

Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives: Building a New Research Environment

A proposal to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Submitted by the
Council on Library and Information Resources
September 19, 2012

Introduction

The Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) requests from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation a sixth annual round of operational funding for the Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives program in the amount of \$299,115 for the grant period January 1, 2013 to September 30, 2017. As we approach the end of this program's first five years, we reflect upon how the evolving online research environment is changing the relationship of special collections and archives to scholarship, as well as upon how our program might respond to this shift in ways that encourage greater efficiency and coherence while decreasing redundancy across institutional and national borders. We also reflect upon the values of this program that we believe remain relevant and important in today's context, as well as describe some new directions we wish to take in the coming year.

- Section 1. Project Description**
- Section 2. Evolving Practices and Concerns**
- Section 3. Five-year Assessment**
- Section 4. Proposed Application and Review Process**
 - *Proposed change to program requirements*
 - *Proposed change to program eligibility*
 - *Proposed change to disbursement of award funds*
- Section 5. Proposed Outreach Activities**
 - *Site visits*
 - *Hidden Collections online community, meetings, and webinars*
 - *Incentivizing collaboration*
- Section 6. Reporting to the Foundation**

Section 1. Project Description

In 2008, the Council on Library and Information Resources approached the Foundation with a proposal designed to address a national issue that had attracted a great deal of attention in the previous decade [See **Appendix 2. Hidden Collections History**]: the pervasive and growing problem of inaccessibility to United States special collections and archives due to increased accession rates and outdated practices for cataloging and archival description. Since that time, the Foundation has invested nearly \$16 million in grant projects designed to reveal previously hidden collections of high scholarly value, using the most up-to-date and efficient standards and practices and the most innovative approaches to connecting collections with the researchers, faculty, students, and others who need them. With nearly 30% of these projects complete, an impressive array of valuable cultural materials is newly available to the public.

Through its first five years, the Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives grant program has continued to receive steady numbers of applicants--with far more quality applications than are possible to fund. These applications have come from a wide range of cultural heritage institutions holding diverse materials. The new [Hidden Collections Registry](#), built upon data received through the program's request for proposals, reflects this diversity: not only are hidden books, photographs, manuscripts, and artworks nominated for cataloging, but increasing numbers of audio and audiovisual formats, maps, architectural drawings, artifacts, and items of ephemera are brought to the attention of reviewers each year. This Registry serves as a resource for potential applicants, scholars, and CLIR staff and has been an important instrument for the program assessment justifying this request.

Under current guidelines, the primary criterion that reviewers use to evaluate Hidden Collections proposals is their potential national impact on scholarship and teaching. The second and third criteria are: innovative and/or highly efficient approaches to description that could serve as models for others, and the adoption of workflow and outreach practices that maximize connections to scholarly and other user communities. Standards applied for processing and description must provide interoperability and long-term sustainability for project data in the online environment. Applicants may nominate collections of any format and from any field worthy of national attention, but the collections in question must be truly hidden, that is, they must not currently be discoverable by users accustomed to working within the related subject domains, either through digital or analog means. A single standing panel of highly qualified scholarly and professional experts evaluates proposals and makes recommendations to CLIR and the Foundation for funding. Most U.S.-based not-for-profit cultural heritage institutions are eligible for the program.

Section 2. Evolving Practices and Concerns

In its original 2008 proposal, CLIR argued that the problem of hidden collections owed much to professionals' rigid adherence to traditional approaches to description, and to their resistance to implementing new national standards, vocabularies, or web-based technologies that supported federated searching of catalogs. This proposal claimed, "the shift to understanding the hidden collections problem as a national responsibility entails an acknowledgement that for the twenty-

first century collaboration, coordination, and coherence of response of cultural institutions to the community of users is fundamental and takes precedence over local practice.” Today, it is clear that this shift has taken place. Due to increased attention to the problem at a national level, librarians, archivists, and curators have become increasingly open to more efficient, standardized, and collaborative approaches to creating access to their collections. A look at events and developments over the past decade [See **Appendix 2. Hidden Collections History**] shows how the Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives program is part of an even larger series of developments and changes that have moved the cultural heritage professions forward toward more sustainable, coordinated collections management. Most recently the incorporation of digitized and born digital content into this management philosophy has gained national prominence, along with a growing awareness that the blending of digital content, digital surrogates of analog content, and descriptions of analog content within an effective online research environment demand rethinking institutional priorities, funding patterns, and staffing strategies throughout the higher education and cultural heritage sectors.

For evidence of these emerging concerns one need look no further than the programs of recent professional conferences. The themes of collaboration across institutional types, changing roles and responsibilities for archivists and special collections librarians, new approaches to processing “born digital” collections, the publication and sharing of linked open data, and devising new data curation and preservation services now pervade conversations about the future of higher education and cultural heritage. A blunt “[Join or Die](#)” was adopted as the title and theme of the 2010 ALA Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Pre-Conference. New cross-professional events such as the [International Linked Open Data in Libraries Archives and Museums Summit](#) held June 2-3, 2011, in San Francisco, have whetted appetites for new solutions to shared problems; one of those instrumental in the “LOD-LAM” movement originating at this Summit, Jon Voss subsequently delivered an address titled “Radically Open Cultural Heritage Data on the Web” at the Museums and the Web conference, SXSW Interactive 2012, and the most recent annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists (SAA). The issues of data curation and preservation, and archivists’ collective responsibility for these activities, were also major themes of the SAA meeting this August. For example, Joel Wurl, Senior Program Officer at the National Endowment for the Humanities, spoke on a panel on research data curation, where he emphasized that the appraisal of digital and digitized collections and archives in light of their potential as data for future research is essential for progress in the humanities. While it is not at all certain what the shift from thinking about digital cultural heritage in terms of collections to thinking about it as research data might mean in practical terms,¹ it is already clear that archivists and librarians need to engage with the producers of digital special collections and archives to prevent unmanageable digital backlogs from accruing or, worse, the permanent loss of irreplaceable cultural heritage. Library, archive, and museum professionals need to devise sensible (and selective) approaches to providing

¹As evidence of the tentative grasp of the professional community on these issues, the most recent SAA publication, *How to Manage Processing in Archives and Special Collections* (by Pam Hackbart-Dean and Elizabeth Slomba), is disappointingly brief and vague in its discussion of the appraisal and processing of digital archives.

appropriate levels of description for the mass quantities of multifaceted data that will shape how tomorrow's scholars will understand today's culture.

Section 3. Five-year Assessment

In order to better assess the impact of this program over the past five years, CLIR staff examined several kinds of evidence, including application statistics [See **Appendix 3. Application statistics, 2008-2012**] and data available through the new Hidden Collections Registry:

<http://www.clir.org/hiddencollections/registry>

The Registry is now up-to-date and reflects all unique program proposals submitted to date. As noted in CLIR's most recent annual report to the Foundation, submitted in July, the size and makeup of the application pool have varied over time due to several factors, including changes to the submission and review calendar and clarifications to the program guidelines, but there have been no evident trends that suggest either increased or decreased demand for support. On the whole, application numbers remain healthy and the applicant pool is consistently diverse in terms of type of organization and geographic location. Although no quotas have been enforced upon the review panel, their selections have consistently reflected the institutional diversity of the applicant pool during the past four cycles. Once the current review period is complete, program staff will be able to judge how representative the newest recipients of Hidden Collections grants will be, but at present the thirty-eight remaining candidates in the 2012 cycle include a good variety of institutions, locations, and collection formats. While in the past the largest numbers of awards have gone to academic institutions or academic institutional consortia (34 out of the 65 grants, or 52%), this proportion is actually slightly less than the proportion of academic to non-academic institutions represented in the pool: collections held at academic institutions make up 58% of the Registry. The one clear trend among program applicants is a gradual decrease in the average amount of funds requested; the amount requested averaged \$246,675 in 2008 and \$188,184 in 2012. This trend has allowed the program to award a greater number of grants to worthy recipients in recent years; in 2008, 15 applicants received grants while in 2011, the program granted 19 awards. Staff expect this trend toward smaller awards to hold for 2012.

