

1-1-2016

# Framing Collaboration: Archives, IRs, and General Collections

Amy Cooper Cary

Marquette University, amy.cary@marquette.edu

Michelle Sweetser

Marquette University, michelle.sweetser@marquette.edu

Scott Mandernack

Marquette University, scott.mandernack@marquette.edu

Tara Baillargeon

Marquette University, tara.baillargeon@marquette.edu

---

Published version. "Framing Collaboration: Archives, IRs, and General Collections," in *Collaborating for Impact: Special Collections and Liaison Librarian Partnerships*. Edited by Kristen Totleben and Lori Birrell. Chicago : Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association, 2016: 17-44. [Publisher Link](#). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, CC BY (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



CHAPTER 2\*

# Framing Collaboration:

## ARCHIVES, IRS, AND GENERAL COLLECTIONS

Amy Cooper Cary, Michelle Sweetser, Scott  
Mandernack, and Tara Baillargeon

### Introduction

Collaborative collecting highlights the opportunity for liaison librarians and archivists in academic libraries to develop an integrated and holistic approach to the successful collection of library materials. Yet as academic libraries become the central location for general collections, institutional repositories, university archives, manuscript collections, and other special collections, the world of collecting in academic libraries becomes more siloed. The profession stands to benefit from a stronger realization of shared collecting practices. Liaison librarians have the potential to provide critical information to archivists in support of faculty collecting and research. Archivists have the opportunity to provide liaison librarians with context about university units and the organization's broader history. Shared information can result in more robust collecting policies and practices across the library.

---

\* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, CC BY (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

This seems to be an opportunity yet to be fully realized. A discussion of collecting policies—with a focus on the interplay between the policies as applied to a library's general collections, its special collections and university archives, and its institutional repository—is necessary to jump-start the discussion of the development of a cooperative framework for soliciting, selecting, and evaluating library collections. Ideally, the evaluation of policy can provide a framework for the development of a collaborative tool for evaluation, education of the liaison librarian in the basic concepts of archival selection concomitant with education for the archivist in general collection decision-making, and the consideration of research opportunities in the allied professions. By considering best practices for collaborative collecting, archivists, and liaisons can explore approaches and practical applications appropriate to their own repository. The survey of current policy represented on institutional websites provides a foundation for future discussion and research.

For the purposes of this study, policies of special collections and university archives, institutional repositories, and general collections in academic libraries were targeted. Faculty papers may be located in either manuscript collections or university archives, depending on the institution. For this reason, the term archives is used interchangeably with special collections in this chapter, with the recognition that it represents the overlapping collecting areas in special collections and university archives. Following a policy analysis, the traditional roles of archivists and liaison librarians—as well as proposed aspirational goals for each group—are considered. Final observations include a joint framework for collecting, suggesting a template for educational priorities for archivists and non-archivist liaisons. This initial research provides an opportunity to explore future collaborative projects, including surveys, workshops, and additional research in consideration of collaborative collecting.

## Literature Review

The relationship between archives and other collecting areas of the academic library has yet to be fully explored in the literature. The focus on archival collecting policies stems from discussions in the 1980s by Faye Phillips and F. Gerald Ham. Phillips provided an analysis of the structure of collecting policies—which has been a standard for repositories seeking to write policy—drawing on the ALA observation that “a written collection development policy statement is a tool that assists acquisitions personnel in working consistently toward defined goals, thus insuring stronger collections with wiser use of resources.”<sup>1</sup> Like Phillips, Ham's work focused on archival appraisal, which sought to tame the overabundance of archival records in the face of limited resources. It was Ham who broadened the discussion of appraisal outside the

boundaries of the archives, noting that archivists “must know intimately the associated printed record held by libraries. This is not to suggest that archivists passively allow librarians to make decisions for them or otherwise do their job, but rather that they make librarians partners in compiling and preserving the documentary record.”<sup>2</sup>

The discussion continued in 2002 with Tom Hyry, Diane Kaplan, and Christine Wideman’s case study, which “determined that the best way to document research [of faculty members] is through the published word found in the library’s holdings.”<sup>3</sup> This project sought to apply the Minnesota Method<sup>\*</sup> of appraisal to the development of a collection development policy for faculty papers within the manuscripts and archives department of the Yale University Library. They consulted with a variety of users, creators, librarians, and others to learn more about the kinds of records created by faculty, the similarities and differences in those records across disciplines, and the types of records likely to be of use for future scholarship. They then consulted with academics and librarians to help develop priorities for collecting. While they ultimately failed to reach a conclusion about how best to prioritize records creators, this consultative work “turned out to be the most important step”<sup>4</sup> for the team. During the course of these conversations the group “realized that our two most important documentary universes, the university archives *and* [emphasis theirs] the manuscript side of the repository, each required a collecting policy for faculty papers, and they were not necessarily identical to one another.”<sup>5</sup> While the outcome of the process appeared to be a set of separate, siloed collecting policies for the Yale university archives and the manuscripts side of the repository, Hyry and his colleagues describe a close working relationship between the two whereby materials considered out-of-scope on one side of the repository may be transferred to the other, where they are in-scope.

This collaboration is significant; since in the early 2000s the existence of any collecting policy was rare. In her 2002 study, “Toward Common Content: An Analysis of Online College and University Collecting Policies,” Jennifer Marshall sought online collecting policies for eight hundred eighty-four college and university archives. She was, however, able to locate collecting policies online for only thirty-eight repositories from the pool. She formulated several theories to explain the low numbers including: a view of collecting policies as internal decision-making tools not for public consumption; a lack of awareness of how the web might be used to share information; and difficulty locating policies within institutional websites, each with its own architecture and a variety of names by which they might refer to the same thing (e.g. collecting policy, collection policy, collection development policy, acquisition policy).

---

\* See a definition of the Minnesota Method at <http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/m/minnesota-method>.

