

Survey Rating Descriptions

Jonathan Lill

1/15/2004

Most of the ratings are on a 1-5 scale with one representing the lowest or worst rating and five the highest or best. For certain media, the physical condition rating was reduced to a three-point, 1-3-5, rating for reasons explained below. The ratings here are listed in the order they are applied in the survey, with housing quality being evaluated first, then the media, and lastly the collection-level ratings of intellectual access, intellectual value and local value. All ratings have been reviewed and approved by appropriate supervisors, curators, and staff members.

HOUSING QUALITY RATING.....1

PHYSICAL CONDITION RATINGS2

LOOSE PAPER.....2

BOUND ITEMS.....3

ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS.....3

GRAPHIC WORKS.....4

PHOTOGRAPHIC PRINTS.....5

FILM.....6

MECHANICAL SOUND RECORDINGS.....7

MAGNETIC MEDIA7

OPTICAL MEDIA.....8

REALIA.....8

INTELLECTUAL ACCESS RATING8

INTELLECTUAL VALUE RATING.....9

LOCAL VALUE RATING.....10

Housing Quality Rating

This rating is a unit-level ranking to describe the overall physical condition of the container and sub-containers. These include the file or manuscript box (or other unit), folders, envelopes, sleeves, etc. It does not evaluate bindings but only enclosures that generally aren't an integral part of the items and can be replaced or supplanted. If quantities of loose items are encountered, they will be grouped together in "Loose items" units and will receive a very low housing quality ranking unless they are such things as large framed prints or realia that need no housing.

1. None to poor: Materials lack any containers or the containers are in such poor shape as to make handling difficult. Containers that are woefully dirty, undersized or ill-fitted will also be included here. Any evidence of water damage and/or mold growth will require a 1 ranking and should be brought to the immediate attention of the Preservation Division.
2. Poor: Non-archival boxes and enclosures that are intact but worn, only slightly damaged, dirty, overstuffed, or ill-fitted. Container labels are not present. A group of loose items that have fair housing in terms of folders or envelopes, but no overall container, will be ranked here.

3. Fair: Non-archival containers that are in good condition and generally fitted to their contents or a mixture of some archival but mostly non-archival materials may be included here. The major container may have a partial or inaccurate label. Collections that have been placed in archival mss. boxes with no further attention will be included here.
4. Good: Housing is mostly of archival materials with those non-archival enclosures present in good condition. Containers are well-fitted to their contents and are accurately labeled. A 4 rating will indicate that the material has most likely been partially processed as a portion of the containers will not need replacement.
5. Excellent: All materials are of archival quality in good condition, well fitted to the contents and have a full label. Again, this ranking implies that collection has been fully processed and thus will not likely be awarded.

Physical Condition Ratings

Loose Paper

Physical condition rankings will be awarded at the box level. Different ratings will be given to each major media type in the container. Again, the scale is one to five. Paper of mixed quality and condition in one container will be averaged out by the surveyor to obtain a single condition ranking. Any container that contains any visible mold or live insect infestation will be given a 1 ranking but noted that the material may otherwise be good or fair. Such material also needs to be brought to the immediate attention of the Preservation Division.

1. Terrible to Poor: Paper shows signs of active mold or pest infestation. Otherwise material suffers from major information loss due to water damage, brittleness, or other damage. Materials may be extremely dirty, acidic, fragile, and physical access is difficult or impossible. Preservation intervention is vital to process these materials.
2. Poor: Paper may show signs of past water or insect damage but no active mold growth and more moderate information loss. Materials may be fragile, torn, dirty, stained or discolored, show apparent acid damage but are capable of being handled without further damage. Fair materials that bear a large amount of cellophane tape, staples, or injurious items will be downgraded to this rank. Containers that hold some terrible material and some fair material may be averaged to a poor rating unless there is mold or live insect infestation. I expect to include here many old newspapers or clippings. Preservation or conservation intervention is not immediately needed but necessary for eventual public access.
3. Fair: Materials are less torn or stained and are largely intact with no apparent loss of information. Acidic materials that have yellowed or become brittle without significant loss or acidic materials such as newspapers that are in good condition but are expected to deteriorate rapidly will be included here. Staples, clips, tape and such may be present and show no significant rust or aging or widespread damage. A fair rating may be given to a mixed collection of good, fair, and poor materials but should contain very little terrible items.
4. Good: Materials show few tears, loss, little yellowing or fading and no apparent information loss. Known acidic materials are in good condition without visible deterioration. There are no materials in