In May, CLIR distributed a survey to all past Hidden Collections grant recipients; an initial summary of survey results was included in the July 2012 annual report to the Foundation and is also included with this request [See **Appendix 4. Recipient survey findings, May-June 2012**]. Although results are tentative since the majority of the respondents are in the midst of or have only very recently begun project work,² the survey suggests that on the whole recipients have been satisfied with their experiences with the program and their work. The testaments of

² 49 out of the 65 total grants are for projects still in progress, 19 of these were only a few months into the project at the time of the survey.

respondents strongly suggest that, at least so far, the Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives Program is serving the needs it was designed to meet:

- "Funding had several key impacts, including the opening of important collections, greater research use, and higher visibility of the repository and thus an increase in acquisitions. Additionally, the CLIR project allowed us to examine processing practices, measure effort and outputs, and assess the quality and impact of output. The assessment methods put into place for the CLIR project have been used across our other functions with the result that we have improved the efficiency and effectiveness of our whole operation.... [W]e are now teaching assessment methods to others regionally and nationally."
- "The...program has been instrumental in enabling us to establish a set of best practices for cataloging materials that have been minimally described in a variety of ways by the variety of departments through which they are dispersed. ... The approach...draws on existing standards and supports detailed yet simplified description that responds to known user needs. Additionally, we have been able to leverage these cataloging efforts to acquire funding for conservation and digitization efforts.... Finally, the CLIR funding has also enabled us to devote staff time to sharing this new approach with a number of other institutions, who have indicated interest in following the same model and contributing records to an aggregated resource."
- "Participation in CLIR Hidden Collections has 1) improved the curatorial standards for our archival material; 2) allowed us to develop an online database of finding aids using a combination of student and staff funded through the program; 3) made it possible for potential users to actually find that we even have content!; 4) unexpectedly, allowed us to engage with a whole new part of the university and wider community, by bringing in people with an interest in history, anthropology, art and photography to offer their help with our project; 5) motivated people within our own museum community to begin organizing their own future archives better; 6) added immense value to our primary...collections by making explicit the relationship between the archival materials and the collections objects and making this information apparent to researchers."
- "Receipt of the grant...has increased visibility of the partner institutions and facilitated publicizing the newly cataloged collections. Funding enabled us to hire and train over 15 undergraduate and graduate students, exposing the students from a myriad of academic disciplines to historical collections.... Cataloging Hidden Collections not only provides access to collections for scholars, but also enables staff to better understand contents when planning future digitization projects."
- "The project funding has allowed us to partner with other institutions and show value in that collaboration."

In addition to their general enthusiasm, a full eighty-eight percent (88%) of respondents reported that progress on their projects had met their expectations, while seventy-seven percent (77%) indicated that they had met (48%) or exceeded (29%) processing goals to date. In addition, a notable 64% of survey respondents reported that their institutional cataloging backlog had

“decreased slightly” or “decreased significantly” since receiving the grant. Finally, an encouraging eighty-one percent (81%) reported that the collections cataloged or processed through their grant have been used in some way since they received the award. They name a wide variety of types of uses, including research for scholarly essays, journal articles, or monographs (56%); institutional blogs (54%); student research papers (46%); live (44%) and online (20%) exhibits; theses or dissertations (39%); or local (29%) or outside (15%) courses. Despite these successes, twenty-nine percent (29%) still indicated that their collections had not yet attracted as many users as they had originally hoped. Given this program's relative youth in relation to the pace of scholarship, however, this minority's pessimism may reasonably be called premature.

Unanticipated difficulties reported in the survey echo the same challenges described in project reports: the most common are delays in staffing; a full fifty-eight percent (58%) of survey respondents indicated they had experienced delays in hiring project workers. Other personnel issues affecting some projects include staff turnover, illness, or retention of student assistants. Dealing with collections that are more disorganized than previously thought has been another common challenge, particularly in projects involving very large collections or recent acquisitions. These kinds of circumstances, coupled with the tight turnaround between award notification and the project start date (currently between January 1 and March 1), exacerbated delays and prevented some projects from proceeding on schedule. With greater time for planning and hiring in advance of the grant period, future recipients could address some of these difficulties more quickly and successfully.

When asked what affected their ability to control backlogs, respondents rated the following factors, from most to least important:

Factors	% respondents rating 6+ (on a 10-point scale)
More funding for professional staff.	83%
More funding for digitization, digital reformatting, and digital processing (scanning/OCR, digital photography, digital forensics) to enable automated or crowdsourced processing.	58%
Better training in cataloging and processing.	56%
More funding for student workers.	48%
More dedicated space for cataloging and processing.	46%
More funding for technical equipment (computers, servers, licenses) for cataloging and processing.	42%

Better, more efficient software for cataloging and processing.	38%
Clearer standards for describing the types of collections in our backlog.	36%
A more minimal approach to cataloging and processing at our institution.	30%
Better collaborations with external partners in cataloging and processing efforts.	18%

Since it is the single largest investment made through this program, the solid placement of professional staffing at the top of this list of factors is not especially surprising, yet this emphasis underlines a continuing need for salary support for special collections and archives catalogers and processors. This suggests that despite the opportunities to develop new practices and acquire new skills afforded by their projects, a majority of respondents feel that managing backlogs going forward will require additional outside help. Other factors rated highly include support for training and for student workers; once again, as these make up significant proportions of this program's grant budgets their emphasis here in the survey may have been a foregone conclusion; nevertheless, these rankings support the argument that this program's current configuration still meets key needs for its constituents.

The emphasis on digitization and providing greater access to digital collections reflects both the expectations of users of special collections and archives as well as the aspirations of librarians and archivists to achieve full online access to their collections.³ However unrealistic these expectations and aspirations might be in the near term, it remains clear that innovations in cataloging and indexing technologies for digital materials that maximize access and efficiency are sorely needed.

Section 4. Proposed Application and Review Process

On May 8, 2012, CLIR staff met with Foundation representatives to discuss the future of the Hidden Collections program in light of how best practices in cataloging and processing have changed in recent years. This fruitful discussion underlined which values and guidelines it was most important to maintain in a possible future incarnation of the program, and which might be adjusted. The discussion concluded with an agreement that the following aspects of the current program should remain unchanged:

1. scholarly significance of collections should remain the primary criterion for evaluation of proposals going forward;

³ Notably, several Hidden Collections projects have managed to incorporate digitization into their project workflows by securing institutional or outside funds to supplement their grants. In at least one case (The College of Charleston) grant recipients made significant changes to their approach to cataloging one large collection because they decided to first digitize, then describe it.

2. the sensible adoption of professional tools and standards, technical approaches that maximize efficient throughput, and demonstrable efforts to engage scholars and students in project work should remain secondary requirements;
3. the focus should remain on genuinely hidden collections, that is unprocessed collections for which there is no current means of intellectual access (in other words, not including retrospective conversion of analog records to digital form);
4. at their discretion, reviewers would continue to be able to give preference to collaborative initiatives over projects based at a single institution;
5. the program should strive to reach the widest possible breadth of institution types and covering the widest range of material formats and subject matter, although no quotas for achieving this kind of diversity should be imposed upon the review panel;
6. the single standing panel, with small numbers of panelists rotating on and off as schedules permit, should remain the instrument for proposal assessment; and
7. program officers should continue to focus on administration of the two-phase review process and outreach to recipients only.

Beginning in 2013, CLIR proposes three alterations to the Hidden Collections program's administration. The first two proposed relate to program requirements and eligibility, the third to a possible change in the disbursement of program funds to grantees.

Proposed change to program requirements

The greatest change to program requirements from previous years would be in its notion of *innovation*. While a value of the program since its inception, "innovation" in cataloging and processing practice has been defined loosely. Distinguishing a particular practice or project plan as "innovative" has been left to the discretion of applicants and review panelists. Should this program continue, the program's standard for innovation would be clarified by offering examples of kinds of innovations illustrated by specific initiatives, such as the following:

1. developing methods to create access to born-digital materials through data mining, indexing, or forensic techniques;
2. establishing best practices for processing mixed analog/digital collections;
3. "crowdsourced," rapid or automated indexing of collections currently being digitized (using institutional or other outside resources) or having previously been digitized without the production of descriptive metadata⁴; or

⁴ An example of the latter case might be a collection that had been rapidly digitized in response to major preservation issues (flood damage, mold, vinegar syndrome, etc.), or for the purposes of a specific research project without attention to creating access for later users. Whereas administrative metadata (filename, file format, date of digitization) may be available, without the attachment of descriptive metadata such as a title, creator, or date of original creation to such collections, they may still qualify as "hidden" to researchers. Currently, it is unclear how many "hidden" digitized collections of high scholarly value there might be, but since these types of materials would lend themselves to rapid or automated approaches rather than the item-by-item treatment traditionally given to rare and special collections, it is possible that developing best practices in these cases would be easily extensible to producing quality intellectual access in the context of the mass digitization projects that are now becoming more common in special collections and archives.

