

# Preservation In Indiana Academic Libraries

---

Robert S. Lamb II  
Preservation & Conservation Librarian  
Indiana State University

---

## Introduction

This project's purpose was to survey the preservation and conservation policies and procedures as well as the staff, facilities, and expenditures of nine representative academic libraries in Indiana as follows: Ball State University, Butler University, Indiana State University, Indiana University - Bloomington, IUPU at Fort Wayne, IUPUI, University of Notre Dame, Purdue University, and the University of Southern Indiana.

The goals were to inform each library of its strengths and weaknesses in the library preservation area and to give each a comprehensive view of what could be done to improve its own situation and possibly to cooperate with other academic libraries in preservation matters.

This Indiana preservation survey consists of two main parts. Part I is the *ARL* (Association for Research

Libraries) *Preservation Statistics Questionnaire*. The *ARL* Questionnaire covers statistics on administration, personnel, expenditures, conservation treatment, commercial binding, mass treatment, preservation photocopying, preservation microfilming production, total library holdings of preservation microform masters, footnotes, and comments.

Each prospective academic library was originally sent two copies of the *ARL* questionnaire with a set of instructions and a cover letter. Later a phone call was made to establish a convenient date for a visitation, at which time Part II of the survey was done together with the participating preservation librarian (conservator or archivist) and several photographs were taken of the work areas. Each librarian was given a copy of Part II of the survey.

Part II of the survey was drafted originally in the Spring of 1989 and later modified to eliminate duplicating portions of Part I. Part II of the survey covered the following areas:

equipment, facilities, preservation supplies, mending and repairs, physical environment controls, security, remote storage, brittle books programs, survey of collection, non-book preservation and conservation, deacidification of paper, educational activities, preservation plans and programs, disaster/salvage plans, preservation committee, cooperative preservation activities, and five-year preservation planning. This part of the survey was mostly a yes-no format of policies and procedures and counting of preservation equipment, tools, facilities, and supplies.

#### **Administration**

One way to measure progress in presentation activities at Indiana academic libraries is to trace preservation units managed by a preservation administrator. The data show concretely that preservation programs are really a standard part of current academic libraries. Six out of nine libraries have appointed a preservation administrator and only two of the nine libraries have a preservation unit not supervised by a full-time preservation administrator. Five of the preservation administrators report directly to the dean of libraries.

#### **Personnel**

The staff size under the preservation administrator is a key factor in indicating a library's level of preservation program development. A summary shows the number of professional staff and of non-professional staff and student assistants in preservation units. The administra-

tor is included with the professional staff.

Ball State has a total of 4 FTE staff in preservation units; Indiana State has 5 FTE; Indiana University has 14.6 FTE; IUPU-FW has 3; IUPUI has 1.5; Notre Dame has 3.25 and Purdue and Butler gave no report.

As far as library-wide preservation activities were concerned, it was difficult to obtain complete or accurate figures because of the chain of command and decentralization of tasks under various departments. The organizational structure of these libraries is rather diverse. The other reason is several libraries provided data only on staff reporting to the preservation administrator. Indiana University has the most staff overall doing preservation work, namely 20.6 FTE library-wide, followed in descending order by Ball State - 5.5 FTE; Indiana State - 5.3 FTE; Purdue - 4.1; Notre Dame - 3.25; University of Southern Indiana - 2; IUPUI - 1.5; IUPU-FW-1; and Butler - .85 FTE.

#### **Expenditures**

Monies spent for preservation activities in the nine Indiana academic libraries range from \$2,371 to \$508,890 for fiscal year 1988-1989. Also these representative Indiana academic libraries spend less than 1% to as much as 5.7% of the total library budget on preservation activities.

Again, Indiana University leads the others in preservation expenditures with \$508,890 for FY 1988-89, followed in order by Purdue - \$181,810; Notre Dame - \$171,888;

Indiana State - \$168,500; Ball State - \$132,834; Butler University - \$33,910; IUPUI - \$26,067; IUPU-FW - \$18,075; and USI - \$2,371.

### Conservation Treatment

The totals below give the number of volumes that had minor treatment as well as the number of volumes given more work-intensive intermediate or major treatment. It is well-known that important differences exist in the type of work done and that comparisons are hard to establish. Purdue does the most conservation work with 17,144 volumes treated. In order by total volumes are the other libraries for FY 1988-89; Indiana University - 7,782 volumes; Indiana State - 2,024, IUPUI - 2,000; Butler - 1,550; Notre Dame - 1,293; USI - 892; IUPU-FW - 689; and Ball State - no report.

### Commercial Binding

This activity consumes most of the preservation budget. The bulk of the money goes into contract binding annually and the remainder into in-house binding. Indiana University spent the most on binding for FY 1988-89 at \$208,123, and 32,717 volumes bound, followed by Notre Dame at \$127,868 and 10,280 volumes. Next in order: Purdue with \$125,178 spent and 19,608 volumes bound; Ball State at \$65,000 and 10,866 volumes; Indiana State with \$50,000 and 6,678 volumes bound; IUPUI at \$28,215 and 3,000 volumes; Butler with \$19,000 spent and 3,565 volumes; IUPU-FW at \$15,000 and 240 volumes; and USI at \$2,071 spent with 400 volumes bound.

