# In a Class by Themselves: Faculty Papers at Research University Archives and Manuscript Repositories

Tara Zachary Laver

**Abstract**

Faculty papers are common in university archives and/or university manuscript collections, but little current literature exists about their acquisition, appraisal, administration, processing, and use. The survey reported herein examined the practices and policies on faculty papers employed by repositories in ARL-libraries and at formerly designated Research I universities. It reports criteria used to identify potential donors, how (and if) archivists pursue of faculty papers, formats of materials sought and retained, level of processing, and use by patrons and staff. More generally, it gauges practitioners' opinions toward what are often perceived to be large, yet underused collections.

In a 1965 letter to the editor of the *American Archivist*, historian Robert Higham chastised the archival profession for not making the effort to acquire and preserve the personal papers of university faculty. He wrote:

> A number of university libraries are asking their publishing faculty members to give them manuscripts of their works. Yet they do not wish to accept the correspondence and papers of these men. But what good are manuscripts, galleys, page proofs, and the like without the papers, not necessarily all the notes, which are related to them and to the author's life as a whole? Future researchers, when faced with nothing but the semi-finished and finished product, may well paint an erroneous picture of their man and his mind. Correspondence, notes, memoranda, and even course reading lists would be and should be valuable sources. Of those who say otherwise, let us ask, "What have you spent in the past in the way of time, effort, and money to acquire these very materials for those who have achieved even a modicum of fame? *Think not* of the past and the present *but of the needs of researchers 100 years from now*![1]

[1] Robert Higham in "Editor's Forum," *American Archivist* 28 (October 1965): 613. Higham's italics.

Were these words the disappointed ravings of an academic, slighted, perhaps, by an archivist's refusal of his faculty papers, or a legitimate call to action at the time? Maynard Brichford conducted an analysis a few years after this letter was written and found that faculty papers amounted to about 11 percent of the collections reported by the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections between 1962 and 1969, while the papers of other professional groups such as businessmen, politicians, literary figures, military leaders, and lawyers comprised about half the NUCMC listings.[2] Higham would be happy to know that a 2001 survey found faculty papers comprise, on average, 22.6 percent of holdings at the archival repositories at twenty-four research universities.[3] Nevertheless, faculty papers continue to be an area of archival enterprise that archivists and manuscript curators find difficult to navigate to their satisfaction, and many archivists question the utility of such collections. A perception exists that they are often large, take up valuable staff time and stack space, and return little on that investment in the way of use. Aside from the question of whether to collect faculty papers, Higham's letter reflects several other issues related to their acquisition, such as what type of materials to collect and which faculty members should be approached. Is Higham's standard of "those who have achieved even a modicum of fame" a sufficient criterion?

If this historian thought archivists underdocumented faculty by not collecting their papers, the collection and administration of faculty papers is an area about which archivists have written little. Faced with the prospect of acquiring and appraising the life's work of an internationally known physicist at Louisiana State University (LSU) whose papers easily took up three rooms, I turned to *Library Literature* in hopes of finding guidance from my archival forebears, only to retrieve no relevant hits on a keyword search of "faculty" and "papers."[4] Indeed, other authors have noted the lack of current literature on

[2] Maynard Brichford, "University Archives: Relationships with Faculty," *American Archivist* 34 (April 1971): 176. While Brichford's analysis of NUCMC data does not provide an exact point of comparison for my efforts to ascertain the extent of faculty papers in repositories' holdings, his is the best measure for this time period of how well university faculty, as a professional group, were represented in the archival record.

[3] Author's survey. See below for further results.

[4] The *Library Literature* database begins with 1984, so I also searched the printed index back to 1936. Through this search and mining footnotes found in other relevant articles, I identified twenty-two publications that at least mention faculty papers: Frances Fournier, " 'For they would gladly learn and gladly teach'—University Faculty and Their Papers: A Challenge for Archivists," *Archivaria* 34 (Summer 1992): 58–71; Helen Willa Samuels, *Varsity Letters: Documenting Modern Colleges and Universities* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists; Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1992); Association of Research Libraries, *University Archives in ARL Libraries: Spec Kit #107* (Washington, D.C.: Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1984); Frederick Honhart, "The Solicitation, Appraisal, and Acquisition of Faculty Papers," *College and Research Libraries* 45 (May 1983): 236–41; Nicholas C. Burckel and J. Frank Cook, "A Profile of College and University Archives in the United States," *American Archivist* 45 (Fall 1982): 410–11; Mary E. Janzen, "Pruning the Groves of Academe: Appraisal, Arrangement, and Description of Faculty Papers," *Georgia Archive* 9 (Fall

appraisal of personal papers, in general, and the emphasis on corporate and governmental records in discussions of archival theory.[5] However, the attendance and discussion at a session at the 2000 SAA annual meeting in Denver on the faculty papers policy developed by Yale's Christine Weideman, Diane Kaplan, and Tom Hyry attest to the interest in the profession about this class of personal papers.[6]

While faculty papers are subject to the same appraisal considerations as any collection, they present unique challenges. By their very nature, universities contain multiple disciplines, and acquiring and processing the papers of faculty members from those diverse disciplines require a degree of subject knowledge and technical expertise that archivists may not possess. Other questions relate to ownership: Are the materials the property of the university or the faculty member, and who owns copyright in them? The presence of student work and letters of recommendation presents privacy concerns. Similarly, data on research conducted with human subjects also raises issues of confidentiality and privacy. If a faculty member has been associated with multiple institutions, determining which is the most appropriate repository for his or her papers is another consideration. On the other hand, the faculty member may feel a subject-specific repository is the better choice. Institutional political factors may also play a part, for as Maynard Brichford has noted, faculty are often sources, advocates, and frequent users of our archives, manuscript holdings, and programs.[7]

---

1981): 31–41; Jane Wolff, "Faculty Papers and Special-Subject Repositories," *American Archivist* 44 (Fall 1981): 346–51; F. W. Ratcliffe, "Archival Responsibilities of University Libraries," *Journal of Librarianship* 12 (April 1980): 71–83; Maynard Brichford, "Academic Archives: Überheferungsbildung," *American Archivist* 43 (Fall 1980): 449–60; Annabel Straus, "College and University Archives: Three Decades of Development," *College and Research Libraries* 40 (September 1979): 432–39; Laurence R. Veysey, "A Scholar's View of University Archives," in *College and University Archives: Selected Readings* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1979), 145–54; Maynard Brichford, "Appraisal and Processing," in *College and University Archives: Selected Readings*, 8–18; Miriam I. Crawford, "Interpreting the University Archives to the Librarian," in *College and University Archives: Selected Readings*, 58–67; David B. Potts, "College Archives as Windows on American Society," *American Archivist* 40 (January 1977): 43–49; Nicholas Burckel, "The Expanding Role of a College or University Archives," *Midwestern Archivist* 1 (Spring 1976): 3–15; Maynard Brichford, "University Archives: Relations with Faculty," *American Archivist* 34 (April 1971): 173–81; Harley P. Holden, "The Collecting of Faculty Papers," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 19 (April 1971): 187–93; Walter Rundell, Jr., "Personal Data from University Archives," *American Archivist* 34 (April 1971): 183–88; J. Frank Cook, "The Archivist: Link Between Scientist and Historian," *American Archivist* 34 (October 1971): 377–83; Robert M. Warner, "The Status of College and University Archives," *American Archivist* 31 (July 1968): 235–37; Dellene M. Tweedale, "Procurement and Evaluation of Materials for a University Archives," *College and Research Libraries* 26 (November 1965): 517–24; Clifford K. Shipton, "College Archives and Academic Research," *American Archivist* 27 (July 1964): 395–400.

[5] Riva A. Pollard, "The Appraisal of Personal Papers: A Critical Literature Review," *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 137, 139; Barbara L. Craig, "The Archivist as Planner and Poet: Thoughts on the Larger Issues of Appraisal for Acquisition," *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 176.

[6] Tom Hyry, Diane Kaplan, and Christine Weideman, "'Though this be madness, Yet There Be Method in it': Assessing the Value of Faculty Papers and Defining a Collecting Policy," *American Archivist* 65 (Spring/Summer 2002): 56–69.

[7] Brichford, "University Archives: Relationships with Faculty," 173.

The dearth of current information relating to faculty papers and the above considerations were the reasons for conducting a survey of archivists and manuscript curators at institutions similar to LSU. The purpose was twofold: to ascertain and create a base of information on the practices and policies of the acquisition, appraisal, administration, processing, and use of the personal papers of faculty members; and, to use that information to formulate guidelines for collecting and processing faculty papers at the LSU Special Collections.

### Review of Previously Published Survey

Though there is much interest in faculty papers among archival professionals at colleges and universities, Frederick Honhart's 1983 article is the only systematic survey to date that concentrates specifically on them.[8] Until his work, faculty papers were mentioned only incidentally in larger studies of university archives. A 1966 survey of colleges and universities in the United States and Canada conducted by SAA's College and University Archives Committee found that collections of faculty members' personal papers were found largely, though not exclusively, at the "larger institutions."[9] The criteria defining a "larger institution" were not given. In their 1982 survey of 110 academic repositories randomly selected from the SAA directory, Nicholas C. Burckel and J. Frank Cook undertook to obtain comparative information about staffing, budgets, holdings, services, facilities, descriptive practice, and usage at college and university archives. They reported that 87 percent of the public institutions surveyed collected faculty papers, compared to 78 percent of private schools. Further, 88 percent of large and 80 percent of small colleges and universities kept them.[10] Again these institutional sizes were undefined. Burckel and Cook also discovered confusion over the definition of college and university archives. Whereas some repositories were responsible for only the official records of the university, others also collected materials such as faculty papers and student organizations' records.[11]

In his survey, Honhart examined the criteria and methodology used by archivists at thirty-eight repositories to determine which faculty members to solicit and how they dealt with issues unique to faculty papers. At the same time, he offered suggestions and guidelines for the solicitation, appraisal, and acquisition of faculty papers. He found that only four repositories (10.5 percent of his sample) had a published statement defining what were considered official records and what were considered the private papers of faculty, though they

[8] See Honhart, "The Solicitation, Appraisal and Acquisition of Faculty Papers."