While university archives programs generally have broad mandates to collect institutional records, materials generated by faculty members are frequently treated as personal papers and can include materials extending beyond the faculty's service to the individual institution, thus documenting more than institutional history. Tara Laver's 2003 survey of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and non-ARL libraries previously designated Research I institutions revealed that 40 percent of respondents treated faculty papers as manuscript collections, 33 percent treated them as university archives, and nearly 18 percent have treated faculty papers as both manuscript and university archives collections within their repository.<sup>6</sup> Only 21 percent of repositories surveyed had a written policy related to faculty papers, though some respondents (number unquantified) indicated a desire to develop such a policy.<sup>7</sup> The methods by which archivists and curators identified individuals with papers of interest varied, including university newsletters and press releases, monitoring of obituaries, and contact with other departments. Interestingly, two survey respondents indicated referrals from staff in other library units, most notably the library gifts processor or development officer, but no responses indicated referrals from liaison librarians.<sup>8</sup> As Laver wrote, "By their very nature, universities contain multiple disciplines, and acquiring and processing the papers of faculty members from those diverse disciplines require a degree of subject knowledge and technical expertise that archivists may not possess."<sup>9</sup> This is an area where a liaison librarian might assist by offering their knowledge about faculty research and activities.

Douglas Bicknese began to address the segregation of collecting policies in 2003 when exploring institutional repositories (IRs) and their roles within the context of the larger institution. He observed, "On-line digital repositories offer archivists the opportunity of affirming or reaffirming their role as a manager of the campus' records and information."<sup>10</sup> However, even in their early iterations Bicknese notes, "The role of the university archives in an institution's on-line digital repository is not discussed at great length in the literature advocating the adoption of such repositories. Therefore, it is possible that local champions of institutional-based on-line digital repositories may not think to include the university archives in planning for such programs."<sup>11</sup> Bicknese argues archives should be at the table when discussions of institutional repositories come into play—specifically, that IRs allow the space (non-physical) to collect faculty output. However, not every record can be effectively saved. Archivists can provide necessary appraisal expertise with regard to what to collect from faculty, as well as when material can be removed from the IR and placed into long-term storage in the archives. "Archivists need to have a key role in these committees to share their expertise in collecting faculty papers and in working with researchers who use faculty papers. They need to explain how their experience appraising faculty papers will help with both recruiting faculty contributors and identifying specific material that will be worth the institution's investment."<sup>12</sup>

Even ten years on, there remains a lack of a recognized collaboration in this area. Dan Noonan and Tamar Chute's 2014 article, "Data Curation and the University Archives," illustrates the persistence of the siloed archivist. Their study explored the archivist's role in data curation at ARL Libraries: 41 percent responded that their archivists were not involved in discussions of data curation. However, they observed there may be a trend towards involving archivists in this discussion since fully one third of the respondents (33 percent) indicated the archivist was either "moderately involved" or "fully engaged" in the discussion of data curation.<sup>13</sup> The study also indicated nearly all (98 percent) archives collect faculty papers and address this in their collecting policies, yet only 49 percent of archives collect research data.<sup>14</sup> This is significant as faculty become increasingly involved in projects, which generate large data sets and IRs offer ways of making them accessible.

Through collection development policies, archivists have always limited what their repositories collect; therefore, if an archivist chooses not to participate at this time because such materials do not fit with his or her repository's mission or policies, that archivist does not necessarily remove his or her authority to collect research data in the future. Furthermore, participating in the data curation process does not necessarily mean that archivists have to collect research data. If an archivist determines that his or her repository does not currently have the capacity for collecting and curating data, he or she may still participate by collaborating with researchers to identify appropriate repositories and curation best practices.<sup>15</sup>

Noonan and Chute stress the collection development policy should govern the collecting priority for research data, as well as staff participation in the data curation process.<sup>16</sup> The AIMS (Born Digital Collections: An Inter-Institutional Model for Stewardship\*) project suggests a strategy to address this. The project's authors articulated the need for archivists to engage donors more effectively in the identification of digital materials and associated rights prior to their actual donation and accessioning.<sup>17</sup> What happens when an archivist accessions research data without taking physical custody? This may happen when research data is accessioned and then stored in an IR that is not necessarily hierarchically part of the archives, thereby creating an issue of custody and/or conflict with the archives' collection development policy. One purpose of placing research data into an IR or other digital preservation environment is to provide a minimum amount of preservation activity, at least preservation of

---

\* See <http://dcs.library.virginia.edu/aims/> for a description of the AIMS project.

the bit stream. However, the most practical way to maintain research data may be to leave it in situ, thereby maintaining pertinent context and functionality, as opposed to taking physical custody and potentially providing a more suitable preservation environment, albeit with loss of key linkages to contextual information. In either scenario, archivists should develop policies and procedures to address these issues.<sup>18</sup>

## Policies

The ongoing discussion in the literature is borne out in the policies we have evaluated: few policies are available online, and those that are available tend to be siloed representations that do not mesh special collection and archival collecting with general collecting or collecting for institutional repositories.<sup>7</sup> Marshall's 2002 observation is likely still valid, "the fact that a repository has not posted a collecting policy on its web site cannot be taken as evidence that the program does not have one."<sup>19</sup> Based on review of those made public, there is little interplay between liaison librarians, those in institutional repositories, and archivists. Policies tend to treat general collections, university archives, special collections, rare books, and institutional repositories as entities that, if not completely separate, are at least segregated to different sections of the general collecting policy. It is possible that repositories do, in fact, have more integrated collecting policies but hold them closely as internal documents, or that they engage in more integrated collecting across the library as a matter of practice that has yet to be codified in policy.

While not universal, it certainly is not unusual for an institution to articulate a general statement of purpose or philosophy of collection development that addresses the broad issues and principles of collection management in the broader context of the institution. These general statements are typically supplemented by individual policies for specific subject areas or distinct collections. At their core, good collection development policies describe the library's user community, relating it to the institutional mission; delineate the scope of the collection relative to the institution's curricular and research needs, there-

\* Substantial comments on all policies reviewed are available in Appendix 2A, which includes a selective review of policies from twenty-one different repositories from academic institutions of varying sizes. Selection was guided initially by institutions with integrated collecting policies, but a dearth of such policies quickly lead to broadened parameters, including institutions of comparable size and mission as well as those mentioned in the literature regarding collection development policies. Inclusion was not limited to membership in any specific organization (ARL, CIC, for example). Future research goals will employ a more structured search in order to fully determine the scope of the issue. Appendix 2B represents, in tabular format, the information found in Appendix 2A, visualizing the relationships between the policies examined.

by defining collecting goals for future development; provide general selection, withdrawal, and cancellation criteria; and outline preservation strategies. Furthermore, collection policies can serve an especially important function in fostering and supporting collaborative collection development across institutions or across units within an institution.

