Analysis of Site Visit Responses

**PRELIMINARY NOTES ON SUMMARY STATEMENTS
DRAWN FROM THE QUALITATIVE PHASE**

This section contains analyses of topics covered during interviews in 20 libraries. The interview protocol (questionnaire) appears in the Appendix, Section B.

Please see Background and Methodology for an explanation of the qualitative methodology used in this study. In brief, the study was conducted in two parts: an online survey of quantitative data, and a set of interviews eliciting qualitative data on attitudes, opinions and emotions relating to the topic of preservation. This section summarizes finding from the qualitative phase. More extensive reportage, including extensive quotations, appears in the Appendix.

In the reports on the qualitative study, the following abbreviations are used throughout:
      Association of Research Libraries   ARL
      University Library Group   ULG
      Land Grant   LG
      Individual institutions of the Oberlin Group OG

Data from ARL and ULG libraries are grouped together, and are responses from LG and OG libraries. It became apparent early in the process of analysis that ARL and ULG data bore remarkable similarity, and showed distinct differences from data associated with LG and OG libraries. Further, LG and OG institutions provided answers that were notably similar. Even the length of responses bore out this pattern. For these reasons, and in the interests of coherence in presentation, the decision was made to group data for ARL and ULG libraries, and to group LG and OG data in the presentation of results.

From the twenty institutions visited, interviewers produced 76 interview reports. Very many were group interviews. Interviewers met and reported on their discussions with 111 people, 55 from ARL and ULG libraries, and 56 from LG and OG libraries.

It is important to caution against regarding any numbers in the report of interviews as completely reliable or fully indicative of whole populations (ARL, ULG, LG, and OG libraries). The sample is very small, and the qualitative methodology used here is not designed to capture quantitative data in consistent ways. Nonetheless the data are suggestive of patterns and occasionally a rough indication of quantity is included for this purpose.

A key to abbreviations and acronyms can be found in the Appendix, Section D. The abbreviations and acronyms used by interviewees are not edited in the quotations, even when they represent older names for organizations, or fragmentary references. In almost all cases, the references can be related to terms in the Appendix list.

The term "staff" in the report refers to all those who work in libraries.

ANALYSIS OF TOPICS COVERED DURING INTERVIEWS

1. What is your role in preservation here?

Summary: Many different job titles fall under the rubric of "preservation." Descriptions of roles range from emphasis on activities to focus on objectives. Some staff involved in binding and other functions considered basic to preservation by many in the broader preservation field do not identify themselves as working in the preservation area.

Interviewees in the twenty institutions visited report a very wide variety of job positions. The data throughout this report indicate a variety of points of view that very probably reflect the nature of the interviewees' responsibilities. To understand the range of views, it can be helpful to know what kinds of jobs are represented in the sample, and in what proportions.

It is important to caution against regarding any numbers in the report of interviews as completely reliable or fully indicative of whole populations (ARL, ULG, LG, and OG libraries). The sample is very small, and the qualitative methodology used here is not designed to capture quantitative data in consistent ways. Nonetheless the data are suggestive of patterns.

From the twenty institutions visited, interviewers produced 76 interview reports. Very many were group interviews. Interviewers met and reported on their discussions with 111 people, 55 from ARL and ULG libraries, and 56 from LG and OG libraries. What follows is a display of data representing job titles. The display is informative, indicating that many different aspects of preservation are represented in the sample population, and in fairly even proportions with the exception of general library administrators who constitute a dominant category.

The wide array of specific job titles provided is here compressed into generic categories. In most instances, the interviewees are heads of their units. (In a few cases, jobs were split between two functions; both are indicated here. The total number of jobs, therefore, exceeds the total number of people interviewed.)

Job (generic title)	ARL/ULG	LG/OG
University administrator	2	2
Director of the library	7	9
Associate/assistant director	5	7
Access services		2

Acquisitions	1	1
Archives	1	6
Binding	2	3
Cataloging	5	2
Circulation/stacks		1
Collection development	1	3
Conservation	1	1
Digital projects	2	
Government documents		2
Information technology/systems	2	5
Newspapers	1	
Preservation	8	1
Rare Books	4	
Reference	1	4
Research	1	.
Serials	2	
Science library	1	1
Subject specialist	1	.
Technical services		3
Technician	1	

Many interviewees explain their roles only in terms of procedures (e.g., select material for hands-on conservation), and these activities can be characterized as predictable. The most revealing responses are those that deal with the respondents' conceptions of their responsibilities, and their attitudes toward their preservation work. In light of the preponderance of administrators and department heads in the sample, most of the jobs described in conception terms are basically administrative in nature. These are explored in some detail here.

Among ARL and ULG libraries (ARL and ULG libraries), conceptual definitions of roles are described in these terms (here edited slightly for consistency):

-- Coordinating, providing general oversight; make sure staff are thinking about preservation issues.
-- Raising awareness across campus; positioning this university in the national preservation arena; strategic planning.
-- Making sure preservation happens here.
-- Providing leadership and management; to fulfill the mission.
-- Advocating for preservation; on the lookout for donors and for support; advancing digital archiving.
-- Facilitating maintenance of infrastructure to preserve anything in digital form.
-- Administering the program – shaping and developing…to match library mission and goals.
-- "Care and feeding" of preservation, getting it resources, pushing it in new directions, making sure it permeates our priorities and plans the way it needs to.

-- Supporting the program and make sure they have the resources they need.
-- Raising preservation awareness.
-- Planning and implementing a preservation program in the university library.
-- Creating a vision for preservation in the library, setting priorities, educating people about the needs, processes, and value of preservation.
-- As an exterior responsibility, raising preservation as a special issue with donors and Friends of the Library
-- Arbiter – to set priorities.

Among LG and OG libraries (LG and OG institutions), respondents reveal more about their personal attitudes toward their jobs. Again focusing on conceptual aspects, rather than procedures, the analysis indicates these definitions of role in relation to preservation. (The statements are edited slightly for consistency.)

-- Look at the big picture; convince team member to see value in preservation.
-- As university archivist, I direct preservation activities there and preservation is one of my areas of interest and expertise; to coordinate/facilitate activities, ad hoc, library wide.
-- My goal as preservation officer is to work myself out of a job. Preservation should be integrated into all parts of the library. Umbrella role, coordinating.
-- I work to chart direction, not dictate it.
-- A reactive role.
-- As director, I have full responsibility and what passes for it. Could not escape.

A few people expressed some qualms about their level of expertise in this area: "I have a lot of the pieces, but I don't always have the experience applying it. Self-confidence is an issue…and patience."

Additionally, in LG and OG libraries, interviewees express some reservations about preservation and their roles in it.

"Every cause needs a champion and I'm not it."

"I've been designated, not really by choice."

"I am the *de facto* conservation person."

Several respondents indicate that they hold a narrow definition of preservation. The director of a ARL/ULG library reports that his involvement is "almost nonexistent." One person from binding and receiving muses that she did not know why she was included in the group interview at all. Another who describes her role in preservation as "almost none" goes on to describe her work as repair and oversight of binding. A third explains that she has no direct role – "my concern is for safe storage and handling of the collection." Another interviewee indicates that the definition of the term preservation is an issue when she comments that she personally prefers the term "conservation" to "preservation" because it makes more sense to her.

(The term "preservation" was not defined for interviewees since one of the goals of the study is to determine the prevailing understanding of the concept of preservation as it is seen in the field today.)

2. Preservation priorities

Summary: Library staff are in strong agreement that general collections come first, with service to students as an additional concern. Future concerns will include digital matters, though the change may be more of an add-on than a shift in priorities.

a. What are the current priorities, in terms of collections and user groups, for preservation resources?

Through succinct and well-articulated responses, interviewees indicate that they are quite sure about their libraries' current priorities. There are differences in the actual content however, very probably due primarily to the variety of positions interviewees hold (in binding, special collections, administration, etc.). In most cases, "priority" is interpreted as "most important overall" although in a few cases it seems to indicate a current preoccupation, such as flood-recovery. There is nonetheless overwhelming agreement on what is most important in these libraries.

First and foremost for ARL and ULG libraries is the general collection, described by one as the "bread-and-butter." A variation is the emphasis on use-based criteria for determining priorities; this statement is usually tied to mention of the general or circulating collections. After that comes special collections (with "unique" materials cited a few times), but that may be a function of the fairly large number of special collections people in the sample. Serials/periodicals/journals are mentioned at the next level of frequency. Less often mentioned are digital/electronic objects, environmental stabilization, and then education of staff and users. References to disaster recovery seem tied to recent events in specific libraries. A reference to moving the collection is unique. One interviewee lists "undoing errors,' especially in housing, as the second of his priorities (with environmental matters as the first).

For special collections, these priorities are mentioned once each: rehousing of 19th century material which gets heaviest use in the collection, manuscripts, rare books in general, binding, microfilming, digital processes, and non-print materials. For binding units, the priorities in one case are these: current collections, periodicals, dissertations and theses. Another binding unit concentrates upon returning material to the shelves as quickly as possible.

For LG and OG libraries, the concept of the general collection seems closely related to its environment with access issues added to the mix : "have collections stored properly and accessible," "protect collections so our patrons have access," "the focus for the physical collection is on environment and access," and "Top priority – constantly looking for how to keep things accessible." The terms "use" or "use-driven" turn up as do references to

instruction. One interviewee explains that "students are prime on the list of priorities – researchers are kind of peripheral."

In the LG and OG library context, the second tier of concerns is expressed in quite specific language in this order of frequency: basic repair and mending, binding, water damage to building and collections, archives (acid-free bindings and unique materials), and special collections. Also mentioned is enforcement of food and drink policies and relations with physical plant personnel – both offered as major priorities. A few respondents mention specific collections as the focus of their attention.

One respondent parried: "It's rather subtle; first 'we do no harm.' It is unusual but not unknown for interviewees to express pique when answering this question: "I have nothing to do with the flow of money. I don't know what 'their' priorities are."

b. Do you foresee the emphasis shifting over the next five years? In what directions?

ARL and ULG institutions, hands down, expect "dramatic" increases in electronic activity (resources, preservation, archiving, access, reformatting from paper and fiche) and in binding (a reduction due to cancelled journal subscriptions and move to digital forms). The next most common forecasts involve environmental controls (pest control and humidity concerns), space (including increased shifting to remote storage), non-print collections, and repair/conservation (including brittle book treatment). Single references suggest future emphasis on deacidification, enclosures, microfilm, photocopying for circulation, archives (putting material on the web), and fundraising.

Looking at the issues from a more conceptual perspective, interviewees variously observed: "I think preservation will become a more integral part of collection management and preservation," and "I see practices and policies changes based on what is used most – monographs, serials, electronic, and paper."

