



**The William Ready Division of Archives &  
Research Collections:  
Organizational Review**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Submitted by:**

**Dr. Ken Cruikshank**

**Vivian Lewis**

**December 30, 2011**

*This abbreviated version of the report was prepared for broad distribution. Due to the confidential nature of some collections-related issues, the full text of the report was only made available to participants in the review and to members of the Library's Leadership Team. For further information, please contact the authors.*

# The William Ready Division of Archives & Research Collections: Organizational Review

## **Introduction**

**Context:** The University Librarian commissioned this review of the William Ready Division of Archives & Research Collections in June 2011. The review was triggered by the retirement of the Director, Dr. Carl Spadoni, after many years of distinguished service. The process was envisioned as an opportunity to take stock of the Division's many strengths, address weaknesses and set ambitious but attainable goals for the future. The reviewers were encouraged to think broadly and to place their comments within the context of current trends and best practices in the archives & special collections community.

**Methodology:** The two reviewers conducted 20 interviews with staff members, campus users and recognized experts in the special collections field. Staff members from other units of the Library were queried via an online survey. These rich sources of information were supplemented by a broad spectrum of current literature in the field.

**Building on Strengths:** The reviewers heard many positive comments by faculty and outside experts concerning all aspects of the McMaster operation: the value of its collections, the professionalism of its staff and the general importance of its contribution to the archival community in Canada and throughout the world.

**New Focus and New Challenges:** In the wake of growing commonality of research library general collections (thanks to the acquisition of large electronic packages and consortial purchases), increasing attention is being given to special collections as the component that sets one library apart from another. In addition, new directions are required to meet changing needs within the academy, the advent of new technologies and evolving approaches in the field.

## **1. COLLECTIONS**

Users and outside experts consistently identified the strengths of McMaster's special collections, in particular 18th-Century book collections and the manuscript collections associated with Bertrand Russell and Canadian publishing.

Strengths aside, some aspects of McMaster's collections need attention:

**Articulating the Collections Policy and Priorities:** While some recent acquisitions are undoubtedly very exciting and valuable, they have stretched

and even altered the traditional collecting strengths of the archives. The statement of collecting strengths now is so broad that it offers little guidance in terms of setting priorities, or in distinguishing McMaster University's collections from those of other archives.

It is important to reflect upon and articulate collections priorities over the next five years so that:

- library staff and university faculty can understand and participate in those new directions.
- current collections can be reviewed, with an eye to “de-accessioning” some collections that fall outside those priorities.

**Aligning Collections with Learning and Discovery:** The expansion into some areas does not clearly correspond or build upon research or teaching strengths at this institution. Some of those we spoke with recommended a faculty advisory committee to help set priorities, or at least polling faculty regularly to better relate acquisitions to existing and emerging strengths. Such consultation would aid in aligning priorities with University activity while allowing the Division and Library to exercise professional judgment.

**Collecting Non-Print Media:** Recent acquisitions of non-print material, while exciting, have been made without the corresponding resources or support. An Archive that is highly skilled at dealing with print materials is lacking some of the tools and training necessary to deal with non-print archives.

Increasingly, collections are likely to include materials that are “born digital.” “Born digital” materials pose a number of challenges:

- They come in a variety of electronic formats, are often received on obsolete or impractical physical storage media and have been produced using a range of technologies.
- The physical media used for storing digital files generally have short life spans and degrade quickly.

We believe that the challenge of accessibility –digitization of older formats and transfer of digital materials from older media- is probably better appreciated and supported than the challenge of preservation. A responsible steward must attend to both.

**Managing Existing Collections:** *Bertrand Russell Collection:* McMaster's most distinguished collection is currently managed by a committed, retired faculty member and one part time library staff person. It is time to develop a new plan to preserve, manage and, indeed, make the most of what our best known collection has to offer.