[9] Warner, "The Status of College and University Archives," 237.

[10] Cited in Nicholas C. Burckel and J. Frank Cook, "A Profile of College and University Archives in the United States," 421.

[11] Burckel and Cook, "A Profile of College and University Archives in the United States," 420.

were unanimous in agreeing that the records of administrative functions carried out by faculty fell into the former category, and research and teaching materials, as well as student records, were considered faculty property.[12] Such agreement was not found, however, when it came to appraisal decisions. Universal appraisal criteria proved illusive, but the age, size, and recognized areas of excellence of the university were all given as considerations. Respondents also consistently cited a faculty member's reputation in his or her respective discipline, service to the institution, or community activities irrespective of contributions to the university or academic discipline as determining factors. Moreover, 79 percent believed the archivist or archives' staff, not interdepartmental committees, should make the decision to solicit.[13]

When addressing the question of the most appropriate repository for placement of papers when faculty have been associated with multiple institutions or even governmental administrations, Honhart's respondents unanimously favored keeping papers intact as opposed to dividing them among institutions. Opinion and practice were not universal, however, on the question of what to do with publications found in faculty papers. Participants reported housing them with individual holdings, adding them to a general faculty publications collection, or retaining them with the papers.[14]

Honhart's was the first, and heretofore, only attempt to gather information systematically about professional practice regarding faculty papers,[15] although in her 1992 work, which concentrated more on faculty's attitudes about their papers, Frances Fournier also interviewed and corresponded with selected university archivists about their opinions of faculty papers. Some valued them highly and therefore pursued them, while others deemed them of little importance and so accepted but did not solicit them. As Honhart had found, Fournier's contacts also did not agree about which faculty members' papers merited acquisition and preservation.[16]

Honhart's and Fournier's research and suggestions for best practice are useful, but they do not provide general information about faculty papers in repositories or specific data about solicitation, appraisal, processing, and

[12] Honhart, "The Solicitation, Appraisal and Acquisition of Faculty Papers," 236.

[13] Honhart, "The Solicitation, Appraisal and Acquisition of Faculty Papers," 237–38.

[14] Honhart, "The Solicitation, Appraisal and Acquisition of Faculty Papers," 240.

[15] Frances Fournier has studied the other side of collecting faculty papers, surveying faculty members themselves on their attitudes about preserving their papers in archival and manuscript repositories and their perceived usefulness of their papers to others. She found they pragmatically assigned value to their records based on how they assisted them in their work, not on any consideration of their historic value. Further, their emphasis on the importance of their published work militated against their preserving the documents that led to that publication, and they also generally had little sense of the possible use by others of their unpublished research files. Fournier, " 'For they would gladly learn,' " 63.

[16] Fournier, " 'For they would gladly learn,' " 66.

use. To form a more comprehensive baseline of current policies, practices, and opinions, further research was necessary.

### Choice of Participants and Methodology

Since faculty are traditionally evaluated for tenure and promotion in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, and institutions of higher learning value these elements differently in evaluating faculty, I chose to survey universities, like Louisiana State University, that had been designated Research I universities under the old Carnegie system.[17] This decision was based on the assumption that faculty members' papers would reflect that research emphasis, and therefore, the types of materials in their collections, their use, and the stature of the faculty would make comparisons and results applicable to the situation at LSU. Because Louisiana State is also a member of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), those included in the survey were archives and manuscript repositories located at universities whose libraries are also members of ARL or were non-ARL libraries in previously designated Research I institutions.[18]

These criteria yielded 124 repositories to be surveyed. Each of their Web sites was searched for e-mail addresses of manuscript curators, whom I expected to comprise the majority of those responsible for faculty papers, as is the case at Louisiana State University. When no curator was given, the e-mail address of the university archivist or head of special collections was used. Consequently, contact information was obtained for 122 of the 124 candidates for the survey.

Using a two-tier approach to improve response rate, in April 2001 a five-question survey was sent via e-mail to the 122 individuals identified as possibly having responsibility for acquiring and administering faculty papers. In addition

[17] Carnegie changed its classification system in 2000, and under the new scheme, LSU is designated a Doctoral/Research University Extensive. This category is defined as institutions that offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and award fifty or more doctoral degrees per year across at least fifteen disciplines. See "A New Way of Classifying Colleges Elates Some and Perturbs Others" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 11 August 2000, A31. There are 148 Doctoral/Research University-Extensive schools, eighty-seven of which were formerly designated Research I. Of those eighty-seven, twelve were not members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The sweeping revision of the classification emphasizes teaching, focusing on the number and type of degrees an institution awards, rather than research or selectivity in admissions.

[18] Membership in ARL is by invitation " 'to major university libraries whose collections and services are broadly based,' " which are defined as " 'those whose parent institutions broadly emphasize research and graduate instruction at the doctoral level and grant their own degrees, which support large, comprehensive research collections on a permanent basis, and which give evidence of an institutional capacity for and commitment to the advancement and transmittal of knowledge.' The criteria for university library members consists of three parts: the first to ensure a similarity of parent institutional characteristics with the current membership; the second to ensure comparability of size; and the third to ensure diversity and significant contribution to the distributed North American collection of research resources." From Association of Research Libraries, *Principles and Procedures of Membership in the Association of Research Libraries*, 2002 at <http://www.arl.org/stats/qualprin.html> (1 March 2003).

to requesting specific information about holdings, the survey also inquired if the respondent would be willing to complete a more extensive questionnaire. Fifty-one responses were returned, yielding a response rate of 42 percent. Of those, 29.4 percent were from private institutions, and 70.6 percent were from public universities. Three respondents declined to participate in the second survey. In May 2001, the follow-up survey, consisting of twenty-two questions was sent, again via e-mail,[19] to the forty-eight remaining archivists. Twenty-four completed surveys were returned, a response rate of 50 percent.[20] Private schools represented 37.5 percent of these replies, and public institutions, 62.5 percent.

The survey focused on the administration, acquisition, processing, and use of faculty papers, in addition to general information about the size of faculty collections in relation to other holdings. The goal was to gain some specific information about who is responsible for faculty papers, what criteria are used to identify potential donors, whether faculty papers are actively pursued, what genres of materials are sought and retained, what priority faculty collections are given in processing, and how these materials are used by patrons and staff. More generally, I wanted to gauge other archival professionals' opinions about what I perceived to be often large, yet underused collections.

### Preliminary Survey

The question of the most appropriate type of repository for faculty papers continually arose in a review of the literature on faculty papers. Are they official records or personal papers, and, consequently, do they belong in university archives or manuscript repositories? Maynard Brichford considers it "the definite responsibility of the archivist" to acquire faculty papers and admonished against quibbling over distinctions of university and personal property, urging, "If they are valuable, take them."[21] Similarly, Helen Willa Samuels advocates evaluating the evidence available to document specific functions of a university without labeling it as "administrative" or "faculty" papers.[22] In practice, however, an administrative unit, usually within the library, is assigned the task to ensure these records are acquired, preserved, and made accessible. Much as Burckel and Cook's survey revealed, this survey shows there is still no agreement

[19] The first survey offered those willing to answer the second one the option of receiving it via standard mail. Three of the fifty-one respondents chose this method of receiving the second survey. The second questionnaire was developed with the assistance of the LSU Center for Assessment and Evaluation.

[20] The answers provided were not always clear or usable, and if that was the case for a question, that institution's response was excluded for that individual question, and it was not counted in calculating percentages. The number of usable responses, from which percentages and numbers were calculated, will be indicated.

[21] Brichford, "Appraisal and Processing," 9–10.

[22] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 25.

in practice as to whether faculty papers belong in university archives or manuscript collections, and some repositories have them in both areas.

Forty-five of fifty-one respondents provided usable answers to the question whether faculty papers are part of university archives or a manuscript collection, and results showed an almost even split between the two approaches. Eighteen (40%) reported that faculty papers are part of the manuscripts collection, fifteen (33.3%) that they reside in university archives within the library system, and two (4.49%) that they are in university archives that are not part of the libraries. Eight (17.8%) institutions have faculty papers in both university archives and their manuscript collections. The remaining two (4.4%) had other arrangements.

All fifty-one of the repositories responding to the survey contain personal papers of their institutions' faculty, and 96 percent reported that they presently solicit or accept donations of faculty papers. However, only 21 percent (n=47) have a written policy regarding them. Some described this policy as "very general," "not very detailed," and "a little less structured than it should be." Some of the 79 percent who do not have a written policy indicated that their practices in this area had been "very informal" and that they hoped and needed to develop a policy. These responses again speak to archivists' need and desire for direction in regard to faculty papers. Additionally, 36 percent have an established method of ascertaining how often faculty papers are used and/or how and for what.

### Second Survey

Twenty-four of the forty-eight respondents to the first survey who had indicated a willingness to complete the second returned the follow-up survey. The group was comprised of fifteen public (62.5%) and nine private (37.5%) institutions. The second survey fleshed out many of the issues only touched on by the first survey and included sections on general information, collection development, processing, and use.

#### *General information*

Responsibility for faculty papers broke down as follows (n=22): manuscript collection—8 (36.4%); university archives in the library system—eleven (50%); university archives not part of the libraries—two (9.1%); and both manuscript and university archives—one (4.5%). Since the archival professionals completing the survey were responsible for faculty papers, determining the collecting focus of their respective programs would also indicate how faculty papers are thought to fit within collections (see Table 1). A slight plurality has a collecting focus of both university and nonuniversity topics.