The prediction of one person well summed up the message of the whole: "I don't see us shifting away from a serious commitment to the circulating collections, but there is a serious need to address the non-print and AV, and prospects for digital collections. These will be add-ons. We're interested in increasing support on conservation for the Special Collections Department."

In LG and OG institutions, nearly half of the respondents see more continuity than change in future priorities. For this group, the emphasis will continue to be on print and book collections, and on serving students' needs. If there is a shift, staff anticipate that it will occur, variously, in the digital area (to provide full text and more resources to users), in space (i.e., remote storage), and in binding (both reduced as digital use grown, and expanded as old material is bound). Other anticipated changes, mentioned singly, involve working on public awareness, staff training, and funding/development (i.e., building an endowment).

3. Contemplating changes in resources

Summary: Increases in funding would be directed first to staff, and next to structures. Collection care follows. Cuts in funding would affect binding most radically, and then staff and collection treatments. Funding is already short, so cuts would be devastating to most preservation programs.

a. If resources currently directed toward preservation were to increase by 30% tomorrow, where would you put the additional resources? Why?
Answers from all libraries ranged widely from high budget items to small purchases, and from the specific to the general. It is probable that respondents, many not knowing what resources now were spent, ignored the "30%" and simply indicated what they would do with a sizeable increase of indeterminate size. One person commented wryly that his library has no money for preservation now; a 30% increase would not mean much in that context. Despite possible confusion about the dimensions of the increase, respondents stated clearly and readily how they would use additional funds.

Interviewees from ARL and ULG libraries report most often that they would use increased funding for staff. This includes increased staff for collection care and for a training position. Where staff are largely on "soft" money, they would be put on permanent lines.

Next in frequency are references to structures and environment. Respondents would, variously, increase space for storage, improve HVAC controls, and construct a cold storage facility. Taking a slightly different perspective, one interviewee speaks of "stabilization – for the biggest bang for the buck – and then intervention."

Digital matters emerge as the next collective concern. Respondents are not usually specific on this point, but among improvements and initiatives would be "document reproduction," "reformatting," and moving to the next stage in creating a common digital depository. Special collections are the next most frequently cited category of activity (replacing acidic enclosures, treatment, expanding conservation activities, purchasing supplies, and outsourcing care). Audio-visual materials also get mentioned a few times because, explained one respondent, the "clock is ticking" on those resources [referring to their rapid and advanced states of deterioration].

Other ideas are mentioned once each and in many cases reflect local, and probably unique, circumstances: replace the board cutter, collaborate with the campus museum, work on the circulating collection, set up an in-house repair facility, deacidify, purchase a box-maker, improve microfilming, work on the university archives, increase processing, re-evaluate older materials, do more preservation photocopying, emphasize unique materials, do some paper-splitting, and improve exhibit equipment.

In LG and OG libraries, as in ARL and ULG libraries, respondents mention staff and staff training most frequently. Details indicate that staff-related concerns include cleaning needs (i.e., dusting), shifting collections, shelving, preservation management and implementation (in the form of a new preservation librarian), and

restoration/conservation (by professional staff). In one library, there is agreement that the money should be used to put those staff now on "soft" money into permanent lines. A related need is for a consultant to help develop preservation priorities.

After staff, digital matters would receive any additional funding. Specific plans include reformatting lesser-used materials, replacing and transforming microcards, scanning archival material, migrating digital files, digitizing for access, and purchasing a digital microfiche reader/printer.

The next most frequently mentioned plans center on the building and environment. Specifically, respondents want more space, better HVAC controls, a new roof, and an environmental assessment.

Another set of responses focuses on collections. Needs here include mass deacidification, binding (including binding of serials backfiles and purchases of special buckram and equipment), collection assessment, problems of oversized materials, and repair and conservation of special collections materials (especially rare books and pamphlets).

Mentioned by only one respondent each were audiovisual materials, outsourcing of box making, and purchase of common supplies (e.g., envelopes and book pockets). In one library, the additional resources would be used to work on materials related to academic programs now being upgraded (e.g., from B.A.-level to Ph.D.-level).

b. If resources now used for preservation were to decrease by 30% tomorrow, where would you apply the cuts? Why?

Respondents were usually willing and able to give simple, one-line descriptions of potential cuts, and these were, interviewers reported, immediately forthcoming.

In the case of ARL and ULG libraries, some respondents chose to add general comments, many involving the realities of revenue allocation in their particular situations. Almost all interpreted "resources" to mean funds alone, and in most cases "discretionary funding" only. This became obvious from comments such as: "We're given restrictions on how we have to spend the dollars. Staff are civil service positions, and we can't reduce them. So reductions would have to be in student support, binding, any outsourcing…If I could, there would be positions targeted." In other cases, respondents noted that certain functions (microfilming, digitizing) were funded by outside sources and therefore couldn't/wouldn't be susceptible to cuts. Administrators generally see the situation as more malleable than did people "on the line." One person seems to resist the question by saying that he would just go after more grant funding. Another interjects a touch of emotion by beginning his answer with: "We would cry." Another comments that such a cut would be "devastating."

In the context of ARL and ULG libraries, the list is quite long. Binding clearly comes first, related usually to lessening of serial binding where JSTOR or MUSE subscriptions exist. There were some variations on this theme: no binding of periodical gifts, not

binding journals or paper-back books destined for off-site storage, and repairing books from the general collections rather than rebind them. One person, after listing potential areas, commented that "Periodicals would have to be [bound] because they damage so easily."

Staff come next on the list of potential cuts. Some would eliminate or reduce student help; another would move from a full-time employee to student help. One person would eliminate a half-time position, and another would remove a person from the bindery, which is currently overstaffed anyway. As noted above, some would have targeted staff but were constrained from doing so by local regulations and circumstances.

There are numerous references to conservation or elaborate item-level treatments. Here the situation is complex. Some would reduce such work. Others would reduce other functions (such as repair of fragile material in the general collections) in order to focus resources on the unique, rare, and/or irreplaceable. (Some of the respondents were speaking as special collections staff.) Outsourcing of special treatments would be reduced or cease altogether, but some note that they do very little of this anyway.

There are two or three references to each of the following areas: digital activities (get rid of the camera, cease digitizing), equipment and supplies (reduce purchases), and routine repairs (where one person, contrarily, notes that less binding would mean more repairing). In single cases, libraries would drop microfilming, delay the building of an off-site storage facility, use document delivery services instead of replacing missing articles in journals, fail to upgrade equipment, and withdraw preservation staff from work on exhibits (which is seen as very time-consuming).

Stepping back from the specific, a few people comment that they would base their decisions on use-based criteria.

For LG/OG libraries, the picture is less complex. Respondents indicated that the amount of resources currently is very low indeed ("Starting with 30% of what?," "Still 30% of nothing," "I'd cry," "We [currently] try to shift money around to 'try to afford' [preservation]," and "No idea. There is nowhere to cut").

By far, the most cuts would affect binding, with serial binding heading the list, especially where electronic subscriptions exist. As for books, some LG and OG libraries now place unbound paper-backs on the open shelves; others might adopt this practice. When talking about journals, a few people, taking the longer view, comment that the library would probably drop some periodical subscriptions altogether to absorb the cuts and to free up a little money for binding and repairing the remaining periodicals.

"Personnel – just kidding – we are understaffed already," commented one interviewee. Other references to personnel indicated that there were not positions to cut (with the exception of one part-time conservator), but some staff time might be shifted from one function to another (e.g., from "handling and contract work" to other basic preservation functions).

Scattered references indicated possible cuts in microfilming, purchase of supplies (especially critical for archives where this is a relatively big budget item), and routine maintenance in rare book areas (i.e., oiling books).

One respondent would seek relief by investigating cooperative storage possibilities. Another predicts she would have to eliminate access to special collections as an indirect result of such a drastic reduction.

The discussion of scarce funds inspired a number of revealing general remarks. Libraries spend a lot of time and energy seeking grant money for preservation activities. Because so much preservation activity is done on grant money, one preservation officer believes that "not to go for grants is being negligent." In his library, nearly two-thirds of the preservation staff are on "soft" (i.e., grant) money.

Given this dependency, it is worrisome to hear that "there's less federal funding. Private funds are harder to get. Endowments are down. Demands are up [for regular library funds]."

State funding is also harder to obtain. "There is a joke about publicly-supported schools having moved from being 'state supported' to 'state assisted' and now to 'state located.'"

In such a climate, one interviewee said plaintively that he could really use more people to write grants; "We can do the intellectual content, but otherwise we need help."

4. Training of staff

Summary: Most libraries report that they train staff. Programs range from structured situations to ad hoc instruction. Interviewees express strong preference for hands-on experiences. They particularly value their own training in treatment methods, although other aspects of preservation are mentioned. By and large, their training has taken place in workshops, short courses, and private study.

a. If staff throughout the library receive preservation training, how is that done? Who are trained?

Many people had a lot to say about training. The simple answers are "yes, almost all libraries do it," and "almost everybody gets trained." The training is usually structured, although some, particularly in smaller administrative units, report "informal" or "ad hoc" approaches to training. The range of skills taught is wide, but most effort is concentrated on basic handling with some follow-up instruction on minor repair. Where training does not now exist, there usually is interest in developing something. Only a tiny number reported no training, or discontinued training, or that they "didn't know" whether training exists. The percentage of institutions without formal training was marginally higher for LG and OG institutions than for ARL and ULG libraries.

There is very little difference in how ARL/ULG and LG/OG libraries pursue training with one exception. In ARL and ULG institutions, workshops that are generated in-house are a regular feature, while in LG and OG libraries, staff attend workshops in other locations (e.g., ALA or SOLINET). Result for the two groups are combined here.

<u>Who are trained?</u>
All staff (multiple responses)
Binding staff
Circulation staff and students (multiple responses)
Copy catalogers
Outsiders
New librarians/staff
Selectors
Shelvers/stack staff (multiple responses)
Special collections staff
Student assistants (multiple responses)
Supervisors
Support staff

<u>What are they taught?</u>
Archives and manuscript techniques
Basic preservation
Binding and minor repair (multiple responses)
Book structures
Care and handling (multiple responses)
Circulation issues [e.g., handling, identification]
Condition assessment (multiple responses)
Consciousness-raising
Cross-training ["a cataloger becomes (also) a mender"]
Digitization and scanning (multiple responses)
Disaster preparedness
Food and drink issues (multiple responses)
Injury prevention
Microfilming processes
Orientation
Photocopying skills
Reformatting
Shelving techniques including taking books from shelves (multiple responses)

The pedagogical techniques used for training include brown-bag lunches, consultants, demonstrations, distribution of information (e.g., handouts), professional meetings, staff-meetings, talks, videos, and workshops (both in-house and at other sites). There was little mention of materials, but a few were cited: ALA booklets, a home-produced preservation video, and a disaster manual. Several people mentioned the need for a basic text and a teaching manual to aid those conducting training.

b. If not, what kinds of staff training would be most beneficial?