4. developing ways to publish and openly share linked data for hidden special collections and archives.

The concept of innovation would not be limited to these examples. An applicant might propose an innovation of another kind, but their proposal would be expected to address a cataloging or processing challenge that is similarly widespread and largely unaddressed.

Unlike in years past, applicants would not be *required* to demonstrate innovation, but instead would be encouraged to do so where possible. For those proposals that convincingly argue for a truly innovative approach, review panelists would be allowed greater leeway in evaluating project budgets. Where a project would require some degree of software development, for example, this would be an allowable expense in the case of a convincingly innovative proposal, yet not allowable in the case of a project that is merely adopting current best practice. This new approach to encouraging innovation will allow more freedom to those applicants taking on greater risks without prejudice to those applicants merely interested in adopting “traditional” models that maximize throughput.

In the final review, the panel would not be required to fund a specific proportion of “traditional” to “innovative” projects (for instance, having that proportion reflect the proportion of both types of proposals in the pool). Instead, program staff will devise a single point system to be applied to both categories of proposals, providing a way for the highest scoring proposals of each type to be compared with one another. Program staff will prepare detailed guidelines dictating the kinds of expenses that are allowable in the budgets of the two categories of proposals for the benefit of both reviewers and applicants.

To support this change in program requirements, CLIR proposes to add the following three questions to the current application form to reflect the expanded scope of the program while making clear its limitations.

1. Describe models that have informed or inspired your project’s design and why they are well suited to your project’s aims and/or describe how your project will serve as a model for others.
2. Describe in detail all expected project outcomes, including any intellectual property rights or restrictions related to these outcomes (e.g., new software that may be created during the course of the project).
3. *For applicants proposing a collaborative project or partnership:* Explain how the collaboration or partnership advances the missions of the collaborating institutions and enhances the capacity of each partner to provide access to its collections and support the creation of new knowledge. Describe any additional benefits afforded by the project that would not be possible if the partners worked individually. (*Note:* In the event that the collaboration includes a non-U.S. institution, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that the U.S. institution is not merely a fiscal agent [see *Proposed change to program eligibility*, below]).

Finally, applicants will be required to state clearly whether their projects represent single institutions or collaborations (currently this information is only sought in an appendix to the applicant's Project Plan). This will help program staff better track trends related to collaboration among applicants and recipients over time.

A more minor change in requirements relates to project timelines. Through the 2012 cycle, recipients were required to begin their projects between January 1 and March 1 of each year. Because grantees are not notified of awards until quite late in the previous year, many have struggled to set up activities following notification (see **Section 3. Five-year Assessment**, above). The delays are most often due to the amount of time required to recruit and hire new staff, as explained by one of the respondents to the recent recipient survey:

We are in the first 6 months of our CLIR grant, and have made progress in material discovery including retrieving archives to be processed.... However, we did not anticipate the length of time to classify and open up a job ad...at our university. Had we known we would have stated that the Archivist position would not start until halfway through Year 1 or until Year 2 of the grant.

Accordingly, CLIR proposes to lengthen the time period in 2013 that grantees may begin their projects to between January 1 and June 1.

Proposed change to program eligibility

The second kind of change proposed is the extension of eligibility to some non-U.S. institutions. Since the program's inception, CLIR has regularly been contacted by those working with special collections at institutions in Canada, Europe and beyond who are enthusiastic about the Hidden Collections initiative and eager to participate. CLIR's website statistics reveal that the program's webpages are frequently read by non-domestic visitors. To date, however, participation in Hidden Collections projects has been exclusively restricted to U.S. institutions.

The primary reason for this change is simple: in an increasingly global networked environment national border restrictions make less intellectual sense in the domains of research and education. Currently applicants are required to be either a college or university institution or registered as 501(c) 3 not-for-profit organization. Determining the equivalent eligibility for non-U.S. institutions would be difficult. Reviewers would be expected to assess the viability of project plans in organizations that may operate differently from those in the U.S.; program staff would be required to monitor the progress of the projects and ensure that staff at non-U.S. organizations were fully included in any and all program-related activities. And there are legal matters to consider: for instance, funds disbursed to non-U.S. entities may not be easily retrieved should a project go awry.

To address these issues, CLIR proposes a pilot project for 2013: allowing Canadian institutions to participate in the Hidden Collections program as *supporting* partners in collaborations with

U.S. institutions holding related collections. The U.S. institution would receive and manage the funds, with the Canadian partner serving as a subcontractor on the project. There is precedent for this within the Hidden Collections program, as it is already the case that collaborative proposals are submitted under the aegis of one institution that receives all project funds on behalf of its partners. Further, the U.S. institution would be required to demonstrate the ways in which the proposed subcontracting relationship with the Canadian institution would advance its own cataloging activities; the U.S. institution must prove itself to be the primary applicant with substantive work of its own, not merely an agent for the Canadian institution.

Section 5. Proposed Outreach Activities

In addition to adjustments to the guidelines and application and review process noted above, CLIR proposes to enhance and expand its outreach strategy to grant recipients. While still focused on maximizing interactions among recipients, certain outreach efforts will be more directly driven by the immediate interests and concerns of recipients and involve more frequent engagement with recipients in online webinars and discussion fora. Face-to-face site visits to recipient institutions will remain important, as these are necessary for program staff to maintain their awareness of the contexts in which their constituents work, but continuing discussions begun on these visits in online fora should help the librarians and archivists working on funded projects forge more enduring connections with one another while having more regular access to program officers. The launch of CLIR's new website in February 2012 now makes these kinds of engagement possible, as it permits both CLIR staff and recipients to create and join public or private communities, host and contribute to discussion threads, and even to create blogs on topics of interest. A successful pilot webinar for grant recipients working with civil rights related collections took place in March 2012; CLIR staff are ready to use what they have learned from this experience to reach out to other groups of librarians and archivists within the program's sphere of influence.

CLIR envisions outreach activities unfolding in three areas as projects advance and relationships between recipients are established:

1. Site visits by CLIR staff to individual project sites
2. An online community for program-related discussion, and occasional online meetings and webinars focused on topics raised on site visits and in other interactions with recipients
3. Providing incentives for collaboration amongst staff from different institutions and opportunities for engagement with outside experts

Site visits

As in the past, CLIR plans to continue site visits to recipient institutions, which have generally taken place in the early to middle stages of grant projects. It has been CLIR's practice to send at least two program representatives on visits; these have generally included one CLIR staff member and one or more members of the Scholarly Engagement Study team, a small group of consultants who have been working with program staff since 2009 on documenting the various

ways in which recipient institutions reach out to scholars and other expert users of their collections. While the formal Scholarly Engagement Study will conclude in 2013, CLIR intends to retain the same site visit format, using a team of two working together on each visit. While on occasion both team members may be CLIR staff, CLIR believes most recipients will benefit from visits that include a consultant (such as a scholar in a field related to the grant project, or an expert in a particular format) or previous grant recipient with experience relevant to the grantee's project on the team.

This site visit structure will serve several important purposes. It will help form a relationship between CLIR and the grant recipient early enough in the grant timeline to afford the possibility of enhancing project outcomes. Expert consultants and representatives of related previous grants will be carefully selected by CLIR staff for their ability to provide guidance to recipients relevant to their day-to-day experiences on the grant, at the time that guidance can be most effective. Finally, CLIR hopes that connecting current recipients with past recipients and other experts in the middle stages of their project work will allow time to foster continuing conversations and collaborations related to topics of mutual interest either in online venues or at subsequent professional conferences and events.

