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Foreword*

Anne R. Kenney
Carl A. Kroch University Librarian
Cornell University

THIS USEFUL COMPENDIUM OFFERS inspiration and relevant case studies on how staff in special collections and liaison librarians can impact research, teaching, and learning by working collaboratively. Although the walls—physical and psychological—that divide special collections and the rest of the library system are more commonplace than not, there are forces underway that are leading to greater synergy:

- The dominance of e-resources for general collections shifts the focus on physical collections more towards special collections. Journal literature has gone almost totally electronic and e-books are making some headway too. As a consequence, general stack collections are undergoing deselection or transfer to offsite and shared storage facilities. Special collections assume a greater role in defining the local campus collection.

- The growing importance of digital scholarship—content, tools, techniques—requires greater digital access to special collections materials. More primary source databases are being made available as licensed resources and there is a concomitant interest in digitizing local holdings as well. Digital scholarship helps mainstream special collections holdings.

- Libraries continue to expand their support for teaching information literacy. The definition of requisite twenty-first-century information skills continues to broaden towards technology competencies but also towards critical thinking and the importance of primary source research.

* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, CC BY (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)
• Universities are placing greater emphasis on research at the undergraduate level. The library as lab for arts and humanities necessarily focuses attention on special collections materials.

• Library outreach beyond arts and humanities has led to reimagining the role of special collections materials to support the sciences and social sciences. Collections that span disciplinary boundaries are seeing greater emphasis, such as those focusing on the history of science, human sexuality, pop culture, and science fiction.

• The rise of liaison programs has led to formalized personal links at the department/discipline level. Support for research and teaching extends to special collections materials.

• Increasing specialization needs (e.g., in IT, preservation, intellectual property and contractual rights, linked data, storage, digital forensics, and social media) requires expertise outside special collections, leading to greater collaboration. Matrix management approaches that bring together individuals across traditional vertical administrative lines can accelerate this trend.

Even as these forces shift special collections more to the center of library life, there remain countervailing forces that maintain a divide:

• By emphasizing differences and distinctive needs, the commonalities that bind special collections and other areas of the library tend to be minimized.

• Distinct hours, access policies, technical processing, resource discovery approaches, and physical locations represent exceptions that require workarounds from mainstreamed operations.

• “Special” can convey a sense of superiority giving rise to misperceptions, distrust, rivalry, and jealousy. As one case study noted “The invisible wall created by library deans, however unintentional, when placing their special collections units on development pedestals are detrimental to departmental relations and, therefore, library services and operations that are holistic.” (See Chapter 7.)

• Different administrative reporting structures can exacerbate rather than minimize organizational divides. Senior leadership must signal the importance of working closely together.

• Emphasis on the physicality of special collections objects is increasingly contrasted with general collections as they become disembodied digital objects more valued for their informational content and ease of use rather than their materiality.

• The rise of liaison programs can lead to turf wars over areas of responsibility and the primacy of contacts with faculty.

This volume offers examples of ways to keep the momentum going. It begins with three overarching chapters that explore collaboration between liai-
son and special collections librarians, including a thorough literature review; a proposed framework for acquiring general and special collections that document the history of the academy and remain responsive to campus curricular needs; and a tutorial on object-based pedagogy that can underpin such arrangements. The thirteen case studies that follow provide concrete examples of how to move the needle towards sustainable efforts and away from one-off examples.

Among traditional markers of synergy mentioned are the development of LibGuides that reference both general and special materials, the creation of exhibition programs across the library that complement special collections exhibitions at Dartmouth, and the co-sponsoring of events, such as celebrations of anniversaries. Formalized arrangements are also popping up that can lead to deeper, more consistent partnerships in collection building, instruction, and community outreach. In the volume, several examples of team teaching, where an instruction librarian and a special collections curator join forces to enhance twenty-first-century literacies or to connect holdings across the library system, such as from the Georgia Institute of Technology and The Claremont Colleges. Subject specialists are also being drawn into instructional programs focused on special collections where their disciplinary or language expertise adds context and scope at Yale and Miami University. This volume’s editors teamed up with language instructors and students at the University of Rochester to extend traditional language acquisition skills through the translation of posters in the AIDS Education Posters Collection produced worldwide in seventy-five languages. At the University of Vermont, a liaison librarian and a special collections librarian introduced primary source materials as learning modules in the education of future teachers. At San Diego State University, a liaison librarian and special collections librarian have teamed up to build, catalog, teach, fundraise, and engage the community in their comic book collection. A similar case focused on the Science Fiction Collection at Georgia Tech in which archivists and librarians worked together to bring the collection to STEM fields as well as digital humanities. Selectors and curators have pooled their resources to purchase materials that build connections across general and special collections holdings, such as African American poetry at James Madison University and artists’ books at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. At Oklahoma State University, a liaison librarian and special collections librarian partnered with an English professor to bring special collections materials and digital humanities affordances into the classroom. The partnership has expanded to other subject areas and the promotion of research at the undergraduate level. The history librarian at the University of Oklahoma has been physically embedded in the special collections facility where she and the Western History Collections librarian have gotten into the habit of working together formally and informally.
One could go further in bridging divides by establishing joint appointments in both special collections and reference departments, offering adjunct curator appointments for area studies librarians in special collections, or assigning general selector responsibilities to special collections staff. There are other examples presented in this volume upon which to move from specific projects to ongoing programs, including the primary source lab series at The Claremont Colleges and the effort at Pitts Theology Library at Emory University to co-develop a volunteer docent program. If special collections are destined to become the mainstay of the library, many more paths to deeper collaboration can and should be developed. Special collections and liaison librarian partnerships offer a good foundation from which to take root across administrative, physical, and cultural divides.
Introduction
Kristen Totleben and Lori Birrell
University of Rochester

In a twenty-first-century academic library, its unique collections distinguish it from other libraries. Special collections and liaison librarian partnerships can have a tremendous impact on the work within the library and the university community. Librarians and their collaborative partners can use their expertise and creativity to increase exposure to special collections by working interdepartmentally on instruction, collection development, research, processing, and other projects. Through these experiences, librarians gain a deeper understanding of the roles of each department and work together to achieve strategic goals for the benefit of research and scholarly communities.

In collaborative relationships the work is synergistic and brings out the best in its contributors. The collaborative work we were doing together—collection processing, instruction, and exhibition curation—inspired us to edit this book. We observed and noted the personal benefits and enriching experience of our shared work leading to professional growth and development, cross-departmental relations, and a delightfully positive impact on our faculty and students. With our individual expertise and skillsets, together we are better equipped to provide our researchers with a holistic, well-rounded perspective on the research process and scholarship. These collaborations spark creative thinking and promote modes of discovery for users and librarians.

This book focuses on cross-departmental collaborations between special collections and liaison librarians, which impact the library and the broader university community. Contributors use a variety of terms to identify themselves and their collaborative partners including (but not limited to!): archivists, or rare book, special collections, manuscript, subject, specialist, outreach, collections, or liaison librarians. With all of these descriptive titles, we recognize the influence of institutional culture and vision on the breadth of roles and responsibilities in our profession.
We hope this book inspires all academic librarians to consider the benefits of cohesive partnerships and encourages them to initiate, develop and sustain collaborative projects at their own institutions. *Collaborating for Impact* addresses a gap in both special collections and liaison librarian literature, showing how librarians work together across library departments. Very little has been written on these partnerships.

Designed to guide the reader through three different themes, this book begins with a comprehensive literature review, written by Sarah Horowitz, of case studies that explore partnerships between special collections and liaison librarians.

Amy Cary, Scott Mandernack, Michelle Sweetser, and Tara Baillargeon share their research on collaborative collection development policies across libraries and archives. They suggest that institutional repository development may be an effective avenue of collaboration for special collections and liaison librarians.

Nora Dimmock offers a compelling examination of object-based pedagogy in her research chapter, which encourages librarians to consider how we partner with faculty to deliver instruction to students and how we partner with faculty to integrate resources into those sessions.

The thirteen case studies that follow address three main themes: *Collection Stewardship; Projects, Research, and Exhibitions;* and *Instruction.* We have placed each case study in the section best illustrating how the collaborative partnership began. Each case study includes institutional background, impetus for collaboration, project scope, and concludes with impact, lessons learned, and next steps.

**Collection Stewardship**

Developing a shared model of collection stewardship enables librarians across departments to consider how their collections complement one another and support the university’s curriculum. Each chapter in this section identifies a gap in collecting practices and how, through collaboration, the librarians considered new ways of building collections to meet the changing needs of their users.

Through their development of the Science Fiction Collection at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Sherri Brown and Jody Thompson share their experiences bridging the gap between STEM fields and humanities disciplines.

Melanie Emerson articulates a proposed collection development strategy for artists’ books through establishing partnerships across the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign campus.

Brian Flota and Lynn Eaton, in response to English faculty collection requests, worked together to build James Madison University’s African American literature primary and secondary source holdings.
Projects, Research, and Exhibitions

Exhibitions, volunteer programs, digital humanities, processing, and other projects enable librarians to respond to collaborative opportunities across their university communities. In this section, librarians offer their experiences implementing projects with multiple stakeholders, which requires developing clear outcomes, workflows, and quick solutions to unexpected challenges.

After observing the increase in comic book course offerings at San Diego State University, Anna Culbertson and Pamela Jackson teamed up to augment the library’s rare and circulating collections of comic books. They developed access policies, descriptive practice, and housing procedures for these unique objects to facilitate use by the comic book arts community.

Morgan Swan and Jill Baron share their experiences working on the exhibit, “Specters of the Great War: France, Italy and the First World War” at Dartmouth College. They shed light on the complex process of preparing and finding creative solutions to challenges when developing an exhibit with multiple stakeholders.

Katie Gibson, Carly Sentieri, and William Modrow discuss a collaborative processing project at Miami University that led to multiple outreach opportunities and was made possible through the liaison librarian’s Spanish language skills.

At the University of Oklahoma, Laurie Scrivener and Jacquelyn Slater Reese responded to a library administration initiative to embed a liaison librarian in special collections. In their chapter, they highlight the approach they took to make this change a success.

Rebekah Bedard explores the benefits of working with special collections librarians to implement a docent program at Emory University’s Pitt Theological Library. Throughout the projects they developed for their volunteers, Bedard and her collaborative partners each brought their specific expertise to foster a successful program.

Instruction

Developing new outreach methods requires special collections and liaison librarians to think creatively about finding collaborative partners, both within and outside of the library. The authors in this section describe how, through collaboration, they developed stronger ties to faculty and students than if they had pursued similar opportunities alone. Each chapter in this section highlights the benefits and challenges of working with new user groups.

Lisa Crane, Adam Rosenkranz, and Gale Burrow explore the impact of their primary source lab, which integrates primary and secondary sources to offer students a more complete view of the research process and support student learning at The Claremont Colleges.
Alison Clemens, Elizabeth Frengel, and Colin McCaffrey describe an ongoing partnership between Yale University’s Directed Studies program and the Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library that uses specific examples from its collections to encourage freshmen to consider how the transmission and reception of texts changes across time.

Lori Birrell and Kristen Totleben initiated the AIDS Education Posters Translation Project and, with language instructors, led the development of an experiential learning model in language classes that previously focused on textbook-based learning. They facilitated the addition of student translations to the online archives of the international AIDS Education Posters Collection at the University of Rochester.

David Oberhelman, Sarah Coates, and English professor Andrew Wadoski developed an assignment for an upper-level, undergraduate Shakespeare course at Oklahoma State University. Students utilized the library’s rare book collection and learned digital humanities techniques to analyze the history of print culture in Renaissance England.

Prudence Doherty and Daniel DeSanto worked with an upper-level class of education majors enrolled in a course on pedagogy in primary education at the University of Vermont. The librarians provided students the opportunity to design lesson plans based on the library’s digital collections. Selected lesson plans were then published online.

Several themes became evident as we edited this book. Primarily, that there are many examples of creative and fruitful collaborative partnerships underway in academic libraries. These collaborative projects often begin with a casual conversation or asking “what if we…” rather than a formal project plan with specific outcomes. As a result, defining the project scope often occurs later in the process and appears to foster creativity and innovation, as seen through the case studies presented here.

While we see a need for research articles devoted to these specific types of partnerships, we also encourage readers to consider creating and sharing partnerships that draw attention to collaborative projects within and beyond this book’s scope. Does this collaborative work change how we perceive our respective roles and responsibilities? If so, in what ways? How do special collections librarians and catalogers work together to increase the discovery of a library’s unique collections? How are specialists in areas of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) or Data Science partnering with liaison and special collections librarians to form research teams with faculty and students? How are acquisition models evolving to focus more of a library’s collection budget on unique collections, and which departments are involved in those decisions and workflows? We challenge you to explore these questions and others in your own work. By sharing your experiences, we can continue to evolve in our respective roles and be a vital part of the research and teaching missions of our institutions.
PART 1
Research Chapters
CHAPTER 1

Special Collections and Liaison Librarian Partnerships:
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Sarah M. Horowitz

Introduction

Merriam-Webster defines collaborate as “to work jointly with others or together especially in an intellectual endeavor.” Working together is common for many library professionals, although this ethos of collaboration is not always apparent in the literature. There are few examples of collaboration between special collections and liaison librarians. This review of the literature takes a wide view of collaboration and the term liaison librarian. It is often difficult to determine from the context of an article and a person’s title, for instance, how much of an instruction librarian’s role is to act as a liaison to various departments. Similarly, the review includes collaborations with technical services and digital collections librarians who have subject expertise and who may have subject responsibilities, even if their job title or primary role is not as a subject librarian. This review also uses the term special collections librarian to encompass those who work with archives, manuscripts, and rare books. Librarians who work in galleries and museums are excluded from this review.
Hue Thi Pham and Kerry Tanner find that collaboration builds upon “knowledge, power and resources” to allow people to work together to solve problems they would not be able to solve individually. They also note that collaboration is widely defined in the literature and can range from networking to full scale involvement on a joint project. Pham and Tanner further note that agreed-upon features of collaboration include “commitment to working together to achieve common goals, shared effort, shared responsibility and accountability, shared resources and outcomes, voluntary participation and values such as fairness and caring for others.” Collaboration should be a joint effort toward unified goals.

The tools and skills taught by special collections and liaison librarians are closely intertwined, a thread which is woven throughout the literature. In fact, in order to work effectively with primary sources, according to Elizabeth Yakel and Deborah Torres, a researcher needs domain or subject knowledge, artefactual literacy, and archival intelligence, thus inherently tying together special collections and subject research.

The Importance of Collaboration

A variety of library leaders and administrators view collaboration as a central aspect of library work; Stephen Abram and Jamal Cromity refer to it as the “strategic core.” Lucy Mulroney and Patrick Williams cite the importance of collaboration as a way to strengthen the context in which undergraduate research takes place. As David Mazella and Julie Grob argue, collaboration can ensure the success of complex or long-term projects. Referring specifically to instructional design, these authors state “Collaboration… ensures that mistakes, observations, and insights noted and gathered by the collaborators are not lost but are folded back into the course's subsequent iterations.”

Good communication is necessary to any collaboration. For librarians, communication can include referring faculty members to other librarians. For example, subject librarians can encourage faculty to contact special collections about materials in their area, while special collections librarians can reach out to subject specialists because “almost none of their [faculty/student] projects only involve our stuff.” Communication benefits not only faculty and students, but also librarians, as it helps develop relationships. Communication is also important to collaboration because participants in a project, who may have shared goals, have different objectives based on their professional areas. Thus, collaboration between different types of librarians involves compromise and negotiation.

Collaboration is an important way for librarians to gain new skills. Doris Malkmus argues that to meet the needs of academic historians, librarians
need to increase their knowledge of local and online primary sources, as well as how to integrate primary sources into their instruction and how to help students read a finding aid. While Malkmus does not specifically advocate for collaboration, one of the best ways for subject librarians to gain such competencies is through collaboration with special collections librarians. Merinda Kaye Hensely, Benjamin Murphy, Ellen Swain, Jason Tomberlin, and Matthew Tru1 encourage special collections librarians to collaborate with information literacy and instruction librarians to improve and expand their skills in these areas.

**Barriers to Collaboration**

In addition to lack of communication, other barriers to subject librarian-special collections librarian collaboration exist. Charlotte Priddle was surprised by evidence of a divide between special collections and public services librarians, which appeared in a survey she conducted about the effects of off-site storage. Special collections departments were often viewed as “other” by colleagues, and there was a sense of special collections as a treasure room with gatekeepers. Special collections librarians felt public services staff sent users to them without providing context or information for the user, such as whether a desired item was stored off-site or making sure they understood that they could not check out rare materials.

To be open to colleagues in a systematic and sustained way, Priddle suggests using library committees to create lines of communication and relationships between library departments. Priddle also recommends more dual-reporting librarians, including people who act as both special collections and subject librarians, while acknowledging dual reporting can be administratively difficult. She also encourages special collections librarians to offer tours to new hires (in all parts of their institution) so they may learn about special collections.

Todd Samuelson and Cait Coker, however, see a tour for new staff as part of the problem. Special collections tours at Texas A&M University traditionally centered on highlights from the collection. This led to a view of special collections as a depository for curiosities, rather than a department which shared a pedagogical mission with the rest of the library, and gave a sense that special collections librarians were custodians, rather than active teachers and curators. Samuelson and Coker highlight a lack of successful communication as the main cause for a lack of successful collaboration. To improve these relationships, they have changed their sessions for new librarians to emphasize how special collections uses materials in classes, and they are working to articulate the different ways special collections and research librarians approach information literacy.
Collaboration among librarians can sometimes be overlooked in favor of other collaborations, such as those with faculty. Erin Dorris Cassidy and Kenneth E. Hendrickson document an instruction collaboration between a history librarian and a faculty member at Sam Houston State University. In the first iteration of their collaboration, they assumed a level of knowledge about digital archives that students did not have. When revising the class, they collaborated with the special collections librarian to develop a guide that demonstrated what archives are, showed how and why to use a finding aid, suggested ways to find archives, and taught methods for evaluating historical materials.20

Areas of Collaboration

Collaboration often revolves around a specific project or outcome. Therefore, this review is divided into sections addressing areas where collaboration between special collections and liaison librarians may be most valuable. While a successful collaboration in one area often leads to further collaboration, much of the literature focuses on a single collaborative project.

Technical Services and Digital Projects

Digital projects and digitized primary sources are a natural fit for collaboration between liaison and special collections librarians because such projects often rely on both subject expertise and rare, unique holdings. They also serve as an opportunity to blend local and international collections and holdings from multiple repositories.21 Digital projects encourage students to think about how archives and primary source databases are collected and put together, what is selected, and how priorities for digitization are established.22

Such collaborations can lead to a greater sense of ownership over digital projects, as seen in a digitization project at the University of Kansas. A Latin American studies librarian and a special collections librarian are jointly working to digitize and expose Guatemalan materials housed in the rare books and manuscript library but of interest to Latin American scholars around the world.23 Ownership is an important benefit to collaboration; participating in the creation of a project builds long-term investment from all participants.

Digital projects can run into pitfalls if the backgrounds and differences of the collaborators are not understood. These pitfalls can be overcome through acknowledgment and staff development, as demonstrated by a digital project at Colorado State University. The collaborators addressed differences between how primary and secondary sources are described. Special collections staff educated liaison librarians on such differences that included describing primary source collections at the box or folder level, and archival theories of prove-
nance and original order. Liaison librarians shared common descriptive practices for individual publications, which focus on the intellectual content and resource itself. This lack of understanding initially impeded communication and collaboration, but was overcome through careful translation of vocabularies and philosophies, as well as spending time with the original materials.

At Cleveland State University, the deep subject knowledge of bibliographers was used to create metadata for digital projects, including the Postcards of Cleveland and the Cleveland Press Shakespeare Photographs. Digital projects are a front on which there have been calls for archivists and librarians to collaborate and integrate their resources and services.

Collaboration can lead to better access to materials. At the University of Rochester, liaison librarians, special collections librarians, and cataloging librarians collaborated to process small manuscript collections. Processors were paired based on their interests in the topics of collections, which meant liaison librarians could bring their domain expertise to the project. Although finding time to work together was challenging, participants appreciated the partnership aspect of the experience. One liaison librarian noted that processing the collection increased his ability to talk with faculty about the library’s unique materials.

Future research into how collaborations develop would be useful to librarians considering their own collaborative digital projects. Questions should address how collaboration influenced the creation and vision of the digital project: Did having both liaison and special collections librarians involved change the design, type of architecture, or technology used? How did it affect the intended audience for the project? In the technical services realm, examples of hidden collections processing—especially around foreign language materials—would be beneficial. How does language expertise enhance processing foreign language collections and the future use of those collections? Finally, exploring collaborations that bring liaison librarians into the decision-making process for processing priorities in order to build on their domain expertise would be welcome.

**Collection Development**

The Online Computer Library Center’s (OCLC) *Taking our Pulse* survey of special collections and archives found that over 50 percent of respondents were collaborating on collection development, mostly with local or regional libraries or members of a consortium, but few had formal collection development agreements. While collaborative collection development presents some difficulties, such as the determining which department pays for and houses materials, it can grow from successful collaborations and provide the foundation for future projects. At the University of Colorado Boulder science-themed artist’s books have been purchased jointly by the special collections and sci-
ence librarians; these purchases are driven by a collaborative instruction pro-
gram and an emphasis on interdisciplinary visual learning.30

Although there is little literature on intra-library collaborative collection
development, area studies collections provide a potential example and ave-
nue for collaborations. Area studies collections are unique collections in that
they often contain both regular and rare materials. Thus, Lisa Carter and Beth
Whittaker argue, the role of special collections curator and area studies librar-
ian are in many ways alike, especially as both desire to improve their ability
to advocate that they are central to university missions.31 Furthermore, spe-
cial collections and area studies librarians benefit from a shared cultural and
language expertise.32 At The Ohio State University, the Japanese librarian and
the Billy Ireland Cartoon Library and Museum staff reevaluated and recon-
ceptualized the collection of manga materials, eventually moving some to the
circulating collection so they could be easily used for teaching.33

No doubt many informal collection development collaborations exist
among liaison and special collections librarians, whether liaison librarians rec-
ommending rare purchases to support faculty teaching and research or special
collections librarians advocating for resources to contextualize their materials.
Following the use of materials acquired collaboratively would be informative,
especially materials used in collaborative teaching, digital projects, or exhibits.
Given the recent emphasis on distinctive library collections, future research
should focus on how this emphasis creates potential new avenues for collab-
oration.

Reference, Outreach, and Exhibits

Reference librarians can play a key role in facilitating discovery and access
to special collections by including materials in their searches at the reference
desk; collaboration between special collections librarians and reference librar-
ians can enhance these opportunities.34 Collaborating to add special collec-
tions materials to LibGuides can also be an important source of discoveries
and referrals.35 Featuring relevant digital primary sources, even if not from
the physical collections, on the special collections department's website, and
including archivist's information on class research guides or LibGuides when
primary sources of any kind are being used in the class, allows students and
researchers access to subject and special collections expertise together.36

Exhibits can also lead to further collaborations. Sean Swanick and Jenni-
fer Garland discuss how an exhibit in their library led to collaborative work
with a class. The authors, an Islamic studies librarian and an architecture and
art librarian, have their feet in two worlds; the Islamic studies librarian works
one day per week in special collections and the architecture and art librarian
oversees rare and contemporary collecting. In this case, the exhibit exposed a
previously underused collection and led to an extension of the initial collaboration from exhibit work to instructional design.\textsuperscript{37}

The lack of literature on liaison and special collections librarian collaboration via social media is surprising, since joint posting on Facebook or Instagram is a low-commitment opportunity for collaboration. Future work might explore whether posts from different librarians attract different audiences. As exhibits gain popularity as a form of library outreach, publications on exhibits can explore not only content creation, but also how special collections librarians’ experience with exhibit design, label writing, and installation can contribute to library projects even when rare materials are not part of the exhibits.

\textit{Instruction}

Instruction and information literacy sources provide the most literature on liaison and special collections librarian collaboration. This is not surprising given the widespread interest in these areas in recent years and the fact that teaching has become a core component of both these types of librarianship. The literature on these collaborations, however, is dwarfed by the amount of literature on librarian-faculty collaboration.\textsuperscript{38} Publications that address instruction often address the issues of liaison and special collections instruction separately. For instance, \textit{The New Information Literacy Instruction} includes chapters on both subject and special collections instruction, but offers nothing suggesting how they might overlap. The contributors to \textit{Using Primary Sources: Hands-On Instructional Exercises} include thirty special collections librarians or archivists and only one subject librarian.\textsuperscript{39}

While some collaborative instruction emphasizes the differences between the types of research conducted in special collections and the rest of the library, others seek to show the integration of special collections and subject resources. This gives students a more complete understanding of the research process and ensures students learn about the connection between primary and secondary sources.\textsuperscript{40} Collaboration also allows for the possibility of different viewpoints in the classroom, which gives students permission to disagree and models analytical discourse.\textsuperscript{41} Increased collaboration among archivists, librarians, and faculty is important because it will “introduce students to a multidimensional perspective on primary sources.”\textsuperscript{42} Collaboration can be used to reframe information literacy instruction by showing how primary sources lead to secondary sources. Shan Sutton and Lorrie Knight describe a class that analyzes special collections documents pertaining to a particular topic and then finds related secondary articles in a database. The librarians encourage students to look at the articles’ footnotes to see the primary and secondary sources cited.\textsuperscript{43}

Merinda Kaye Hensley, Benjamin Murphy, and Ellen Swain argue that collaborations between information literacy librarians and archivists offer great ben-
benefits for archivists since information literacy librarians have experience designing and testing instruction standards. These collaborations are also opportunities to improve pedagogical strategies that foster active learning and better model the archival research process. Jason Tomberlin and Matthew Trui encourage special collections librarians to serve on library-wide instruction committees to make subject librarians aware of how they can incorporate special collections materials into their sessions and to learn from the expertise instruction librarians have in developing learning outcomes and conducting effective class sessions.

Writing and Introductory Classes

The use of special collections materials continues to be essential when developing new approaches to research and writing because it allows students to “engage in various modes of writing; conceive of the potential networks of production and circulation for their work; and identify the library as a locus for sustained, organic, social, and productive inquiry.” In their work, Lucy Mulroney and Patrick Williams found that librarians and instructors sought ways to train students to be critical users, not only of documents but also the information systems used to find them, and to encourage critical, transferable approaches to using sources. They found that special collections defamiliarizes the concept of source, allowing students to reexamine how to think about and search for information, and that using archival finding aids helped to create critical users of databases. The collaboration led the authors to conclude that research in special collections is an integral part of information literacy.

Collaboration can transform an instruction session. Melissa Hubbard and Megan Lotts discuss a collaboration that created a hands-on experience for entry-level students in an information literacy course. They transformed the special collections session from a passive show and tell, to a more dynamic session where students handled materials and discussed them in relation to information literacy concepts such as subjectivity and peer-review.

Science Classes

At the University of Colorado Boulder, special collections librarians began collaborating with science librarians to reach science faculty. Relationships between science librarians and faculty were important in their effort to convince faculty to bring their classes to the department and use the physical collections, rather than rely solely on their digital surrogates. This outreach resulted in science librarians conducting sessions in special collections, which led to an increase in the number of sessions taught in special collections and gave science librarians a new teaching opportunity. The entire project has led to greater collaboration and collegiality between departments.
Amanda Brown, Barbara Losoff, and Deborah Hollis describe a collaboration using visual materials to teach visual literacy to science students and expose them to special collections materials. The article discusses several classes and posits that “the use of imagery, in addition to active learning, enhances student learning in the sciences”; visual materials can help bring to life and make more tangible abstract concepts. Since special collections is a natural place to teach visual literacy, there is a natural collaboration among science and special collections librarians.

**Social Science Classes**

Co-design of instruction sessions can result in better outcomes for the collaborators and beneficial experiences for students. Regina Lee Roberts and Mattie Taormina found working together on classes expanded their thinking, as well as fostered student understanding of research as a complex and transformative process. The collaboration was intended to teach critical thinking across the curriculum. Classes visited special collections to use materials related to student research topics and then learned database searching. The content delivered in the second part of the session connected to special collections materials the students had used, and the authors found the discussion was richer than those sessions that did not have a special collections component.