*“Hidden” collections:* The Library has significant unprocessed collections (approximately 20,000 books and a large quantity of unprocessed archives). The Division needs to set clear and defensible priorities (framed around user demands and University teaching and learning priorities), then cost out the solutions as a series of discrete and manageable projects. Consideration should be given to hiring trained graduate students to work with library staff on processing collections (using the models in place at University of Chicago and elsewhere).

*Preparation of Finding Aids:* Division leaders should scrutinize arrangement and description procedures very carefully. As Greene and Meissner stated in their landmark 2005 article, archivists need to streamline procedures, provide basic level description and, in many cases, accept a lower grade of perfection.

**Preservation:** Although preservation is an important component of archive work, growing the preservation lab (in terms of adding staff or expanding the array of equipment) from the Library’s base budget is not a viable proposition. The Library may wish to explore enhancements to the preservation lab as a donor opportunity.

In the meantime, however, the Division needs to establish clear procedures for setting preservation priorities, including the order in which materials ought to be treated, and the level of preservation work appropriate for different materials.

## **2. UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES**

McMaster is the only major Canadian university that does not formally preserve its own institution’s records. Access to information and privacy legislation has underlined the importance of ongoing record retention and destruction, a records management regime that, at some point, must be aligned with a process of maintaining a selection of records of historical value. This is a University, not a University Library, issue.

Having failed to follow up on a report commissioned back in 2000, McMaster recently created a Committee to identify authority, responsibility and accountability for records management. We heard differing opinions regarding the scope of the initiative (e.g., digital versus paper), the time frame (do we start with current records or do we attempt to gather retrospectively?) and the value of having the Library take the lead role in bringing the University Archive to life. As the committee proceeds with its work, as it should, we strongly recommend the addition of a representative from Archives and Special Collections.

We strongly believe that the University Library must be cautious in approaching this issue: while there may be a temptation to attract the one time investment that the University’s governing bodies may come up with, the Library needs a clear mandate

with ongoing funding from the University (for staff, space and technology) before it proceeds down this path.

### **3. PUBLIC SERVICES**

We were deeply impressed in our interviews by the commitment of all staff to service, assisting researchers and making the collections accessible. Faculty routinely commented on the “exemplary” service they received by department staff. That said, some areas need attention.

**Serving the Public:** Consideration should be given to reducing Reading Room hours and moving to scheduled retrieval times (rather than retrieving on demand). Such policies would free up staff time for other work.

**Finding Aids:** Currently finding aids are generally created as Word documents and then converted to alternative formats (HTML, MARC). New collection management software is required to generate the finding aids in all the needed versions and to support the ability to search and drill down across files. Some project time is needed to do a retrospective conversion.

**Bertrand Russell Finding Aids:** Some effort needs to be made to make BRACERS more accessible. In addition, we were surprised to find that other Russell finding aids have not yet been digitized and made accessible on the website.

**Web Site:** Significant portions of the website, including all of the finding aids, were never converted to the new Drupal environment. There is considerable enthusiasm for making the website more interactive, not only to streamline some routine enquiries, but also to improve access to the finding aids and to more regularly highlight the collections and exhibits. Website resourcing is a library-wide issue.

**Exhibits:** Physical exhibits help to bring the collections to life and are often the showpieces of research library special collections. Given the remote and limited space that is currently available, however, we question whether too much time is being invested in physical exhibitions. If possible, it might be better to change the exhibit outside the archives less frequently, and to concentrate on exhibits in other parts of campus (e.g., in conjunction with conferences) and where adequate security and climate-control provisions can be put in place. And every physical exhibit ought to be accompanied by or result in a new virtual exhibit.

**Working with Undergraduate Students:** Our sense is that the primary clientele of McMaster’s archives are faculty, graduate students and external researchers. We recommend that greater attention be given to undergraduate students - to enhance their learning experience (by putting more primary source materials in their hands), to make the public more aware of the collection, and, frankly, to maintain support within the University for the unit.