terrible condition and very few in poor condition. Staples, clips and tape are present only in limited quantities and are in good condition. A mixture of excellent and fair materials may be ranked here.

5. Excellent: Known acidic materials are absent or few in number and in near-pristine condition. Very little or no wear evident. Very little or no tape is evident and clips and staples have not damaged the items. An excellent rating may be given to a container that has a small number of good items in it, but no fair or poor materials.

Bound Items

Bound items will generally follow the criteria for loose paper.

1. Terrible to poor: Items show insect infestation or mold growth. Otherwise, books and albums may be highly brittle, torn, dirty, stained, or illegible. Pages are missing, bindings are broken, boards and spines are detached or missing. Handling the items is difficult or impossible without further loss.
2. Poor: No visible mold growth or pest infestation. Bindings may still be in tatters or volumes may have become disbound but have minor apparent information loss with the pages in good order. Covers and spines may be detached or torn but are mostly present. Items show visible water damage, brittleness, staining and dirt; items in albums have become detached with possible loss. Tape or other adhesives may be present and are deteriorated. Items may be handled without further damage. A poor rating may be given to a mixture of terrible and fair items unless there is mold or insect evidence.
3. Fair: All items are bound with most covers and spines attached. Items may still be fragile, brittle or show rips and stains, but little paper loss. Paper may show visible acid damage such as yellowing but are still intact. Limited damage from minimal tape or adhesive. Scrapbooks may have loose items but little or no missing items. Known acidic items that are in good condition but expected to deteriorate rapidly should be ranked here. Most scrapbooks containing news clippings or other mixed materials should be ranked here or lower unless they are in impeccable condition. A fair rating may be given to a mixture of poor and good items but no terrible items.
4. Good: Covers and spines are intact though they may be worn or damaged; bindings are in good shape and flexible. No information or paper loss. Wear and tear limited mostly to covers, not interiors. Known acidic materials are not deteriorated or embrittled. Very little or no tape or other acidic adhesives with no evident damage. This rating may be given to a mixed group of fair and excellent items but no poor items.
5. Excellent: Limited wear and tear to covers, pristine pages with no tape or adhesives. Scrapbook items are fully attached. Very few, if any, known acidic items and those showing no deterioration. An excellent rating may be given to a container that contains some good items but no fair items.

Architectural Drawings

1. Terrible to Poor: Paper shows signs of mold or pest infestation. Otherwise material suffers from major information loss due to water damage, brittleness, or other damage. Materials may be extremely dirty, acidic, fragile, and physical access is difficult or impossible. Preservation intervention is vital to process these materials.