Hidden Collections online community, meetings, and webinars

In analyzing the past five years of this program, it has become clear that many Hidden Collections recipients share similar concerns, such as reaching out to overlapping user communities, dealing with specific material types and formats, as well as forging outreach strategies that maximize collection use. CLIR believes recipients would benefit from making stronger connections with similar projects to collaborate and/or share from their experiences. The inclusion of former grant recipients on site visits to new recipients with similar projects or collections is one method of encouraging these connections; however, depending on the availability of experts and the need to connect like-minded professionals over a longer term, this may not work for every new project, and of course even where it does there is almost certainly a wider community of experts available to the recipient than can be represented in such a visit. As noted above, CLIR's new website offers an array of tools useful for facilitating ongoing dialogue between and amongst larger numbers of professionals with similar interests. CLIR currently hosts an email discussion list for Hidden Collections recipients, and plans to transition this email list into a more robust community in [CLIR Connect](#) (the collaborative section of CLIR's website). The community will support not only discussion but also document sharing and private discussions for sub-groups of librarians, archivists, and curators connected to the Hidden Collections program.

Based upon the input of recipients given through the website, program surveys, and conversations on site visits and at professional conferences, CLIR staff will also host periodic online meetings and webinars focused on topics of specific interest to recipients. Staff would invite recipients to suggest topics and/or speakers and then appoint one or more recipients to organize online meetings or webinars around the most common or most timely suggestions; in this way, CLIR would be providing guidance for how to have an effective meeting or webinar

while assigning responsibility for the content of those meetings and webinars to those most qualified and motivated to take that responsibility. During the first half of 2013, CLIR staff will focus on collecting input from recipients on potential topics for meetings and webinars; during the second half of the year, staff plans to organize and host the first two of these meetings. Once established, CLIR hopes to organize these meetings or webinars at a rate of about four per year. These online events would be in addition to the applicant webinars held during the open application period.

Incentivizing collaboration

While CLIR works directly with recipients to nurture communication and connections that already fit well within institutional and grant budgets, there are cases where providing a small amount of additional support can make such communication more inclusive and/or increase the likelihood of connections producing useful outcomes. An honorarium for a webinar speaker or discussion leader, a small consultancy fee for an expert guest attending a site visit, or limited travel support for a presenting archivist to attend a program-related face-to-face meeting or workshop are three examples of ways CLIR can maximize the benefits of recipients' engagement with one another. To this end, CLIR proposes to encourage collaboration amongst grant recipients by offering small honoraria, consultant fees, or travel support to recipients or appropriate outside experts on a case-by-case basis, at the discretion of program staff. This support may be tied to a project site visit, an online meeting or webinar, face-to-face meeting or workshop connected to a professional conference, a jointly written publication, or any other activity that is:

1. directly related to the Hidden Collections program and *at least two* of its projects' specific goals;
2. tied to a specific outcome that furthers those goals (such as a collaboratively produced public report); and
3. not easily funded through other means.

This new initiative would be an expansion of the program's past tradition of providing consultant fees to members of the Scholarly Engagement team for their work on planning and reporting on site visits. Using a simple form to be incorporated into the program website, past and present recipients would propose cross-project collaborations and apply for small grants of up to \$1,500 in support of those collaborations. Cross-year collaborations would be encouraged, though not required. For example, CLIR anticipates that successful requests may include small workshops for current project staff given by past recipients, such as those given by 2008 recipients from PACSCL for staff at the Free Library of Philadelphia, or the creation of a joint online exhibition, such as the collaborative project now underway involving recipients working with natural history collections. In cases where supporting in-person meetings would be most efficient and appropriate, recipients would be allowed to request limited support for this purpose. In such cases CLIR expects that these meetings would most likely be scheduled around larger meetings and conferences that many recipients would already be attending, such

as SAA or RBMS. Applicants for this type of support would be required to document that no other means of support is available for their travel to these conferences.

Section 6. Reporting to the Foundation

A significant portion of CLIR's reporting to the Foundation for this program is based upon the information submitted by the grantees in their own reports. CLIR will include copies of all current awardees' reports as appendices to the relevant program reports to the Foundation, along with a summary of their contents.

Reporting Guidelines to be followed by the Hidden Collections grantees

CLIR is in the process of implementing a new reporting process for the Hidden Collections grantees. Currently, recipients are asked to provide a document containing both a narrative and financial report. While the single-document narrative format is useful in that it enables grantees to address their projects' progress as they find best fits their needs, as the program has grown it has become more difficult for staff to efficiently track the progress of both individual projects and the overall program by extracting and compiling this information from the narrative reports. Accordingly, CLIR proposes to design a new web form for report submission. This form will allow recipients to provide information regarding their projects in a more structured fashion, and because the information from the web form can be extracted into a spreadsheet, CLIR staff will more easily be able to analyze and compare the responses.

The form will include fields for the following elements:

- Objectives (*A brief review of the project objectives and any changes that have occurred*);
- Deliverables (*A clear, concise description of the expected outcomes and benefits of the project, both to institutional practice and to scholarship. In the case of innovative projects for which software is a deliverable, this section must also include a discussion of intellectual property issues and provide URLs for open source software and documentation*);
- Accomplishments (*A brief summary of progress made towards realizing those deliverables since the last reporting period*);
- Challenges (*Any setbacks or challenges since the last reporting period*);
- Project Personnel (*Significant board, management or staff changes since the last reporting period*);
- Presentations and publications (*A description of any grant-related conference presentations, exhibits, course materials, publications, news articles, or other public outcomes*);
- Future Plans (*Plans and goals for the upcoming year*);
- Financial Narrative (*Comments on actual expenditures during the current reporting period as they relate to the proposed budget, and an explanation of any variance of 10% or more between projected spending and actual spending in each budget category*).

Grantees will also be asked to provide numerical information regarding the following:

- cubic feet, linear feet and/or number of objects originally proposed for processing
- cubic feet, linear feet and/or number of objects processed during the reporting period
- cubic feet, linear feet and/or number of objects processed to date

In addition to the information requested above, grantees will also be expected to provide a financial report. CLIR provides a template for this purpose based on that used by the Foundation. Because many larger institutions already have established financial reporting processes in place it has been CLIR's practice to accept the information in the grantee's own form as long as it includes the necessary information; however, in the interest of efficient report assessment, this process can be changed to require grantees use only the financial template provided by CLIR if the Foundation finds that format most helpful.

Financial reports will include the following elements:

1. The original signature of an institutional financial officer and date of the signature;
2. The amount of accrued interest income;
3. The original amount of the award;
4. A column showing the same categories that appeared in the approved proposal budget;
5. A column showing the expected budget for the reporting period;
6. An accounting of expenditures during the reporting period of both the grant funds and interest earned;
7. A column showing the variance between the budgeted and actual expenses during the reporting period;
8. A column showing the expected budget for the overall project;
9. An accounting of expenditures during the overall project of both the grant funds and interest earned.

The financial report will be accepted via the webform as a document upload in either PDF or Excel format. Grantees will also be able to upload any supporting documents, such as screenshots, publication copies, training materials, or example finding aids, that they wish to share as part of their report. CLIR expects this form to be fully operational by the end of October 2012.

Report receipt and evaluation

Grantees are informed of the report schedule in their original award letters. CLIR's Chief Operating Officer, Sharon Ivy, with support from program staff Amy Lucko and Christa Williford, will monitor the timeliness of report submission, including sending reminders to grantees regarding their reporting dates. CLIR has long used a database to track report deadlines for program grantees--a system that requires a great deal of manual oversight by staff. Over the coming months, CLIR proposes to change this process for both current and future grantees. Reporting dates will be entered into CLIR's electronic calendaring system, which will send automatic reminders to staff regarding upcoming deadlines for grantee reports. CLIR uses Microsoft Outlook as its primary calendar system, and as this is a widely used program CLIR will investigate the possibility of sharing the automatic reminders directly with grant recipients, thereby streamlining the process and lessening the likelihood of missed reporting dates.

Reports will be reviewed twice a year. First, program staff members Christa Williford, Amy Lucko and Jena Winberry will review them upon receipt. Staff will read the narrative and address with the recipient any concerns or questions that may have been raised by or in the report. Most questions involve requests for extensions or staff reassignments, and it is CLIR's policy to grant these requests when possible. Requests for project extensions will henceforth be shared with the Foundation on an as-received basis to allow timely updates to their own files. Ms. Ivy will review all financial reports, advising program staff regarding their compliance with the program's guidelines. Should there be problems with financial reports, Ms. Ivy or Ms. Lucko will contact recipients and request the necessary revisions.