**History Classes**

Several case studies from Yale University highlight the importance of involving special collections librarians and subject librarians in the instruction planning process, which allows them to discuss course objectives and use them to plan assignments and in-class exercises together. For a freshman history seminar, where the goal of the session was helping students integrate primary sources with secondary sources to develop an argument, the librarian and archivist both modeled the process of using historical evidence to generate questions and construct arguments.

Having multiple librarians involved in instruction can allow each librarian to teach in their area of expertise while working toward the learning goals of a course. Although the sessions may be conducted separately, it is helpful to meet beforehand to discuss learning objectives and plan sessions that will introduce students to document-based research. In a documents-based research course in the social and behavioral science program (CSBC 331), the history librarian at Eastern Washington University focused on finding secondary sources, the archivist discussed how to use finding aids and evaluate documents, and the government documents librarian explained how to determine whether something is a legitimate source of government information.
Future Research

Although the literature on collaborative instruction is the richest part of this survey, there are many areas which would benefit from further exploration: How do librarians frame these collaborations when talking with students? What evidence do we have of the benefits students derive from these collaborations? Do students come away from collaborative sessions with a more holistic view of the research process and types of resources available to them? This survey found only one mention of assessment that included liaison and special collections librarian collaboration. Surely, more could be said about how and when collaborative instruction is most valuable. There is an opportunity to examine the ideas and strategies generated from collaborations, even when an instructor is not actively teaching with another librarian.

Conclusion

A variety of themes emerge when considering this literature holistically. A successful collaboration hinges on good communication among all participants, particularly the acknowledgement of similarities and differences. Collaboration does not just happen; it requires commitment and investment from all involved, and often, buy-in from supervisors or administrators. Most authors viewed collaborative projects positively, reporting deeper knowledge of what their colleagues do and benefits to users, although further assessment of user experience is needed.

Although there is evidence that special collections and liaison librarians are collaborating, there is a lack of literature addressing why these collaborations are important from an institutional standpoint. Literature that moves the discussion of liaison librarian-special collections librarian collaborations beyond case studies, such as addressing its theoretical underpinnings and the value of incorporating multiple viewpoints into library work, would be beneficial. To fill these gaps, it will be important for librarians to foreground the strengths and problems around inter-librarian collaboration. The profession undervalues and tends not to consider collaboration among librarians; instead, these collaborations should be as seriously invested in and celebrated as are collaborations with faculty, information technologists, and other galleries, libraries, archives, and museums.
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CHAPTER 2’

Framing Collaboration: ARCHIVES, IRS, AND GENERAL COLLECTIONS

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

Introduction

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

* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, CC BY (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).
This seems to be an opportunity yet to be fully realized. A discussion of collecting policies—with a focus on the interplay between the policies as applied to a library’s general collections, its special collections and university archives, and its institutional repository—is necessary to jump-start the discussion of the development of a cooperative framework for soliciting, selecting, and evaluating library collections. Ideally, the evaluation of policy can provide a framework for the development of a collaborative tool for evaluation, education of the liaison librarian in the basic concepts of archival selection concomitant with education for the archivist in general collection decision-making, and the consideration of research opportunities in the allied professions. By considering best practices for collaborative collecting, archivists, and liaisons can explore approaches and practical applications appropriate to their own repository. The survey of current policy represented on institutional websites provides a foundation for future discussion and research.

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

Literature Review

The relationship between archives and other collecting areas of the academic library has yet to be fully explored in the literature. The focus on archival collecting policies stems from discussions in the 1980s by Faye Phillips and F. Gerald Ham. Phillips provided an analysis of the structure of collecting policies—which has been a standard for repositories seeking to write policy—drawing on the ALA observation that “a written collection development policy statement is a tool that assists acquisitions personnel in working consistently toward defined goals, thus insuring stronger collections with wiser use of resources.” Like Phillips, Ham’s work focused on archival appraisal, which sought to tame the overabundance of archival records in the face of limited resources. It was Ham who broadened the discussion of appraisal outside the
boundaries of the archives, noting that archivists “must know intimately the associated printed record held by libraries. This is not to suggest that archivists passively allow librarians to make decisions for them or otherwise do their job, but rather that they make librarians partners in compiling and preserving the documentary record.”

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

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

* See a definition of the Minnesota Method at http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/m/minnesota-method.
While university archives programs generally have broad mandates to collect institutional records, materials generated by faculty members are frequently treated as personal papers and can include materials extending beyond the faculty’s service to the individual institution, thus documenting more than institutional history. Tara Laver’s 2003 survey of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and non-ARL libraries previously designated Research I institutions revealed that 40 percent of respondents treated faculty papers as manuscript collections, 33 percent treated them as university archives, and nearly 18 percent have treated faculty papers as both manuscript and university archives collections within their repository. Only 21 percent of repositories surveyed had a written policy related to faculty papers, though some respondents (number unquantified) indicated a desire to develop such a policy. The methods by which archivists and curators identified individuals with papers of interest varied, including university newsletters and press releases, monitoring of obituaries, and contact with other departments. Interestingly, two survey respondents indicated referrals from staff in other library units, most notably the library gifts processor or development officer, but no responses indicated referrals from liaison librarians. As Laver wrote, “By their very nature, universities contain multiple disciplines, and acquiring and processing the papers of faculty members from those diverse disciplines require a degree of subject knowledge and technical expertise that archivists may not possess.” This is an area where a liaison librarian might assist by offering their knowledge about faculty research and activities.

Douglas Bicknese began to address the segregation of collecting policies in 2003 when exploring institutional repositories (IRs) and their roles within the context of the larger institution. He observed, “On-line digital repositories offer archivists the opportunity of affirming or reaffirming their role as a manager of the campus’ records and information.” However, even in their early iterations Bicknese notes, “The role of the university archives in an institution’s on-line digital repository is not discussed at great length in the literature advocating the adoption of such repositories. Therefore, it is possible that local champions of institutional-based on-line digital repositories may not think to include the university archives in planning for such programs.” Bicknese argues archives should be at the table when discussions of institutional repositories come into play—specifically, that IRs allow the space (non-physical) to collect faculty output. However, not every record can be effectively saved. Archivists can provide necessary appraisal expertise with regard to what to collect from faculty, as well as when material can be removed from the IR and placed into long-term storage in the archives. “Archivists need to have a key role in these committees to share their expertise in collecting faculty papers and in working with researchers who use faculty papers. They need to explain how their experience appraising faculty papers will help with both recruiting faculty contributors and identifying specific material that will be worth the institution’s investment.”
Even ten years on, there remains a lack of a recognized collaboration in this area. Dan Noonan and Tamar Chute’s 2014 article, “Data Curation and the University Archives,” illustrates the persistence of the siloed archivist. Their study explored the archivist’s role in data curation at ARL Libraries: 41 percent responded that their archivists were not involved in discussions of data curation. However, they observed there may be a trend towards involving archivists in this discussion since fully one third of the respondents (33 percent) indicated the archivist was either “moderately involved” or “fully engaged” in the discussion of data curation.\textsuperscript{13} The study also indicated nearly all (98 percent) archives collect faculty papers and address this in their collecting policies, yet only 49 percent of archives collect research data.\textsuperscript{14} This is significant as faculty become increasingly involved in projects, which generate large data sets and IRs offer ways of making them accessible.

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

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

\textsuperscript{*} See http://dcs.library.virginia.edu/aims/ for a description of the AIMS project.
the bit stream. However, the most practical way to maintain research data may be to leave it in situ, thereby maintaining pertinent context and functionality, as opposed to taking physical custody and potentially providing a more suitable preservation environment, albeit with loss of key linkages to contextual information. In either scenario, archivists should develop policies and procedures to address these issues.18

**Policies**

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

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

* Substantial comments on all policies reviewed are available in Appendix 2A, which includes a selective review of policies from twenty-one different repositories from academic institutions of varying sizes. Selection was guided initially by institutions with integrated collecting policies, but a dearth of such policies quickly lead to broadened parameters, including institutions of comparable size and mission as well as those mentioned in the literature regarding collection development policies. Inclusion was not limited to membership in any specific organization (ARL, CIC, for example). Future research goals will employ a more structured search in order to fully determine the scope of the issue. Appendix 2B represents, in tabular format, the information found in Appendix 2A, visualizing the relationships between the policies examined.
by defining collecting goals for future development; provide general selection, withdrawal, and cancellation criteria; and outline preservation strategies. Furthermore, collection policies can serve an especially important function in fostering and supporting collaborative collection development across institutions or across units within an institution.

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

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

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

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

The upshot is there is little standardization in the way collecting policy is represented in academic libraries. What is more, there is little evidence of collaborative interplay between liaison librarians and archivists. It is clear that archives, IRs, and general library collections are still viewed primarily as sep-
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Arate and distinct entities. There are, of course, differences, and these distinctions are useful. In working to develop a policy reflective of both the IR and the University Archives, the authors at Marquette University focused on the IR as primarily a means of access, while the University Archives has a responsibility for long-term preservation, and this necessitates a difference in collecting focus. However, recognition of the differences in collections can be tempered by recognizing commonalities. The authors have sought these commonalities in evaluating collecting policy in the IR and the University Archives at Marquette, which leads to consideration of the potential that exists in framing collecting policies.

Roles of Archivists and Liaisons: Towards a Joint Framework

Liaison librarians are well positioned to play a key role in furthering the acquisition of collections for archives, special collections, and institutional repositories. The August 2013 ARL report *New Roles for New Times: Transforming Liaison Roles in Research Libraries* highlights the evolution of the liaison role in the research library: “An engagement model in which library liaisons and functional specialists collaborate to understand and address the wide range of processes in instruction and scholarship is replacing the traditional tripartite model of collections, reference, and instruction.”

Jaguszewski and Williams identify two new roles for liaisons—those of advocate and consultant—while recognizing an imperative for library staff at all levels to work across traditional silos. Interviews with library organizations conducted in preparing the report provide examples of liaison librarians advising faculty on personal information management, developing an understanding of research methods in their assigned disciplines, and recruiting content for institutional repositories. These liaison activities and the knowledge developed by working directly with faculty complement the work done by staff in university archives as they identify and solicit faculty papers for collection. While the ARL report does not specifically identify archivists as natural partners for liaisons, this is a logical extension of the type of relationship emerging in the profession. The advocate and consultant roles identified by Jaguszewski and Williams are ones which liaisons could be educated to fulfill with regard to university archives’ collecting, just as they have for new and emerging roles as advocates and consultants in digital humanities, teaching and learning, digital scholarship, and scholarly communication.

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

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

In addition, Hyry and his colleagues underscore that conversations among archivists, librarians (presumably including liaison librarians), creators, and other experts are useful in better understanding the documentary universe of an institution, the potential use of records, and how to set priorities for collecting in a world of limited resources. The Yale case study also illustrates the
overlapping, though not identical, lenses through which any body of records can be evaluated based on the goals of the specific collecting unit (specifically separate manuscripts and university archives collecting areas) and the need for coordination between those areas when within the same institution. Overlap is also apparent when one considers university archives and institutional repositories as well. Given that liaison librarians are increasingly called upon to assist in educating faculty about scholarly communication efforts, they can likewise foster conversations between individual faculty members, institutional repository staff, and archivists regarding potential areas of overlap in collecting.

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

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

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

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

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

- Is the faculty member recognized as a leader in his or her profession/discipline?
  - Received career service award or designation of fellow by relevant professional association
  - Received significant national or international award (e.g. Nobel Prize, MacArthur, Guggenheim, etc.)
  - Served as president of a major national or international professional body
  - Received honorary degrees from outside institutions of higher education
  - Stands out when compared to institutional peers

As conversations with potential faculty donors take place, liaison librarians are likely to be asked logistical questions related to the transfer of material to the archives. Not only should liaison librarians have an awareness of the general practices and procedures used to physically or digitally transfer re-
cords so they can respond to basic questions in the absence of an archivist, the joint framework should also include links to specific forms used to secure the transfer of records, donor agreements, and other administrative documents used to bring materials into archival custody.

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

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

Conclusion

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

There are many potential answers to this question. Discussions between colleagues have uncovered perceptions that encourage, or at least facilitate, separation. In the case of liaison librarians, there is a perceived lack of knowledge of how archives programs relate to the general collection and a narrow vision of the scope of archival collecting. Liaisons may be prone to considering archivists as focused solely on preservation and may be unaware of the reference service and instruction archivists provide daily. Conversely, there is the
age-old perception that archives are not easily accessible, not welcoming, and foreign. What is more, the case can be made that archivists perpetuate the notion they are expert with domain-specific knowledge. They may have a narrow vision of liaison librarians as service-providers, rather than as librarians who build strong relationships with faculty based on knowledge of their research, teaching, and subject expertise.

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

The roles and framework presented here, then, are a first proposal, based on observations and an exploration of policy. The clear path, which this group of authors intends to pursue, is to inform this preliminary proposal with a fuller survey of repositories, to explore hidden collaborations, and to further define practice. Continued research and discussion are necessary and should be undertaken in confidence that the knowledge liaison librarians and archivists each brings to the table are complementary. There is tremendous potential in collaborative collection to enrich all areas of library practice.
Appendix 2A. Collecting Policies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Georgetown (DigitalGeorgetown):** This policy at http://www.library.georgetown.edu/ir/policies does not reference the university archives. “The IR
is intended primarily as a repository for previously-published work, and not as an independent publishing platform for new research articles. However, the IR does offer departments or units the ability to publish and disseminate their existing working paper series, Journals, or theses not covered by the ETD submission process.”

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

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

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

It is interesting that they make a statement which suggests faculty and staff papers are “…considered on a case-by-case basis. Some of the criteria that may be used to appraise these collections include: national or international reputation in an academic field or industry, record of service at Pepperdine University and contribution to its growth and development, and service and contribution in community, state, and national affairs.” Though they do not go so far as to state there is collaborative collecting between subject liaisons and archivists, they do note, “The Special Collections and University Archives acquires materials through donation, transfer from university departments, transfer from the library’s general collections, and purchase. The decision to acquire materials will be based on an appraisal by Special Collections and University Archives professionals to assess the historic and/or research value of the materials, as well as the cost to process, preserve, store, and maintain the materials. Other faculty and administrators will be consulted as needed.”
Purdue University: An articulated policy statement for the Archives and Special Collections unit is available at https://www.lib.purdue.edu/spcol/general-policies. While no general collection development policy was located, the special collections and archives policy does include a statement placing its materials in a broader context: materials relate to a “subject area of distinction for Purdue University” and “support the research and teaching needs of the University.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

University of Michigan’s Bentley Historical Library: This repository has an incredibly detailed Records Policy and Procedures Manual: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1J0keM_YqsimzqqGUpU0NPq6Zj2Do1nLAz_4Qeo8ZdwA/edit#. The section on what to transfer starts on p. 21; the section on faculty papers begins on p. 31. The document references Deep Blue, which seems to be more broadly defined than the traditional IR. The document indicates it serves as the Bentley’s electronic records repository (“While the paper collections are stored
at the library, digital materials are stored in Deep Blue.”), and this is borne out when looking at the Bentley’s community within Deep Blue: http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/65133. For example, the College of Architecture record group represented in Deep Blue includes posters, invitations, brochures, etc. Deep Blue (and coming soon, Deep Blue Data http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/data/) has significant policy documentation:

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

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

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

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

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

University of Texas at Austin: While no formal general collection development policy was found, an “About the Collections” page is available at https://www.lib.utexas.edu/about/collections/policy, which includes a link to subject-based statements of collecting scope. No evidence of integration with special collections, university archives, or an institutional repository was found.
The UT-Austin policy for its Digital Repository is available at https://repositories1.lib.utexas.edu/policies_Collections. While there is no reference to other collection policies, the policy spends considerable time discussing the organization/structure/hierarchy of the IR, including assigning collecting responsibilities to “Community Administrators.” The Communities center around units within the university. Special Collections focuses on a few specific collections, (https://www.lib.utexas.edu/apl/Collections/Special_Collections) and the University Archives is included in a completely separate center, the Briscoe Center for American History (https://www.cah.utexas.edu/Collections/UT_Archives.php). The UT Archives collections also focus on university units and entities, but there is no reference to collecting in the IR, Special Collections, or General Collection.

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

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

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

The IR is available at http://libra.virginia.edu/ and a brief statement describing the commitment to open access is available at http://www.library.virginia.edu/libra/. There is no mention of a relationship to the general collection or to the University Archives.
Weber State University: They have a general collecting policy available at http://library.weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/collec_manag_policy.cfm#Acquisi-
tion. Their General Acquisition Guidelines take the library as a whole and 
at least mention manuscripts and rare books. Manuscripts in printed, edit-
ed form, facsimile editions, and microform are selected by subject librarians 
using the same criteria as for other monographic materials. This indicates 
some collaborative work on the part of subject librarians. However, there is a 
stringent statement that rare books will not be purchased. To do so would be 
inappropriate, given the library’s stated objectives and financial constraints. 
Manuscripts and rare books acquired as gifts are discussed in the Special Col-
lection Policy at http://library.weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/Collection%20Policy.pdf, which indicates there is some collaborative work between the Special 
Collections area and the general collections.

University Archives are maintained and considered a separate entity from 
the Special Collections and general collections. They stress the archives col-
lects the history of the university and has no records management responsi-
bility. They do have a University Archives Acquisition Policy at http://library.
weber.edu/libadmin/lppm/arch_acquistion_policy.cfm. This policy is short 
and does not specify any relationship between liaison librarians and archives.

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

Yale University Library considers Manuscripts and Archives as a single 
entity. (http://web.library.yale.edu/mssa ) While the “About” page (http://web.
library.yale.edu/mssa/about ) refers to materials “first collected by faculty and 
other members of the Yale community to support their own research activ-
ities,” ultimately, manuscripts and University Archives were merged in 1961 
and the structure remains combined. Statements about the Manuscript Col-
lections (http://web.library.yale.edu/mssa/collections/manuscript-collections) 
and the University Archives (http://web.library.yale.edu/mssa/collections/un-
iversity-archives) do not mention each other or the Institutional Repository.
Appendix 2B. Institutional Collecting Policy Relationships

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Collections</th>
<th>Special Collections</th>
<th>University Archives</th>
<th>Special Collections &amp; Archives (combined)</th>
<th>Institutional Repositories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amherst College</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>collection, not policy</td>
<td>collection, not policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>Similar model/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell University</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>General Collections</td>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>University Archives</td>
<td>Special Collections &amp; Archives (combined)</td>
<td>Institutional Repositories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Links to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>References broader collecting goals; transfers from general collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>References broader collecting guidelines, but no distinct policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>General Collections</td>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>University Archives</td>
<td>Special Collections &amp; Archives (combined)</td>
<td>Institutional Repositories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Refers to compliance with broader collection management policies, practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary (data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cloud State University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>References, but no link to actual policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cloud State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>References and links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California–Los Angeles</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California–Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois–Urbana Champaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois–Urbana Champaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Amherst</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>General Collections</td>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>University Archives</td>
<td>Special Collections &amp; Archives (combined)</td>
<td>Institutional Repositories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan, Bentley Historical Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas–Austin</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas–Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas–Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>References, but not policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>References / Links</td>
<td>References / Links</td>
<td>References / Links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>References academic programs supported by the collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Notes

3. Tom Hyry et al. “‘Though This Be Madness, Yet There Is Method in’t’: Assessing the Value of Faculty Papers and Defining a Collecting Policy.” *The American Archivist* 65 (Spring/Summer 2002): 65.
4. Ibid., 62.
5. Ibid., 64.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., 170–171.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Virginia</th>
<th>General Collections</th>
<th>Special Collections</th>
<th>University Archives</th>
<th>Special Collections &amp; Archives (combined)</th>
<th>Institutional Repositories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weber State University</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Mentions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weber State University</td>
<td>Mentions</td>
<td>Mentions</td>
<td>Additional copies for “General Collection,” but no reference to policy</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weber State University</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
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<th>Yale University</th>
<th>References</th>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Yale University | | | | | Primary |

| Yale University | | | | | Primary |
9. Ibid., 161.
11. Ibid., 87.
12. Ibid., 88.
15. Ibid., 210.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., 212.
18. Ibid., 213.
21. Ibid.
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CHAPTER 3*

Object-Based Pedagogy:
NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION IN THE HUMANITIES

Nora Dimmock

Introduction

There has never been a more exciting time to be an academic liaison librarian. The introduction of new modes of inquiry across virtually every discipline afforded by digital technology has created opportunities to expand traditional library practice beyond bibliographic instruction and management to include new methods and tools. In archives and special collections, the movement towards promoting the use and value of artifacts more broadly than ever before is creating a renewed focus on outreach activities for these library specialists. And in the college classroom, advances in cognitive science are driving changes in pedagogy; students are looking for more authentic opportunities to apply knowledge learned in the classroom to real life experiences in the community and on the job market. The convergence of these changes across the academy creates the perfect opportunity for all three—liaison librarian,
special collections librarian, and professor—to collaborate in the construction of new teaching paradigms for college students that strengthen student learning outcomes and contribute to the development of new modes of scholarly communication. Object-based pedagogy (OBP), a teaching practice that has been used in cultural heritage museums for decades, is the perfect platform for bringing all three educators together to create a classroom for the twenty-first century.

OBP is a teaching practice and methodology grounded in constructivist learning theory based on the study of objects or things. The pedagogy has a lot in common with inquiry-based and experiential learning practices; the critical theory lends itself well to material culture studies. It is a teaching practice designed to bring archivists and artifacts into conversation with historians, scientists, social scientists, humanists, and other disciplinary scholars, including librarians, to create new knowledge.

This chapter will use constructivist learning theory as a framework for investigating new pedagogies—including inquiry-based learning (IBL), experiential learning (EL), problem-based learning (PBL), and object-based pedagogy (OBP)—and their place in the current higher education landscape. Some of the issues facing liaison and special collections librarians in the academic library are examined with a focus on the development of new practices that lend themselves well to OBP and support the creation of knowledge production in the digital age. The chapter will also discuss how the development of an object-based learning curriculum can be strengthened by the collaborative creation of an OBP with the scholar, liaison librarian, and special collections librarian as creators, and conclude with a number of examples.

Constructivist Learning Theory

Constructivist learning theory is grounded in the work of early psychologists, including Jean Piaget, who characterized the construction of knowledge as a dynamic cognitive process whereby individuals are constantly seeking equilibration, or balance, between what they know and what they do not know in any given situation.1 Fosnot and Perry describe the role of equilibration in how we construct meaning and new knowledge: “As we assert ourselves with our logical constructs and “act on” new experiences and information, we exhibit one pole of behavior—the pole of activity on the surround; our reflective, integrative, accommodative nature is the other pole—the pole of self-organization.”2 Learning takes place through the constant movement between poles. Two fundamental concepts in constructivist learning theory, representation and cognitive structures, provide a useful framework for developing an OBP.
Representation is the concept that language and symbols play a role in the construction of ideas and new knowledge, that they are not simply transmitting or communicating ideas and concepts already known. Fosnot describes the power of representation: “Constructing symbolic representations empowers us to go beyond the immediacy of the concrete, to cross cultural barriers, to encounter multiple perspectives that generate new possibilities.” Representation also drives people to attempt to order and categorize their experiences so they fit within their individual cognitive understanding; learning takes place when they are forced to find new meanings outside of this construct.

Cognitive structures are human constructs developed to order an individual’s knowledge of the world into holistic systems in essence they are epistemologies. Piaget states, “the notion of structure is comprised of three key ideas: the idea of wholeness, the idea of transformation, and the idea of self-regulation.” Wholeness refers to the idea that structures are comprised of parts that have no meaning outside of the structure and that the structure itself is more than its individual parts. Transformation is the idea that there are relationships between the parts that can be defined wholly within the structure. Self-regulation is the idea that structures are closed systems that seek equilibrium within the structure. Constructivist theorists posited that individuals construct these systems to make sense of the world; learning takes place when an individual becomes aware of them and can make new meaning outside of them. Academic disciplines—such as history, philosophy, and anthropology—can be seen as cognitive structures, each with their own sets of ideas, vocabulary, and norms, with new ideas occurring outside of the structure that are then brought back into the system. More contemporary educational theorists might call these systems mental models: “a critical set of cognitive skills, then, are the ones that enable us to extract information from the external world, allowing these mental models to be constructed, elaborated, revised, and updated.”

**Inquiry-Based Learning**

Inquiry-based learning (IBL), and in corollary, inquiry-based pedagogy, expands upon constructivist learning theory: “constructivism as a set of beliefs provides a model of cognition that leads directly to a method of teaching that, in turn credits the student with the power to become an active learner.” Blessinger and Carfora characterize IBL as an approach that foregrounds the learner and their direct engagement with the curriculum through the instructor’s skillful creation of coursework directly relevant to the learner. Built on a solid foundation of facts grounded in the curriculum, this coursework is designed to allow the student to take responsibility for their own learning in an environ-
ment designed to support their inquiry; teaching is focused on student understanding and not memorization.\textsuperscript{8} The goal in IBL is to move students along the continuum of learning the fundamentals of a discipline or concept through the guidance of the teacher to the point where they are generating their own questions and directing their own learning.\textsuperscript{9}

Inquiry-based pedagogy is common in the science lab where, for example, carefully planned experiments allow students to discover scientific properties of materials or observe chemical reactions. This hands-on type of engagement with the subject matter can provide a more authentic way for students to learn through making and doing; project-based learning is one IBL method that embraces this approach. In project-based learning “students encounter and imagine multiple solutions and manage multiple resources as they research or study and write in various ways.”\textsuperscript{10} Inquiry-based instruction has been shown to be more effective than traditional instruction when measuring student learning.\textsuperscript{11}

**Experiential Learning**

Experiential Learning theory expands upon constructivist learning theory to assert learning is not confined to cognitive processes, but is also socially constructed through experiences—experiences that involve our bodies moving through space. “Experience might be best remembered in the first telling, the collective telling, the re-telling, and the re-remembering of our bodies, not simply our minds.”\textsuperscript{12} A hallmark of experiential learning is reflection: the power of experience is unleashed through the deep critical analysis that leads to new ideas and changes. In experiential learning theory both practitioner and learner reflect on experience to gain new insights.\textsuperscript{13}

Experiential learning is an excellent framework for providing students the authentic type of educational experiences that translate well to life outside the academy. Service learning is one example of experiential learning that has been embedded in higher education for decades; students learn through projects that benefit community partners through the planning and reflection built into good programs.\textsuperscript{14} Community service provides another opportunity for students to learn through experience. Conrad and Hedin note that while the idea of learning through community service is not new, community service as an experiential learning methodology is a more contemporary application.\textsuperscript{15} The authors’ note that while it can be hard to measure the effectiveness of service, there exists both quantitative and qualitative evidence that service learning produces positive educational outcomes: “Evidence from qualitative, anecdotal studies suggests even more strongly and consistently that community service can be a worthwhile, useful, enjoyable, and powerful learning experience.”\textsuperscript{16}
Problem-Based Learning

Experiential learning is also taking place inside the academy—the most obvious example is in the laboratory, but examples exist in programs across the arts and sciences as well. The focus on collaboration among scholars to solve some of the big problems facing our communities and world, including climate change, racism, and poverty, are entering the classroom through problem-based learning (PBL). PBL asks educators to move beyond traditional classroom teaching to create curriculum that involves engaging students in solving “realistic, authentic problems—such as pollution of the planet and feeding the hungry—that are so complex, so messy, and intriguing that they do not lend themselves to a right or wrong answer approach.”17

Object-Based Learning

Constructivist learning theory as a framework for object-based learning and object-based pedagogy positions the learner’s understanding of objects within shared social, cultural, and political structures, and through the exploration of that common construct pushes understanding beyond it to create new structures of meaning. Representation provides a critical framework for understanding how we label, describe, organize, and communicate knowledge about things necessary to build new narratives around them. In the article “How Objects Speak,” Miller reminds us that in order to “unlock the meaning” of objects we need to move beyond our rote systems of understanding of seeing an object as a single thing with a single use or name and place it within larger narratives or cognitive structures that transmit new knowledge.18 In this learning paradigm, the construction of new knowledge is analogous to the creation of new cognitive structures or epistemologies.

