The existence of box-level/folder-level finding aids."

"There are virtual exhibits that include selections from a few collections."

"Usually graphics about or from the collection."

15. Is this information consistent for all manuscript collections described on the Web site or does it vary by collection? N=65

The information varies by collection	35	54%
This information is consistent for all collections	30	46%

MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS ON THE WEB

16. How many manuscript collections currently are represented on the Web site? N=59

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	11,000	831.59	334.50	1,649.31

Collections on the Web	N
<10	2
10–49	5
50–99	4
100–199	9
200–299	3
300–399	8
400–499	5
500–599	4
600–999	4
1000–1999	6
2000–4999	5
>5000	1

17. If not all collections are on the Web site, please briefly describe the criteria and process for adding a collection. N=44

Selected Comments from Respondents

"1) Anything processed since 2004 goes up. 'Legacy' finding aids are represented in collection-level records in library catalog. 2) Time to create Web site. 3) As staff available and in response to user demand."

"1) Curator decides that a collection or portions of a collection should be digitized and prepares a project proposal. Requests to digitize materials can be initiated by patrons or the curators. 2) Curator presents proposal to the Board of Curators for approval. 3) Board of Curators reviews the proposal and sends a recommendation to the library's Administrative Council for final approval and prioritization. 4) Project team is formed and the project begins."

"231 finding aids, plus accession record information for unprocessed collections. Transitioning to new EAD delivery platform for all 481 finding aids. All collections—processed and unprocessed—have at least a collection-level MARC record in ILS. Maintain separate database-derived html-only Web site for institutional archives, not in EAD."

"Added as completed. Add legacy records as time allows."

"All but the most recent acquisitions, which generally get added as they are logged in."

"All collections are represented in the OPAC, with a 'K-level' record for unprocessed collections and 'I-level' records for processed collections. Only processed collections are represented on the Web site, that is, index entries with links to electronic finding aids. Single item collections, those with no finding aids, are represented only in the OPAC."

"All collections that have been processed are added to the Web site."

"All faculty papers and historical collections are described on the Web site. The control plan for university records is available online, but only those collections with EAD-encoded finding aids are fully represented."

"As collections are processed or re-processed (updated) we put the finding aid on the Web. We are continually converting legacy finding aids for presentation on the Web. Have been doing so since 1994."

"As new collections are processed, finding aids are marked up and put in the DLXS database."

"At present we do not have either criteria or a process for adding collections."

"Catalog records and finding aids are added as collections are accessioned and processed."

"Collection descriptions are added to the Web site in the form of EAD-encoded finding aids. These finding aids are added after the collection has been processed. When materials from a collection are selected for digitization or when researchers show interest in a collection that does not have an online finding aid, we create one to match demand."

"Collection-level record and/or finding aid available."

"Collections could be represented on the Web with 1) a bibliographic record, 2) a finding aid, 3) a virtual exhibit, 4) a digitized copy, or 5) all of the above."

"Collections that are open for research are added to the Web site. Collections that aren't processed are not currently listed on the Web site. Collections can also be closed or restricted according to a range of criteria."

"Collections that are processed and available for research. This figure is an estimate."

"Curatorial decision to include information about a collection on the Web site with appropriate note that it has not been processed for unassisted use. If curator decides to include information on the Web the data is entered into an access database (with link to finding aid) which is delivered via Cold Fusion to the Web."

"Depending on the time of year, it may take us two or three weeks after a new arrival to get the collection described and online, and we hold out a small number of collections that for one reason or another we choose not to publicize at the moment. We may, for example, choose not to provide a minimal description for a small collection if we judge that full processing can be achieved with little additional effort and if full processing will take place 'soon.'"

"I write special descriptions because of exhibitions, events, donor relations, collections of national importance, or digitization projects. The Manuscripts Cataloging Librarian puts collections on the Web site as she has time."

"Importance of collection for access by researchers or interest to the library."

"Importance, size."

"Its research importance and qualifications of staff available to organize and produce a finding aid."

"Most collections which are processed are done so because there is a tax consideration involved. Others are done if the time and money (labour) is available."

"Must be processed; with a finding aid created in the departmental template."

"New collections are added as there are processors available to prepare the guide. Collections are assigned on the basis of use/demand and mission and political concerns (in Frank Boles sense of the term in 'Black Box' article."

"Newly acquired archives may not be represented as yet, but are made available as the data is uploaded from an Access file. Collections in locations outside Special Collections are not represented. Only collection-level information is provided. Some collections have their own Web page."

"Only a minimal amount — they are chosen are representative collections while the full finding aids are available on the Kentuckiana Digital Library."

"Only processed collections and significant unprocessed collections are mentioned or included on the Web site."

"Our Manuscripts Librarian must give permission for finding aids to be uploaded to the Web. A collection must be fully processed for its finding aid to go on the Web."

"Part of the processing workflow to add the collection to the Web site when processing has been completed; looking at legacy finding aids and use by researchers."

"Priorities set by individual archivists. Now only posting fully RAD compliant finding aids (inventories)."

"Recent acquisitions are not yet on the Web."

"Recently acquired collections are not added until all processing/appraisal work is completed."

"The annotated list of manuscript collections has not been updated in some time due to implementation of a content management system. We are actively maintaining our EAD guides online and making that a routine part of processing procedures, but we are currently in between a legacy EAD site and a new one and waiting for library technology to complete improvements so the old site can be abandoned."

"The majority of our collections have at least a MARC collection level record. Collections that have a higher level of research potential and are under 50 boxes are under consideration for processing for finding aids on OAC."

"Two special projects, one of them grant-funded, required online posting of finding aids and other information in

special subject areas."

"Usually, a collection description is added when the processing is complete. Occasionally a brief description will be added before this is done with a statement such as 'not cataloged' or 'cataloging in process.'"

"We are adding new collections as they are accessioned or processed. Some legacy finding aids have been added, but our focus is on newly-collections."

"We are working towards doing this for every manuscript collection as long as we have some intellectual control of the collection. Whether this is done now depends on staff time and the existence of the necessary information."

"We cannot answer this question because the information is very scattered, given the decentralization of special collections programs here."

"We only put information on the Web for those collections that pass minimal-level scrutiny. As long as the title, extent, inclusive dates, and abstract are accurate, the collection meets the criteria."

"We use our Web site as our collection management tool as soon as a collection is received, appraised and accessioned; it is given a short one paragraph summary description. If importance and complexity of the collection warrants it we do a more fulsome finding aid such as a partial or full-blown inventory."

"When we converted our legacy finding aids from word processing files, we had 95 finding aids that only had RLIN records and so were not converted. We have begun to add these to our Web site using an XML template in NoteTab to produce the EAD. To date we have input 43 of the records."

FINDING AIDS ON THE WEB

18. Are finding aids included on the Web site? N=64

Yes	60	94%
No	4	6%

If yes, how many finding aids currently are on the Web site? N=56

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	6,000	655	290	1,182.85

Finding Aids on the Web	N
<10	3
10–49	5
50–99	11
100–199	6
200–299	3
300–399	9
400–499	4
500–599	4
600–999	3
1000–1999	2
2000–4999	5
>5000	1

19. If not all finding aids are on the Web site, please briefly describe the criteria and process for adding a finding aid. N=44

Selected Comments from Respondents

"1415 collections on OAC; 3 collections on UCLA Digital Library site. Criteria for adding finding aid to OAC: processed collection; collection-level record in OPAC and Voyager; EAD finding aid. Criteria for adding collection to UCLA Digital Library site: digital surrogates available and useful to research community."

"All collections that are processed are put on the Web site as the Manuscript Cataloging Librarian has time."

"All newly created finding aids are posted to the Web site once they have been reviewed. We have posted some legacy finding aids that were converted through a grant process, and legacy finding aids are posted in a preliminary form."

"All of our finding aids are on a consortium Web site with a link to our Web page, with the exception of three heavily used guides that are in PDF files."

"As they are processed they will be added (workflow)."

