BIBLIOGRAPHY

Total Cost of Stewardship:

An Annotated Bibliography for Responsible Collection Building

OCLC

Total Cost of Stewardship: An Annotated Bibliography for Responsible Collection Building

J. Gordon Daines III
Brigham Young University

Martha O'Hara Conway
University of Michigan

Brigette Kamsler
George Washington University

Chela Scott Weber
OCLC Research

Nicholas Martin
New York University

Andrea Riley
National Archives and Records Administration

Mary Kidd
New York Public Library

March 2021

OCLC Research
Dublin, Ohio 43017 USA
www.oclc.org

ISBN: 978-1-55653-196-5
DOI: 10.25333/fcv7-5e65
OCLC Control Number: 1241185449

ORCID iDs

J. Gordon Daines III, Brigham Young University https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8639-2484

Martha O'Hara Conway, University of Michigan https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6758-3157

Brigette Kamsler, George Washington University https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0583-5379

Chela Scott Weber, OCLC Research https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6358-5128

Nicholas Martin, New York University https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9436-5718

Andrea Riley, National Archives and Records Administration https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2151-5682

Mary Kidd, New York Public Library https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9294-0961

Please direct correspondence to:
OCLC Research
oclcresearch@oclc.org

Suggested citation:
Daines, J. Gordon, III, Martha O'Hara Conway, Brigette Kamsler, Chela Scott Weber, Nicholas Martin, Andrea Riley, and Mary Kidd. 2021. *Total Cost of Stewardship: An Annotated Bibliography for Responsible Collection Building*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. https://doi.org/10.25333/fcv7-5e65.

CONTENTS

MEMBERS OF THE COLLECTION BUILDING AND OPERATIONAL IMPACTS WORKING GROUP

The ideas and tools presented in this publication are a product of the significant contributions and collaboration of all members of our working group.

- Matthew Beacom, Yale University
- Heather Briston, University of California, Los Angeles
- Martha O'Hara Conway, University of Michigan
- J. Gordon Daines III, Brigham Young University
- Andra Darlington, Getty Research Institute
- Audra Eagle Yun, University of California, Irvine
- Ed Galloway, University of Pittsburgh
- Carrie Hintz, Emory University
- Jasmine Jones, University of California, Los Angeles
- Brigette C. Kamsler, The George Washington University
- Mary Kidd, New York Public Library
- Sue Luftschein, University of Southern California
- Nicholas Martin, New York University
- Erik A. Moore, University of Minnesota
- Susan Pyzynski, Harvard University
- Andrea Riley, National Archives and Records Administration
- Gioia Stevens, New York University
- Chela Scott Weber, OCLC

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The ideas and tools presented in this publication represent the work of many and benefited from the previous efforts and valuable input of multiple colleagues whom the authors wish to thank.

The initial formulation of the Collection Building and Operational Impacts (CBOI) Working Group was inspired by the 2018 Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Conference panel "Collection Development Opportunity or Collections Management Burden? Evaluating the Operational Impact of Collections Stewardship."[1] We thank the presenters on that panel: Jordon Steele, Johns Hopkins University; Carrie Hintz, Emory University; Matt Francis, Pennsylvania State University; and Molly Bragg, Duke University.

The CBOI Working Group collaborated throughout 2018-2020 to bring this work to fruition. We want to especially acknowledge the leadership of Carrie Hintz, Mary Kidd, and Gordon Daines in chairing the subgroups that created the communication tools, cost estimation tools, and annotated bibliography, respectively.

Several existing tools informed our approach to and the features of our cost estimation tools. We would like to acknowledge the thought, care, and labor put into making and sharing these resources:

- University of California Libraries and Special Collections, for the Guidelines for Efficient Archival Processing in the University of California Libraries (versions 3.2 and 4.0)[2]
- The Smithsonian Archives of American Art, which authored the Archives of American Art Processing Guidelines[3]
- The University of Florida George A. Smathers Libraries, Cataloging and Discovery Services Department (CatDS) for the Services Provided cataloging levels schema[4]
- The Digital Library Federation (DLF), for their "Digitizing Special Formats" Wiki, as well as the Digitization Cost Calculator[5]

We extend thanks to OCLC Research Library Partnership Senior Program Officer Dennis Massie, for sharing insight from his work on OCLC's Interlibrary Loan Cost Calculator,[6] and to Beth Dodd of University of Texas at Austin, who shared an example of UT's local cost calculator spreadsheet. Our cost estimation tools benefited greatly from these concrete examples.

The entire tool suite was significantly strengthened by review from external testers. We are grateful for the time and expertise shared by our testers and their generous and incisive feedback: Elvia Arroyo-Ramirez and Jolene Beiser, University of California, Irvine; Christie Peterson, Smith College; Maggie Schreiner, Brooklyn Historical Society; Weatherly Stephan, New York University; Robert Clark, Rockefeller Archives Center; Lea Osborne, New York Public Library; and Mark A. Matienzo, Stanford University.

We are also grateful to OCLC Research colleagues Merrilee Proffitt, Mercy Procaccini, Rebecca Bryant, Brian Lavoie, and Steph Harmon for their insightful comments on drafts of our work, and to Jeanette McNicol, Erica Melko, and JD Shipengrover for the editing, layout, and design expertise they brought to bear throughout the publication process. The CBOI Working Group was a project of the OCLC Research Library Partnership (RLP), whose work is made possible by the sustaining support of RLP member institutions and OCLC's commitment to research in service of libraries and archives.

Introduction

The following annotated bibliography is part of a collection of resources created by the OCLC Research Library Partnership's (RLP) Collection Building and Operational Impacts Working Group.[7] These resources are designed to support archives and special collections in making informed, shared collection building decisions; bring together collection management and collection development considerations; and support communication between colleagues in curatorial, administrative, and technical services roles.