2. **Poor:** Paper may show signs of past water or insect damage but no active mold growth and more moderate information loss. Materials may be fragile, torn, dirty, stained or discolored, show apparent acid damage but are capable of being handled without further damage. Green prints, even if apparently in good condition should be ranked here. Fair materials that bear a large amount of cellophane tape, staples, or injurious items will be downgraded to this rank. Early blueprints will frequently fall into this category due to brittleness. Sepia and diazo prints will fall here if they show significant fading or other damage. Likewise, more recent media, such as early Mylar, may show loss and degradation and fall into this category, though other examples of the same media may be in excellent condition. Preservation or conservation intervention is not immediately needed but necessary for eventual public access. Containers that hold some terrible material and some fair material may be averaged to a poor rating unless there is mold or live insect infestation.
3. **Fair:** Materials are less torn or stained and are largely intact with no apparent loss of information. Acidic materials that have yellowed or become brittle without significant loss or acidic materials such as more recent blueprints that are in good condition but are expected to deteriorate rapidly will be included here. Green prints should be ranked here only if in excellent condition. Staples, clips, tape and such may be present but show no significant rust, aging or widespread damage. A fair rating may be given to a mixed collection of good, fair, and poor materials but should contain very little terrible items.
4. **Good:** Materials show few tears, loss, little yellowing or fading and no apparent information loss. Known acidic materials are in good condition without visible deterioration. There are no materials in terrible condition and very few in poor condition. Staples, clips and tape are present only in limited quantities and are in good condition. A mixture of excellent and fair materials may be ranked here. I do not expect to include blueprints in this category, though all other media may be rated a 4.
5. **Excellent:** Known acidic materials are absent or few in number and in near-pristine condition. Very little or no wear evident. Very little or no tape is evident and clips and staples have not damaged the items. An excellent rating may be given to a container that has a small number of good items in it, but no fair or poor materials. Only the most recent items, or excellently preserved drawings are likely to be included here. Drafting cloth, while persisting with remarkable durability is unlikely to fall into this category simply due to age.

Graphic Works

Graphic works are expected to be mostly on paper, though some on fabric or other material may be encountered. Sculptures will be rated as realia. Painting, prints, posters, drawings or mixed media works will be rated here. Architectural images will be placed here only if they are not considered to have served as working or shop drawings.

1. **Terrible to Poor:** Works show signs of mold or pest infestation. Otherwise material suffers from major loss due to water damage, brittleness, or other damage. Materials may be extremely dirty, acidic, fragile, fragmented and physical access is difficult or impossible. Preservation intervention is vital to process these materials.
2. **Poor:** Works may show signs of past water or insect damage but no active mold growth and more moderate information loss. Materials may be fragile, torn, dirty, stained or discolored, show apparent acid damage but are capable of being handled without further damage. Paintings may be cracked, soiled or have areas of loss. Picture frames may be damaged with broken glass. Fair materials that

bear a large amount of cellophane tape, staples, or injurious items will be downgraded to this rank. Containers that hold some terrible material and some fair material may be averaged to a poor rating unless there is mold or live insect infestation. Preservation or conservation intervention is not immediately needed but necessary for eventual public access.

3. Fair: Materials are less torn or stained and are largely intact. Acidic materials that have yellowed or become brittle without significant loss will be included here. Paintings may be cracked or soiled but show no or very minor loss. Damaging materials such as acidic mattes, broken glass or frames may be present but the artworks themselves are intact. Tape, mounting materials and adhesives may be present but show limited, localized damage. A fair rating may be given to a mixed collection of good, fair, and poor materials but should contain very little or no terrible items.
4. Good: Works show few tears, loss, and little yellowing or fading. Known acidic materials are in good condition without visible deterioration. There are no materials in terrible condition and very few in poor condition. Mounting and framing materials may be acidic and ultimately need replacing but are intact and show no damage to the works. A mixture of excellent and fair materials may be ranked here.
5. Excellent: Known acidic materials are absent or few in number and in near-pristine condition. Very little or no wear evident. Matting and framing materials if present are in good condition and show no sign of deterioration or harm to the works. An excellent rating may be given to a container that has a small number of good items in it, but no fair or poor materials.

Photographic Prints

Photographic prints include any positive or negative photographic image not on a film base (polyester, acetate, nitrate, etc.) These may include glass plate negatives, glass plate positives, lantern slides, daguerreotypes, ambrotypes, albumen prints, tintypes, sepia prints, stereographs, other early prints on paper, Polaroids, silver gelatin prints, and modern color prints. Photographic images printed by means of silkscreen, computer, photo-etching, etc., will not be considered photographs and will instead be described as graphic works or realia as suitable. Note that whether the images are black and white or color is noted in a separate field.

