



**THE GREATER PHILADELPHIA RESEARCH COLLECTIONS
NETWORK**

A program of the Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries (PACSCL)

**THE CONSORTIAL SURVEY INITIATIVE
January 2005 – December 2007**

**A Proposal to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
October 1, 2004**

Table of Contents

Project Summary	page 1
Proposal Narrative	
A. Background	page 2
Brief history of PACSCL	
Significant past and current activities	
Prior support for consortial projects	
B. Project Rationale	page 5
C. Project Description	page 7
D. Project Outcomes, Benefits, and Sustainability	page 13
E. Budget Summary and Narrative	page 15

APPENDICES

- A. PACSCL Strategic Plan
- B. PACSCL: Profiles of Key Leaders
- C. Summary of Participant Collections and Profiles of Participating Institutions
- D. Ratings Criteria – The Historical Society of Pennsylvania
- E. Resumes and Job Descriptions: David Moltke-Hansen, Rachel Onuf, Linda Bills, Archive Director, Project Director, Surveyor

Project Summary

PACSCL requests \$410,809 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to develop and implement a consortial survey initiative among 21 of our 27 member institutions. This survey and assessment of our archival backlogs will inform the prioritization of preservation and access needs and create preliminary descriptions of collections previously inaccessible to researchers. By quantifying our knowledge of our archival collections we can develop proposals individually and collectively that address the access needs of our collections on a priority basis. In addition to providing data for internal analysis, information collected during the survey also can be used to generate preliminary collection-level records, which would be made available to the research public through an integrated, searchable, web-accessible database of selected survey data and notes.

PACSCL will use The Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP) protocols as a model to develop a common assessment culture and standard across participating institutions. Key participants will work together to adapt the HSP survey model to suit the more diverse needs of the consortium members without losing the benefit of a uniform survey methodology; develop training for the survey team, which will include permanent staff at participating institutions as well as people hired specifically for the project; and review and revise the ratings criteria sheet developed by HSP. The key participants will hire a consultant to design a database that will be used to capture data at each institution. This cooperative database, the ratings criteria, and any other tools developed over the course of the project would be shared with other consortia interested in assessing their collections' needs.

PACSCL has polled member institutions to ascertain the level of interest, an estimate of the quantity of materials participants wish to include, and how much staff time they anticipate devoting to the survey. The 21 institutions that responded positively estimate that there are more than 3,300 collections totaling roughly 33,000 linear feet in our collective backlog. Three of these institutions have assessment projects in process or recently completed. These three institutions are interested in sharing their assessment tools and in contributing to the cooperative database.

Key participants have been identified. They include HSP; Haverford, Bryn Mawr, and Swarthmore (the tri-college consortium within PACSCL); the Wagner Free Institute of Science; and, in an advisory capacity, the National Archives, Mid Atlantic Region. PACSCL will serve as lead institution with David Moltke-Hansen leading the project, supported by Rachel Onuf on a consulting basis and the Director of Archives of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, when hired. Haverford College will participate and serve as the administrative agent.

The project will commence January 2005 and end December 2007, with some pre-planning activity, for which no funding is requested, occurring October – December 2004.

Proposal Narrative

A. Background

The 27 member libraries and archives of the Philadelphia Consortium of Special Collections Libraries (PACSCL) collect, care for, and share with a world-wide audience collections that, in their depth and variety, comprise an internationally important body of rare and unique materials for students, scholars, and lifelong learners at any level.

The collections of PACSCL member libraries include a total of more than 3,000,000 rare books, 200,000 linear feet of manuscripts and archival materials, and 9,000,000 photographs, maps, architectural drawings, and works of art on paper. PACSCL member libraries hold rich collections of materials on national, regional, and local history; the natural and social sciences; world history, literature and religion; art and architecture; and business and industry. PACSCL member institutions include the nation's oldest circulating library; the libraries of some of the country's most prestigious universities, museums, and learned societies; important government archives, and a noted public library.

PACSCL is unique among library consortia in this country. It was born out of the conviction that the extraordinary collections of Philadelphia area libraries deserved greater visibility and broader support. In 1985, 16 institutions came together to create PACSCL as an informal cooperative group with a shared agenda ranging from access to public programs and development. Now, almost twenty years later, PACSCL has grown in size to its present 27 libraries and evolved into a formal organization. During that period, PACSCL has compiled an impressive track record in developing projects and programs that have greatly benefited member institutions and their diverse constituencies.

With generous support from foundations and corporations, PACSCL has demonstrated its commitment to the importance of rare book, manuscript, and archival collections and to the role of these materials in scholarship and in public life. Its accomplishments include:

- The **Leaves of Gold** medieval manuscript exhibition at the Philadelphia Museum of Art and the Frist Gallery in Nashville TN, catalog, website, CD-ROM, and children's programming (2001-02 and ongoing at <http://www.leavesofgold.org/>), funded by The Philadelphia Exhibitions Initiative of The Pew Charitable Trusts and The William Penn Foundation (\$375,000).
- A **Finding Aids Project** to provide access to manuscript collections, including EAD training, digitization of existing finding aids, and establishment of a unified search interface (1998-ongoing), initially funded by the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation (\$125,000).
- The creation of a **Collaborative Online Public Access Catalog** for those member libraries without individual OPACs (1997-ongoing), initially funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Barra Foundation and other local funders (\$500,000).