The more focused, subject-based collection policies are often written to standardize processes and procedures and to protect the library against challenges. Such policies typically define the subject matter to be included in the collection; the depth of the collection, often down to the sub-discipline level as it relates to the research and curricular strengths of the institution; collecting level; language, geographic, and chronological emphases; price limitations; formats; and related collections.

Among the general and subject-based collection development policies reviewed, roughly half refer to university archives and/or special collections, but a mere 6 percent mention or refer to institutional repositories. Conversely, it is not unusual for archival or special collections collecting policies to refer back to the general collection guidelines of the institution. While many general policies include references to related collections, they typically refer to other subject-oriented collections within the same institution or with local and regional institutions; it is rare to see such connections to their own special collections and/or university archives.

Policies for special collections and university archives are often written as a single document for what is often a combined service unit. The policies typically define the scope of the collections, often naming the specific collecting areas, categories of records, or unique collections, as well as specifying other collecting parameters, collecting responsibilities, and terms of use. Approximately 25 percent of the policies considered in this study make reference to the general collection development policies of the institution, but fewer than half of them (12 percent) refer to the institutional repository policy.

Institutional repository policies tend to be process-based: articulating who may submit materials, how to deposit materials, copyright and intellectual property issues, and the like. Explication of the role of the IR vis-à-vis the university archives in providing long-term preservation and curation is mixed. In some cases, the policy explicitly states the IR is the venue for the long-term preservation of all records and research output of the institution. In others, the relationship between the two collections is clearly delineated, with definite distinctions made of the functions of the two collections. In most, however, no collaboration is obviously apparent.

The upshot is there is little standardization in the way collecting policy is represented in academic libraries. What is more, there is little evidence of collaborative interplay between liaison librarians and archivists. It is clear that archives, IRs, and general library collections are still viewed primarily as sep-

arate and distinct entities. There are, of course, differences, and these distinctions are useful. In working to develop a policy reflective of both the IR and the University Archives, the authors at Marquette University focused on the IR as primarily a means of access, while the University Archives has a responsibility for long-term preservation, and this necessitates a difference in collecting focus. However, recognition of the differences in collections can be tempered by recognizing commonalities. The authors have sought these commonalities in evaluating collecting policy in the IR and the University Archives at Marquette, which leads to consideration of the potential that exists in framing collecting policies.

## Roles of Archivists and Liaisons: Towards a Joint Framework

Liaison librarians are well positioned to play a key role in furthering the acquisition of collections for archives, special collections, and institutional repositories. The August 2013 ARL report *New Roles for New Times: Transforming Liaison Roles in Research Libraries* highlights the evolution of the liaison role in the research library: “An engagement model in which library liaisons and functional specialists collaborate to understand and address the wide range of processes in instruction and scholarship is replacing the traditional tripartite model of collections, reference, and instruction.”<sup>20</sup> Jaguszewski and Williams identify two new roles for liaisons—those of advocate and consultant<sup>21</sup>—while recognizing an imperative for library staff at all levels to work across traditional silos. Interviews with library organizations conducted in preparing the report provide examples of liaison librarians advising faculty on personal information management, developing an understanding of research methods in their assigned disciplines, and recruiting content for institutional repositories. These liaison activities and the knowledge developed by working directly with faculty complement the work done by staff in university archives as they identify and solicit faculty papers for collection. While the ARL report does not specifically identify archivists as natural partners for liaisons, this is a logical extension of the type of relationship emerging in the profession. The advocate and consultant roles identified by Jaguszewski and Williams are ones which liaisons could be educated to fulfill with regard to university archives’ collecting, just as they have for new and emerging roles as advocates and consultants in digital humanities, teaching and learning, digital scholarship, and scholarly communication.

Liaison librarians, through their relationships with faculty and knowledge of faculty research activities, can help archivists identify and acquire collections for the university’s archives, particularly faculty papers. While archivists

likely know the breadth and depth of the archives' holdings in specific subject areas or how the papers of an individual faculty member can fill a gap in their collections, they do not always have relationships with the targeted individuals or departments and, as Laver's research suggests, frequently rely on public information as leads in their collecting. Through their personal relationships with departments, liaison librarians can offer insight into whether their faculty might be amenable to making a donation, whether they have retained records in their office or lab to be donated, how their materials may be used by others within the field or for instructional purposes. Such insight may lay the groundwork for more successful solicitation for faculty papers than a cold call. Working together, the library's complement of liaisons can augment the collection development work of the individual university archivist within an institution.

Noonan and Chute's research related to data curation highlights another avenue where archivists and liaisons can be particularly effective in working together. As liaisons engage in more personal information management activities with faculty, they can draw upon the knowledge and expertise of the archivist, who increasingly has background coursework, if not experience, in working with electronic records and thinking through issues of file naming, file format selection, and digital preservation. Noonan and Chute's observation that archivists need to engage donors more effectively in the identification of digital materials and associated rights indicates a need to work closely and enter into a conversation with the faculty conducting research. Partnering in information management training would allow the liaison and archivist to jointly address and educate themselves and faculty partners about opportunities for gathering data, outlets for that data (IRs, data repositories, university archives, or a combination of outlets), and to keep abreast of the research streams coming out of university departments. Liaison librarians are well-positioned to identify researchers looking for these sorts of services; learning more about the data being generated in the university setting can inform archivists and allow them to plan for the resources required to capture and preserve the record created by faculty members. Moreover, by collaboratively training faculty in areas of personal information management, liaisons and archivists are able to influence the circumstances of records and metadata creation and to make the long-term preservation and delivery of those same records by the university archives an easier task because good record-keeping practices have been in place from the start.