The reports will then be reviewed again in aggregate by the program staff in the early summer, as CLIR prepares its own annual report for submission to the Foundation. The purpose of the second review is to consider the reports as part of a larger whole.

In its own reporting to the Foundation, CLIR proposes to structure each report as follows (please note that additional appendices may be added as appropriate; e.g. should grantees be surveyed during the report period in question, an appendix containing survey questions and responses would be included with the report):

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: Grant activities for the reporting period
- Section 3: Program Assessment
- Section 4: Plans for the coming year
- Section 5: Timeline
- Section 6: Financial Report Narrative

Appendices:

- A. Financial Report
- B. Hidden Collections Grant Recipients for the most recent award cycle
- C. Hidden Collections Application Statistics over the course of the program
- D. Hidden Collections Review Panel for the most recent award cycle
- E. List of Initial Proposal Submissions for the current award cycle
- F. Hidden Collections grant reports for the current reporting period

Program Officers Christa Williford and Amy Lucko will be responsible for drafting the narratives and financial report commentaries, while Chief Operating Officer Sharon Ivy will provide updated figures reflecting expenditures to date and any interest earned. President Charles Henry will review and approve each report before it is sent to the Foundation.

Appendix 2: Hidden Collections History

2001: ARL Special Collections Symposium, launch of [Task Force](#); [publication of results of 1998 ARL Survey of Hidden Collections](#)

2002: Library of Congress revises EAD schema

2003: “[Hidden Collections, Scholarly Barriers](#)” (white paper); LC conference “[Exposing Hidden Collections](#)”

2004: DACS (SAA); [Archivists’ Toolkit](#) (Mellon Foundation); UCLA’s [Center for Primary Research and Training](#)

2005: Greene/Meissner “[More Product, Less Process](#)”; “[A Public Trust at Risk: The Heritage Health Index Report \(HHI\)](#)” (Heritage Preservation, IMLS)

2006: [Archon](#), University of Illinois; [ARL Special Collections Task Force Final Report](#)

2007: [Uncovering Chicago Archives Project](#), University of Chicago (Mellon Foundation); [Connecting to Collections](#) (IMLS with numerous partners)

2008: [Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives](#); [CollectionSpace](#) launched (Mellon Foundation)

2009: [CLIR report on archival management software](#); “Special Collections in ARL Libraries” (ARL working group report); new survey on special collections and archives (OCLC); “Age of Discovery” Forum (ARL, CNI)

2010: [Taking our Pulse](#) (OCLC Research survey); first Digital Public Library of America national meeting; [The Sustainability of Digital Special Collections](#) (ARL)

2011: [Processing the Past](#) (Blouin and Rosenberg); [ArchivesSpace](#) project funded (Mellon Foundation); [Taking Stock and Making Hay: Archival Collections Assessment](#) (OCLC Research, 2011)

2012: [Social Metadata for Libraries, Archives and Museums](#) (OCLC Research); [CLIR/DLF Data Curation Postdoctoral Fellowship Program](#); [Special Collections and Archives in the Digital Age](#) (ARL)

2013: planned launch of DPLA prototype; Archon and Archivists’ Toolkit migration services for [ArchivesSpace](#)

Appendix 3: Application statistics, 2008-2012

Initial proposals, 2012: 100

Proposals, 2011: 72 (*initial*) / 40 (*final*) ** Proposals, 2009: 169 / 91 ** Proposals, 2010: 145 / 92 ** 2008: 118 (*no initial cycle in 2008*)

Applications by geographic region

2012 Initial Proposals	2011 Preproposals	2010 Preproposals	2009 Preproposals	2008 Proposals
Northeast/ Mid-Atlantic: 44%	Northeast/ Mid-Atlantic: 43%	Northeast/ Mid-Atlantic: 48.9%	Northeast/ Mid-Atlantic: 39.6%	Northeast/ Mid-Atlantic: 33%
Southeast: 11%	Southeast: 16.7%	Southeast: 15.2%	Southeast: 15.4%	Southeast: 37%
Midwest: 16%	Midwest: 12.5%	Midwest: 13.8%	Midwest: 20.1%	Midwest: 17%
Southwest: 5%	Southwest: 4.2%	Southwest: 6.9%	Southwest: 7.7%	Southwest: 1%
West: 24%	West: 23.6%	West: 14.5%	West: 17.2%	West: 19%

Applications by type of organization

2012 Initial Proposals	2011 Preproposals	2010 Preproposals	2009 Preproposals	2008 Proposals
Academic libraries: 52%	Academic libraries: 36.1%	Academic libraries: 51.7%	Academic libraries: 55%	Academic libraries: 69.5%
Public libraries: 2%	Public libraries: 2.8%	Public libraries: 1.2%	Public libraries: 7.7%	Public libraries: 1.5%
Historical societies: 6%	Historical societies: 6.9%	Historical societies: 5.5%	Historical societies: 6.5%	Historical societies: 6.5%
Museums: 18%	Museums: 25%	Museums: 21.4%	Museums: 7.7%	Museums: 4%
Govt. libraries/Arch.: 2%	Govt. libraries/Arch.: 1.3%	Govt. libraries/Arch.: 2.1%	Govt. libraries/Arch.: 4.1%	Govt. libraries/Arch.: 5%
Other*: 20%	Other*: 27.8%	Other*: 17.9%	Other*: 18.9%	Other*: 14%

**Other includes mixed consortia, presidential libraries, botanical gardens, independent research libraries and archives, research centers and institutes, film societies, and other not-for-profit cultural organizations.*

Applications by amount requested

2012 Initial Proposals	2011 Preproposals	2010 Preproposals	2009 Preproposals	2008 Proposals
\$10,000-\$74,999: 4%	\$10,000-\$74,999: 1.4%	\$10,000-\$74,999: 0	\$10,000-\$74,999: 0	\$10,000-\$74,999: <1%
\$75,000-\$99,999: 20%	\$75,000-\$99,999: 16.6%	\$75,000-\$99,999: 14%	\$75,000-\$99,999: 13%	\$75,000-\$99,999: 8%
\$100,000-\$299,999: 62%	\$100,000-\$299,999: 56%	\$100,000-\$299,999: 63%	\$100,000-\$299,999: 59%	\$100,000-\$299,999: 60%
\$300,000-\$500,000: 14%	\$300,000-\$500,000: 26%	\$300,000-\$500,000: 23%	\$300,000-\$500,000: 28%	\$300,000-\$500,000: 32%
\$500,000+: 0	\$500,000+: 0	\$500,000+: 0	\$500,000+: 0	\$500,000+: <1%

Appendix 4: Recipient survey findings, May-June 2012

1. What type of institution best describes where you work?		
Academic Library	21	44%
Independent Library or Research Center	5	10%
Public Library	2	4%
Museum	10	21%
Historical Society	4	8%
Government Library or Research Center	2	4%
Other Non-Profit	4	8%
Total	48	100%

2. What statement best describes your CLIR Hidden Collections project?		
All project work took place at my home institution.	30	62%
My institution partnered with one other institution for this project.	7	15%
My institution had more than one other institutional partner for this project.	11	23%
Total	48	100%

3. What types of materials are in the collections that were (or are being) processed for your project? (Select all that apply.)		
Book	17	35%
Text (printed or digital text-based records of any kind)	34	71%
Manuscript (handwritten documents of any kind)	38	79%
Ephemera (of any kind)	30	62%
Image (photographs, photonegatives, slides, digital images, etc.)	32	67%
Audio (any audio format, analog or digital)	20	42%
Audiovisual (any audiovisual format, analog or digital)	20	42%
Architectural or engineering drawings	11	23%
Maps	16	33%
Artifacts	16	33%
Artworks	14	29%
Maps	6	12%
Specimens	2	4%
Datasets (analog or digital)	5	10%
Other, please specify	7	15%

4. Has progress on your project met your expectations so far, or did it meet your expectations?		
Yes	42	88%
No	6	12%
Total	48	100%