The collection of materials published includes:

- The OCLC Research report: *Total Cost of Stewardship: Responsible Collection Building in Archives and Special Collections*[8]
- An annotated bibliography of related resources
- A Total Cost of Stewardship Tool Suite, comprising a set of Communication Tools and a set of Cost Estimation Tools[9]

Together, they support Total Cost of Stewardship, which is a model of working that considers the cost to acquire, care for, and manage a potential acquisition, the labor and specialized skills required to do that work, and institutional capacity to care for and store collections.

The Collections Building and Operational Impacts Working Group was created to explore the intersections of current collecting and collection management practices to better integrate collection management considerations into the collection development process. As part of these efforts, the group undertook a literature review to help understand the major components of the full life cycle of collection acquisition and use, ground this work in current thinking and practice, and identify where there were gaps and needs.

This resulting annotated bibliography serves as an accompanying resource for *Total Cost of Stewardship: Responsible Collection Building in Archives and Special Collections*.[10] It includes works that address all phases of collections work, including selecting, acquiring, processing and cataloging, preserving, and providing access to archives and special collections, both generally and specifically. In particular, we were interested in the connections between collecting and collection management. We highlight here articles that make connection points between selection, accessioning, appraisal, arrangement and description, access, and advocacy, or that in some way address costs and value in special collections.

The resources cited in this annotated bibliography can aid readers in deepening their understanding of the challenges currently facing archivists and special collections librarians, and in formulating approaches for dealing with those challenges. A deeper understanding of the literature referenced here will also make the tools developed by the working group much more useful.

OVERALL BUSINESS PROCESS

Daines, J. Gordon III. 2011. "Re-engineering Archives: Business Process Management (BPM) and the Quest for Archival Efficiency." *The American Archivist* 74(1): 123-157. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.74.1.h8159344u8331165.

Daines argues that archivists need to take a holistic approach to the archival business process. Each component of the archival business process impacts the others and it is imperative for archivists to understand the interconnectedness of their work. For example, appraisal decisions have a direct impact on archival processing. Taking a holistic approach to the archival business process suggests that we need to examine the full cost of acquiring materials from appraisal costs to storage costs.

Santamaria, Daniel A. 2015. *Extensible Processing for Archives and Special Collections: Reducing Processing Backlogs*. Chicago: ALA Neal-Schuman.

Santamaria defines and argues in favor of the practice of extensible processing and lays out a framework for its implementation. Extensible processing prioritizes creating and publishing catalog records and/or finding aids for archival collections as a first step in the processing life cycle, a clear-cut method to prevent unprocessed materials from being hidden indefinitely in backlogs. From that baseline of access to all unprocessed materials, repositories can make responsible decisions, based on available resources, to build out levels of arrangement and description based on each collections' perceived needs. The practice integrates a number of developments in contemporary archival theory, including principles of minimal processing, privileging of original order, institutional transparency, and dedication to access and backlog elimination.

ACCESSIONING

Searcy, Rachel. 2018. "Beyond Control: Accessioning Practices for Extensible Archival Management." *Journal of Archival Organization* 16(3-4):153-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2018.1517292.

Searcy examines traditional archival accessioning practice and thought, arguing that the lack of a theoretical framework for accessioning inhibits archivists' ability to "exercise professional judgment with accessioning decisions, especially when confronted with new and complex issues" (2). She examines the literature on accessioning, identifying significant reliance on the traditional definition of accessioning as gaining intellectual, physical, and administrative control over a collection, and highlights recent work on accessioning that distinguishes it as a discrete archival function with implications on collections management and access. She then presents a case study of building an accessioning program at New York University employing both theoretical frameworks and practical considerations. Searcy offers an expanded definition of accessioning as "the process by which we examine, analyze, stabilize, and document our knowledge about a grouping of archival materials upon their arrival in order to confirm our stewardship of them" (7).

Greene, Mark. 2010. "MPLP: It's Not Just for Processing Anymore." *The American Archivist* 73(1): 175-203. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.73.1.m577353w31675348.

Greene underscores the importance of appraisal and the interconnectedness of the various activities that comprise the archival enterprise. He points out that the lack of appraisal creates costs in terms of storage and processing. He also argues that what happens in accessioning impacts arrangement and description, which impacts access. The article reinforces the importance of taking a holistic approach to the archival enterprise when trying to develop cost-benefit models.

Weideman, Christine. 2006. "Accessioning as Processing." *The American Archivist* 69(2): 274-283. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.69.2.g270566u745j3815.

Weideman discusses an accessioning project at Yale to reduce costs (time and financial) associated with processing. She describes the process adopted for accessioning materials at Yale, the time it took, and the consequences for operations throughout the repository. The article highlights the interconnectedness of what happens during appraisal, accessioning, and arrangement and description. Weideman does acknowledge that this minimal approach could have potential detrimental effects on reference.

APPRAISAL

Barnard, Megan, and Gabriela Redwine. 2016. "Collecting Digital Manuscripts and Archives." In *Appraisal and Acquisition Strategies*, edited by Michael Shallcross and Christopher J. Prom, 69-116. Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Barnard and Redwine provide recommendations on collecting digital manuscripts and archives focused on building collection policies, building relationships with creators and colleagues, making appraisal decisions prior to acquisition when possible, and ensuring proper documentation upon acquisition. While some of the advice about developing collection development policies is not specific to digital records, they encourage including considerations specific to digital content in general collection development policies. These include consideration of file types, formats, and media; when hardware will be collected; retention of materials created by someone other than the creator; uniqueness of materials; and plans for policy updates due to technological changes. In terms of building relationships, making contact with creators should be done as soon as possible and is an opportunity to foster good digital work habits and discuss privacy and copyright issues. They provide some questions and tools to assist in selection prior to acquisition.