"At Indiana University all EAD finding aids are on a separate Finding Aids Web site managed by the Digital Library Program, not the Web site of the Lilly Library. A finding aid is added to the DLP Finding Aids Web site when the encoding is completed by a SLIS intern and revised by the Head of Technical Services."

"Collection-level records are maintained in legacy format in a card catalog in our reading room. We create an EAD-encoded finding aid for these collections when the collection sees high demand or when items are selected for digitization. At that time, the finding aid is added to our online database."

"Collections that are processed are put on the Web site as the Manuscripts Cataloging Librarian has time."

"Collections without finding aids are generally those still only described in our card catalog or those that are uncataloged. Cataloging is assigned from a priority list of collections agreed upon by public service, curatorial, and administrative staff. Currently finding aids are created in an MS Word template during processing and then converted to EAD when processing is completed. We are currently reviewing various methods and techniques both simplify and speed this process."

"Curator makes decision."

"Current finding aids are routinely encoded and added. Legacy finding aids are encoded as time permits."

"Depends on need."

"Essentially all legacy print finding aids, indexes, card files, etc., have been migrated online. Some collections, however, are represented on the Web only by brief collection-level records."

"Finding aids are added as collections are processed."

"Finding aids in EAD are produced as a product of processing."

"Finding aids that are encoded in EAD are included on the Web site."

"If EAD-encoded."

"If the finding aid is not suitable for Web delivery a note associated with the collection informs the research that a paper finding aid is available in the repository."

"In the past we would load when we had a completed folder level finding aid. We are starting to add brief EAD records now."

"Most important to researchers, most requested or relationship to the university."

"Most manuscript finding aids are on the Web, a few aren't due to time and money."

"New acquisitions are added when processed. Fonds acquired before implementation of EES are transcribed when staff resources permit."

"Newly processed small collections created in EAD; older finding aids converted from WordPerfect using macros; selection based on significance, currency of data, and staff availability."

"No, because the KDL is used to host the finding aids. It provides a centralized digital repository for Kentucky-wide resources."

"Once processed, then converted to HTML."

"Only the finding aids that have been proofed and reformatted to meet current standards are placed online. We only put up finding aids that have container listings."

"Putting it in an electronic format, proofreading the electronic copy, looking for inconsistencies, reorganizing collection if needed."

"Retrospective finding aids project recently completed—not all existing collections had finding aids. Transitioning to new delivery platform for all 481 existing finding aids."

"See previous answer. For finding aids that were completed during the conversion of the legacy finding aids, we are also creating EADs using NoteTab based on the text finding aid."

"Size and research importance."

"Some legacy finding aids remain to be converted."

"Some of the above are single items, requiring very little description. The above number is finding aids in HTML on the Web site. Otherwise, we now only add finding aids in EAD. Criteria include narrative description and box content description."

"The 6,000 finding aid figure for our Web site includes University Archives' holdings as well as our manuscript collections. We currently have around 1,200 HTML pages on our Web site and 99% of those are finding aids."

"The criteria depends on the ease of encoding and completeness of the legacy finding aid. The process involves encoding being completed by processing staff or interns, initial quality control being conducted by the University Archivist, then subject curators reviewing for content. After review, the University Archivist uploads EAD to server and publishes it."

"There are links from the Special Collections Web site to the Online Archive of California. As finding aids are finished, they are marked up, and go into OAC."

"These finding aids on the Web are as a result of donor agreements."

"They are added in order of their anticipated use. Criteria used to evaluate include conditions relating to public access, collection scope, content, and general interest in subject matter."

"University Archives: If most of the collection is unrestricted, we put the finding aid online when it is processed to the level we deem appropriate for the specific collection. If most of the collection is restricted, we do not put the finding aid online."

"We are currently in the process of evaluating our legacy finding aids. When new accessions are added, finding aid may get reviewed and updated."

"We are gradually adding all finding aids to the Web site."

"We do not host any of our finding aids locally. They are hosted by OAC and we provide links to them from our Web site. Our Web pages for manuscript collections are currently being re-designed and in the future we will display all of our completed EAD finding aids using an XSLT style sheet on our own Web site."

"When processing is completed, as time permits."

20. In what format are the online finding aids? Check all that apply. N=60

Delivered in HTML with EAD encoding	35	58%
HTML from a word-processor document	27	45%
PDF	19	32%
Other	12	20%

Please specify other format.

Finding aid is created directly in EAD and posted.

HTML from Dreamweaver

HTML with EAD and XML

Online database/index

Some are searchable databases.

Through the RLG interface

UCLA Digital Library collections delivered as digital surrogates with collection- and item-level metadata (not traditional finding aids).

We have not yet rendered all finding aids in PDF, but plan to do so this spring.

XML also on Web

XML used for OAC

XML with EAD encoding delivered with XSLT

21. Does the library convert legacy finding aids to new styles for Web publication? N=62

Yes	48	77%
No	14	23%

22. Do all online finding aids reflect the same style? N=62

Yes	44	71%
No	18	29%

23. Does your institution participate in any online consortium or program that hosts and/or harvests your EAD finding aids? N=63

Yes	40	63%
No	23	37%

If yes, please briefly describe the program. N=40

"TARO (Texas Archival Resources Online) makes descriptions of the rich archival, manuscript, and museum collections in repositories across the state available to the public. The site consists of the collection descriptions or 'finding aids' that archives, libraries, and museums create to assist users in locating information in their libraries." (2 responses)

"ARCHEION, CAIN."

"Archeion: A provincial electronic union list of fond level descriptions. http://archeion-aao.fis.utoronto.ca Archeion contributes our descriptions to OurOntario http://ourontario.ca/ and Archives Canada http://archivescanada.ca."

"ArchiveGrid." (5 responses)

"ArchiveGrid and Washington Research Library Consortium."

"ArchiveGrid—harvests XML finding aids from a file on our server."

"Arizona Archives Online is a collaboration of the three Arizona public universities and is intended to serve as a statewide EAD database. We have discussed allowing harvesting by external consortia but our Fedora platform is not ready."

"Brown recently received an NEH grant to partner with nine other archives, historical societies, and libraries in Rhode Island to create an EAD-based union database of finding aids. This project is called the Rhode Island Archival & Manuscript Collection Online (RIAMCO). Brown is the lead institution since we are the only institution in Rhode Island currently using EAD."

"California Digital Library — Online Archive of California."

"Columbia University hosts a database containing all of our medieval manuscript descriptions. The project is called The Digital Scriptorium."

"CRRA: Catholic Research Resources Alliance has a Web site to which members post the kind of information covered (I think) in this survey."

"Finding aids have been harvested by RLG (and more recently we presume by OCLC) as well as by ArchivesUSA. Google and other search engines of course routinely chew through them and, so far as we can tell, produce nearly all of the reader traffic. We also have one large finding aid that was EAD-marked and is maintained by the American Institute of Physics as part of a project they initiated several years ago."

"Five Colleges cooperative EAD site (Mt Holyoke, Smith, Amherst, Hampshire, and UMass)."

"Historic Pittsburgh Web site."

"Northwest Digital Archives, a group of institutions offering access to archival and manuscript collections in Idaho, Alaska, Oregon, Montana and Washington." (3 responses)

"OAI (contribution to OAIster)."

"Online Archive of California (OAC)." (6 responses)

"Our finding aid records are exposed for harvesting by OAIster."

"Our finding aids are harvested (for preservation purposes) by the Digital Library of Georgia. We also preserve our findings with the MetaArchive project."

"Our finding aids were harvested by RLG and now by OCLC. Cataloged records in Dublin Core are harvested by an OAI harvester."

"RLG Archives Grid. Also plan on hosting a subject-based consortium of our own design for the history of medicine."

"State consortium KYVL."

"The Rocky Mountain Online Archives, hosted by University Libraries, University of New Mexico is a consortium of archival institutions in Colorado, New Mexico and Wyoming."