- Its **Initiative for the 1990s I and II** cataloging and access projects (1991-96), adding some 200,000 of consortium members' most significant bibliographic records to the major online bibliographic utilities, funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts (\$4,250,000).
- Its inaugural **Legacies of Genius** exhibition and catalog (1988), with funding from nineteen corporate and foundation sources (\$800,000).

PACSCL also has shared its skills and expertise with the broader profession of librarians and archivists through workshops and seminars on cataloging issues ranging from the description of nineteenth-century imprints to the intellectual control of ephemera. In December of 2003, PACSCL gathered together some of the country's leaders in the field of research libraries to share ideas and insights on the benefits and challenges of collaboration not only with PACSCL institutions, but also among other library and museum colleagues.

As it looks to the future, PACSCL has identified key priorities for the next few years, outlined in the attached strategic plan (Appendix A). One is to improve access for all users through expanded, integrated, and networked cataloging and digitization programs that will build on systematic assessment of the preservation, processing, and other access needs of members' holdings. A second priority is to leverage existing professional development activities to build cooperative programs that anticipate and serve the needs of the community that we are working to build among the staffs of member institutions. The third priority involves outreach. PACSCL is committed to helping its members enhance their reach and value to diverse research constituencies and educators, as well as supporters. Beyond that, PACSCL is committed to contributing to the cultural and economic life of the greater Philadelphia region.

PACSCL is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of one representative from each member library. An Executive Committee, consisting of six elected members (four officers and two at-large members), the immediate past chair, and the chairs of standing and ad hoc committees, oversees programs and planning. The organization has a part-time executive director and offices housed at The Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Funding for the operation of the organization is provided by member dues.

PACSCL's income and expenditures statement for 2003 is attached, showing income of \$63,291.39 and expenses of \$73,340.96; the income shortfall was anticipated and provided for by reserved dues income from prior years. Growth in membership and a change in dues structure will eliminate any deficit by 2006. Haverford College (see below) will serve as administrative agent for this project.

The members of the PACSCL Executive Committee are:

- David Moltke-Hansen, President, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, *Chairman of the Board*
- Edward T. Morman, Librarian, The College of Physicians of Philadelphia, *Vice Chairman of the Board and Chair, Nominations and Governance Committee*
- Robert Kieft, Librarian of the College and Director of College Information Resources, Haverford College, *Secretary*

- Janet Evans, Librarian, Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, *Treasurer*
- V. Chapman-Smith, Regional Administrator, National Archives, Mid Atlantic Region, *At Large*
- Gary Kulik, Director of the Library, Winterthur, *At Large*
- William Lang, Head, Rare Book Department, Free Library of Philadelphia, *Immediate Past Chair*
- Eric Pumroy, Head of Special Collections, Bryn Mawr College Library, *Chair, Access Committee*
- Michael T. Ryan, Director, Annenberg Rare Book & Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania, *Chair, Development Committee*
- Derick Dreher, Director, Rosenbach Museum & Library, *Chair, Outreach Committee*
- Terry Snyder, Deputy Director, Hagley Museum & Library, *Chair, Professional Development Committee*

Profiles of Committee Members and PACSCL's Executive Director, Laura Blanchard, are attached as Appendix B (Profiles of Key Leaders).

PACSCL provides services to its members and, through its members, to diverse and overlapping user constituencies. These services currently include an online public access catalog for six member libraries; maintenance of a search utility for electronic finding aids; professional development activities for members including a listserv to aid in communication and networking; and a website providing access to information on member library programs and activities. It has recently completed a strategic planning process that will result in the creation of a series of initiatives called The Greater Philadelphia Research Collections Network.

Although PACSCL's constituency is technically its 27 member libraries, in a broader sense its constituency is the collective constituencies of those members. These include the patrons of the Free Library of Philadelphia, the faculty and student bodies of the eight colleges and universities among its members as well as other area colleges and universities, and the many visitors to its other member institutions, whose collections support not only research but a broad array of exhibitions and public programs. This collective constituency represents a wide range of ages, races, ethnicities, and economic strata and is composed both of residents in the Philadelphia area and of scholars or tourists who travel to the area to partake in its cultural and heritage resources.

Haverford College will serve as administrative agent for this project. The College and Library have performed this role for other grants to the Three Colleges and to PACSCL, and the Library has a bookkeeper on its staff of 26FTE to handle grant-related financial matters. The Library has a budget of roughly \$3,200,000 for fiscal year 2005.