Cook, Terry. 2011. "'We Are What We Keep; We Keep What We Are': Archival Appraisal Past, Present and Future." *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 32(2): 173–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/00379816.2011.619688.

In this article, Cook reflects on the practice of and responsibility inherent in archival appraisal and acquisition. He argues that we must challenge historical assumptions about appraisal and then charts the evolution of archival thinking on appraisal and archival value through three distinct historical phases, describing the ways they continue to impact thinking and practice. He closes by describing a new phase now being entered, that has the potential to create "an archival legacy shaped by an appraisal respecting diversity, ambiguity, tolerance, and multiple ways of archival remembering, celebrating difference rather than monoliths, multiple rather than mainstream narratives, the personal and local as much as the corporate and official" (181-182).

Cox, Richard J. 2002. "The End of Collecting: Towards a New Purpose for Archival Appraisal." *Archival Science* 2(3–4): 287–309. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02435626.

An essay in which Cox ruminates on the distinctions between collecting and appraisal. He argues for the need for archivists to have a clear, intentional approach to appraisal, and that the decision-making processes and results of appraisal must be documented so that the methods of collection and collections can be interrogated in a similar manner to the records themselves.

———. 2004. *No Innocent Deposits: Forming Archives by Rethinking Appraisal*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.

Cox's book springs from the fundamental impossibility of "saving everything"—despite widespread professional and popular incitements to do so—and constitutes a set of reflections upon the theory and practice of archival appraisal. The book's chapters constitute discrete essays on such topics as the theoretical/practical relationship between appraisal and collecting, the records manager's role in appraisal decisions, and models for appraisal of digital archival material. Among the essays' concerns are trends in personal collecting and public memory, the shared and divergent characteristics of archival practice and cultural heritage collecting, and the total role of appraisal in the ecosystem of the archival repository.

Daniels, Maygene F. 1991. "Records Appraisal and Disposition." In *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions*, edited by James Gregory Bradsher, 53-66. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

This chapter serves as an overview on appraisal goals and methods within a primer on archives and their management. Daniels gives an overview of the process of appraisal, noting that goals of the institutional acquisitions policies, institutional resources available for records processing and ongoing care, and evaluation of the records themselves must be weighed in making an informed appraisal decision. She also discusses factors to consider in evaluation of records, documenting appraisal recommendations, the relationship between appraisal and accessioning, and the necessity of systematic reappraisal.

Ham, F. Gerald. 1984. "Archival Choices: Managing the Historical Record in an Age of Abundance." *The American Archivist* 47(1): 11–22. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.47.1.v382727652114521.

Ham identifies how the volume of modern records challenge archivists and argues for a change in collecting and collection management behavior in order to responsibly steward collections. He specifically discusses six aspects of collection management that he sees as key to this: interinstitutional cooperation in collecting, disciplined and documented application of appraisal procedures, deaccessioning, prearchival control of records, reducing record volume, and programmatic analysis and planning. He emphasizes the connection between appraisal and processing in collection management and advocates for paying attention to the cost implications of bringing in new collections: "Critical to the more disciplined appraisal process is a fiscal assessment of the cost of accessioning, organizing, and preserving the records. Archivists must learn to attach a price tag to appraisal decisions." Ham also reinforces the importance of documenting appraisal decisions for managing records into the future.

Huth, Geof. 2016. "Appraising Digital Records." In *Appraisal and Acquisition Strategies*, edited by Michael Shallcross and Christopher J. Prom, 7-68. Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

Huth provides an overview of issues related to appraising digital records. He describes the concept of the "digital ecosystem" and three inherent issues it presents for scheduling and appraisal: fecundity, diversity, and interdependence. He proposes two primary strategies for success: get in early (at the point of records creation or sooner) and be embedded within the larger organization. He describes how appraisal can address digital records issues such as identifying the records copy, the format and timing of transfer, arrangement, preservation, and access. After providing a general overview of approaches to appraisal and the content of an appraisal report he discusses the role of a technical appraisal of the records. The technical appraisal may lead to decisions about the level of preservation of the records. He recommends that appraisers be the ones to identify the record copy of digital records and that we develop a transfer plan for the records at the time of appraisal. He also discusses records custody, intrinsic or artifactual value of digital records, and the costs of custodianship, including recovery costs, transfer and acquisition costs, transformation costs, and technology maintenance costs. Finally, he mentions that appraisers should always be open to re-appraisal of records. Appendices include an archival and technical appraisal checklist and a list of types of tools used for digital records appraisal.

Hyry, Tom. 2016. "Conversion or Collision? Archival Appraisal and the Expanded Role of Special Collections in the Research Library." Paper presented at the The Transformation of Academic Library Collecting: A Symposium Inspired by Dan C. Hazen, Harvard University, 21 October 2016. https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/hazen/files/convergence_or_collision_hyry.pdf.

Hyry makes the argument that the best archivists understand the costs and responsibilities of stewardship as well as the archivist's role in best utilizing the resources available to them. He points out that appraisal is one of the most important factors in responsible collection management, but that successful collection management requires a holistic approach. Costs associated with collections begin with appraisal of potential acquisitions.

Sauer, Cynthia K. 2001. "Doing the Best We Can? The Use of Collection Development Policies and Cooperative Collecting Activities at Manuscript Repositories." *The American Archivist* 64(2): 308–49. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.64.2.gj6771215231xm37.