1. Terrible to poor: Images show signs of mold growth or insect infestation. Glass plates are terribly cracked, broken, and in pieces. Paper prints show extreme acidity, fading, crumbling, water damage, or staining and significant information loss in any case. Daguerreotypes display silvering to the extent of image obliteration. .
2. Poor: Photographic prints show significant fading, acid damage, staining, discoloration or dirt, folds, tears, or loss. Past water or pest damage may be evident but no active mold growth. If images are laminated to paper or board, boards show significant dirt or damage and are dangerously acidic. Glass plates show cracking and some breakage but are mostly intact. Items may be dirty, scratched, abraded, but have little overall image or information loss. Material may be handled safely but will need preservation attention for continued access. A mixture of terrible items with fair or better ones may be ranked a 2 if there is no mold growth. Daguerreotypes may show silvering but still have discernible images and tintypes may have serious crazing with some flaking.
3. Fair: Images may exhibit dirt, tears and creases or water damage. Fading has not progressed to loss of image or significant color information (a fade to complete monotone.) Acid damage is limited and

embrittlement is not present. Prints may be mounted on acidic backings but show little acid bleed-through, though mountings can be fragmented, torn, or brittle. Glass plates have minor cracking and little loss located only at edges and margins. Daguerreotypes show little silvering and crazing on tintypes is confined to the edges with no flaking. The faces of images may still show dirt, abrasions, or minor loss.

4. Good: Images may exhibit some fading or yellowing, but no scratches, tears or image damage. Acidic mountings may be torn or stained but not embrittled and have not damaged the images. Glass plates are intact with little damage to images. A mixture of fair and excellent materials may be rated a 4 but should include no poor items.
5. Excellent: Like new. Little or no dirt, scratches or abrasions and negligible fading. Glass plates are clean and intact. If any materials are known to be acidic they are limited and in outstanding condition. Mounts are not apparently acidic and also intact and clean. An excellent rating may include some good items.

Film

Positive images such as transparencies and slides are included here, as well as microform, negatives, and motion pictures. Whether the items are black and white or color is detailed separately as it impacts preservation decision-making. The NEDCC's technical leaflet, *A Short Guide to Film-Base Photographic Materials: Identification, Care, and Duplication* by Monique Fisher, was used as reference.

1. Terrible to poor: Items show mold or fungal growth, or active insect infestation. Negatives, transparencies or motion picture film are known or suspected to be nitrate-based regardless of condition. Cellulose acetate films display significant, warping, bubbling, brittleness, channeling and present a strong vinegar odor (the vinegar syndrome). Handling is difficult or impossible without image loss. Preservation attention is needed for any handling or examination.
2. Poor: No nitrate stock should be included here; instead, rank it a 1. Acetate films may exhibit a vinegar smell, a color shift to red and blue, warping and curling but minimal channeling, embrittlement and bubbling. Film reels may show white powder or debris from flaking emulsion. In all cases material may be handled safely but will need preservation attention for continued access. A mixture of terrible items with fair or better ones may be ranked a 2 if there is no nitrate present or mold growth.
3. Fair: Acetate film exhibits little or no vinegar smell, curling or color shift, and absolutely no bubbling or channeling. Negatives, transparencies, and motion picture films may be torn, soiled or stained and film reels may exhibit torn perforations but are intact. A mixture of poor and good materials may be ranked as fair.
4. Good: No film is present from prior to 1955 or is in excellent condition with no vinegar odor, obvious color shift or curling. Films show minimal dirt or staining and no tears, creases, or other damage. Prints may exhibit some fading or yellowing, but no scratches, tears or image damage. Acidic mountings may be torn or stained but not embrittled and have not damaged the images. A mixture of fair and excellent materials may be rated a 4 but should include no poor items.

5. Excellent: Photographic prints are in pristine condition without fading, scratches or dirt nor any acidic mounts. Those mounts present should be in good condition. Film is of recent origin and free from creases, stains, or tears. An excellent rating may include some good items.