Object-based learning has long been part of museum practice. Chatterjee, Hannan, and Thomson note that although it has been known by a number of different names, including object-centered learning and object-based inquiry, objects used in these capacities share a common role: “all these terms refer to the role of objects in the acquisition and dissemination of subject-specific and cross-disciplinary knowledge, observational, practical and other transferable skills.”19 The authors’ note the emergence of material studies as an interdisciplinary field of research in the humanities and the increased emphasis on pedagogy as practice in higher education are creating a space for object-based learning in the archives and special collections.20 Objects exist within social, cultural, and historical relationships with humans, and can tell us a lot about the societies in which they exist.21
No discussion of object-based learning would be complete without a discussion of material culture studies. Dant argues the study of things is integral to cultural studies in that material objects are imbued with social meaning “through their design, the work of producing them, their prior use, the intention to communicate through them and their place within an existing cultural system of objects.” Material studies include the study of a wide range of materials and things—from the study of architecture and the built environment, to the study of fashion, art, and media, to the study of everyday objects and ephemera—predisposing them to interdisciplinary scholarship. In asserting the interdisciplinary nature of material culture studies Woodward notes, “this is important because no object has a single interpretation—objects are always polysemous and capable of transformation of meaning across time and space contexts.” He further notes, “a fundamental principle of material culture studies is that objects have the ability to stand for other things—or establish social meanings—on behalf of, or more precisely along with people.” The idea that objects can be characterized as almost living things—with histories, personalities, and status—imbues them with what we might describe as a social life; the idea of the social lives of objects is a foundational idea for a pedagogy based on object-based learning.

Changing Librarian Practice in the Academic Library

The advent of digital technology for the production and dissemination of scholarly communication has had a profound effect on the core activities of academic libraries, shifting the focus from managing books and physical materials to managing information in an increasingly distributed online environment. At the same time, a more highly competitive market in higher education is placing more emphasis on student learning and undergraduate research in order to attract highly motivated students. Educational researchers are questioning the relationship between research and teaching in an effort to point out the need for renewed focus on teaching excellence: talented researchers do not necessarily make talented teachers. Hughes notes that while there is no evidence of a relationship between research and teaching, there is enough evidence to prove there is a relationship between research and learning.

In an effort to remain relevant in this higher education context, librarians are developing new core competencies to support contemporary modes of scholarly communication, teaching, learning, and research. Purchase-on-demand and vendor approval plans have assumed the bulk of the work of selection and acquisition of materials, opening up space for academic librarians with subject liaison responsibilities to move from selectors and bibliographers
to outreach librarians. These outreach activities have a renewed emphasis on supporting faculty research. The current trend in providing data curation expertise for faculty members engaged in sponsored research activities is a good example; funders are demanding research data management plans that articulate how data will be described, stored, and curated.26 Other outwardly-facing roles for academic librarians include the aptly-named embedded librarians: librarians who are part of research and/or teaching teams where their day-to-day responsibilities may be more tightly bound to their multi-disciplinary team than the library.27

In the archives and special collections, librarians have been somewhat insulated from these trends because their activities have never focused solely on bibliographic activities that support local faculty and students. They have been much more closely aligned with museums and cultural heritage organizations that serve a diverse community of users inside and outside the academy, and their disciplinary practices are distinct. Academic library special collections departments typically hold collections of manuscripts, photographs, personal papers, rare books, and audiovisual materials; archives may hold local history and university records and official correspondence. Purcell notes, “Initially, the purpose of special collections departments was to provide some access to those unique materials, while actively preserving and protecting the material from harm.”28 Current practices might include the creation of finding aids, the curation of exhibits—physical and virtual—instruction, and the creation of original scholarship around a special collection. Because of the rareness or fragility of the materials, special collections librarians have been limited in their outreach efforts by concerns for the security and safety of the materials.

There has been increased focus on the value of library special collections in the past decade for a number of reasons, including increased fiscal constraint from the rapid rise in serial costs and the economic recession of 2007. In addition, the ease of distribution of electronic texts have led academic libraries to focus on their unique content rather than physical collections of books duplicated by other library collections. One outcome has been an expansion of outreach activities in the archives and special collections aimed towards strengthening support for scholars and attracting donors.29 Common outreach programs in the archives and special collections are designed to build a community of users around the collections, both virtually and physically, and include activities to highlight collections and attract researchers.30

* The disciplinary organization for archives and special collections librarians is the Society of American Archivists, a distinct organization from the American Library Association, ALA, the disciplinary organization for public, special and academic librarians. There are also some other fundamental differences in practice, including a different cataloging standard.
A review of the literature reveals a great deal of scholarship around academic library practice and the skillsets needed to be successful in the twenty-first century. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) surveyed their membership, in July 2015, to determine how the liaison role is transforming and concluded practice is indeed moving from a focus on resources to a focus on users and engagement with scholars and students. According to Kalin, librarians need both technology skills (hard skills) and professional skills (soft skills) to accomplish tasks: “soft skill competencies could include the ability to create rapport with users, to engage colleagues as a mentor, and to foster teamwork.” These skills are critical to forging collaborative partnerships among library specialists and faculty to support new teaching and learning models in higher education.

A number of successful collaborations between academic librarians and faculty members engaged in pedagogies related to object-based learning can be found in the literature. In problem-based learning (PBL) faculty-librarian collaboration is essential; according to Cheney, “PBL, by its very nature, requires these two efforts to be joined—how else can students solve problems if they do not also know how to locate the information they need?” She notes the collaborative teaching model is iterative; there is a constant revision of both lessons and assessments based on feedback. Literature on embedded librarians is also a good source for information about librarian-faculty collaboration. Moniz, Henry and Eshleman assert that the role of the embedded librarian in curriculum development is parallel to the faculty members, implying a peer relationship. Faculty are more dependent on a librarian’s ability to navigate new scholarly communication and classroom environments in an increasingly digital world, shifting the balance from librarians supporting faculty in the creation of knowledge to becoming co-creators. At many institutions librarians have assumed a leadership role in the digital humanities, bringing a digital skillset into collaborations that include the publication of digital editions of texts. Collaborations among liaison librarians, special collections librarians, and scholars can produce powerful synergies that come together in the classroom to create dynamic and exciting new environments for student learning based on the study of objects.

Object-Based Pedagogy: Faculty-Librarian Collaboration in the Humanities

The renaissance in humanities scholarship, driven in part by the digital turn, creates the perfect opportunity for archivists and outreach librarians to expand upon traditional primary-source focused activities involving curation and cataloging to include activities that focus on digital representation, data
modeling, and critical digital scholarship. For learning to take place, an object-based pedagogy must challenge students to move beyond their mental models of objects and the role they play in mediating our social, political, and cultural lives to construct new meaning. Librarians can play a key role. There are three types of collaborations in OBP that academic libraries are well-positioned to support: the traditional exhibit with an online archive component; mapping to represent the social lives of objects; and data modeling for critical annotation of a manuscript collection related to a course of study.

For the traditional exhibit with an online archive component, the special collections librarian and faculty member work closely together to choose a relevant collection of primary sources or objects that allow students to explore the ideas of curation and exhibition. The size of the collection and nature of the project is scalable; it could be designed as a project to take place over three classes or a full semester depending on the objective of the curriculum. The students would be provided with guidance on how exhibitions work and given the opportunity to explore how scholarship is embedded in the curation and the arrangement of objects and accompanying text. The liaison librarian would then work with the students to create an online component of the project, leading them through ideas about descriptive metadata, organizational schemas through website navigation, and devising website designs and interfaces exposing the scholarship inherent in the curatorial decisions. Throughout the process, the faculty member provides context to the objects that place them within the disciplinary construct, often history (because many academic library special collections are focused on cultural heritage), but it could be any special collection with meaning for a specific area of study.

This type of collaboration is ideal for building a curriculum around the social lives of objects that can be relevant to more than one discipline. Ulrich, Gaskell, Schechner and Carter provide an intriguing example of one such object, “Blondie Goes to Leisureland,” a boardgame from the Baker Library collection in the Harvard Business School. The boardgame was distributed by appliance retailers as part of Westinghouse Electric Company’s “Leisure Living” advertising campaign in the 1940s and featured Blondie, from the popular comic strip, and her domestically challenged husband, Dagwood. The authors do an excellent job placing the boardgame into a larger narrative of the changing nature of domestic life afforded by the arrival of electronic appliances and the widespread adoption of electricity throughout the United States: “Innovations like refrigerators and washing machines may have done more to change women’s work than to necessarily reduce it.” The object could also be placed in a collection of objects highlighting the use of popular culture images in advertising: Blondie and Dagwood also starred in a month-long exhibition promoting nuclear power in 1948. Finding that one special object in the archive, like this boardgame, could be key to anchoring this type of collaborative OBP.
The second type of OBL is also related to the social lives of objects in that it involves tracing the use of objects across time and space. Spatial tools provide a unique way for students to explore special collections and archives within a critical dimension. Who had access to these objects? Who owned them or maintained them? How were they passed down or acquired and who decided they were valuable? These are some of the questions that can be explored in this framework. Many academic librarians have experience with Geographic Information System (GIS) and mapping software, but free and easy-to-use tools, like Google Earth, can also be used for a collaboration in OBP tracing the social lives of objects. A History of the Book course is a good example of a curriculum that would work well with this model. In this OBP, the faculty member provides the disciplinary context and works with librarians to devise an encounter with objects using a geographical or spatial framework for analysis. Librarians can provide expertise in GIS software and tools, and research support. Students could explore the provenance of a rare item by tracing its ownership over time, or mapping the travels of a diarist, or the correspondence of a collection of letters—the possibilities are limited only by the nature of the collections.

The final collaborative project that proposed for an OBP involves the creation of a data model for critical annotation of manuscripts. As in the first model, special collections librarians would work with the faculty member and liaison librarian collaborators in curating a collection. Then the liaison librarian would guide students through a data modeling exercise using the collection. The team would choose a curated collection of manuscripts or texts that share a common theme—for example, letters between suffragists or political allies—then challenge the students to devise a mark-up schema for annotating the collection so that common themes can be searched for and aggregated across the letters. An easy way to start is with a single letter, and have the students highlight all the important information they think should be labeled—for example, personal names, place names, concepts or themes. This exercise can deeply engage students with the texts and provide the class with a framework for discussing labels, language, symbolism, and how they can create structures for both common understanding and bias.

Conclusion

Encounters with objects can be a powerful learning tool in an environment where reflection and interpretation become part of the classroom culture and students are active participants in constructing meaning. This new classroom dynamic bridges traditional humanities scholarship and academic library practice and focuses on new modes of engagement with objects, exposing their power to tell stories and generate new research questions. Deep engage-
ment with material objects during curriculum development opens up a new space for the scholar and special collections librarian to devise curatorial activities that can be brought into the classroom and into contemporary digital scholarship. The skill liaison librarians have brought to the creation of organizational schemas, metadata creation, and data models for books and journals are easily transferable to the description of material objects in a disciplinary context. Both special collections and liaison librarians can provide expertise in representation, a powerful tool for understanding the social lives of objects in a disciplinary framework that places the learner at the center of the dialogue.
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Science Fiction at Georgia Tech:
LINKING STEM, HUMANITIES, AND ARCHIVES

Sherri Brown and Jody Thompson

Introduction
The Science Fiction Collection1 at the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech) is a major component of the instruction, research, and outreach events involving the archives, the library, campus, and local communities. Collaborative efforts between archivists and librarians have stimulated growth of the physical and digital archival and circulating science fiction collections and have helped bridge the divide between a largely science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) focused campus and the humanities. Sherri Brown, former subject librarian for the School of Literature, Media and Communication (LMC), and Jody Thompson, head of archives, are two of the key players in the growth, outreach, instruction, and use of the collection. This case study highlights how this collection has been collaboratively cultivated and how it works as an essential resource in meeting the teaching, research, and learning goals of the library and the archives.

Institutional Background
Founded in 1885 as a trade school, the Georgia School of Technology was
renamed the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1948. Its advancements in technological and scientific research have transformed it from a regional to an internationally-recognized institution.

An R1-Doctoral public research university, Georgia Tech prides itself on the millions of dollars of grant funding its researchers bring in every year. It also is committed to the education of tomorrow's leaders in a largely technology-focused world. Consistently ranked high in academic excellence and return on investment for its students, Georgia Tech currently boasts a ninety-six percent freshman retention rate.²

With a stated institute-wide focus on improving the human condition through science and technology, Georgia Tech is known for its particularly rigorous STEM curriculum. Current enrollment stands near twenty-five thousand students. Of the over fifteen thousand undergraduate students, sixty-two percent are enrolled in the College of Engineering, twelve percent in the College of Computing, and seven percent in the College of Sciences. The top five undergraduate degrees awarded in spring of 2015 included mechanical engineering, industrial engineering, computer science, electrical engineering, and biomedical engineering. Graduate enrollment is also heavily weighted in the STEM disciplines, with over eighty percent of students enrolled in the Colleges of Engineering, Sciences, or Computing.³

Traditional humanities and social science disciplines at Georgia Tech often have a STEM-related focus. For example, LMC uses the tagline “Humanistic Perspectives in a Technological World” to describe the focus of their research and teaching.⁴

In 1998, a donation of materials to the Georgia Tech Archives by professor emeritus, Irving Flint “Bud” Foote, created the Bud Foote Science Fiction Collection. Foote (1930–2005), served as a professor in what was then known as the School of Literature, Communication and Culture, teaching science fiction studies for over three decades. In 1998, he donated his personal collection of over eight thousand science fiction books as well as his papers to the archives. Since then, the collection has grown through the help of many donors including science fiction author, David Brin, science fiction scholar, Richard Erlich, and the Atlanta Science Fiction Society. The expanding collection is now housed in several locations in the library.

The archives’ non-circulating collection contains over twelve thousand monographs, fifteen hundred serials, and several manuscript collections. The library’s circulating collection currently holds approximately eight thousand monographs and over four hundred serials issues. The collection includes many notable items: first edition scientific romances and utopias from the late nineteenth century, major novels published by science fiction authors of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, first editions of David Brin’s major works, the complete Ballantine Fantasy Series, and rare first editions by H.G
Wells and Jules Verne. While most of the collection’s holdings are in English, other languages represented include Danish (Verdens Undergag), French (Au Cœur de la Comète), German (Krozair von Kregen), Japanese (Toki o kakeru shōjo), Russian (Zaveshchanie professora Douélia), and more. The collection has a modest budget for new materials.

**Impetus for Collaboration**

At Georgia Tech, science fiction makes a natural connection between the humanities, science, and technology. As the archives continued to process and make available Foote’s book collection into the 2000s, a greater emphasis on science fiction literature, film, and criticism occurred within LMC and in other avenues across campus.

Librarians noted the cross-disciplinary connections of science fiction and the potential such a collection held for the Institute, and so in 2009, the dean of libraries convened a science fiction task force to consider the future of the collection. The task force, comprised of librarians and archivists, provided several suggestions for the collection and its use. One key recommendation was to grow the collection to support both the current and future research needs of students and faculty within LMC and to appeal to the leisure reading interests of a largely science and engineering-focused student body. While the Foote Collection laid a foundation of science fiction materials, further development would help to supplement its strengths and make it a collection worthy of any dedicated science fiction researcher.

One outcome of the task force was the creation of a cross-departmental team that would assess the science fiction collection and plan for its future development. This idea evolved into Georgia Tech’s current Science Fiction Committee, a standing committee that informs collecting and provides outreach for our collections. Brown chaired the Science Fiction Committee for several years, with membership including the access archivist, two other librarians, and a number of library staff members.

**Project Scope**

The collaboration between the archives and library, along with campus constituents and the broader science fiction community, has closely followed the mission of the Georgia Tech Science Fiction Committee. The committee’s charge focuses on the need to (1) develop and maintain the Georgia Tech Science Fiction Collection, (2) oversee the Science Fiction Collection website, (3) encourage events, exhibits, and other programming relevant to the Georgia Tech Science Fiction Collection, and (4) raise campus and community awareness of
the Georgia Tech Science Fiction Collection. As a result, connections between the collection, campus, and the science fiction community have continued to grow. Collaborative efforts are highlighted in three areas related to the collection: outreach, instruction, and the creation of a dynamic digital humanities project.

**Outreach**

One of the initial outreach projects undertaken by the Science Fiction Committee was to publicize the collection with its own webpage. With the help of the library’s web developer, the Science Fiction Collection site was launched in late 2010. The page highlights some of the collection and its history and allows users to search for science fiction works in the library’s catalog.

Growth of the collection and awareness of its offerings has relied on close ties with the Georgia Tech campus and the Atlanta-area community. On campus, Dr. Lisa Yaszek, associate chair of LMC, is a science fiction scholar who spearheads many science fiction-related initiatives and has championed the collection for many years. The Georgia Tech librarians and archivists have collaborated with Dr. Yaszek to host and promote science fiction author events and the Science Fiction Committee has provided input into possible course offerings for a future master’s degree program in science fiction within LMC. Dr. Yaszek is also the faculty advisor for the Sci Fi Lab, a weekly radio program of “the best in everything science fiction” co-produced by LMC, WREK radio (Georgia Tech’s college radio station), and the Georgia Tech Library. These efforts help promote the physical collection and strengthens connections between librarians, library staff, archivists, faculty, and students interested in science fiction.

Outreach by the library and archives to the surrounding community has also drawn interest in the collection and its use. The Atlanta area has an active science fiction community and annually hosts DragonCon, a popular science fiction/fantasy convention that has grown to over fifty thousand attendees since its inception in 1987. In 2012, the Science Fiction Committee began creating Science Fiction Collection pinback buttons and making them available to students, faculty, and staff who attend DragonCon to wear as “flair.” The button tradition is hugely popular and is low cost. A one-time purchase of the button maker and then annual purchases of button-making supplies are a budget-friendly request that the library’s administration has continually approved. One of the members of the Science Fiction Committee designed the annual buttons using vintage science fiction book covers and magazines. In order to avoid copyright issues, images used for the buttons are first determined to be in the public domain.
The committee limited the annual number of buttons created to about five hundred total, so as to heighten demand and collectability. The buttons are made available at service points throughout the library and archives about a week before the convention and every year the supply has run out within a couple of days.

In 2015, the Science Fiction Collection buttons were added to the library’s table at the Atlanta Journal-Constitution (AJC) Decatur Book Festival, an annual community festival including world-class author talks and other events. The Science Fiction Committee plans to grow its involvement with this event. The buttons make students and the Atlanta community aware of the large science fiction collection housed at Georgia Tech. They act as conversation-starters to drum up interest in both the archival and circulating collections.

In the fall of 2014, Brown was contacted by an organizer of another, smaller Atlanta-area science fiction convention, AnachroCon, who invited the librarians to attend and speak about the Georgia Tech Science Fiction Collection. After consultation with the committee, Brown and Thompson decided to invite other committee members, who often do not have the opportunity to attend or present at conferences, to lead the presentation. Following the true spirit of collaboration that has marked the collection and its related events, the library invited Dr. Yaszek from LMC and students from the Sci Fi Lab radio show to join the panel and provide a broader context of science fiction research and interests at Georgia Tech. In February 2015, the panel presented “Science Fiction Initiatives and Programs at Georgia Tech” at the area conference. When Dr. Yaszek had a last-minute conflict, the library sent two staff members from the committee who discussed the history of science fiction at Georgia Tech, the evolution of the archives and circulating collections, and some of the unique historical materials in the collection. The acquisitions librarian described the acquisitions process for the collection and how the graphic novel and DVD science fiction holdings have grown to supplement the traditional texts. The three also discussed the collaboration between the library and archives staff and LMC (including Dr. Yaszek), and their work with the radio show (one of
The library panelists served for a short time as co-host of the show. Two students from the show added information about their own research and coursework related to science fiction literature and how the Georgia Tech Science Fiction Collection aided them in their scholarly endeavors.

Each outreach activity has helped build connections throughout campus and in the community. Dr. Yaszek worked with Thompson to make a connection with the Atlanta Science Fiction Society, Atlanta-area science fiction enthusiasts who meet once a month for programming and discussions. The group now makes an annual deposit of materials to the library—largely convention materials collected at area events—and recently agreed to fund the library’s subscription to *Analog*, a key science fiction magazine. Brown and Thompson coordinated a plan to make the issues of *Analog* and other science fiction journals and magazines, available for two years in the circulating collection. After that, the serials are moved to archives for long-term preservation as part of the collection.

**Instruction**

Another collaboration between archivists and liaison librarians is through instruction offerings. As a liaison librarian at Georgia Tech, Brown has access to listservs for her liaison department and its sub-units that the archivists do not. Therefore, each semester, Thompson sends a call for those interested in using the archives for their class projects to the liaison librarians, who then forward it on to their departments. Oftentimes, the resulting classes will be co-coordinated with an archives component and a general library research component. Science fiction is one collection that sees a great deal of use each year due to its ties with both STEM and the humanities.8

One example of a course-integrated project collaboration between Thompson and Brown occurred in the fall of 2013. Brown was approached by Dr. Patricia Taylor, an instructor in the writing and communication program, in response to an email Brown sent to all instructors inviting them to contact her if interested in having their students work with the archives during the semester. Dr. Taylor was planning an introductory English course on science fiction and ethics and was interested in having students create an electronic exhibit related to the course theme. Brown set up a brainstorming meeting with Dr. Taylor and Thompson prior to the start of the semester before the instructor finalized her syllabus. The three confirmed the details of the project and constructed a plan on how the archives and library would be involved. The project made use of both the library’s circulating science fiction collection and the archives’ non-circulating rare magazine collection. The final deliverable required the creation of a website highlighting representative science fiction found in the archives from a particular time period. For the details of the assignment, see Appendix 4A.
Four dates over the course of the semester were identified to host an introduction to the resources and time for the students to work with the collections. Learning objectives for the introductory sessions included: (1) garnering a basic knowledge of archives and libraries; (2) understanding the different types of materials available; (3) understanding the nature of archival research; and (4) applying the process and knowledge learned through this project to other research projects in the library and archives.

The project began by introducing the students to the library and archival science fiction collections through tours led by Brown and Thompson. Three fifty-minute sections of twenty-five students would meet each time, so the librarians decided in order to cover all necessary content while making the most of the librarian and archivist’s time, the sessions would occur on two different dates and only one collaborator would be present. To ensure no overlap in sessions, Brown and Thompson coordinated the topics and resources to be covered in each session. Thompson and other archivists would focus on primary sources and archival research, while Brown would provide instruction on finding and evaluating secondary source materials and resources.

Since the majority of classes consisted of first-semester, first-year students, the collaborators decided to make the initial session, which met in mid-September, an introduction to basic library resources, an overview of the circulating science fiction materials, and instruction in how to search for assignment-related resources via the online catalog and databases. The library session began with a brief tour of the library’s multimedia studio; students were introduced to the lab space where they would find computers loaded with the creative suite software needed to create their websites. They then made a stop at the circulating Science Fiction Collection, in the main library, to familiarize the students with the location and space. This was followed by an introduction to the types of multimedia tools available for student use—everything from laptops, to digital cameras and camcorders, to Wacom digital drawing tablets, to iPads. Finally, Brown introduced students to academic library research, using their assignment as an example, by showing them a class-specific research guide she had created based on their assignment needs and demonstrating searches in databases including MLA International Bibliography and JSTOR for relevant articles related to science fiction studies. The collaborators decided the guide would focus on how to find secondary source materials; the students would be introduced to primary sources and archival research during the next class session.

Later that week, students met in the archives for an instruction session on how to find archival collections through the archives’ finding aids and digital collections, and how to handle rare materials. At the end of this session, students participated in a non-curriculum based active learning activity called History Sleuth.
The project gave the students hands-on experience with primary materials dealing with Georgia Tech history from the general university archives collections. Students used the collections to answer questions related to the history of Georgia Tech. History Sleuth is a fast-track, engaging way to introduce students to archival research and lessen the intimidation of working with rare and unique materials.

During class the following week, the instructor brought the students back to the archives to meet with an archivist, engage in hands-on experience with the science fiction magazines, and start work on their group projects. Their final assignment would consist of contributing to a website providing context for stories found in the archives’ collection of science fiction magazines including *Astounding*, *Galaxy*, *Asimov’s*, and *Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction*. Following Dr. Taylor’s assignment requirements, the students were instructed to focus on issues published between 1940 and 1980. With the help of one or two archivists teaching each session, the student groups selected their science fiction magazine articles and were instructed on the allowances and restrictions of copyright. During the session, the archivists briefly discussed the differences between physical and intellectual ownership and how to seek permission to use published materials in their digital collection.

The assignment focused on group writing and design, and touched on topics such as cover art, biographies, and important historical events. The students also received technical instruction on creating their websites from their instructor. Throughout the semester, the students worked on their essays and created the digital collection.
At the end of the semester, the course instructor sent Thompson and Brown an email sharing some of the best group websites and letting them know how well students had incorporated their archival work into their presentations.

![Figure 4.3. Three of the group websites created for Dr. Taylor’s class.](image)

When asked to reflect back on the project, one student noted that while it involved a good deal of work, the experience was worthwhile:

> It was really cool to go visit the archives and look through the old materials. I remember being awed and impressed by the preservation of the materials, and I’m very glad we were able to get scans of the relevant material, since I was so afraid of damaging the works. The magazines were structured very differently from magazines today and were a lot of fun to flip through.\textsuperscript{11}

**Digital Humanities**

Another opportunity Brown and Thompson had to collaborate with a faculty member came in the spring of 2012, when a relatively new assistant professor in LMC, Dr. Lauren Klein, contacted Brown. Brown was already working with the professor’s spring 2012 class providing research instruction and assistance. Dr. Klein hoped another collaboration could continue into the fall when she would be teaching a class on digital humanities. Dr. Klein was interested in involving archival materials in her major course project and she had heard the archives had a science fiction poster collection. The archives collection has few posters, but this opened up a dialogue about what comprises the collection. After an email discussion with Thompson and Brown, the professor became interested in using the science fiction convention programs and fanzines from the collection. A time was set for the three to meet and discuss how use of this collection might work for the professor’s class. The final class product was to
be a digital collection of fanzines and programs taken from the larger archives collection. The three collaborators determined the specific roles needed for students to create the digital exhibit. The students were broken into groups with each group member performing a different role: one was chosen as project manager, one sought copyright permissions from the fanzine’s creator, one scanned and checked the OCR (Optical Character Recognition) documents and transcribed as needed, and one was responsible for creating the digital collection for that particular fanzine issue on the class website, using the collection management tool, Omeka.

The students came as a class to the archives twice. The first visit occurred at the beginning of the semester and introduced students to archival practices, preservation, and copyright. The session was led by one of the archivists; Brown attended and provided support. In the second session, which occurred a couple of weeks later, the archivist and Brown introduced the students to the fanzine collection. Students perused the collection in their groups and chose the particular fanzine issue with which they wanted to work for the semester. Days later, those students assigned as scanners visited the archives to learn to create an archival master of a scanned document and derivative files from that document. Brown attended as well, prompting students with her own questions about OCR and archival scanning.

Mid-semester, Brown, Thompson, and others attended a presentation of the digital collection prototypes the students had created and were given a chance to critique the students’ work. Brown and Thompson focused their questions on display issues, metadata, and copyright. At the end of the semester, the same group returned to the class to see final group presentations and provide final feedback.

Conclusion

The success of the collaboration between Brown and Thompson helped promote the Science Fiction Collection within the library and archives and use of materials by the Georgia Tech campus and the Atlanta science fiction community. Future endeavors and enhanced changes are described in three areas in relation to the collection and collaboration: impact, lessons learned, and next steps.