Sauer argues that written collection development policies and cooperative collecting activities are two tools that archivists should use in the course of creating and building archival collections. Collection development policies keep archival institutions focused, while cooperative collecting makes sure related collections are not far from one another. She describes a survey done to better understand why collection development policies and cooperative collecting activities are not utilized as frequently as they could be. Sauer found that archivists believe that collections are simply too multifaceted and repository collecting focuses too overlapping for clear collecting lines to be drawn. Interestingly, the survey also found that archivists found value in collection development policies and cooperative collecting, even though they are reluctant to use them. While Sauer does not explicitly state that institutions that are not currently using collection development policies or engaging in cooperative collecting should prioritize planning and implementing these tools in their strategic plans, this is the logical conclusion of her arguments.

Tallman, Nathan, and Lauren Work. 2018. "Approaching Appraisal: Framing Criteria for Selecting Digital Content for Preservation." Paper presented at the iPres2018 International Conference on Digital Preservation, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/8Y6DC.

Tallman and Work argue that digital preservation practitioners should work with selectors and curators to help them understand how characteristics of digital records and their preservation needs impact the selection of digital records. After reviewing appraisal practices for general and special collections and identifying common selection criteria for both, the authors compare preservation of analog and digital content, noting that analog preservation strategies can be easier and less expensive, and that digital content is more challenging and expensive to preserve. They recommend a framework for selecting digital content for long-term preservation based on value, uniqueness, cost, legal or fiduciary requirements, restrictions, and the preservability of content and context.

ASSESSMENT

Carter, Lisa R. 2012. "Articulating Value: Building a Culture of Assessment in Special Collections." *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 13(2): 89-99. https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.13.2.376.

Carter argues that "value is a function of what institutions do with their rare and unique materials—how they connect them to the greater academic enterprise and to their users' development as scholars and lifelong learners" (90). An important responsibility of a special collections repository is articulating the value that they bring to an institution. This involves multiple factors including the ability to show that financial resources are being used effectively to bring value to the overall institution (ROI). Archives and special collections need to be better at assessing the value that their collections bring to their sponsoring institutions.

Chapman, Joyce, and Elizabeth Yakel. 2012. "Data-driven Management and Interoperable Metrics for Special Collections and Archives User Services." *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 13(2): 129-151. https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.13.2.379.

Yakel and Chapman argue that special collections repositories need to better utilize their operational data to demonstrate the value they bring to institutions. They define operational data as the information gathered in the course of doing business. They are specifically looking at operational data associated with the user services provided by special collections and archives. For the purposes of this project, the costs associated with various archival and special collections activities need to be gathered as operational data and that data needs to be used to inform the activities of the repository. Yakel and Chapman also argue that we need to standardize the kinds of operational data that we are gathering so that we can compare activities across repositories.

Conway, Martha O'Hara and Merrilee Proffitt. 2012. "The Practice, Power, and Promise of Archival Collections Assessment" *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 13(2): 100-112. https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.13.2.377.

Archival collection assessment is an activity that encompasses a broad range of collection surveys, which may be undertaken for a variety of purposes to support prioritization and decision-making: appraisal, collection management, conservation, processing. In this article, Conway and Proffitt describe how collections assessment has been used and how others might tap into shared practices. Attention is also paid to prioritizing the needs

of researchers. The quantitative and qualitative information that archival collections assessment yields allows practitioners to make informed decisions to steward the collections in its care more effectively.

Conway, Martha O'Hara and Merrilee Proffitt. 2011. *Taking Stock and Making Hay: Archival Collections Assessment*. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research. https://doi.org/10.25333/C33S6M.

In this report, Conway and Proffitt define archival collections assessment as "the systematic, purposeful gathering of information about archival collections" (7). They present model projects and their methodologies, which serve as exemplars that can be adapted by librarians, archivists, and others who are considering collections assessment to meet local needs, including exposing hidden collections, establishing processing priorities, and informing collection management decisions. The report encourages a community of practice, as establishing a broad base of skills in the profession would make it easier for institutions undertake this activity.

Griffin, Melanie, Barbara Lewis, and Mark I. Greenberg. 2013. "Data-driven Decision Making: An Holistic Approach to Assessment in Special Collections Repositories." *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 8(2): 225-238. https://doi.org/10.18438/B8D03M.

Griffin, Lewis, and Greenberg examine how their department implemented a holistic assessment model that accounts for both public and technical services operational costs and strategic priorities. They argue that a holistic approach based on data allowed the department to implement needed improvements that allowed them to better utilize their resources. For the purposes of the Total Cost of Stewardship project, understanding the costs associated with collection development in a holistic way will help special collections librarians better utilize their resources—both fiscal and human.

Gustainis, Emily R. Novak. 2012. "Processing Workflow Analysis for Special Collections: The Center for the History of Medicine, Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine as Case Study." *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 13(2): 113-128. https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.13.2.378.

Gustainis presents a case study describing the process of creating a program to gather and report processing metrics at the Center for the History of Medicine at Harvard Medical School's Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine. It details the goals of collecting these metrics, the details of their approach to breaking down processing activities into quantifiable types of work, the analysis considerations they developed to help contextualize and better understand the metrics, and their use of the metrics to estimate processing costs and institutional processing capacity, and to examine and alter their processing practices. The article concludes by connecting their project to larger efforts to develop processing metrics, and a call for operational transparency and shared practice around gathering and reporting metrics.

COST ESTIMATING TOOLS

American Library Association. 2018. "Cost Analysis." Tools, Publications & Resources. Last modified August 2018. http://www.ala.org/tools/atoz/cost-analysis.

ALA Guide on cost analysis tools and literature in libraries.