Mechanical Sound Recordings

This category includes all older analog recording dependent on mechanical playback including wax and paper cylinders, wax discs and shellac and vinyl discs. Physical condition can generally be judged visually, though the original quality of the recording may be poor, especially with the older media. And because a playing machine is still needed to evaluate the latter quality, only a three-point system is used at this time. To keep this ranking consistent with the prior rankings the three levels will be 1, 3 and 5, with one being the lowest and five the highest.

1. Terrible to poor: Enclosures or items show evidence of mold growth or have a musty odor indicative of fungus. Discs and cylinders are severely warped throughout or are extensively broken and cracked. Discs and wax cylinders are without individual containers or dividers leading to severe abrasion, scratches or gouges. Paper rolls are extremely brittle, torn or damaged. A 1 rating should include few items in fair or good condition.
3. Fair: Individual containers are generally present though in poor condition, being ripped torn or with severe loss. If enclosures are not present at all, items must appear in excellent condition. Discs show only moderate or limited warping and scratching. Cracks or breakage are extremely limited. Paper cylinders may show distinct aging and dirt but no tearing or brittleness. There is an absence of mold evidence on containers and items.
5. Good to excellent: Sleeves, jackets and enclosures may be worn but are intact and items show signs of adequate protection with little scratching or abrasion and almost no cracking or warping. Items are clean.

Magnetic Media

The physical condition of magnetic media, like optical media to follow, is difficult to rate without viewing or listening to the item in some player, a process which this survey has neither the time nor the facility to accommodate. Therefore, the rating is based on visual inspection only and is also reduced to a three-level ranking. Any evidence of fungal growth will automatically be rated a one and flagged for immediate preservation attention. I have referred extensively to AMIA's *Videotape Preservation Fact Sheet 9: Tape Inspection*, available at http://www.amianet.org/11_Information/11g_VidPres/inspection.html.

1. Terrible to poor: Enclosures show evidence of mold growth or have a musty odor indicative of fungus. Other odors (such as "dirty socks," "pungent," "waxy," or astringent") are present; or a distinct vinegar smell is detected. Reel-to-reel tapes show breakage, tearing, unspooling, popped strands, or poor packing, particulate shredding, a white powder or crystalline residue. Reels or their containers show signs of liquid contamination. Audio and video cassettes show visible damage to their casings, breakage or shedding as above. Computer disks may be bent cracked or show other physical distress. There are few or no enclosures and/or the enclosures present are highly degraded.
3. Fair: For magnetic tape, no odor is present, there are no signs of liquid penetration, fungus growth, or particulate build-up. Containers are generally present though in poor condition. Reels and

cassettes may show some breakage, distortion, or poor packing. If enclosures are not present at all, items must appear in excellent condition.

5. Good to excellent: Enclosures are present and show little degradation. No staining, dirt or particle accumulation is evident on the enclosures or items. Reels appear wound adequately and tears, breaks, or other damage is absent.

Optical Media

As above, this is a three-level ranking based solely on visual inspection.

1. Terrible to poor: Discs are broken, cracked, discolored, display cloudiness, show severe gouging or scratching on either side or display damage to their edges. CD “rot” is apparent through the bronzing of the label side of the CD and/or ink bleed-through to the play side of the disc. Enclosures are not present or are highly degraded.
2. Fair: Enclosures are mostly present but are in poor condition or do not house the discs separately. Discs are intact but some may show some scratching, cloudiness or discoloration. Discs may be extensively labeled on their face. Some bronzing or “rotting” may be apparent but is not widespread.
3. Good to excellent: Enclosures are present, sufficient, and in good condition. Labels, if present are only on the enclosures or very minimally on the discs themselves. Discs are in good condition and show no signs of damage to the encoded side of the disc and little or no damage to the face

Realia

Because of the possible range of realia in the surveyed collections, no rating system can be specific or comprehensive. Therefore we will use a three-level ranking as with magnetic and optical media.