In addition, Hyry and his colleagues underscore that conversations among archivists, librarians (presumably including liaison librarians), creators, and other experts are useful in better understanding the documentary universe of an institution, the potential use of records, and how to set priorities for collecting in a world of limited resources. The Yale case study also illustrates the

overlapping, though not identical, lenses through which any body of records can be evaluated based on the goals of the specific collecting unit (specifically separate manuscripts and university archives collecting areas) and the need for coordination between those areas when within the same institution. Overlap is also apparent when one considers university archives and institutional repositories as well. Given that liaison librarians are increasingly called upon to assist in educating faculty about scholarly communication efforts, they can likewise foster conversations between individual faculty members, institutional repository staff, and archivists regarding potential areas of overlap in collecting.

Finally, by bringing the archivist into regular conversation with the faculty member, liaisons can assist in informed collection development on the part of the archivists and archivists can come to a deeper understanding of the research practices of the university and the subject emphases of individual faculty members. With this greater understanding and awareness of the way in which faculty work and teach, archivists can take classroom use into consideration when assessing the value of a body of work for collection by the archives. In this way, the archivist can be better poised to collect materials which can be reintegrated into the classroom and scholarship, further strengthening relationships over time and ensuring that archival collecting better supports teaching and research needs.

There is much to be gained by liaison librarians and archivists working collaboratively in collecting faculty papers for the library. However, the educational backgrounds and experiences of liaison librarians have not necessarily prepared them to be knowledgeable about policies and practices for developing archival collections. Archivists, on the other hand, may have formalized relationships with department chairs to obtain administrative records, but may not have direct knowledge of individual faculty members and their research interests and processes. Liaisons can help archivists make connections with faculty to help them begin to understand the needs of the curriculum within a discipline. Liaisons can bring archivists into the classroom by educating archivists as to how collections could be used or subject areas developed within the collections.

Since liaison librarians' roles include promoting the institutional repository, they tend to have a better understanding of the types of materials collected by the repository. Likewise, if faculty members have heard about the library's interest in collecting their materials, this awareness tends to be within the scholarly communication context with emphasis on the published work and, in some cases, the research data supporting that work. Through ongoing communication, archivists can help liaisons develop a better understanding of the kinds of faculty papers and records archives collect, factors employed to evaluate materials, and the process used to acquire faculty materials. A proposed joint framework can serve this purpose by laying out, in a shared document,

language both parties understand and can use in outreach with the campus community.

A joint framework describing the types of materials collected by university archives is important in educating the liaison and faculty donor about the breadth of material the archives collects. As evidenced in the review of policy, many archives already have some sort of general statement about what it is they collect, which can lay the foundation for a joint framework. As the university archives and the institutional repository both seek to document faculty members' scholarship, a joint framework must also provide a basis for understanding the mission and role these units play in the campus context and on how the institution chooses to handle content that could logically be collected by both units.

A joint framework should also lay out criteria to help determine which faculty members' papers would be of interest to the archives. Whereas institutional repositories generally collect all of the university's research or scholarly works (or that for which they can secure permissions), university archives must be selective when soliciting the papers of faculty members. A questionnaire listing these selection criteria is a critical part of a joint framework, allowing both parties to bring their expertise to bear and to make transparent the many factors at play when deciding whom to solicit. While some university archives' collecting policies list broad criteria to help prioritize the collecting of faculty papers, liaison librarians may be more comfortable using them when they include concrete examples specific to the institutional context. For example, some archives' collecting policies indicate they are interested in collecting the papers of faculty members recognized as leaders in their discipline. Institution-specific examples of what serves to designate that someone is recognized as a leader in their discipline might look something like this:

Is the faculty member recognized as a leader in his or her profession/discipline?

- Received career service award or designation of fellow by relevant professional association
- Received significant national or international award (e.g. Nobel Prize, MacArthur, Guggenheim, etc.)
- Served as president of a major national or international professional body
- Received honorary degrees from outside institutions of higher education
- Stands out when compared to institutional peers

As conversations with potential faculty donors take place, liaison librarians are likely to be asked logistical questions related to the transfer of material to the archives. Not only should liaison librarians have an awareness of the general practices and procedures used to physically or digitally transfer re-

cords so they can respond to basic questions in the absence of an archivist, the joint framework should also include links to specific forms used to secure the transfer of records, donor agreements, and other administrative documents used to bring materials into archival custody.

Finally, to minimize frustration and confusion, the joint framework should lay out and make clear where responsibilities are shared and where they fall to specific individuals, either archivists or liaison librarians. The joint framework, therefore, must emerge as a result of ongoing conversations among archivists and liaison librarians and must be developed together to ensure its usefulness to both parties. By working together, liaisons and archivists can leverage existing networks and knowledge to efficiently acquire collections significant to the history of the university and responsive to campus curricular needs.

This kind of collaboration cannot be done in a vacuum. Library leadership must foster an environment that supports and encourages the development of common policy and facilitate opportunities to meet and discuss collaborative and coordinated approaches to collecting. Library leadership can do this through inclusive visioning and strategic planning that clearly articulates cooperative library and departmental goals and priorities. Furthermore, library administrators must be willing to allocate time for the development of workflows across units or departments and allow for conversations that engage all stakeholders in the process. Providing opportunities for staff development and cross-training between departments provides another means of support and encouragement for broader thinking and wider perspectives. Leadership must proceed in full recognition that these tasks will necessarily take time away from other priorities and must encourage the use of resources in the archives, research and instruction, and the IR to develop these policies.

## Conclusion

The overarching question deserves further consideration: Why isn't collaborative work between archivists and subject liaisons happening on a large scale, with regularity? One might argue this happens informally. The literature and general professional knowledge speak to the potential benefits of collaborative collecting, yet few repositories in this survey showed broad treatment to engage both archives and the general collecting policy.

There are many potential answers to this question. Discussions between colleagues have uncovered perceptions that encourage, or at least facilitate, separation. In the case of liaison librarians, there is a perceived lack of knowledge of how archives programs relate to the general collection and a narrow vision of the scope of archival collecting. Liaisons may be prone to considering archivists as focused solely on preservation and may be unaware of the reference service and instruction archivists provide daily. Conversely, there is the

age-old perception that archives are not easily accessible, not welcoming, and foreign. What is more, the case can be made that archivists perpetuate the notion they are expert with domain-specific knowledge. They may have a narrow vision of liaison librarians as service-providers, rather than as librarians who build strong relationships with faculty based on knowledge of their research, teaching, and subject expertise.