Chapman, Joyce, Kinza Masood, Chrissy Rissmeyer, and Dan Zellner. 2015. "Bibliography on Cost Assessment and Digitization Workflow Best Practices in Digital Libraries." Digital Library Federation (DLF). Google Docs. Last modified June 2015. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yFWNWonZXHEFagI0A4ujeCl6U7SriJbfmqAgFGLA-Os/edit#heading=h.g8p9a51871o6.

This bibliography provides literature resources for cost and time assessment, image capture best practices, quality control best practices, and metadata best practices for digital image capture.

DLF. 2019. "Assessment:Costs." DLF Wiki. Last modified 15 January 2019. https://wiki.diglib.org/index.php?title=Assessment:Costs&oldid=14586.

This comprehensive Wiki was developed by the DLF Cost Assessment Group, who were tasked to "collect, aggregate, and share data on the time it takes to perform various tasks involved in the digitization process to help with project planning and benchmarking," resulting in a Digitization Cost Calculator. The Wiki links out to meeting notes taken over the course of four years (2015-18), a best practices and guidelines for the collection of time data for digitization processes document, and a Cost Assessment Bibliography.

Dohe, Kate, and David Durden. 2018. "The Cost of Keeping It: Towards Effective Cost-modeling for Digital Preservation." ***iPres2018*** **(Conference Proceedings, September 2018). In DRUM (Digital Repository at the University of Maryland). https://doi.org/10.13016/M2CZ3283Q.**

Dohe and Durden address the University of Maryland's development of a "Digital Preservation Cost Calculator," which they used to cost out projects and prepare for grant applications. Dohe and Durden detail how they developed their cost calculator; interestingly, they started their work by performing an environmental scan of all preservation systems through the NDSA Levels of Digital Preservation and Preservica Digital Preservation Maturity models. Their development started out with spreadsheets which proved cumbersome, and later was transformed into a web-based tool. The article further addresses plans for future development of the tool.

PROCESSING

Colati, Gregory C., Katherine M. Crowe, and Elizabeth S. Meagher. 2009. "Better, Faster, Stronger: Integrating Archives Processing and Technical Services." ***Library Resources & Technical Services*** **53(4): 261. https://journals.ala.org/index.php/lrts/article/view/5184/6294.**

This article describes how the University of Denver's Penrose Library combined archival processing and technical services in an effort to provide more efficient and detailed description of archival materials for patrons. It is another example of the interconnectedness of the various processes that make up the archival enterprise and a good reminder that financial resources are not the only resources at stake when trying to maximize resource use.

Cooper Cary, Amy, and Pam Hackbart-Dean. 2018. "Establishing Processing Priorities: Recommendations from a 2017 Study of Practices in US Repositories." ***Journal of Archival Organization*** **15(1/2): 34–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2019.1609309.**

This article examines the challenge of setting processing priorities. To understand the complicated interaction between access, research value, and prioritizing processing, the authors distributed a survey to archivists and held five focus group discussions. The article examines the procedure for setting processing priorities at a repository level and argues that establishing processing priorities means balancing available resources, institutional priorities, and donor relations.

Cox, Robert S., 2010. "Maximal Processing, or, Archivist on a Pale Horse." ***Journal of Archival Organization*** **8(2): 134-148. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2010.526086.**

Building upon Greene and Meissner's More Product, Less Process (MPLP), Cox proposes a philosophical shift from the negation implied by the term "minimal processing." Rather than focus on doing as little as possible, archivists should approach new acquisitions with the intent to provide as robustly processed collections as possible within the repository's means and according to the demands of the collection. Cox's model focuses on methods of description and poses accessibility as a first step, rather than an end, of the processing life cycle. Finding aids need as much descriptive information as possible, in order to be discoverable, and description therefore should be approached as a dynamic process that may never end as collection descriptions are revisited, amended, and updated to suit the needs of researchers.

Douglas, Jennifer. 2016. "Toward More Honest Description." ***The American Archivist*** **79(1): 26-55. https://doi.org/10.17723/0360-9081.79.1.26.**

Douglas looks at archival organization and how it is represented in finding aids. She focuses on three types: shaping by the creator of the archives, shaping by the archivist, and shaping by other interested parties. Douglas argues that these conventional means of description hide the "constructedness" of the organization, and that collections and finding aids should be more honestly described, acknowledging how archives are shaped over time. Suggestions for how to do this includes description from the creators of the records, opening accessioning and processing files to researchers, and providing opportunities for researchers to contribute their own knowledge to finding aids.

Dundon, Kate, Laurel McPhee, Elvia Arroyo-Ramirez, Jolene Beiser, Courtney Dean, Audra Eagle Yun, Jasmine Jones, Zachary Liebhaber, Charlie Macquarie, Lara Michels, Shira Peltzman, and Liz Phillips. 2020. ***Guidelines for Efficient Archival Processing in the University of California Libraries (Version 4)*****. UC Office of the President: University of California Systemwide Libraries. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4b81g01z.**

The Guidelines for Efficient Archival Processing were revised in 2019 to address feedback received about how archivists in the University of California (UC) system were using the Guidelines in their day-to-day work. The survey results indicated a need to add information on specific content areas (accessioning, born-digital processing, and appraisal) and extensible collections management.

The revised Guidelines take a holistic approach to archival stewardship. Processing is acknowledged as one component of the life cycle of archival materials that includes appraisal, accessioning, arrangement and description, preservation, access, and deaccessioning. Each of these components needs to be considered as a collection works its way through the archival business process. The revised Guidelines also include processing and management strategies for dealing with born-digital content. The authors hope that the Guidelines will support the integration of born-digital appraisal, accessioning, and processing workflows. The revised Guidelines also include updated examples, links, and appendices. The Guidelines are meant to be used in conjunction with an existing processing manual and not as a processing manual itself.