1. Terrible to poor: Artifacts or objects are broken, severely marred, incomplete, greatly stained, dirty, or otherwise unfit for safe handling, viewing or access. Evidence of insect infestation or mold growth.
3. Fair: Artifacts may be cracked, marred, discolored, but are intact and only show light soiling or water damage and no mold growth. Items may be fragile and susceptible to damage if handled or provided access, but are currently intact.
5. Good to excellent: Artifacts show very little dirt, stains or aging, no cracks or loss; items are not exceptionally fragile.

Intellectual Access Rating

This is a collection-level rating that ranks the level of intellectual control over the entire collection. It is concerned solely with the presence or absence of ancillary materials that describe or represent the collection and its component materials. It is on a one to five scale with one being the lowest ranking and five the highest.

1. None to poor: No finding aid, MARC record or catalog card, inventory, collection description or other document describing the collection exists at all or a collection-level description exists but is

incomplete or inaccurate. These collections are completely inaccessible to researchers. The majority of the unprocessed collections, selected for inclusion in the survey for this reason, will likely fall into this category.

2. **Poor:** A collection-level description of the collection, catalog card or MARC record exists, but with little or no box-level detail. Also collections with partial or largely incomplete box- or item-level descriptions will fall into this category. For architectural drawings collections, project-level descriptions are inaccurate and/or incomplete and no series or item-level description exists. These collections are not open to researchers except in exceptional circumstances because of the difficulty of identifying materials within them.
3. **Fair:** A complete, or nearly complete, box-level description exists or an incomplete box-level description is complemented by other series- or item-level partial lists. Older finding aids, if existing only on paper and of questionable accuracy, may fall into this category or a collection description, such as a catalog card, may rate a 3 if the collection is small and simple and the card is accurate. Collections that are or were “in process” should also fall into this category. Collections rated a 3 may be accessible by researchers. For collections of architectural drawings, a 3 rating indicates that there is a complete project-level description with location assignments accompanied perhaps by partial or inaccurate series or item-level description and may be accessible to researchers. in whole in part
4. **Good:** A complete finding aid or series-level inventory with adequate collection description exists on paper or as an electronic text document, or a sufficient MARC record is in RLIN or CLIO with appropriate subject headings and added entries. Further work needs to be done to bring access up to an ideal level. For architectural drawings collections, a complete finding aid exists with a thorough collection summary and subject and name access, sheets have been filled out for the entire collection that itemize the physical component, but no online access tool exists.
5. **Excellent:** The collection has a finding aid available online via HTML or EAD, a MARC record exists in RLIN or CLIO with sufficient access points and the collection is thus fully accessible to the researcher. An excellent rating would necessitate that the collection be fully processed.

Intellectual Value Rating

The Intellectual Value Rating is a rating made up primarily of two evaluations of a collection defined in a similar manner to that of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The first evaluation is of the current research value of a collection and includes consideration of the following questions.

Does the collection

- Include material on topics currently receiving high attention from scholars?
- Include material in areas where scholars are just beginning to take interest?
- Include other media relating to topics previously documented primarily in paper?
- Include documents or material in areas otherwise not well covered?
- Contribute to the overall understanding of the subject?
- Present an important piece in a constellation of associated collections located at Columbia or elsewhere or substantially reinforce important collections already held at Columbia?
- Include materials whose usefulness is expected to be long-term and continuing?

The second evaluation is of the informational richness or breadth and depth of the collection. The following questions (among others) should be considered in this evaluation.

Does the collection

- Contain materials that provide unique insight into the topic?
- Contain a majority of original and manuscript documents or is largely composed of transcripts, photocopies, or published materials.
- Document its topic thoroughly or is its coverage sporadic and fragmentary?
- If composed largely of copies and published material, does the collection bring together materials otherwise widely scattered and/or inaccessible?