It may make sense to create some kind of formal relationship between Archives & Research Collections and key departments across campus, perhaps building on current connections to Sociology, Religious Studies, English and History as a starting point. The emphasis could be on designing assignments that make effective use of the collections, and that can be generalized across a number of courses. Because CLL is actively engaged with the Library in the Blended Learning strategic initiative and is consciously trying to become more proactive in working with faculty, it may make sense to work with that unit to identify particular project possibilities.

**Digitization:** Early digitization projects feature a small number of meticulously rendered items, and offer, as one faculty member put it, a “curated introduction” to the collections. Advanced researchers prefer access to complete collections, and the kinds of tools that enable them to work with them.

More clarity is needed around the Library’s digitization activities, and initiatives need to be better coordinated.. There appears to be confusion around the proposed “Digitization Lab” and its relationship with the soon-to-be-opened Sherman Centre. Additional work is needed on the technical infrastructure for digitization. This infrastructure must support, not just the mere creation of digital objects (arguably the “easy” part), but also the preservation and dissemination of digital content.

New funding models are required. As the former Director noted, many of the key funding sources for archival digitization are drying up. The Library’s existing budget is inadequate to support digitization on its own. We need new sources of external funding to support this important work.

We heard mixed reviews about one approach to funding – partnering with commercial vendors. On the one hand, some emphasize that we and most other institutions need to outsource much of the digitization work to a third party since we lack the infrastructure to do that work ourselves. On the other hand, we heard concerns about private companies determining what is being digitized, about controlling quality and about the ethics of putting collections behind “pay walls.”

#### **4. STAFFING**

Research Collections currently has a small core of devoted, hardworking staff (4.5 permanent staff, 1 Postdoctoral Fellow and a small, variable number of contract staff and student assistants). The recently created position of Research and Advanced Studies Librarian provides some additional assistance to the Division.

The small number of the staff inhibits innovation and discourages greater engagement with undergraduate instruction; staff members are tied to reactive,

sometimes low-value work and are reluctant to initiate new services that they justifiably worry they will be unable to sustain.

Our assessment of staffing is based on existing activities. If a decision is made to create a University Archive / Records Management Program, additional staffing will be required.

**Leadership:** The reviewers explored the notion of hiring a new Director as a strategy for enhancing subject expertise, donor stewardship skills, grant writing and faculty relationships, but ultimately ruled it out as being too top heavy given the current staffing complement. At the present time, given the strong archival background of the current AUL for Collections, it seems feasible to have that individual continue the direct oversight of the unit, with day-to-day management duties performed by the Archives & Research Collections Librarian. This arrangement currently is working well and keeping it would provide stability for the Division. As well, it would free up staffing dollars that could be re-invested within the Collections Area (primarily but not exclusively within Research Collections itself). Finally, such an option assigns Research Collections key prominence in the organization by putting its leader at the Library's senior management table.

**Archival Assistant:** Most internal staff participants agreed that the recent departure of a library assistant has dramatically reduced the department's ability to arrange and describe collections and therefore is contributing to the backlog, and putting more pressure on current staff. Our discussions with other special collections librarians confirmed the critical importance to operations of archival assistants. The next staff appointment ought to be in this area.

**Archivist:** In recent years, Research Collections has employed 2.5 archivists (and has had as many as 3.5). These individuals were charged with arranging and describing collections and providing assistance (both face-to-face and online) to visitors. The unit currently employs 1.5 archivists. The small size of the archivist complement severely limits the Division's ability to deal with the backlog and manage the collection, let alone engage the University community. We support the hiring of an archivist with an area of specialization in digital formats. Ideally, this should be a full time appointment, but we would support the creation of a part-time appointment as a first step. The support of such a vital position might be attractive to donors.