Impact

The impact of this collaboration between the archivists and Brown has greatly increased the use of both the archives and circulating Science Fiction Collection. In particular, until the collaboration, the archives’ science fiction maga-
Zines were rarely used by faculty and students. Now, numerous class projects are conducted each year around the collection.

One of Dr. Klein’s goals from the beginning of her class was to have the digital collection preserved and added to over time, and so once a year, she leads another class through the process and works with the archivists to lend their expertise. Overall, the archives is benefiting from the ever-growing digital collection as use of the physical and digital collections have increased. The digital collection has grown to include eleven zines.\(^{12}\)

The collaboration also benefited the librarians and archivists involved through continuing professional development. In working together with the archivists, Brown learned much about archival procedures and about Georgia Tech’s specialized collections that she then, in turn, was able to pass on to others in her liaison department. The archives hopes to expand their work with other liaison librarians in the future to create new and engaging partnerships.

**Lessons Learned**

At Georgia Tech, science fiction has held popular appeal for professors and students, but any unique collection held by a special collections or archives could be used in the same way. The collaborators have learned the key to successful outreach and instruction lies in targeting the right audience and taking every opportunity to remind users of what is available, why it is special, and how it can be used.

The collaboration between Brown, Thompson, and others has helped spread the word about the collection and distribute the amount of work and effort needed to keep the collection in the forefront of people’s minds. The collaborators promoted the idea that library research is a natural extension of archival research and vice versa to benefit their respective areas. Students and other researchers often start out with an idea for a specific need—either for primary resources, such as archival special collections, or for secondary research such as journal articles or monographs. In coordinating efforts between the two units, the archivists and librarians are able to extend the research help they offer users. If a student comes to the archives for a story from a 1940s issue of *Astounding Science Fiction*, for example, it is an opportunity to promote critical resources for placing that story in context. In the same vein, when a professor mentions to a librarian that he/she is teaching a class on science fiction, the librarian can suggest allowing students to experience unique primary materials held in the archives.

In working with Dr. Klein’s digital humanities classes, a few of the procedures have changed as lessons were learned as to what worked well and what did not. Students are continuing to benefit from the project, obtaining hands-on experience with unique primary materials and a better understanding of
archives, digital collections, and materiality. The feedback from students has been helpful in assessment. In several of the students’ class evaluations, comments were made about connecting the physical and the digital materials, so archivists have revised the class accordingly.

**Next Steps**

The Science Fiction Committee and its campus collaborators continue to promote the collection. Outreach efforts on campus and in the community continue to expand. LMC is interested in science fiction as a subject area, so the plan is that collaboration among Thompson, the humanities librarian, and the department will continue to grow. The Science Fiction Committee, with help from the archivists and Dr. Yaszek, are talking about archiving the Sci Fi Lab radio programs as podcasts to be added to the larger Science Fiction Collection. This is a unique opportunity to capture the media output of Georgia Tech students and faculty and to preserve it for generations to come.

Staff continue to engage with the Atlanta-area community. The organizers for another science fiction convention invited Thompson to present about the collection. Plans are underway for library and campus partners to attend JordanCon, a fantasy literature convention, in spring 2016.

Brown left for a new opportunity in January 2016. The new humanities librarian will serve as chair of the Science Fiction Committee and assume the annual collaborative efforts Brown and the archivists cultivated. Plans are to seek out opportunities across institutions to continue the relationships built over the last five years in support of science fiction research. The Science Fiction Collection at Georgia Tech has proven to be an attractive impetus for partnerships on campus and in the Atlanta area. Its unique blend of humanities and STEM-related themes, archival and library resources make the collection perfect for building relationships that will strengthen the archives, the library, Georgia Tech, and ties to the local community.
Appendix 4A. English Assignment

Dr. Patricia R. Taylor
English 1102 | Fall 2013 | Artifact 4

Science Fiction Special Collections Website

CONTEXT

The Georgia Tech Science Fiction Collection is one of the Institute's most unique resources for research and education. In 1998, GT literature professor Irving “Bud” Foote laid the foundation for the science fiction collection by donating his personal book and magazine collection to Georgia Tech Archives, which currently holds over 10,000 science fiction and fantasy novels, anthologies, and more than 1,000 periodical issues. This includes complete or largely complete runs of significant science fiction magazines, such as: Astounding/Analog (1933–2006); Asimov’s (1977–2005); Galaxy (1950–1980); and Magazine of Fantasy & Science Fiction (1950–2000, partial). American science fiction printed between 1950 and 1990 is the collection’s strongest coverage area. Most fiction items are held in Georgia Tech Archives; duplicate copies of these items (when available) can be found in the Library’s general collection, along with a variety of secondary and reference works related to science fiction studies.

PROJECT

Over the course of the rest of the semester, you will work in groups of 5 to develop a website that explores and contextualizes part of the collection, and offers a window into the science fiction of a particular time period. Each group will be assigned a year range (anywhere from 2–5 years) between 1940 and 1980. The website will be complemented with a group presentation that introduces our class to a representative science fiction story from the time period, as well as some of the material from the website.

GROUP WRITING AND DESIGN

1. As a group, you will design a website that will introduce people to the science fiction you discover in the course of your archival research.
2. This website should include not only information about the science fiction stories, authors, and magazines in the archives, but also information on the historical, scientific, or cultural contexts of the stories. To this end, the group should devise a series of articles for the website, and assign them equitably between members of the group. [See individual component]
CHAPTER 4

a. Suggested topics for articles might include, but are not limited to: cover art; author, artist, or editor biographies; contemporary scientific developments; important historical events; advertising; awards; readership; layouts; magazine distribution; patterns in story content; representations of gender or race; etc.

3. The group must also collaboratively write a 500–750 word “introduction” to the website, and include a comprehensive works cited.

INDIVIDUAL WRITTEN COMPONENT

1. Each person must write a minimum of 1500 words of “copy” for the website in order to receive a passing grade for the individual component of the project.

2. You may distribute these 1500 words across as many or as few articles as the group decides are necessary. For example, one person might be directed to write a single 1500-word article; someone else might write three 500-word articles; someone else might write five 300-word articles; someone else might one 1000-word article and two 250 word articles. Someone else might even write ten 150-word articles.
   a. Collaborative writing is acceptable for some of articles if the majority of each person’s contributions are still individual. For example, two people might write three 400-word articles each, and then together co-write one 700-word article.
   b. Each article must include the names all of major contributors.

3. These articles must demonstrate academic and not just popular research into the topics chosen for the articles, and they must always have both stance and support. Be sure to also make use of the features and affordances of websites (multimedia, linking, etc.) in your articles.

PRESENTATION

1. The group will choose 1–2 stories from the collections for the class to read and discuss. These must be chosen by Oct. 9th.

2. You will choose select materials and information from your website to help the class understand the historical, cultural, or scientific context of the stories, and produce a 20-minute presentation. All members of the group must contribute orally to the presentation.

3. In the remaining 25 minutes of class, you will lead the rest of the class in a discussion of your chosen stories.

Important Dates
Sept. 16: Research Orientation
Sept. 20: Archives Orientation (History Detective)
Sept. 23: Archives Research
Sept. 25: Part A Due: Proposal for Website Organization
Oct. 9: Archives Research. Part B Due
Oct 18: Time in class for group work
Nov. 11 and 13: Time in class for web design work
Nov. 15–25: Group Presentations
Nov. 27: Final Website Due

PART A: WEBSITE DESIGN AND ORGANIZATION PROPOSAL

Must include:

- Assignments for primary roles:
  1. Project Manager. Responsible for keeping all members of the team coordinated, making sure all elements of the project are properly assigned, making sure all individuals are up-to-date on their tasks (reminding individuals of deadlines, assignment requirements, etc.), and assigning tasks equitably as necessary.
  2. Website designer. Responsible for designing, creating, and maintaining the site architecture.
  3. Presentation Coordinator. Responsible for coordinating the presentation by making sure the class has copies of the short story at least 1 week in advance; organizing the content of the presentation; making sure all members contribute equally to the presentation; organizing discussion questions; and keeping the presentation itself on-time.
  4. Visual Designer. Must work closely with Website Designer and Presentation Coordinator to establish and maintain a consistent visual look to represent the team. Responsible for all image creation, making sure images on the site look good, etc.
  5. Editor. Responsible for proofreading and doing minor editing for all documents for the website and presentation.

- A 300- to 500- word description of the content of the website, including major themes/through-lines for research, with rationale.
- A bulleted list of expected articles and approximate lengths, with authors assigned.

PART B

By the end of class on Oct. 9th, each group should have a list of all magazine issues and page numbers they want the library to scan. This should include the story or stories you want your classmates to read for your presentation.
Notes

8. Since 2011, the archivists and the LMC librarian have offered fifteen instructional sessions and projects dealing with science fiction. Sessions included classes from LMC, English, and the Duke University Talent Identification Program (TIP).
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Introduction

Collecting artists’ publications—both books and serials—can be a complicated and expensive project. A collaborative collection development policy is one way to make the process sustainable, especially during times of budget reductions and limited resource allocations. This case study specifically considers the process of formulating and implementing a collaborative collection development strategy for artists’ books at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). It considers the preparation work necessary for such an undertaking, the implications for the librarians and curators involved in the process, as well as the benefits and challenges to instituting such an approach to collections.

At art and design schools or museum libraries, artists’ book collections tend to be the responsibility of one librarian or curator, and the collection development policy is specific to the individual library or site. However, in a large university these materials are often held in multiple locations. At UIUC, artists’ books are held at the Rare Book and Manuscript Library (RBML), the Ricker Library of Architecture and Art, and the Krannert Art Museum (KAM), which makes developing the collections and maintaining consistent access to the materials more difficult than if they were held in one location. In
this regard, it can be beneficial for art librarians and special collections curators to work together to best serve the many constituencies on campus and to build collections that serve the larger community of scholars.

The term artists’ book is not necessarily common idiom outside the realm of art historians, art librarians, and special collections curators, in part due to the amorphous and disparate nature of these books, but also because they are often produced in a limited edition and not widely available to a broad audience. Additionally, artists’ books are defined differently depending on the specific collection context or individual writing about the materials. Scholars on the subject suggest the artists’ book, as thought of today, had its beginnings in avant-garde movements of the early twentieth-century. Artists began quickly and cheaply producing books, magazines, and other types of publications that included their thoughts, words, and images. This was a move away from the art establishment that prioritized fine press printing, luxury editions, livres d’artistes and the consumer culture that collected such items.* These early examples can also be part of an artists’ book collection insomuch as they inform the history of artists’ book making practices.

For the purposes of this case study and the collaborative strategy for collection development of artists’ books at UIUC, a simple and straightforward definition was agreed upon. The term artists’ book will refer to materials conceived and created by an artist as art, which comes in the form of a book or a book-like object. They are “as visually and conceptually whole as a painting or a sculpture.”1 The artist-produced publications can be realized as a serial form or as a stand-alone singular book. Regardless of the means of production, edition size, or price, an artists’ book is considered art and was conceived as such. By leaving the definition somewhat open-ended, rather than imposing strict demarcations, decisions about what constitutes an artists’ book collection can be left to stewards and selectors of these collections. At UIUC, decisions regarding acquisitions must be a reflection of the curricular mandates and instructional programs, which can change over time. Additionally, it is important for policy to allow for shifting ideas and classifications of these unique items. During initial discussions, it was clear librarians and curators had differing views of what constitutes an artist’s book. However, by working together agreements about collection priorities are becoming clear, which will benefit both collections and scholars.

* Livres d’artistes and éditions de luxe were often the creation of a publisher interested in presenting rare and fanciful editions of well-known works of literature elaborately embellished by equally well-known artists, frequently presenting modern interpretation of classic works by Dante, Shakespeare, Ovid, and the like.
Institutional Background

The University of Illinois is a public, land-grant university founded in 1867. The University of Illinois system has three campuses; Urbana-Champaign is the flagship and largest campus. UIUC is a doctoral university with over forty-four thousand students enrolled in 2015: thirty-two thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight undergraduate students and eleven thousand two hundred and nine graduate students. UIUC consists of over fifteen academic divisions with over one hundred fifty fields of study for undergraduate students and more than one hundred graduate programs.2

UIUC has one of the largest public university library collections in the world, with a collection of thirteen million volumes and over twenty-five individual unit/department libraries. The Ricker Library of Architecture and Art, one of the unit libraries, contains over one hundred thirty thousand volumes and more than thirty-three thousand volumes of periodicals. The collection is actually much larger, but many items—including some artists’ books—have been moved to university’s main library, RBML, and the university’s high-density storage facility on campus. The Ricker Library serves as the main library for the Schools of Architecture and Art+Design.

RBML is one of the largest special collections in the United States. RBML is located in the Main Library. Much of the collection is onsite in their secure vault area; however, some materials are in a protected area of the high-density storage facility on campus. RBML provides presentations, class visits, and specialized instruction sessions for students and faculty across all academic divisions and hosts a large number of scholars from around the world each year.

Impetus for Collaboration

New Librarians and Curators at UIUC

For many years, librarians at the Ricker Library and curators at RBML had collaborated and consulted with one another regarding art and architecture-related materials. They hosted classes from the Art History Department, as well as from the Graduate School of Library and Information Science (GSLIS), who were interested in items from both libraries’ collections. As RBML and the Ricker Library had worked on cataloging and special projects in the past, collection development of artists’ books was another way to collaborate to improve access, service, and outreach to shared researchers.

The collaborative approach to collecting artists’ books developed, in part, from these established close-working relations, but also because of a renewed interest in the artist’ book collection that came from new hires within RBML,
the Ricker Library, and the museum. These new librarians and curators had a deep interest in and experience with collecting artists’ books and saw the value of working together to build the unique collections on campus. In the summer of 2015, Melanie Emerson, Head of the Ricker Library of Architecture and Art, Valerie Hotchkiss, and Andrew S. G. Turyn, Endowed Professor and Director of RBML, began conversations regarding a shared approach to building collections, which eventually led to the inclusion of Amy L. Powell, curator of modern and contemporary art at the KAM. As the process moved forward, other curators from RBML were brought into the process. Every curator or librarian included in the early conversations and planning process was responsible for collections that included artists’ books. Yet, each lacked a complete understanding of the other collections and how the collections might complement and enhance the holdings of one another, while staying true to the mission of the individual entities.

Prior to joining UIUC’s Ricker Library of Architecture and Art, Emerson’s work experience was primarily within the realm of art museum libraries and archives. In these smaller and specialized libraries, collections included a large number of special collection materials—specifically artists’ books, artist illustrated books, and livres d’artistes. Upon starting at UIUC, it was clear to Emerson the library’s collection of artists’ books was spread throughout the collections and libraries—most heavily concentrated within RBML and the Ricker Library. Trying to navigate this vast and dispersed environment led to many questions about the artists’ book collection: questions about the organization, selection, availability, and the focus of these materials. Who was responsible for acquiring these materials and promoting the collections to faculty and students? Collaboration between the Ricker Library and RBML became a clear way to develop a strategy to develop collections, increase discoverability, and increase use of these vital and unique materials.

**Collections and Research Trends**

While UIUC’s special collections (including RBML) has not made artists’ book a top priority, a 2010 survey of special collections and archives by OCLC shows this is a growing area of interest. Respondents to the survey made clear there was a concerted effort to build artists’ book collections. UIUC, RBML, and the Ricker Library already have a number of very important artists’ books and have some strong holdings in contemporary artists’ books. The Ricker Library has many examples of late twentieth-century artists’ books, such as

* The Krannert Art Museum (KAM) does not actively collect artists’ book per se, but they do have some materials that can be considered within the realm of “democratic multiple,” and other types of multiples by artists.
all of Ed Ruscha’s books. RBML has a strong collection of fine press, artist illustrated books, and handcrafted artists’ books by artists with an affiliation to the university, but also those that represent exemplars of book arts. In addition to having a solid collection of artists’ books—though not a distinct collection—the librarians and curators in the Ricker Library and RBML have deep knowledge of artists’ books. Librarian expertise and the existing collections of artists’ books create an ideal opportunity for creating a holistic collection development strategy.

Artists’ books are original art objects and offer valuable opportunity for primary source research—which is at the core of current research trends in the humanities, most notably in art history. In the 2014 report from ITHAKA S+R on the changing nature of the research habits of art historians, the authors suggest access to primary source materials should be priority for librarians, archivists, and curators. “Many interviewees said their most significant working relationship with a librarian or archivist is with the individual who helps them access primary sources.” The research needs of the UIUC faculty, curators, and students reflect this trend toward original source materials, especially in art and design fields. This underscores the importance of collaboration between librarians and curators at UIUC to better serve users through a cohesive collection development strategy and consistent cataloging of special collections, such as artists’ books. All of which can lead to greater knowledge of similar materials throughout campus. When librarians, curators, and archivists build collections together, it strengthens their ability to help users with research, making them an effective partner in the research process.

**Instruction with Artists’ Books at UIUC**

Across higher education, there is an interest in incorporating experiential learning techniques into instruction; using artists’ books as primary source materials offers students different modes of engaging in critical thinking and research. To this end, some librarians and faculty have been working together to develop programs incorporating special collections and rare books, in particular, artists’ books. At UIUC, the Ricker Library has worked with five faculty members in architecture, graphic design, art history, and landscape architecture to incorporate artists’ book into instruction sessions. In the 2015–2016 academic year, artists’ books were incorporated into six undergraduate instruction sessions and one graduate course. Like many other materials in special collections, through visual form, artists’ books invite curiosity, exploration, and investigation, lending themselves to new ways of presenting ideas and thinking about research, which provides the impetus for reevaluating current collection development related to artists’ books.
During the fall 2015 semester, RBML hosted a group of students from an art history course on twentieth-century European art. The class relied heavily on the Ricker Library’ holdings of Futurists, Surrealists, and other modernist materials—including artist illustrated books and journals—supplemented by materials available at RBML. This gave librarians and curators opportunity to better understand the holdings of each collection and how to build upon these resources. RBML curators and staff frequently request materials from the Ricker Library to supplement their collections when hosting workshops on bookmaking and the history of artists’ books. In addition to working with faculty from the School of Art+Design, RBML curators have also shown artists’ books in presentations for classes not directly tied to art or design.

**Project Scope**

**Preliminary Research**

To create a collaborative collection development policy or guidelines, research began on artists’ book collection development at other institutions. There have been a number of articles related to artists’ books and collection development, but most do not provide details of these policies. Instead, articles tend to cover the history of collections or descriptions of individual collections. Many articles are written by or based on interviews with librarians at art and design schools or other stand-alone special collections where there is one person responsible for the collections. There is a natural propensity of art and design schools to collect these materials, but this does not speak to how these materials are collected at UIUC, where the artists’ books are spread throughout departments and across a sprawling campus.

In addition to articles, at least two surveys have been conducted in the last ten years through the Art Librarians Society of North American (ARLIS/NA) e-mail listserv (ARLIS-L), which solicited collection development policies from subscribers: one by Terrie Wilson, art librarian at Michigan State University (MSU), in August 2001 and another by Traci Timmons, librarian for the Dorothy Stimson Bullitt Library at the Seattle Art Museum, in July of 2015. In response to the 2015 survey, Timmons received only four responses that included written collection development policies related to artists’ books—one was the policy written by Wilson for MSU’s fine art library collection. MSU’s policy is available on the library’s website as a LibGuide; artists’ books are included in an appendix. The policy, as well as Wilson’s article on the same topic, hints at a collaborative relationship between the special collections library and the fine arts library on MSU’s campus, but does not focus on this aspect. Because of the similarities between departments at MSU and UIUC, MSU’s policy was a very useful for writing our policy.
Assessment and Maintenance of Current Collections

Before crafting a policy, the Ricker Library and RBML need firm understanding of the current collection of artists’ books. UIUC librarians and curators have been working to better identify all the artists’ books in the collections. Since August of 2015, the Ricker librarians have been searching holdings in the library’s main stacks and the high-density storage facility to identify artists’ books and other books illustrated or designed by artists. This time-consuming project involves searching the library catalog for materials by a large number of artists who are known for making or illustrating books. Once an item has been determined to be an artist’s book or something akin to an artist’s book (i.e. limited-edition, artist-illustrated book), it is transferred to Ricker Library’s non-circulating collection or the special collection area of the high-density storage faculty. A benefit of this process is finding materials with cataloging errors. One such example is Ben Shahn’s illustrated holiday book published in 1951. Two copies of the book were found to be held by UIUC: the Ricker Library’s copy was cataloged as a completely different book and the copy in storage had the wrong publication date. Analyzing the current holdings of artists’ books, and their catalog records laid the foundation for understanding the artists’ book collection and continuing to implement the collaborative approach to collection development.

Such a review of collection holdings builds on existing collection management projects, including RBML's efforts to transfer early and rare materials from the library’s collection to special collections. While RBML had not targeted artists’ books previously, artists’ books can fit the guidelines set by RBML and some artists’ books have already been moved. RBML’s criteria is based, in large part, on ALA’s Guidelines on the Selection and Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections, and includes age, rarity (held by five or fewer libraries in WorldCat), limited editions, and value of materials. Moving these materials to special collections ensures a controlled and secure environment, as libraries at UIUC outside the special collections libraries all have different levels of climate control and secured storage areas. Many of the items found by the art librarians are items that are considered semi-rare—often limited edition contemporary artists’ books—thus more appropriate for the Ricker Library collections.

Conclusion

At UIUC there has been a history of bookmaking practice that has its roots in the School of Art+Design, specifically in the photography and printmaking departments, and this has spread to the GSLIS program. Artists’ book collections have long held an important place in the library because they engage
students with art in a direct and tactile manner. This can help students better understand artistic practice as well as make connections between visual representation, intellectual inquiry, and research practices. New librarians and curators at UIUC have made efforts to use these books as teaching tools for studio courses, traditional history, and theory-based course work. Artists’ books meet students’ growing desire for visual materials. Artists’ books may first be encountered as more traditional text-based sources, and then discovered as something much more profound based on its visual content. To this end, they can serve as a very effective form of outreach and engagement for librarians working with students and faculty across disciplines, but especially in more visual fields, including art history, art, design, and the history of art production.

**Impact**

The most immediate and noticeable impact of this process has been the ways in which the liaison librarian interacts with special collections—it provided the impetus to consider the special collections as an extension of those in the Ricker Library, rather than a separate collection. The project gave the librarians and curators the chance to talk about library holdings, collection priorities, as well as long-term goals for the libraries. It offered the opportunity to understand where more collaboration and joint projects might benefit both RBML and the Ricker, and also other libraries on campus. Beyond the direct impact on those working together, the collaboration has meant reaching out to other librarians on campus to understand collaborative projects that have been successful as well as those that have not. It provided the opportunity to explore commonalities in collections, services, and users between unit libraries and special collections. Thinking about curators and librarians as a larger team providing instruction and services to overlapping researchers offers the chance to enhance access to materials in a holistic manner. The project has also lead to a greater understanding of the artists’ books in the collections and how they might be incorporated into various forms of instruction and outreach. Additionally, librarians and curators have established new relationships with faculty across campus, which has been particularly useful for the librarians and curators who are new to UIUC.

**Lessons Learned**

Originally the plan was to complete the majority of the work by the end of the summer and early fall of 2015, however the scale of the UIUC library system and the complexities of the state procurement system made some of this work difficult and slow moving. Additionally, overcoming embedded notions regarding individual collections is difficult and ceding control, or even shar-
ing control, for collections decisions have implications beyond the scope of the project. It is difficult to modify current workflow and incorporate other librarians into existing procedures within the acquisition process. However, by coming to a good understanding of the policies and the collections within the various units involved, it is possible to modify the process incrementally. Developing a collaborative collections strategy for crafting guidelines and building collections, even if informal, has the potential to build collections strategically and develop a unique collection of artists’ books matching the strengths of the individual collections and reflecting the breadth of the university library holdings.

While our project is not complete and is, in fact, taking much longer than anticipated, it has led to a larger discussion about how the library, museum, and special collections can work together to promote and build a unified collection that will improve the user experience in what can be a complicated system of libraries and special collections.

**Next Steps**

The next steps for implementing a collaborative approach to collection development policies and practices for artists’ books are to assess collections and determine distinctions between locations on campus. Each of the libraries at UIUC share a library-wide mission, but have different priorities within their collections. The Ricker Library’s collection is thought of as a teaching collection that works well when coupled with secondary sources and supporting materials in the collection. RBML continues to collect materials that augment their larger collections. Artists’ books can serve as examples of specific types of production, structure, or printing processes. The museum’s acquisition process is focused on leveraging collections for use in exhibitions and programming. Working with the art librarian and special collection curators to understand how their collection development practices complement one another, or perhaps, overlap, enables the museum staff to reserve their resources for highly-sought, museum quality pieces, rather than those sources that might be more appropriate for a library to collect. By collaboratively assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the collection, the librarians and curators can plan for acquiring in areas determined to be of interest and focus for each of the libraries. Collecting artists’ books in such a manner will build a more robust collection across the library system.

The goal for UIUC is to put these steps into practice:

- **Discuss the collaborative approach with library administration.** The collaborating team seeks to make the acquisition process easier and to enhance the discoverability of the artists’ book collections. Additional funding may be available through centralized funds or with
the help of the library’s advancement (or development) office. It provides the chance to have frank discussion about budget allocations, especially during difficult financial times. Communication allows the collaborating librarians and curators to identify shifting priorities and plan for the future. The University of Illinois, like many state-funded institutions, has strict acquisition (or procurement) procedures that make acquisitions from independent artists and publishers more difficult than those from the mainstream presses. By working together with library administration, there is the chance to find new ways to open up this process or find procedures that make the approval of vendors efficient.

- **Meet jointly with vendors and artists selling artists’ books.** This can be complicated and may not always be possible, as there are occasionally unplanned vendor visits and meetings off campus at book fairs and the like. When possible, all librarians and curators responsible for collecting the materials will be included in meetings with vendors who sell artists’ books.

- **Meet annually to discuss acquisition of artists’ books.** The meeting will provide an opportunity to stay informed about the collection, which will allow the liaison librarians and special collections curators to better incorporate these items into instruction sessions and presentations. It also ensures those collaborating understand how the collections are growing across campus. Additional communication among curators, librarians, and faculty throughout the year regarding new acquisitions or items under consideration may spark ideas about other materials that may be considered for acquisition. Regular communication between departments builds a better understanding of these unique collections and provides the chance to make connections with new programs and instruction sessions.

- **Identify staff for cataloging artists’ books.** RBML has curators and staff who work on their materials and the Ricker Library has a specific staff member who catalogs special items, such as artists’ books. By working together with acquisitions and cataloging, the group can identify the correct person to handle all original cataloging necessary for the artists’ books, to ensure consistency and expediency.

### Notes

6. In September 2015 Timmons shared the results of her survey with a number of interested parties, including the author.
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Introduction

The collaboration between Lynn Eaton, special collections librarian, and Dr. Brian Flota, English liaison librarian† at James Madison University (JMU), began with a simple premise. Their goal was to build the special collections’ holdings of African American literature. What began with an initial acquisition of eight issues of *Journal of Black Poetry* evolved into a partnership with JMU’s Furious Flower Poetry Center (FFPC), the first academic center devoted to African American poetry in the United States. Because of this successful
venture, the special collections librarian was able to work with JMU faculty to train and support citizen archivists for outreach into the local African American community.

Throughout the process—over two and a half years—Eaton and Flota built on their shared collection development interests to cultivate relationships within the library, across campus, and beyond, into the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. This provided and promoted access to African American literary and cultural output that had previously been missing from JMU’s resources and might not have otherwise been accessible. Eaton and Flota’s persistent communication of their collection development focus with interested faculty members and the FFPC demonstrated their commitment to increasing the diversity of their holdings. While this partnership has been extremely rewarding so far, it also offers the opportunity for new types of collaboration in the future.

**Institutional Background**

James Madison University began in 1908 as the State Normal and Industrial School for Women at Harrisonburg. Over the past century, JMU has transformed itself into a major Master’s level regional university with the vision “to be the national model for the engaged university: engaged with ideas and the world.”