B. Project Rationale

In the past few years, PACSCL has focused on projects that enhance access to our collection surrogates. Card catalogs transformed into online public access catalogs (OPACs) and paper-based finding aids morphed into substantively and stylistically standardized EAD documents, also available online. Now attention has turned to collections to which researchers either have

no access or very limited access. A number of threads have led to the development of this project, including PACSCL's strategic planning process, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's support of the HSP survey protocols, and the difficulties experienced by PACSCL's Access Committee as they tried to get new consortial projects off the ground.

In the course of crafting a strategic plan for the consortium, leadership recognized the need to strengthen the role of PACSCL as a model for regional collaboration. This strategic planning priority also called for the development of "compelling new initiatives for access and collections care, ones which will also share collections more broadly, meet important social needs, raise member libraries' visibility, and build new constituencies."

To further that priority, the Access Committee was charged with identifying topical subcategories representative of the strengths and needs of PACSCL members. The Committee then was to develop preservation and access projects around these categories. In the course of polling member institutions about their under-described holdings in different areas, it became clear that members did not always know what they had or knew the collections in the backlog so superficially that they were not able to slot them into the available categories, such as "religion" or "politics and government." Additionally, although the consortial aspect put some spin on topical preservation and access projects, they weren't particularly compelling new initiatives.

As various subcommittees worked to get their topical proposals out of the planning stages and onto paper, several PACSCL members thought that a step back might be in order. If the backlogs of member institutions were surveyed it would be much easier to develop thematic proposals in the future. And if there was some consistency to the type of survey performed at each repository, it would be easier to identify shared priorities and develop compelling consortial preservation and access projects. PACSCL also had the decided advantage of having a member institution, HSP, that had recently surveyed its collections, using a survey instrument first developed by its President, David Moltke-Hansen.

The idea of surveying across the consortium quickly gained members' interest and nearly four-fifths of the member institutions have decided to take part. The 6 that are not participating are Winterthur, which has a relatively small quantity of archival holdings (2,000 LF) and does not have a backlog; LaSalle University, The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, and St. Charles Borromeo Seminary because they focus on books, not archival collections; and the City of Philadelphia Department of Records and the Mid-Atlantic Regional Branch of the National Archives, both of which deal with government records that have priorities determined in substantial part by the needs of the records' creators and their publics.

In addition to satisfying PACSCL's own priorities, by making some components of the survey records available to the public via the consortial database and to the scholarly community by uploading portions of these records to RLIN and OCLC, the consortial survey project will allow researchers to know about the existence of an additional 3,300 collections totaling more than 33,000 linear feet, over 26 million manuscripts, nearly one-sixth of the total held by PACSCL institutions. To this end and given the participation of several PACSCL members in ARL's 2003 Hidden Collections Conference, we have been in discussion with members of the ARL Hidden Collections committee to explore ways in which our projects may be mutually informative. We

share goals, but we are employing different assessment methodologies and data formats. Further discussion with the Hidden Collections committee will help us map our proposed data format to theirs, with the result that our records can be incorporated in the national databases with those produced by Hidden Collections.

Although not all collections will be able to be made available to researchers immediately, many will, if sometimes only in a more-or-less limited manner. As a result of the survey another criterion for determining the priorities of both individual institutions and the consortium will also come into play: user demand for unprocessed, unavailable collections.

C. Project Description

PACSCL proposes to develop and implement a model for surveying archival collections across a diverse consortium of institutions whose only common ground is their general location in the greater Philadelphia area. Over the course of nearly three years, the project will adapt and apply the existing HSP survey protocols to the backlogs of 21 member institutions, allowing all to prioritize access and preservation work collectively and individually. Survey data will be entered into a union database and key fields will be used to generate the equivalent of an accession-level record for each collection, which will be made available to the research public via the national databases. As a result researchers will gain new or refined access to information about approximately 3,200 collections, totaling about 33,200 linear feet. A summation of project participants is included as Appendix C.

Project Development

Project development is already underway. An administrative agent, Haverford College, has been identified, as have the key participants, who include:

- David Moltke-Hansen, President, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Principal Investigator
- Rachel Onuf, outgoing Director of Archives, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, consultant: training, database design, and project evaluation
- Incoming Director of Archives, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, day-to-day oversight after training by Rachel Onuf and in consultation with David Moltke-Hansen
- Robert Kieft, Librarian of the College and Director of College Information Resources, Haverford College (participant, ARL Hidden Collections liaison and administrative agent)
- Eric Pumroy, Head of Special Collections, Bryn Mawr College Library, chair of PACSCL's access committee
- Lynn Dorwaldt, Librarian, The Wagner Free Institute of Science, representing issues relating to smaller institutions among PACSCL members
- V. Chapman-Smith, Regional Administrator, National Archives (advisory), offering insights on best practices from other assessment models, drawing on her experience as New York State Archivist and Commissioner of Records of the City of Philadelphia

The key participants are critical to the success of the project. This particular model of having a small lead group within a larger consortial project worked well during the Gladys Kriebel

Delmas Foundation-funded archival finding aids encoding project of PACSCL, recently completed. The approach has a core team both troubleshoot and motivate individuals at other participating institutions. The key participants, with staff of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania being responsible for day-to-day oversight, will review and revise the survey instrument, hire and guide the work of the database developer and project staff, and educate and motivate the other survey participants. Surveying will start at key participants' institutions, and these individuals will take an active role in the survey process, both at their own institutions and at others.