**Postdoctoral Fellows:** We are convinced of the value in continuing to use Postdoctoral Fellows as part of the staffing of Research Collections. Fellowship programs potentially attract strong graduate students to the library and archive professions. The fellows help fill gaps in expertise and can be very helpful in processing and making use of newly acquired materials. The fellows can contribute teaching and bridge relations with various departments in the University. As well, the fellows can attract funding from outside the Library's regular budget (from other departments at the University or from external granting programs, such as CLIR).

A Postdoctoral Fellowship should be limited in duration (typically 1-2 years), and should be advertised or sought for particular subject areas of interest to Research Collections each time. The fellowship should be clear about expectations in terms of teaching and the specific project or projects to which the Postdoctoral Fellow will contribute. Ideally, the project will be related to and support the fellow's ongoing research program and professional development.

**Contractual Positions:** We suggest elsewhere that some donors might be encouraged to support the collections that they donate to the Library, or another donor might be sought to help make a particular collection accessible to the public. In such situations, it might make sense to hire a formally trained archivist in a contractual position, to deal with the processing of a particular collection or set of collections.

**Graduate and Undergraduate student assistants:** The University as a whole is clearly becoming more committed to supporting and promoting experiential education. We recommend that the Library, perhaps working with CLL and selected Departments, identify and define experiential opportunities for undergraduate and even graduate students that might benefit Research Collections. There are students in Humanities and Social Sciences who already are interested in going on to archival and library studies and might welcome the opportunity to gain some experience, and there are other students who might become interested in the profession as a result of such an experience.

**Volunteers:** Research Collections has been fortunate enough to have received the support of some very talented and hardworking volunteers from the community. For the moment, we do not think there are adequate numbers of staff to expand our existing volunteer base and, given limited resources, we would prefer to see attention paid first to developing experiential opportunities for students.

**Work Environment:** Staff members generally work fairly well together. Some do feel frustrated by the perceived lack of resources and attention given to Research Collections by the Library and the University. A number of initiatives have helped build morale within the unit. A number of staff pointed to the key role being played by the current Archives and Research Collections Librarian. He is in a position to attend to day to day management, and is perceived to be setting fair standards of performance and holding staff accountable in a consistent manner. As well, during the time the review was being conducted, the Associate University Librarian for Collections relocated his office to Research Collections. Having a senior leader located within the Unit has been a very positive move, for it underlined that Research Collections is valued within the University Library, and it also facilitated quick decision making within the unit.

## **5. FACILITIES**

We have concerns about the quality and quantity of space that has been assigned to Research Collections, although we recognize the complexity of dealing with such

concerns. All participants recognize that good solutions are costly, since special collections space must be climate-controlled and secured. In addition, the compact nature of much of the current space has some advantages for the small number of staff who are attempting to supervise and serve users while also completing other tasks. Overall, we urge caution in making any dramatic changes to the current facilities; any changes must be carefully planned so as to best serve the needs of users, staff and the collections, and all costs associated with any changes must be accounted for.

Again, the assessment of space needs is based on current scope. If a decision is made to proceed with a University Archive, additional space will be required.

**Location and Collections Profile:** A number of review participants contended that the relatively obscure, basement location assigned to Special Collections did not reflect its importance to the University Library. We were encouraged by users to consider alternative, improved spaces that might enhance the profile of the collection. The Provost was very clear that the University is short of space for many other facilities, and those are likely to be the focus of advancement and government relations work. On the other hand, she suggested that the University is interested in incorporating study space into new academic buildings, which might reduce the demand on the campus libraries to provide that space, thus freeing up some existing space for Research Collections.

**Collection Space:** Research Collections is in desperate need of additional space for shelving the collections. Inadequate and inappropriate shelving facilities represent a very serious issue for Research Collections and the University as a whole. Those who donate or sell their materials to us have every right to expect that we will do everything possible to secure and preserve these historical materials. It is our responsibility to do so.