The JMU Libraries consists of two main libraries—Carrier Library (which houses social sciences and humanities materials) and Rose Library (which houses materials related to STEM subjects)—and two smaller libraries devoted to music and education resources. The libraries have a liaison program with approximately a dozen subject specialist librarians who work closely with academic schools and departments. Each liaison is responsible for collection development within these disciplines and receives allocated library funds to purchase titles in his areas. Besides selecting the collections items himself, Flota also receives recommendations from English faculty to buy specific titles. Flota’s collection development responsibilities extend to items related to English literature purchased with the intention of residing in special collections. This is especially useful to augment the special collections materials budget.

The JMU special collections began in 1983 with a focus on rare materials from the Shenandoah Valley. Curated by a part time special collections librarian, the initial manuscript collections and print materials (along with the librarian) fit into a small office space. The collection now numbers over seven thousand rare books and serial titles. It also contains over seven hundred linear feet of manuscripts. In comparison to nearby state schools (University of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University, George Mason University), JMU’s special collections is much smaller in staff and budget and its holdings
are more limited. Collection development focuses on documenting the history of the Central Shenandoah Valley, but has expanded to include university history as well as materials and collections directly supporting curricular and subject areas of strength for the university. Another area of growth for special collections focuses on supporting the university’s goal of “engaged community.” Through instruction sessions, tours, class collaborations, and outreach with faculty, classes, and the greater Harrisonburg area, special collections supports engagement with primary source.

Impetus for Collaboration

In July 2013, Lynn Eaton became the special collections librarian, while Brian Flota joined the university the following month as the English liaison librarian. Shortly after Flota’s arrival, the librarians discussed potential collaborations and collection development projects. As a result of rare and specialized book requests from English department faculty, they began working together to obtain important single issues of the pulp magazine *Weird Tales* (dating from the 1920s and 1930s) and a 1583 edition of John Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments* (also known as *The Book of Martyrs*). Flota contributed funds from the English literature budget to Eaton in special collections for the acquisition of these items.* This contribution was essential to ensure the purchase of these texts.

In Spring 2014, English professor Dr. Mollie Godfrey, asked Eaton and Flota to purchase copies of *The Journal of Black Poetry*, an important publication released during the height of the Black Arts Movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Following this request, a visiting assistant professor in the English department, Dr. Hilary Holladay, inquired about special collections’ holdings of African American literature items. After a careful examination of their holdings in this area, Flota and Eaton were surprised, and frankly underwhelmed, with what their collection did not include. African American literature has previously been an area of collection strength for the libraries. Developing this area of the collection was due, in part, to supporting JMU’s commitment to diversity as outlined in its values statement. This gap in holdings led Flota and Eaton to substantially increase special collections’ holdings of African American literature, especially twentieth-century African American poetry. After pooling funds to purchase eight issues of *The Journal of Black Poetry* and two issues of another key journal, *Umbra*, Eaton and Flota decided to devote a larger portion of their collecting budgets to ensure special collections more fully represented this curricular interest of the English department’s faculty who specialize in African American literature.

* At JMU libraries, liaison librarians are able to share their collection development funds with other subject areas without prior approval from the director of collections.
JMU’s commitment to diversity is well represented by the FFPC, the nation’s first academic center focusing on African American poetry. Eaton and Flota’s acquisition of African American literature titles for special collections became an essential talking point in discussions with the FFPC leadership about the commitment of special collections and the JMU libraries to further develop and support these collections.

Project Scope

Collection Development

Flota and Eaton’s outreach to and communication with the FFPC was an important step for the development of JMU special collections’ African American literature collection. According to the FFPC’s website, the mission of the Center is to “cultivate, honor, and promote the diverse voices of African American poets by making the genre accessible to a wide audience and collaborating with educational and cultural institutions, literary organizations, and artists.” (Emphasis in original). The Center hosts visiting poets, sponsors workshops, holds a summer poetry camp for children, and holds panels, seminars, and a decennial poetry conference.

Prior to Flota and Eaton’s arrival at JMU, the FFPC staff reached out to special collections for assistance in organizing and describing a selection of their historic material. During the summer of 2012, a special collections student intern spent a few weeks working with a small subset of their archival materials, with the materials remaining at the FFPC. Discussions began at this time about the potential establishment of an archival collection with JMU special collections. These talks did not proceed far, in part, because of employee turnover in special collections.

In July 2014, Eaton met with FFPC director, Dr. Gabbin, and her staff to review and discuss the archival materials in the FFPC. Eaton had heard great things about FFPC’s collection, but had not seen it. Eaton’s knowledge about the collection’s content was limited to a two-year-old finding aid. After meeting with the FFPC staff and surveying their holdings, it became clear to Eaton and Dr. Gabbin that the print, analog, and born-digital materials in the collection would fit well within special collections’ new focus on African American literature and would provide a rich source of material for students and scholars from multiple areas of study.

Nationally, there are other collections of African American poetry, but the breadth of the FFPC materials—the poets, the span of time, and the audio-visual documentation of poetry readings—make it stand out as an invaluable resource. In spring 2015, the deed of gift for the FFPC Archives was formal-
ized, with the FFPC agreeing to donate their archives (physical and digital) to JMU Libraries. Materials in the FFPC collection feature items related to the three decennial conferences—highlighted by extensive video documentation of each conference—including FFPC’s quarterly poetry readings, interviews and correspondence with prominent African American poets, biographical content, and FFPC records. The ultimate goal for the FFPC Archives project is to create an interactive, multimedia, online archive providing search functions along with tools to encourage social and creative connections, remixing, and new scholarship.

To support the third Furious Flower Poetry Conference, held in late September 2014, Flota ordered all available books of poetry and prose by the forty poets performing at the conference for the library’s general collection at the request of the FFPC. Flota also created two displays, featuring titles by these poets, that were hosted in both Carrier and Rose Library. In addition, Flota presented a paper at the Furious Flower Poetry Conference on the writer Ishmael Reed and his use of the figure of the black cowboy in his early poetry. These efforts deepened his relationships to both the English department and the FFPC. Following the conference, Flota and Eaton worked together and shared their funds to purchase a wide selection of important African American literature titles.

**Outreach**

In the spring of 2015, English professor, Dr. Godfrey, and writing, rhetoric and technical communication (WRTC) professor, Dr. Seán McCarthy, reached out to Eaton with an opportunity for collaboration. Godfrey and McCarthy received a Diversity Excellence Education Program grant from JMU to organize a local history initiative to curate an online and traveling exhibit celebrating the Lucy Simms School (now known as the Lucy Simms Continuing Education Center), which was Harrisonburg, Virginia’s elementary and high school for African American children from 1939 to 1966. The project would better document and represent the local African American community.

The grant provided funds for Godfrey and McCarthy to work with students over an entire year. Eaton trained junior and senior JMU students in archival research, archival processing, digitization, and metadata to help create an online exhibit of manuscripts, photographs, and artifacts gathered from the local African American community. Eaton enlisted the skills of Kate Morris, the special collections research services and technical services librarian, who then created and led an archival processing training session for the students in September 2015. Additional JMU library colleagues assisted in the digitization and online exhibit software training for the class. The materials were shared throughout the local community as part of a regional traveling exhibit. Staff
then developed an online exhibit to highlight the content. This collaborative work has built positive relationships between JMU and the surrounding community and area repositories.

Conclusion

Impact

Since they began working at JMU in 2013, Eaton and Flota’s collaboration not only built up the physical holdings of the collection, but also a fruitful relationship with English faculty and the FFPC. Because of the increase in African American literary titles in special collections, JMU English classes, with an emphasis on African American literature, now have improved resources and regularly visit Eaton and her staff in the special collections reading room. Flota introduced more English students to this material through one-shot instruction sessions, which provided students the opportunity to study and see the application of primary sources to their in-class research. In several instances, Eaton and Flota co-taught these sessions. As a result, students increasingly use these materials in their coursework. Before this collaboration, these kinds of experiences would not have been possible. Collecting this material reveals a culture, literary tradition, and time period of which students, otherwise, might have been unaware.

Eaton and Flota’s work diversifies JMU’s special collections holdings and provides directed, growing, on-campus resources for increased scholarship in African American literature by students, faculty, and visiting scholars. Their collaboration builds constructive relationships across campus and the community.

Eaton and Flota plan to develop the collection of African American literature indefinitely; the collection has already yielded positive benefits for JMU and the local community. The groundwork for productive collaboration has been firmly laid within the library and with other JMU faculty partners. Through their communication, responsiveness and collaboration, Flota and Eaton gained the trust of the English and WRTC departments as well as the FFPC. Based on this trust, another English professor, Dr. Allison Fagan, has begun working with Eaton and Flota to develop a Chicana/o American literature collection within special collections.

Lessons Learned

The continually evolving collaboration between Eaton and Flota was, on the whole, positive. They worked effectively within the constraints of budgets and time. Eaton and Flota identified a range of affordable and attainable items—periodicals, poetry chap books, and pulp paperbacks—to form the basis of the
African American literature holdings in special collections. Their philosophy regarding outreach is based in collection development—in other words, “If you collect it, they will come”—which led to the acquisition of the FFPC Archives. Their efforts were maximized, in part, by Flota’s frequent communication with English department faculty and FFPC staff. Special collections staff and Flota were responsive to faculty requests for assistance and instruction, creating a climate of accommodation and aiding the development of new relationships and new opportunities for collaboration.

Despite the overwhelmingly positive results of Eaton and Flota’s collaboration, there are several things they would do differently. Eaton and Flota were so focused on extra-library relationships that they failed to share information about their collaboration with other librarians. In hindsight, they could have utilized the African American literature LibGuide, which Flota maintains, to promote the collection. Eaton could have highlighted collection material on the special collections home page. With more time, Eaton would make greater use of social media to market African American literature resources more widely. Lastly, Eaton and Flota could have reached out to JMU’s Office of Access & Inclusion to develop other avenues through which to promote the collection, such as their annual Diversity Conference, where librarians, faculty, and staff could present on the African American literature holdings in special collections.

**Next Steps**

In the 2015–2016 academic year, Flota and Eaton have continued to purchase noteworthy African American literature texts. They will work with Dr. Godfrey in the English Department on a Diversity Curriculum Development Grant at JMU to purchase rare African American literature items to be used in an English course she will teach in the 2017–2018 academic year. Being awarded this grant would highlight special collections’ expanded holdings in this field, which is a resource for students and scholars. Flota and Eaton’s relationship with the FFPC, underscored by the acquisition of their archives, has the potential to draw national interest. The active collecting of traditional printed materials will make JMU special collections an attractive repository for future donations of personal and institutional papers, manuscripts, and digital materials related to African American literature, culture, and local history. As a result, these efforts must be sustained indefinitely.

To build on the productive work of their collaboration thus far, Flota and Eaton wish to extend their efforts into new collection development areas, such as Chicano/a Literature. Their work needs to be shared explicitly with colleagues in the libraries as a guide for collaborative efforts. Eaton and Flota will seek partners within the Office of Access and Inclusion and, ideally, serve as
members of JMU’s Diversity Council to promote these collection development areas, identify new areas of need, and develop opportunities inspired by JMU’s commitment to diversity.

By trusting their collection development instincts and following the lead of several JMU faculty members, Eaton and Flota cultivated a small but growing collection, demonstrating that the libraries were committed to making special collections’ holdings diverse and reflective of JMU’s vibrant curricula. The success of this collaboration is such that the libraries have committed to continuing support of these initiatives and has directed additional money towards special collections. With the groundwork laid, there is now significant potential for Eaton and Flota to contribute to JMU and the community through a shared university vision that focuses on diversity as a core value.

Notes
2. Ibid. JMU outlines its commitment to diversity in the most current iteration of its “Mission, Vision, and Values Statement” as such: “We strive to be an inclusive community that values the richness of all individuals and perspectives.”
4. Ibid.
5. See https://www.jmu.edu/multicultural/programs/deepimpact-program.shtml.
7. At this time, the online exhibit is being beta-tested and is not available to the public.
8. Local repositories include Bridgewater College, Eastern Mennonite University, the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Historical Society, and the Massanutten Regional Public Library.
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Agents of C.H.A.N.G.E.:¹

BREAKING GROUND IN COLLABORATIVE POP CULTURE CURATION

Anna Culbertson and Pamela Jackson

Introduction

At San Diego State University (SDSU), courses using comics are regularly offered across the curriculum. SDSU Library’s Special Collections and University Archives unit (SCUA) has been collecting comics for more than ten years. The collection focused on underground and alternative comics and was not heavily promoted or, therefore, used. In fall of 2011, the new dean of the library convened an outreach committee for the comic arts. Consisting of three liaison librarians, one special collections librarian, and one library media center representative, the committee’s charge was to raise awareness of the comic arts in higher education and to work with the broader San Diego community in support of the comic arts. As a result of the committee’s efforts, the library began to accumulate massive donations of comics in virtually every genre, thus broadening the collection’s scope. SCUA lacked the resources to efficiently process this collection and make it available. As more students request access to these comics, the department has faced numerous challenges to ease of access from a closed-stacks environment.
The authors of this chapter are Anna Culbertson, assistant head of Special Collections and University Archives (SCUA), whose research and collection development interests align with the curation of speculative fiction and popular culture materials, and Pamela Jackson, subject librarian for television, film, theatre, new media and the comic arts. Two years ago, Culbertson and Jackson saw an opportunity to break new ground at SDSU by using these donations to build a special collection that is mainstreamed through collaboration. They began co-directing a major initiative to increase awareness of the Comic Arts Collection and promote its use across the curriculum. Working together, they have been able to compile and manage internal inventories of donations, co-teach classes, implement a unique mode of cataloging, raise funds to support processing and storage, present on their work at conferences, and partner with the community to promote the library’s centrality with regard to the San Diego comic arts fandom network.

This chapter aims to highlight and explore these new modes of popular culture curation—born not only of necessity, but also of a desire for a holistic model of access and service across library units. Culbertson and Jackson will expound upon the background and conditions that led to this collaboration in the hope it may be useful to librarians implementing such a project from scratch. They will then look at the various ways in which collaboration can and has occurred, including collection development, collection management, reference, instruction, fundraising, donor relations, promotion, and outreach. It is useful to emphasize each of these efforts has either developed alongside or as a result of the others, so the lines between background and project scope may, at times, seem blurred. This highlights the symbiotic nature of the many aspects of collection curation and the various collaborative possibilities it poses. Finally, Culbertson and Jackson will describe their challenges, learning opportunities, and victories they have encountered along the way, with an eye on the projected vision for this collection, its role in the library, and, ultimately, the role of such collections in academia.

Institutional Background

San Diego State University is one of California State University’s twenty-three campuses, offering bachelor’s degrees in eighty-nine areas, master’s degrees in seventy-eight areas, and doctorates in twenty-one areas. The average age of undergraduate students is twenty-two and the average age of graduate students is twenty-nine. Approximately 15 percent of students are studying at the graduate level. Designated a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) by the United States Department of Education, SDSU has a student population of thirty-three thousand two hundred thirty, 27.6 percent of which are Hispanic or Latino.
SDSU Library is the primary academic library for the main SDSU campus. As of October 2015, the library’s collection included over 6.6 million items, with over 216,900 journals, databases, and e-books. At just over five hundred thousand square feet, the library provides seating for four thousand users. Located inside the library, Special Collections and University Archives holds over eighty thousand printed volumes, over five hundred manuscript and archival collections, eight hundred linear feet of university records, numerous graphic and ephemera collections, and digital collections. Major print holdings include alternative religious movements, surfing, speculative fiction, comic arts, zines, natural history, fine press and artists’ books, historic astronomy, children’s literature, and Edward Gorey. Significant archival holdings include women’s studies, performing arts, San Diego/regional history, local civil rights history, and Chicana/o studies.

Librarians in the California State University system have faculty status. At the time of writing this chapter, SDSU employs twenty full-time library faculty, one and a half full-time equivalent faculty in an early retirement program, and one and a half full-time equivalent faculty in temporary or adjunct library faculty positions. Additionally, the library has fifty-five staff members and one hundred thirty-five student assistants.

Impetus for Collaboration

Interest in the popular arts is strong in Southern California, particularly in Los Angeles and San Diego. San Diego is home to Comic-Con International, one of the largest events of its kind in the world and the largest in North America,\(^3\) and IDW Publishing, “regularly recognized as the fourth-largest comic book publisher in the United States.”\(^4\) San Diego is also home to numerous smaller conventions that celebrate and study comics, science fiction, fantasy, horror, anime, steampunk, and related areas of fandom. Librarians from SDSU collaborate especially with San Diego Comic Fest\(^5\) to produce the annual convention celebrating comics, science fiction, television, and film. Likewise, the city is home to Little Fish Comic Book Studio, offering all-ages, all-abilities comic book art instruction,\(^6\) and the San Diego Comic Art Gallery,\(^7\) which opened in June 2015.

In 2011, the library received a grant from Cal Humanities—an independent, non-profit, state partner of the National Endowment for the Humanities—for a project called *The Comic-Con Kids: Finding and Defining Fandom*. The project collected video oral histories exploring the emergence of comics, science fiction, and fantasy in the youth counterculture movements of the 1970s, focusing on the founding of Comic-Con International. That same year, the library dean convened the SDSU Library Comic Arts Committee, an out-
reach committee for the comic arts. By way of these activities in 2011, Culbertson and Jackson were connected and found common ground in their work and professional philosophies. Seeing an opportunity to elevate the status of comics-related scholarship and related activities on campus through promotion of library resources, they began strategizing.

As previously mentioned, special collections had been collecting underground and alternative comics for a decade. Due to the success of the Comic Arts Committee’s outreach efforts, the library had accumulated over thirty-five thousand comics, almost exclusively by donation, broadening the collection scope to include comic art in all genres. While the collection featured a sizable number of graphic novels and other, more durable comic publications, the majority of the collection were floppies; in other words, the thin, stapled-paper periodicals universally thought of as comic books. While bound graphic novels lend themselves nicely to a circulating collection, floppies presented unique preservation and organization challenges for an academic library. The logical home for such publications was special collections. However, as more students discovered and asked to use these comics, the special collections librarian was met with a serious obstacle to access: cataloging, inventorying, and storing the comic books in a way that they would be easy to retrieve from a closed-stacks environment.

All librarians outside of SCUA, whether in public or technical services, are assigned as liaisons to specific subject areas. As liaisons, they maintain the library’s collections in these subject areas, teach advanced subject-specific research skills to students, and serve as the primary point person for students, faculty and other researchers. Library faculty in SCUA interact directly and separately with multiple disciplines that incorporate use of primary sources and other special collections materials into coursework. Instructional collaborations between SCUA librarians and liaison librarians have been rare, mainly owing to time constraints. Historically, SCUA has been run as an independent operation, maintaining its own service point, reading room, stacks, storage and supplies. Collection development has always been done by the librarians within the unit, as well as all reference, research and curation of exhibits. However unintended, this has isolated SCUA from the larger library picture. Special collections librarians and liaison specialists have expressed interest in working across departmental boundaries, but a sustained model of collaboration has not been cultivated.

**Project Scope**

The growth of the comics collection and its potential for widespread scholarship on campus was too large for one unit or librarian to manage. Partnering to explore new modes of popular culture curation was born, not only of ne-
cessity, but also of a desire to evolve away from traditional practices that have resulted in siloing. This collaboration provided a new model popularly seen amongst library faculty as instrumental in achieving a shared goal of main-streaming special collections operations and making holistic decisions about collections, exhibits, digital projects, and instruction.

Culbertson and Jackson’s first opportunity to collaborate occurred during a conversation about comics in Jackson’s office when Africana studies professor, Ajani Brown, who conducts comics research, sought the librarians’ input into planning an upper-division course. The course, entitled Afrofuturism, would explore “how speculative fiction concerns itself with the black experience” and “reimagining the black identity.” The ensuing conversation shifted almost immediately to “let’s host your class in special collections together!” and a collaborative instruction session was scheduled. The librarians analyzed the needs of the students and co-taught an engaging session on Afrofuturism in comics and science fiction. The session objectives were to (1) briefly instruct students in the proper use of special collections materials, (2) introduce students to primary and secondary research sources related to speculative fiction, (3) provide hands-on engagement with primary source materials to inspire research and creativity, and (4) ask students to think critically about how the materials presented in the session exemplified Afrofuturism. The librarians brought related sources held in special collections and, amongst an energetic array of graphic materials, took turns speaking about primary and secondary sources on the course topic. The course demonstrated the potential of the un-processed comics collection residing in the library’s basement and prompted the idea of a co-curatorial effort.

Both Culbertson and Jackson felt daunted by the size of the comic arts collection and knew the task would call upon all the passion and expertise they had to offer. It was clear the development and curation of this collection should be collaborative and new storage and preservation solutions would be needed. Culbertson and Jackson began by compiling and managing internal inventories of donations so they could respond to reference and instruction requests. Many of the collection’s donors provided inventory lists, and Culbertson had created a spreadsheet of titles from the original comics collection housed in SCUA. Even after organizing these lists, they were unable to easily locate individual comics; the gifts were shelved in five different locations and the arrangement of items did not match the alphabetical inventory spreadsheets.

The degree to which each donation was organized at the start of the project also varied. One of the first and largest donations sat on shelves in its original shipping boxes. Culbertson and Jackson began unpacking and sorting the boxes by the first letter of the comic book title and then returning the materials to the boxes, now labeled A-Z. They met in the basement, every Wednesday morning, for two hours to sort comics. While such hands-on oversight of a
collection is more commonplace in special collections librarianship, it was a new and eye-opening level of collection management for Jackson.

The more Culbertson and Jackson worked together, the more they began to rely on each other for collective decision making. Comics are complicated publications. The title on the cover often does not match the series title, which may be found buried inside the publication, along a gutter, on any page. This is, of course, the main source of information for serials cataloging. For the untrained eye, it can be inconsistent. Series often include haphazard subtitles or story arcs, and volume/issue numbering is erratic. Working side-by-side allowed them to make decisions about sorting the collection in a way that makes sense for accessing the comics in an academic setting. They also decided not to integrate the donations (six collections located in different parts of the basement) until fully cataloged, so the inventory spreadsheets would remain useful in the meantime.

Cataloging an extensive backlog of serial titles for inclusion in the regular library catalog proved prohibitive to access for a few reasons. First and foremost, the library simply does not have the cataloging support to accomplish this within a reasonable time frame. In the serials unit, only one full-time librarian and one part-time staff position are trained to catalog serials. After consulting with the cataloging unit, Culbertson and Jackson were met with the reality that there were many competing cataloging projects taking priority over the comics collection, and there was no funding available to hire a temporary cataloger for the project. Perhaps more important, they both felt MARC records leave much to be desired. Comic books are highly visual, yet feature an inordinate amount of complex serial data for being relatively short publications. Browsability and cover recognition are important qualities of comics readership. Amongst the metadata schemas that might solve the dilemma of visual access are those developed for digital content, but comics are copyrighted and, therefore, not candidates for digitization. Even if digitization were the solution, the amount of Dublin Core fields generated by each comic issue, in order to be useful to a comics researcher, would encumber efficiently describing these publications.

Culbertson and Jackson researched alternatives by first looking to other libraries with large comics collections for examples. At the time of writing this chapter, Michigan State University was providing publicly-accessible, alphabetical lists on their library’s website and University of Florida had published a downloadable Excel spreadsheet. Virginia Commonwealth created a searchable text-based index using the content management system, Omeka. Bowling Green State University and Portland State both used MARC records and Library of Congress call numbers, which, as stated, was not an option. It was encouraging to note SDSU’s situation was not unique; other institutions were looking to cataloging alternatives as well.
A solution materialized when one of the comics donors introduced Culbertson and Jackson to the commercial cataloging software he used to inventory and appraise his collection; software created specifically for comic book collectors and businesses. They immediately questioned what obligation they had to traditional cataloging practices for a non-traditional collection. Together, they defined and prioritized their requirements for an ideal comics catalog. They wanted a cataloging solution that was easy and quick (but thorough), allowed for original and copy-cataloging, was customizable, and allowed local notes. For ease of user access, they needed a browsable public interface searchable by multiple access points, including cover art, linked characters, and contributors. They researched solutions and determined the best option was an inexpensive, cloud-based program called Comic Collector Pro.

Since comic book collecting was relatively new at SDSU, Culbertson had to research preservation needs. Most collectors and dealers “bag and board” their comics with protective bags and stiffeners and store them in “long or short” comic boxes. Culbertson inquired of several vendors and was surprised to discover these supplies do not usually meet archival standards for acid-free storage. The only sources Culbertson was able to locate for guaranteed archival comics storage supplies were major library supply vendors. The cost for boxes was approximately twelve dollars and seventy-five cents per box that holds approximately one hundred comics (about thirteen cents per comic). Acid-free stiffeners and bags added approximately forty cents per comic. In the early stages of this project, it took a student assistant an average of eight hours to catalog one hundred comics. At ten dollars per hour that’s eighty cents per comic for cataloging. They also needed a one-time sum of $2500 for a dedicated, portable workstation plus hardware and software to catalog and back up the collection.

With an estimated cost of one dollar and thirty-three cents per floppy comic to preserve and catalog, they were faced with the need to fundraise and, after an unsuccessful grant attempt, were unexpectedly approached by the SDSU Office of Alumni Engagement. Culbertson and Jackson have learned comics fans are an active community and will support a library’s efforts, if programming is sufficiently promoted. The electronic solicitation manager on campus was developing an online crowdfunding program called STRIVE and heard about the efforts to make comics accessible for research. Being a serious comics fan himself, he was well aware of their research value, and was also excited because the project fit plans to highlight unique activities on campus that would work well with the concept of crowdfunding. Culbertson and Jackson worked with the Office of Alumni Engagement and SDSU’s multimedia production coordinator, in the university relations and development department, to create the campaign, Make Comic Arts Accessible.

The STRIVE campaign garnered even more community media attention. Over the course of a couple of months, the librarians gave interviews for the
SDSU NewsCenter,\textsuperscript{11} the local nightly news,\textsuperscript{12} one of San Diego’s major local newspapers,\textsuperscript{13} and for the library’s website.\textsuperscript{14} STRIVE campaign goals are modest and run for thirty days. The campaign goal was set at $4,000 and successfully funded at nearly 160 percent.

Conclusion

Impact

The longer Culbertson and Jackson worked together to develop and curate the collection, the more they considered themselves a team. They now instinctively view all comics-related work as collaborative and rarely face decisions alone. They continue to co-teach library instruction sessions for courses involving comics scholarship and provide tours to community organizations and donors interested in the same. They frequently collaborate on reference inquiries as well. It is an expansive field of scholarship which allows both librarians to draw on their knowledge and strengths. Keeping track of researcher’s needs also aids the overall management of the collection, so communicating with one other about any comics-related reference is key to their success.

The impact of this collaboration is evidenced by increased willingness across the library to support the creation of new positions in special collections and a tangible interest amongst library faculty in co-teaching instruction sessions that combine primary and secondary source research methods. This is especially rewarding to us, given the organizational challenges touched upon in this chapter. The invisible walls created by library deans, however unintentional, when placing their special collections units on development pedestals are detrimental to departmental relations and, therefore, library services and operations that are holistic. Fortunately, their current dean is wholeheartedly in favor of holistic efforts. Jackson has gained a deeper understanding of how SCUA operates and has become a champion for the unit. She also feels intellectually stimulated by the research and problem-solving skills required of special collections operations. Culbertson is happy to have a more involved role outside of SCUA, contributing subject expertise to all sorts of reference inquiries that do not exclusively concern primary source materials.

Lessons Learned

It is Culbertson and Jackson’s hope they have demonstrated the benefits of collaboration far outweigh the challenges. However, there are challenges, the largest being time. This effort presents a new model at SDSU for a liaison librarian working intensely in a field that has been historically deemed the domain of special collections. Productivity at a tangible level would require Jackson work
above and beyond her normal assigned duties or to request reassignment. Similarly, the collection itself is so vast and the oversight so different from overall SCUA operations, that time is a factor for Culbertson. Having administrative support for their collaborative project helped to ensure its success.