**Table 1** Collecting Focus of Repositories

| Collecting Focus | # of Repositories (n=21) | % of Repositories |
|---|---|---|
| University only | 8 | 38.1% |
| University and nonuniversity (i.e., local history, geographic areas, specific disciplines, topic, or era) | 9 | 42.9% |
| Nonuniversity topics only | 4 | 19.0% |

Further, among the institutions at which faculty papers are treated as personal papers, they constitute an average of 22.2 percent of all manuscript collections and 20.2 percent of repositories' total linear feet of holdings. The average collection of faculty papers is 12.1 linear feet in size, compared to a 17.2 linear feet average size for all manuscript collections. This statistic is contrary to the perception that faculty papers are larger than nonfaculty personal papers.[23]

### *Collection Development*

Collection development, or appraisal and acquisition—deciding which donors to solicit, which collections to accept, and which materials in a collection merit retention—is perhaps the most difficult aspect of archival work. One must view a prospective collection in light of the evidential and informational value it contains, the anticipated use by and research value to patrons, and the documentation it provides of a topic the repository has identified as one of its focus areas, determining which materials within the collection best represent those topics. These considerations must be balanced with institutional priorities and repository staffing, space, and financial resources. Consequently, this section of the survey endeavored to gauge at what level those responsible for faculty papers pursued faculty collections, what criteria and means are used to identify prospective and desirable donors, how faculty papers fit into their stated collecting mission, and what genres and categories of materials are accepted or retained and why.

The collection development policy is one tool archivists have developed to assist them in appraisal. Thirteen of twenty-four (54.2%) respondents have such

[23] These numbers are based only on the responses from the eight archivists at repositories where faculty papers are treated as personal papers in a manuscript repository. Six of those eight provided usable data. Since few if any would argue that collections of faculty papers are larger than institutional record groups, the appropriate comparison is against other collections of personal papers. Respondents at archives where faculty papers are part of university archives did respond to the question, however. At those institutions, faculty papers constitute an average of 27 percent of the number of holdings and 11.1 percent of total linear feet of holdings. The average group of faculty papers is 6.5 linear feet in size, compared to a 20.9 linear feet average size for all record groups. Thus, faculty papers in manuscript repositories are 1.9 times larger, when measured in linear feet, than faculty papers in university archives, and they comprise 1.8 times the number of manuscript repositories' holdings.

a written policy, and of those thirteen, ten include a statement regarding faculty papers. These statements indicate faculty papers are primarily collected to enhance documentation of the university's academic and administrative history, including both the accomplishments of faculty and the history of the university as a community, beyond the documentation found in "official records."

Such thinking is in line with those who have advocated the collection of faculty papers. Helen Willa Samuels argues faculty papers should be considered "part of a common pool of potential documentation" for the seven functions of modern academic institutions that she has identified: to sustain the institution, confer credentials, foster socialization, provide public service, conduct research, promote culture, and convey knowledge.[24] Similarly, Frances Fournier advocates collecting faculty papers for the understanding they can bring to studying the university's functions: teaching, research, community service, and maintenance of institutional infrastructure.[25] Maynard Brichford contends faculty papers can clarify and expand upon issues and decisions discussed in official records and formal accounts. Moreover, according to Brichford, academics merit documentation because they have traditionally "played a central role in preserving and perpetuating human knowledge and culture" and "have been largely responsible for the development of academic disciplines."[26] He is not alone in finding an application beyond university history for faculty papers. David B. Potts and Laurence R. Veysey have also argued that they provide "windows on American society" and intellectual life.[27]

Indeed, the literature indicates overwhelming support for collecting faculty papers, but respondents to the survey did not universally agree. To the question "do you accept faculty papers if they are offered," 29.2 percent replied they accept all and 70.8 percent accept some (n=24); none reported that they refused all offers. Both groups provided the following explanations for why they acquire such materials (the number of repositories giving each reason follows in parentheses):[28] to document the university's history and the town-gown relationship (12); to record the development of academic disciplines and faculty's accomplishments, stature, and involvement in them (6); in consideration of political expediency or the best interest of the repository or university (4); to build the

[24] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 25, 20.

[25] Fournier, " 'For they would gladly learn,' " 59.

[26] Brichford, "University Archives: Relationships with Faculty," 178, 175–76. See also, Brichford, "Überheferungsbildung," 449, 453, 460.

[27] Potts, "College Archives as Windows on American Society," 93; Veysey, "A Scholar's View of University Archives," 147.

[28] When respondents provided explanations or other examples than those listed by me, the number of respondents who provided the same explanation or example is given in parentheses. Percentages for these are not given since other participants did not have them as a choice and the results would therefore be skewed. They are provided for your information.

holdings of a new or small collection (3); competition from other repositories for distinguished faculty's papers (1); and, to acquire content related to another collecting area, an example of which would be the papers of a faculty member in the sciences at a repository that collects in science and technology (8). Citing much the same reasons, two-thirds of respondents reported they actively solicit faculty papers. The remaining one third, however, do not actively solicit faculty papers at all because of a lack of staff, space, and time (4); their impression that these collections are underused for the amount of resources they require (2); a belief that the types of materials commonly found in faculty papers (reprints and offprints, drafts, and research notes) lack research value (2); an emphasis on administrative records (1); and the lack of a clear policy for determining what makes one faculty member more significant than another (1).

Of these 33.3 percent who do not solicit faculty papers, 25 percent accept all and 75 percent accept some when they are offered because of the information on university history they provide or the faculty member's prominence and contributions in his or her field. Respondents did not mention a desire to document faculty as a class for the influence they have on culture and intellectual life.

An issue related to the degree to which faculty papers are actively pursued or passively accepted is the criteria archivists or curators employ to decide which faculty members' papers to accept or solicit. Survey participants were given the criteria shown in Table 2 and asked to mark all that applied. They were also given the opportunity to list other determinants.

When the data were further analyzed to determine what combinations of these factors participants used, a more specific set of criteria emerged (see Table 3).

Considerations of the "fit" of the topic documented in the collection to a repository's other collecting areas proved to be the most used criteria, and "collection topic" is largely determined by and identified with the faculty member's research area. Other factors, such as an individual's contributions and service to the university (3) and the degree to which the papers offer a record of an undocumented department (1) or reflect the region, campus, or community (2) were also common considerations. Tenure was not the primary determinant in collection development decisions. Given the size of the tenured faculty at these schools, this finding is not surprising. Further, since one who is well

**Table 2** Criteria Used in Accepting or Soliciting Faculty Papers

| Criteria | # of Repositories (n=24) | % of Repositories |
|---|---|---|
| Appropriateness to repository's other collecting areas | 18 | 75.0% |
| Stature in field | 15 | 62.5% |
| Other | 9 | 37.5% |
| Tenured | 5 | 20.8% |

**Table 3** Combinations of Criteria

| Criteria | # of Repositories (n=24) | % of Repositories |
|---|---|---|
| Stature, appropriateness, and other only | 6 | 25.0% |
| Stature and appropriateness only | 4 | 16.7% |
| Appropriateness only | 4 | 16.7% |
| Tenured, stature, appropriateness only | 3 | 12.5% |
| Tenured only | 2 | 8.3% |
| Other only | 2 | 8.3% |
| Stature only | 1 | 4.2% |
| Stature and other only | 1 | 4.2% |
| Appropriateness and other only | 1 | 4.2% |

known and respected in his or her respective field is likely to have tenure, scholarly reputation effectively serves as a more stringent discriminating point.

These findings are analogous to Honhart's 1983 study identifying national or international reputation in one's discipline and service to the institution as two consistently cited appraisal criteria. The third he identified was faculty members' community involvement.[29] Many of these repositories are also charged with documenting local or regional history, and so acquiring papers relating to faculty members' community involvement was considered a way to add to that documentation. Beyond this however, the majority of those who indicated "appropriateness to other collecting areas" as a test primarily looked at the faculty member's area of research. An example of this was a Louisiana State University geology professor who researched Louisiana salt domes. As the manuscripts curator for the Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, which seeks to comprehensively document that geographic area's history, I would have sought his papers regardless of his association with the university. Respondents who chose this condition gave similar examples in their comments.

If the above-described elements drive archivists' and curators' decisions about what constitutes desirable materials, how do these practitioners identify individuals who might have such papers? The survey gave the methods listed in Table 4 and asked participants to mark all that applied. It also offered respondents the opportunity to provide other examples, and their responses included word-of-mouth from other faculty (3), targeting departments whose faculty were likely to conduct research in a topic the repository had identified as a collecting area (2), referrals from the library gifts processor or development officer (2), and an arrangement with the faculty development office to receive notification of retiring faculty (1). As in Honhart's survey, the individual archivist ultimately decides who are appropriate faculty members to approach for their papers.

[29] Honhart, "The Solicitation, Appraisal and Acquisition of Faculty Papers," 237–38.

**Table 4** Methods of Identifying Prospective Donors

| Method | # of Repositories (n=20) | % of Repositories |
|---|---|---|
| University newsletter and press releases | 13 | 65.0% |
| Monitor obituaries | 10 | 50.0% |
| Contact with departments | 9 | 45.0% |
| Other | 8 | 40.0% |
| No established method | 5 | 25.0% |

**Table 5** Genres Present in Faculty Papers (By category and ranked within)

| Function | Genre | % Indicating Genre Present in Held Faculty Papers (n=24) |
|---|---|---|
| TEACHING | Lecture notes | 95.8% |
| | Syllabi | 83.3% |
| RESEARCH | Research/subject files | 100.0% |
| | Drafts | 91.7% |
| | CV/Résumé | 91.7% |
| | Data | 87.5% |
| | Reprints | 70.8% |
| PROFESSIONAL SERVICE | Correspondence/ Memos | 100.0% |
| | Reports | 100.0% |
| | Minutes | 91.7% |
| | Conference materials | 75.0% |
| | Agendas | 70.8% |
| UNIVERSITY SERVICE | Correspondence/ Memos | 91.7% |
| | Reports | 87.5% |
| | Minutes | 75.0% |
| | Agendas | 66.7% |

Once a targeted faculty member has agreed to donate his or her papers, the task begins of determining which types of materials within those materials best provide the information sought. Archivists or curators often initiate this process as they box and transfer collections to the repository or by providing guidelines to faculty donors of what and what not to transfer themselves.[30] Exercising this judgment proceeds during the collection's processing as individual items or categories of materials are weeded.