5. What statement below most closely resembles your assessment of your progress on your project (or your progress so far)?		
We have exceeded our goals and processed/cataloged or are processing/cataloging ahead of schedule.	14	29%
We are meeting our goals and progressed/are progressing more or less as expected.	23	48%
We progressed/are progressing more slowly than expected.	11	23%
Total	48	100%

6. If your progress was/is slower than expected, what factors below contributed to the delays you have experienced? (Choose all that apply.)		
The hiring process for project staff was longer than expected.	11	58%
The hiring process for student workers was longer than expected.	2	11%
Turnover in project staff caused delays.	6	32%
Turnover in student staff caused delays.	3	16%
It took longer than expected to implement technology required for our project.	5	26%
It took longer than expected to train students and/or staff to work on our project.	2	11%
Permanent staff dedicated to the project had less time to give to the work than anticipated.	4	21%
Establishing common goals with our collaborating partners has taken more time than anticipated.	0	0%
Other, please specify (<i>see comments below</i>)	8	42%

- Staff selected for the project had prior commitments resulting in postponement of start date.
- Ran into unanticipated technical difficulties in providing processed resources online
- Our progress in certain areas has exceeded expectations while in others, progress remains behind schedule. Despite delays in hiring project staff, we are on or ahead of schedule for cataloging. We were able to achieve this by working in a temporary system (and hiring fantastic catalogers!) while a more robust system is under development. The development for the more robust, final system that will be made available online is currently behind schedule.
- State of disarray of some portions of 1200 linear foot collection was worse than anticipated, and slowed work to some degree.
- Turnover in university administrative departments
- The materials promised to be processed were not carefully examined before hand and the contents of the collection and how to proceed in processing them have caused delays
- It took longer than expected to define and balance the new workflow of our project.

7. Which among the following factors do you feel have made/are making your project a success so far? Rank these factors from least to most important to you and your institution.					
<i>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</i>	<i>True, but not important.</i>	<i>True, and somewhat important.</i>	<i>True, and important.</i>	<i>True, and among the most important factors.</i>	<i>N/A</i>
We can now make materials processed/cataloged through our project available to scholars for the first time.	0	1	2	43	2
	0%	2%	4%	90%	4%
More information about collections processed/cataloged through our project is now available online.	0	1	5	37	5
	0%	2%	10%	77%	10%
More potential users of the collections processed/cataloged through our project now know they are available.	0	1	9	32	6
	0%	2%	19%	67%	12%
More scholars and students have consulted the collections processed/cataloged through our project than before.	0	0	9	24	15
	0%	0%	19%	50%	31%
The experience of working on our project has been valuable to the career advancement of a new librarian/archivist/curator.	1	9	24	7	7
	2%	19%	50%	15%	15%
The experience of working on our project has contributed to the educational experience and career objectives of students.	1	5	22	12	8
	2%	10%	46%	25%	17%
We have implemented new, more efficient cataloging and processing procedures at our institution based upon our experience with this project.	1	4	15	19	9
	2%	8%	31%	40%	19%
We have implemented new standards for cataloging and processing at our institution that will make it easier to share/ aggregate records with other institutions holding similar collections.	1	7	16	11	13
	2%	15%	33%	23%	27%
Our collaboration with project partner(s) will continue beyond the life of the project.	1	3	9	8	27
	2%	6%	19%	17%	56%

8. In what ways do you feel your project has been less successful than you hoped it would have been? (Select all that apply.)		
We were not/have not been able to process/catalog as many materials for our project as we hoped.	6	19%
We were not/have not been able to process/catalog materials for our project in as much detail as we hoped.	3	9%
We were not/have not been able to make descriptions of the materials for our project available online as quickly as we hoped.	6	19%
Potential users of the collections cataloged/processed through our project are not finding information about them as quickly as we hoped.	2	6%
We have not yet had as many requests to use the materials as we hoped.	9	28%
The experience of working on our project was not as valuable to the project staff we hired as we anticipated it would be.	0	0%
The experience of working on our project was not as valuable to the student workers we hired as we anticipated it would be.	0	0%
We have not yet been able to make permanent changes we hoped to make in the way we process/catalog collections at our institution.	3	9%
The collaboration we hoped to establish with our project partners wasn't as successful as we hoped.	5	16%
Other, please specify (<i>see comments below</i>)	9	28%

- There is deeper work needed on the collection than we have time for presently.
- Although we accomplished our primary goals in the project, we did not have sufficient time to complete the conversion of finding aids - but this was not one of the projects stated goals.
- It's too early in the project to evaluate.
- we are in the middle of the project, and at this time we have had no disappointments
- Staff and student worker turnover, as well as finding qualified students caused a slow down in expected productivity
- We are not far along enough to properly address this question.
- We're just getting going on the project
- We have not yet been able to digitize items included in our project to make them even more useable and enhance the descriptions in our finding aids.
- We missed internal milestones, although we caught up eventually.

9. To your knowledge has anyone used the materials you have cataloged and/or processed during your project for a specific purpose since you were awarded the grant?		
Yes	39	81%
No	9	19%
Total	48	100%

10. If you answered "yes" to Question 9, for what specific purpose have individuals used the materials cataloged and/or processed during/since your grant was awarded? (Select all that apply; you may include uses by individuals within as well as from outside your institution.)		
A personal project not to be published (such as a family history or genealogy).	10	24%
A course taught at my institution.	12	29%
A course taught outside my institution.	6	15%
A student research paper.	19	46%
A thesis or dissertation.	16	39%
An entry or entries for a blog associated with my institution.	22	54%
An entry or entries for a blog not associated with my institution.	7	17%
A published, edited news article.	9	22%
A podcast or other sound recording.	2	5%
A webcast, film or video.	6	15%
An "in person" exhibit at my institution.	18	44%
An "in person" exhibit not at my institution.	8	20%
An online exhibit hosted by my institution.	3	7%
An online exhibit hosted by an outside individual or institution.	1	2%
A scholarly essay, journal article, or monograph that has been or will be peer reviewed, edited, and published.	23	56%
An essay, magazine article, or book written for a general audience that has been or will be edited and published.	9	22%
Other, please specify (<i>see comments below</i>)	13	32%

- This collection is still closed until processing is completed.
- television news stories
- Since our EAD repository went live, it is difficult to assess precisely at this time how materials are being used across the 21 participating institutions.
- Public event at my institution
- As documentation to better understand collections held at another institution.
- We anticipate increased use, but it's too early in the project to evaluate.
- A recording issued commercially
- To gather names of students who had worked at a closed Research Station so that their subsequent professional accomplishments might point to the need to support similar projects from funding agencies. Also, some curators visited the Museum library to research collections for a possible collaborative exhibition about a scientific expedition.
- K-12 digital library resources
- Presentations at conferences

- An 18th-century chart of presidios in New Spain was displayed in an exhibit on the Camino Real in November 2011. This has led to further research by one of the project investigators, who created a map based on the coordinates in the chart.
- Numerous "show and tell" presentations for visitors at the institution.
- Television news feature stories, e-book published by my institution

11. Knowing what you know now, if you had to begin your project again, would you have approached it differently?

Yes	23	48%
No	25	52%
Total	48	100%

12. Please give us your best estimate of the amount and types of materials included in your project that you have completely processed/cataloged to date (i.e. 1000 linear feet of manuscript materials; approximately 20,000 photographic prints; 1500 book titles; 500 cubic feet of audio and audiovisual recordings, etc.). If nothing is completely processed/cataloged, indicate what materials have been partially processed and specify what remains to be done to complete processing/cataloging.