Culbertson and Jackson stress the importance of considering such things as compatibility and personality before embarking on a collaboration of this size. It is not necessary to be in complete agreement regarding professional philosophies, priorities, and goals, as long as some commonalities are shared. Another essential is mutual respect. Collaborators need to trust one another’s decision-making abilities and expertise. Perhaps one librarian is an expert at cataloging and the other excels at instruction, but the opposite is not the case. Set parameters from the start that do not leave either person stranded too far outside their comfort zone.

Another challenge is the evolving nature of the project’s required work. Jackson is gaining new experience with collection management, fundraising and donor relations. Both librarians are navigating the challenges of media interaction and offers of help (which are appreciated but result in supervision duties that are not manageable). In a community that embraces the popular arts, one can imagine how an increase in media attention might lead to innumerable, even overwhelming, inquiries from would-be volunteers and donors of comic collections long forgotten in local garages.

There have been a number of more practical challenges: space to store the ever-growing collection, the expense of acid-free comics boxes, bags, boards, and finding the time to co-supervise a cataloging student assistant who technically reports to SCUA. The latter has been addressed using collaborative documents in Google and holding decision meetings between the student and both librarians, so supervision is a team effort.

**Next Steps**

One goal of Culbertson and Jackson’s campus outreach efforts is to help teaching faculty identify ways to include comic arts in their curricula and encourage student research, which further connects the library to the university’s mission. The highly complex and interdisciplinary nature of comics content necessitates the development of a resource that extends far beyond the scope of any typical library guide. At the time of writing, Jackson is completing a semester-long research sabbatical to study and organize comics by themes and topics that may be of most use in the higher education curriculum. The online guide she is creating will encourage the use of the library’s comic arts collection and give student researchers and faculty a starting point to explore how topics covered in the classroom are represented in sequential art. In addition, Jackson is creating “pull lists” identifying where comics by topic are located in the library’s basement to facilitate easier instruction preparation in SCUA.
The more they work with comics scholars, particularly students, the more they see the need for an innovative and dedicated space in the library. The library contracted for a building-wide space plan in 2013, which included the relocation of SCUA operations to a more prominent and central area of the library. This plan provided a unique opportunity to pioneer a mode of special collections service that provides users with direct access to selected items in the collection. Comics readership needs are best met by a self-service model of access. The comics scholarship experience is serendipitous and necessitates the ability to browse titles, but individual issues are quicker reads than the typical monograph, so retrieval of single-issue floppies can be tedious and continual. This concept proves challenging in a special collections environment where access to materials is usually mediated. Since most of the collection does not require security at a closed-stacks level and would be perfect for inclusion in a browsable but non-circulating reading room setting, the librarians have developed an idea for supervised browsability within the public space of special collections. In April of 2015, they submitted a proposal to library administration justifying a space dedicated to comics in SCUA’s new location. Originally, this was a stand-alone, dedicated, reading room with a user-driven retrieval system, which would enable the comics to remain secure while allowing users the freedom to browse and pull titles. However, until SCUA is relocated these plans remain flexible, with the idea of not pushing a cost-prohibitive agenda. At this point, Culbertson and Jackson continue to process and catalog the collection in preparation for a move.

Since they began this project, Culbertson and Jackson have realized that there are so many possibilities for innovative collaborations between liaison librarians and special collections librarians at their own institution. They have witnessed firsthand the interest that these efforts have provoked amongst their colleagues at SDSU. It is therefore their hope that librarians everywhere will consider collaborating and exploring creative problem-solving for unprecedented and worthwhile pursuits.

Notes

1. The title is a nod to the Marvel Comics superhero team, Agents of S.H.I.E.L.D. Culbertson and Jackson self-identify as change agents in their library both for their efforts at supporting popular culture scholarship through focused attention to collections and services, and for their efforts at collaborative mainstreaming of special collections resources and functions.
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CHAPTER 8

Meaningful Alliances: MANAGING A COLLABORATIVE EXHIBIT ABOUT WORLD WAR I

Jill Baron and Morgan Swan

Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on a specific exhibit entitled “Specters of the Great War: France, Italy and the First World War,” that was installed in one of Dartmouth College’s Baker-Berry Library exhibit spaces in the spring of 2014. The principal librarians who collaborated to ensure the project came to fruition were Jill Baron, the librarian for romance languages and Latin American studies, and Morgan Swan, the special collections education and outreach librarian. This chapter reports on the development of the exhibit, particularly through the preparation phase, and focuses on several decisive moments that required Baron and Swan to find creative solutions to carry out the exhibit. The experience resulted in valuable lessons applicable to any attempt at a collaborative exhibit.

Institutional Background

Dartmouth College is a four-year private liberal arts college located in Hanover, New Hampshire. With just over four thousand undergraduates and

* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, CC BY (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)
about two thousand graduate students (mostly in the sciences and professional schools), Dartmouth is the smallest member of the Ivy League in terms of student population. Founded in 1769, the college is strongly committed to its identity as a liberal arts institution and sees undergraduate education as its primary mission. As a result, there is a shared sense of purpose among the various departments on Dartmouth’s campus.

Dartmouth College Library functions as a microcosm of the larger college with regard to its commitment to intra-institutional collaboration. Baron works within the research and instruction department (RIS) of Baker-Berry Library, which consists of four full-time staff members and nine professional librarians with collection development and liaison duties to academic departments and programs in the humanities and the social sciences. RIS librarians are largely self-directed, responding to the immediate needs of faculty and students, while managing long-term collection development, reference, and instruction activities. Faculty and librarian collaborations are encouraged and quite common, especially given the ambitious research agendas of Dartmouth faculty. Moreover, given the rural setting of Dartmouth College, joint projects begin just as frequently in supermarket aisles as in departmental offices. Work means gliding seamlessly from conversation to conversation, managing relationships (and projects) with a wide variety of stakeholders.

Although initially housed within Baker-Berry, Rauners Special Collections Library now has its own stand-alone facilities within Webster Hall, which sits on the college green less than a hundred yards from Baker-Berry Library. Because of its physical location, Swan’s position, must be pro-active about connecting with faculty and other educators on campus. Since 2003, Rauner’s primary mission has been undergraduate education. To fulfill this mission, Swan continually seeks out potential collaborators both at Dartmouth and in the larger community and his position is defined by his productive professional relationships.

One way in which the Dartmouth Library pursues the mission of fostering intra-institutional collaboration is through regularly-installed public exhibits. Baker-Berry Library, the main humanities and social sciences library on campus, has an exhibits program employing a half-time exhibit designer, Dennis Grady. Grady collaborates with librarian-curators in a variety of ways, most notably by designing exhibit posters to serve as background panels. In addition, the program offers curators and their collaborators guidance in the form of a curator’s handbook that describes best practices in exhibit curation. Library exhibit topics are as varied as the materials owned by and studied in the libraries, and librarians from all departments are encouraged to develop

opportunities for exhibits. Satellite libraries on campus manage their exhibits independently of this program.

Exhibits in Baker-Berry serve one of two functions: either to coincide with and promote a noteworthy campus event (such as an important anniversary, conference, symposium, or similar activity) or to highlight collection materials organized around a central theme. Ideally, they do both and are often planned and executed in collaboration with faculty members or students. To begin the exhibit planning process, librarians, or staff propose an exhibit for display in one of two spaces in Baker-Berry Library. These exhibits generally stay in place for the duration of a ten-week academic term. The two available exhibit spaces in Baker-Berry are located on the building’s first floor: the first consists of six large windows in Baker Main Hall, a wide east-west thoroughfare with space for seating, and the second is Berry Main Street, a north-south thoroughfare which connects the library to the north end of campus. It is also where the circulation and research and information desks are located. These corridors experience a lot of foot traffic giving high visibility to both of the exhibit spaces. As such, it is not uncommon for librarians to negotiate with each other for exhibit space. The exhibit calendar is typically booked a year in advance.

Impetus for Collaboration

The initial opportunity for Baron and Swan to work together on an exhibit project came about as a direct result of their individual efforts to engage collaboratively with Dartmouth faculty. The Dartmouth College Library employs several dozen professional librarians who interact with one another regularly, whether on committees or for special projects. Baron and Swan both serve on the library’s Education and Outreach Committee and, in this capacity, meet twice monthly. As new librarians to Dartmouth, Baron and Swan established “talking teaching,” a monthly support group for teaching librarians across departments, where librarians could discuss their teaching activities, share strategies, and provide encouragement. This supportive atmosphere gave Swan and Baron a chance to connect with each other and build rapport and mutual trust essential to their productive collaboration on the World War I exhibit.

In November of 2012, an opportunity arose for Swan and Baron to collaborate on an exhibit. A faculty member in the Department of French & Italian shared with Baron her plans to organize a conference on the topic of World War I in France and Italy to be held in May of 2014. Enthusiastic about this event, Baron proposed the library feature an exhibit on the same topic coinciding with the academic conference. Doing so would offer participants another point of interaction with the themes of the conference and Dartmouth’s relevant library collections. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, the exhibit would publicize
the conference to the wider campus community and demonstrate the library’s
dedicated support of academic programming on campus. Late in the winter of
2013, the faculty member assembled a conference-planning group with faculty
from three different departments: French and Italian, history, and art history.
She also asked Baron to serve on this group. Initial meetings involved reviewing
possible speakers and invitees, and defining the themes of the conference.

By the summer of 2013, the group had decided upon a title, “Specters of
the Great War: France, Italy and the First World War” and exhibit planning be-
gan in earnest. Baron secured the Baker Library’s main hall for the exhibit. As
the idea for the exhibit took shape, a problem emerged for Baron: the thought
of curating an exhibit, moreover an exhibit on World War I, was daunting. Her
lack of experience in exhibit curation and subject expertise in history, much
less in military history, presented a significant challenge. However, the exhib-
it presented an ideal opportunity to collaborate with faculty and excel at her
liaison duties. These factors prompted her to seek the involvement of experts
or, at least, cheerful and willing colleagues in the development of the exhibit.

A fortuitous coincidence brought Baron and Swan together. Swan’s role as
the primary contact person for Rauner’s outreach efforts directly involved him
in a separate initiative related to the centennial anniversary of World War I’s
inception. In August of 2012, a visiting professor in the theater department had
contacted Rauner Library with the intention of curating a campus-wide pro-
gram centered around the Great War, complete with a shared reading assign-
ment for all incoming first-year students, classes taught in many departments,
exhibits, a major website presence, theatrical performances, and a symposium.
Given the ambitious scope of this professor’s project, Rauner was cautious-
ly supportive, committing to the creation of a bibliography of WWI-related
materials held by the special collections library. Swan took the lead on this
project and, over the next eight months, compiled a comprehensive inventory
of special collections items related to the war. Ultimately, the envisioned cam-
pus-wide program never came to fruition. However, when Baron approached
staff in Rauner Library about a collaborator for the exhibit, Swan volunteered
because of the work he had already done on the inventory, which became an
instrumental tool for identifying potential exhibit materials. Also, Swan was
willing to undertake the project because of the positive working relationship
he and Baron had formed collaborating on the “talking teaching” group.

Project Scope
Assembling a Team
Now that librarian partnership had been formed, Baron and Swan sought out
the participation of a faculty collaborator. For the Baker-Berry exhibits pro-
gram, the practice of faculty-librarian collaborations is common, especially when the exhibit serves to publicize an academic event on campus. With that in mind, Baron approached the faculty conference chair and asked whether she or another faculty member on the conference-planning committee might be inclined to work with them on the exhibit. Yet rather than volunteer herself, or suggest another person, the chair suggested Baron invite all ten faculty members of the committee to participate.

Baron was intrigued by the idea of managing a team of curators, while not convinced it was logistically feasible. She also saw the wisdom in avoiding the exclusion of any faculty involved with the conference who might also be interested in the exhibit. A year into her tenure at Dartmouth, Baron had already managed a digital project involving faculty, students, and an instructional designer, and enjoyed working in a team environment. In an organization that prides itself on its collaborations with faculty, no library exhibit had ever boasted so much faculty involvement.

When she relayed the chair’s suggestion to Swan, he expressed concern because of the potential for complications with regard to timing, vision, and magnitude of the endeavor. The conference-planning committee was comprised of Dartmouth faculty across three different departments, but no one involved, save the history professor, was a World War I scholar. Still, the opportunity to participate in and even guide such an ambitious undertaking outweighed the concerns held by both librarians. Baron communicated to the faculty lead that they would be happy to involve as many faculty as were interested, and she invited the conference planning team to join her and Swan at an initial exhibit-planning meeting. Given the dearth of WWI specialist knowledge on the exhibit committee, Swan and Baron also invited Fran Oscadal, the history librarian, to join them. Oscadal had curated library exhibits in the past, and his history knowledge and institutional experience would be of great benefit to the project. Having another reliable library colleague to assist with preparation also seemed prudent. Ultimately, five faculty members from the conference-planning group joined the three librarians for the first exhibit-planning meeting. Additionally, representatives of the college’s Hood Museum of Art were present. Eventually, nine people would form the exhibit curation team: Baron, Swan, Oscadal, Grady (the exhibit designer), and the five faculty members.

**Committee Structure**

Convened in a Rauner classroom in August of 2013, the first meeting of the exhibit committee gave all those present a chance to review general exhibit guidelines, to discuss possible overarching themes for the exhibit, and to see unique WWI-related materials held in special collections as inspiration.
When it came to brainstorming exhibit themes and ideas for the six exhibit windows in Baker Hall, the conversation became lively and many possible themes for the exhibit emerged. Despite the positive energy, this democratic approach to exhibit curation posed some challenges: With so many possible directions for the exhibit to take, who would ultimately decide on an exhibit narrative? Who would determine whether an idea was worth pursuing or feasible? Who would assign tasks and tenaciously remind the exhibit contributors about deadlines? To ensure its success, the exhibit required a lead curator.

To avoid friction among participants, Baron and Swan put themselves forward as project managers. The library was already serving as the host of the physical exhibit, and they were the team members best suited for locating and marshalling informational resources related to the exhibit’s topic. The exhibit committee agreed. Soon after their appointment, however, Baron and Swan determined this particular exhibit paradigm necessitated two exhibit coordinators: a lead curator, who would oversee the development of window content, including assisting with locating resources, selecting appropriate items, arranging the visual displays, and editing labels, and other exhibit copy; and a project manager, who would be responsible for setting meeting agendas, assigning tasks, and ensuring everyone was on track with their deliverables.

Swan assumed the role of lead curator and Baron took on the role of project manager; they then conveyed this decision to the rest of the exhibit participants. These assignments built upon the pair’s respective and complementary professional and personal strengths. This arrangement, besides being efficient, would also prove useful later during exhibit preparation when conflicts arose. Given their distinct roles, Baron and Swan shared the brunt of the challenges that developed and supported each other towards resolution while still maintaining a clear focus on their individual tasks.

**Defining the Scope of the Exhibit**

Having determined the organizational structure of the committee, the next step was for Baron and Swan to provide focus for the project, both structurally and thematically. With the consent of the other participants, they entitled the exhibit “A Visible War: French and Italian Perspectives on World War I” and divided the six windows into six categories: pamphlets, futurism, newspapers and public media, maps, posters, and fashion/regalia. The categories were partially based on brainstorming that occurred during the initial meeting and interests of individual faculty members, but also were derived from the librarians’ familiarity with potential exhibit items available at the library. Baron and Swan presented this schema over email to the exhibit team and
solicited volunteers for curating each window. Windows were assigned either to an individual or to a pair of committee members. The futurism window, for example, was assigned to a faculty member from the French department and a faculty member from art history. While the six windows belonged within the same exhibit, each curator was responsible for content selection, content curation, and descriptive text.

Because this plan allowed for the possibility of thematic disunity between the six cases, Swan’s role as lead curator and Grady’s creative use of graphic design were key to maintaining the exhibit’s narrative and visual cohesion. Swan received the initial copy and edited it in aggregate to ensure thematic linkages between the individual windows as well to the larger introductory text to the entire exhibit. Grady then took the copy, as well as the desired case content, and organized them in such a way as to create visual continuity from case to case. The timeline required to execute this successfully meant that Baron’s diligence in keeping participants on task, whether via email, phone calls, or regularly scheduled meetings, was essential to ensure the exhibit’s implementation and completion.

In addition to the exhibit windows, Baron and Swan sought volunteers for two other exhibit elements: a flat case book display and a film montage to be played on loop on a movable LED screen. Both of these additional elements would be placed next to the exhibit cases in order to create a seamless exhibit experience. For the film montage, Baron solicited the involvement of the 2013–2014 Jones Media Center Digital Media Intern, a one-year position awarded to a recent Dartmouth graduate. This further expanded the exhibit team and provided an opportunity for the intern to advance her video-editing skills in collaboration with the faculty member, who selected the films and film clips.

Once everyone knew their roles and the various exhibit responsibilities had been divided up among committee members, the project progressed reasonably well. While the majority of curators submitted their first drafts in a timely fashion, others did not, despite multiple reminders. This was not entirely unexpected, but Baron and Swan were subsequently left with the responsibility of completing the writing and arrangement of items for the windows by the final deadline. Although this situation did give Baron and Swan more control over the final exhibit, it also meant more work than originally intended.

The exhibit was mounted at the beginning of the spring term in 2014 and received praise from colleagues in the library and faculty in the French and Italian department. During the conference, Swan led participants in a well-attended exhibit tour, and the exhibit was featured in numerous campus media. All in all, the exhibit achieved its main goal to highlight library collections through an exhibition in connection with an on-campus conference, and to date remains the most intensively collaborative exhibit the library has hosted.
Conclusion

Impact

One of the joys of this collaboration was discovering Baron and Swan had an easy conversational style, which was likely because of their shared experiences in other collaborative contexts. This made discussing challenges directly, face-to-face or via email, a successful and enjoyable method for finding solutions. Another positive realization was that Baron’s and Swan’s positions are much alike, despite surface differences, in their dedication to meeting the needs of faculty and students. The project also provided a better understanding of the needs and goals of the many departments and stakeholders in a campus-wide academic event. As a whole, the long, and often convoluted, process of developing a collaborative exhibit provided many opportunities for the two librarians to learn more about how best to attempt such a feat in future.

Lessons Learned

1. Seek out collaborative opportunities.
   Baron and Swan were able to work well together and be highly productive in planning and running the exhibit project because they had already established a familiarity with one another and with the other project partners. Librarians must be pro-active, developing strategic relationships with faculty members, students, fellow librarians, or other potential partners on campus—even if there is no specific project in mind—if they hope to create and manage collaborative groups comprised of stakeholders from different backgrounds.

2. Have a shared vision for the exhibit.
   One of the first challenges Baron and Swan faced was defining the scope and purpose of the exhibit. Swan’s experience with exhibits, and working with faculty in that context, had been limited to special collections materials. As a result, his assumption was the exhibit would emphasize the unique resources the library had to offer and would try to reach the broadest constituency possible by having a wide scope. However, Baron’s perception of the exhibit was based upon its connection to and conversation with the French and Italian department’s conference on WWI. As a result, she felt it made sense to limit the scope to French and Italian involvement in WWI. Moreover, the interests of faculty members contributing to the exhibit needed to be respected.
Ultimately, a workable compromise was reached based upon the perceived non-negotiables of all participants. Each exhibit window would include a mixture of unique library resources and external materials, with clear documentation of the original sources. The scope would be limited to French and Italian perspectives of the beginning of the war, but not so narrowly confined that it relied only upon specific interests of conference presenters.

3. **Communicate expectations and concerns clearly with all parties involved**

Baron and Swan discovered early there was a potential for overlap in terms of the subject, content, and timeline for the exhibit. Dartmouth’s Hood Museum of Art expressed concerns in the first meeting about the timing of the exhibit. They had scheduled a major WWI exhibit in the same exhibit space for the fall of 2014 curated by their student interns and focused exclusively on WWI-era posters from Hood’s collections. It would be problematic to select posters from Hood’s holdings that might compromise the interns’ freedom to develop an exhibit without overlapping or redundant material. Because of this, museum staff were initially resistant to the inclusion of materials from their institution, although a compromise was reached. Performing an environmental scan and anticipating potential overlaps is essential at the outset of a project, especially an exhibit.

4. **Be prepared to mediate disputes between institutional groups or individuals that have competing agendas or different priorities, and to keep them focused.**

The best example of mediation for Baron and Swan was the determination of thematic content for individual exhibit windows. Each faculty pairing or individual assigned a window had a particular vision for their respective displays. One pair was committed to discussing the concept of futurism with only a peripheral connection to the war, while another was enthused by the idea of displaying WWI regalia from her private family collection. While neither concept lacked merit, Baron and Swan found themselves needing to revisit the purpose of the exhibit with contributors to ensure a common unifying theme across the installation.

5. **Agree on a timeline.**

Given the number of people involved with this project and the frenetic pace of a college campus during term, staying on schedule was an inevitable challenge. Baron and Swan were initially able to limit delays by deciding upon the thematic scope. Baron set clear deadlines at the start of project for each manageable portion of the process. Reminders were sent along the way referring back to the timeline to keep people accountable. Having two co-organizers meant Baron and Swan could take turns reminding participants whenever deadlines were missed.
6. **Accept power imbalances and make them work for the benefit of the exhibit.**

Baron and Swan worked to manage power imbalances among committee members to ensure that the planning and completion of the exhibition moved forward on schedule. They sought to leverage faculty and librarian expertise to create the best overall result. While library staff managed the exhibition, their partnership with faculty enabled them to gain access to materials for the exhibit that otherwise would have been denied them because of institutional policy.

**Next Steps**

In sum, managing this large exhibit was a positive experience. They now better understand the goals of various groups on campus and, therefore, how to approach them to suggest mutually beneficial collaborations. Baron and Swan are committed to continuing their strategic development of relationships within the academic community.
Introduction

When the rich research materials that would become the Rodolfo Usigli Archive came to Miami University, by all accounts their state was not particularly unusual for collections of authors’ papers. Dozens of boxes of materials—manuscripts, typescripts, books, and memorabilia mingled together, scarcely labeled, stacked with little regard for chronology, content, or conservation status—came to Miami University libraries’ loading docks from a musty garage in central Mexico. With only a partial inventory (photocopied and annotated by the seller) as a guide, this collection would have presented a substantial challenge for any processing librarian. However, Miami’s special collection’s staff faced an issue that made all the other challenges seem minor: no one on the staff could read or speak Spanish.

From the moment of its acquisition, the Usigli Archive has demanded collaboration between special collections librarians and other members of Miami
University’s faculty and staff. The language of the majority of the materials, the supplemental paperwork, the secondary literature, future researchers, and the previous owners all presented a roadblock to creating access to the collection.

In 1995, Dr. Ramón Layera, a professor in Miami University’s Department of Spanish and Portuguese, facilitated the procurement of the collection from the Usigli family. Without Dr. Layera’s thorough knowledge of Mexico’s culture, language, and legal system, and his willingness to work hand-in-hand with library staff, the collection would not have come to Miami University. The library’s offer to purchase the materials produced the first faculty and librarian collaboration.

It has only been through complete and sustained cooperation and collaboration that the collection has begun to reach its full potential. The history of the collection provides a good overview of how this collaboration or, more accurately, these collaborations have shaped and improved access to and use of the Usigli Archive. This chapter addresses the ways collaboration between special collections and the Spanish and Portuguese library liaison has improved the collection’s organization; how this enhanced, accessible organizational system has created more opportunities for scholarship; and how the relationship between the collection, special collections staff, and the liaison librarian has had a positive effect on the way faculty and students interact with Usigli materials.

Under some circumstances—namely, those of Miami University’s special collections librarians upon the acquisition of the Usigli Archive—this level of collaboration has proved not just beneficial, but essential to creating and promoting a functional, accessible collection. As Morgan Daniels and Elizabeth Yakel suggest, a more thoroughly described collection is a more valuable collection. In the case of the Usigli Archive, collaborating with a liaison librarian—someone who has specialized knowledge not only of her subject areas, but also of the needs and expectations of the departments and fields she serves—greatly increased this value, and created even greater opportunities for outreach and faculty collaboration as the use of the collection increased.

Institutional Background

Miami University

Miami University is a mid-sized, doctoral public university in Southwestern Ohio with three campuses. It is primarily residential, with around sixteen thousand undergraduates and twenty-five hundred graduate students on the main campus in Oxford, Ohio. The Oxford campus also hosts four libraries: the Business Engineering Science and Technology Library, the Amos Music Library, the Wertz Art and Architecture Library, and King Library. The last of these is the university’s main library, which in addition to housing the major-
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Collaboration in the Miami University Library’s general materials and staff, also contains the Walter Havighurst Special Collections and University Archives.

While Miami University’s special collections’ location in the main library would seem to indicate frequent collaboration with other library departments; such collaboration is infrequent. The department’s location on the third floor, removed from the offices of the public services staff and popular first-floor access points like the reference and circulation desks, has contributed to its isolation. Past collaborations with members of Miami University’s faculty have been frequent and fruitful, but the intra-library collaboration described in this case study was one of the first for Miami University’s special collections.

**The Rodolfo Usigli Archive and Early Collaborations**

Miami University Libraries purchased the Rodolfo Usigli Archive in 1995. The collection includes a wealth of materials in a variety of formats: Rodolfo Usigli’s personal papers and correspondence; his manuscript and typescript drafts of plays, poetry, prose, and translations; photographs; and a selection of ephemera and promotional materials related to the performance of his works. Processing all thirty-seven linear feet of the collection began immediately, with the hope that within a few years the collection would be rehoused, described, and fully accessible to users.

Without Professor Layera’s subject expertise in Mexican theater, his mastery of the Spanish language, and his connections with the Usigli family, the materials might never have come to Miami University. Yet Dr. Layera was not familiar with manuscript processing standards. The labor and expertise of a special collections librarian was required to give the collection the attention it deserved.

Lack of language proficiency did not prevent the enthusiastic and eager staff from working with this unique collection. In fact, the lack of Spanish proficiency frequently guided the use of the collection, early on, by focusing more on outreach and instruction—two areas that definitely invite collaboration, especially with faculty members—than on thorough and detailed description. These efforts were primarily directed by then head of special collections, Marty Miller, and Ramón Layera, who would remain deeply invested in the collection’s development throughout his tenure at Miami University. In 1996, less than a year after the collection first came to the university, the efforts of these early (and largely informal) collaborations came to fruition: Miami University held a grant-funded international symposium to formally establish the Usigli Archive as part of the Walter Havighurst Special Collections. This also happened to coincide with Miami University’s Year of Celebration of Latin American Culture. Members of the Usigli family and scholars from Mexico, the United Kingdom, and the United States gathered to present research papers
on Mexican theater, and special collections hosted the first exhibit featuring the Usigli materials. The Department of Theater performed Ramón Layera's translation of Usigli's play, *El Gesticulador* (*The Impostor*).

Following the excitement of the symposium, the level of collaboration diminished, as did work with and on the materials in the collection. Little effort was made to make the collection accessible—this was in large part due to the language barrier—and other, more manageable projects took priority. Years later, in 2001, the head of special collections, Janet Stuckey, utilized the collection for instruction to classes in Mexican theater in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese and in introductory sessions to graduate students in the Department of Theater. Based on available special collections instruction statistics, these efforts did not necessarily involve collaboration with the liaison librarian. International researchers still came to use the collection, though their visits became less frequent with time. Ramón Layera also continued to use the collection, and the research he conducted served as the basis for his book, *Rodolfo Usigli: itinerario del intelectual y artista dramático*. Well over a dozen books and several articles were published by Layera and other scholars utilizing the Usigli Archive.

In 2005, the centennial of Usigli's birth provided the perfect opportunity to increase the visibility and improve the organization of the collection. The libraries made a concerted effort to work with the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, the Department of Theater, and the Latin American studies program to improve access, and entered into partnerships with the Instituto Nacional de Bellas Artes, the Centro de Investigación Teatral Rodolfo Usigli (CITRU), and the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) to host a second international symposium of scholarship on Mexican theater and Usigli's works. At this juncture, the collaborations that would eventually reshape the collection's organization, use, and usefulness began in earnest.