It would seem that past archivists and curators "kept everything." Respondents were given a list of genres associated with teaching, research, and university and professional service and asked which were found among the faculty papers at their repositories (see Tables 5 and 6). With the exception of meeting agendas from both university and professional service and research

[30] An example of these guidelines can be seen at <http://www.lib.iastate.edu/spcl/arch/guidelines/faculty.html> (1 March 2003).

**Table 6** Formats Present in Faculty Papers (Ranked overall)

| Genre | % Indicating Genre Present in Held Faculty Papers (n=24) |
|---|---|
| Research—Research/Subject files | 100.0% |
| Professional—Correspondence/Memos | 100.0% |
| Professional—Reports | 100.0% |
| Teaching—Lecture notes | 95.8% |
| Research—Drafts | 91.7% |
| CV/Résumé | 91.7% |
| Professional—Minutes | 91.7% |
| University—Correspondence/Memos | 91.7% |
| Research—Data | 87.5% |
| University—Reports | 87.5% |
| Teaching—Syllabi | 83.3% |
| University—Minutes | 75.0% |
| Professional—Conference materials | 75.0% |
| Research—Reprints | 70.8% |
| Professional—Agendas | 70.8% |
| University—Agendas | 66.7% |

reprints, each type is present at over three-fourths of participating repositories, with research/subject files and professional service correspondence and reports found at all of them.

Participants were also asked to provide examples of other genres, both within the functional categories and in general. Six indicated the presence of unlisted materials for teaching, with the following cited by one repository each: grade books, student work (exams, papers, etc.), photographic materials (including slides), course development notes, course outlines, correspondence with students, videos of lectures, awards, and visual aids such as specimens. In the area of research, one respondent added scholarly correspondence, and another, field recordings. Photographic materials related to the university were cited by three repositories, and university audiovisual recordings by one. Though three indicated their collections contained additional forms of materials pertaining to professional service, they did not give examples. Seven wrote they also had general "other" genres, including photographic materials (5), scrapbooks (1), memorabilia (1), clippings (1), audiovisual recordings (1), personal papers such as diaries and correspondence with family and friends (3), postcards (1), and posters (1).

While responses to this question provide general information about what is found in faculty papers, the more helpful and relevant question for practitioners is, What are these archivists and curators currently retaining from newly acquired (or newly processed) collections and why? To address this point, respondents were given the same choices of genres as in the previous question and asked to mark all that applied (see Tables 7–10). They also were asked to

**Table 7** Genres Retained in Newly Acquired and Newly Processed Collections for Teaching

| Genre | % Indicating Genre Retained in Newly Acquired/Newly Processed Collections (n=24) |
|---|---|
| Lecture notes | 87.5% |
| Syllabi | 79.2% |

list any other genres that they accepted and retained.[31] Responses are reported below, as each category is considered in turn. Types of materials not specific to teaching, research, or service that were also cited include the following: photographs (4), scrapbooks (2), artifacts or memorabilia (2), personal papers such as memoirs, diaries, appointment calendars, and correspondence (3), and audiovisual recordings of interviews, speeches, or lectures (1).

Respondents reported that these kinds of materials, and those examined and reported below, effectively document the teaching, research, and service missions of their universities (11), as well as institutional history (3), thus explaining collection and retention of them. Others wrote that their understanding of the pattern of use of certain genres drove their appraisal decisions (2) or that they erred on the side of caution and preservation (2). Four evinced a desire to document "the whole person." At the same time, availability of information elsewhere, as in the case of reprints and some professional and university service files (7) and the perception that faculty papers are not used enough to warrant their collection, processing, and administration (3) were cited as reasons not to accept or retain faculty papers.

### *Teaching*

Undoubtedly, teaching is the most obvious part of faculty members' job responsibilities, though institutions of higher learning weigh this aspect of faculty's work differently depending on their mission. Instruction is the most readily apparent activity that accomplishes what Samuels has termed the university's function of conveying knowledge, and she advocates the retention of reading lists, syllabi, tests, and lectures to document this activity.[32] Miriam Crawford contends such materials warrant preservation because they illustrate

[31] My questions on appraisal were targeted to identify which genres were deemed most valuable for documenting research, teaching, and professional and university service, and why, regardless of their physical format and realizing that professors increasingly use technology in all their teaching, research, and communication. Additionally, though this question about genre and follow-ups to it were included in the collection development section, responses actually represented appraisal decisions made both at the time of acquisition and while a collection was being processed, whether it was recently acquired or part of a backlog.

[32] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 65.

teaching methods used during a particular period of an institution's history.[33] Mary Janzen similarly argues for their significance in documenting the history of pedagogy, as well as the development of new and important ideas in a discipline.[34] Frances Fournier believes instructional materials also contribute to the history of a discipline by illustrating specific areas stressed at certain times in instruction. They also, she contends, show accepted academic standards.[35] The vast majority of respondents, 87.5 percent, collects lecture notes and 79.2 percent collects syllabi. Correspondence with former students (3), reading lists (2), recordings of classes (2), research proposals with faculty comments (1), letters of recommendation or related/similar correspondence (1), correspondence about students with administrators or family members (1), course development notes and outlines (1), and student work (1) were all also cited. Few provided their reasons for acquiring these materials, beyond the general reasons given above; two repositories identified them as ways to document student life and faculty interaction with students. Respondents who do not retain such materials indicated they did not because they employed "easier" ways of documenting curricular matters (1) or had other mechanisms of collecting syllabi (2). Another consideration was privacy in regard to student work and performance (1).[36]

#### *Research*

At research universities such as those represented in this survey, research materials are likely to comprise a large portion of faculty papers. The very nature of research—the research process and the dissemination of results—raises issues of documentation and appraisal. As Samuels points out, conceptualizing and formulating research plans often occur in informal conversations or in a moment of inspiration; consequently, that process is less likely to be as well documented as the execution and results of the research itself. Further,

[33] Crawford, "Interpreting the University Archives to the Librarian," 63.

[34] Janzen, "Pruning the Groves of Academe," 35.

[35] Fournier, " 'For they would gladly learn,' " 60.

[36] Respondents provided their own reasons for or against a given genre, and I did not provide a list of possible reasons from which to choose. Nevertheless, given university archivists' familiarity with the Buckley Amendment, it was surprising that only one respondent mentioned a concern about student privacy and three volunteered they collected such student-related genres as letters of recommendation, student work, and correspondence with parents and administrators about students. Most literature about student privacy is in the context of university records such as transcripts and applications, but it can still be applicable to student records found in faculty papers. See Marjorie Rabe Barritt, "The Appraisal of Personally Identifiable Student Records," *American Archivist* 49 (Summer 1986): 263–75; Mark A. Greene, "Developing a Research Access Policy for Student Records: A Case Study at Carleton College," *American Archivist* 50 (Fall 1987): 570–90; Charles Elston, "University Student Records: Research Use, Privacy Rights, and the Buckley Law," *Midwestern Archivist* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1976): 16–32.

**Table 8** Formats Retained in Newly Acquired and Newly Processed Collections for Research

| Genre | % Indicating Genre Retained in Newly Acquired/Newly Processed Collections (n=24) |
|---|---|
| Research/subject files | 95.8% |
| CV/Résumé | 91.6% |
| Data | 79.2% |
| Drafts | 79.2% |
| Reprints | 41.7% |

she observes, the collaborative nature of much of today's research means both that the records generated may be geographically dispersed and the funding of such ventures by government or other outside agencies or corporations can raise issues of ownership. Additionally, research can result in records comprised of multiple formats that may be fragile or require special equipment to read or preserve.[37] Finally, grant-funded research presents the need to document research not only for its results but also for accountability to the granting agency and evidence.[38]

It should not be surprising then that the question of what to retain to document faculty's research and why elicited more response than any other. In addition to the genres supplied on the survey and shown in Table 8, respondents indicated they sought and kept the following to document this university function: correspondence with colleagues (3), bibliographies (2), talks, speeches, and addresses (2), field recordings (1), grant proposals and final reports (1), research proposals (1), photographs (1), interviews (1), and lab notebooks (1).

With publications serving as an important measure of faculty performance in the publish-or-perish environment of academia, the question of whether it is necessary to preserve the files, drafts, and data that produced a publication arises, since the research is preserved in the published report.[39] A majority, fifteen of twenty-four, or 62.5 percent, responded that such research files should be preserved. An additional 29.2 percent (7 of 24) neither agreed nor disagreed with this thinking but emphasized the decision should be made on a case-by-case basis. Those who advocated retention argued that such materials show the research process, including the researcher's thinking, and methodology (7), provide a way to collect what the library lacks in its collection of published works (1), or document significant changes in thinking within a discipline (1). Additionally,

[37] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 110–12.

[38] K. J. Barata, "Managing Intellectual Assets: The Identification, Capture, and Maintenance of Federally-Sponsored Scientific Research," *Archival Issues* 21, no. 2 (1996): 130. Though Barata advocates establishing records management programs separate from libraries and archives to manage these "intellectual assets," the records she suggests retaining are often found in research faculty's papers.