"The Washington Research Library Consortium (WRLC) has begun a test program involving EAD."

"TRLN (Triangle Research Libraries Network): NC State, Duke, UNC-Chapel Hill, NC Central."

"Virginia Heritage, a consortium of 23 institutions in Virginia. http://ead.lib.virginia.edu/vivaead/."

"We are part of the 'Archives Canada' (Archival Information Network) group sponsored by the CCA (Council of Canadian Archives), as a member of the Saskatchewan/Manitoba Archival Information Network)also called SAINMAIN."

"We are part of the Utah Manuscripts Association consortium that is currently in the midst of a project to develop a statewide repository of finding aids."

If no, does the library plan to do so in the future? N=22

Yes	11	50%
No	11	50%

Selected Comments from Respondents

Yes

"It is possible that we will do this, but there is no guarantee."

"I've answered yes, but we have not begun investigating anything specific."

"OhioLINK Finding Aid Repository—consortial repository of finding aids in the state of Ohio."

"The OhioLINK Consortium is scheduled to release an EAD encoding tool and repository this year. The repository will deliver finding aids and use the XTF Search Engine, adapted from the California Digital Library implementation, for search. We expect to adopt the encoding tool and participate in the finding aid repository for delivery and search."

"We hope to create a local consortium so that our finding aids will be searchable along with those of other archival and manuscript repositories in the region."

No

"At least not in the near future."

"No plans currently, but this could change."

"Not for now."

24. **Does the library have any special software or program that allows users to search across fields? N=62**

Yes	36	58%
No	26	42%

If yes, please briefly describe the software. N=40

Selected Comments from Respondents

"Advance."

"ARCHON allows some searching across finding aids."

"At UCSD we use Orpheus; we also have Online Archive of California. Both of which have search engines."

"Currently investigating XTF for this purpose."

"DLXS." (4 responses)

"DLXS, which we are in the process of testing for implementation."

"Done in OAC."

"DT search."

"Endeca as an interface for the online catalog; provides the speed and flexibility of popular online search engines while capitalizing on existing catalog records."

"eXist — an open source XML database application that features index-based XQuery processing."

"ExLibris–Aleph."

"Federated searching is handled by Webfeat."

"GAMMS has many search functions."

"I don't have the name of the software we are using now, but we plan to move to DLXS in the next few months."

"I'm not sure that it qualifies as 'special software,' but the site has a general search engine that searches across the documents but that does not particulate elements."

"In-house DBTextWorks network; fast and flexible searching."

"InQuery (aka Aurora), licensed from Chiliad Publishing, but no longer supported. Full text search, primarily used at LC for American Memory indexing."

"No need — EAD formatting permits searching using the browser."

"On the OAC: For search and delivery of EAD finding aids, the OAC utilizes the CDL-developed eXtensible Text Framework (XTF) system. For search and delivery of TEI-encoded texts, the OAC utilizes the CDL-developed XTF system. Text searches are limited to the full text of the documents. For search and delivery of image metadata, the OAC utilizes the CDL-developed XTF system."

"Online Archive of California."

"Part of the Online Archive of California."

"Primo."

"Re:discovery for the Internet."

"Tamino, an XML search engine."

"The Digital Library Extension Service: DLXS software consists of two components. The first component is the DLXS middleware, available as a free Open Source resource. The second component is the XPAT search engine, available in two versions. One version of the search engine (XPAT) is licensed and available for a fee. The other version (XPAT Lite) is freely available but has a limit on the size of the data which can be indexed. Additional information is available at http://www.dlxs.org/products/index.html."

"We are implementing PRIMO which is expected to provide this capability for our html files as well as bibliographic database and leased electronic products."

"We are in development to use CONTENTdm to display finding aids after we create a map from the database to DC fields."

"We have recently implemented XTF search software that we obtained from the Online Archive of California and adapted for our use."

"Well yes, in the sense that researchers can do this with our MARC records in our local OPAC or in World Cat."

"XPat."

"XTF from California Digital Library. The indexing part of XTF is based on Lucene, a common XML indexing tool."

"Yes, we have a searching mechanism on the Archives' home page. I believe we used Ruby on Rails to design this function."

"Yes, we use a site-specific Google product as well as a home-grown search utility that we use to search the Web site by the 'call number' designation, GREP."

TRAINING FOR ONLINE MANUSCRIPT ACTIVITIES

25. What types of training and professional development opportunities have the staff who add manuscript collections to the Web used to gain their expertise? Check all that apply. N=64

On-the-job training	63	98%
Peers	51	80%
Professional association-sponsored workshops	50	78%
Library school	50	78%
Electronic discussion lists	47	73%
Conferences	47	73%
Professional journals and readings	46	72%
Workshops in house	37	58%
Blogs and online readings	34	53%
Other opportunity	7	11%

Please specify other opportunity.

"Archival training program at Western Washington University."

"Our archivists teach student archivist interns and in reviewing the literature for instruction and in discussing with them what their faculty are telling them, the archivists gain from the experience."

"Rare Book School (workshops not sponsored by a professional association or in-house)."

"Rare Book School course on EAD."

"TARO training."

"Two librarians took archives courses as part of their library degree program."

"Visits to other institutions."

ORGANIZATION FOR ONLINE MANUSCRIPT ACTIVITIES

26. Please indicate how your library has organized to provide manuscripts information online. Check all that apply. N=62

Incorporated online manuscript activities into existing unit/department/library without making any name change	52	84%
Redefined librarian/archivist position(s) to include online manuscript activities	35	57%
Staff who process manuscripts for the Web receive assistance from other departments/units	27	44%
Online manuscript activities are distributed across the institution	17	27%
We are now in the planning stages for reorganizing to accommodate online manuscript activities	3	5%
Incorporated online manuscript activities into existing unit/department/library and renamed the unit/department/library	2	3%
Other organizational structure for online manuscript activities	0	—

If online manuscript activities are distributed across the institution, please briefly describe which units and staff are involved. N=21

"Archives and Manuscripts, the Center for Digital Initiatives, and Library Technical Services work together to provide manuscripts information online. Library Technical Services primarily does the description and encoding, the Archives and Manuscripts perform quality control and content review on top of encoding and description, and the Center for Digital Initiatives handles the tools used for encoding and publishing information to the Web."

"Bibliographic and Metadata Services outsources our MARC cataloging and assists with formulation of LCSH headings and name authority entries. Informatics and Cyberinfrastructure services assists with digitization projects and loading EAD guides to Arizona Archives Online."

"Each department handles its own archival and Web processing."

"EAD activities at LC are coordinated by an EAD Technical Group with representatives from custodial units which create online finding aids, and from the Automation Planning and Liaison Office (APLO) and Information Technology Services (ITS)."

"EAD encoding and mounting to KDL are done within UK Libraries Digital Programs, a department within SCDP. Archives is a separate division within SCDP."

"Library Information Technology (LIT) is responsible for providing a project manager for each project as well as supplying technical expertise, the cataloging department aids in the establishment of metadata schemes and

the implementation of those schemes, and curators are responsible for content selection. We are developing an in-house software program to help distribute the gathering of the information necessary to place manuscript collections online. (see http:/www.lib.byu.edu/indi)."

"Peer archivists/librarians in the Law Library and the Music Library are available for consultation and assistance and work with Archives as a team on cooperative ventures."

"Please note that this represents workflow for the Charles E. Young Research Library Dept of Special Collections only. There are other special collection libraries who contribute EAD finding aids to the OAC as well, with different workflow: Staff involved: manuscript processors (3 librarians, 3 staff) and two OAC staff (1 library asst, 1 computer resource specialist)."

"Public Services Department, Lilly Library: 1 librarian (.1 FTE) and 1 library assistant (.25 FTE). IU Digital Library Program: 2 librarians, 2 professional staff. IU School of Library and Information Science: 1 graduate assistant (.25 FTE)."

"Scripps Institution of Oceanography Library archives staff also process manuscripts and provide online information."