ARL and ULG libraries and LG and OG libraries generally suggest different lists of training that would benefit their staffs. There are two exceptions where interests overlap; these are 1) the handling of materials and 2) the selection of books for conservation/preservation treatment. In other cases the concepts may be similar for some categories, but the language used is different enough to warrant separate attention.

ARL and ULG libraries want training in the following areas. Most of the references come from only one or two voices.

Archival acquisition
Bench-level conservation training
Book repair
Conservation techniques for the non-conservator
Costing repair techniques
Digital camera training ("What can it do for us?")
Fund-raising, grant-writing, development
Leather techniques for binding
Long-term care of digital products
Personnel management
Preservation of objects/realia (e.g., plastics, 'zines)
Photographic processes
Scanning
Selecting books for conservation/preservation
Sewing (bindings)
Special collections techniques for non-special collections staff
Subject specialist training – at the national level
Time management
Training for library directors

The list of suggestions from LG and OG libraries is dominated by the call for instruction in basic repair. Next comes basic care and handling and then selection of books for treatment. The list includes:

Binding (including hand-binding)
Care and handling
Disaster response
Digitization
Exposure to studies for guidance in making decisions
Mold treatment
Freezing techniques
Selection of materials [mostly books] for conservation/preservation

In all sizes of library, interviewees express preference for hands-on experience over other modes. ARL and ULG libraries find these tools acceptable: CD's, online chat formats,

distance learning techniques, regional workshops – but not too expensive, one-sheet instructions for students on handling, videos (e.g., "Murder in the Stacks"). LG/OG libraries indicate preference for pamphlets, lectures, and – most importantly – hands-on experience.

c. What aspects of your own training have proved particularly valuable on the job from a preservation perspective? What skills would you like to acquire?

Answers range from the general to the highly specific. Among interviewees in ARL and ULG libraries, the skills most frequently mentioned relate to the artifact/object itself and its treatment (i.e., book binding, book structures, basic conservation skills, history of the book, descriptive bibliography, parts of the book, and repair). Other valued skills are scattered: disaster avoidance and recovery, cataloging, information retrieval, management, microfilming, printing, research/academic work, selection, and technical services.

Those in ARL and ULG libraries report that they developed their skills mainly though institutions: the Cornell Institute, Lilly Library training, NEH grant participation, Rare Book School (University of Virginia), Newberry Library, New York Botanical Garden, RLG training sessions, SAA, Society of Georgia Archivists, SOLINET, University of Texas at Austin, and the Wisconsin Historical Society. Some studied with or worked with individuals who influenced them: Paul Banks, Pat Battin, Lisa Fox, Bob Futernick, Carolyn Harris, and Hedy Kyle. Other important sources of skills cited include: field placement, graduate school (hands-on), relationship with an archivist, reading, visit to a commercial bindery, and viewing "Murder in the Stacks." Several mention the importance of experience, expressed as: ad hoc training, on-the-job experience, "seat of the pants," and seeing how others do things.

Among interviewees in LG/OG libraries, the training that they most value dealt with treatments (repair and hand-binding), digital issues and techniques (including scanning workflow and image quality), disaster preparedness, environmental issues (mold and HVAC), and basic handling (including how to remove a book from a shelf).

These skills were obtained also largely through institutional programs: ALA, AMIGOS, California County Library System (20 years ago), Cornell, Florida State University classes, Mt. Angel Abby, NEH Seminar in Black History, and the Wellesley seminar for preservation administrators. Additional references exist to private study, undergraduate experience, and participation in an overlap study with similar libraries.

There were few critical comments made in response to this question, but a few people recalled, with reservations, the preservation information they were offered in schools of library and information science.

"It's interesting that in formal library training, we don't learn much about how books are made, what makes them fragile. In recent years we've talked more about the mutability of electronic products than about paper."

"In library school, [they] talked about [preservation] – nothing practical."
A single dissenter to the idea of developing the preservation skills of staff reports that he had worked with a person trained in preservation in his previous job, but the expert "was wasting his time. It was futile because it was not a library of record."

d. Do you see a role for regional or national organizations in assisting with your training activities or those of other staff in your library?

See the section on "Outside agencies" at the end of this section.

5. User education

Summary: Very few libraries conduct formal user education programs although many make use of one-to-one encounters when problems occur. The focus of intervention is usually food and drink, photocopying, and treatment of materials. Staff are skeptical about the utility of user education efforts.

a. Does your library conduct user education in the care and handling of materials?
b. If so, what has been the focus of this training?
c. Has it helped?

Little interest is expressed in the topic of user education in the care and handling of materials. A considerable number of libraries claim no training at all. Several others describe one-on-one, or point-of-need instruction. Some recall past training, now discontinued, and some just don't know whether or not training is offered.

Among ARL and ULG libraries, in those situations where such user education is offered, the strongest emphasis is on food and drink. Other topics include handling of materials during photocopying and generally good care. Instruction is offered in these forms and with these tools: exhibits (most frequently mentioned), brochures/hand-outs, plastic bags for rainy days (presumably an implicit message), and posters or signs (particularly near copying machines). One person notes that in the rare book department, the staff mediate use. Another explains that she instructs by personal example. Respondents speculate that the use of flyers sent to faculty and the use of videos and other visual aids might help.

Among LG and OG libraries, the approach also seems to be primarily one-on-one instruction. The "teachable moment" seems to be the best time, according to one person, for such instruction. Oral instruction and demonstration work best. Additional strategies include bookmarks, an online workbook for archives, and the special collections registration form (that contains regulations about handling). One person contents that people won't read documents; he walks through the rare books reading room and looks for transgressions that can be corrected on the spot.

As to whether these strategies help, few offer opinions, and those who do are ambivalent.

Several respondents in both ARL and ULG and LG and OG libraries expressed reservations or skepticism about undertaking reader education in preservation at all. These comments are typical.

"It's hard enough to get students to any orientation. I wonder if it is the best way to spend dollars."

"We don't want to scare them off."

"I have doubts about how effective a 'scare the pants' approach would be."

"I worry about the impact of the information --- best at point of need. I don't want to confirm the stereotype of librarians."

Several interviewees claim that mishandling is not a problem in their institutions. Others note that user education in the proper handling of materials works most effectively if done as part of an academic course, but a dissenter who tried to work preservation into her academically oriented classes "got blank stares."

d. How might national or regional organizations assist you with user training?

See the section on "Outside agencies" at this end of this section.

6. Information sources about preservation

Summary: Preservation information exists in abundance, according to interviewees, but gaining access to the right kind at the moment of need can be difficult. There is a need for repackaging of that information for specific needs, audiences, and objectives. Preferred formats begin with electronic communication modes and include also workshop demonstrations, printed materials, and conventional audio-visual modes.

a. Do you think there is a need for additional information about preservation beyond what is currently available?

The idea that everyone should know about preservation is a new one, according to several interviewees. The hunger for information is pervasive but opinions about its adequacy, availability and nature vary widely.

Enough information exists, according to a clear majority, but there are many barriers to its use. Finding it takes energy. What exists should be repackaged and tailored for practitioners so that it is easy to use. The information could be layered – with some aimed at experts, some at librarians new to the subject, and some at a general public of library users. It is very difficult to determine what is authoritative and current. There is a lot of information out there, but "who is it getting to?" Many people, observed one, are not even aware of the brittle book problem.

Both ARL/UGL and LG/OG institutions share these concerns, but among LG and OG institutions there are additional concerns. Many feel they don't know what's available or don't know what they don't know. For one, access to information is "more a matter of the individual library's prioritizing and finding the time." Some indicate that they are left behind by the "select few" who know about preservation. One spoke out vehemently against the proselytizers as overdoing the emphasis on preservation. She believes that preservation, and by extension its information base, should be "appropriate to what needs to be done." Said another, "What is needed is knowledge of how to get what is out there." Repeatedly, the need for providing local information technology people with information was expressed.

People need information for very specific topics. From libraries of a variety of sizes came the call for emergency/disaster plans and management, models for contracts, advice on preparing materials for compact storage, more detailed ARL statistics for preservation, book drop information, and suggestions for CD and video containers. From an ARL/ULG library came a call for help with business policies for cost-recovery. And, predictably, there is a need from all for information about the digital realm: guidelines and standards, file formats, and more. (One person cited the difficulty in following citations about digital matters into the information science literature.) Audiovisual materials are a concern especially for several ARL and ULG institutions. Commercial binderies seem to keep their customers informed so the need for more of that kind of information is not urgent.

b. In what forms should it be delivered?

Preferred formats include web sites (with search capability), listservs (or "hotline"), workshops, hand-on experience at other institutions in workshops and internships; less often mentioned were printed publications (ALA booklets were cited), video conferences, and videotape. An information clearinghouse was mentioned once. A novel suggestion was a "dial-a-problem" format, online, with the use of a template for presenting the answer.

A lone voice expressed the "lack of good science in the area of preservation" about such topics as the deterioration of paper. Using the literature of other fields, such as paper chemistry, seems not to be a common practice for librarians engaged in preservation issues.

7. Cooperative ventures in preservation:

Summary: The record on cooperative activities is mixed. Where interviewees could think of any, those ventures they mentioned made up a highly varied list. Some people are frankly skeptical about cooperative activities. The high level of cooperative activity that marked past decades seems to have waned. The "wish list" for cooperative activities is diverse and there seems to be at least tempered interest in sharing skills and experience.

a. Is your library engaged in any cooperative activities that have had an effect on preservation?

Among the 20 libraries visited, most, though by no means all, report some kind of cooperative action. The list of cooperative ventures is long for those libraries where interviewees could recall such activity at all.

Significantly, a few interviewees mentioned that their libraries participated in none, or that they could not think of any. In these cases, if there were any such programs, they did not enjoy a high profile within the institutions visited. In one case, the interviewee explained that the dean did not encourage cooperation so the library has not engaged in any. A skeptic observed: "Collaboration is great and necessary but unless it gives to the individual institution staff and resources to maintain it and keep it going, you may do more harm than good." Another respondent, with ambiguous feelings about collaboration, noted that collaboration can have a negative effect on preservation: "[Our regional, inter-college] delivery system is very active and we ship frequently to all participants. This has a dramatic impact in preservation. There is more wear and tear in the transport but you can get your hands on more copies of items and this helps access." Reported another, "I read an article that said cooperative programs can be helpful, but you have to take care of what's at home first and that's our priority."

While the list of past and present collaborations is long, one person observes that "Not too many cooperative ventures are happening any more. There are fewer grant dollars for this." This comment suggests that grant dollars are often the impetus, or at least a necessary component, for cooperative activities.