We have determined that the survey will focus on backlogs of archival collections. For this project, the term "backlog" refers to materials that in many cases are beyond researchers' ken: unprocessed collections that researchers cannot access and for which they cannot access any information. The term also encompasses other degrees of inaccessibility: unprocessed or underprocessed collections with inadequate descriptions or with severe conservation issues that prohibit or limit access. In a few instances, collections may be backlogged because of a need to reformat (a collection of photographic negatives, for instance) or an inability to read the current format at all (obsolescent electronic media). "Archival" and "collection" are two other terms that need to be defined in advance. A "collection" will be any grouping of materials that the institution intends to process as a unit. In addition to including all of the usual suspects, such as manuscripts and photographs, "archival" collections may be comprised in part -- or entirely -- of printed materials of an ephemeral nature, as long as the repository intends to continue to manage them as archival collections.

Addressing questions of database design and construction, including the basic issue of whether to select and adapt an existing software package or to partner with an outside vendor or even OCLC, requires additional expertise and entails, depending on the choices we make, very different costs. The budget for this aspect of the project is a rough estimate based on the \$10,000-\$20,000 cost, including training and exclusive of maintenance, for a proprietary system like FileMaker Pro, CONTENTdm, Museum System, or MultiMIMSY. The total cost will vary considerably with the data entry protocols we choose, the authorization structures we want, and the requirements of porting data to other systems and the Web. We understand that the estimated cost may have to be augmented with contributions from member IT staffs or funds from other sources.

Fortunately, Linda G. Bills, one of the region's leading library automation consultants and an expert in the operation of consortial library systems, resides in the Philadelphia area. She oversaw the creation of, and managed for over a decade, the consortial library system of Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore Colleges. In addition, she has consulted for a number of other academic and research libraries, written and lectured widely on this topic, and served as interim director of college libraries undergoing major changes in management or organizational structure. A copy of her resume is attached. She will charge PACSCL a reduced fee for her services (\$80 rather than \$100 an hour) and, since she lives in the area, there will be no travel or related expenses. She will advise the steering committee on software selection by surveying the proprietary systems named above as well as open-source alternatives. She will also help with the identification of programmers and other consultants to bring the database and its web-based interfaces to completion.

The database fields will be selected with an eye toward making them easily adaptable and exportable into any number of existing professional standard formats, including encoded archival description (EAD) and MARC 21, which will be important for coordinating this project with Hidden Collections. If fields do not correlate one-to-one, the designer will need to be able to develop crosswalks from the database to the other platforms. The different views of the data are intended for different audiences: the individual institution can see all fields, but some may be restricted from the common PACSCL-wide view. The view made available to researchers as an accession-level, or preliminary, record, would include basic information about the collection and whether or not it is accessible but not the ratings or internal note fields. The database will be designed to make it possible to import the public view of the survey records directly into an OPAC.

Project Implementation

The project will be staffed by archivists hired and trained specifically for this project as well as by permanent staff at the various institutions. Members' staffs will focus on their own holdings but will spend at least a couple of survey sessions at another repository to share expertise in various subject areas, languages, or document types and to foster intra-consortial understanding. Permanent staff at 14 institutions pledged that they would be responsible for 10% to 25% of the survey and assessment work at their institutions. Four members committed to do 26-50%, and staffs at the remaining three institutions expect to be responsible for up to 75% of the survey and assessment work.

As with the HSP survey project, surveying will always be done in teams of two or more, and an effort will be made to have a member of the hired staff on every team. The key participants will hire the Project Director and together develop training for the two Project Surveyors. The lead trainer will be Rachel Onuf, who managed the Historical Society of Pennsylvania's survey and assessment project, earlier funded by The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. She will make six trips of two to four days each for training and project evaluation purposes. The training will be based in part on packets developed for the HSP surveyors and will include readings about historiographical trends and document types, a review of recent topics of fellowship applicants to member institutions, a crash course in what types of conservation issues to look out for, and introductory tours to meet the collections and staffs of the participating institutions.

Project staff also will be expected to be familiar with Steve Hensen's *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts*, as well as the Canadian-U.S. Task Force on Archival Description (CUSTARD) project's brand new content standard, *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DAC5)*, which is intended to supplant *APPM*. Project staff will initially survey together in order to develop a consistent approach to the content fields and the ratings. Once they have sufficiently internalized the ratings scheme and the intricacies of archival description, they will fan out to survey with key participants.