**Project Scope**

**New Collaborations**

Ten years after its acquisition by Miami University, the Usigli Archive lacked clear, consistent organization. This hindered use and collaborations. Soon after Katie Gibson assumed responsibilities as liaison to the Department of Spanish and Portuguese and Latin American studies, Stuckey discussed with Gibson the possibility of collaborating on projects related to the collection. Principal among these projects was to increase access; the method to do this required creating a descriptive finding aid from the short, box-level inventories that were the main means of accessing the collection.
No schedule was set for this initial special collections/liaison librarian collaboration. Gibson grew into her position and took on additional liaison responsibilities; in the intervening time, Stuckey retired. With changing staff and shifting responsibilities within special collections, the focus of the liaison-department partnership also changed. The Usigli Archive again seemed poised to be placed on the back burner. Yet the flexible and informal nature of this collaboration allowed for an organic adaptability. Its lack of specific, rigid timelines and goals made it more functional than it might have been otherwise; so work was done when it could be done. Colleagues worked together to help when and how they could, acting independently in this shared goal: to create access to the collection.

Organizing the Collection

Creating access started with tackling the collection’s organization, which had proved challenging from the moment of the collection’s acquisition. Although the collection had arrived with a partial inventory that served as an initial guide, this document was hand-written in Spanish by the previous owner and offered little in the way of description. Before partnering with Gibson, special collections librarians had formed a more formal partnership with the Department of Spanish and Portuguese to assist with arranging, organizing, and processing the collection. A series of undergraduate scholars from the department, under the supervision of special collections librarians, were responsible for physically processing and organizing the collection, including rehousing materials in archival folders and boxes. Graduate students from the department also began the process of creating new inventories for the materials based on their new organization. Each year, one student (funded through the Department of Spanish and Portuguese) worked in special collections on the Usigli Archive.

Over several years, graduate students from the Spanish and Portuguese department created a thorough inventory and organized the collection into correspondence, manuscript drafts, photographs, and objects. While this process revealed many hidden treasures in the collection, such as correspondence with George Bernard Shaw and an original Diego Rivera print, reliance on a graduate students proved problematic. Students were fluent in the language, but there were inconsistencies in the quality of processing, attention to detail, and adherence to standards. As students came and went, there was a need to retrain, leading to interruptions in workflows. Furthermore, changing responsibilities and staffing within the department meant students and staff were unable to fully devote their time and attention to the collection.

Fortunately for special collections and the Usigli Archive, establishing the collaboration with Gibson on the project changed the opportunity dramat-
ically. Gibson contributed her knowledge of the context and content of the collection, and with Dr. Layera, helped identify sections of the collection most likely be of interest to researchers. Graduate students could then strategically target different parts of the collection to inventory and describe. Working closely with the students, special collections staff, and the inventories themselves allowed Gibson to become deeply knowledgeable of the collection. Over the next two years, Gibson committed ten hours per week to the organization project. She created finding aids, checked the accuracy of existing finding aids, and coordinated work with the graduate student. Gibson provided continuity for the project despite the turnover of graduate students, leading to the completion of the initial inventories and the creation of four finding aids made accessible online.

Once initial inventories were completed, Gibson's and special collections' responsibilities shifted to outreach. The targeted finding aids encouraged an upsurge in use and gave Miami University libraries a compelling reason to invest in the collection; a part-time, dedicated, staff member fluent in Spanish was hired to process the remaining collection and to bring existing inventories up to finding aid standards. This created an opportunity for the liaison librarian and special collections staff to take on a wider range of collaborations. With a usable set of finding aids available online to researchers and scholars increasing the collection's visibility, new projects quickly emerged.

**Scholarship**

After organizing and processing the collection, the next project was to bring wider attention to the collection and to highlight a particular correspondence. Layera joined the collaboration team for this project. Special collections staff, Gibson, and Dr. Layera chose to highlight the correspondence between Rodolfo Usigli and George Bernard Shaw, with the goal of publishing a book on the topic. Gibson and Layera worked together to translate the correspondence; they also used their subject expertise to research the historical context in which the relationship between Shaw and Usigli developed. Special collections staff provided support by obtaining copyright permissions, scanning documents, and facilitating printing of the work. The result was a commemorative book published by the libraries with images of letters, photographs, and other documents from the collection detailing the relationship between these two men. The book, which would not have been possible without this collaboration, serves as a gateway to the collection, showcasing Usigli's connection to the larger world of theater through his relationship with Shaw.

The increased visibility from finding aids and book reviews in academic journals brought the collection the attention of international scholars. Once again, the collaboration between special collections staff and the liaison librar-
ian facilitated communication with researchers from Spain and Mexico. Special collections forwarded research questions in Spanish to the liaison librarian who then worked with the department to answer them. With the liaison librarian acting as primary contact, the collection was accessible to an international audience of researchers.

**Instruction**

At a primarily undergraduate institution, perhaps the most beneficial development of a collaboration between special collections librarians and liaison librarians is the impact on the undergraduate research experience. The Usigli Archive has seen use in a variety of humanities classrooms—principally in courses related to history, theater, literature, and the Spanish language. Although special collections librarians and liaison libraries can take very different approaches to instruction, working together, they can foster information literacy skills and the skills necessary to work with rare books and manuscripts, and a resulting “broader introduction to communication and critical thinking.”

One class identified for collaboration is an upper-level undergraduate and graduate Latin American theater class. Kimberly Tully, then curator of special collections, included an introduction to handling rare materials by a special collections librarian. Gibson then provided an overview to materials on display from the Usigli Archive, putting them into the context of the themes and content in the course. Students were then able to interact with the materials under the guidance of the special collections librarian. Students compared typescript drafts of plays to the final texts, examined photographs of sets and costumes from the play’s premiere, and struggled to read Usigli’s hand-written drafts, notes, and letters. Gibson discussed the plays, their content, and their reception. Tully presented the use of primary source materials in research and showed how to search and find materials in special collections and archives. Both the liaison librarian and a special collections librarian were available for consultation. The students’ learning experience was enriched because both perspectives were represented in the room.

Other instruction opportunities coming from their partnership have been much more serendipitous. Gibson, in conversation with a faculty member, mentioned the Diego Rivera print in the Usigli Archive. The print was a remnant of Usigli’s work in the theater section at the Department of Fine Arts, and as translator of André Breton’s surrealist manifesto for the 1938 Surrealist week in Mexico City. It was used to promote the event around the city. The professor worked with Gibson and Tully to arrange for her Mexican history class to visit the library to make use of the Usigli Archive.
Outreach

With nearly a five-year gap between the current and former head of special collections, the fate of the Usigli Archive fell to Gibson and special collections curators and staff. With the hiring of William Modrow, their new head of special collections, staff stressed the importance of the collection, and the department’s history promoting its use. Together, the Modrow and Gibson sought new uses for the collection and reestablished contacts with researchers.

The results were quick and encouraging. Faculty scheduled class sessions with the materials, and interest in collaborations with institutions in Mexico were received with enthusiasm. Furthermore, the Spanish and Portuguese department’s administration supported, with resources, reestablishing the connections between the libraries, their department, the Usigli family, and the institutions in Mexico. This resulted in an increase in scholarly resource and new relationships among the libraries and other departments on campus. None of this would have been possible without the foundational collaborative work among Layera, Gibson, and the special collections staff.

Conclusion

A large number of faculty, library staff, and librarians have participated in the work of this collaboration. It has shifted and evolved to fit staff time, meet the instructional needs of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, and has expanded to include new and ongoing initiatives. No one person in the group would have been able to accomplish these goals without the others.

Impact

The benefits of successful collaboration are well-documented. When liaison librarians work with special collections librarians, instruction sessions improve. Students gain access to primary source material, which requires a broader set of skills to access and critical thinking skills to analyze. Liaison librarians make use of their department connections to increase the number of classes using a collection, and their subject background can provide a richer experience for students. However, when centered on a newly-acquired collection of materials, the benefits of a successful collaboration extend beyond the instruction experience. From the initial processing, Gibson was able to support special collections with background and language knowledge. A long-term working relationship between library staff and faculty has provided stability through a time of transition in the department.

Special collections was not the only beneficiary of this partnership. The liaison librarian increased her knowledge and experience working with special
collections and manuscript materials. This expansion of the liaison’s research interests and projects has been a basis for greater collaboration with faculty in assigned liaison areas, and provided the source material for a project to develop new skills in digital humanities.

Lessons Learned

1. **Identify unique collections.**

   Collaborations between special collections librarians and liaison librarians can be particularly fruitful when featuring a collection unique to a particular institution. Liaison librarians can bring their background knowledge to a unique and complex set of questions, and special collections librarians can gain from expanded insight into a unique collection.

2. **Identify information gaps.**

   It is important for both parties to identify gaps in knowledge. Special collections librarians must consider what skills or specific knowledge would make processing a collection easier and in turn, make it more accessible for users. In this particular case, language comprehension was key, and recognizing that gap served as the impetus for collaboration. Liaison librarians might consider to facilitate faculty and student use special collections.

3. **Be flexible and adapt to changing needs.**

   Two deans and university librarians, three heads of special collections, two curators of special collections, several faculty members, and many student workers have participated in directing and describing the Usigli Archive, which facilitated the outreach efforts described in this chapter. Being open to changing priorities of each partner in the collaboration and adaptable to accommodate these shifts will allow a productive collaboration to continue. Rigid and formal partnerships often end when one part of the group is no longer able to contribute at the same level.

4. **Document your work.**

   When collaborations form, one should never assume the relationship will be stable over the long term. Even a stable collaboration can be subject to transitions in staff or responsibilities. Documenting work procedures, roles, and responsibilities of project team members from the outset facilitates a smooth transition and long term sustainability.

   Due to all these changes, the available documentation included a mixture of electronic and print resources, so identifying the most recent update was not possible. The extensive documentation was fragmented. For example, a
list of classes making use of the collection did not include dates. Instruction
dates were tracked in an instruction statistics database no longer in use. This
left new staff to guess when classes made use of the collection and which
of the graduate students completed which projects. The process of gathering
instruction statistics from two databases listing course numbers, university
course listings describing course content, and other informal records docu-
menting project work, taught the importance of clear and consistent docu-
mentation. To be useful, documentation should be clearly delineated by year,
task, person responsible, steps taken to complete the task, and completion
date.

5. **Be strategic.**

   When collaborating, it is easy to feed off mutual enthusiasm for a proj-
et, but it is important to remember to be strategic in selecting projects.
   It is not possible to do it all. Target work toward projects supportive of
   both the liaison and special collection department’s goals. In the context
   of working in an academic library, Gibson, and her collaborative partners
   prioritized the uses of the collection to support undergraduate teaching
   and learning. Larger-scale collaborations will come in time.

**Next Steps**

**NEW PARTNERSHIPS**

After Layera’s retirement, the libraries worked with another faculty member
in the Spanish and Portuguese department, using the Usigli Archive primarily
with instruction to her Latin American theater courses. After hearing from the
Usigli family and possible partners in Mexico, Modrow, the liaison librarian,
the chair, and a faculty member in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese
are developing and expanding the Usigli collaboration. Initial plans involve
a joint grant application to support a collaboration with scholars in Mexico,
and possibly with institutions with which the libraries have collaborated in the
past. This project will be on a much larger scale than any previous collabora-
tions (such as the symposiums in 1997 and 2005), but the hope is to draw on
lessons learned from earlier work. The shared goal is to increase international
access to the collections.

**DIGITAL SCHOLARSHIP**

Another ongoing project is the development of a digital project featuring items
in the George Bernard Shaw and Rodolfo Usigli correspondence. The goal is to
situate the materials in their historical, literary, and political context in order
to examine the relationships between these artifacts and Usigli’s memoir of meeting Shaw, written decades later. Although originally intended as an exercise in learning digital humanities tools and methodologies, the project will further extend the awareness of the collection.

Notes

6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
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CHAPTER 10

Better Together:
EMBEDDING A LIAISON LIBRARIAN IN A SPECIAL COLLECTION

Laurie Scrivener and Jacquelyn Slater Reese

Introduction

Traditional library organizational structures tend to create separation between special collections and liaison librarians that can result in artificial and detrimental boundaries. When that structure is changed by physically locating a liaison librarian in a special collections department, the relationship can evolve, enhancing the institution’s ability to fulfill its mission. In this particular case, a history librarian and a special collections librarian did not have explicit instructions regarding how to collaborate, but a strong working relationship that supports their library’s mission has naturally developed.

In this chapter, history and area studies librarian, Laurie Scrivener, and western history collections librarian, Jacquelyn Slater Reese, describe their experiences working together following organizational restructuring at the University of Oklahoma (OU) Libraries. Part of that change included physically “embedding” Scrivener in special collections. The successes and challenges of their experiences will help inform and encourage other librarian collaborations in similar settings.

* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License, CC BY-NC (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).
Institutional Background

The University of Oklahoma is a public doctoral university (Highest Research Activity) that has three campuses. The main campus in Norman houses all academic programs except health-related fields, which are in Oklahoma City; both sites also offer satellite programs in Tulsa. The Norman campus enrollment for fall 2015 was approximately twenty-four thousand students with about fifteen hundred full-time faculty members. The Department of History, which both librarians serve, offers graduate degrees at the doctoral and master's levels. Graduate enrollment in the department has averaged about fifty students per year over the last five years, with many students choosing to study the American West or Native American history.

Libraries are administered separately at all three OU campuses, with the Norman campus University Libraries (UL) having a central library, four branches, and six special collections. There is also a separately administered law library. Until 2012, with the dean's retirement and appointment of an external candidate, the UL structure had been fairly traditional, with public and technical services divisions. Although special collections and liaison librarians both reported to public services, they rarely worked together, except for occasional user referrals or instruction sessions. The new leadership made significant organizational changes, which continue.

A major change, reconfiguring the reference department, led to the disbursement of most liaison librarians throughout the system. Those who retained subject assignments were administratively moved under the new scholarly services and research initiatives department. Some librarians continued in the same physical space or in other locations within the main library, but two librarians were physically moved, or “embedded,” in other campus locations. The business librarian relocated to the Price College of Business and the history librarian to the Western History Collections, one of the UL’s special collections. One librarian physically remained in the former reference department space, but administratively transferred to a new undergraduate services and learning initiatives department, without subject responsibilities.

The Western History Collections (WHC) is one of six special collections in the UL system and is housed in a building separate from the main library. Its purpose is to enhance the UL general collection on the history of the American West; to support the research and teaching programs of OU; and to provide opportunities for research through the acquisition, preservation, and access of materials relating to the development of the Trans-Mississippi West and Native American cultures. There are four divisions within the WHC: the library division containing more than eighty thousand volumes, the manuscripts division with more than two thousand collections of primary textual material about Oklahoma and the West, the photographic archives with two million
historic images in various formats, and the university archives. The WHC is staffed by a curator, who is also the director of special collections for the UL; a head of operations; a librarian, who is also the photo archivist; an archivist; a staff assistant; several graduate assistants; and about a dozen student employees. Like most special collections, the WHC is a non-circulating, closed stacks collection and requires registration before pulling resources for use. Standard rules regarding food, drink, and bags apply. Appointments are not necessary, and the WHC is open to the public with extended evening and weekend hours.

**Impetus for Collaboration**

Collaboration between Scrivener and Reese began in spring 2013 with a university pilot project emphasizing freshman use of primary sources in a required U.S. history survey course. For that course, the two librarians, together with a librarian working in another special collection, co-taught two instruction sessions to each of eight discussion sections of the course. In the fall of that year, the pilot program was officially implemented and four freshman-level U.S. history classes were offered. That semester, Scrivener organized four open sessions for research paper assistance and Reese offered to assist with these sessions. Together they helped two hundred and thirteen students.

In fall 2013, Scrivener, Reese, and the same librarian from another special collection were assigned to a strategic plan implementation team tasked with integrating primary source materials into undergraduate research projects to support the “building on excellence in special collections” strategic initiative. They met several times to generate ideas to meet the initiative, and suggested action items such as creating a humanities primary resource web portal, assessing faculty/staff needs for primary resource materials for classroom use and curriculum projects, creating an outreach plan, and creating a finding aids database. Although these ideas have not been implemented, the project allowed the librarians to formulate philosophies about primary sources and special collections that help inform their work. The project also made clear to Reese and Scrivener the similarities in their work and user base, and firmly established the two worked well together and had similar viewpoints regarding reference and instruction.

In June 2014, in response to increased demands of the freshman history courses and to the library’s strategic plan initiative to build on excellence in special collections, the liaison librarian–special collections librarian collaboration was made formal when, after eighteen years of having an office in the main library, Scrivener relocated to the WHC. The change was suggested by the associate dean for exploration and engagement and agreed to by the WHC curator. With the move, her title was temporarily changed from history and area studies
librarian to history librarian and primary research projects specialist. Originally her collection development and instruction responsibilities were limited to the discipline of history, but a little more than a year later, her liaison responsibilities were expanded to include political science and international and area studies, due to administrative staff changes and the limited number of liaison librarians. Her title reverted to history and area studies librarian.

With the physical move, Scrivener and Reese’s offices were now across the hall from each other rather than in separate buildings, increasing interaction and collaboration between them dramatically. No special program, instructions, or directives were given to them as to how to approach their new organizational dynamic, but they have embraced the opportunity to work more closely together and are open to new ways of thinking and approaching tasks.

**Figure 10.1.** Image showing the proximity of Scrivener and Reese’s offices in the Western History Collections’ reading room. Photo courtesy of Tara Reynolds, University of Oklahoma.

**Scope of Collaboration**

As there were no directives on how the two should work together, they are making it up as they go along and responding to issues as they arise. These circumstances allow for maximum creativity and freedom, but can generate
uncertainty about expectations. For example, it was unclear how much time Scrivener would be expected to help with WHC-specific reference requests and events. Reese wasn’t sure how much training to give Scrivener and how often to ask her to help. The situation remains fluid and undefined. Nevertheless, informal feedback and that from evaluations is positive. In a situation with this level of flexibility, administrative support is key, and the WHC curator has been crucial to the successful collaboration. He warmly welcomed Scrivener to the WHC and included her in department’s events and programs. There was no territoriality or possessiveness over the collection that one might expect when an outsider moves in. Scrivener’s two supervisors, since moving to the WHC, have similarly been supportive of her efforts.

Given she is physically located in the WHC reading room, it was important Scrivener receive basic training in special collections procedures and processes in case reference or other questions arose when the WHC full-time staff were unavailable. For the most part, however, she continues to perform the same job duties as when she had an office in the main library: instruction, collection development, reference work in-office, online, and at the main library reference desk. Although her job duties have not changed, simply having an office in the WHC has allowed Scrivener to observe and learn about the workings of a special collection. Reese has learned more about databases and other resources in the main library. The joint instruction sessions they have taught have been key to learning about each other’s job. All this interaction has widened their library skills, deepened their understanding of researchers they both assist, and increased knowledge of their common subject area, the American West.

Areas of collaboration include library instruction, reference, collection development, general information and contact sharing, and promotion of WHC via social events. Since 2014, Scrivener and Reese have co-taught eighteen library instruction sessions; whereas before the move—except for the previously mentioned freshman history classes—there was almost no co-instruction. The librarians have co-taught sessions mostly for history courses, although they have also worked together on English classes and summer teachers’ institutes. Instruction is not always equally divided between the two. Some classes warrant in-depth instruction from Reese in archival research and only a mention of library resources such as databases. For other classes, Reese gives a brief introduction, while Scrivener goes into great detail about database and catalog research. In a class such as a graduate-level introduction to historical methods, the time is equally divided. Decisions about how to split the time are based on the requests of instructors and the course content. For example, an expository writing instructor contacted Scrivener for a session on alternative Oklahoma history, which would benefit from the use of special collections. Scrivener suggested the class should hear from Reese as well, and the instructor agreed. As it turned out, Scrivener was ill the day of the class and Reese taught both aspects:
library resources and archival material. Without the collaboration of the two, the instruction session would have been cancelled and an opportunity lost.

In addition to formal instruction sessions, the librarians provide tours for prospective graduate students and faculty. This was always a common occurrence for Reese, but Scrivener was rarely asked to tour prospective candidates in the main library. These tours have given Scrivener the opportunity to describe main library resources, and given the candidates the opportunity to ask questions about the main library.

A goal of both librarians is to make special collections less intimidating. Most co-taught classes are held in the WHC classroom or reading room, exposing students to the special collections environment; such exposure gives them the opportunity to discover the richness of original primary sources that exist locally. The WHC reading room is a quiet area and open for study; the librarians mention this, along with highlighting the group study room, during instruction sessions. The reading room, originally the law library, sells itself with its wood paneling, vaulted ceiling, and tracery windows. Exhibit cases filled with items from the WHC collections and artwork displayed around the room add to its appeal.

Figure 10.2. The Western History Collections’ reading room, where researchers and studiers can enjoy the quiet atmosphere. Photo courtesy of Hugh Scott, University of Oklahoma.
Their close proximity to one another facilitates communication. It is much easier to walk across the hall to bounce an idea or question off a colleague than to call, email, or walk across campus to do so. As a result, Scrivener and Reese frequently ask for each other’s assistance, and both have learned a great deal about their respective resources. When a user physically comes to the WHC, Reese usually handles the reference question, although Scrivener occasionally assists. Therefore, when Scrivener is at the main library reference desk, she is much more knowledgeable about what is available in the WHC and can more confidently give information to users or make referrals. Because students have been to the WHC for instruction sessions, many return to ask reference questions either by appointment or drop-in. If both librarians are available, whichever librarian has more knowledge or experience on the topic answers the question. Otherwise, one librarian attempts to fill in for the other or makes a referral.

Scrivener and Reese have also worked together on two LibGuides to support their reference and instruction activities. The first LibGuide was for the pilot history course in 2013 and the second expanded on that guide’s Oklahoma history section to create a new guide for primary and secondary sources about Oklahoma history. The virtual interface of LibGuides allows seamless access to special collections materials and main library materials. Better knowledge of each other’s resources has resulted in more cross-referencing within the librarians’ own guides, exposing users to sources that might not have been listed before the move.

Along with formal reference question sharing, the proximity and work habits of the librarians allow for better sharing of library news, contacts, and other issues. Information gained by Scrivener, simply by being housed in the WHC, is shared with librarians in the main library with the hope of promoting better understanding of the WHC and special collections. Similarly, communications that only the liaison librarian would normally receive are shared with WHC staff to keep them aware of what is happening in the main library. For instance, software for scheduling student employees was mentioned at a meeting of the scholarly services and research initiatives department, and that was shared with Reese and her staff assistant who then implemented the software at the WHC. Librarian contacts are also useful in terms of increased awareness of the WHC. For example, Scrivener was contacted by a professor needing books purchased for a campus-wide World War I event; she mentioned this to the curator and to Reese, and they offered to display a number of original WWI posters at the event. When the professor learned of this, he was thrilled to accept the offer.

Scrivener and Reese have separate collection development budgets and processes for acquiring material, but there have been opportunities to learn from one another and to see how the collections complement each other.
Scrivener is able to purchase duplicate copies of WHC books for the main library when necessary. Additionally, if a history professor asked her to purchase an item to support a class, but the item turned out to be a valuable first edition of *The Grapes of Wrath*, she could turn to Reese to purchase and secure the item, since it is within the scope of the WHC’s collection. Communication on collection issues also occurs in the deselection and weeding process. In a large deselection project, Scrivener consulted with Reese to ensure the WHC had a chance to accept titles before deselection. Collaboration extended to digital resources when, working with the Native American studies librarian, Scrivener and Reese were able to successfully advocate for the purchase of a new database covering the American West and Native American topics. From the donation perspective, Scrivener now has had the opportunity to interact with donors, something that never occurred previously.

Another area of collaboration is in the promotion of the WHC via social events. As previously mentioned, the WHC reading room is a beautiful space, which lends itself to social occasions. Receptions for the history department faculty and graduate students, OU departments, alumni groups, and the Edward Everett Dale Society—the WHC friends group—have all been held in the reading room. Although receptions have occurred in the WHC for many years, this is a new activity for Scrivener, allowing her to make new connections and greet old ones in a new environment. Having an additional person at these events eases the load on Reese and WHC staff and allows them to connect with people Scrivener may know well.

**Challenges**

Naturally, there are some difficulties with the new arrangement. One that arose initially was that main library reference staff sometimes forgot the unique job function of each librarian. They tended to send users to Scrivener, with whom they had worked, even if the question was about WHC resources, which often resulted in a delay because referral to Reese was necessary. With time, incorrect referral by the main library has become less common. Another concern is the WHC and the scholarly services and research initiatives department have two different reporting systems for reference and instruction statistics, making it difficult to do analysis or comparison.

Scrivener worried, before she moved to the WHC, whether students and faculty would continue to visit her for assistance. Previous to the move, users would often go to the reference desk and then be escorted to her office for in-depth, subject-area assistance. That is not feasible with the five-minute walk between the main library and the WHC, but statistics show the number of students consulting with her has actually risen. In terms of security and logistics, the layout of the WHC reading room makes it easy for students
consulting with Scrivener to get to her office without endangering WHC resources. These students are not required to sign in unless they need WHC materials. Although many students who consult with Scrivener are not studying the American West, it is hoped the experience of visiting the special collection will put the WHC and special collections, on the students’ radar and make such collections less intimidating.

Although precise statistics were not kept for faculty contacts, Scrivener does see fewer faculty drop-ins than when she had an office in the main library. Most history faculty have study carrels in the main library and it was convenient for them to stop by her office. Since she continues to serve on the main library reference desk a few hours per week, however, faculty can and do drop by the desk with questions. The continued connection with the main library by service on the reference desk has proven crucial to keeping up with events there and with her liaison colleagues.

Conclusion

This collaboration has evolved into a mutually beneficial partnership. Both librarians turn to each other for assistance and advice, learning more about their distinct roles. This undirected collaboration has led to a closer relationship between the history department and the special collections, brought more people into the WHC, and created an overall increased awareness of special collections. The unknowns at the onset of this embedding have resolved themselves into stronger connections and awareness, benefiting Scrivener and Reese and the library system.

Impact

The impact of this collaboration extends beyond the two librarians involved. The many connections Scrivener has due to her length of service to the organization, both internal and external, have benefited Reese. Other subject specialists visit Scrivener, allowing Reese to meet and increase her working relationships with other librarians. Scrivener’s connections with the history department, as well as with other campus faculty, have also allowed for more contact between Reese and campus faculty.

Lessons Learned

Several lessons have been learned from this unique situation that are useful for others considering this type of collaboration. Flexible and supportive administration is crucial. In this instance, administrators allowed the librarians to
work together without much direction to discover what worked best; the lack of structure was helpful. Librarians in such a position should take advantage of the openness, looking to share information with one another even if it does not seem relevant. Open communication can create more partnerships within and outside the organization, as in the case of the World War I posters being displayed at a campus event. Reese would not have been able to make this connection on her own, and Scrivener did not necessarily have that intention when sharing the event topic with the WHC staff.

Other lessons learned rely on the individuals and personalities involved. For this collaboration, the librarians knew each other previously and had limited experience working together. They discovered as they worked together more frequently that they have complementary personalities and work well together, which has helped create a stronger working relationship. Scrivener taking on additional subject responsibilities a year into the collaboration, for instance, meant more of her time was spent working in areas not supported as frequently by special collections and required both librarians to adjust their expectations. Another factor making the embedding of a liaison librarian into a special collection a smooth experience is that Scrivener, the curator, and the head of operations have all worked at the UL together for many years. Familiarity with individuals can color opinions in positive and negative manners, but in this instance everyone kept open minds toward the possibilities of a new partnership, to the benefit of all involved.

**Next Steps**

Though the future is unknown, there are areas where Scrivener and Reese can plan for continued collaboration. They have established connections in reference, instruction, and collection management which will continue well into the foreseeable future. They can decide to be more intentional with this collaboration, working together on instruction sessions and tackling collection development projects jointly. They can also more quickly turn to each other for reference questions as they learn more about each other’s areas.