For ARL/ULG libraries, the list of cooperative organizations includes a Berkeley-Emery training project, DLF, Carnegie Museum, CIC, Colorado Preservation Alliance, an Illinois newspaper project, an Illinois State Library teaching project, New York State projects (training, film preservation, microfilm, performance art archives, and digitizing scholarly journals with a commercial publisher), Indiana University project for Victorian literature, LOCKSS project with Stanford and Indiana, Oakland Conservation Community, OCLC, OLC, PASCAL, RLG, SAA, and SOLINET. One ARL/ULG library from an ARL/ULG state system reports cooperative activities almost exclusively with other academic libraries in the system. Many of the projects mentioned are regional projects. [See the Appendix for a key to abbreviations.]

The LG/OG libraries in this sample report engaging in AMIGOS, an Alabama archives project, FCLA for Florida-related materials, Five-college (Ohio) cooperative for delivery, Great Western Library Alliance on "waters of the west" materials, Gettysburg-Dickinson-Franklin & Marshall projects, Minnesota Tri- College group for serials ownership, Ohio Preservation Council, OLA, ORBIS, San Antonio newspaper project, and a University of North Dakota serials project.

b. Which cooperative ventures have the largest effect on your preservation work here?

From all those listed above, the projects perceived as having notably positive effect included the following:

New York State programs: "We receive funds for training and preserving. John Dean would say this is important. It brought us into contact with people though it is a small amount of money."

SOLINET: "have been very beneficial." "SOLINET microfilming projects have had the largest effect."

The University of North Dakota serials project: "Progress last year, willing to partner, good cooperation on archival collections."

ORBIS: "Really strong impact…The regional collection development group."

RLG: "We did cooperative work in the early years with RLG and its microfilming projects. Those were the most beneficial."

New York State Big 11 research library program: "Very fortunate to have it. We lack all kinds of other state support but it's good we have that. It's a forum for all kinds of activity."

PASCAL: "PASCAL is the biggest. Really is the only one in my area."

c. What kinds of cooperative projects or organizations should exist to help you with preservation work here?

The wish list is a long one, although most suggestions came from larger libraries. Their staff want:

"a paper trail for deacidification [in special collections]. Put treatment in the record; don't put it in staff mode only. This way other libraries could see it."

"Opportunities for digital imaging, conservation, digitizing, and accessing."

"Regional repositories that will allow non-record libraries to divest themselves of material."

"Group of venue for preservation administrators to meet again. There was such incredible momentum in RLG. I've thought about ARL…ALA doesn't do it."

"Specialized facilities that can handle work….We don't have enough capacity to nonbook arena."

"Clearinghouse for digital technology…the migration vs. emulation debate—where to come down on that?"

"Sharing expensive machinery, unusual types of treatment, lab facilities."

"A source for stuff to be done – at good prices."

"Sharing a preservation librarian…2-3 ways."

"Clearinghouse to develop display/handout work"

"Bindery interest group – level of people in the trenches."

"Project to digitize micro formats."

"Nice to be able to send multi-media materials to a cooperative site"

"Something like NEDCC to send stuff to."

Staff in LG/OG libraries call for:

"Participate in digital subscriptions"

"Joint storage facility"

"Partnerships with the tribal colleges in North and South Dakota."

"Good web resource site"

One enthusiast for cooperation summed up his feelings for the interviewer: "There is too much to be gained by collaboration to pursue preservation and … access projects alone. Don't want to reinvent the processes. Want to learn from peers."

8. Best practices and standards

Summary: Although they may not think of them as "best practices and standards," many interviewees report, albeit tentatively, that they have adopted solutions that are generally approved in the preservation field. Practitioners seem to think more in terms of specific procedures than of conceptual approaches in this area. References to best practices and/or standards are unusual in policy documents.

a. Have you identified best practices or standards that have proved helpful to you in preservation activities here?

Many interviewees seemed either uncomfortable or unusually reticent on this topic. The evidence therefore seems unusually fragmentary. Some general remarks indicate that these terms and concepts may not be completely familiar: "No one has the answers," "[We're] working to learn best practices", "[We] try to do what is best for the book for

the long haul, not just for the moment", "We go more on instinct than anything," "It would be good to have some models," and "[I] can't articulate any off hand…"   It is quite probable that even for the institutions that report "No," some, upon further reflection, might agree with one interviewee that "I'm sure there are [best practices and standards used here], but I can't cite any." One interviewee answers enigmatically, "We have our own."

It appears that almost all libraries use at least some "best practices" and standards, although the terms for them may vary. ARL and ULG libraries describe a wider variety of application areas (e.g., digital, environmental, microfilming) than do LG and OG institutions (which report principally binding, ILL, and archives applications). ARL and ULG institutions also have much more to say on the subject generally.

Where responses were elicited, they were very specific. In such instances, these categories of applications came readily to mind: commercial binding, deacidification, product information, rehousing, encapsulation, reformatting AV, displays and exhibits, temperature, humidity, microfilming, scanning, environmental concerns (i.e., fans and humidifiers), and preserving film, video and audiovisual materials.

Individual standards, organizations, and even a personality are described: RLG microfilming standards, Digital Library Federation guidelines, Metadata Encoding Transmission Standard, Dublin Core, Library Binding Institute, American National Standards Institute, CIP (for digital objects), and IPI (for longevity information). Guidance is sought from CNI, ACRL, and ARL. A few LG and OG institutions report using materials that are "archival;" one of them reports using "safe" materials from Light Impressions, Metal Edge, and Gaylord. Said one respondent, "[Cornell's] John Dean's solutions have emerged as best practices."

b.. Have any generally recognized best practices or standards been adopted in policy statements here?

As to representing best practices and standards in policy statements, that is unusual. There are references to processing manuals, procedural manuals, and disaster preparedness plans as the closest to policy documents in this area. Says one, "[We] have web policies …. [I] don't think any of them are specifically on preservation." Another interviewee reflects that best practices had been applied to the handling of library materials: "They haven't hurt, but their impact is not measurable."

9. Collection preservation issues:

Summary: Large-scale, formal surveys are rare these days, but surveys designed to examine a particular area or problem are occasionally undertaken. As for major challenges or concerns relating to collection preservation, interviewees have ready responses: digital concerns, space/buildings, basic collection management issues, time, staff conscious-raising, non-print materials, and training of selectors.

a. If you have conducted any preservation surveys of your collections, please describe them.

Full-fledged, formal collection surveys of any kind are rarely conducted these days. One ARL library reported an ongoing, structured survey of the whole collection. Two report beginning work on new surveys, one for a law school. Many libraries report "informal" surveys consisting of examining books as they return from circulation, or sporadic visual inspection while visiting the stacks for other purposes. Participants seem generally confident that they understand the needs of their collections from their informal analysis. Only one person indicates concern about the lack of formal surveys when he describes a survey as a "dire need."

Surveys were conducted quite commonly about 8-10 years ago, often in connection with the search for "brittle books." The RLG Conspectus also was an impetus. Little action seemed to follow these general surveys, although one librarian reporting keeping a list from her periodical visits to the stacks that they consulted when money became available for treatment.

These days, surveys are likely to be conducted in connection with a particular event: flood, renovation, mold outbreak, state-sponsored project, or SAA questionnaire. These surveys are general in nature, but produce preservation information as a by-product. Detailed surveys are likely to concentrate on a specific area of the collection: sets, LP's, AV material, rare material in the general stacks, musical scores, 19th century fiction (for brittle books), vellum bindings, archives and special collections.

Some of those who do not conduct surveys had strong reasons for their decision. They had trouble keeping their heads above water as it is. Said one, "What's the point if you have no money?"

Awareness of surveys seems quite low in general. Most interviewees didn't know, or didn't remember, whether any surveys had been in their institutions. In some institutions, interviewees reported conflicting data.

The few consultants cited as having conducted surveys seem to have produced general remarks about the collection condition; in one case no written report was submitted at all.

Little difference was obvious between ARL/ULG and LG/OG responses. The small scale surveys described above took place mainly in the ARL and ULG institutions, and those spokespersons had rather more to say on the subject generally than their LG/OG counterparts.

b. What are the most serious challenges or concerns for you now in terms of preserving collections?

Respondents had ready and focused answers to this query. Answers vary, in part due to the variety of job responsibilities represented, but in all cases interviewees indicate a clear understanding of their problems.

For ARL and ULG libraries, there are five specific topics that dominate the list: digital concerns ("born digital" and migration), "the basics" (circulating collection, physical collections, deterioration, and "brittle books" which are discussed below), time (for repairs, oversight, and "to make it happen"), none-print materials (video, moving images, microfilm and audio recordings) and reorienting subject specialists. The last of these gives rise to some venting: " Selectors/subject librarians like to collect, but they don't like to take care of what we collect." The same sentiments in a more positive framework:

"What we haven't done is training subject specialists—we haven't done enough of that. It's a different kind of training in how to make preservation decisions, and to select options for treatment. Preservation tends to be a lower priority for this group. It's painful and time-consuming. I've never been in a library where they didn't run away from it."

For a very few libraries in this study, "brittle books" are cited specifically as the major problem, although it may be that the concept is embodied in references to deterioration, 19th century material, and document reproduction. In two cases, the problem is linked to selectors: "From my own perspective, I'd hire assistants to help selectors get through the backlog of brittle books. I've even had selectors tell me 'I hate old books.' They must have more to do than they have time for." Taking another tack, a preservation libraries states: "I'd try to streamline the process to see if there are ways to eliminate some decisions that selectors have to make – maybe pre-select titles by lists of authors, subject areas, or dates. Or I'd eliminate the selection process and just microfilm all brittle material." Yet another library reports doing just that, that is, automatically replacing (with reprints made on demand) all materials in particular sections that are by nature brittle – all without involving selectors at the item level.

Other specific concerns in ARL and ULG libraries include: environmental controls (air quality, HVAC), funding, prioritizing, binding, serials, stacks (damage from shifting), particular local collections, conservation (going too far), and training librarians now in the work force:

"Universally I am shocked and amazed at how little preservation training librarians have. I've had loads more training about light and stuff than they. I've told preservation and conservation librarians that there needs to be loads more."

More general remarks touch on raising awareness ("Raising awareness raises demand for services and raises perceived need closer to real need. Changes priorities."). Another concern: "Moderating 'cool ideas' from directors. E.g., deacidification is a going thing in ARL libraries, but not necessarily a priority for preservation practitioners"). Taking the long view, one respondent offers: "Integration of preservation as a major business function of research libraries."

For LG and OG libraries, three issues emerge as most compelling. Two involve buildings, with temperature and humidity most frequently cited, with space concerns closely following. The third is making staff understand preservation. On education needs, respondents are quite expansive:

"Really describing preservation in a way that makes it more integral in day to day experiences in the library, instead of 'Oh that's [X's] or that's [Y's] problem.' The regular staff could walk by the stacks and see things squished to death and not respond. The definition of
preservation needs to be translated in a way that's more than the high- end stuff. It has to have a live hook to it. If you lined up 10 people in this office and asked 'What's preservation,' they'd identify it with rare books. Hardly anyone thinks of binding as a preservation activity."