"Special Collections Cataloging provides some support, especially in catalog records However, each of the programs in special collections does manuscript processing and on-line description."

"Special Collections students and staff create the EAD-encoded finding aids. Staff in the Digital Library Center process these files, make them available by posting to the Web, and preserve the EAD files."

"Technical service 'Metadata' librarian is instrumental in working with SCUA to encode finding aids and catalog collections. Other staff reporting to the Metadata librarian also participate in these activities."

"The Manuscripts Cataloging Librarian catalogs all manuscript collections for Special Collections units, creates EAD finding aids for all Special Collections units, and occasionally processes literary and some historical collections."

"The Music and one of the Africana librarians produce finding aids for collections in their fields. A cataloger produces the marc record using the information from the finding aid."

"The position of Archivist and Processing Coordinator was created to create descriptive information and collaborate with technical staff in designing search and display platform. Staff were reassigned to descriptive project to generate collection level information on all collections. The descriptive project is conducted by all units of the Special Collections Library, of which Historical Collections and Labor Archives is one of three units."

"The Special Collections and Manuscripts cataloger is located in our Monographic Services Division rather than in Special Collections."

"There is an Archives unit at UdeM : http://www.archiv.umontreal.ca/."

"We do not process our manuscript collections for the Web, we process them for patrons! One of the ways that we provide access to our collections is by providing finding aids online. That said, we do have a person who takes our finding aids and mounts them on our Web site."

"We receive assistance from the Library's IT department when displaying finding aids and digital collections of the Web. These departments are Systems and Digital Library Development."

"Within Special Collections, Shoah Foundation Institute Visual History Archive, USC Digital Archive, Cinematic Arts Library."

If staff who process manuscripts for the Web receive assistance from other departments/units, please list those departments/units and describe the role they play. N=32

"Assistance from the Cataloging Department—the Electronic Resources Librarian reviews MARC cataloging and vets our Online Archive of California finding aids. He also has set up templates for our use for manuscript and photograph cataloging."

"Catalog Department of the MU Libraries."

"Cataloging assistants work part time in our Film and Media Archive and will be doing some arrangement and description of manuscript portions of those collections for entering in our MAVIS system."

"Consult with Libraries' technical services unit, including Web manager and usability specialist."

"Desktop Network Services Department; Preservation Department — software assistance, server management; consultation, manuscript conservation."

"Digital Library Services assists with Web site development, training, trouble shooting. Systems (IT) provide hardware, software and technical support."

"Digital Research Library. Mount of Historic Pittsburgh Web site."

"Generally, staff from the University Archives have more experience and knowledge of this work. Archivists tend to help staff from other departments."

"ISS—assist with programming issues related to using ARCHON; Cataloging department using the records created by the program."

"ITadd—systems office; SCETI (Schoenberg Center for Electronic Text & Image) may get involved in future."

"Libraries IT unit manages the DLXS site with input from Archives & Special Collections staff."

"Library Information Technology Services is assisting with evaluating archives software that will allow for automatic Web posting."

"Library Systems."

"Limited assistance from the IT department in maintaining the EAD server."

"Metadata and Cataloging Department staff create metadata for digital collections. IT staff support databases used to manage information about collections and digital assets, as well as software used to publish finding aids to Web."

"Online finding aids are indexed by ITS; assistance with Web pages from Network Development & MARC Standards Office, and from the Office of Strategic Initiatives. Some tools used in encoding were developed by staff then in the Music Division."

"Programming assistance for newly created XML databases is provided by another department in the library

called the department for Digital Access and Information Architecture (i.e., programmers)."

"Public Services Department, Lilly Library: encoding word documents into HTML for Web, Web presentation, and managing the Lilly Library Web site. IU School of Library and Information Science graduate assistant: EAD encoding of word documents. IU Digital Library Program: technical expertise in programming, usability and interface issues for implementing the finding aids Web site, advice on application of the EAD tag library, set specifications for the display of online finding aids, manage the creation of tools to assist with the EAD encoding process, and ensure EAD finding aids are shared with appropriate aggregations."

"Special Collections staff physically process all manuscripts collections. For online display of manuscript material, they select the items and (if needed) create an EAD-encoded finding aid for the collection. Staff in the Digital Library Center, along with Special Collections students and staff, scan and (if needed) create transcriptions (TEI) for the materials. Finding aids are edited to reflect presence of a digital surrogate. The Digital Library Center staff process the files, make them available by posting to the Web, and take responsibility for long-term digital preservation."

"Staff who code other material for the Web do the coding of finding aids."

"Systems."

"Technical Services Department catalogs the finding aids; Computing Operations & Research Services assists with Tamino for ingesting and searching."

"The Library Systems department provides technical support, particularly for collections with ContentDM files."

"The Manuscripts Cataloging Librarian advises processing staff and oversees the cataloging of manuscripts by Special Collections Team members in Technical Services."

"The Systems Department provides assistance. Systems helps us if we have questions about uploading our finding aids to the Web or about cataloging issues."

"The Systems Department within the library assists us with Web site design, database creation, and troubleshoots any other problems that we encounter with the creation and maintenance of our manuscript collection Web pages. They have also developed an XSLT style sheet that will allow us to display EAD finding aids locally on our Web site after the re-design of our manuscript collection Web pages are complete."

"To create the online display, we cooperate with cataloging and technical departments."

"University Archives, Law Library and Music Library collaborate on planning for consistent standards, software, searching platforms, and visual identity."

"We are assisted by LETS (Library Electronic Technologies Services, the library electronic support unit."

"We receive assistance from the Library's IT department when displaying finding aids and digital collections of the Web. These departments are Systems and Digital Library Development."

"We receive assistance from the Web Services Department that supports all of the libraries in the system."

"Web support, metadata conversion support, branding support, server and disc space support from Library Web Services, Library Technology Office, campus Information Technology Services."

If there is another organizational structure for online manuscript activities, please describe it. N=4

"As previously mentioned, the Western Historical Manuscript Collection (A UM System unit housed coincidentally in the Ellis Library) has a Web site with a smaller number of online finding aids but the repository has a much larger number of manuscript collections than does SCARaB."

"Digitizing manuscript collections is handled separately (American Memory)."

"Separate Digital Manuscripts Program that creates item-level access to selected collections held by our institutional as well as collections from partnering institutions."

"These questions don't very well reflect the range of our activities. Primary responsibility for the organization and description of manuscript collections resides in Special Collections & University Archives, and we routinely create and move online essentially all html finding aids. We coordinate closely with a Central Technical Services (CTS) Department when record-building intersects with the general library OPAC, and we coordinate closely with the Digital Library Services (DLS) unit when undertaking CONTENTdm initiatives. All of these activities can be properly thought of a 'manuscript activities.' Depending on the specific project, CTS, DLS and/or Special Collections staff may be involved in scanning and providing metadata. It is a much more fluid world than it used to be!"

CHALLENGES OF ONLINE MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

27. Please describe up to three challenges of/barriers to migrating manuscript collections to the Web. N=62

Challenge 1	Challenge 2	Challenge 3
"Migrating manuscript collections." If this means moving "content" (or creating digital surrogates), then the first challenge is certain the variety of formats and the sheer number of "objects" — from sound and moving image recordings to the text written and printed on hundreds of thousands of sheets of paper.	Again if we are talking about surrogates, creating item-level metadata.	Again if we are talking about surrogates, very few of the "objects" can be mechanically transcribed (e.g., successfully OCRed without painstaking editorial review). While massive scanning to "image" large amounts of material may be "trivial" (because it can be partially mechanized and anyway requires few skills), providing real "content" is complex.