- Our project is still in the pre-cataloging phase; we are refining the cataloging protocols, training staff, and finalizing selection of the cataloging software.
- 2 months into the project, around 2000 photographic prints have been cataloged. We have just finished bringing on student workers and staff and have 23,000 items left to be processed.
- 359 linear feet of manuscript and AV materials
- 318 cubic feet of personal and professional records, including manuscripts materials, institutional records, photographs, audio and audiovisual recordings, and ephemera.
- Approximately 16 feet of manuscript, print & ephemera materials, and 30 photographs.
- 500 linear feet of manuscript material; Approximately 500 artifacts; approx 750 printed items; approx 40 histories. All have finding aids; some lack EAD and finished online MARC records
- 2425 linear feet
- Over 400 collections were processed. Additional collections were partially processed with CLIR funding and partially processed with NHPRC funding.
- Over 230 linear feet of personal papers, manuscripts, illustrations, etc. Finding aids for 43 author collections were created and are online. 4,178 item-level metadata records have been created in our digital collections database (1,044 are viewable online. Rights issues are being examined for the others.)390 MARC records were created across all collections for published volumes.
- 1,195 records (online) for over 700 archives and manuscripts collections. 185 linear feet of collections processed over the course of three years.
- 1,000 books cataloged. 400 record carton boxes processed to date.
- 115 linear feet of archival collections
- 1,166 Islamic manuscripts and folios.
- nearly 2000 linear feet
- approximately 2,000 photographic prints processed; approximately 23,000 photographic prints partially processed and still being worked upon
- 4000 LF. 133 collections.
- 266 linear feet of archival materials processed; 5000 volumes cataloged; 1,000 reel-to-reel and 3,600 cassette tapes described in a finding aid.

- We are still at the beginning stage of our grant project: entering the 4th month of a 3 year project. Our goal for the first year is to create collection-level records for every collection. Nonetheless, we have created preliminary collection-level records in Archivists Toolkit for 194 collections (up from 15). During the process of collection assessment we have "discovered" several additional collections. We need to create an additional 64 collection level records and still need to add scope and content and extent notes and subject access terms to about three-quarters of the 194 records. These records have not been published to the Online Archive of California yet, but a more complete list of our collections is now on our (new) website.
- 75 linear feet of manuscript materials
- 4,900 item-level records, 433 collection-level records, and 751 authority records.
- manuscript collection, 15 linear feet including approximately 200 sound recordings.
- 20 lin. ft. of sound recordings plus one collection of 682 lin. ft. comprised of audio and video recordings and a wide variety of archival materials including business documents, advertising, promotion and marketing files, correspondence, inter-office memos and negotiations with booking agents, concert program booklets, artist publicity materials, posters, photographs, scrapbooks, original artwork, and etc.
- 359 linear feet of mixed materials Approximately 1220 photographic prints 27 cubic feet of audio and audiovisual materials
- 1800 linear feet of mixed manuscript material
- Approximately 3000 linear feet of archival records, photographic prints and photographic slides have been minimally cataloged. Over 53 linear feet of manuscript, departmental records and photographic prints have been processed and arranged with detailed finding aids created.
- 839 manuscript volumes fully or near fully catalogued
- 1110 book titles; 1500 volumes Although cataloging has been completed, final totals of manuscript material are pending: it is estimated that we cataloged over 1,000 maps and architectural drawings and approximately 300 linear feet of manuscripts and archives.
- 491.75 linear feet of records, including photos 28 linear feet of audio and video recordings (approximately 700 recordings) 89 oversized papers 194 oversized bound volumes Cataloging of 3 serials (consisting of 188 total issues) is in process (by non-grant staff).
- 418 cubic feet pre-processing, 321 post-processing
- We have catalog records for 52,167 items of film or video. It is too hard to estimate the amount of cubic feet those items represent. We anticipate more records form one of the partners but at this time we can not estimate how many.
- Approx. 5,000 individual suelta plays cataloged (more than a third of the total)
- of the 7 partners who are in the first year of a 2-year grant, 3 partners are almost 50% finished, 2 are beginning their work now (this is on their schedule), and 2 are starting in the fall (both had thought to start in July, but timing from a project support status was better to align with the academic year).
- Approximately 100 quilts and coverlets - the cataloging was begun in early April, 2012.
- Created online access via a finding aid to nearly 7,000 posters
- 83 linear feet of manuscripts; 3 linear feet of books; approx. 25,000 print/slides/negs. and 2 films.
- To date 561 linear feet of manuscripts, architectural drawings, photographs and models.
- All the proposed materials to be cataloged have yet to be completed.
- Approximately 77 feet of field notes, personal papers of scientists, and locality files; 6 feet of ledgers have been processed and data put online. Other materials currently in processing include sculptures, 3

feet of lantern slides, 2 feet of photographic negatives that have all been rehoused and are ready to be processed; and 6 feet of personal papers in process.

- Processed and described to the folder level: 650 linear ft. (ca. 370,000 photographic prints) and 45,000 negative sleeves (more than 200,000 negatives) Processed and described to the box level: ca. 500 linear feet. (Ideally, more description will be provided in future, but arrangement work has made all material open to research.)
- We are in the first year of a three-year grant. Several students have been hired for the summer to inventory the collection.
- We haven't begun actual processing, but have been undergoing training in metadata schema
- To date we have completed item-level MARC records for more than 20,000 pamphlets. We have 2,000 more records to complete to meet the expectations of the grant but anticipate we will be able to exceed expectations and complete 2,000-4,000 more titles!
- About 126 linear feet of manuscript materials of which maybe five feet are other materials such as photographs, ephemera and printed materials.
- 5,500 printed almanacs; 1,126 of which have been cataloged since the project began in March, 2012
- Twelve ephemera collections (more than 1000 linear ft.) at all four partner institutions, an estimated 380,000 items. Since the conclusion of the project in 2010, we've continued work on additions to the CHS ephemera collections, est @ ca.250 linear feet (several thousand items).
- 7,000 posters
- 442 linear feet of mixed manuscript material; 9.8 linear feet and 2481 items of rare photographic material

13. Complete this statement: Compared with when our Hidden Collections project was funded, the size of my institution's backlog today has:

Increased significantly	0	0%
Increased slightly	2	4%
Decreased significantly	17	35%
Decreased slightly	14	29%
Remained about the same	6	12%
Other comments about backlog increase or decrease (<i>see comments below</i>)	9	19%
Total	48	100%

- Decreased in terms of collection-level description, though not in terms of processing and fuller cataloguing with finding aids.
- If referring to our partner institution...their backlog has decreased significantly.
- WGBH backlog decreased slightly, but the partners backlog decreased significantly.
- backlog will be significantly decreased when the project is completed in 2013, as projected.
- Decrease is only slight due to increased volume of acquisition.
- We don't have the concept of backlog in our vernacular, because we never thought about it that way.
- I am not privy to that information. I have been directed to solely do what is instructed in the grant.
- The backlog decreased significantly but there is still an enormous backlog ...
- Decreased significantly in the one format we selected to do, and more importantly the success of the project has increased publicity and staff optimism about tackling other backlogs - an unanticipated outcome.

14. Where 1 is the least and 10 the most significant, rank the factors below in terms of their significance to eliminating your institution's backlog.											
<i>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't Know
More funding for professional staff.	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	26	4
	4%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	2%	8%	19%	54%	8%
More funding for student workers.	1	6	3	3	2	2	5	8	5	8	5
	2%	12%	6%	6%	4%	4%	10%	17%	10%	17%	10%
Better training in cataloging and processing.	3	4	3	6	4	3	11	8	5	0	1
	6%	8%	6%	12%	8%	6%	23%	17%	10%	0%	2%
More dedicated space for cataloging and processing.	6	3	7	3	3	2	8	7	4	2	3
	12%	6%	15%	6%	6%	4%	17%	15%	8%	4%	6%
More funding for technical equipment (computers, servers, licenses) for cataloging and processing.	1	8	4	9	2	6	4	6	4	0	4
	2%	17%	8%	19%	4%	12%	8%	12%	8%	0%	8%
Better, more efficient software for cataloging and processing.	2	4	6	4	8	10	3	4	1	0	6
	4%	8%	12%	8%	17%	21%	6%	8%	2%	0%	12%
Clearer standards for describing the types of collections in our backlog.	6	6	6	3	8	5	5	3	3	1	2
	12%	12%	12%	6%	17%	10%	10%	6%	6%	2%	4%
A more minimal approach to cataloging and processing at our institution.	8	2	10	6	5	3	2	2	4	4	2
	17%	4%	21%	12%	10%	6%	4%	4%	8%	8%	4%
Better collaborations with external partners in cataloging and processing efforts.	7	8	3	3	6	3	4	1	1	0	12
	15%	17%	6%	6%	12%	6%	8%	2%	2%	0%	25%
More funding for digitization, digital reformatting, and digital processing (scanning/OCR, digital photography, digital forensics) to enable automated or crowdsourced processing.	5	2	1	4	3	10	3	4	8	4	4
	10%	4%	2%	8%	6%	21%	6%	8%	17%	8%	8%

15. How would you characterize the impact that funding through the Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives program has had on your institution? Is there anything else you would like CLIR to know as it assesses the overall impact of this program and considers what its future might be?