"Apathy — people do not see the value. Part of daily tasks…not one of the main goals. Not sexy, except for digital. More interest in digital, which takes care of part of the apathy. It is a question of assuming values. What is an item worth?"

A related, common concern involves water in the form of flooding and roof leaks. The others vary widely. Workflow is an issue, described with an unexpected twist: "Whenever we do have these [preservation] workshops, and the staff gets bees in their bonnets and pretty soon the system is overwhelmed. Everyone is feeling righteous in identifying problems and then it hits the bottleneck: there are only two people handling it and it's so labor intensive." A variation on workflow is the reference to the difficulty of coordinating processing for the central and branch libraries.

Scattered references point to types of materials (unique, recordings, Black history, dictatapes, and models), funding, electronic materials, and damage from photocopying. Single references emerged for food and drink, the circulating collection (now being "used to death"), and time:

"There used to be time to walk around in the stacks looking for books that needed preservation. Now, there is no time for this, or to read about preservation. (The increase in the number of e-mail messages received each day has had a lot to do with this.)"

A particularly thought-provoking response is the observation that the major problem was "balancing access with preservation." This idea was touched upon in many responses throughout the study although no questions specifically addressed it. One respondent in this section articulates the problem of access and preservation eloquently:

"In the old days, access was through the card catalog. Users were the victims of the ways we organized information, and they are painfully complicated. The new generation does a Google search and gets information fast. We're still organizing our electronic collections as if we still controlled access to information. How do we take the best of what we do which is a philosophical belief in organizing information and valued information, and do it quickly with electronic information and make it available? These hordes of librarians

are running around and I don't think they're doing the right thing. We need to get best minds in the country on this."

10. Suppliers of materials and services

Summary: Interviewees are quite satisfied with their suppliers and supplies, and especially with binding services and materials. Nonetheless, interviewees can readily name improvements that they would like to see. There is some concern that materials are not always archivally sound, although advertised as such. Many express concern about the cost of supplies.

a. If you purchase preservation supplies or services, are you satisfied with the suppliers that now exist?

Almost everyone, in both LG/OG and ARL/ULG libraries, expresses satisfaction with suppliers and supplies. The occasional qualification runs from "very happy" through "pretty satisfied," to "sort of." Many interviewees expressed their full approval of their binding services.

From ARL and ULG libraries, respondents note that the buckram supply has dried up, and there were rumors about difficulties with microfilm supplies, although the bearer of this tale was switching to digitizing and was therefore not to concerned about film issues. In this context, photographic supplies meet with particular approval.

Staff in LG and OG libraries are more specific about what they buy: mylar, mildew spray, non-acid paper, shelving, Princeton files, boxes and in one case a disaster-cleanup service (contracted before an event).

A few issues or problems emerge here, almost all articulated by staff in LG and OG libraries: binding can take too long, some vendors will not accept purchase orders, back orders sometimes take too long, supplies are too expensive, and supplies labeled "preservation" in fact "ain't."

Two respondents offer unique expression of their needs, along with indications of their involvement in cooperative solutions: "In the design of the new area, it would be nice to have help in determining how much space is needed for supplies. We have to order in quantities…regional groups have more clout to get better prices." And, "I have to learn who to buy things from. Still learning. I talk with other libraries. People are open. Lots of cooperation."

b. What materials, supplies and services would you like to see developed or improved?

The only appreciable difference in responses from ARL/ULG and LG/OG institutions is the greater interest in digital processes and supplies on the part of ARL and ULG libraries. Responses were succinct and specific, although the meaning of the terms not always entirely clear:

AV housing
Bindery that will do entire processing (labels, security strips, and property stamp)
Binding (good looking non-warping, and adequate for low use, paperback items)
Binding slips
Book cradles and supports for reading room use
Book repair (not very, very high end)
Buckram (more colors, more in general, and in pre-cut sizes)
Detection devices for media
Envelopes for pocket materials
High-quality imaging
Interlibrary loan shipping containers (including padded, lightweight suitcases)
Labels, barcodes and stickums (for date due slips)
Microfilm readers that clean more easily
Microfilmers (in general, and for newspapers specifically)
Moving image services (for videotape and digital reformatting)
Multi-media services (analog)
Paperback stiffened binding
Photocopies (book-friendly)
Photographic supplies (ordinary, not especially for high end applications)
Rubber bands (many sizes, for books)
Scanners (especially with book cradles)
Scoring machine for boxes ("but that exists already")
Staples (galvanized)

Off-hand comments indicate a concern about the cost of supplies: "What we get is probably OK; we just don't have the resources to get enough." "[We'd like] to buy in smaller quantity at a good price." And, "Nice if we could get some kind of price break on supplies and that kind of thing."

Stepping back from the question, several interviewees expressed more general concerns about supplies and suppliers.

"Better access to experts of whom [we] can ask questions."

"There's a lot out there [digital reformatting services], but it's hard to tell if they're preservation conscious."

"I'd really like to see the whole digitization thing become a national plan, but I'd like to see it develop in a more realistic, systematic way….I think there has to be some attention to building the infrastructure for digital products."

"[What's needed is] maybe simplified digitization…like a coffee grinder. Pour stuff in the top and have it come out scanned, indexed, and ready for use."

Expressing well the general sense of approval, one interviewee comments: "Vendors have been very responsive to new suggestions and come out with new products. There is almost too large a menu to choose from now."

11. Policies

a. In what areas have you developed policies that affect preservation?

Summary: Although most libraries in the sample have de facto policies affecting preservation, they may or may not have a written record of these "policies." The list of areas with "agreements," if not formal policies, is long. Implementation of these "policies" or "agreements" has generally gone smoothly.

Answers, though brief and to the point, suggest that this is a complex situation in most institutions. Although staff in ARL and ULG libraries have rather more to say generally about the subject than their counterparts in LG and OG libraries, they more frequently report not having preservation policies at all, or not knowing whether they have preservation policies, than do library staff in LG and OG institutions. It is important to keep in mind that answers represent what respondents could recall on the spot about policies and not necessarily the actual facts in and about those policy documents.

There are few simple "yes's" to this question, although most institutions indicate that they have, if not formal policies, something close in the form of procedural documents, informal policies, operating practices, standards, understanding, and "unwritten" policies. "There are skeletons of various creatures." And, "At one point we were doing [a policy statement] and updating it, but we've stopped doing it. [My colleague] and I have been here a long time."

For some libraries, "preservation practices are integrated into all library procedures and that's where they belong." Similarly, "The whole policy is informed by preservation standards."

Just a handful of respondents say "no" flatly, and in some cases the responses come from different people in the same institution so it is difficult to produce a calculation.
More fruitful is the list of topics for which "policies" are reported to exist. (One might quibble that "procedures" might be the more appropriate term in some cases.) For ARL and ULG institutions it is:

Binding (several instances)
Brittle books
Conservation
Collection development (for acquisition, deaccessioning)
Digital materials (file formats, processing, digitizing)
Emergency/disaster preparedness plan
Encapsulation
Exhibitions

Food and drink (many instances)
Key control and access
Special collections (care and handling, security, access, processing manuscripts)

For LG and OG institutions, the list is similar, though the terms used are more specific:

Binding
Circulation
Cleaning of materials
Duplication of films and video
Emergency/disaster preparedness plan (several instances)
Food and drink (multiple instances)
Interlibrary loan
"Last copy"
Replacement
Storage and accessibility of collections
Users
Vault materials
Weeding

This exercise seemed to have stimulated thought about the need for policies: "I am going to do that [e.g., develop policies] as soon as you leave;" "Maybe in the next few weeks we will have some [preservation concerns] incorporated into policy. I have asked a strategic planning group to begin addressing these issues….We are trying to make that transition."

A few interviewees offer reasons for having policies, these two centering on smoothing possible areas of disagreement among staff: "In the past there has been no support for a preservation policy, but our new administration will change this so we're moving towards it." Ruminates another respondent: "In general, policies are good for expectations and measurement. It is better to have them than not."

b. Can you describe your experience in implementing these policies?

Experience with implementation is reported generally to be positive. A few minor frustrations are voiced, specifically with food and drink policies.

"We get good cooperation….People are responsive to training. It's all personalized because of its small size. We have buy-in."

"Gone well – no convincing necessary. The frustration is funding – we need more ongoing funding."

"Policies for emergency procedures have been very effective. During a flood…the library was called in to provide help for university recovery. [The university community] saw that it was very helpful."

"No problems. The [preservation] department is respected here. It is to [my colleague's] credit that we enjoy such stature --- and to mine!"

"We have had policies for a while, but I'd guess they've been pretty dormant in terms of enforcement."

"Being so decentralized, implementing policies is difficult. The food and drink policy will vary; it's acceptable some places but will meet with much anger elsewhere."

"Food and drink is chugging along – one roadblock after another."

c. How might outside organizations assist you in improving the implementation of locally defined policies?

(See the section on Outside organizations at the end of this section.)

Special collections

12. The common needs of special collections, archives and manuscript collections:

Summary: Special collections needs center on environmental/building concerns, non-print materials, and staffing issues. ARL and ULG libraries anticipate expansion in the digital realm, although this development will represent an expansion of activity, not a shift from the essential focus of special collections on original materials. All libraries anticipate funding needs.

a. What are the preservation needs in this library for special collections (broadly defined)?

For special collections, the present preservation needs and future directions of ARL and ULG libraries differ somewhat from those of their LG and OG counterparts. It is true that there is some overlap in such areas as digital/electronic matters, environmental concerns, and item-level treatment, as would be expected, but the emphases and, to some degree, the language are different.

(Much information about the present needs of ARL and ULG institutions for their special collections is explored in fuller detail in the sections on digital activity. LG and OG institutions, which generally reported less activity that area, are represented in those sections as well. Here we record the responses to this particular question.)

For ARL and ULG libraries, three areas of current need emerge as central in response to this question, and seemingly in this order: environment/building, non-print materials, and staff (both skills and time). For LG and OG libraries, environmental concerns loom above all the others. The full lists of articulated concerns are presented separately.

ARL and ULG libraries:

Assessment
Building
Conservation
Compact shelving
Digital activity
Environment
Equipment
Funds
Non-print (audiovisual, including analog and digital, photographs, etc.)
Off-site storage facilities
Skilled staff
Staff time
Training
Treatment (of broadsides, posters, artists books, objects, and brittle books; also need protective enclosures, deacidification and boxes)

Observations from staff in ARL and ULG libraries indicates recognition of the problems, and developing plans for addressing them:

"[Needs are] significant and potentially enormous. We haven't done nearly enough, even though the curators have a good idea of what needs to be done."