[39] This emphasis reflects the attitude faculty members have about their papers, according to Fournier, " 'For they would gladly teach and gladly learn,' " 163; Barata, "Managing Intellectual Assets," 136.

they cited other uses for the data collected during research (5) and the fact that not all data make it into the publication (3). Indeed, when responses to this question are viewed in combination with the others about what to retain to document research and why, the biggest debate seems to center around data, which 79.2 percent retain (see Table 8). As one respondent put it, "Most of what we collect today is records related to research that has some enduring historical value. For example, anthropological, sociological, biological, and zoological studies often generate unpublished data that transcend the original intent of the research. In a sense, the research serves as an archive of information on a particular culture, ecosystem, or animal species at a given point of time."[40]

Samuels makes a similar argument about data. Observational data, primarily the fodder for research in the physical, biological, and some social sciences, is time-bound and unrepeatable. As such, it can serve as a snapshot of natural phenomenon and have historical use in the future. She also contends that the data and its future users are better served by its being deposited in a subject-appropriate repository.[41] Conversely, experimental data is repeatable because it is the product of an experiment whose parameters and methods can be documented and repeated. Similarly, the data used in research such as historical and literary study—primary documents and texts—can be revisited and reviewed. In Samuels's estimation, such data rarely should be preserved in their entirety. As responses to question 7 show (Tables 3 and 4), however, the appropriateness of such data to a repository's collecting areas is a prime appraisal criterion. The 20.8 percent who do not accept data cite privacy concerns (2),[42] issues of preserving data in fragile media or maintaining the equipment necessary to access the data therein (1), or its geographically dispersed and incomplete nature (1).

Samuels also argues that drafts rarely provide "evidence of the substantive intellectual process."[43] According to Mary Janzen, they are seldom consulted, and she advises considering their degree of order and completeness when making retention decisions.[44] Nevertheless, a majority of respondents, 79.2 percent,[45]

[40] Respondent #19. Direct quotes from respondents will be identified by the unique number assigned to each survey participant.

[41] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 124–25. For more on faculty papers in subject repositories, see Jane Wolff, "Faculty Papers and Special-Subject Repositories." For more on appraisal decisions about observational and experimental data, see Paul Lewison, "Toward Accessioning Standards—Research Records," *American Archivist* 23 (July 1960): 297–309.

[42] As with concerns about student privacy, it was also unexpected that more respondents did not indicate confidentiality and privacy considerations in relation to data from experiments in which humans are subjects. The issue was not specifically addressed by the survey. Diane Kaplan offers an excellent case study of implementing an access policy for such records in "The Stanley Milgram Papers: A Case Study on Appraisal of and Access to Confidential Data Files," *American Archivist* 59 (Summer 1996): 288–97.

[43] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 132.

[44] Janzen, "Pruning the Groves of Academe," 36.

[45] See Table 8.

**Table 9** Genres Retained in Newly Acquired and Newly Processed Collections for Professional Service

| Genre | % Indicating Genre Retained in Newly Acquired/Newly Processed Collections (n=24) |
|---|---|
| Correspondence/ Memos | 91.7% |
| Reports | 87.5% |
| Minutes | 79.2% |
| Agendas | 62.5% |
| Conference materials | 50.0% |

retains drafts. Those who explained this decision believe drafts do show the author's thought and creative processes (7), and they also consider the significance of the work (2). Three repositories give special consideration to drafts of literary manuscripts, which were deemed to be more illustrative of the creative process.

Another category of research file—reprints and other near-print items—is often amassed by faculty members. Today, that information is easily available elsewhere through interlibrary loan and document delivery, and most respondents cited this availability as justification for not retaining such files with faculty papers. As a compromise, Honhart advocated compiling a bibliography of those items removed.[46] A related question inquired how printed volumes or personal libraries given with the papers are handled, and the results were as follows (n=24): nineteen (79.2%) send the volumes to the library's book collection (though two of those also retain offprints and reprints with the faculty papers); one (4.2%) retains the library as a named collection; and four (16.7%) indicated their practice varied by collection.

### *Professional Service*

As officers, committee members, and reviewers, faculty provide service to their respective disciplines and professional organizations. Such participation speaks to a faculty member's standing and stature in his or her field. Documentation of that participation and standing is found in professional correspondence, reports, and minutes. Responses in this survey reflect this thinking and emphasis in both their number and content. However, two respondents volunteered that the organizations should have the copy of record of reports, minutes, agendas, and conference materials, so unless the materials in a faculty member's papers specifically relate to his or her service, they are considered strong candidates for weeding. Further, the promotional rather than substantive

[46] Honhart, "The Solicitation, Appraisal and Acquisition of Faculty Papers," 124.

nature of conference materials also warranted their removal for one repository, if significant marginalia and notes were not present.

### *University Service*

Through their university service, primarily on committees, faculty members sustain their respective institutions by recruiting and advancing faculty, developing curricula and university academic policies, participating in internal governance, and recruiting graduate students.[47] This participation is documented through correspondence, reports, minutes, and agendas, all of which are accepted or retained by a majority of respondents (see Table 10). Additional university-related materials that are accepted or retained include photographs and video recordings (1), as well as general university history (1), with documenting "radical" faculty members' activities given as an example.

**Table 10** Formats Retained in Newly Acquired and Newly Processed Collections for University Service

| Genre | % Indicating Genre Retained in Newly Acquired/Newly Processed Collections (n=24) |
|---|---|
| Correspondence/ Memos | 87.5% |
| Reports | 79.2% |
| Minutes | 70.8% |
| Agendas | 62.5% |

A primary consideration for retention expressed by respondents was whether the university service papers of a faculty member duplicate what is held in the official records. At the same time, as stated earlier, documenting university history is a chief reason archivists gave for accepting faculty papers, and, as Brichford argues, they give a view of policy decisions not always captured in the official record.[48] Another author contends that additional documentation of university activities, such as that provided by faculty papers, provides evidence of both the individuals involved in decision making and the corporate culture of an institution.[49]

It should not be surprising then that no clear cut answers emerged in response to the question, "How does your institution handle the argument made by some archivists that a university function or activity of which a faculty member was a part is documented in the records of the university in the university archives, so preserving his or her records of that activity is not neces-

[47] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 154; Fournier, " 'For they would gladly teach,' " 62

[48] Brichford, "University Archives: Relationships with Faculty," 178.

[49] Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, 154. See also Straus, "College and University Archives," 432.

sary?" Eight of twenty-four (33.3%) disagreed with "some archivists," citing the lack of official university records programs to collect committee records (4) and the additional information faculty papers could provide to enhance the official record (3). On the other hand, four of twenty-four (16.7%) agreed that retaining such materials in faculty papers was not necessary if the same information is found in university records. The remaining twelve participants indicated they handled this issue in both ways. In general, they agreed with the statement but keep duplicates in faculty papers when they are heavily annotated, thereby enhancing the official record (3); when the individual's role in the committee was significant and could be delineated from the committee itself (3); or when the individual's papers would make no sense without them (1). Additionally, if the faculty member's papers were not duplicates but rather represented the most complete set of committee records, they were either retained in his or her papers with appropriate cross-references (2) or removed to the appropriate record group (4).

One can find an argument advocating the preservation of almost any of the genres listed in Tables 7–10 above in either the literature or this survey. However, the practicalities of the restrictions of space, funding, and staff resources, as well as the volume of modern collections, require some decisions about what to accept and keep in faculty papers.

Research/subject files are apparently considered the most important aspect of faculty papers, with 95.8 percent of respondents retaining them. Professional correspondence and CVs/resumes each scored 91.7 percent. Professional reports, lecture notes, and university correspondence grouped together at 87.5 percent. Research drafts and data, professional minutes, university reports, and syllabi were reported evenly at 79.2 percent. These were followed by university minutes (70.8%), professional and university agendas (both 62.5%), professional conference materials (50%), and research reprints (41.7%). To determine which category or function is better documented, and hence, one could conclude, deemed most important to document, the percentages for each category's genres were averaged: teaching (83.4%), research (77.5%), university service (75%), and professional service (74.2%). If the reprints, which were an outlier at 41.7 percent, are excluded for research, that category's average increases to 86.5 percent. One would expect research to be the primary focus at research universities.

Respondents' reports of what was in their existing collections of faculty papers versus what they presently acquire or retain in newly obtained or newly processed collections can also serve as in indicator of whether archivists who currently have responsibility for acquiring and appraising faculty papers have become more selective than their forebears. One would expect that they have become more discriminating, given the American archival profession's attempts to develop appraisal theory that reconciles the expanding documentary

**Table 11** Comparison of Retention of Individual Genres in Previously Held and Newly Acquired or Processed Collections, Ranked According to Percentage Retained in Newly Acquired or Processed Collections

| Genre | % Indicating Retained in New (n=24) | % Indicating Present in Held Faculty Papers (n=24) | % Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| Research—Research/Subject files | 95.8% | 100.0% | –4.2% |
| Professional—Correspondence/Memos | 91.7% | 100.0% | –8.3% |
| Research—CV/Résumé | 91.7% | 91.7% | 0.0% |
| Professional—Reports | 87.5% | 100.0% | –13.5% |
| Teaching—Lecture notes | 87.5% | 95.8% | –13.5% |
| University—Correspondence/Memos | 87.5% | 91.7% | –4.2% |
| Research—Drafts | 79.2% | 91.7% | –12.5% |
| Professional—Minutes | 79.2% | 91.7% | –12.5% |
| Research—Data | 79.2% | 87.5% | –8.3% |
| University—Reports | 79.2% | 87.5% | –8.3% |
| Teaching—Syllabi | 79.2% | 83.3% | –4.1% |
| University—Minutes | 70.8% | 75.0% | –4.2% |
| Professional—Agendas | 62.5% | 70.8% | –8.3% |
| University—Agendas | 62.5% | 66.7% | –4.2% |
| Professional—Conference materials | 50.0% | 75.0% | –25.0% |
| Research—Reprints | 41.7% | 70.8% | –29.1% |

universe with shrinking resources and recognizes that bulky collections to which thoughtful appraisal and selection criteria have been applied are eminently more usable and relevant.[50]