Once the surveyors are trained, the Project Director will be spending much of his or her time coordinating schedules, reviewing and providing feedback on all of the survey records, visiting repositories before and during the survey process, and managing the overall workflow of the project. He or she will also need to bring in subject specialists or other additional expertise if the

surveyors encounter materials they cannot interpret well enough comfortably to assign a research value rating. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania usefully brought in economic and business historians, for instance, to help surveyors understand the informational values in and the way to read business accounts unfamiliar to most of the staff. Legal and scientific records pose the same challenge.

Ratings

The survey teams will rate the collections according to physical condition, quality of housing, physical access, research value, intellectual access, and estimated processing time, using rating scales and criteria based on the HSP model, described in Appendix D. In refining the criteria used by HSP, the project staff and supervisors will be informed by some of the variations developed and tested by the University of Virginia and Columbia University. Columbia's attention to "local value" as a concept potentially distinct from research value seems a particularly useful addition in a consortial environment and staff at institutions participating in the survey will be encouraged to assign local value ratings in addition to the research value ratings. Another Columbia University variant we are eager to incorporate into our project is the assignment of physical condition ratings at the box-or volume-level, as well as at the collection-level. In the case of very large collections, we shall sample, much as Columbia's project staff did. If specific institutions want to assess condition at the folder-level, they will be encouraged to do so on their own time.

We also agree with Columbia's assertion that the survey process is a great opportunity to pay more attention to non-paper media and will happily borrow the language of the ratings criteria developed by Columbia for graphic works, photographic prints, film, mechanical sound recordings, magnetic media, optical media, and realia.

The ongoing project at the University of Virginia is also of great interest, especially as they determine how use statistics will impact the research value rating. Although HSP ultimately decided not to include use statistics, in part because we did not have much aggregate information at that time, many of the participating institutions will have excellent statistics and will want to incorporate them into that rating. Virginia has also developed an excellent Procedure Manual for their student surveyors. The large number of surveyors and sprawling reach of this project warrants the creation of such a manual, even if it must, by necessity, be more generalized, and it will be a useful tool for building a shared assessment culture and experiential base.

Our plan to have basic collection-level records of all surveyed backlog collections available to the research public as one of the end-products of this project echoes Columbia University's desire to sustain their survey database as an accession database, and one of the challenges for our project staff will be to persuade the staff responsible for accessioning at the participating institutions to assign ratings and make an accession-level record available to the public at the time of accession from this point forward.

Conservation

Conservation notes on the ratings scale will flag items needing immediate attention and indicate the presence of nitrate film stock, metal fasteners, possible mold, folded documents, water damage, and any number of other concerns. Additionally, the HSP experience suggests that

emergency conservation needs, particularly in the areas of housing and mold, will come to light in the course of the surveys. Key participants will encourage institutions to share their resources and expertise in conservation with other project participants. For example, HSP is prepared to make its isolation room and mold cleaning room available. In addition, the PACSCL professional development committee is in the early stages of planning a peer-to-peer conservation workshop.

Project Analysis

Once the surveying is complete, the Project Director will analyze the data, with advice from Rachel Onuf. Although the focus is on the greater consortial picture, basic analysis for each institution also will be accomplished. Averages for the various ratings, overall number of collections, and total linear footage will be provided. Although each institution may not have access to the data during the analysis stage, once analysis is finished and the data are available over the Internet each institution will be able to query the database and generate any type of report it may wish to see for its own holdings or (except for fields restricted to the holding institution) the entire consortium. Institutions will be able to update most of the fields in their own records but will not be able to change the survey ratings, which will be read-only for everyone except the database administrator.

In conjunction with the designer, if necessary, the Project Director then will make selected fields of the database accessible to the research public via the web. Individual institutions may decide to download their records (or selected records) to their OPACs. The database should also provide a means of tracking requests for the surveyed material, and the effect of user demand on the prioritization process will need to be determined as part of the analysis stage of this project.

The Project Director will analyze the consortial data to develop a long range access and preservation plan for PACSCL. Priority will be given to collections with a high research value and a low condition rating; among those, collections that aggregate nicely by theme, type of material, or other common characteristic will be suggested as potential project candidates. The Project Director also will do the reverse and work with the Access Committee to develop projects that target the specific interests of potential funders.

Conference

The results of the consortial survey initiative are of potential interest and value to the professional associations, public and private funders, and other individuals and organizations with a stake in formulating collaborative approaches to the issues of hidden collections. Upon completion of the survey, we plan to organize a conference that draws together key participants and such stakeholders as the Association of Research Libraries, the Library of Congress, OCLC, the Council on Library and Information Resources, the Institute for Museum & Library Services, and the funders who have supported PACSCL's collaborative access projects. These stakeholders will join with the project leadership team in roundtable sessions to share information and consider how this work can inform planning for other regional initiatives as well as for the national agenda. We also propose to combine the working session with a larger, more public program to which other PACSCL member institutions and other collecting institutions in the region will be invited.