These perceptions lead to a reluctance to make collaborative work between liaison librarians and archivists a priority. With a lack of clear policy necessitating a collaborative vision of library collection and with stereotypes playing into professional differences rather than similarities, it is hard to break out of professional silos. The benefits of collaboration may not be evident, in large part, because both our professional literature and practice do not yet reflect them.

The roles and framework presented here, then, are a first proposal, based on observations and an exploration of policy. The clear path, which this group of authors intends to pursue, is to inform this preliminary proposal with a fuller survey of repositories, to explore hidden collaborations, and to further define practice. Continued research and discussion are necessary and should be undertaken in confidence that the knowledge liaison librarians and archivists each brings to the table are complementary. There is tremendous potential in collaborative collection to enrich all areas of library practice.

## Appendix 2A. Collecting Policies

This section provides a brief description of the policies considered for this paper. This is not an exhaustive description, but an effort to note where policies overlap and where they remain siloed.

**Amherst College:** The General Collection Development Policy for Special Collections and University Archives is available at <https://www.amherst.edu/library/archives/collectiondevelopment#scope>. The policy is not quite integrated, but a few statements suggest a certain amount of collaboration such as: “Archives & Special Collections’ primary responsibility is to serve the research needs of Amherst College faculty and students. To this end, the department seeks to collect in subject areas receiving substantial and sustained attention within the College community, those representing ongoing departmental research interests, or those areas that are the focus of interdisciplinary programs.” The Institutional Repository is new (2013) and focuses on open access to faculty articles. See <https://www.amherst.edu/library/services/facstaff/openaccessresolution>. There is no reference to relationship with the greater library or the University Archives.

**Boise State University:** Found at <https://library.boisestate.edu/about/colldev/>, the “Collection Development Guidelines” make reference to the Archive Collection which includes “all...University records that have legal or permanent value in documenting the history of the university.” The Guidelines also refer to the Special Collections department, which “houses research materials that are unique, rare, or fragile.” There are no distinct policies for the archives, special collections, or institutional repository.

**Boston College University Archives:** In this policy found at <http://www.bc.edu/libraries/collections/collinfo/a-zlist/archives.html>, no reference is made to the IR when describing their collecting parameters, which are described from a number of angles, including interdisciplinary elements, formats, and types of materials, languages, geographic areas, and time period. This seems different from the way many archives present the collecting information; and the framework may map more closely to the way a general library collecting policy would be written. The institutional repository at Boston College (eScholarship@BC) <http://dlib.bc.edu/policies> does not reference the university archives. “The content of the repository consists of scholarly and creative work and research affiliated with Boston College, including all academic disciplines and departments (with the exception of the Boston College Law School).”

**Bucknell University:** Bucknell provides a “Library and Information Technology Special Collections / University Archives Collection Development Policy at: <http://www.bucknell.edu/documents/lit/policies/SC-UACollectionPolicy.pdf>.

This single document contains policies for Special Collections, Manuscript Collections, and University Archives. The criteria suggest that Special Collections and University Archives will collect material that

- Compliments(sic), enriches, and/or builds on existing collection strengths
- Supports the teaching, learning, or long-term research needs of users while meeting other selection criteria
- Supports curricular needs while meeting other selection criteria
- Intrinsic local (Bucknell University only), national or international

However, they also note they will not collect “publications authored by faculty, staff, or alumni unless ‘will collect’ criteria is met.” The University Archives policy does not list faculty papers as records they will collect. In fact, they note, “Materials for which a university office or its staff is not the originator” falls outside the collecting range for University Archives.

**Bucknell Digital Commons:** <http://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/> is part of their Open Access initiative. It does not provide significant collecting information and there is no mention of the general collection or the University Archives. You can see collections available at <http://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/communities.html>, which provides a clickable list of collections.

**Florida International University:** Access is provided to materials collected via the Digital commons, however there is no reference to other collection policies. Found at <https://library.fiu.edu/digitalcommons/policies>, this site primarily answers commonly asked procedural questions. The FIU Special Collections and University Archives has a presence at <http://specialcollections.fiu.edu/university-archives>, but this website offers no statement about collecting, except for a brief statement on holdings. There is no mention of broader university collections or of the IR.

**Georgetown University Archives:** The website <http://www.library.georgetown.edu/special-collections/archives> is limited and included only a brief description of collecting: “The Archives serves as the institutional memory of Georgetown University. As such, it acquires, preserves and makes available records of enduring value that document University activities, functions, decisions, policies and programs.” There is no mention of the IR or general collection.

**Georgetown (DigitalGeorgetown):** This policy at <http://www.library.georgetown.edu/ir/policies> does not reference the university archives. “The IR

is intended primarily as a repository for previously-published work, and not as an independent publishing platform for new research articles. However, the IR does offer departments or units the ability to publish and disseminate their existing working paper series, Journals, or theses not covered by the ETD submission process.”

**Pepperdine University Libraries:** They have a collection development policy at <https://wikis.pepperdine.edu/display/LIBPROC/Special+Collections+and+University+Archives+Collection+Development+Policy>.

They note, “Materials are collected in areas that accomplish one of the following goals: enhance or provide context for current collection strengths, support the mission of the university, or support instruction and use by our students and faculty. Specific areas of interest are outlined in further detail below.”

University Archives has their own statement, “The University Archives has been established as the repository of the historical records of the university, according the Records Management Policy, section 8.0 (<http://community.pepperdine.edu/it/content/records-management-policy.pdf>). As such, the University Archives documents the major activities, decisions, and development of the university by collecting materials with long-term historical significance. These materials are used by members of the university community as well as outside researchers who are seeking source materials to promote the heritage of the university, understand its past, and examine its impact on American educational, social, religious, and political history.” Academic departments and faculty are specifically mentioned as areas that are collected, including “Faculty and staff papers.”

It is interesting that they make a statement which suggests faculty and staff papers are “...considered on a case-by-case basis. Some of the criteria that may be used to appraise these collections include: national or international reputation in an academic field or industry, record of service at Pepperdine University and contribution to its growth and development, and service and contribution in community, state, and national affairs.” Though they do not go so far as to state there is collaborative collecting between subject liaisons and archivists, they do note, “The Special Collections and University Archives acquires materials through donation, transfer from university departments, transfer from the library’s general collections, and purchase. The decision to acquire materials will be based on an appraisal by Special Collections and University Archives professionals to assess the historic and/or research value of the materials, as well as the cost to process, preserve, store, and maintain the materials. Other faculty and administrators will be consulted as needed.”