"We need more thorough bibliographic description to help us understand what we have."

"Establishing an endowment for ongoing support."

LG and OG libraries:

Compact shelving ("as fire protection")
Environment
Reorientation
Repair
Skilled staff
Treatments
UV covers for lights

Observations from LG and OG libraries indicates a growing consciousness of preservation issues in special collections contexts:

"There is a need for [preservation]. [I] look forward to reinforcing, formalizing."

"The archives staff is more concerned with preservation and conservation; special collections is more concerned with security."

"New space will have a rare books room. Will help to bring out the need for policies, special care."

"I guess I see more happening. General awareness in saving/preserving older materials."

b. Do you foresee a shift in the preservation needs of special collections over the next five years? (In what directions?)

Among ARL and ULG libraries, the anticipated action is clearly in the digital realm. (See the sections on digital issues).

"I'm much more interested in digitization. We'll be preparing material for scanning, developing high quality scanning. We'll never do all the material. People will still want to come here to see our material."

Digital activity is seen, therefore, often in the service of the original for special collections staff.

"We are seeing an increase in archival collections and special materials use. That's what's going to be distinctive about institutions. As digitizing gets common, the taste for these materials will be increased. We see an increase in using this material for teaching. The 'wonder' of books increases as digital experience increases."

One reader corrects the language of the question: "The emphasis is not really shifting, barring cutbacks, but I do see it expanding to include more specific collections and non-print media."

ARL and ULG libraries indicate the desire and expectation that users will come to their original collections: "We'll reach out a bit more to let people know this is available. We have to think creatively." Other expected changes in five years include "perhaps an increased emphasis on off-site storage for conservation as well as convenience" and attention to archives. A considerable number of respondents do not anticipate major changes in their approaches.

In LG and OG libraries, staff express their future needs more specifically:

Digital/electronics
Pulling material from shelves for a move
Records management (improvement)
Scanning of photographs (from the archives for alumni)
Shelving
Space

Some needs are based on unique, political situations such are described in this response: "The need for good archival space will increase. Aging population in the state. Archives could grow, but people are reluctant to give without a good environment for preserving

collections. We only have a window of time. I worry that children and grandchildren will throw materials away before libraries/archives can secure them."

Echoing their ARL and ULG counterparts, LG and OG libraries anticipate future funding needs: "We need funds for the endowment of the archivist position."

13. Digital technology

Summary: Concern about digital technology is high in ARL and ULG libraries, and is developing rapidly in LG and OG libraries. The definition of pertinent digital technologies, however, seems to vary considerably from one institution to another, and therefore the extent of development is difficult to determine from interview data. In general, libraries consulted here are not yet very active in this area, beyond routine maintenance of basic digital subscriptions and other services provided from the outside. Projects do exist to transfer locally held information to digital form (e.g., scanning), but frequently these are unique initiatives unrelated to an overall strategy. Lack of funds, service organizations, and standards are holding back progress in this area. The tone of remarks indicates cautious enthusiasm.

a. Do you consider the preservation of digital information to be a significant concern at your institution?

In ARL and ULG libraries, the answer is overwhelmingly "yes," although frequently there are qualifications. A flat "no" is very rare. Several respondents speak of "awareness" that might exist in the library or in the institution's leadership, or is in a state of development. One person notes that "The overwhelming perspective in campus ITS is of the utility of the information and not its permanence. The campus as a whole doesn't have an awareness of preservation needs for the majority of its records." Many libraries are "talking about" digital technology, but not necessarily doing much at the moment.

Despite the quite general agreement that digital information is a significant concern in the home institution, there are differences of opinion about the dimensions of the issue. For some, digital issues center largely on e-journals from outside sources. For others, it entails preserving material created in-house or converted/formatted in-house. In relation to this topic, interviewees often mean different things by the same terms.

Several respondents express concern and bewilderment about standards. Echoing others, one respondent calls for a national solution "with one institution in charge of migrating data forward. It removes a tremendous burden. Without this, most projects will just disappear. We're going to lose a bunch of that [digitized] stuff." Some respondents admitted they don't know enough about digital matters to become active in this area or to understand the issues.

An enthusiast with positive experience with developing a digital depository responds: "People can see how they fit into the model; the comfort level is growing. We're

switching from "central" depositories to "common" depositories." And further: "The common depository has provided a focus. Territoriality has broken down."

Raising a fundamental issue, one interviewee observes that "people tend to think of digital projects as discrete from others kinds of projects." Another states provocatively: "When you think of digital data, you need to think about what NEEDS saving. I used to work in an archives. We saved 3% of what we had. The university archives saves 5%. In the real world, not everything is saved."

For LG and OG libraries, responses fall into fairly even categories of "yes," "no," and "sort of, with qualification." Where a qualified concern was indicated, close analysis of responses indicates that it is very unusual for libraries in this grouping to be actively engaged in activity. A few people consider "back-ups" of subscriptions, etc., to be preservation activity, and they report being involved in making sure that such procedures are performed, although they generally do not do that themselves (in one case relying on the local IT organization). The comment of one respondent captures well a common sentiment: "Not a significant [concern] here. Those developing the digital library program know it's a concern, but for most it's barely on the radar screen."

For a number of people, future migrations appear to be an obstacle. Says one, "[It's] great for rich places with money to continue to migrate." Several interviewees in one institution with significant African-American materials expressed a unique variation on a general concern; it was summed up by one: "With digitizing, others will control our materials and we'll lose it. Others can migrate our material and we can't. Microfilm all, digitize a little for sale to the public or to academic institutions."

b. How does the existence of digital technology affect your preservation activity?

Among the relatively few people who provided information on this point in ARL and ULG libraries, opinion is fairly evenly divided about whether digital technology has thus far significantly affected preservation activity. For those who say no, most predict that it will soon affect their preservation work.

Among those using digital technology, most report scanning (e.g., state records, photographs, abolitionist pamphlets, local history, Oscar Wilde material). Special collections people seem to be taking the lead in institutional applications. One person reports doing "baby EAD" [electronic archival description] and a few others are reformatting to paper using digital means. Some of the applications described, such as putting material for students on the web, have strong access components tied to preservation issues. One person reports satisfaction that specials collection material recently put on the web has inspired a high level of use and exposure that the material never had previously.

Some frustrations are voiced. A documents librarian wants the GPO to become more involved and interested in retrospective materials. Some express concerns about standards and quality, as in this spirited responses: "I'm not doing any digitizing until I

have the right equipment. Then we'll get going. I'm a proponent, but it's important to do it right, and I think a lot of institutions are doing it right." Among the several comments about digitizing general collection materials, one respondent explains this topic is important because "students want everything in digital form."

For LG and OG institutions, the effects of digital technologies have, in most cases, yet to be felt in the overall preservation approach. Among difficulties, interviewees cite the relentless need to keep current, the shortage of information about actual practice, and the need to coordinate with IT and other campus units engaged in digital work with preservation implications.

14. Space

Summary: Shortage of space is a serious concern for all libraries, though even more acute for ARL and ULG libraries than for LG and OG libraries. Space problems are intimately bound up with funding issues. Most libraries anticipate that space will be a concern five years hence. Many libraries are turning to remote storage, with its many variations, as a major solution to the problem. Some express the belief that digitization will offer some relief.

a. Is shortage of space a current preservation concern for you? Is it a concern to any other segments of the staff?

In ARL and RLG libraries, 80% of the interviewees state unequivocally that space is a serious current concern. The nature of the concern is, variously: big, serious, grave, and potentially disastrous. Not unusual is the lament that "It's horrible. We're bursting at the seams. I no longer have space for equipment, or staff, or collection storage to take on grant-funded projects. The library stacks are at full capacity." Reports one person, with a laugh: "You have to be careful not to trip over the books on the floor! We have every nook and cranny [filled] – collections all over the campus in very different environments, to put it mildly."

Some offer further details on their concerns about space, citing lack of funds, damage to books constantly being shifted to deal with space shortages, inadequate workspace, and the need for controlled environment. One person stresses the need for "Adequate space -- the right kind of space, managed environment. [This is] the first line of defense…we're losing that battle because the library is adding materials faster than it is adding space."

Among the fortunate few without current space concerns, PASCAL (storage facility) is cited as a great help in having addressed this problem. One person who works mainly with digital material muses that she "never considered space in terms of preservation."

For LG and OG libraries, space is an urgent concern in 60% of the comments recorded, with 22% indicating that it is not a current problem, and 18% qualifying their responses. (It should be borne in mind that in some institutions many people were interviewed, and the situations of those libraries may be over-represented in these very loose statistics.)

The situation seems more nuanced in these libraries. Where there is ambiguity on this point, it sometimes occurs that the general stacks are crowded, but special collections or archives has adequate space. A few libraries have novel reasons for the space pressure, such as: "Incorporating the former departmental collections into the rest of the library has contributed significantly to their space shortage and a need for building expansion." Reflecting on the nature of the space problem, one interviewee offers the reminder that "space is a money issue" and another observes that the "question of information technology has muddled it enormously."

b. Will space be a problem, in terms of preservation, within five years?

The predictions about future space concerns are tied to other factors: the use of remote storage, building renovation and extensions, the construction of new buildings, and the effect of technology. On the last point, one respondent eloquently outlines the issues:

"Need more space in the long-term but we are purchasing increasingly fewer volumes. If we create an Information Commons (a high-tech space with support for research needs as well as assistance with computer and multimedia applications), we'll lose some space. The building as a whole can hold about 10 years' more collections. Trying to integrate more educational services in the library—but will lose space as we move down that road."

The sense conveyed by comments is that a little more than half of the interviewees believe that space will still be an issue in five years. Again, this prediction is dependent upon many if's; said one person, space will be a problem "if we continue to get money to purchase new books."

c. If so, how is your library planning to address these concerns?

Overwhelmingly, ARL and ULG libraries are turning to off-site storage to solve space problems. A refinement of this concept is high-density storage, with books shelved by size categories. Some of the anticipated facilities are currently under construction. There are some joint storage facilities already, and it is anticipated that more regional and multi-institution facilities will soon be established. Patron access to the stacks of such facilities is, of course, a moot point. One respondent is concerned that staff hired to work in such facilities might not have a preservation orientation. These facilities go by various designations, but staff caution, for reasons of institutional politics, against referring to them as "storage." The term "remote storage" seems to have disappeared, although some are quite far from the home campus.

Off-site storage and preservation are entwined in complex ways. In one instance, the preservation staff complains that they were not consulted about the facility now being constructed. In another case, the interviewee argues that the removal of materials will benefit preservation in that it will give the unit space to do its work. In another case, the preservation unit may be moved to the off-site facility itself, although staff would prefer to remain on campus for reasons of ambiance.