At first glance, the general decline in the percentage of repositories that acquire or retain specific genres in newly acquired or processed collections versus the percentage of repositories that indicated the same type of material was present in its previously held faculty papers (see Tables 11 and 12) gives the impression that archivists and curators have put that appraisal theory into practice. However, when the data are analyzed using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient, that impression is shown to be false.[51] The test found a 0.878839 correlation between the two data sets, which indicates they bear a very

[50] On the evolution of appraisal theory from one grounded in the assumption that records of value are scarce to one that recognizes and emphasizes that there is an overabundance of records, see, among others, the following: Richard Cox, "The Documentation Strategy and Archival Appraisal Principles: A Different Perspective," *Archivaria* 38 (Fall 1994): 11–36; Timothy Ericson, "At the 'rim of creative dissatisfaction': Archivists and Acquisition Development," *Archivaria* 33 (Winter 1991–1992): 66–77; Mark Greene, "The Surest Proof: A Utilitarian Approach to Appraisal," *Archivaria* 45 (Spring 1998): 127–69; Helen Willa Samuels, "Who Controls the Past?" *American Archivist* 49 (Spring 1986): 109–24; Ole Kolsrud "The Evolution of Basic Appraisal Principles—Some Comparative Observations," *American Archivist* 55 (Winter 1992): 26–35. For commentary on and discussion of this paradigm shift, see Luciana Duranti, "The Concept of Appraisal and Archival Theory," *American Archivist* 57 (Spring 1994): 328–44; Frank Boles and Mark A. Greene, "Et Tu Schellenberg? Thoughts on the Dagger of American Appraisal Theory," *American Archivist* 59 (Summer 1996): 298–311.

[51] The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient measures the extent of a linear relationship between two data sets.

**Table 12** Percent Change in Retention of Individual Formats in Previously Held and Newly Acquired or Processed Collections, Ranked

| Genre | % Change |
|---|---|
| Research—CV/Résumé | 0.0% |
| Teaching—Syllabi | –4.1% |
| Research—Research/Subject files | –4.2% |
| University—Correspondence/Memos | –4.2% |
| University—Minutes | –4.2% |
| University—Agendas | –4.2% |
| Professional—Correspondence/Memos | –8.3% |
| Research—Data | –8.3% |
| University—Reports | –8.3% |
| Professional—Agendas | –8.3% |
| Research—Drafts | –12.5% |
| Professional—Minutes | –12.5% |
| Professional—Reports | –13.5% |
| Teaching—Lecture notes | –13.5% |
| Professional—Conference materials | –25.0% |
| Research—Reprints | –29.1% |

strong, direct relationship; in other words, there was little meaningful change between what was kept in the past and what is presently retained.

One possible explanation of this apparent continuity in appraisal decisions is that practitioners continue to adhere to the older paradigm of appraisal theory, which assumes a scarcity of records, instead of putting into practice current theory, which assumes or emphasizes an abundance of materials. For example, even though research reprints showed the greatest decline in retention in this sample, the rate at which they are kept is still questionable. Given the accessibility of those articles through interlibrary loan and document delivery, retaining them as part of a faculty member's papers is unnecessary. This explanation is not to say, however, that not changing is "bad" in all instances. Rather, it is to realize that some genres duplicate information available elsewhere (reprints, conference materials, minutes, agendas) or offer little insight into the research process (drafts of nonfiction, repeatable data), and therefore are candidates for removal. Such considerations are necessary, because, as other authors have noted, the abundance of modern documentation requires active and discriminating selection and appraisal.[52]

### *Processing*

Processing encompasses the range of activities performed to arrange, describe, and preserve a body of archival materials and begins with the

[52] See note 50.

**Table 13** Processing Priority Assigned to Faculty Papers

| Priority Level | Number (n=23) | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Low | 3 | 13.0% |
| Medium | 12 | 52.2% |
| High | 3 | 13.0% |
| Other | 5 | 21.7% |

archivist's first screening of a collection. Decisions about which genres to accept or retain in those early stages represent a first pass in selection, and the archivist acquires a sense of the collection's arrangement scheme, if one exists, or what an intelligent and appropriate arrangement would be. At the same time, that firsthand experience with the collection informs the priority the collection is given in the processing queue. Considerations of donor stipulations, physical condition, availability of resources, competing priorities, and the perceived value to researchers affect that judgment. To determine whether, as a class, faculty papers are treated any differently in terms of processing than other manuscript collections or record groups, respondents were asked to rate the level of priority for processing they assign faculty papers, in general, compared to their other holdings.

Those whose answers are categorized as "other" volunteered that all collections are processed in the order they are received (1) and that processing priority for faculty papers varies by collection and does not differ from how the priority of other, nonfaculty materials are determined (4).

A related question is What form of finding aid is generally ultimately produced for faculty papers? As Megan Floyd Desnoyers suggests, establishing and meeting an ideal standard level of processing is not feasible given growing backlogs, the size and volume of contemporary collections, and limited archival budgets, and, therefore, practitioners should look at processing as a "range of choices along a continuum for each of the four essential processing activities: arrangement, preservation, description, and screening."[53] This survey question was most concerned with description. Four levels of description were identified: an accession description only; a container list only; a partial inventory comprised of a biographical/historical note, a scope and content note, and a container list; and a full inventory, which was defined as containing the elements of a partial inventory plus series descriptions and index terms. Keeping Desnoyers's argument in mind, each collection should be evaluated individually for the relative merits and necessity of one level of finding aid over another. This part of the survey was meant, however, to discover what, if any, patterns, existed for faculty papers as a category.

[53] Megan Floyd Desnoyers, "When Is a Collection Processed?" in *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings on Archival Theory and Practice*, ed. Maygene F. Daniels and Timothy Walch (Washington, D.C.: National Archives Trust Fund Board, 1984), 310–11.

**Table 14** Form of Finding Aid

| Form of Finding Aid | Number (n=24) | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Full | 14 | 58.3% |
| Partial | 2 | 8.3% |
| Container list only | 1 | 4.2% |
| Accession information only | 0 | 0.0% |
| Other | 7 | 29.2% |

Of those who indicated "other" and provided explanation, one indicated only that a Web summary is created, and five said that the form of finding aid varied by collection.[54] More significantly, at only two of twenty-four repositories (8.3%) did this form or level of description differ from that ultimately produced for other collections or record groups. In one instance, faculty papers as a category always receive full inventories, whereas other collections may only receive a container list. The other repository reported the use of collections of faculty papers as teaching materials for graduate and practicum students and that their work results in only a Web summary. Further, at the 79.2 percent (19 of 24) repositories that create MARC records as part of their description activities, all create them for faculty papers.

**Table 15** Processing Priority and Form of Finding Aid

| Priority | Full | Partial | Container List Only | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low (3 of 23, 13%) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Medium (12 of 23, 52.2%) | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| High (3 of 23, 13%) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other (5 of 23, 21.7%) | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

Does the form of finding aid produced bear any correlation to the processing priority assigned to faculty papers? As Table 15 shows, a consistent majority of those who assigned high (66.7%), medium (66.7%), or an "other" (60%) processing priority produced full finding aids, while only for the lowest priority did a majority (66.7%) provide less than a full inventory. Even of the latter, one stipulated that the finding aid varied by collection, so a full inventory was a possibility.

#### *Use*

As stated earlier, some archivists expressed their perception that faculty papers are little used, leaving them reluctant to expend resources to collect and

[54] It is important to note that such a caveat does not imply a less-full description is provided. Rather, "varying by collection" entails all of the possibilities listed, which includes a full inventory.

**Table 16** Comparative Use of Faculty Papers to Nonfaculty Papers and Records

| Impressions Comparative Use | From Statistics (n=13) | From Impressions (n=10) | Statistics Combined (n=24)[55] |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lower | 30.8% (4) | 50.0% (5) | 37.5% (9) |
| Higher | 7.7% (1) | 0.0% (0) | 4.2% (1) |
| Same | 61.5% (8) | 50.0% (5) | 58.3% (14) |

process these collections. This section of the survey sought to explore that impression and to identify who uses faculty papers and for what purposes. Respondents were asked to rate how the frequency of use of faculty papers at their respective repositories compared with that of their other holdings. They were also asked to indicate whether their answers were based on statistics or their impressions.

Respondents who based their response on impressions split evenly between lower and the same use, with none believing faculty papers receive higher use than nonfaculty papers. The experience of those who based their responses on statistics differs, however. Only 30.8 percent of them finds use to be lower, a higher percentage (61.5%) finds it to be the same, and one (7.7%) finds it higher. Without having impressions versus statistics for every repository, of course, one cannot say how accurate archivists' perceptions of use versus actual use are. The responses do show, however, that the impression exists that faculty papers receive less use, and, as respondents have expressed, that influences their decisions about acquisition and appraisal of faculty papers.

Regardless of how their amount of use compares with other collections, faculty papers are used, and the survey sought to identify by whom. Such information, as well as for what the collections are used, which is also discussed below, would be helpful in identifying which types of materials to retain or accept in collections. Respondents were given various user groups/patron categories and asked to mark all that applied. Table 17 records those results, showing use by patron category ranked by the combination of responses based on statistics and impressions.[56]

Reported other users of faculty papers are lawyers (1), historians (1), and "anyone" (1). Not surprisingly, scholars in related fields, other faculty members, and graduate students comprise the heaviest users of faculty papers. Given these patrons' academic bent, it logically follows that faculty papers are most often

[55] All twenty-four respondents answered this question, but one did not indicate the bases for his/her answer that use was the same, so it was only included in the combined total.