Finally, the Project Director will make sure that someone at each participating institution is identified as the ongoing contact for the survey project. This person is responsible for keeping his or her institution's records in the database updated. Oversight of the database will fall to the Executive Director of PACSCL, Laura Blanchard, and the development of preservation and access projects stemming from the survey will be carried forward by the Access Committee.

Timeline

Pre-planning stage (October – December 2004)

- The key participants convene a series of meetings to review the ratings criteria sheet and revise it as necessary and to gain familiarity with the survey process.
- The key participants convene a short series of meetings with all participants to review the project definitions of "backlog," "archival," and "collection," the ratings sheet, and the survey process.
- PACSCL staff begins data gathering on database software vendors.

Start-up stage (January 2005-July 2005)

- The key participants work with consultant Linda Bills to identify the best approach to the database selection/adaptation, and to select software and consultants for this purpose (January-February 2005). The key participants and consultant Linda Bills begin the selection/adaptation of the survey database software package (April 2005). The basic Dublin Core structure of the survey record would be compatible with OCLC. While retaining many of the fields used in the HSP survey database, this more sophisticated instrument will be geared toward three different audiences, allowing each to see appropriate data. The public would see, in effect, an accession record, the consortium would have access to all of the ratings, and some fields might be available only to the institution that owns the collection.
- The key participants hire a project director (May 2005) and together they develop training for the survey teams. Two project surveyors are hired (July). Laptops are purchased and the survey database is loaded onto them.
- The project director trains the project staff and all permanent staff who will be working on the survey and plans for implementation. Historians and other document type specialists share their expertise.

Implementation stage (August 2005-October 2007)

- Survey teams begin to survey at key institutions. Project director rotates through the various repositories, ensuring the survey methodology is uniform. Initially, teams meet frequently to discuss issues and work through problems.

- Project staff move to the other participating institutions and continue to survey collections, meet together as needed, and call in consultants with subject or document-type expertise.
- Project director reviews all data as it is produced, ensuring standards and uniformity are maintained.
- Project director plans and organizes conference in partnership with key participants and PACSCL's executive director.

Analysis stage (November-December 2007)

- Project director analyzes data, makes database accessible to the research public via the web, participates in conference (December 2007), and develops long range access and preservation plan for PACSCL.

D. Project Outcomes, Benefits, and Sustainability

1. Provide a model of a cooperative, cost-effective approach to addressing the national problem of hidden research collections.

PACSCL's assessment project can inform the work of such initiatives as the Association of Research Libraries' Hidden Collections project. Specifically, it offers a model of how regional groups of special collections libraries, including those outside the ARL community, can work together to participate in the Hidden Collections initiative. To that end, the project's key participants are working to schedule a meeting with ARL planning team members to discuss issues of project design and data sharing.

As a model, this project also has the benefit of helping to create or contribute to national efforts to prioritize conservation/preservation efforts based on collective, rather than individual, assessments of intellectual and research value, something that Hidden Collections will not do. The assignment of such values will be controversial, but the controversy itself would invigorate the special collections community and provide a medium for communication about how we collectively can promote scholarly activity.

2. Enhance PACSCL member organizations' knowledge of our collective holdings and the great extent to which their topics overlap.

In the past, many library staff members have been aware of the region's collective holdings and how their topics overlap. But this awareness has relied on the memory and incomplete knowledge of individual collections. The assessment program will help us to systematize and make more comprehensive the collective knowledge of the region's special collections community. As a result, librarians, researchers, and others, not only in Philadelphia but around the world, will be able to gain an overview of collection strengths and interrelationships. This

overview can help inform researchers' priorities and help area special collections libraries to begin the process of rationalizing their collections policies. A number of members even are discussing the possibility of some limited trading of collections.

3. Help researchers locate “new” archival collections that had been hidden in backlogs.

Many of these collections are not known to exist or to be housed in area institutions. In other cases, researchers do not know the rough extent or nature of individual collections. The survey and assessment will be adding dramatically to knowledge about the total volume of holdings -- 35,000 linear feet is approximately 17.5% of the aggregate archival holdings among PACSCL members. We will be reporting these materials to OCLC, where the Hidden Collections initiative of the Association of Research Libraries also is intending to report the data it is gathering about holdings in the nation's major academic research libraries.

4. Facilitate the development of collaborative project proposals that focus on common themes, collections with a high research value, and/or collections at risk due to their poor condition.

At present, member institutions know at best imperfectly and partially what other holdings there are in shared areas of collecting. As a result, it is difficult for staff to propose to such funders as NEH and The William Penn Foundation projects to help address the needs of these collections -- needs never heretofore systematically assessed. Furthermore, institutions have had no basis for determining shared priorities for backlogged materials. This project will provide such a basis.

Sustainability.

In terms of server space and ongoing database maintenance, both are well within the capabilities of PACSCL's core organization, and will be contributed on an ongoing basis. The design of the project provides for staff training in assessment procedures at PACSCL member institutions, resulting in a significant body of assessment expertise in the greater Philadelphia area. Members are committed to applying the same ratings scale to newly-acquired collections at the time of accession and for the transmission of assessment techniques to new staff as they are hired.