### Mass Deacidification

None of the nine Indiana academic libraries surveyed is currently doing mass deacidification, although some are doing manual treatments by spraying or dipping on a production line basis.

### Preservation Photocopying

Most photocopying is done in-house on alkaline paper. None of the pages were done outside from the nine Indiana libraries under commercial contract. 742 total pages were done in-house. Indiana State University led the group with 650 pages followed by the University of Southern Indiana - 31; Butler - 28; IUPUI - 23; and IUPU-FW - 10 pages. The rest reported zero or no report.

### Preservation Microfilming

No uniform measure for counting is presently in place. Some libraries count titles; others count number of exposures; while others count only physical volumes. What is needed are agreed-upon standards of counting. The statistics gathered do not presently represent the current level of preservation microfilming production of the nine academic libraries surveyed. Indiana State was the leader with 60,400 total exposures, followed by Notre Dame with 31,868 exposures. The other seven libraries reported zero or not applicable.

The total library holdings of preservation microform masters is not particularly significant in Indiana. Most libraries surveyed, that is, 8 out of 9, are apparently not doing anything in-house and not much by contract either. Indiana libraries cannot afford it, so new funds are

needed in this category.

### **Equipment**

Ideally the researcher may assume that if a preservation unit has the most equipment and hand tools, it probably has the personnel trained to operate them, and productivity is probably high or constant. Such is usually the case. The mending unit at Indiana University is the best equipped, yet turns out the second largest production in mending and repairs, while Purdue leads totally in this category with several mending workshops spread around the campus. Equipment totals, including hand tools, are as follows: Indiana University - 468; Indiana State - 153; Notre Dame - 127; USI - 108; Butler - 105; Ball State - 97; IUPU-FW - 69; Purdue - 67; and IUPUI - 43.

### **Facilities**

The more facilities available, generally the better the preservation unit is. If the laboratory can accommodate more staff and student workers, it can do many more varied tasks in conservation. More work stations are in use, more space is available for brittle books, greater efficiency is realized in work production; and more ability to perform assembly-line book repairs is readily evident. The facilities surveyed included lights, desks, chairs, storage, drawers, floor space, windows, electrical outlets, water sinks, work benches, rest rooms, book cases or shelves and heat controls. The preservation facility totals of Indiana University were 537; next was Indiana State at 250; Butler - 205; Ball State - 165; USI - 137; Notre

Dame - 95; IUPUI - 78; Purdue - 77; and IUPU-FW - 41.

### **Preservation Supplies**

These supplies are the usual materials that are used in day-to-day mending and in-house repair operations. The more you have, the more operations you can perform. Also, the more staff and student assistants you can use during one or more work shifts. Twenty-three types of supplies were counted. The totals were as follows: USI - 19; Notre Dame - 18; Indiana University - 17; Butler - 16; Ball State and Indiana State - 14; IUPUI - 9; Purdue - 8; and IUPU-FW - 7.

### **Mending and Repairs**

These are the most frequently performed specific tasks done in-house and reported on daily and monthly work tally sheets. The better equipped and manned preservation units will perform a greater variety and usually better quality work. Those schools doing the greatest variety of tasks are most outstanding. However, there are some repairs that are not done because it is more efficient to send materials out to have the work done commercially. Sixteen types of repairs were surveyed showing the following: Notre Dame - 15; Butler and Indiana University - 14; Ball State - 13; Indiana State, IUPUI, Purdue and USI - 12; and IUPU-FW - 11.

### **Physical Environment**

This includes all the elements necessary in regulating the physical situation in any library such as temperature, relative humidity,

lights, insects, rodents, fungi, dust, smoke, food, drink and fire precautions. Most libraries are doing a good job in these categories. The biggest problems have been flat roofs that leak and controlling eating, drinking and smoking. Of the nine libraries surveyed, only one allowed food and drink throughout the building. Most libraries have signs on the entrances and throughout their premises, and rules on consumption and smoking are enforced by library personnel and/or student monitors. Nine specific areas of regulation were inspected. The results were as follows: Notre Dame and USI - 9; Ball State, Indiana State, Indiana University, IUPUI - 8; Butler and Purdue - 6; and IUPUI-FW -4.

### **Security**

This area is a matter of considerable concern to all Indiana academic libraries, and it is perhaps the best category in enforcement and compliance. The only area where most libraries fall short is a lack of all-night or late night study rooms, since these rooms were not built into the original plans of libraries. Many schools use empty dining rooms for this purpose. Theft and mutilation are usually caught at the circulation exists, but occasionally are seen in the stacks or government documents units. Notre Dame has uniformed student guards at the front door and patrolling the stack areas. ISU has a student patrol on week-nights and weekends. All libraries surveyed except IUPUI (3) tied at 4 in this category.