Adequate staff to process our collections and create finding aids.	Completely different levels of processing for different collections, which the finding aids reflect. Many of the legacy finding aids lack the contextual information (biographical, scope notes) needed for an online finding aid. For several years the University we used a processing manual that did not match national standards and practices, our finding aids reflect the local practices.	As we put up more finding aids, we are seeing increased use of the collections. Our electronic reference service particularly reflects this use. A challenge is to keep our reference service at a level to meet this added demand, from both in person and electronic researchers.
Communicating vision about variety of descriptive practices (e.g., MPLP) to other professional staff and their implementation of that vision.		
Complexity and usefulness of existing legacy finding aid.	Staff communication.	
Constantly changing software, hardware, and technology.	Lack of commercially available turnkey systems for making finding aids available and searchable online.	Shrinking funds and resources (at least in higher education, yet ever-expanding expectations from users.
Conversion of 400 legacy finding aids required grant funding and the bulk of staff time for 2 years.		
Converting finding aids by scanning or re-keying.	Adhering to accepted archival standards.	Providing different venues of Web access: online catalogue, our own Web site, and Web union lists.
Cost. Scanning is relatively simple but in order to make the scanned images useful descriptive information has to be gathered and this is time consuming and labor intensive.	Time. Curatorial expertise is needed to ensure that collections are appropriately described and accessible.	A systematic way of selecting manuscript collections to place online.
Creating, learning, and maintaining standards of description.	The excessive amount of time and the cost involved in migration.	Justifying #1 and #2 in light of the relatively slight value of the work.
EAD encoding — either staff or funds for off-site encoding of new and legacy guides.	Systems/Web staff to deliver encoded guides to Web.	Mechanism to allow for updates and corrections.
Finding Aids which predate computer age.		

Formats of finding aids vary widely — created over time by various individuals and at different times. Rather than re-doing them, the library digitizes what is already in existence.	No database system to manage the finding aids. Time consuming to update the Web site—changes have to be made across multiple pages.	Too few staff to process incoming material.
Inadequate resources to process collections and create finding aids.		
Inadequate staffing and department-wide training. Standardization suffers when description and encoding is left up to student assistants who have only minimal in-house training in either. With only one full-time professional in the Special Collections Library, very little direct supervision can be provided. The two staff members who aid in supervising the students have not had any training in EAD and processing beyond in-house training. Also, the turnover rate for these assistants is high, further hindering efforts for standardization.	Lack of existing descriptive information. We have nearly 2000 manuscript collections that have very little (to no) existing descriptive information. The only information that exists in many cases is a brief card catalog record. In some cases, this record does not contain the "basics" needed to create a more full record (date ranges, creator name, etc.). This means that additional research is required to create a finding aid that can be included with the others.	
Increasing number of descriptive tools and descriptive content to maintain.	Lack of full implementation of a content management system and temporary loss of certain functionalities associated with the new Arizona Archives Online site.	Growth of collections and reassignment of staff to duties in other departments. Lack of external funding opportunities for this work.
Indexing.	Transcribing the text of the manuscripts so that the text can be OCR indexed & searched by the end user.	Having the right equipment and the best process.
Labor.	Training.	
Lack of IT support.		
Lack of staff.	Lack of a professional archivist on staff.	
Lack of staff.	Inadequate intellectual control of collections.	No decision on standards.
Lack of standardization in legacy finding aids.	Time to create specifications for vendors to convert unusual finding aids.	Cost of outsourcing encoding.
Lack of standardization of legacy finding aids.	Some key information not in legacy finding aids, e.g., biography/history notes or scope notes.	Legacy finding aids are detailed to the item level.

Lack of sufficient archival processing staff and cataloging staff.	Lack of sufficient technical support for such things as system administration and troubleshooting.	Insufficient space for physically processing collections as a precursor to the creation of on-line finding aids (mostly EAD).
Legacy finding aids are incomplete and sometimes inaccurate and need substantial work to comply with Rules for Archival Description (RAD). Some are still handwritten.	Competing priorities. While Web access is beneficial, most of primary users are onsite faculty and graduate students and so initial focus is on preparing locally accessible finding aids.	Staff time and resource pressures. Focus is still on identifying/correcting content lists and staff have multiple and often competing priorities.
Limited resources.	Time intensiveness.	
Maintenance and updating existing files (and version control).		
Money, lack of.	Time, lack of.	Expertise and equipment, shortage of.
Not enough archivist staff for the size of our collection.	We have a large backlog of unprocessed collections including several very large collections (one collection is 2,600 linear feet).	Lack of a Content Management System.
Not enough staff or hours in the day.		
Not enough staff to do all the work required. One staff member in SCUA manages our Web site and adds information about collections to it, but this is not her primary responsibility; she is also our photo manager.	We don't have a staff member dedicated solely to this task.	
Personnel to retrospectively convert holographic finding aids into electronic text and then formulated into our Web site format.	Technical Support and a specific file sever for the division.	No in-house digitization program.
Prioritizing this work among other department needs.		
Resources needed to convert legacy finding aids to electronic format, and to reconfigure their structure to adhere to EAD, DACS and OAC requirements.	Resources (staff) needed for creating, editing, maintaining EAD finding aids.	

Shortage of available staff to process manuscript collections. Currently, there are no staff members assigned to assist in the arrangement and description of manuscript collections. Student workers and interns occasionally participate in these functions, but spend far less time on this than is actually needed.	Shortage of professional staff with the expertise and time to migrate manuscript collections to the Web. Only one full-time archivist has been trained to encode finding aids in EAD and this individual is also solely responsible for mounting such collections to the Web. This position has a number of other responsibilities that limit the amount of time that can be spent on such activities.	
Since no additional staff is available for encoding finding aids to migrate to the Web and money has not been available for outsourcing finding aid conversion, staff time devoted to encoding is taken from staff who would otherwise be reducing processing backlogs.	Multiple copies of expensive software must be purchased to enable archivists to create finding aids directly in EAD; this has only recently become possible. The size and complexity of our collections put constraints on the tools (such as Access databases and Archivists' Toolkit) that can be used for encoding.	The extent of our finding aids awaiting encoding will require more streamlined processes for conversion; we are still using tools initially developed more than ten years ago.
Staff resources.	Time.	
Staff resources including training for staff.	Finding an effective way to communicate between curatorial staff and technical staff.	Managing the need for predictable, structured information in the fundamentally fluid and unpredictable environment of manuscript collection.
Staff time to process collections.	Staff time to migrate legacy paper finding aids.	
Staff to convert legacy records to DACS and update the information in those records. Some of these records have minimal information.	Creation of templates — CSS (style sheets).	Staff to mark up finding aids for the Web.
Staff to do the work.		
Staff: not enough.	Time: not enough.	Money: not enough.
Staffing.	Equipment — both the quantity and necessary upgrades.	Workspace.

Staffing — there is not enough staff to handle the large accessioning and processing backlog never mind spend time to put information on the Web on a regular basis.	Expertise and training — the staff who spend time arranging and describing manuscript collections need training and guidance. One-on-one training has proven the most beneficial, but currently only the University Archivist is able to provide this training. He does so on an as needed basis.	Inconsistent legacy finding aids — As we review legacy finding aids we are discovering that some of them are missing the important elements to put online.
Technical support for getting all of our finding aid container lists added to our finding aids through implementation of archivists Toolkit.	Human resources and financial resources to accomplish this task in the midst of other vital priorities such as processing and preservation of collections—particularly special formats like AV and electronic records.	Greater availability means greater usage. Having our container lists available online will likely create an increase in requests for materials from offsite patrons, which will increase our workload and require us to revisit our policies and procedures.
Technical support.	Staffing.	
Technical support: available technical support is insufficient in quantity and in experience with EAD issues.	Time: EAD encoding and Web work takes away from processing time.	Legacy finding aids must be updated to meet professional standards and repository description guidelines before being put online.
The decentralized organization of manuscript collections has lead to a variety of practices and requirements for online collection descriptions.	We currently lack centralized and supported system architecture to encode descriptions and provide effective delivery and search to users.	A wide variety of legacy information, in terms of format and content, creates a barrier to systematic conversion.
The process is often time consuming especially when conducting a retrospective project for already processed finding aids that are either Word documents or paper documents.	Competing demands for staff time and the increasing need to prioritize projects.	The varying levels of technical competence among staff members in determining and implementing a variety of methods to train staff on new skills.
Time.	Money.	Technology.
Time.	Cost.	Cost.
Time.	Lack of inter-unit cooperation.	Money.
Time away from other responsibilities— reference, exhibitions, instruction, outreach, donor relations, collection development, etc. It's hard to fit in time to process manuscripts! Our increased online reference service takes away from staff time for processing collections.	Not enough staff to write collection descriptions. We have many collections that have undergone little or no processing.	Cleaning up database to be standardized for export to XML.