The Burke Science Building storage area offers some relief, but the area is neither climate controlled nor easy to access. Efforts should be made to identify nearby storage spaces with proper security and environmental controls and to identify little used collections that could be placed there. Such a move must also be factored into the Division's staffing and service delivery plans.

There is some risk of water damage to the collections. The department began a project to put plastic on top of all bookshelves, and completion of this work should be made a priority. This is a sensible investment in a priceless collection.

The space shortage also underlines the need to review the collection with an eye to transferring to other institutions some low-use collections that no longer reflect collection goals.

**User Space:** Virtually all on-campus participants commented on the poor quality of the user space. The space is quite small, and the room can easily become very noisy and cluttered. There is no separate instruction space, so only small numbers of students can be accommodated at a given time. The alcove where exhibits are

located is quite dark and cramped. Staff members also expressed some concerns about the security of the space.

Discussions have been ongoing for a few years about relocating the Reading Room to an upper floor. Such a solution would free up space for collections on the lower level and provide the Division with a much more prominent public face, especially if it included exhibit space and a separate instruction area. Nevertheless, the concept of relocating the Reading Room must be approached with great care. The new space would be costly to construct given the intention to create a place of prominence, the requirements for climate control (at least in the exhibit space but preferably throughout) and the very significant security demands. As well, the solution would require additional staff. We also would be concerned that, depending on its location on the main floor, a Reading Room could be regarded by students as a potential general study space.

**Workspaces:** Workspaces generally are small and cramped; this is particularly true of the spaces for working with collection materials. The one exception is the preservation laboratory, which is of a reasonable size. Overall, space is tight, and while the close proximity of archivists to the Reading Room can result in good service for users, it is disruptive. One of the workspaces has been rearranged recently; it would appear to be a better arrangement that provides at least one or two good workspaces for dealing with materials.

The Wilson Institute for Canadian History has recently proposed that a relatively small space in the new liberal arts building could be dedicated to Research Collections. The idea would be to create a space where an unprocessed Canadian collection or collections could be temporarily stored, and where they could be worked on. A Postdoctoral Fellow would be assigned to assist with this work, and would also use the collection as a resource in teaching undergraduate and graduate students at the Institute. The idea is promising, but there are some concerns that would need to be addressed.

## **CONCLUSION**

In recent years, special collections have become the focus of much attention in university libraries; the collections help define what is unique about each research library and the universities they serve. The former Director noted early in the process that “This is not the time to retreat or stand still.” We agree, but we also take seriously the conclusion reached by another participant, that Research Collections is in danger of “collecting beyond its capacity.” There is little point in accepting material if it is going to remain unprocessed and inaccessible to the public, and, even more seriously, if proper shelving space is not available to protect and preserve it. There is a need to align resources and channel ambition more carefully. Good stewardship of our rich collections will require some review, some planning, and some investment in staff and facilities.

We strongly support recent proposals to create a University Archive to house our rich historic record and to oversee ongoing records management. We endorse the Library taking a lead role in overseeing this Archive – but only if the University provides a clear mandate and continuous funding to support it.

We are impressed by the continuing commitment and professionalism of the staff. They provide excellent service to those who seek out the collection; the next challenge is to bring the collection to the attention of more users and to make them a more regular part of undergraduate and graduate instruction. We are confident that, given adequate resources and a rigorous approach to future planning for collections, preservation and digitization, the staff of Archives and Research Collections will be up to the challenge.

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. COLLECTIONS**

**Recommendation 1.1:** Formulate a true acquisition policy for the Division. The policy should reflect a tight set of acquisition priorities for the coming five years (rather than a description of existing collections). The policy should be crafted in close collaboration with faculty and other key users. The results of this work should be shared with the Library Advisory Committee and published on the public web site. Commit to replicating this review every five years to ensure that the collection stays mission critical.

**Recommendation 1.2:** Continue the process whereby potential new acquisitions are discussed by the AUL for Collections, the Archives and Research Collections Librarian and associated Postdoctoral Fellow(s). Include the Conservator when discussing fragile materials.