The Guidelines aim to help UC libraries implement efficient and transparent collection management practices; standardize archival appraisal, accessioning, processing and access practices; define baseline standards for archival processing; integrate born-digital processing into existing processing workflows; assess and communicate the operational impact of archival functions across the life cycle of collections; and allow archivists to work in a cost-effective manner.

Ericksen, Paul and Robert Shuster. 1995. "Beneficial Shocks: The Place of Processing-Cost Analysis in Archival Administration." ***The American Archivist*** **58(1): 32-52. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.58.1.h9847h1372211l75.**

Ericksen and Shuster provide a case study of the cost of archival processing at the Billy Graham Center Archives. They offer examples of how the BGCA computed labor; supply and storage costs are provided on pages 43-4. The article cites Thomas Wilsted's article "Computing the Total Cost of Archival Processing" as the basis for their cost calculations.

Gorzalski, Matt. 2008. "Minimal Processing: Its Context and Influence in the Archival Community." ***Journal of Archival Organization*** **6(3): 186-200. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332740802421915.**

In a literature review of writings responding and related to Greene and Meisner's More Product, Less Process (MPLP) article, Gorzalski gives an overview of the discussion about the cause of archival backlogs and shows the connection between appraisal and processing decisions and the impacts of these decisions on users. The article includes an overview of the history of cost and budget concerns being discussed in archival literature and details several studies of cost or time and effort in processing.

Greene, Mark A., and Dennis Meissner. 2005. "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing," ***The American Archivist*** **68(2): 208–263. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.68.2.c741823776k65863.**

Greene and Meissner identify growing archival backlogs—caused by the outpacing of processing by acquisition—as the most urgent ethical concern facing archivists in the 21st century and propose several measures repositories can take to make their collections accessible more quickly. Their study, based largely on analyses of processing grant files and solicited survey responses, measures the massive scope of backlogs across the profession and focuses on processing methodologies as a means to reduce them. Greene and Meissner ultimately propose redefining standards of arrangement, description, and preservation to prioritize access and minimize processing time and cost.

Hubbard, Melissa A., and Anne K.D. Myers. 2010. "Bringing Rare Books to Light: The State of the Profession." ***RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage*** **11(2): 134–51. https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.11.2.337.**

This article examines whether or not the focus on hidden collections has motivated special collections professionals to find innovative solutions with regards to rare books. They describe efforts at the Southern Illinois University Carbondale campus to deal with rare book backlogs including acceptance of less than full records and using staff members who had not previously cataloged rare books. They highlight several different approaches to dealing with rare book backlogs and highlight the importance of working with technical services.

Hujda, Kathryn, Caitlin Marineau, and Amanda Wick. 2016. "Maximum Product, Even Less Process: Increasing Efficiencies in Archival Processing Using ArchivesSpace." ***Journal of Archival Organization*** **13(3-4): 100-113.** **https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2018.1443549.**

This article examines the impact that implementing ArchivesSpace had for the University of Minnesota Libraries' Department of Archives and Special Collections. It examines how a software solution has the potential to cause an institution to rethink its approach(es) to archival processing. The article highlights how the implementation of ArchivesSpace led to the streamlining of a variety of processes. The findings are a good reminder of the need to take a holistic approach within different archival activities (i.e., examine all of the activities under the umbrella archival processing) and the fact that changes to one archival activity have an impact on other archival activities (i.e., changes to processing impact collection management). The implication for the current research project is a need to look at all aspects of the archival business process as we try to find areas where resources can better be understood and managed.

Meekhof, Jennifer. 2020. "Tiers of Cataloging: A Trim Model Approach for Metadata Capacity." ***Technical Services Quarterly*** **37(3): 291-301.** **https://doi.org/10.1080/07317131.2020.1768703.**

This article presents a case study from the University of Michigan Library about efforts to quantify and communicate cataloging capacity. Drawing inspiration from the automotive industry's creation of the trim package to reduce customization in car production, Meekhof discusses eliminating customization in cataloging in order to increase efficiency. She summarizes their efforts to generalize types of cataloging work (original, copy, rush, etc.) into four tiers to better communicate capacity and simplify new cataloging project requests with selectors and collection managers. The article includes a matrix that lays out timeframe, requirements, annual departmental capacity, and cost per unit for each tier.

Ness, Carl Van. 2010. "Much Ado about Paper Clips: 'More Product, Less Process' and the Modern Manuscript Repository." ***The American Archivist*** **73(1): 129-145.** **https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.73.1.v17jn363512j545k.**

The article by Carl Van Ness responds to the concepts introduced by Greene and Meisner as More Product, Less Process (MPLP). It argues that the backlog problem confronting archivists is not exclusively a processing problem, but is rooted in other parts of the archival enterprise. Van Ness highlights the impact that appraisal has on processing and argues that tackling the backlog means starting at the beginning. This is another article underscoring the interconnectedness of the archival business process.

Prom, Christopher. 2010. "Optimum access? Processing in College and University Archives." ***The American Archivist*** **73(1): 146-174.** **https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.73.1.519m6003k7110760.**

This article analyzes processing techniques in college and university archives and their impact on processing workflows and collection access. Prom uses a subset of data from Greene and Meissner's 2003-04 survey that informed "More Product, Less Process" as well as his own online survey administered in 2006. He finds that there is no correlation between use of intensive arrangement methods (removing staples, interleaving, etc.) and slower processing rates, and there are only minor correlations between intensive descriptive practice and low processing rates. He cites this as evidence that backlogs are not built by lack of processing efficiency alone, suggesting that the entire archival enterprise must be considered and well-managed to address backlogs. Prom offers several potential strategies to address continued backlogs of inaccessible records related to arrangement and description work.