[56] The numbers in parentheses in the "From Statistics," "From Impressions," and "From Statistics and Impressions" columns represent that patron category's ranking within that individual group. In instances where reported use among patron categories was equal, the rank is given as the same, hence there are multiple number ones, number twos, etc. in a given column.

**Table 17** Use by User Group, Ranked by Combination of Statistics and Impressions

| User Group/Patron Category | From Statistics (n=10) | From Impressions (n=11) | From Statistics and Impressions[57] (n=2) | Statistics and Impressions Combined (n=23) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scholars in same or related fields | 100.0% (1) | 100.0% (1) | 100.0% (1) | 100.0% (1) |
| Other faculty members at the same institution | 80.0% (3) | 90.9% (2) | 100.0% (1) | 87.0% (2) |
| Graduate students | 90.0% (2) | 81.8% (3) | 100.0% (1) | 87.0% (2) |
| Professionals in related field | 70.0% (4) | 72.7% (4) | 50.0% (2) | 69.6% (3) |
| Undergraduate students | 70.0% (4) | 54.5% (6) | 50.0% (2) | 60.9% (4) |
| Documentary makers | 60.0% (5) | 36.4% (7) | 50.0% (2) | 56.5% (5) |
| General public | 40.0% (6) | 63.6% (5) | 50.0% (2) | 52.2% (6) |
| Other | 10.0% (7) | 18.2% (8) | 50.0% (2) | 13.0% (7) |

**Table 18** Type of Use, Ranked by Combination of Statistics and Impressions

| Type of use | From Statistics (n=7) | From Impressions (n=12) | From Statistics and Impressions[59] (n=3) | Statistics and Impressions Combined (n=23) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| New research | 85.7% (1) | 91.7% (1) | 100.0% (1) | 91.3% (1) |
| University history | 85.7% (1) | 91.7% (1) | 100.0% (1) | 91.3% (1) |
| Exhibitions | 85.7% (1) | 91.7% (1) | 66.7% (2) | 87.0% (2) |
| Student papers | 71.4% (2) | 83.3% (2) | 66.7% (2) | 78.3% (3) |
| Honorary compilations | 42.9% (3) | 33.3% (3) | 100.0% (1) | 43.5% (4) |
| Other | 14.3% (4) | 16.7% (4) | 0.0% (3) | 13.0% (5) |

used for new research, as Table 18 shows.[58] (As before, respondents were given several choices of types of projects for which faculty papers might be used and asked to mark all that applied.) Yet, equal number of respondents found that faculty collections were used for university history. Because participants had given emphasis on documenting university history as a reason to collect faculty papers, their use in university history-related projects is not surprising. Other

[57] Two repositories indicated their responses were based on both statistics and impressions. Rather than counting them twice in both statistics and impressions, they are treated separately. "Statistics and Impressions Combined" in the far right column combines all repositories' responses, regardless of their basis and includes the two repositories.

[58] As with Table 13, Table 14 is ranked by the combination of responses based on statistics and impressions, and the numbers in parentheses in the "From Statistics," "From Impressions," and "From Statistics and Impressions" columns represent the ranking within that individual group of each type of use. As before, in instances where reported use among patron categories was equal, the rank is given as the same.

[59] Three repositories indicated their responses were based on both statistics and impressions. Rather than counting them twice in both statistics and impressions, they are treated separately. "Statistics and Impressions Combined" in the far right column combines all repositories' responses, regardless of their bases and includes the three repositories. Also included in that count is the one respondent who did not indicate the basis of his or her answer. Hence the answer was only included in the combined total and why n=23 and not 22.

types of use reported by participants are articles in alumni/faculty publications (1), litigation over copyright infringement, product liability, and negligence (1), documentaries (1), and Web pages (1).

Why study which collections are being used, by whom, and for what? As stated earlier, some archivists surveyed expressed their belief that faculty papers receive less use than their other collections, a perception that influences their decisions about pursuing and accepting similar materials, prioritizing collections for processing, and screening materials within collections for retention. A sampling of comments illustrates this thinking:

> They are largely unused materials, and I am not willing to commit my limited resources to soliciting materials that even when processed and described in detail will not likely ever be used. (Respondent 21)

> [We] don't solicit [faculty papers because it] requires enormous investment of staff time and resulting records are among the least heavily used. (Respondent 4)

At the same time, others found faculty papers to be useful in responding to patrons' needs, or anticipate that they will be, and this has influenced them to pursue, acquire, and make available those materials:

> They are very useful and worth collecting here, but this may not be universal. (Respondent 12)

> It is our responsibility to build these collections and document this history now, so that a record will be available for future research. I think some of the collections may not be consulted for many years, but they all have tremendous potential. (Respondent 14)

> A very important component of our archives. They contain buried treasures of information . . . faculty papers will be particularly useful in the documentation of our university's history. (Respondent 20)

Indeed, one author who has surveyed the professional literature about the role use plays in archival enterprise has identified the theme that use is the ultimate reason for keeping archives.[60] It would seem that those surveyed here apply their knowledge of and experience with the use of faculty papers, as well as the use anticipate faculty papers will receive, to formulate their approach to them. Some archivists, however, are uncomfortable with the idea of assigning value based on use, and indeed, considering use in this way begs the question of whether past use, either of a specific collection or type of collection, such as

[60] William J. Jackson, "The 80/20 Archives: A Study of Use and Its Implications," *Archival Issues* 22, no. 2 (1997): 133–34.

faculty papers, is an indicator of future use.[61] Of course use, whether anticipated or past use of similar collections, is just one factor to consider in appraisal decisions. One respondent's comments point to what faculty papers offer in the way of documentation of institutional mission, regardless of the amount of use they receive or the administrative burden they pose: "Although faculty papers are often time-consuming to process, complex to administer, and receive less use than other parts of the Archives holdings, they are extremely important to collect because they document the core mission of a large academic institution such as [this one]—teaching and research—in a way that the archival records of the University can not."[62]

Indeed, other factors, among many to examine in considering faculty papers, or any collection, are whether the information is duplicated elsewhere, how the collection meets the repository's mission (or documents that of its parent institution) and fulfills its collection development policy, and whether the repository can service the collection in terms of necessary equipment and staff support and expertise.[63]

Additional criteria that appraisal theorists have identified are the value of the information, costs of retention, and implications of appraisal recommendation or decisions. These are further broken down as follows: value of the information—content, use (current and potential, as well as limitations on), relationship to other documentation, and functional characteristics (position in organization of creator and unit, unit activities, and the record's original purpose); costs of retention—cost of acquisition, processing, preservation or conservation, storage, and servicing for reference purposes; and implications of appraisal recommendation for external relations and internal policies.[64]

## Conclusion

Despite checklists, black boxes, and collection development policies, there is neither an accepted, professionwide formula for evaluating collections, nor a common and interoperable set of definitions or taxonomy for evaluating how a collection would measure up if such a formula existed, as previous researchers of appraisal practice have found.[65] Such decisions ultimately come down to the

[61] See Karen Benedict, "Invitation to a Bonfire: Reappraisal and Deaccessioning of Records as Collection Management Tools in an Archives—A Reply to Leonard Rapport," *American Archivist* 47 (Winter 1984): 47–48.

[62] Respondent #7. Identifying information has been removed from quotations and statistics.

[63] Taken from "Appraisal Checklist," in Faye Phillips, *Local History Collections in Libraries* (Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1994), 147–49. See the checklist for additional factors.

[64] Frank Boles in association with Julia Marks Young, *Archival Appraisal* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, 1991): 20–23.

[65] Boles and Young, *Archival Appraisal*, 18–19.

educated and professional judgment of the individual archivist or curator. In the case of faculty papers, as studied in this survey, that certainly proved to be the case. Repeatedly, participants wrote that their decisions about faculty papers, from choosing whom to solicit, to appraisal and processing decisions, were largely made on a case-by-case basis. Further, their answers often revealed inconsistencies in both their thinking and practice regarding faculty papers. For example, twelve repositories that accept and/or solicit faculty papers, half of the respondents, reported that they did so to document the university's history. On the other hand, eight of those same twelve repositories reported judging whom to solicit or accept based on the appropriateness of his or her papers to other collecting areas. Additionally, one would expect that the percentage of respondents who disagreed with the statement that because a faculty member's published research is preserved and available in its published form, preserving the files, drafts, and data that produced the publication is not necessary, to be roughly equal to the percentage of repositories that reported retaining data, drafts, and files. This was not the case. Though 62.5 percent disagreed with the above statement, 79.2 percent reported that they retain data and drafts, a difference of 16.7 percent.

Perhaps this disconnect between opinion and practice is evidence of archivists' continued adherence to an older paradigm of appraisal theory that assumes a scarcity of records, instead of putting into practice current theory, which assumes or emphasizes an abundance of materials, thus requiring active and discriminating selection and appraisal. A particularly illustrative example of this tension is the fact that 42 percent of respondents' retain reprints, despite these research libraries' access to the effective interlibrary loan network and document delivery services. Additionally, data provided by respondents showed their selection decisions differed little from those made in the past. Given the lack of resources and space faced by many repositories and the size and volume of modern collections, archivists will be forced to reconsider their appraisal process and employ a theory that recognizes these limitations.

Indeed, participants acknowledged their lack of and need for a policy on faculty papers, and that also explains why they were often hesitant to make generalizations about their practice. The appropriate place and treatment of faculty papers is not even standardized across the profession. As the survey showed, some institutions view them as records appropriate for the university archives, while others treat them as personal papers properly suited to a manuscript repository. Nevertheless, commonalities among participants emerged. A majority of repositories both accepts and solicits collections, and documenting university history is the primary reason they do. Ultimately, respondents agreed that faculty papers should not be treated any differently than other collections in how they are appraised or processed. What is sought and retained in faculty papers is largely agreed upon. Research/subject files, vitas, drafts, and data;

lectures and class syllabi, professional correspondence, reports, and minutes; and university correspondence and reports are most widely accepted, retained, and valued. Among the three functions of faculty—research, instruction, and service—research is best documented, and, therefore, one concludes, considered the most significant. Additionally, a majority finds that use is equal to that of other types of collections. The appropriateness of topics in faculty papers to other collecting areas and the faculty member's stature in the field of the creator were agreed upon criteria for solicitation or acceptance of individual collections.