**Recommendation 1.3:** When considering new acquisitions, estimates of preservation and processing requirements must be included in the decision making to the fullest extent allowed by pre-accessioning appraisal. Assessment of the priority of the new acquisition in relation to existing processing schedules should also be included. When cost is large, identify potential sources of funding. This may include approaching the original donor for assistance in making his/her materials accessible to the public.

**Recommendation 1.4:** Scrutinize arrangement and description processes. Ensure that the depth of processing is directly aligned with anticipated use of the collection. For low-use collections, ensure that the depth of processing meets but does not exceed requirements for issuing tax receipts.

**Recommendation 1.5:** Seriously explore the transfer of low-use collections falling outside the Division's key collection areas to other institutions, especially when transfer would result in dramatically increased use.

**Recommendation 1.6:** Set processing priorities based on user demand and alignment with the University's teaching and learning strengths. Ensure that these priorities are reflected in the University Library's strategic plan.

**Recommendation 1.7:** Plan for ongoing development and support for the Russell Collection.

**Recommendation 1.8:** Commission the Conservator and Archives and Research Collections Librarian to establish an annual preservation plan for the Division. The plan should identify key priorities for the coming year.

## **2. UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES**

**Recommendation 2.1:** Continue active and enthusiastic involvement in campus plans to create a University Archive to house McMaster's rich historical records and to possibly serve as the central authority for records management.

**Recommendation 2.2:** Add a member of Archives and Research Collections to the committee.

**Recommendation 2.3:** Agree to assume responsibility for the University Archive if and only if the role comes with a clear mandate (historic versus current, print versus online, required or optional deposit) and continuous funding. The mandate should specify mandatory transfer of selected University records without regard for their format as part of the University's larger records management program.

## **3. PUBLIC SERVICES**

**Recommendation 3.1:** Review service hours with an eye to freeing up more staff time for collection work. Consider shortened hours, especially during low-use times.

**Recommendation 3.2:** Move to scheduled archival delivery times. Would be especially important if the Reading Room is moved away from its current location or if collections are relocated to other storage locations.

**Recommendation 3.3:** Digitize additional Russell finding aids and post them on the public website. Review linkages to BRACERS.

**Recommendation 3.4:** Divert time spent on physical exhibits to traveling shows outside the unit (e.g., in conjunction with scholarly conferences on campus) until such a time as appropriate exhibit space is available within the unit. (Would require a selective approach to exhibit scheduling (given staffing levels) and, in some cases, the use of digital surrogates to protect very rare materials.)

**Recommendation 3.5:** Ensure that every physical exhibit is coupled with an online showing. Explore use of open source software for this purpose.

**Recommendation 3.6:** Make a concerted effort to enhance engagement with undergraduate students through a variety of strategies (classroom assignments, etc.). Build on current connections with Sociology, Religious Studies, English and History as a starting point. May wish to engage CLL in discussions of possible projects and grant opportunities.

**Recommendation 3.7** Going forward, focus on deep digitization of entire collections (instead of visually attractive but highly-selective numbers of items from collections).

**Recommendation 3.8:** Develop broad multi-year goals for digitization projects and clear priorities for digitization on an annual basis. Ground these priorities on use and alignment with University teaching and research. Engage Research Collections staff and users in these decisions.

**Recommendation 3.9:** Approach digitization as a possible donor activity. Cost out specific projects in conjunction with the Library Development Officer and University Advancement.

**Recommendation 3.10:** Be cautious about vendor agreements or other partnership agreements. When negotiating new agreements, ensure that the Library is engaged in decisions regarding selection of materials, technical specifications, production rates, workflow, metadata creation, quality control and delivery of digital files to the Library.

#### **4.STAFF**

**Recommendation 4.1:** If it is the intention of the University Library to raise the profile of Research Collections, then the current staffing complement is inadequate. Staff renewal with the division must be a Library priority.