Some see a solution in turning attention from printed materials to digital forms, although few talk about the space needed to provide digital services.

In discussing culling collections when transferring materials to storage facilities, one person states that ARL statistics are a deterrent to eliminating duplicates. He explains that ARL libraries do not want to reduce their volume counts lest they drop to a lower rung in the ARL listing of institutions by collection size.

It is rare to hear about the construction of new buildings or renovations, but even those solutions might not yield the space expected. Reported one, we "had hoped that the renovation would do more but floor-load capacity was found to be lower [than required for books] and ADA [Americans with Disability Act] requirements reduce space usable for stacks."

In LG and OG libraries, where the concern is not quite so widespread if still acute for some, the hope lies also mainly in off-site storage as a solution. Plans for such facilities seem tentative in most cases. There is some talk as well of building or extending current building/s but that is dependent upon obtaining funding. A few speculate that some weeding might occur.

d. Is there a role for regional or national organizations is assisting you with this problem?

(See the section on "Outside agencies" at the end of this document.)

15. How do you think preservation is regarded in your library?

Summary: Where staff are conscious at all of preservation, they generally hold it in high regard. Often, however, staff are not particularly conscious of preservation. Explanations for its being overlooked include the speculation that preservation is so pervasive that it has become invisible, and that staff are simply not oriented toward it. Administrators are more likely to describe preservation as essential than are those on the front lines. This exercise raised awareness of preservation at least among those directly involved in the study, and in some cases among others in the libraries.

Everyone was quite expansive when answering this question. About a quarter of the respondents believe that preservation is highly or very highly regarded ("for a few people we walk on water"); this was true for both ARL/ULG and LG/OG libraries. Many qualified their generally positive responses with a "but" as in the following comments.

"Little elves – that is how we are viewed. The staff likes to see results – they're sometimes disappointed."

"Highly valued for high risk, unique materials. Ignored for the rest because it is rolled into daily life…. There is an underlying professional commitment – and if things went wrong they would notice."

"Really just binding; print preservation is considered a black hole…Just lip service."

"Philosophically [preservation is] held in high esteem and practically not held in people's minds. Because if it doesn't make sense to store things on top shelves, but [books] are there, you end up grabbing them by the tips of their spines. I'd say there's a neutral sense, but not high up there."

A few surmise that preservation is so pervasive that people are not conscious of it anymore and therefore are not aware of concern about it.

"You know I really don't think most people think much about preservation. Most just come to work and do their job."

"Fifty percent of the rank and file does not give a thought to it…We don't think about it as we do it."

"The IMLS survey [Part I of this study] caused us to realize that preservation is not at the top of our consciousness."

A few institutions report that they are "getting there."

"At one time, it was only tolerated but we have assumed a central role now. People come to us. Favorably regarded here."

"Now if there is a major initiative, preservation is included at the table. This is a major improvement."

"The [large] size of the library – specialization -- leads to people not knowing all areas. [As a result of education efforts] most staff know to come to Preservation with damaged books…. Aware of brittle paper, aware of mold issues…their eyes are more open to preservation."

Preservation seems to be "not really" well regarded more often among LG and OG libraries than among ARL/ULG libraries. In many cases, in LG and OG institutions, the problem is simply unfamiliarity with the concept of preservation as a wide-ranging set of activities that involve almost the entire staff at one time or another. Other resistance is based on economic concerns. One staff member from an LG/OG institution seemed to be coming into consciousness himself when he mused that "preservation isn't just for the well-to-do institutions." Some responses are contradictory.

"People in binding don't see their job as preservation – the definition has to be broadened."

"Highly regarded, but mainly as a binding activity."

"Not very well [regarded] because I don't know very much about it. And I am not aware of the people who came before me regarding it."

"Generally other staff know it's important, but can't be allocating funds for preservation and don't want their ox gored to support it."

"Looked upon favorably by staff as long as it doesn't involve time and money."

Sometimes an event can trigger greater awareness:

"We have a consciousness that we didn't have before the move. The decision to save or not engendered this. People here don't realize that our problems are shared by larger institutions. If Yale is having the same problem with retention, we're OK. It is good to share horror stories."

Especially for ARL and ULG libraries, regard for preservation can vary from department to department, with selectors among the most skeptical.

"[Regard for preservation] has shifted because we have a new dean and head of collections who are preservation-minded. There's a feeling of hostility from some of the selectors; others are very concerned."

"Selectors/subject librarians like to collect, but they don't like to take care of what we collect."

"[Preservation] doesn't have the visibility it needs. Among librarians as opposed to circulation staff, it's neither a priority nor a well-understood area."

"Important but maybe there are staff who would say it is not given enough attention. Special collections staff see it as clearly part of what they do."

Some interviewees described the process of improving the reputation of preservation in their institutions.

"We haven't tried to impose restrictions but persuade people."

"[Our preservation staff] know their field but also are reasonable and work with us to put real procedures in place. Don't aspire to an unattainable "preservation heaven. We don't always bring in preservation early enough in initiatives but it's better than it used to be."

Behind many answers is an implied tension between "keeping" and "using" materials. Describing her special collections librarian, one obviously irritated staff member reported that "If anything comes in, she wants to grab all the stuff and not use it. And she has imbued the students with this ethic, too. We have to play off this with the need for access." A more positive statement of this sentiment occurred elsewhere:

"High regarded here. Even students, stack people – the stacks look good. We have a commitment to keep materials sturdy enough to circulate. Nice balance of respect for materials and interest in use."

A few offer explanations for low regard or low awareness for preservation in their institutions.

"Many younger people are not interested in old material. Some feel things are replaceable. I don't, but some do."

"A downside is that I've found people personalize attitudes – if they like the preservation librarian, they like it [preservation]. There are some problems here because our preservation librarian does not have good interpersonal [?] skills. She's a good person and I like working with her. So I'm doing it."

The answer to the question of regard may depend on the point of view of the respondent, with those having broader responsibilities being more aware of the concept. Suggests one person, "Administrators would say that it is integral, very important part of service. If you ask many people on the front lines, they would not be so clearly supportive."

The most ebullient response to the question of local regard for preservation comes from an ARL/ULG library:

"I think it's just aces now. We had a preservation consultant and hired a preservation/conservation team.… and we have Nicholson Baker, who made everybody mad, but he raised consciousness. So preservation here is a big deal. The consultant said for a collection worth half a billion dollars, what's half a million to preserve it? So I think everybody's on board."

16a. Has this exercise engendered significant discussion in your library?

Opinion is nearly evenly divided about whether this preservation study engendered discussion. This is true for all sizes of libraries. A major outcome is the raising of awareness and consciousness among participants, whether or not discussion actually took place. A few comment that the exercise made them aware that they were doing preservation activity all along.

Some interviewees report not receiving the questionnaire much ahead of time; the lack of discussion may be tied to the processes of conducting the study.

There is some slight evidence that the filling out of the statistical questionnaire, Part I of the study, caused more reaction and discussion than preparation for Part II, the interview. A few comment that they look forward to the results and that discussion and action may follow then. The sentiment that it is "very helpful to be a part of the study" is echoed in various ways several times.

Where discussion did occur, enthusiasm seems very high. The respondents' own colorful prose, more so here than in other answers, indicates the extent of interest.

Selected responses:

"No – [laugh] – because there is plenty of discussion already!"

"Yes, realized how much spending and how little they thought about preservation on a daily basis."

"Yes, everyone met, was involved. Lots of conversation. Wondered at statistics. Aware that we should be doing more. Raised consciousness."

"Yes. The survey form helped to show the time and money spent…Very helpful to be a part of the study."

"Yes, we should be doing these things; some say we are doing them, others not. It has had a huge guilt reaction and entertaining in that way."

"It has gotten us to refocus and provide some ideas. The survey in and of itself was a preservation exercise."

"This exercise has been a godsend to me. I've been to the workshop. This is leading to an appreciation by the administration for what I've been saying."

OTHER TOPICS

The following topics are somewhat anomalous. For **Environmental concerns** and **Treatments**, there were no specific questions asked on interviewees, but many offered lengthy commentary on these topics nonetheless. These topics have therefore been included here. For **Outside agencies**, many questions included sections on how such agencies might be helpful. Because the responses were largely duplicative from one question to another, the data on this topic have been grouped and are presented as one section below.

Environmental concerns

Heating and air conditioning
Staff frequently express concern about current local environmental controls and worry that future cuts in funding could reverse recent progress. Relationships with physical plant staff are seen as critical to achieving appropriate conditions. The awareness of environmental concerns often arises in reaction to an accident or incident. Environmental controls are seen as fundamental to preserving collections.

Food and drink
Formerly forbidden in most libraries, beverages and even food are commonly allowed in at least some portions of library building. This is a vexing preservation problem with complex public relations implications. Enforcement is difficult. Some libraries try to educate readers in the least harmful approaches to satisfying their desires for food and drink and their responsibilities to the library collections.

Care and handling of library materials
Seen as one of the most basic and effective tools in preserving materials, proper techniques for care and handling enjoy universal support from library staff. Training in these techniques is common for almost all staff. The circulation function is recognized as critical here. While there is agreement on importance, there is less consensus on how best to address the issue, and little hard evidence on what approaches are most effective.

-- Heat and air conditioning

Although not a topic in the questionnaire, environmental issues emerged as much on the minds of library staff. Judgments about the adequacy of local environmental controls were about evenly divided for both ARL/ULG and LG/OG libraries. Concern was voiced that decreases in resources would negatively affect the advanced made to date in this area.

Relationships with the physical plant department emerge as a critical element in achieving the necessary balances, especially with heating and air conditioning systems, and fire prevention systems.

"We tried to have a building with temperature control, but physical plant wants control of the whole campus and they treat the library like every other building – sprinklers, etc. They did not ask and put water in the rare book room. They didn't get input from staff. We didn't think to tell them."

Some people seem to throw up their hands in face of HVAC difficulties: "The [library] staff knows that the Library has HVAC problems. Unfortunately, they must push for a response from the College's physical plant department." Others have taken a more pro-active and diplomatic approach:

"Cooperation on campus pays off. We treat custodial staff as library staff. They are on our listserv."

"We worked hard at establishing this relationship, explaining the implications of certain actions and formally thanking them in front of their supervisors."

Awareness of environmental needs often arises from an accident or incident: leaky roofs, mold outbreaks, move to a new or renovated facility, vermin, and the "occasional moth." Some climate and air quality present particular hazards (Atlanta), although other locations have conditions that are naturally benign (Colorado). Sometimes change alone creates imbalances and problems: "[We are imposing a] demand on an HVAC system that was not designed for the way it is being used."