### **Remote Storage**

This category frequently does not apply at universities with new library buildings or a small book collection because no necessity exists. Recent book collections (less than 50 years old) or collections devoted to undergraduate or a few master's level programs, seldom if ever have a remote storage area. The larger schools with older, bigger collections and considerable research materials, offering many masters and doctorate programs, would be more likely to have remote storage facilities. In Indiana out of the nine libraries visited, Indiana, Purdue, Ball State, Indiana State, and the University of Southern Indiana have remote storage areas.

### **Brittle Books**

Brittle books programs are now more prevalent, and in many cases the brittle books are either returned to stack area encased in phase boxes, sent to remote storage, or housed in a special area such as Special Collections or Archives. The preponderance of libraries visited do have a brittle books program, although those with newer book collection and bound periodicals do not presently need one. In Indiana seven of the nine libraries surveyed do have active brittle book programs.

### **Collection Survey**

The procedure of surveying the condition of books in the collection has not caught on yet. Older collections need more attention to mending and binding as well as brittle book culling. Only two procedures manuals were written and used in Indiana at the time of this survey. Books

pulled for repair or mending are not always checked out internally to the preservation unit so one would not necessarily know the book's location. Computer listings by author, title or date groupings are seldom used, although seven of the schools surveyed have taken advantage of this invaluable library tool. Six of the nine schools have surveyed the condition of the collection.

### **Non-Book Materials**

The non-book materials preservation and conservation category covers such items as sound recordings, microforms, video discs and tapes, motion pictures, film (slides and reels), photographs (positives and negatives) and fine arts and lithographs. These formats do need preservation and conservation attention in any modern academic library. In three out of nine Indiana libraries surveyed, the preservation tasks are not applicable because they are under the purview of the audiovisual, archives or some other unit outside the library. In some cases, the library does not take care of a particular format.

### **Deacidification of Paper**

Because no American library is using mass methods of deacidification, it was prudent to learn how many Indiana libraries were using manual methods. Some libraries have few or no older books, so they did not need to deacidify their holdings. Others had more older books, manuscripts, and scores which needed treatment and repairs. Butler and Indiana State were active in using either spray or dipping to

deacidify paper.

### **Educational Activities**

In-house classes are designed to educate all library users: faculty, staff, students, student workers and the general public on preservation and conservation practices to protect books and non-book library materials. These activities are by lecture, brochures and pamphlets, films, TV programs and slides. Such programs get the message across with emphasis and entertainment. Most of the nine libraries did not feel it prudent to proselytize their teaching faculty on these matters—only 3 out of 9 did so. For the library staff—5 out of 9 orientated their staff in preservation of books. For students and the public, 6 out of 9 academic libraries prepared conservation instruction and orientation programs. Butler and USI are the two most active academic libraries in this area.

### **Preservation Plans**

Usually a formal written document on preservation policy is written by the preservation librarian, archivist, or the faculty preservation committee for the university library and approved and modified by the administrators. Five out of nine Indiana academic libraries in this survey have done so. These plans generally cover all aspects of preservation and conservation such as goals and objectives, environmental controls, binding, mending and repair, brittle books program, fumigation and deacidification preservation micro-filming, remote storage, library security and a disaster plan.

### **Disaster Salvage Plans**

Such plans are essential to save as many books and non-books as possible in libraries from destruction and to salvage whatever can be restored after a flood, fire, tornado, earthquake, stack or wall collapse, leaky roof or boiler explosion.

Emergency plans for evacuating personnel and patrons are under a different jurisdiction in the library. Five out of nine Indiana academic libraries surveyed have a disaster/salvage plan. With such a plan in place actions become routine because all procedures were written in advance.

#### **Preservation Committee**

The establishment of a preservation committee composed of teaching faculty, professional librarians, and library staff is considered a positive step by most academic libraries in order to advise the library administration of real needs and problems as well as solutions in preservation and conservation matters. However, not all libraries concur on this point, nor do they give preservation concerns much attention or support. In this survey only three out of nine Indiana libraries responded positively.

#### **Cooperative Preservation Activities**

This category deals with workshops and conferences in cooperation with other academic libraries or public and school libraries in matters of proper preservation policy and standard conservation procedures and practices. These activities are popular and widespread in Indiana as indicated by the survey with all nine

academic libraries active. As these practical workshops have become more widespread, preservation information and procedures reach not only our academic colleagues, but into the grass roots of librarianship.

#### **Five-Year Plans**

Five-year preservation plans project incremental planning in preservation and conservation into the future, always dropping the last year and adding more ideas as each academic year commences. Also, a review of each year's achievements and shortcomings in preservation is conducted in a follow-up study. Not all academic libraries engage in strategic planning when it comes to preservation policies and conservation procedures. Of the nine libraries surveyed, only four, Indiana University, Indiana State, Butler and USI wrote five-year plans.

Finally, it should be emphasized that each of the nine representative academic libraries surveyed is constantly striving to improve its preservation operations by acquiring more equipment, supplies, personnel and facilities to provide greater service in conserving books for future generations of Indiana students and scholars.