**Recommendation 4.2:** Formalize the current arrangement whereby the Associate University Librarian for Collections maintains direct oversight over the Archives. Have the Archives & Research Collections Librarian and any Postdoctoral Fellow(s) associated with the Division report directly to the AUL.

**Recommendation 4.3:** A junior position of Archival Assistant, which has been left vacant since a staff departure, represents the first staffing priority for the division.

**Recommendation 4.4:** Serious consideration should be given to hiring an archivist with an area of specialization in digital formats as the 2<sup>nd</sup> staffing priority. This position could be part-time to start. The position could, potentially, be attractive to a donor.

**Recommendation 4.5:** Research Collections should continue to employ Postdoctoral Fellows in clearly defined roles, taking advantage of external funding opportunities to provide temporary special subject expertise, and deepen connections between the collections and undergraduate education.

**Recommendation 4.6:** Staff should work with CLL, Graduate Studies and selected Departments, to identify and define experiential opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students working in Research Collections.

**Recommendation 4.7:** The University Library should create opportunities for Research Collections staff to engage with library staff as a whole, with an eye to leveraging expertise and sharing staff and tasks. Some interaction with the McMaster Museum of Art might also be encouraged.

## **5. SPACE**

**Recommendation 5.1:** Explore existence of nearby storage spaces with proper security and environmental controls for possible relocation of low-use collections.

**Recommendation 5.2:** Complete the work begun some years ago to protect the tops of shelves from water damage.

**Recommendation 5.3:** Continue the discussions regarding relocation of the Reading Room, but with great care. Proceed only if the proposal includes a prominent location, easy access to the collections for retrieval, good security and good climate-controlled exhibit space. Consider this an exemplary donor opportunity. Also consider bundling the proposal with a physical home for the University Archive.

**Recommendation 5.4:** Continue to explore the concept of creating special collection space at the Wilson Institute for Canadian History. Proceed only if the proposal includes climate controlled, secure space, and issues including collection acquisition, ownership and access are addressed.

**Recommendation 5.5:** Consider relocating some processing work into the Preservation Lab.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Helen Ayre (Records Manager, Policy Analyst and FIPPA Coordinator, McMaster University)

Renu Barrett (Archivist, McMaster University Library)

Bev Bayzat (Library Assistant, McMaster University Library)

Dr. James Benn (Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Religious Studies, McMaster University)

Dr. Suzanne Crosta (Dean of Humanities, McMaster University)

Dr. Ilene Busch-Vishniac (Provost and Vice-President (Academic), McMaster University)

Dr. W. Bruce Frank (University Secretary, McMaster University)

Dr. Jim Greenlee (McMaster University's Historian, currently working on a book chronicling the University's history, from 1957 to 1987)

Robin Keirstead (University Archivist, University of Western Ontario)

Anne Kenney (Carl A. Kroch University Librarian, Cornell University)

Loryl MacDonald (Archivist, University of Toronto Archives AND President, Canadian Association of Archives)

Nick Ruest (Digital Preservation Librarian, McMaster University Library)

Audrie Schell (Preservation Assistant, McMaster University Library)

Dr. Vic Satzewich (Professor of Sociology, McMaster University)

Dr. Noah Shenker (Postdoctoral Fellow, McMaster University Library)

Dr. Carl Spadoni (Director, Archives & Research Collections, McMaster University Library (retired))

Rick Stapleton (Archives and Research Collections Librarian, McMaster University Library)

Sheila Turcon (Archivist, McMaster University Library)

Dr. Peter Walmsley (Professor of English, McMaster University)

Wade Wyckoff (Associate University Librarian, McMaster University Library)

## **KEY REFERENCES**

ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee. "2010 Top Ten Trends in Academic Libraries: A Review of the Literature." *College & Research Library News*, vol. 71 no. 6 (June 2010): 286-292. Available at: <http://crln.acrl.org/content/71/6/286.full>