Indicating some frustration over the persistence of environmental problems, one respondent sums up the problem: "The environment is our most serious problem. We can deacidify, reformat, and box, but if we put them back in the same environment, we haven't done much good"

-- Food

Few problems are more vexing than food and drink in the library. Formerly forbidden, food finds its way into the building in the forms of water and coffee in containers and even through onsite cafés. Opinions vary as to the wisdom of this development, but it seems unavoidable: "Humans can't walk around without coffee or water."

A significant number of libraries have added café service either in the library entrance area, or adjacent to it. (One librarian negotiated additional seating in a nearby campus dining area.) Arguments for café service have two rationales. The most important, for several respondents, is to attract students to the library:

"Major change in food and drink in the library. Four years ago we didn't allow food or drink in the building. Then we allowed drinks in covered containers. Then Java City came along (located just as you walk in the library on the right). A campus committee on student life thought of the idea. Faculty and staff thought it a good idea to have a coffee shop in the library as there is no coffee/food on that side of the campus. [I] had mixed feelings. Turnstile count was going way down—like a morgue in the library. Library only wanted a coffee bar— but food came along with Java City. Problems with lemon bars coated in powdered sugar and flaky baklava. Put up signs to encourage no food in the stacks. Isolation of food is not working. If it's getting students in the door—I think it's worth the risk. We don't want to become a museum and we need funding."

The second argument for food is based on the assumption that library users will insist on having it available, whether or not it is officially sanctioned. If a café offers refreshment adjacent to the library proper, the argument goes, the food will not be snuck into the collections and work areas.

While some reported having cafés, no one volunteered great enthusiasm for them. Some would like cafés and a few have them in the plans for renovations. One library is removing all food from the vendor, although beverages will still be offered. The situation periodically comes to a head, and excesses have to be reigned in. This occurs typically during exam periods: "The more stress students are under, the more they eat."

Many libraries, perhaps most, permit beverages into almost all areas of the library (with the exception of special collections) if closed containers are used. One library has developed a suitable container with a friends-of-the-library logo that is offered for sale. "The student group has been behind it, which is a great advantage."

While staff reportedly support control of eating and drinking in the library – and especially so in the LG/OG libraries – it is sometimes staff members themselves who are "geared toward food." Reported on interviewee, "I would like to see less food in the staff areas."

Enforcement is very difficult. It helps, reports one, to have librarians wear badges so that they are identified as authority figures; their mere presence is effective, and when they speak they are listened to. In another library, librarians pick up food residue and say to the transgressor, "Excuse me, you dropped something." Observed one: "We need to be draconian." Another expresses frustration that he is alone among his colleagues in wanting to enforce no-food rules. Policies about food and drink exist in some libraries, and not in others, in about even proportion.

Since a major reason for forbidding food and drink is the avoidance of vermin and pests, one library, accepting the inevitable, made special arrangements with physical plant for more frequent garbage pickup:

"We know students bring in food, we talked with physical plant about more garbage cans out front and that they need to be emptied at least once/day. Then found very little food in the stacks …. We were not getting Sunday morning clean up; we were able to convince physical plants to do the garbage on Saturday and Sunday. By emptying the cans we show we care."

Readers are educated about food and drink problems variously through screen savers, signs, posters, handouts, and exhibits. One library is planning a media kit to distribute to campus publications. Another is planning a web presentation. A reportedly successful element is attitude: "All the library staff feels a sense of ownership, including the student workers. And that attitude rubs off."

-- Care and handling

There is no perceivable debate about the importance of sound methods for the care and handling of library materials. Observed one respondent: "The issues are enormous and we often forget that many of the most effective tools are the most basic related to handling and housing."

One of the best strategies seems to be to avoid moving materials unnecessarily. Reported on preservation officer: "I want to establish a steady state – anticipate/identify optimal size for onsite collections and move things [to remote storage] on a regular basis. The handling of these materials is critical." One example of anticipating and avoiding excess handing has to do with the reformatting process: "Make the digital and conservation work go hand-in-hand. For example, handle the material as little as possible, so when you pull it off the shelf, if it needs to be reboxed or repaired, etc., do it, and with a museum object, write a condition report [then]. It will cost less time and money to do it then as part of the chain." Yet another notes that damage from shifting is due to the fact that "stacks are so over-crowded".... "[I have] grave concerns about the amount of damage during the many shifts and reshelving process."

Many libraries engage in training for proper care and handling. Typically staff and student workers --notably in the circulation area -- are trained through workshops, special sessions, and one-on-one instruction, sometimes at the "point of need." In one instance, users are trained to handle archival material properly as part of a history course. One librarian has mounted exhibits on the damage caused by improper handling. Another reports frustrations in setting up such an exhibit:

"I wanted to do a special exhibit about the handling of materials. You know – to tell them not to use a piece of bacon as a bookmark. But it is a hard sell; it takes diligence. I have not taken the time to do it. You know – it gets pushed to the bottom of the page. We are very short staffed and the economy is bad. I don't know when it will get better. The [aftermath of a natural disaster] will hit the state hard. People need help, and people and businesses will not be paying taxes."

Despite the general agreement on the importance of proper care and handling, there is little reportage on what approaches are effective. Typical is the comment: "[A staff member who had attended an AMIGOS workshop] wrote up some guidelines for the circulation staff but hasn't really gotten any feedback."

Treatments

Staff seem preoccupied with particular treatment procedures and areas of activity. Prominent among these are binding and microfilming. Interviewees seemed comfortable with the topic of treatments, and often lingered here at the expense of the more conceptual topics of the study. Needs in this area are highly specific and they are perceived by front-line staff as critical to the preservation effort.

Although not asked about specific treatment techniques, interviewees occasionally linger over the details of a favorite or important method. These are included to indicate what comes to mind when people discuss their everyday preservation activities.

Binding is constant theme, although in unexpected ways. A few libraries do not, or no longer, bind paperbacks. This works better for them, says one, than cheap bindings and/or

plastic covers. Some libraries wait to see whether the paperback circulates before selecting it for binding or for some other indication of potential high use. The staff at the circulation desk can spot books in need of binding. One interviewee speculates that owning a velo-binding machine might make life easier than sending thin material to Kinko's for treatment. Another laments her library's reliance on "peg" binding for journals, which was chosen in a moment of financial difficulty as being "better than nothing." Libraries that are moving to off-site storage are considering or actually doing no binding for some periodicals in hard copy that will not be in the general collections. (This topic comes up also in discussions of off-site storage.)

Fragile material is occasionally boxed. In one library they used to make their own boxes but have moved to "ready-mades." Some material in jeopardy is placed in bags that are sealed with ties.

One cataloger reports that when she arrived, she "took tape into the collections, and taped and taped." The taping has lasted 10 years. She does not see this as preservation but is pleased that it has kept the books intact in the face of no obvious alternatives in her situation.

Periodic cleaning of books, and dusting in particular, are cited as important.

As to reprints, it was observed that in the U.S. the move has been away from conservation of original materials to replacement with reprints. One LG/OG library looked at replacing material in very poor repair with reprints, but did not consider this feasible, primarily for financial reasons.

Microfilming as a preservation technique has both supporters and detractors. One the pro side is the librarian who reports being more comfortable with microfilm than digital technologies for preservation. (Skepticism about digital modes as preservation modes occurs elsewhere in interviewers' remarks elsewhere also, specifically in the sections on digital technologies.) On the con side is the interviewee who sees microfilming as an access mechanism, not a preservation medium, and prefers digital modes for the preservation purposes. (In contrast another respondent contends that "I'd be putting more access into preservation by digitizing. I'm/we're not fond of microfilming.")

Finally, one respondent discusses book-rests as a preservation devices. The best he has seen are made in-house.

Outside agencies

Summary: Interviewees frequently mention interacting with outside agencies that have preservation programs and activities. The list of agencies is a long one. The kind of help that is wanted from outside agencies begins with money, and includes information, standards, disaster assistance, repositories and more. Staff welcome visitors, from materials prepared by those beyond the walls of their agencies and other libraries, who can tell them what is happening in the field. The also welcome training institutions; there

is particular need for materials addressing basic issues in appropriate language and modes of presentation.

References to outside agencies come up throughout the interview reports, in relation to many different questions. Some references are made in response to specific questions about the role of outside agencies in relation to three specific topics: training of staff, user education, and digital technology. Other references abound. It is obvious that interviewees, whatever their formal relationship to preservation, think of their local work in a larger context having significant interactions with many organizations beyond their walls. Some outside agencies are other libraries and other educational institutions. Others are national and regional organizations and institutions. The same references come up in reports from ARL/RLG libraries as from LG/OG institutions.

Participants mention having positive interactions with the following organizations and independent institutions:

ALA, and particularly the Preservation Administration Discussion Group
AIC
AMIGOS
ARL
Central Pennsylvania Archivist Group
CLIR
CLR
Colorado Preservation Alliance
DLF
Georgia Archives Institute
IPI
LC
NELINET
OCLC
NEDCC
NEDOC
NEH
NYLA
RAP
RLG
SAA
SOLINET
Upper Midwest Conservation Associates
USAIN
Western Area Conservation

References to state activity center on Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, New York, and Virginia.

(References to other organizations, many with a narrower focus, appear in the section on training staff, Question 4.)

The kinds of help people want from outside agencies cluster about a few topics. Money is number one. Following that, interviewees want: authoritative information (frequently called for), standards, assistance with disaster-related issues, advice on products with testimonials, high powered research, digital repository services, assistance with planning regional storage facilities, and training on how to express their needs when seeking funding. Several people comment that they wanted to know what other people are doing. It is particularly helpful to have visitors, "circuit riders," come to talk candidly about what is happening elsewhere.

While respondents treat the topic seriously, one person offers a light-hearted expression of a need to deal with stresses of the job: "A team of psychiatrists maybe. It's really helping us to have people coming from outside to help or by talking about what the rest of the world is doing."

As for assistance with training from outside agencies, respondents expressed enthusiasm for some familiar modes of training: books, syllabi for preservation, flyers, hand-outs, posters, teleconferences, videos, and web sites (along the model of Cornell's website). Some believe that new formats are needed: "We need to talk to people in formats and ways they're not used to – in formats they use and in a flashy way that gets attention. Maybe a rock group could write and record a song about our disappearing cultural heritage. That would be kind of interesting. The time for 'Slow Fires' has come and gone."

As to content for training, there are many suggestions in the reports, most of which are captured in the section on staff and user training/education (Questions 4 and 5). There is a strong emphasis on the basics and on raising public awareness, expressed in this reflection:

"I think part of the problem with preservation is that it has an esoteric sound to it. You think of old books and leather treatment. We need training in how to protect your resources – a continuum of ways to take care of them. When we get into our preservation modes or spikes, we go from nothing to 60. After a workshop we'll then do this for a couple of months and then get tired of it. What we need is something to help give us simple ways to indicate that preservation is part of everyone's work. We could use exportable workshops, grounded in realistic, limited resources, stressing what are the kinds of things [we ought] to engage in."