These two evaluations should be considered and weighed separately before being merged to come up with a single numerical ranking for the collection as follows:

1. None: The collection has **no** research value.
2. Limited: The collection has **limited research value** either because of the topics covered or the paucity of information content and/or quantity of material
3. Pertinent: The collection has **pertinent research value**: it deals with a subject of proven interest to researchers and has the quality and/or quantity of materials sufficient to warrant consultation by a researcher.
4. High: The collection is of **high research value**: it contains a high quantity of unique and essential materials on a highly researched subject, thereby making it essential to any research on the subject.
5. Unique: The collection is **unique** in the quality, quantity, and value of materials about a subject that is of great research interest. Anyone interested in the subject covered in the collection would of necessity have to make extensive and primary use of the collection.

Local Value Rating

A separate rating will be assigned for the additional values that fall outside of the Intellectual Value Rating. These values include:

- Monetary Value (Object Value): Does the collection include materials that are rare or unique or have significant aesthetic value? Are any materials so rare or precious that extra care or urgency is needed to maintain their security?
- Exhibit Value: Does the collection contain materials of lesser scholarly interest but that are particularly picturesque or illustrative of the topic?
- Political Importance: Does the collection contain politically sensitive materials or materials with privacy restrictions that require greater control and more immediate attention?
- Institutional Value: Include material relating to traditional subject strengths at Columbia and central to our core goals? Does the collection have particular interest to Columbia, its operation and history but without importance to a wider scholarly community?
- Relational Value: Does the collection have relatively little intellectual value or informational depth by itself but is a piece of a larger, more important collection or set of collections?

- Age: Has the collection remained unprocessed and inaccessible for an unusual length of time without cause (has it simply been overlooked?)
- Provenance Value: Was the collection acquired from a Columbia faculty, significant individual or unusual, source that should increase the attention or care it receives?

If a collection has any of these values, they should be weighed and considered together to assign a single numerical rating as follows:

1. None: The collection has **no** local value or interest.
2. Limited: The collection has **limited** value insofar as it pertains to the functioning and history of the institution or complements more prominent collections.
3. Pertinent: The collection is **pertinent** to the history of the institution and/or plays a significant role in the collection development of the library.
4. High: The collection **highly** prized by the institution as reflective of its history, achievements, and collections. Included in this category would be materials relating to major Columbia and/or local events and people e.g. the riots of 1968, Lionel Trilling, University Seminars, etc.
5. Unique: The collection is **unique** in the scope, quality, quantity, and value of materials about a subject that is of great local interest. The papers of great Columbia University professors would be of unique local value, as would primary source material dealing with major developments and historic events relating to the university.

The intellectual and local value will not be combined but will be presented in tandem for easy comparison as the following table illustrates.

| Research Value/Local Value | Explanation |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1/1 | No research value / No local value |
| 1/2 | No research value / Limited local value |
| 1/3 | No research value / Pertinent local value |
| 1/4 | No research value / High local value |
| 1/5 | No research value / Unique local value |
| 2/1 | Limited research value / No local value |
| 2/2 | Limited research value / Limited local value |
| 2/3 | Limited research value / Pertinent local value |
| 2/4 | Limited research value / High local value |
| 2/5 | Limited research value / Unique local value |
| 3/1 | Pertinent research value / No local value |
| 3/2 | Pertinent research value / Limited local value |
| 3/3 | Pertinent research value / Pertinent local value |
| 3/4 | Pertinent research value / High local value |
| 3/5 | Pertinent research value / Unique local value |
| 4/1 | High research value / No local value |
| 4/2 | High research value / Limited local value |
| 4/3 | High research value / Pertinent local value |
| 4/4 | High research value / High local value |
| 4/5 | High research value / Unique local value |
| 5/1 | Unique research value / No local value |
| 5/2 | Unique research value / Limited local value |
| 5/3 | Unique research value / Pertinent local value |
| 5/4 | Unique research value / High local value |
| 5/5 | Unique research value / Unique local value |