ARL Task Force on Special Collections. *Research Libraries and the Commitment to Special Collections*. Washington: Association of Research Libraries,, December 17, 2002. Available at: <http://www.arl.org/rtl/speccoll/speccollprinciples.shtml>

Association of Canadian Archivists. *Code of Ethic*. Available at: <http://www.archivists.ca/content/code-ethics>

Association of Research Libraries. *Special Collections in ARL Libraries: A Discussion Report from the ARL Working Group on Special Collections*. Washington: Association of Research Libraries, March 2009. Available at: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/scwg-report.pdf>

Barenbak, Adam et al. *Special Collections Engagement*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries Spec Kit 317, August 2010. Executive Summary available at: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/spec-317-web.pdf>

Blixrud, Julia, "University of Chicago Explores Library-Faculty Partnerships in Uncovering Hidden Collections," (ARL, *Research Library Issues*, April 2007): 4. Available at: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/arlbr251uncap.pdf>

Conway, Martha O'Hara and Merrilee Proffitt. *Taking Stock and Making Hay: Archival Collections Assessment*. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research, 2010. Available at: <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2011/2011-07.pdf>

Council on Library and Information Resources. *No Brief Candle: Reconceiving Research Libraries for the 21st Century* (CLIR Publication no. 142). Washington: CLIR, August 2008. Available at: <http://publications.arl.org/rli267/21>

Deane, Patrick. "Forward with Integrity: A Letter to the McMaster Community." September 26, 2011. Available at: <http://dailynews.mcmaster.ca/images/forwardwithintegrity.pdf>

Greene, Mark A. and Dennis Meissner. "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing." *American Archivist* 68 (2005), 208-263. Available at: <http://ahc.uwyo.edu/documents/faculty/greene/papers/Greene-Meissner.pdf>

Jones, Barbara. *Hidden Collections, Scholarly Barriers: Creating Access to the Unprocessed Special Collection Materials in North America's Research Libraries*. ARL Special Collections Task Force White Paper, June 2003. Available at: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/hiddencollswitepaperjun6.pdf>

Kenney, Anne and Carl Kroch. "The Collaborative Imperative: Special Collections in the Digital Age," *Research Library Issues*, Washington: Association of Research Libraries, December 2009: 20-29. Available at: <http://publications.arl.org/rli267/21>

Lynch, Clifford. "Special Collections at the Cusp of the Digital Age: A Credo." *Research Library Issues*, Washington: Association of Research Libraries, December 2009: 3-9. Available at: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/rli-267-lynch.pdf>

Mandel, Carol, "Hidden Collections: The Elephant in the Closet," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage* 5 (Fall 2004): 106. Available at: <http://rbm.acrl.org/content/5/2/106.full.pdf>

McMillan, Gail, Matt Schultz and Katherine Skinner, *Digital Preservation (ARL Spec Kit 325)*, (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, October 2011.. Executive summary available at: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/spec-325-web.pdf>

Meyer, Lars, *Safeguarding Collections at the Dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Describing and Measuring Contemporary Preservation Activities in ARL Libraries*, May 2009. Available at: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/safeguarding-collections.pdf>

Saunders, Richan and Associates. *Report on the Records Management and Archives Programmes of McMaster University and Divinity College* (2000). Available from the University Secretariat.

Society of American Archivists. *Code of Ethics for Archivists*. Available at: <http://www2.archivists.org/standards/code-of-ethics-for-archivists>

Stapleton, Rick, *Backlog of Archives Requiring Arrangement and Description, as of June 23, 2011*, William Ready Division of Archives & Research Collections, unpublished report.

Waters, Donald. "Archives, Edition-Making, and the Future of Scholarly Communication." New York: The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, March 2009 (working draft used with permission of the author).

Waters, Donald and Helen Cullyer. "Changing Roles of Research Libraries." (Mellon Foundation document provided by the author).