These commonalities have led to the following guidelines, which are now used when accepting, evaluating, and processing faculty papers at LSU. Only unique data, interviews, or field recordings that offer possibilities for reinterpretation are retained. Reprints and offprints are not kept; instead, a bibliography is created and appended to the collection's inventory. Drafts of nonfiction are only retained if they have significant and substantial annotations or the author received a very prestigious award for the work. Research files primarily containing photocopies of articles or documents in other repositories are discarded because they are available elsewhere. Only materials related directly to the faculty member's participation in or personal service to the profession or university are preserved. Collections that relate to some aspect of Louisiana or the Lower Mississippi Valley, beyond the connection to the state by virtue of the creators' employment at LSU, are more actively acquired and given a higher processing priority than faculty papers that do not.

Employing these content-oriented criteria makes some collection development decisions easier, but judging which faculty members' stature in their respective professions warrants the acquisition of his or her papers remains a subjective determination. Indeed, evaluating that stature is the point at which drawing conclusions across institutions seemed to become meaningless in the survey because of the subjectivity of individual archivists' perceptions and decisions. While having a professionwide, clear-cut prescription for handling faculty papers would make our jobs as those responsible for them easier, the institutional priorities, corporate cultures, subject strengths, user communities, and organizational missions of our respective repositories make a reliance on such a formula, if one existed, inappropriate. The practices of other, similar institutions can, however, offer guidelines and resources in formulating policies.

**Appendix A**

Dear Colleague,

I am conducting a survey of archivists at ARL Libraries and institutions previously designated as Research I universities under the Carnegie classification to ascertain what institutions similar to mine, Louisiana State University, are doing with the personal papers of their faculty members. Specifically, I'm interested in how you identify which faculty members to solicit, what criteria merit solicitation or acceptance of offered papers, which categories of materials you retain, how published materials are handled, and any information about how these collections are used. My purpose is two fold; there is a surprising dearth of literature on the subject, and I intend to write a policy on faculty collections for my institution so that we can make the most effective use of our resources.

This initial survey is to ascertain which repositories are collecting faculty papers, either through active solicitation or acceptance when they are offered, and to identify who at an individual repository is responsible for acquiring them. I will then send a follow-up survey in mid-April to those who respond to the first one. The second survey will be longer and more extensive, asking for specific information about how faculty papers are handled. If you are not the most appropriate person at your institution to answer these surveys, please forward this message to the person who is.

The first survey is below. Please copy it into a new email and reply. I have set up several groups and am sending this to multiple people at once, so please be sure to respond just to me. If you would prefer, you can mail it to me at the address below. Please respond by April 4.

Thank you for your consideration and your time. I hope you find that you can participate.

Sincerely,

Tara E. Zachary
Assistant Curator for Manuscripts Special Collections, LSU Libraries
Hill Memorial Library Baton Rouge, LA 70803
(phone) 225-578-6546

PRELIMINARY SURVEY, Faculty Papers

Name:

Title:

Collection:

Institution:

Address:

Email:

1. Does your repository contain personal papers of your institution's faculty?
   Yes _____ No _____

2. Is your repository presently soliciting or accepting donations of faculty papers?
   Yes _____ No _____

3. If you answered yes to #1 and/or #2, are they part of University Archives or Manuscripts? As part of your answer please give the overall administrative structure of your repository's archive and manuscript collections. (For example, the manuscript collections at LSU and the University Archives are each a separate unit within LSU Special Collections. One person is not responsible for both.)

4. Do you have a written policy regarding faculty papers?
   Yes _____ No _____

5. Do you have any established method of ascertaining how often faculty papers are used and/or how and what they are used for?

6. Are you willing to participate in the second phase of this survey?
   Yes _____ No _____

7. If you answered yes to #6, would you prefer to receive it in an email or in hard copy by regular mail?

   Please send me the next survey by email _____

   Please send me the next survey by regular mail_____

**Appendix B**

Dear colleague,

The second phase of the survey is below. Please return it to me by May 31. If you have any questions, please contact me at tzachar@lsu.edu or 225-578-6546.

Thanks for your assistance and overwhelming willingness to participate!

Tara E. Zachary
Assistant Curator for Manuscripts
Special Collections, LSU Libraries

**********

For all questions, please answer in terms of the administrative unit to which faculty papers belong, manuscript collection or University Archives. The answers you provide will be used to give statistics and qualitative information and anecdotes. All information provided will be confidential and any identifying information will be removed.

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. Approximately how many total collections or record groups are in the unit containing faculty papers? How many linear or cubic feet?
2. Approximately how many collections of faculty papers does your repository have? How many linear or cubic feet?
3. What is the collecting focus (topical, geographical, chronological) of the unit containing faculty papers?

**COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT**

4. Do you have a written collection development policy for the unit containing faculty papers?

Yes _____ No _____

If you do, is there a statement regarding faculty papers? Yes ____No ____

If so, please quote it here or attach a copy. (For those that have a written policy specifically for faculty papers, please also attach or send a copy.)

5. Do you actively solicit faculty papers? Yes _____ No _____

Why or why not?

6. Do you accept faculty papers if they are offered (passive)?

Yes, I accept all faculty papers offered._____

Yes, I accept some faculty papers offered._____
No, I do not accept faculty papers if they are offered_____

Why or why not?

7. If you answered yes to #5 and #6, what criteria do you use to decide which faculty members' papers to accept or to solicit? Mark all that apply:

_____tenured
_____appropriateness of his or her papers to the other collecting focus of your repository (IE—geology professor whose area of research is salt domes of Louisiana. We collect on Louisiana, so even if he wasn't an LSU professor, we would want his research).
_____stature in field
_____other (please explain):

8. If you have a documented or established process for identifying these faculty, please describe it. (exs. obituaries, university newsletter and releases, personal contact with dept., etc. . . .)

9. What format and/or types of materials are in the faculty papers now in your collection? Mark all that apply.

teaching
_____lecture notes
_____syllabi
_____other (please list):

research
_____research/subject files
_____drafts of papers, articles, or books
_____data
_____reprints of articles
_____resume or curriculum vitae
_____other (please list):

service

professional
_____memos and correspondence
_____agendas
_____reports
_____minutes
_____conference programs and notes
_____other (please list)

university
_____memos and correspondence
_____agendas
_____reports
_____inutes
_____other (please list)

General other:

10. What format and/or types of materials do you keep from newly acquired collections (whether solicited or accepted). Mark all that apply.

Teaching
_____lecture notes
_____syllabi
_____other (please list):

Research
_____research/subject files
_____drafts of papers, articles, or books
_____data
_____reprints of articles
_____resume or curriculum vitae
_____other (please list):

Service
professional
____memos and correspondence
____agendas
____reports
____inutes
____conference programs and notes
____other (please list)
university
____memos and correspondence
____agendas
____reports
____minutes
____other (please list)

General other:

11. Of the formats marked in #10, why do you accept or retain the ones you do?

12. Of the formats not marked in #10, why don't you keep them?

13. Some archivists argue that if a faculty member's published research is preserved and available in its published form (book or article), preserving the files, drafts, and data that produced the research is not necessary. How does your institution handle this issue?

14. Some archivists argue that a university function or activity of which a faculty member was a part (service on committees, for example) is documented in the records of the University in the University Archives, so preserving his or her records of that activity is not necessary. How does your institution handle this issue?

15. If printed volumes/faculty's library are given with the papers, do you generally:
____retain them as part of the manuscript collection
____remove them and add appropriate volumes to the library's book collection
____retain them as a named collection (named for the faculty member)
____other (please explain)

Comments on collection development:

**PROCESSING**

The purpose of this section is to determine whether, as a class, faculty papers are treated any differently in terms of processing than other collections or record groups.

16. What level of priority for processing are faculty papers assigned, in general, compared to other collections or record groups?

_____Low
_____Medium
_____High

17. What form of finding aid do you generally ultimately produce for faculty papers?

_____full inventory (includes bio note, scope and content, series descriptions, index terms, container list)
_____partial inventory only (includes bio note, scope and content, container list)
_____container list only
_____accession description only
_____Other (please describe)

Does this differ from the form or level of description you generally ultimately produce for other collections or record groups? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, how does it differ?

18. Does your institution produce MARC records for archives and manuscripts in general?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes, do you produce MARC records for faculty papers as part of their processing?

Yes_____ No_____

Comments on processing:

**USE**

19. If you have a method of collecting statistics on a collection's use, in terms of frequency of use, how does usage of faculty papers compare to the other collections or record groups in your repository?

_____Lower than other collections or record groups

_____Higher than other collections or record groups
_____About the same as other collections or record groups
_____Other (please explain)

20. If you don't have a method of tracking a collection's use, what are your impressions of how frequently faculty papers are used?

_____Lower than other collections or record groups
_____Higher than other collections or record groups
_____About the same as other collections or record groups
_____Other (please explain)

21. Who uses your faculty papers? Mark all that apply.

_____other faculty members at your institution
_____scholars in the same or a related field from other institutions
_____professionals in a related field but who are not scholars
_____documentary makers
_____graduate students
_____undergraduate students
_____general public
_____other (please explain)

These answers are based on: Statistics _____ My impressions _____

22. For what kinds of projects are your faculty papers used? Mark all that apply.

_____exhibitions
_____new research resulting in articles, books, or documentaries
_____student papers
_____University history
_____honorary compilations
_____other (please explain)

These answers are based on: Statistics _____ My impressions _____

23. In general, what are your thoughts about faculty papers?