**Purdue University:** An articulated policy statement for the Archives and Special Collections unit is available at <https://www.lib.purdue.edu/spcol/general-policies>. While no general collection development policy was located, the special collections and archives policy does include a statement placing its materials in a broader context: materials relate to a “subject area of distinction for Purdue University” and “support the research and teaching needs of the University.”

**Purdue E-Pubs:** The site <https://www.lib.purdue.edu/repositories/epubs/about> states: “Purdue e-Pubs: Policies and Help Documentation” describes processes and procedures for depositing materials, including the purpose of repository, scope of eligible materials, and more. No reference is made to general collection development policy or principles.

**Purdue University Research Repository (PURR):** Found at <https://purr.purdue.edu/legal/collection-policy> this document articulates policy for digital data repository. Materials are to be “appropriately related to the University’s research and teaching mission,” but while the distinction between PURR and E-Pubs is made, there is no reference to general policy.

**St. Cloud State University:** A general descriptive policy about the Library is available at: <http://www.stcloudstate.edu/library/about/policies/collection-dev.aspx>

This policy states the archives are “A collection of documents, records, or other materials about and/or unique to Saint Cloud State University. St. Cloud State University Archives, while considered a collection within the James W. Miller Learning Resources Center, adheres to its own collection development policy.” There is no link to this collecting policy from this page.

The University Archives offers its own website and provides information about the holdings at <http://www.stcloudstate.edu/library/archives/about/default.aspx>. Its collection development policy (including a section on Special Collections and a section on Rare Books) is made available as a PDF at [http://www.stcloudstate.edu/library/archives/\\_files/documents/collection-development-policy.pdf](http://www.stcloudstate.edu/library/archives/_files/documents/collection-development-policy.pdf). The policy makes no mention of the Institutional Repository or of the general library collecting policy.

**Texas A&M:** This collection development policy, <http://library.tamu.edu/assets/pdf/University%20Libraries%20Collection%20Development%20Policy.pdf>, makes reference to institutional repository (OAKTrust) in regards to theses and dissertations, as well as providing a link to the IR and delineating its purpose, scope, and acquisition policy.

**OAKTrust:** Policy found at <http://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/> offers no reference to the general collecting policy.

**University of California–Los Angeles:** UCLA Library Collection Development Policy [http://www.wasc.ucla.edu/Appendix\\_E/Library\\_Collection\\_Policy.pdf](http://www.wasc.ucla.edu/Appendix_E/Library_Collection_Policy.pdf) makes no reference to special collections and archives policy nor to IR policy.

**Library Special Collections:** This policy at <http://www.library.ucla.edu/special-collections/discover-collections/collecting-areas> makes no reference to the general collection development policy or institutional repository policy.

**e-Scholarship:** Found at <http://www.library.ucla.edu/support/publishing-data-management/scholarly-communication-services/publish-escholarship>, this policy makes no reference to the general collecting policy nor to special collections and archive.

**University of Illinois Archives:** Includes an “About Us” area <http://archives.library.illinois.edu/about-us/> which includes a “Documentation Policy” <http://archives.library.illinois.edu/about-us/documents-and-policies/documentation-policy/>. The document makes no mention of the IR, but includes a deep analysis of their collections. The Student Life and Culture Program and the Sousa Archives seem to be separate entities.

**University of Illinois IR (IDEALS):** At <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/>, it states on their home page that they invite “unpublished and published” materials and suggest departments use the IR to “distribute their working papers, technical reports or other research materials.” They have an “about” page <https://wiki.cites.illinois.edu/wiki/display/IDEALS/IDEALS+Resources+and+Information> which includes a link to IDEALS Policies (<https://wiki.cites.illinois.edu/wiki/display/IDEALS/IDEALS+Policies>) including a collection policy (<https://wiki.cites.illinois.edu/wiki/display/IDEALS/Collection+Policy>). The collection policy does not mention any relationship to the Archives.

**University of Massachusetts Amherst:** This general collection development policy at <https://www.library.umass.edu/about-the-libraries/policies/collection-development-policy/> is a stand-alone policy with no evidence of policies for special collections, university archives, or an institutional repository.

**University of Michigan’s Bentley Historical Library:** This repository has an incredibly detailed Records Policy and Procedures Manual: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1J0keM\\_YqsimzqqGUpU0NPq6Zj2Do1nlAz\\_4Qe08ZdwA/edit#](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1J0keM_YqsimzqqGUpU0NPq6Zj2Do1nlAz_4Qe08ZdwA/edit#). The section on what to transfer starts on p. 21; the section on faculty papers begins on p. 31. The document references Deep Blue, which seems to be more broadly defined than the traditional IR. The document indicates it serves as the Bentley’s electronic records repository (“While the paper collections are stored

at the library, digital materials are stored in Deep Blue.”), and this is borne out when looking at the Bentley’s community within Deep Blue: <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/65133>. For example, the College of Architecture record group represented in Deep Blue includes posters, invitations, brochures, etc.

Deep Blue (and coming soon, Deep Blue Data <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/data/>) has significant policy documentation:

- Intellectual Property Policy <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/static/about/deepblueip.html>
- Preservation and Format Support Policy <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/static/about/deepbluepreservation.html>
- Privacy Policy <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/static/about/deepblueprivacy.html>

The best articulation of a “collecting policy” is on their FAQ page <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/static/about/deepbluefaq.html>. The FAQ page includes the statement “but our goal for Deep Blue is to have decisions on what it should contain and offer be made mainly by you and the other members of the UM community at large. So, we encourage you to deposit your work ...” In the section “What Types of Deposits Does the Library Discourage?” it notes, “Per the Standard Practice Guide, some completed materials, especially those of an administrative nature, are better suited for the University Archives at the Bentley Historical Library.” This indicates a distinction between the institutional repository and the University Archives.