Time to create records.	At this point, no ability to search across collections other than a database that includes only a portion of our collections.	
Time, labour, and money.	Backlog of described collections.	Backlog of undescribed collections.
Time.	Staff, but overall we're well staffed. The problem is the amount of retrospective work left to do.	Keeping up with technology.
Time. I need more time to prepare more entries for the Web.	Staff. For the past few years I have been the only person in the department working on this. A few months ago, however, a Processing Archivist started and will soon begin working on the Web work.	Technology support. Until recently it was very difficult for me to add new entries or edit existing ones. Another person in IT had to do it for me. We now have a new Web Services department, and they have created easy interfaces that allow me to add materials myself.
Time-consuming to process collections.	Need more qualified staff to process and create finding aids. Although we all do processing, some of us can devote very little time to it.	Constant need to update information on the Web.
Training staff who are hesitant to learn new technologies.	Consistency.	Backlog.
Trying to explain archival functions and procedures to those not experienced in the archival profession.	Working with the challenges of XSLT style sheets.	
Uploading from GAMMS takes about 30 minutes per collection.	Staff time is limited.	
We have a large number of large collections with little or no processing.	We have limited staff and technical resources for the size of the project.	A perceived increase in online reference requests strains the staff time available for processing.
We've long ago put our finding aids into electronic form. Our current challenge is to keep up with creating EAD finding aids for the volume of material that we collect. The biggest challenge to migrating manuscripts themselves to the Web is deciding which to digitize.		

BENEFITS OF ONLINE MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

28. Please describe up to three benefits of migrating manuscript collections to the Web. N=61

Benefit 1	Benefit 2	Benefit 3
Access.	Access.	Access.
Access by the public.	Easy to refer patrons to relevant finding aids.	Patrons requesting boxes in advance, prior to visit.
Access to collection descriptions by remote users.	Ability to search across finding aids either in an institution-specific site or a larger database such as ArchiveGrid.	Saves researchers time when they arrive at the repository if they have access to the finding aid beforehand.
Access to collections for users is greatly enhanced.	Great for promoting collections.	Great for improving reference services.
Access to findings aid on Web.	Standardization of descriptions.	Focus on reducing backlog.
Access.		
Accessibility.	Searchability.	Usability.
Accessibility.	Standardization.	
Affords another path to accessibility.	Makes collection more searchable.	Peer institutions are doing it and patrons are more likely to expect this form of access.
Better access for researchers: As a policy, we do not photocopy paper finding aids for researchers. Having finding aids online helps them better plan their research trips and saves us from answering a lot of questions.	Standardization of archival description with EAD: New finding aids are being created consistently.	Dissemination of holdings to a wider audience: Collections previously hidden or discovered only by word of mouth through contact with staff or other researchers are now available for all to find.
Better access for researchers to our holdings.	Advertisement of our holdings creating a wider audience and more users.	Usage data to justify additional staff, to provide better stewardship to collection donors, to drive collection acquisition efforts
Better access worldwide.	Ease of data storage.	Ease of updating and adding to finding aid.
Collection visibility is the key benefit from migrating collection descriptions to the Web. From this benefit many others are derived, including making collections and specific items known to potential researchers, cross-collection searching, public relations, collection development, and many others.		

Collections are accessible globally.	Access can be unmediated.	Enhances profile of university and of the collections. Broader communications with and alerts to university and offsite researchers.
Dissemination & access.	Optimal exploitation of our collections.	Giving a great visibility to our collections.
Dramatically higher use of the collection resources. Last November 2007 our reference numbers matched those for the entire year of 1986.	Users know more about the collection and how it works before coming in for themselves or requesting services over the phone or e-mail.	The unified system (our collection management tool also serving as our public interface) has eliminated a great deal of confusion of users and our records center staff.
Ease of access.	Collection control and development.	Less wear on materials.
Easier and quicker access to collection descriptions for researchers both on campus and worldwide.	Staff can better access information this way. We usually go directly to NWDA for encoded finding aids, not OUR Web site.	
Easy access for patrons and greater use of manuscript materials.	Increased visibility of special collections repositories.	Placing collections online has the potential to generate new leads that can help develop existing collections.
Facilitating independent discovery of archival materials.		
Finding aids uploaded to the OAC become searchable across collections and institutions, thereby providing enhanced discoverability for researchers. Searches may lead to additional related resources not otherwise discoverable.	Finding aids on the OAC are discoverable through Google and other broadly used search engines.	Finding aids provide a basis to which digital surrogates may be linked.
Greater access for patrons; able to search subjects across collections and institutions. With full finding aids on the Web patron is able to indicate more clearly exactly what they need.	Visibility of collecting areas for potential donors.	A statistical analysis of collections searched by patrons allows us to determine the subjects researchers are most interested in. This assists us in collection development and in planning which collections should be cataloged next.
Greater access of collections for patrons who are not onsite.	Greater awareness of our department's wonderful collections.	
Greater access worldwide.	Increased understanding from researchers of our collections.	Ability to link related collections.
Greater access.	Satisfied researchers.	Feeling of accomplishment.

Having fond listings show up in search engines.	Attracting an international community of researchers to our holdings.	Simplified updates to our inventories.
Improved access.	Improved control of collection material.	
Improved access. More users are finding our collections.	Publicity for the institution and visibility for Special Collections.	Opens up possibilities for collection development, whether by gift or purchase.
Improved discovery of our collections.	Encoding has been incorporated into our regular workflow.	
Increased access.	Searchability.	
Increased access.	Provides a centralized location for collection information	Allows a greater searchability across collections
Increased access to the collections.	Researchers have access to more specific information about the collections, saving them time and allowing them to know what is here.	If appropriate, we can link digital images from a collection to the finding aid. We have linked images from collections of photographs to visual materials finding aids.
Increased access to the collections.	Major contributing factor in the successful move of collections to and the use of collections from our offsite storage facility.	Increased efficiency for public services staff who use this online information probably more than anyone — assisting patrons, searching across collections for selecting materials for classroom instruction, etc.
Increased awareness of primary research materials available.	Enhanced and expedited reference. Researchers can do preliminary research prior to arrival.	Increased visibility of repository and its resources, including recognition of donations (and donors) of collections.
Increased discoverability of collections by constituents.	Simultaneous access by more than one user.	Greater ability to manage physical collections.
Increased onsite patron visits and offsite reference inquiries.	More facile reference service.	Better/increased knowledge about our collections gained by prepping finding aids for Web delivery.
Increased public access to and visibility of collection materials.	Greatly enhanced searchability of collection materials.	Increased opportunities for discovery through consortia, Google, etc.