University of California Systemwide Libraries. 2012. *Guidelines for Efficient Archival Processing in the University of California Libraries (Version 3.2)*. UC Office of the President: University of California Systemwide Libraries. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1sw157j3.

These guidelines were produced in 2012 to support change in processing practices across archives and special collections within libraries at the 10 University of California campuses. The guidelines responded to a collective backlog of more than 70,000 linear feet comprising more than 4,800 collections. It emphasizes applying More Product, Less Process (MPLP) tactics in processing to achieve goals, such as making processing more efficient, defining a common understanding of baseline processing, implementing iterative processing practices, providing baseline access to all collections, evaluating processing needs for individual collections, setting target rates for processing, and assessing archival productivity. Emphasis is on high-quality minimal processing tactics, a clear imperative to judge each collection individually to determine specific need and apply professional judgement to find approaches that balance need and available resources.

In addition to overarching guidance, the document includes significant detail and practical advice for carrying out these strategies. It also discusses the impact of these strategies on other parts of the enterprise. Implications for public services are addressed, including guidance about training and policy to support use of minimally processed collections. There is brief recognition that processing backlogs can also be created by over collecting, with basic guidance to avoid this. There are multiple resources to support discussion and decision-making about appropriate processing time and effort allocations, including a level of control framework; guiding questions for assessing research value; other questions to consider including physical condition and order, intellectual access and order, presence of privacy issues, and institutional resources; and examples and ways to approach carrying out each level of control with specific guidance for photographic, audiovisual, born-digital and digitized, and university archives materials.

Wilsted, Thomas. 1989. "Computing the Total Cost of Archival Processing." *Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference Technical Leaflet Series* 2: 1-8. https://marac.memberclicks.net/assets/documents/marac_technical_leaflet_2.pdf

Wilsted explores the value of archives collecting processing statistics to cost out archival processing. Wilsted outlines a five-step process to approach calculating processing cost: 1.) Define terms, 2.) Assess the value of statistics on processing costs, 3.) Compute the cost of processing time, 4.) Compute the cost of materials and 5.) Determine the effect of appraisal and other factors on comparisons. The article provides useful formulas for calculating processing costs.

PEDAGOGY

Fusich, Monica, Jane Magee, and Elizabeth A. Thomas. 2009. "Assignment Research Calculator: Designing and implementing a Customized Product to Reach Your Students." *College & Research Libraries News* 70(8): 456-468. https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.70.8.8234.

The Assignment Research Calculator (ARC) was built by the University of Minnesota and offered to students as a free, easy-to-use and open-source tool to help manage their

time writing research papers. The calculator takes date/time data and translates these inputs into a visualization timeline. This article walks the reader through how the ARC was conceptualized, developed and ultimately promoted and tested by student users.

VALUE OF, AND INVESTMENT IN, SPECIAL COLLECTIONS IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Association of Research Libraries. 2009. *Special Collections in ARL Libraries: A Discussion Report from the ARL Working Group on Special Collections*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. https://www.arl.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/scwg-report-mar09.pdf.

"This report identifies key issues in the management and exposure of special collections material in the 21st century." The report employs a broad definition of "special collections," encompassing both distinctive material in all media and attendant library services. The report makes a total of 17 recommendations in three areas: Collecting Carefully, with Regard to Costs, and Ethical and Legal Concerns; Ensuring Discovery and Access; and the Challenge of Born-Digital Collections. The recommendations highlight the need for the research library community to support actions that will increase the visibility and use of special collections and to promote existing and developing best practices in the stewardship of special collections.

———. 2009. *Research Library Issues: Special Issue on Distinctive Collections, no. 267*. Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI and SPARC. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. https://doi.org/10.29242/rli.267.

This issue of Research Library Issues includes some of the papers that were presented at the ARL/CNI Fall Forum, "An Age of Discovery: Distinctive Collections in the Digital Age," that was held in October 2009. It also includes a synthesis of three major themes that emerged at the forum: use as the driving force in the value proposition of collecting, maintaining, and providing access to special collections; the need to align special collections with the core mission and activities of the research library; and the importance of digitization and collaboration in support of changing modes of research. The papers included here, as well as those referenced within, remind us that investment in special collections requires user-centered mission alignment, resource reallocation towards mainstreaming and sustainability, and a commitment to the trust-intensive work of collaboration.

———. 2013. *Research Library Issues: Special Issue on Mainstreaming Special Collections, no. 283*. Bimonthly Report from ARL, CNI and SPARC. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. https://doi.org/10.29242/rli.283.

Aligning, integrating, and mainstreaming special collections into broader library operations is the focus of this issue of Research Library Issues. It includes six case studies from ARL member libraries that are incorporating special collections more holistically into library initiatives. The cases were selected by the ARL Working Group on Transforming Special Collections in the Digital Age after issuing a call for proposals in 2012. In her introduction to the issue, Lisa Carter provides an overview of the themes that emerged from the case study submissions and identifies three areas of opportunity for further attention: assessment, unified discovery, and managing born-digital materials.

Carter, Lisa R., and Beth M. Whittaker. 2015. "Area Studies and Special Collections: Shared Challenges, Shared Strength." ***portal: Libraries and the Academy*** **15(2): 353-373. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2015.0017.**

This article argues that special collections and area studies librarians face similar challenges in a dynamic academic library environment. These challenges include the need to articulate the value proposition of these unique collections and to better connect them with the curricular needs of their affiliated universities. The need to articulate a value proposition has led many institutions to develop cost-effective processes that drive meaningful integration with the parent institution.