Budget Summary and Narrative

	Mellon	Contributed	Total
YEAR ONE			
Project Director (6 mo)	20,000		
Surveyor I (4 mo)	11,333		
Surveyor II (4 mo)	11,333		
Fringe (25%)	10,666		
PACSCCL member salary/fringe	0	70,875	
Rachel Onuf, 13 days @ \$500	5,500	1,000	
Rachel Onuf, travel (4 trips @ \$118)	354	118	
Rachel Onuf, per diem (16 days @ \$175)	2,450	350	
Training consultant (document types)	2,500		
Database design/construction	25,000		
Laptops and software (3 @ \$2,500)	7,500		
Supplies (paper, photocopying)	1,000		
Professional Development (project staff)	1,000		
Travel (project staff)	1,666		
Total Year One	100,302	72,343	172,645
YEAR TWO			
Project Director (12 mo)	40,600		
Surveyor I (12 mo)	34,339		
Surveyor II (12 mo)	34,339		
Fringe (25%)	27,319		
PACSCCL member salary/fringe	0	110,895	
Rachel Onuf, 5 days @ \$500	2,500		
Rachel Onuf, travel, 2 trips @ \$118	236		
Rachel Onuf, per diem, 6 days @ \$175	1,050		
Training consultant (document types)	2,500		
Database, revisions/troubleshooting	10,000		
Supplies (paper, photocopying)	1,000		
Professional development (project staff)	1,000		
Travel (project staff)	1,666		
Total Year Two	156,549	110,895	267,444
YEAR THREE			
Project Director (12 mo)	41,818		
Surveyor I (11 mo)	32,363		
Surveyor II (11 mo)	32,363		
Fringe (25%)	26,636		
PACSCCL member salary/fringe	0	100,946	
Rachel Onuf, (4 days @ \$500)	2,000		
Rachel Onuf, travel (2 trips @ \$118)	236		
Rachel Onuf, per diem (5 days)	875		
Supplies	1000		

Professional Development (project staff)	1000		
Travel (project staff)	1,667		
Database portal construction	5,000		
Conference Expense	9,000	5,300	
Total Year Three	153,958	106,246	260,254
SUMMARY			
Year One	100,302	72,343	172,645
Year Two	156,549	110,895	267,444
Year Three	153,958	106,246	260,254
TOTALS	410,809	289,484	700,343

Note: Contributed costs line exclude overhead, not attempting to use various institutions' indirect cost rates.

Budget narrative

Project staff salaries. The salaries are calculated on a base salary of \$40,000 for the project director and \$34,000 for the surveyors, with increases of 3% in months 13 and 25 of their employment.

Project Director: Year 1, 6 months at \$40,000 annual salary
Year 2, 6 months at \$40,000, 6 months at \$41,200
Year 3, 6 months at \$41,200, 6 months at \$42,436

Surveyors: Year 1, 4 months at \$34,000 annual salary
Year 2, 8 months at \$34,000, 4 months at \$35,020
Year 3, 8 months at \$35,020, 3 months at \$36,070

Fringe benefits are calculated at 25% of annual salary.

PACSCL member salary/fringe. All salaries based on annual increases from the base plus 25% fringe. PI, Director of Archives and steering committee calculated on 36 months to encompass pre- and post-grant period planning and follow-up activities.

Principal investigator: 15% FTE in year 1, 10% in years 2 and 3

HSP director of archives: 10% FTE in years 1-3

PACSCL steering committee members: based on an annual salary and fringe of \$84,000 with 3% annual increase, and assuming 5 hours per month for meeting and consultation: \$15,000 in year 1; \$15,450 in year 2; and \$15,913 in year 3.

PACSCL participating staff: Based on an average salary/fringe of \$50,000 and the proportion of contributed time described in Appendix C (summary sheet), starting at \$6,250 for the first twelve months, with annual increases of 3%

Year 1: 4 months at \$6,250

Year 2: 8 months at \$6,250, 4 months at \$6,438

Year 3: 8 months at \$6,438, 2 months at \$6,631

Consultancy: Rachel Onuf. Calculated on a 22 days at a daily rate of \$500, with round trip travel of \$118 and a per diem of \$175, with additional per diem allowances if split consultancy days should be necessary. PACSCL will contribute the cost of one two-day trip during the pre-planning stage of this proposal.

Rachel Onuf's per diem is based on \$105 for lodging, \$60 for meals, and \$10 for local taxis. The \$105 hotel rate is the best rate PACSCL has negotiated for conferences with a hotel close to The Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Consultants: Document types. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania usefully brought in economic and business historians, for instance, to help surveyors understand the informational values in and the way to read business accounts unfamiliar to most of the staff. Legal and scientific records pose the same challenge. This budget item provides a fund for two to three days of consultancy in Years 1 and 2 at the rate of \$800-\$1,000 per day. We expect to be able to draw the relevant expertise from scholars in the greater Philadelphia area, eliminating the need for a fund for travel.