Increased usage. We have nearly tripled our use since we began adding our EAD-encoded finding aids to the Web. Researchers (especially those who are not "professional" researchers) are better able to find us and our collections.	Ease in working with undergraduates. We have had great success in bringing undergraduates into Special Collections, due in part to the finding aids and digitized materials on our Web site.	Collaboration. Bringing manuscript collections online means that they are easier to find outside of the walls of the repository. We can more readily locate institutions with collections similar to ours (and vice versa). This opens the door to potential collaborative efforts to bring together finding aids and digital images. Because our metadata is in a shareable, standard format, we could more easily participate in such an effort.
Increased use of collections.	Increased access to collection information helps users and staff.	Increased visibility and awareness of collections. This can lead to development opportunities and can attract more collections.
Increased user access to manuscript collections. Manuscript collections that are available online provide users with 24/7 access to collection information. Individuals unable to visit the repository can view collection information online at their convenience and submit reference/reproduction requests via the Web or by telephone. This allows a repository to expand its user-base exponentially.	Increased usage of manuscript collections onsite. Disseminating collection information online is a good way to increase visibility and leads to repository visits by researchers, scholars, and interested parties who need to obtain a more in-depth understanding of a specific collection's contents.	The opportunity to take advantage of Web 2.0 technologies. By having manuscript collections online, repositories have the option to employ the use of new technologies that allow for a more collaborative approach to finding aid creation.
Increased visibility and ease of information access for researchers.		
Increased visibility of collections and therefore increased collection use.	Easier for staff to access collection descriptions in one place.	Can provide information more easily to patrons when answering reference questions that include information in the finding aids.
Increased visibility to potential users.	Common location for information about manuscripts and archival collections available anywhere there is network access.	Less wear and tear on the originals along with improved retrieval.
Increased visibility/accessibility by staff and users.	Ability to collocate similar and related resources across institutions.	Ability to integrate more detailed metadata in other access tools (online catalogs, institutional repositories, etc.)

Increases use of the collections by making their information more visible.	Once we implement DLXS researchers will be able to do cross-collection finding aid searching across several units.	
Make collections more accessible.		
Making our finding aids/collections available to all.		
Much higher visibility for collections and increased use.		
Online access enhances the visibility of Penn State Special Collections in general, promoting awareness of unique Libraries' resources. We are partners in the ArchivesGrid site which reciprocally enhances access to resources for Penn State researchers.	More users find collections and there is more use of existing holdings.	There is the potential for more users to complete reference work before they come into the Libraries. We have not assessed this in any way.
Over time, will allow primary users to conduct at least preliminary research off site.	Assist staff in locating and retrieving materials consistently.	
Remote access.	Preservation of information.	Improved findability and searching.
Remote access 24/7.	Digital content is harvestable and machine searchable.	Digital content can be sliced and diced and combined with other digital content in unimaginably numerous ways.
Researchers benefit from advance access to finding aids and can make their onsite visits more productive; our reading room remains very busy and many researchers approach the desk with printouts from the finding aid in hand.	Library's holdings are well publicized in our online catalog, by inclusion in the online catalog (with links from the catalog records to the online finding aids), and by inclusion in ArchiveGrid.	Online access, with the ability to search across collections, increases usability of the finding aids and facilitates research discovery and use of our material.
Researchers find the finding aids via Google searches and learn about materials we own that they were not aware of.	Web finding aids help researchers determine more readily of collections may hold information in which they're interested and be specific in requesting boxes and folders.	
Scholars worldwide have greater access to our collections.	Because our finding aids are so detailed, researchers have a very good idea of just what documents are in each folder.	Staff can consult online finding aids to assist researchers on-site and off-site.

There is far more use of our materials from patrons around the world. E-mail requests for publication rights to reproduce images from our materials has soared.	This allows for 24-hour access to our materials at any desktop or laptop computer.	It lessens the need to handle the original items.
This provides our users a way to search our manuscript collections--they've never been able to do this before.	Having finding aids and collection information on the Web brings users to our Web site who may never have come there otherwise.	It's making our reference work a little easier. Patrons now email, call, or come in person to see a collection and already know the exact box they need in a collection. This gives our reference staff more time to help other patrons.
Use of EAD enables collocation of cross institutional search results.	Patrons arrive at the repository with accurate descriptive information, reducing the time needed for the reference interview.	Brief descriptions on the Web enable us to demonstrate the value of our collections and create opportunities for external support when individuals need prompt access to materials.
Visibility for researchers.	Visibility for library staff.	Trying to create a union catalog of finding aids for all archives.
Wider audience.	Easier to search digital formats; better reference quality.	Promotes preservation.
Wider availability.	Access.	Control of resources.

USAGE TRACKING

29. Does the library track the usage of either print or online finding aids? Check all that apply. N=64

	Yes	No
In-house finding aids	9	51
Online finding aids	28	34

If yes, please briefly describe the tracking method.

In-house finding aids tracking method N=10

"Circulation use of our in-house printed finding aids. Check out records of our manuscript collections."

"Hard copy use forms filled out by patrons."

"Keep statistics from paper records."

"Reader registration forms."

"Standard Webalizer application for the entire library."

"Statistics."

"Through patron registration records."

"Usage observations."

"We tabulate monthly statistics on how many manuscripts collections get used per month."

"Well, we don't track use of finding aids, we track use of collections."

Online finding aids tracking method N=29

"123 log analyzer — currently set up to report top 200 hits on library Web site but can request a report that shows all hits of departmental pages."

"ACCESS database."

"Apache Web server logs tell us which EAD files have been accessed and when."

"Counted as part of statistical analysis."

"Customized system, locally designed to track page views."

"Electronically generated reports showing number of hits, downloads, etc."

"Hits on finding aids on Web sites."

"Institutional IT staff generates annual Web statistics which permit us to see which finding aids are viewed."

"IT Web statistics."

"OAC provides contributing institutions with statistics on finding aid usage."

"Occasional non-scientific examination of Web traffic data provided by commercial Web analytics software (Web Trends)."

"Run statistical reports."

"Sort of search data on the NWDA server at Washington State University. Done infrequently."

"Statistics from the Online Archive of California."

"Statistics provided on the OAC."

"The computer applications unit can run reports to count the number of request for different pages from 2004 to the present."

"Tracking of Web access."

"Urchin."

"We do not track individual digital finding aids, nor finding aids as a group. The Libraries has some general tools for counting and analyzing 'hits' of files, and this might give us some information. Since our finding aids have been harvested by any number of search engines and other projects, however, I doubt there is a realistic way to gather much useful information about how and by whom they are used. Our perception, however, is that where in-house finding aids were rarely sought out, when we now place a finding aid online, we very frequently have in our in-boxes, within a matter of days, a reader request relating to the collection. This does not _always_ happen, of course, but frequently enough to suggest that online finding aids are found in ways that in-house documents could not and were not found."

"We observe at a high level, the number of hits to our online finding aid pages. In January 2008, the top 100 pages visited on our Web site included 5,000 visits to the finding aids. (This does not include hits to subsequent levels of the finding aids.)"

"We use a statistic database to keep track off finding aid usage."

"Web logs record which documents (finding aids) were opened and how often."

"Web page statistics through the Online Archive of California. Of course, through Web statistics you cannot tell how a person is using the finding aid, or if the finding aid was even useful for their informational needs."

"Web Tracker."

"Web tracking."

"Web tracking software allows us to see general Web statistics for all online finding aids. This provides some vague but useful information."

"Web usage logs provide a gross picture of discovery and usage."

"We've just implemented Google analytics in Arizona Archives Online and we look forward to seeing data."

"When patrons request a collection in the reference room they are asked how they found out about a collection. We record these answers. At this point, this is the only usage tracking we are doing."

30. **Does there appear to be any difference in the frequency of use of in-house and online finding aids? N=41**

Yes, online finding aids are used more	33	81%
Yes, in-house finding aids are used more	5	12%
No, they are used about the same	3	7%

Selected Comments from Respondents

Yes, online finding aids are used more
"All finding aids are online."

"Almost all of our reference requests come to us via e-mail and specifically cite the finding aid that the researcher has consulted online."

"Computers are available to patrons in the reading room. From there, they can browse our online finding aids. This tends to be the first place that our researchers turn. In some cases, after searching online, they use our card catalog located in the reading room. We do not provide paper copies of online finding aids."

"Knowledge gained by casual observations of reference staff."

"Online finding aids are seen by more but not necessarily put to better or more significant use."

"Online information is used more, both the EAD finding aids and the collection descriptions on the Web site."

"The types of reference requests we receive indicate that the online finding aids are used more often than in-house finding aids."