Dupont, Christian, and Elizabeth Yakel. 2013. "'What's So Special about Special Collections?' Or, Assessing the Value Special Collections Bring to Academic Libraries." ***Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*** **8(2): 9-21. https://doi.org/10.18438/B8690Q.**

In this article, Dupont and Yakel call attention to the need for standardized performance measures and usage metrics that are suited to assessing the value and impact of special collections and archives and their contributions to the mission of academic research libraries. Noting that value propositions for special collections, although often not labeled as such, have typically been framed around inherent features of the collections themselves and/or their use by scholars, the authors argue for a shift from collection-centric to user-centric approaches for gathering data about the activities of special collections and archives, and for the development of measures and metrics that can be consistently and widely applied to facilitate cross-institutional comparisons.

Light, Michelle. 2019. "From Responsible Custody to Responsible Stewardship." In ***Archival Values: Essays in Honor of Mark A. Greene*****, edited by Christine Weideman and Mary Caldera, 96-112. Chicago: Society of American Archivists. https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/lib_articles/590.**

This article analyzes "responsible custody," one of 11 core values of archivists as described by the Society of American Archivists (SAA). It lays out the history of the discussion of stewardship as a responsibility in the archival profession. It makes an argument to revise the SAA core value of "responsible custody" to instead be "responsible stewardship." The concept of "responsible stewardship" ties directly to the need to carefully manage the resources needed to acquire and care for special collections materials.

NOTES

1. Steele, Jordan, Carrie Hintz, Matt Francis, and Molly Bragg. "Papers Panel: Collection Development Opportunity or Collections Management Burden? Evaluating the Operational Impact of Collections Stewardship." Presented at the Association of College and Research Libraries, Rare Book and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) Conference, 21 June 2018. In ALAIR (American Library Association Institutional Library Repository) https://alair.ala.org/handle/11213/10885.

2. University of California Systemwide Libraries. 2012. Guidelines for Efficient Archival Processing in the University of California Libraries (Version 3.2). UC Office of the President: University of California Systemwide Libraries. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1sw157j3;

   Dundon, Kate, Laurel McPhee, Elvia Arroyo-Ramirez, Jolene Beiser, Courtney Dean, Audra Eagle Yun, Jasmine Jones, Zachary Liebhaber, Charlie Macquarie, Lara Michels, Shira Peltzman, and Liz Phillips. 2020. *Guidelines for Efficient Archival Processing in the University of California Libraries (Version 4)*. UC Office of the President: University of California Systemwide Libraries. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4b81g01z.

3. Smithsonian Archives of American Art. 2019. "Processing Guidelines." Research and Reference. Revised 2019. https://www.aaa.si.edu/documentation/processing-guidelines.

4. University of Florida. 2021. "Cataloging and Discovery Services" George A. Smathers Libraries. https://catds.uflib.ufl.edu/.

5. Digital Library Federation. 2020. "Digitizing Special Formats." Last edited 3 November 2020. https://wiki.diglib.org/Digitizing_Special_Formats;

   Digital Library Federation. n.d. "Digitization Cost Calculator." Accessed 3 March 2021. https://dashboard.diglib.org/.

6. OCLC Research. 2021. "OCLC Interlibrary Loan Cost Calculator." https://www.oclc.org/research/areas/systemwide-library/interlibrary-cost-calculator.html.

7 OCLC Research. 2021 "Collection Building and Operational Impacts Working Group." The OCLC Research Library Partnership. https://www.oclc.org/research/partnership/working-groups/collection-building-operational-impacts.html.

8. Weber, Chela Scott, Martha O'Hara Conway, Nicholas Martin, Gioia Stevens, and Brigette Kamsler. 2021. *Total Cost of Stewardship: Responsible Collection Building in Archives and Special Collections*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. https://doi.org/10.25333/zbh0-a044.

9. Hintz, Carrie, Chela Scott Weber, Martha O'Hara Conway, Heather Briston, Sue Luftschein, Audra Eagle Yun, and Ed Galloway. 2021. *Total Cost of Stewardship: Communication Tools*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. https://doi.org/10.25333/4bqc-5k43;

Kidd, Mary, Jasmine Jones, Chela Scott Weber, Erik A. Moore, Gioia Stevens, Susan Pyzynski, Andra Darlington, and Matthew Beacom. 2021. *Total Cost of Stewardship: Cost Estimation Tools Manual*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. https://doi.org/10.25333/4bqc-5k43;

Kidd, Mary, Jasmine Jones, Chela Scott Weber, Erik A. Moore, Gioia Stevens, Susan Pyzynski, Andra Darlington, and Matthew Beacom. 2021. *Total Cost of Stewardship: Operational Impact Estimator*. Microsoft Excel Workbook. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. https://doi.org/10.25333/4bqc-5k43;

Kidd, Mary, Jasmine Jones, Chela Scott Weber, Erik A. Moore, Gioia Stevens, Susan Pyzynski, Andra Darlington, and Matthew Beacom. 2021. *Total Cost of Stewardship: Quick Cost Estimator*. Microsoft Excel Workbook. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. https://doi.org/10.25333/4bqc-5k43.

10 Weber, Chela Scott, Martha O'Hara Conway, Nicholas Martin, Gioia Stevens, and Brigette C. Kamsler. 2021. *Total Cost of Stewardship: Responsible Collection Building in Archives and Special Collections*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. https://doi.org/10.25333/zbh0-a044.

For more information about our work related to digitizing library collections, please visit: **oc.lc/digitizing**

OCLC

6565 Kilgour Place
Dublin, Ohio 43017-3395

T: 1-800-848-5878
T: +1-614-764-6000
F: +1-614-764-6096
www.oclc.org/research

ISBN:978-1-55653-196-5
DOI:10.25333/fcv7-5e65
RM-PR-216841-WWAE 2103