**University of Notre Dame:** This institution offers more information on collecting including a general Collection Development Policy for Subject specific areas. <http://search.nd.edu/search/?entqr=3&q=%22collection+development+policy%22>

- a collecting policy for University Archives <http://archives.nd.edu/about/collectionpolicy.pdf>,
- a Records Management and Archives Policy [http://policy.nd.edu/policy\\_files/Records%20Management%20Archives%202015.pdf](http://policy.nd.edu/policy_files/Records%20Management%20Archives%202015.pdf),
- and a policy for the Institutional Repository <https://curate.nd.edu/policies/content>.

The Archives’ policies seem siloed from general subject area collection development policies and the IR policy, however, the IR policy makes reference to the Archives’ policy.

**University of Texas at Austin:** While no formal general collection development policy was found, an “About the Collections” page is available at <https://www.lib.utexas.edu/about/collections/policy>, which includes a link to subject-based statements of collecting scope. No evidence of integration with special collections, university archives, or an institutional repository was found.

The UT-Austin policy for its Digital Repository is available at [https://repositories1.lib.utexas.edu/policies\\_collections](https://repositories1.lib.utexas.edu/policies_collections). While there is no reference to other collection policies, the policy spends considerable time discussing the organization/structure/hierarchy of the IR, including assigning collecting responsibilities to “Community Administrators.” The Communities center around units within the university. Special Collections focuses on a few specific collections, ([https://www.lib.utexas.edu/apl/collections/special\\_collections](https://www.lib.utexas.edu/apl/collections/special_collections)) and the University Archives is included in a completely separate center, the Briscoe Center for American History ([https://www.cah.utexas.edu/collections/ut\\_archives.php](https://www.cah.utexas.edu/collections/ut_archives.php) ). The UT Archives collections also focus on university units and entities, but there is no reference to collecting in the IR, Special Collections, or General Collection.

**University of Utah:** This institution offers a page on collection development primarily related to functions and does not specify policy. (<http://www.lib.utah.edu/collections/collection-development/> )

The Institutional Repository, “About USpace” ( <http://uspace.utah.edu/about.php> ) states their mission is “To collect, maintain, preserve, record, and provide access to the intellectual capital and output of the University.....;” services offered include copyright management, manuscript submissions, archival services...;”. There is no mention of University Archives in either area, but University Archives does have its own page available at <http://www.lib.utah.edu/collections/archives.php>. This page provides only minimal information about collection content.

**University of Virginia:** University of Virginia Library describes its collections comprehensively at <http://www.library.virginia.edu/collections/>. This page includes references to Special Collections, Manuscripts, Rare Books, and University Archives. Some of these pages make cross references between the Alderman Library (general collection) and the Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, which houses the Special Collections. The Special Collections Library has its own Collection Development Policy, available at <http://small.library.virginia.edu/collections/collection-development-policy/>. Notable is a statement at the end indicating academic programs supported by the collections.

The IR is available at <http://libra.virginia.edu/> and a brief statement describing the commitment to open access is available at <http://www.library.virginia.edu/libra/>. There is no mention of a relationship to the general collection or to the University Archives.

**Weber State University:** They have a general collecting policy available at [http://library.weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/collec\\_manag\\_policy.cfm#Acquisition](http://library.weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/collec_manag_policy.cfm#Acquisition). Their General Acquisition Guidelines take the library as a whole and at least mention manuscripts and rare books. Manuscripts in printed, edited form, facsimile editions, and microform are selected by subject librarians using the same criteria as for other monographic materials. This indicates some collaborative work on the part of subject librarians. However, there is a stringent statement that rare books will not be purchased. To do so would be inappropriate, given the library's stated objectives and financial constraints. Manuscripts and rare books acquired as gifts are discussed in the Special Collection Policy at <http://library.weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/Collection%20Policy.pdf>, which indicates there is some collaborative work between the Special Collections area and the general collections.

University Archives are maintained and considered a separate entity from the Special Collections and general collections. They stress the archives collects the history of the university and has no records management responsibility. They do have a University Archives Acquisition Policy at [http://library.weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/arch\\_acquisition\\_policy.cfm](http://library.weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/arch_acquisition_policy.cfm). This policy is short and does not specify any relationship between liaison librarians and archives.

**Yale University:** The IR for Yale University is available at <http://elischolar.library.yale.edu/terms.html>. The web representation is process-oriented and discusses who can participate, how to submit, copyright guidelines and policy, author rights, etc. The IR does delineate different research units at <http://elischolar.library.yale.edu/communities.html>, and even includes the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library as one of these units. However, the University Archives is located in the Sterling Memorial Library and not in the Beinecke; they are different buildings on campus.

Yale University Library considers Manuscripts and Archives as a single entity. (<http://web.library.yale.edu/mssa> ) While the "About" page (<http://web.library.yale.edu/mssa/about> ) refers to materials "first collected by faculty and other members of the Yale community to support their own research activities," ultimately, manuscripts and University Archives were merged in 1961 and the structure remains combined. Statements about the Manuscript Collections (<http://web.library.yale.edu/mssa/collections/manuscript-collections>) and the University Archives (<http://web.library.yale.edu/mssa/collections/university-archives>) do not mention each other or the Institutional Repository.

## Appendix 2B. Institutional Collecting Policy Relationships

This table attempts to depict the relationships between different collecting policies at the institutions examined. The designation “Primary” indicates the point of reference for the examined policy. “References” indicates that the primary policy references the other collection. “Integrated” indicates where other policy is integrated into the primary policy. Other descriptive notes are self-explanatory.

For example, Bucknell has policies for general collections, combined special collections and archives, and the institutional repository. Only the combined special collections & archives policy makes reference to another policy (in this case, the general collection).