"There are no numbers to back this up at the moment but it standard reference practice to go to the online finding aids first, then to the paper as the next level of research if something isn't found."

"This is only an impression that I have, based on the increase in the number of e-mail requests and long-distance users."

"We don't produce paper finding aids anymore. We use the online finding aids in-house."

"We have no in-house finding aids available to the public. All our finding aids are either online or in published form as monographs."

"We have not assessed the use of in-house finding aids; this answer reflects an impression."

Yes, in-house finding aids are used more

"Impression of staff involved."

"It is hard to answer this question because you don't define use. Since we do not provide container lists with our online finding aids, to use our collections, it is necessary to visit the onsite versions or request that specific container lists be e-mailed or mailed. We get lots of casual and preliminary browsing to the collections area of our Web site, but would be difficult to correlate this use with the use that leads to a request for material."

"Only because most of our collections don't have online finding aids."

"Presently there are more print-only finding aids than online finding aids. Outside users tend to rely on online finding aids, while onsite researchers rely on in-house finding aids."

"We have many more in-house finding aids right now so their usage statistics (if we had them) would be higher."

No, they are used about the same

"About the same number of researchers use collections without online finding aids, as use collections with online finding aids (i.e., some collections have only online aids, others have only in-house aids)."

"Since we don't track the use of in-house finding aids, we can't really tell."

Other

"Can't evaluate this yet."

"Difficult to assess."

"I was not aware until I began this survey that these online usage stats are available, so I cannot say which are used more."

"Impossible to determine in the absence of statistics for use of online finding aids. Researchers in reading room use both. Researchers who contact the reading room by mail, e-mail, or telephone are directed to online finding aids whenever possible."

"Unable to determine because the usage is not tracked."

"We do not have in-house finding aids."

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

31. Please enter any additional information regarding manuscript collections at your library that may assist the author in accurately analyzing the results of this survey. N=20

Selected Comments from Respondents

"A preliminary in-house box list is done for each collection to allow us to place collections into storage. We have pretty good control over our collections in-house. However, only 9.4% of our collections are fully processed."

"At Notre Dame all modern manuscripts are held in the University Archives, which is administratively separate from the University Library system."

"At our institution we consider any unpublished materials that aren't official university records to be manuscript collections. Our manuscript collections are diverse—we have everything from plantation records to Congressional papers to women's club records."

"At Western we do not formally segregate university records from MSS collections in the archives so some arbitrary decisions were made in responding for physical content (especially unprocessed) and time devoted to MSS work by staff."

"Because of the wide variety of types and levels of inventories no effort was made to count those that included series."

"Comment regarding question 11: All have been converted; we don't have legacy finding aids at UCSD."

"Given the decentralized nature of special collections here, it is difficult to report accurately the investment of staff resources in processing manuscripts. Many small departments have many things to do."

"Historical Collections and Labor Archives is one unit of the Special Collections Library at Penn State-University Park. With a total of nearly 950 collections, we are the smallest unit. Special Collections has developed a database and is currently committing staff to describing all collections at the collection level in order to automate

the export of valid EADs for each collection. We consider all staff who are working on the description project to be involved in 'putting manuscript description online.'"

"Indiana University Archives also holds manuscript collections. At the Lilly Library, we do not keep statistics on several of the questions you asked and I have left those questions blank."

"It's difficult to parse the work on university records separately from manuscript collections. None of our staff is dedicated to arrangement and description, we all have broader responsibility."

"Mainly I'm concerned that you realize that there are manuscript collections in the University of Oregon Archives collections. The finding aids to these collections are processed and finding aids encoded and collections cataloged just like the manuscript collections."

"MIT has approximately 600 manuscript collections, ranging from a few or single items to over 200 cubic feet of material. Most of the collections are those of former or current MIT professors."

"Our collections are very large—typically 100 linear feet or more. This makes providing access to the container lists a challenge and a goal."

"Our institution is currently in the process of redesigning the portion of our Web site that provides access to manuscript collections. Each collection will receive its own dedicated page which lists collection title, collection number, extent, description, date, subject, and access notes. There will also be links present on this page directing users to additional information including finding aids, catalog records, or item listings. Finding aids will be hosted locally using an XSLT style sheet and MARC records will be created for all manuscript collections."

"Rare Books: The manuscript collections are still generally under-organized and under-described. Despite regular accession, there has never been the staff to undertake organization except at a very minimum level. Furthermore, the whole question of Web access is one that has not been addressed. Osler: We find that the RAD entries on our Web page are generating a lot of interest & use."

"These answers apply to the manuscripts held by the U-M University Library. We report ARL statistics for the University Library together with several independent libraries on the U-M campus, including the Bentley Historical Library, which holds over 40,000 additional linear feet of manuscripts."

"Two separate units are represented in the answers above: University Archives Rare Books & Special Collections (Manuscripts Collections)."

"We are continually providing greater access to manuscript collections. Our next areas of work concern thematic access and digital collections."

"We currently have three vacant positions in our technical processing area—Acquisitions Specialist, Technical Services (processing) Archivist, and Head, Special Collections Technical Services. Some of the statistics are based on 2006–early 2007 figures, which are the latest I have."

"We make an effort to create many levels of access to our collections. This survey touched upon EAD finding aids and collection-level descriptions. We also create access to collections through online exhibits: http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/archives/exhibit.html. Two other areas of the University Libraries have small collections of manuscripts: the Law Library (http://law.lib.buffalo.edu/departments/info-services/collections/Finding-Aids/index.asp) and the Music Library. The Music Library has a sort of middle online category: older forms of inventories that would not now be considered finding aids, that have been put into HTML format for online

access. These collections often require a fair amount of work to re-process to align with current practices and demonstrated patterns of use. http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/music/special.html. Law has one librarian who spends 25% of her time arranging and describing manuscript collections, 25% on adding ms collection information to the Web, and 50% on reference and library instruction. Law has 114 linear feet of processed collections. 7 collections are processed at the folder-level; 7 are represented on the Web site; 9 finding aids (all marked up in EAD) are on the Web site (7 for mss collections, 2 for records collections). Law does not create MARC records for mss collections. Music has one librarian who spends 40% of his time arranging and describing collections, 20% on adding information to the Web, and 40% on reference and cataloging. Music has 429 linear feet of processed collections and 109 feet of unprocessed collections. 49 collections have been processed at the folder level; 5 collections have been provided with item-level description to provide access to musical works; 41 collections are represented on the Web; 33 finding aids are on the Web; 13 are marked up in EAD. Music creates MARC records for mss collections; 34 collections have MARC records."

"We use templates for EAD encoding, which allows students to help."

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

University at Albany, SUNY

University of Alberta

Boston College

Boston Public Library

Brigham Young University

University of British Columbia

Brown University

University at Buffalo, SUNY

University of California, Berkeley

University of California, Davis

University of California, Irvine

University of California, Los Angeles

University of California, San Diego

University of Chicago

University of Colorado at Boulder

Colorado State University

Columbia University

University of Connecticut

Cornell University

University of Delaware

Emory University

University of Florida

Florida State University

George Washington University

Georgia Institute of Technology

University of Guelph

University of Hawaii at Manoa

University of Houston

Howard University

University of Illinois at Chicago

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Indiana University Bloomington

University of Iowa

Iowa State University

Johns Hopkins University

University of Kansas

Kent State University

University of Kentucky

University of Louisville

University of Manitoba

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

University of Miami

Michigan State University

University of Minnesota

Université de Montréal

University of Nebraska–Lincoln

New York Public Library

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

North Carolina State University

Ohio State University

University of Oklahoma

Oklahoma State University

University of Oregon

University of Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania State University

Purdue University

Rutgers University

University of Saskatchewan

University of Southern California

Syracuse University

University of Tennessee

University of Texas at Austin

University of Utah

Vanderbilt University

University of Virginia

University of Washington

Washington State University

Washington University in St. Louis

University of Waterloo

Wayne State University

University of Western Ontario

University of Wisconsin–Madison

Yale University

York University