Database: The total of \$40,000 for database design and construction or purchase and modification includes a \$5,000 fund for 60 hours of consultation by Linda Bills, who will guide the steering committee through software selection, vendor identification, and selection of additional consultants to modify software as required, mount on the PACSCL web server, and construct the appropriate web interfaces. It also provides for \$10,000-\$20,000 for purchase or subscription for the appropriate software and \$10,000-\$20,000 for software modification, as described in the narrative, and a \$5,000 fund for portal construction. PACSCL is committed to securing funding from member institution IT budgets, dues income, or other sources if the cost of this line item exceeds the budgeted total.

Professional Development. Fund for project staff to travel to professional conferences to build skill levels and/or present reports on the work in progress. Budgeted at \$500/year for registration for meeting attendance for the project director (SAA, MARAC, etc.), and \$250 each for the two surveyors (a total of \$1,000/year).

Professional Travel. For project staff travel to professional development meetings listed above. Annual travel/per diem fund of \$750 for the project director and \$458 for each of two surveyors (a total of \$1,666/year). Actual travel, hotel, and per diem will vary based on conference locations.

Conference. The conference expense budget is based on PACSCL’s experience hosting an IRLA pre- and post-conference meeting surrounding its 2003 symposium, “Consorting with the Future.” It includes a fund for modest honoraria and/or travel expense for up to ten invited speakers, primarily from outside the greater Philadelphia area, as well as a fund for printing and/or photocopying and mailing invitations, conference programs, and conference proceedings. The IRLA meetings were attended by a core group of about 25 and the PACSCL symposium by about 110. Budget detail is provided below.

	Mellon	Other	Total
Invitations: 500 @ \$2 (print/mail)	1,000	0	1,000
Programs and handouts	750	0	750
Speakers airfare: 10 @ \$300	3,000	0	3,000
Speakers lodging: 10 @\$105	1,050	0	1,050
Speakers: local transportation: 10 @ \$50	500	0	500
Speaker meals: @ \$102 x 10 (note 1)	1,020	0	1,020
Fund for speaker honoraria (note 2)	1,000	0	1,000
Preconference catering: breaks, lunch	680	1,020	1,700
Preconference subscription dinner: other attendees	0	2,100	2,100
Conference catering: break (110 @ \$8)	0	880	880
Conference catering: reception (65 @ \$20)	0	1,300	0
	9,000	5,300	13,000

Notes on Conference Budget Detail:

Speaker hotel rates are based on conference rates obtained from the Doubletree Hotel for the December 2003 PACSCL symposium.

Catering costs are based on those from the December 2003 symposium.

Registration fees for preconference and conference will be calculated to cover food costs for participants. PACSCL will absorb the conference catering and reception costs for the speakers but seeks a subvention for their preconference catering costs.

Note 1: The fund for speaker meals assumes a preconference subscription dinner at \$70, for which PACSCL seeks a subvention, with other attendees bearing their own cost.

Note 2: The fund for speaker honoraria is extremely modest, but may be augmented by unused funds from other speaker-related line items. For example, we assume that some speakers will not use the full airfare/lodging allowance, or may not arrive in time to participate in the preconference activities, and that funds from these line items may be shifted to honoraria; additionally, some speakers may not be permitted by their organizations to accept honoraria.

Excerpt of Attachment C: Collections Summary

Institution	Interested?	#collections	# linear feet	10-25% staff	26-50%staff	51-75% staff
Academy of Natural Sciences	Yes	300	1,400	Yes		
American Philosophical Society	Yes	50	500			Yes
Athenaeum of Pennsylvania	Yes	100	840	Yes		
Bryn Mawr College	Yes	100	1,500		Yes	
Chemical Heritage Foundation	Yes	30	850	Yes		
College of Physicians	Yes	50	290	Yes		
Free Library of Philadelphia	Yes	5	1,200			Yes
Hagley Museum & Library	Yes*	0	0	Yes		
Haverford College	Yes	40	400			Yes
The Historical Society of Pennsylvania	Yes	52	772		Yes	
Library Company of Philadelphia	Yes	34	500	Yes		
National Archives	Yes*	0	0	Yes		
Pennsylvania Horticultural Society	Yes	15	90	Yes		
Philadelphia Museum of Art	Yes	64	860		Yes	
Presbyterian Historical Society	Yes	1,115	8,100		Yes	
Rosenbach Museum & Library	Yes	15	3,250			
Swarthmore College	Yes	800	2,600	Yes		
Temple University	Yes	150	1,000	Yes		
University of Delaware	Yes	50	1,240	Yes		
University of Pennsylvania	Yes	350	7,000	Yes		
Villanova University	Yes	1	300	Yes		
Wagner Free Institute of Science	Yes	1	600	Yes		
TOTALS		3,322	33,292	14	4	3

*These institutions are contributing no records to the project, but are prepared to participate in other ways.