- This grant has made a huge impact on our museum. Cataloging this collection helps the local and scholarly community and furthers our mission. Programs like this help museum collections shine in a way that isn't otherwise possible.
- The impact was enormous. It allowed us to take a significant bite out of our backlog, process an important collection that compliments many other collections in our holdings, and we were able to recruit grant staff who are not permanent staff.

- Funding had several key impacts, including the opening of important collections, greater research use, and higher visibility of the repository and thus an increase in acquisitions. Additionally, the CLIR project allowed us to examine processing practices, measure effort and outputs, and assess the quality and impact of output. The assessment methods put into place for the CLIR project have been used across our other functions with the result that we have improved the efficiency and effectiveness of our whole operation. The CLIR Hidden Collections funding had an enormous positive affect on us and, as we are now teaching assessment methods to others regionally and nationally, on many others as well.
- It has only been several months, but already we have standards and processes in place that we did not have before, better volunteer organization and directives, and online access to hundreds of records that were not available before. In addition, we have embarked on a collaborative exhibit with another local history museum that uses the materials in this collection.
- The CLIR grant aided in changing the organization from a warehouse to an archive nearly operating at professional standards. Some work needs to be done to finish and polish a percentage of the finding aids; but new staff is on the way to do this. The institution went from an organization with a significant backlog to an institution with barely a backlog.
- The program has helped us to effectively eliminate the backlog of architectural materials.
- Prior to participating in this program, we had grown from a volunteer-run institution to a professional one that still hadn't tackled its arcane practices for dealing with library and archival material. A private donation enabled us to modernize book cataloging, and CLIR set us on the road to modern accessible archival finding aids. The availability of affordable software (Archon) coupled with CLIR funding to hire additional staff allowed our geographically remote institution to make our nationally significant collections accessible. Further, we established procedures to continue adding to this project and are now working to make our object collections equally accessible through CollectionSpace. Perhaps the greatest impact was the realization that despite our size, we can make use of the same resources institutions with more funding and more staff have access to, and are able to compete with them for limited resources. Further, staff members have more time to work on collections because researchers are able to answer their own questions. It also enables us to find resources for exhibits, publications, and programs efficiently. This grant revolutionized the way our institution handles archival collections. I can only hope that it will continue and that its scope will someday expand to include digitization, as the researchers who now find our collections seem to expect it. CLIR's grant program, and it's staff, are to be commended.
- This was an extremely important grant for us. As a public library, we had no standardized method for dealing with archives. This grant allowed us to hire archivists who introduced us to and trained us in Archivists Toolkit. We were able to crosswalk between AT and our own web platform thanks to the IT person covered in the grant. A most wonderful experience all around! Thank you CLIR!
- The impact of the support received by our institution from CLIR has been extremely significant allowing for implementation of technology and establishment of policies and procedures, which has streamlined our collection management functions.
- The progress has been phenomenal, and we are very excited to gain intellectual control over this collection!
- Establishment of processing guidelines and workflow system that enables us to make our finding aids available online and promotes dissemination of collection information to a wider audience.
- It has allowed important and necessary work to be accomplished on a significant collection. This work has provided an example of how to approach other collections for maximum impact and productivity.

- without the grant, it is unlikely these collections would have ever been processed, or at least not in the near future. I think institutions need to be held accountable somehow that they actually comply with what they said they would do in the grant. Perhaps this is comparing the annual report to original grant. but I think it's a wonderful program and I hope it continues long into the future.
- This has been a wonderful grant which has helped our Museum become part of the 21st century. We have had a great response from researchers and our board on the project.
- For the PACSCL community, the 2008 CLIR Hidden Collections Grant was life changing beyond belief. The key beneficiaries were: PACSCL, in general; the 21 participating institutions, whose back logs were reduced; on the patron side, researchers now have access to 133 regional finding aids. This was unimaginable four years ago. The CLIR/Hidden Collections program though costly, is I believe, justified when one considers CLIR's investment in collaborative projects like the one PACSCL has recently completed. I hope that the Andrew Mellon Foundation will continue to see that their investment in Hidden Collections is generating amazing results.
- Our basic problem was very simple: It is critical that researchers - anywhere in the world - are able to know what we have in our collection. Publishing collection level records online and on our website will make this possible, for the first time in the more than 40 year history of this important collection. Though we are at the beginning of our grant project, the progress we've made so far is exciting; we can see that this will be a reality, probably in less than a year! Funding for a professional archivist is making this possible.
- The Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives program has been instrumental in enabling us to establish a set of best practices for cataloging materials that have been minimally described in a variety of ways by the variety of departments through which they are dispersed. These collections share characteristics with library, archive, and museum collections and serve a variety of information needs making it difficult to neatly fit them into one approach. Without the funding, there would not have been the resources to devote full time staff to identifying current practices, information needs, and gaps between practices and needs and to then develop a cataloging approach for exposing the hidden collections. The approach that has been developed draws on existing standards and supports detailed yet simplified description that responds to known user needs. Additionally, we have been able to leverage these cataloging efforts to acquire funding for conservation and digitization efforts to even further improve access. Finally, the CLIR funding has also enabled us to devote staff time to sharing this new approach with a number of other institutions, who have indicated interest in following the same model and contributing records to an aggregated resource based on this approach thereby extending the impact beyond our home institution and partners to the broader professional community.
- Collections targeted for this project are totally inaccessible to users. While it's still too early to evaluate the impact of the project, we anticipate that this project will have significant positive impact for our users and the archival community. We would suggest that minimally described archival collections be covered by the grant guidelines, because we have found that old catalog records are often inaccurate and incomplete, particularly for special format materials.
- The funding was critical for processing our most important collections.
- CLIR funding has impacted our institution by shrinking our backlog by more than 400 linear feet. We were also able to hire grant staff and retain them as permanent, professional staff, contributing even further to an increase in processing activities and available collections for research. While the use of the CLIR funded collection has not been as much as we hoped, the users of that collection are engaged in intense research of voting trends or the Civil Rights Movement. Our collaboration with local

institutions has only strengthened an already positive working relationship. CLIR has also been a wonderfully supportive agency throughout the process and continues to offer good resources and opportunities for our grant staff to remain involved in the program.

- This project has provided a prototype/model for minimal cataloging to make a large number of the Library's archival collections available in a relatively short period of time. For the future we are looking to build from the records we have created, looking into possibilities to link to other collections both within and outside the institution.
- Receipt of the grant and resulting publicity has increased visibility of the partner institutions and facilitated publicizing the newly cataloged collections. Funding enabled us to hire and train over 15 undergraduate and graduate students, exposing the students from a myriad of academic disciplines to historical collections while at the same time enabling staff to provide access to newly cataloged collections. Cataloging Hidden Collections not only provides access to collections for scholars, but also enables staff to better understand contents when planning future digitization projects.
- The overall impact has been good in that funding enabled to process a very large and important collection we expect will be high use and that otherwise might not have been made available for a very long time. In terms of evaluating the future of the program, we do have some suggestions for the application process if it goes forward. First, a slightly higher word limit on sections dedicated to describing the collection would be invaluable. The current character restrictions are incredibly limiting, especially for collaborative projects. Enabling applicants to more fully describe their projects will lead to stronger applications. It might also be nice to allow applicants to upload one or two photos that show the materials being described. Finally, we would suggest that reviewers be allowed to ask applicants questions clarifying elements of the application. We submitted an application for a new round of funding that was denied in part because reviewers thought we were requesting money for current full time staff. In fact, we were planning to use project archivists from our first CLIR grant. In instances like that, we feel that if there's a question, reviewers should be allowed to seek clarification. Perhaps the questions can be sent through the CLIR offices to protect reviewer anonymity. Regardless, we have been very grateful to be a part of the Hidden Collections program and it has been a great pleasure to work with CLIR throughout our project.
- Provided us with a working space to experiment, change practice in-house, and engage the professional community.
- The project funding has allowed us to partner with other institutions and show value in that collaboration. We will have exposed a great collection of material that otherwise would have been neglected.