	<b>General Collections</b>	<b>Special Collections</b>	<b>University Archives</b>	<b>Special Collections &amp; Archives (combined)</b>	<b>Institutional Repositories</b>
Amherst College	References			Primary	
Amherst College					Primary
Boise State University	Primary	References collection, not policy	References collection, not policy		
Boise State University				Primary	
Boston College	Primary				
Boston College	Similar model/format		Primary		
Boston College					Primary
Bucknell University	Primary				
Bucknell University	References			Primary	
Bucknell University					Primary

	General Collections	Special Collections	University Archives	Special Collections & Archives (combined)	Institutional Repositories
Florida International University	Primary			Includes statement	
Florida International University				Primary	
Florida International University					Primary
Georgetown University			Primary		
Georgetown University					Primary
Marquette University	Primary				
Marquette University				Primary	Integrated
Marquette University				Integrated	Primary
Pepperdine University	Primary			Links to	
Pepperdine University	References broader collecting goals; transfers from general collection			Primary	
Pepperdine University					Primary
Purdue University	References broader collecting guidelines, but no distinct policy			Primary	

	<b>General Collections</b>	<b>Special Collections</b>	<b>University Archives</b>	<b>Special Collections &amp; Archives (combined)</b>	<b>Institutional Repositories</b>
Purdue University	Refers to compliance with broader collection management policies, practices				Primary (data)
St. Cloud State University	Primary		References, but no link to actual policy		
St. Cloud State University			Primary		
Texas A&M University	Primary				References and links
University of California–Los Angeles	Primary				
University of California–Los Angeles				Primary	
University of California–Los Angeles					Primary
University of Illinois–Urbana Champaign			Primary		
University of Illinois–Urbana Champaign					Primary
University of Massachusetts Amherst	Primary				
University of Michigan			References		Primary

	General Collections	Special Collections	University Archives	Special Collections & Archives (combined)	Institutional Repositories
University of Michigan, Bentley Historical Library			Primary		References
University of Notre Dame	Primary				
University of Notre Dame			Primary		
University of Notre Dame			References		Primary
University of Texas–Austin	Primary				
University of Texas–Austin		Primary			
University of Texas–Austin			Primary		
University of Texas–Austin					Primary
University of Utah	Primary	References, but not policy			
University of Utah			Primary		
University of Utah					Primary
University of Virginia	Primary	References / Links	References / Links		References / Links
University of Virginia	References academic programs supported by the collections	Primary			
University of Virginia			Primary		

	General Collections	Special Collections	University Archives	Special Collections & Archives (combined)	Institutional Repositories
University of Virginia					Primary
Weber State University	Primary	Mentions			
Weber State University	Mentions transfers & additional copies for "General Collection," but no reference to policy	Primary			
Weber State University			Primary		
Yale University	Primary				
Yale University	References			Primary	
Yale University					Primary

## Notes

1. Faye Phillips, "Developing Collecting Policies for Manuscript Collections," *American Archivist* 47 (Winter 1984): 37.
2. F. Gerald Ham, "Archival Choices: Managing the Historical Record in an Age of Abundance," *The American Archivist* 47 (Winter 1984): 15.
3. Tom Hyry et al. "'Though This Be Madness, Yet There Is Method in't': Assessing the Value of Faculty Papers and Defining a Collecting Policy," *The American Archivist* 65 (Spring/Summer 2002): 65.
4. *Ibid.*, 62.
5. *Ibid.*, 64.
6. Tara Zachary Laver, "In a Class by Themselves: Faculty Papers at Research University Archives and Manuscript Repositories," *The American Archivist* 66 (Spring/Summer 2003): 166.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*, 170–171.

9. Ibid., 161.
10. Douglas Bicknese, "Institutional Repositories and the Institution's Repository: What is the Role of University Archives with an Institution's On-Line digital Repository?" *Archival Issues*, 28:3 (2003–2004): 81.
11. Ibid., 87.
12. Ibid., 88.
13. Daniel Noonan and Tamar Chute. "Data Curation and the University Archives." *The American Archivist* 77 (Spring/Summer 2014): 206.
14. Ibid., 208.
15. Ibid., 210.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., 212.
18. Ibid., 213.
19. Jennifer Marshall, "Toward Common Content: An Analysis of Online College and University Collecting Policies." *The American Archivist* 65 (Fall/Winter 2002): 254.
20. Janice M. Jaguszewski and Karen Williams. *New Roles for New Times: Transforming Liaison Roles in Research Libraries*. Association of Research Libraries. August 2013: 16. Accessed April 11, 2016, <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/nrnt-liaison-roles-revised.pdf>.
21. Ibid.

## Bibliography

- Bicknese, Douglas. "Institutional Repositories and the Institution's Repository: What Is the Role of University Archives with an Institution's On-Line Digital Repository?" *Archival Issues* 28, no. 3 (2003–2004): 81–93.
- Gorman, G. E. and Ruth H. Miller. *Collection Management for the 21st Century: A Handbook for Librarians*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997).
- Gregory, Vicki L. *Collection Development and Management for 21st Century Library Collections: An Introduction*. (Chicago: ALA Neal-Schuman, 2011).
- Ham, F. Gerald. "Archival Choices: Managing the Historical Record in an Age of Abundance." *The American Archivist* 47 (Winter 1984): 11–22.
- Hry, Tom, Diane Kaplan, and Christine Wideman. "'Though This Be Madness, yet There Is Method in't': Assessing the Value of Faculty Papers and Defining a Collecting Policy." *The American Archivist* 65 (2002): 56–69.
- Jaguszewski, Janice M. and Karen Williams. "New Roles for New Times: Transforming Liaison Roles in Research Libraries." Association of Research Libraries. August 2013. <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/nrnt-liaison-roles-revised.pdf>.
- Laver, Tara Zachary. "In a Class by Themselves: Faculty Papers at Research University Archives and Manuscript Repositories." *The American Archivist* 66 (2003): 159–196.
- Marshall, Jennifer. "Toward Common Content: An Analysis of Online College and University Collecting Policies." *The American Archivist* 65 (2002): 231–256.
- Miner, Meg and Stephanie Davis-Kahl. "Collecting Campus Culture: Collaborations and Collisions." *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 1 (2012): eP1053. doi:10.7710/2162-3309.1053.

- Noonan, Daniel and Tamar Chute. "Data Curation and the University Archives." *The American Archivist* 77 (Spring/Summer 2014): 201–240.
- Phillips, Faye. "Developing Collecting Policies for Manuscript Collections," *The American Archivist* 47 (Winter 1984): 30–42.
- Yakel, Elizabeth et al. "Institutional Repositories and the Institutional Repository: College and University Archives and Special Collections in an Era of Change." *The American Archivist* 71 (Fall/Winter 2008), 323–349.