Throughout this process, the missions of the library system and the WHC have remained at the forefront for both librarians. Their more firmly forged partnership has benefited the students, faculty, and staff of the university as they pursue teaching, research, and learning. The librarians have learned from each other in unexpected but exciting ways, and the continued collaboration of an embedded subject specialist in a special collection will benefit many different stakeholders, the organization, and the librarians.
Notes


CHAPTER 11

Expanding Our Reach:

COLLABORATING TO LEAD A VOLUNTEER DOCENT TEAM

Rebekah Bedard

Introduction

Special collections departments have unique holdings that delight, inspire, and are vital for research. But too often they have limited resources for sharing these collections. Librarians in special collections and reference can expand outreach efforts by working together, across departments, to teach users about the libraries’ unique holdings. In collaborating with one another, though, what if librarians went a step further and partnered with members of their communities? One promising group of collaborative partners is library volunteers. Volunteers have long worked in libraries and their “efforts are often characterized as the cornerstone of library advancement.” What if special collections librarians and reference librarians were to collaborate with one another to lead volunteers in improving access to special collections?

Over the past two years, librarians from Pitts Theology Library’s special collections and reference departments have done just this. Reference librarian and outreach coordinator, Rebekah Bedard, developed and led a team of volunteer docents in collaboration with six special collections librarians: Pat Graham, Brandon Wason, Debra Madera, Margaret Peddle, Denise Hanusek, and Armin Siedlecki. Bedard brought skills in volunteer management and instruction, and
the special collections librarians brought in-depth knowledge of collections and projects. This chapter looks at the steps they took to initiate and implement the program: (1) planning; (2) recruiting; (3) orienting; (4) supervising; and (5) evaluating. Each of these steps was only possible through collaboration.

Through their interdepartmental collaboration, Bedard and the special collections librarians have developed an indispensable group. By completing projects in special collections and leading tours of exhibits, the docents are helping the library to expand access to unique holdings and develop stronger community and interdepartmental relationships. This chapter provides a valuable model for other libraries interested in developing similar programs.

**Institutional Background**

**Pitts Theology Library**

Emory University’s Pitts Theology Library is one of the largest theological libraries in North America, with over six hundred thousand volumes in its collections, including over one hundred thirty thousand rare books and four thousand cubic feet of archival material. The library’s special collections include the Kessler Reformation Collection, the English Religious History Collection, the Wesleyana Collection, the English and American Hymnody Collection, and the Geffen and Goldstein Haggadot Collection, as well as collections of incunables and Sub-Saharan African periodicals. Working with these collections are sixteen staff in four departments. Reference Librarian and Outreach Coordinator, Rebekah Bedard, came to the library in the spring of 2014, and helps coordinate the work of library volunteers. When she began, the library had a small team of dedicated volunteers working in special collections.

**Impetus for Collaboration**

In the spring of 2014, Bedard and the special collections librarians were interested in further developing the volunteer program. They wanted to recruit more volunteers to assist in special collections. In addition, as the library prepared for a move into a new building with an expanded special collections department and exhibit gallery, they saw an opportunity for further volunteer assistance with special collections projects and exhibit tours. One of the library’s volunteers presented them with an idea: to develop a library docent program. Docents are tour guides who make exhibits more meaningful to visitors. Most common in museums, they disseminate curators’ ideas, and engage and interact with diverse groups of visitors. As such, they “fill an important part of a museum's educational mission.” Bedard and the special collections librarians set
out to build a team of library docents who would lead tours of exhibits and assist with projects in special collections. Bedard had experience in instruction and volunteer coordination, and the special collections staff had an in-depth knowledge of collections and projects. They knew they could only do this together.

**Project Scope**

*Step 1: Planning*

Library staff began by collaborating to plan the program. First, Bedard and Graham studied the literature on volunteer and docent programs, and spoke with experts in the field. In “Establishing a Library Docent Program,” Mary H. Nino recommends establishing a planning committee comprising “a staff member who enjoys working with volunteers,” additional staff members with relevant expertise, and “an energetic library supporter from the community.” Bedard and Graham followed this advice, and met with a dedicated volunteer who had experience in docent programs. Together, they also met with the Director of Educational Programs at Emory’s Carlos Museum. Later, they met with an experienced docent from the Carter Center, where docents meet weekly to lead tours and work on projects.

After discussions with Graham, Bedard had conversations with other special collections staff. She talked about the prospect of developing a volunteer docent program, and addressed any concerns that they had upfront. In developing a library volunteer program, there are two main issues to consider. On the one hand, volunteers should not be given any tasks that require specialized library knowledge. On the other, volunteers’ tasks should be meaningful, so that they can maintain enthusiasm and “contribute specialized skills and knowledge that may not exist among staff.” Bedard and the special collections staff set out to develop a program that would meet both of these needs. The docents’ projects would be helpful for the special collections department, but would not require librarian-level expertise. Similarly, the docents’ exhibit tours would be exciting for the docents and would bring new skills to the library.

Bedard and special collections staff worked together to do a needs assessment. With their in-depth knowledge of the department, special collections staff identified three projects. Graham noted that it would be helpful to have volunteers search for woodcuts in rare books to be scanned for the online digital image archive; Siedlecki and Hanusek affirmed that it would be helpful to have docents lead tours of exhibits; and Wason recommended scanning and describing a major collection of Sub-Saharan African postcards.

After carrying out a needs assessment with special collections staff, Bedard developed a program plan. She decided to follow the Carter Center’s model,
and have the docents come on Friday afternoons to lead tours and work on projects. She wrote a docent plan and project descriptions, with goals, duties, and expectations. After Bedard had developed an initial program plan, she finalized it with the special collections team.

**Step 2: Recruitment**

Bedard and the special collections librarians posted advertisements on the library website, social media accounts, and Friends newsletter. Next, they advertised by word of mouth. This second method turned out to be more effective. Karp rightly notes that “personal contact is the best way to advertise a library’s need for volunteers.” Bedard and special collections staff reached out to volunteers and Friends, re-engaging four former volunteers and recruiting two new ones. Volunteers also helped with recruitment. One volunteer, who was also a docent at a nearby museum, spread the word to others and, before long, she had recruited five prospective volunteers. Later, one of the new volunteers recruited a friend. Working together, volunteers, special collections librarians, and reference librarians recruited a total of twelve prospective docents.

After they had recruited docents, Bedard conducted interviews. She asked prospective volunteers to fill out an application form, which included a checklist of interests based on the needs assessment. Bedard then met with prospective volunteers for an interview to assess their backgrounds, skills, and interests. She also took them on a tour of the library and introduced them to special collections staff. After each interview, Bedard consulted with special collections staff. In the end, they selected ten docents. Using the docents’ checklists of interests, they then matched them to special collections projects and created a schedule.

**Step 3: Orientation**

For the first few weeks of the program, Bedard, Graham, and Wason oriented the docents to the library and its special collections. Bedard gave the docents a handbook with contact information, an overview of the program, and information on the library. Then, Graham and Wason introduced the docents to the library’s unique holdings. Graham took the docents on a tour of the art in the library and Wason took them on a tour of the special collections department.

To give the docents background on the history of the book, Bedard and Wason also coordinated a series of twenty-minute workshops. In these sessions, special collections and reference librarians partnered to teach the docents about incunables, paper, bindings, illustration, and printing techniques. These activities helped the docents to prepare for the sorts of questions they would encounter on their exhibit tours. At the end of orientation, the docents were even more excited about their work.
Step 4: Training and Supervision

Bedard then collaborated with special collections curators and catalogers, Siedlecki and Hanusek, to train the docents in leading exhibit tours. Siedlecki and Hanusek provided knowledge of specials collections by taking the docents on in-depth tours of the exhibits and recommending resources for further study. In most cases, Siedlecki and Hanusek had not only curated the exhibits, but had also cataloged the materials in them. Thus, they had a deep, rich body of knowledge to share with the docents. Bedard also drew on her fifteen years of experience in instruction to provide training in pedagogy and give the docents feedback during practice tours. Bedard, Siedlecki, and Hanusek then worked together to supervise the docents. Siedlecki and Hanusek answered questions about exhibit content, and Bedard scheduled tours and communicated with the docents on an ongoing basis.

Figure 11.1. A docent-led tour in the gallery.
Special Collections Projects

For special collections projects, Bedard partnered with the head of Archives and Manuscripts, Brandon Wason, and his colleagues, Debra Madera and Margaret Peddle. Wason, Madera, and Peddle explained projects to the docents and Bedard created training documentation. Staff were then available to supervise the docents during their weekly shifts, while completing their own departmental work.

First, Wason, Madera, and Bedard trained and supervised some of the docents as they scanned and described postcards from the library’s Sub-Saharan African collection. Drawing on his technological skills and knowledge of archival processing and conservation, Wason trained two docents in scanning postcards and assigning item numbers. Bedard and Madera then drew on their backgrounds in metadata-creation and instruction to train and supervise four of the docents in describing the postcards. In a few short months, the docents had scanned and described over five hundred postcards. The digitized postcards provide unique insight into social, religious, and cultural life in Sub-Saharan African missions, and are already being used by African studies researchers and classes at Emory.

Peddle and Bedard also trained four of the docents to search through rare books for woodcuts that Peddle could scan for the library’s digital image archive. Peddle and Bedard developed training materials and a clipboard the docents use to track their progress. Over one year, the docents searched for woodcuts in all of the library’s rare books from the 1700s.

Figure 11.2. Docents searching for woodcuts.
Step 5: Evaluation

Bedard and the special collections librarians evaluate the program collaboratively on a weekly and annual basis. Each week, they check in with one another and with the docents. This ongoing evaluation enables them to make quick improvements. When one of the docents found the scanning process cumbersome, Wason found a way to streamline the process. In public services, Bedard also evaluates the docent program at the end of the year. She does quantitative evaluation of the number of docent hours, projects, tours, and tour attendees. In addition, she evaluates the financial value of the program by multiplying the hourly worth of volunteer work\(^\text{14}\) by the number of hours volunteers have worked, and then subtracting program costs, such as training time and supplies.\(^\text{15}\) She and special collections staff also do qualitative evaluation by collecting and analyzing feedback from docents and visitors. Bedard and the special collections staff collect words of thanks and volunteer stories and use them in annual reports to give a sense of the program’s impact on the library.

Conclusion

Impact

By collaborating across their departments to plan, recruit, orient, supervise, evaluate, and motivate the docents, Bedard and the special collections librarians have built an indispensable group. Together, they have developed a group that expands access to special collections and fosters stronger community and inter-departmental relationships. Their collaborative efforts have underscored the value of communicating to meet multiple departmental needs, planning and being flexible, instituting cross-departmental training, and learning from one another.

VOLUNTEER IMPACT

The opportunities the program created for growth and learning had an impact on the docents. Bedard and the special collections librarians teach the docents about collections and help them develop skills in areas such as instruction and computer literacy. The docents enjoy working with staff and gaining insight into the work of the library. They also enjoy learning from one another, often doing extra research on exhibits and sharing resources with each other. Special collections staff note they are frequently impressed with and inspired by the docents’ desire to learn. The docents have conveyed how much they enjoy working with staff and one another. Many have commented on the sense of community across the departments at Pitts and expressed gratitude for being welcomed into it. In addition to learning new skills, the docents contribute
their own experiences to the program’s outcomes. Each docent enjoys building on his or her skills and contributing to the library’s mission. Bedard and the special collections staff acknowledge these accomplishments with words of thanks each week and with a year-end party. The docents often mention how appreciated and valued they feel. In a note to Graham, one of the docents remarked, “You have assembled amazing (and very appreciative) staff members.”

COMMUNITY IMPACT

The program’s impact extends beyond the docents and into the community. During the first year of the program, the docents led biweekly tours of four exhibits. The tours were well attended and attendees frequently returned and spread the word to others. Bedard also organized lectures and events to accompany each exhibit. The docents provided two or three tours at each event, with an average attendance of fifty guests. They also provided special tours for groups from local churches and organizations. In addition, the docents led a number of tours for K–12 groups. The first was for Homeschool Day, a collaborative event with Emory’s Carlos Museum related to the theme of Genesis. A group of thirty kids explored works on paper at the Carlos Museum and then came to Pitts for a tour of rare books and a book-making activity. The program was well received by all. Following Homeschool Day, the docents led similar programs for Sunday school groups. More recently, the library has developed a partnership with a local high school and has begun hosting history classes for docent-led exhibit tours and rare-book activities related to their studies.

Figure 11.3. Leading a tour in special collections.
Karp notes that “[a] successful volunteer program in a library improves services, increases productivity, enhances the library’s public image, and raises the level of financial support for the library.” This statement is true of the collaboratively built program at Pitts. The docents are helping the library expand access to special collections by enriching services and building stronger community and interdepartmental relationships.

LIBRARIAN IMPACT

Library staff have also experienced the positive benefits of working with docents. Through their work on special collections projects, the docents help improve staff work and enrich library services. They increase productivity by giving staff more time for projects requiring professional expertise. Their searching for woodcuts enables Peddle to spend more time on digitization and their scanning postcards, and writing metadata helps Wason and Madera to improve access to these collections for researchers. The docents are also enrich services by leading tours of exhibits. Here, they provide “value added services that run alongside core activities supported by paid staff.” Without them, Siedlecki and Hanusek would not have the time to provide tours for such a wide range of groups. Friends, faculty, students, and K–12 groups are thrilled by the tours and have remarked that the presentations are without peer. The docents also enrich the special collections and reference departments through gifts of further time and resources. In addition to volunteering in special collections, many docents volunteer in outreach programs. Many give donations and in-kind gifts as well. Most recently, the docents came together to purchase a rare facsimile of the Sarajevo Haggadah for the library’s special collection of Haggadot.

The docent program also helps Pitts’ reference and special collections staff to build stronger relationships with the community. Through the docent program, the reference and special collections departments have built stronger ties with others at Emory University. After collaborating with Emory’s Carlos Museum, for example, Graham and Wason began collaborative collection development with them, and Bedard and the Carlos Museum initiated joint outreach programs. The docent program helps the library reach out into the broader community. Graham notes the program has a multiplying factor: librarians collaborate to train docents who, in turn, help to share collections with the community. Many guests on docent-led tours have asked to join the Friends group and gone on to share their enthusiasm with others.

Another result of the docent program has been the strengthening of interdepartmental relationships. In working together to train and supervise the docents, Bedard and the special collections librarians have developed a greater sense of community across library departments. They enjoy working with one another and with the docents. In addition, special collections staff frequently
note while they sometimes feel isolated on the fourth floor of the library, the weekly time with reference staff and volunteers helps them feel better connected.

**Lessons Learned**

Through their collaborative work, Bedard, Graham, Siedlecki, Wason, and others have learned the value of (1) communicating to meet multiple departmental needs, (2) planning and being flexible, (3) combining tours and projects, and (4) learning from one another.

First, in special collections and reference there are competing priorities, with various projects to complete, student assistants to supervise, and users to assist. In planning docent activities, Bedard and special collections staff need to communicate frequently to avoid conflicts in scheduling and to ensure everyone is on the same page.

Second, Bedard and the special collections librarians have learned the value of planning and flexibility. They need to have strong organizational and planning skills. Bedard and special collections staff must work together to schedule and assign docents to appropriate projects.

Third, Bedard, Wason, Siedlecki, and others have learned how helpful it is to combine tours and special collections projects. Grenier argues docents need both formal training and experiential learning. Experiential learning, he claims, leads to greater cognitive flexibility and better retention. Docents at Pitts not only gain formal training for tours, but also gain experience working with special collections. Their work on special collections projects provides experiential learning that strengthens their tours. As they search for woodcuts in rare books, for example, they gain deeper insights into the history of book-binding, which they can then draw upon in their tours.
Fourth, the docent program has taught the special collections and reference departments more about one another’s work and has made them better at collaborating on other projects. From the special collections staff, Bedard has learned about the library’s unique collections and ways to make them accessible. From Bedard, the special collections librarians have learned more about instruction and outreach. In addition, the frequent communication between reference and special collections librarians has made them better at initiating other collaborative projects—most recently, working together to improve the library’s social media efforts. They also work more efficiently on collaborative instructional sessions for students and visiting groups.

Next Steps

Bedard and the special collections librarians continue to develop the docent program. In 2016, they will be collaborating to initiate and supervise offsite docent projects in transcription and metadata. In addition, as Bedard and the special collections staff have learned to manage larger groups of volunteers, they look forward to expanding the program. This year, they will recruit five new docents to support the library’s growing outreach to Emory University classes, K–12 groups, and visitors.

Concluding Remarks

Tara E. Murray notes, “[s]pecial libraries looking to begin or expand their volunteer programs are advised to study the lessons learned from other types of libraries and organizations.” Pitts’s special collections and reference librarians hope these experiences will provide insights for others interested in developing collaboratively-led volunteer programs. A range of other projects could be beneficial, from assistance in preservation to assistance in marketing. As others collaborate to develop volunteer programs, they are encouraged to contribute to the literature as well. There is need for further research on the interdepartmental leadership of volunteer programs in special collections. Reference and special collections librarians at Pitts have found their collaborative work on the docent program deeply valuable in expanding access to special collections and in strengthening interdepartmental relationships. They hope this work will inspire others to engage in similar partnerships.

Notes

7. Ibid.
10. Ibid., 318.
20. Ibid., 84.
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CHAPTER 12*

Developing a Primary Source Lab Series:
A COLLABORATION BETWEEN SPECIAL COLLECTIONS AND SUBJECT COLLECTIONS LIBRARIANS

Adam Rosenkranz, Gale Burrow, and Lisa Crane

Introduction

In 2014, special collections and subject specialist librarians at the Claremont Colleges Library came together to pilot a lab series giving graduate students the opportunity to analyze a primary source closely as an artifact, explore related digital primary sources, identify potential research questions, and find examples of secondary scholarship that spoke to those questions. The lab series emphasized research not as a linear sequence, but a process with a holistic view of the range of available resources, paper and digital, historic and contemporary. Although the librarians who developed the lab series were excited about collaborating with graduate school faculty, they have grown to see the value of collaboration among librarians with differing expertise.

* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, CC BY (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).
Four librarians have been the leaders in developing the Primary Source Lab series. Carrie Marsh, one of the early lab planners and participants, and Lisa Crane are librarians in special collections. Adam Rosenkranz is the subject specialist for history, philosophy, German, and Arabic. Gale Burrow is the subject liaison librarian subject specialist for British and American literature and a special collections librarian.

**Institutional Background**

The Claremont Colleges (TCC) is a consortium of seven private institutions: five undergraduate colleges and two graduate schools: Pomona College (1887), Claremont Graduate University (1925), Scripps College (1926), Claremont McKenna College (1946), Harvey Mudd College (1955), Pitzer College (1963), and Keck Graduate Institute (1997). Many central services, including the Claremont Colleges Library, are provided by an eighth entity, the Claremont University Consortium (CUC).

Intended by first president of The Claremont Colleges, James Blaisdell, to be modeled on Oxford University, each academic institution has its own administration, its own students and faculty, and its own distinctive mission. Situated on slightly less than one square mile of land approximately thirty-five miles east of Los Angeles, the schools are contiguous, classes on different campuses are within easy walking distance, and students take classes and occasionally major in disciplines not offered on their home campus. These highly ranked institutions offer rigorous curricula, small classes, distinguished professors, and personalized instruction in a vibrant residential college community that provides intensive interaction between students and faculty. Located at the geographic center of the seven academic institutions, and serving and supported by all seven, the library provides TCC with the research resources and support of a medium-sized university library.

The library has a long history of course-integrated library instruction in both undergraduate and graduate TCC courses. Subject specialist librarians work closely with most first-year seminar courses and with many advanced courses, generally focusing on the resources and strategies important for research with scholarly sources. Librarians also schedule many individual appointments with both students and faculty every semester. Special collections librarians work with faculty and their classes to introduce students to the wealth of primary source materials in special collections and archival collections. Because they are considered teaching collections, students are able to work with them as any research scholar. Many students return individually to work with the primary source materials they have seen in class and to request more.
Impetus for Collaboration

TCC librarians responsible for general and subject specific reference and instruction find that very often students looking for sources for their research projects have selected a topic before doing any preliminary research to determine the state of scholarship, or lack thereof, on that topic. They already committed to the topic and, even when faced with the near impossibility of finding relevant, appropriate sources, they do not want to give up that topic. A major challenge for librarians has always been reaching students early in the research process, working with them to articulate research questions based on exploration of primary and secondary sources to develop their own voices, and find relevant scholarly conversations before choosing a research focus.

In fall 2011, Burrow was talking with an early modern studies professor in Claremont Graduate University’s School of Arts & Humanities about working with the students in her graduate Shakespeare class. In the course of that conversation, the professor expressed her concern that new graduate students often choose their topics without first exploring relevant primary and secondary sources. This conversation was the impetus for a Primary Source Lab Series.

Project Scope

The Primary Source Labs integrate instruction for research with both physical and digital primary sources and research with scholarly sources in order to help students understand a more complete research process. A major goal in the lab series was to help students see themselves as part of relevant scholarly conversations by enabling them, not only with the technological tools (search strategies, databases), but conceptual tools as well: what to look for in the physical objects, differences among types of sources, and the give and take, non-linear nature of research itself.

Spring 2012—First Primary Source Lab

Several weeks of planning went into developing the first primary source lab, which was piloted in spring 2012. The planning group included graduate faculty representatives in literature, history, religion, philosophy, and cultural studies in the School of Arts & Humanities, librarian subject liaisons for those subjects, and special collections librarians. The plan for the lab was based largely on resources and concepts the planning group identified as important for graduate level research. Faculty and librarians agreed the starting point would be primary sources. Faculty identified print resources they thought were important, such as Selden Society reprints. Librarians identified primary and secondary digital
sources to be included. Twelve student participants were selected by the faculty planners and represented all the disciplines in the School of Arts & Humanities. The pilot lab was scheduled for two and a half hours and included three segments. The outcomes for the lab were announced at the beginning: Participants should be able to ask questions about the primary source provenance and themes; understand that there is more to be found than initial research will produce; and expect that knowledgeable people (faculty and librarians) be available to advise them.

The first segment of the lab was held in special collections. Marsh introduced the goals/outcomes of the lab and led the exploration and questioning of a single, selected primary source, one which the librarians and faculty hoped would inspire research ideas for all participants across all disciplines. The source was a hand-drawn and colored map of an internment camp in China from the scrapbook of a female Christian missionary held in the camp during World War II. The faculty members and librarians imagined potential topics the source might inspire, including art/art therapy as a coping mechanism, representation vs. reality, history of internment/POW camps, living conditions in camps or prisons, trauma and incarceration, cultural geography and mapmaking, gender aspects of POW experience, and life in separation from larger society.

Students spent forty-five minutes in examination and directed discussion of the primary source, with attention to its physical attributes and what it had to say about its cultural and historical context. The students were next divided into groups of three or four, accompanied by a librarian, to visit specific areas in the general collections where different faculty pointed out “hidden” research sources they thought were particularly important. Finally, the students gathered in the library classroom for an introduction to digital primary sources and scholarly journal databases, led by Rosenkranz and Burrow.

Immediately after the pilot lab ended, librarians and faculty in the planning group met to discuss their perceptions of the lab. They felt the students had not engaged with the primary source as they had hoped. Even with prompting, the students had difficulty finding significant relationships between the map and their own areas of interest. Workshop leaders also realized the second segment, the physical tour to see specific resources, took longer than the allotted forty-five minutes and lasted over an hour. That meant that there was too little time for the students to benefit as much as they might have from the third segment in the library classroom.

Following the pilot lab, participants were asked what had been effective about the lab and what needed to change to be more effective. Their responses confirmed what the faculty and librarians had observed. In summary, students felt the idea of a research lab was valuable, but the pilot had tried to cover too much in too little time, had not been sufficiently focused on student research interests, and had not allowed time for deep engagement or practice.
Spring 2014—Primary Source Lab Series

Other library priorities put the primary source lab concept on hold, but in 2013–2014, librarians began revising the lab plan. This time four librarians, Marsh, Crane, Rosenkranz, and Burrow, formed the core planning group in consultation with the professor in early modern studies. With the proliferation of access to more and more resources, the librarians felt that practice with both primary and secondary sources, as well as both physical special collections and digital resources, would be necessary to present a full picture of research. This collaboration allowed for special collections librarians to draw from their collections knowledge to choose the primary sources, and subject specialist librarians to draw from their subject expertise to select the digital resources and tools most important for the specific research process. As evident from the lab worksheets included at the end of this chapter, each lab consists of several modules. Special collections librarians led the exploration and discussion of primary sources in Lab 1 modules, and subject specialist librarians led the exploration and discussion of digital sources, search techniques, and other tools and techniques in Lab 2 and 3 modules. Having taught several of these lab series together and shared their expertise, Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow find that they are confident teaching most modules of the labs, but they appreciate the support of partner teachers.

Lab 1

The preliminary outline included three two-hour labs. In Lab 1 students would work with materials in special collections. The special collections librarians, in conversation with the collaborating professor, decided to have the students focus on the materials as artifacts, paying close attention to everything except the main text. What could they learn, what research questions might arise from examination of the binding, the paper, the illustrations, the front matter, etc.?

Learning outcomes for Lab 1 were developed using both information literacy and visual literacy concepts and skills. These are the learning outcomes that guided development of the worksheet (see Appendix 12A) and discussion in Lab 1.

Students will be able to:
- Define/differentiate/identify primary sources in relation to other types of sources.
- Describe differences in information, format, and production for documents from the period.
- Identify the kinds of information that could be found in Early Modern documents, including writers/producers, intention, etc.
- Locate appropriate primary documents.
• Articulate how sources discussed/examined in the lab are relevant for the work they’re doing in their courses.
• Cite primary sources appropriately.
• Articulate the importance of using primary sources, not just the scholarship on those sources.

Students in Lab 1 of the early modern studies lab were presented with an array of primary sources to choose from for the duration of the lab. The early modern studies worksheet asked students to first glean basic information from the physical source they had chosen to explore: author creator, printer, place of publication, and date of the document. The worksheet also asked students to look for unique characteristics such as illustrations, signatures and pagination (foliation), and marginalia, and what these characteristics might say about society in the Early Modern period. They were also supplied with an early modern studies glossary (see Appendix 12B).

Lab 1 for early modern studies concluded with discussion asking students to consider three questions:
• What do you know about early modern texts and the early modern period based on your study of these documents? How do you know these things?
• What problems do the documents help you to solve?
• What questions for further research do these documents raise?

Discussion of these questions led early modern studies students to begin to understand how a thorough investigation of the primary text as artifact might contribute to more complete research.

**Lab 2 and Lab 3**

Learning outcomes for Lab 2 and Lab 3 focused on skills and concepts described in the *ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* approved by the ACRL Board of Directors in January 2000. Using the ACRL Standards, the librarians formulated specific learning outcomes to guide the development of the worksheets and discussion in Labs 2 and 3.

Students will be able to:
• Navigate and use primary sources online.
• Define/differentiate/identify secondary sources in relation to other types of sources.
• Use primary/contemporary sources to explore Early Modern contexts and themes.
• Explore current/modern scholarship focused on the Early Modern period.
• Choose the best research strategy/strategies for their particular question.
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- Identify key scholars and key journals in their disciplines.
- Develop effective research strategies, whether using physical or online resources.
- Evaluate sources (articles, books, etc.) to determine appropriateness for their particular research.
- Determine when it is necessary to ask for permission to use materials created by someone else.
- Make reasonable choices about how to manage their research; i.e., whether or not to use a citation management tool like Zotero or RefWorks.
- Cite sources appropriately within their discipline or for publication.
- Find dissertations by others in their fields.
- Recognize the issues around open access and take advantage of the opportunities available to them via Scholarship@Claremont.

The pilot Lab 2 for early modern studies included exploration of various editions of Early Modern texts available in digital format, of responses to those texts and related sources from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, and of scholarship from the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries.

In Lab 2, led by subject specialist librarians, students were asked to expand their research conversation to include other editions, contemporary sources, and modern scholars as well. Students looked for different editions and/or contemporaneous reactions to the topic of the original documents, as well as scholarly and non-scholarly responses to the documents and/or the events and ideas surrounding the documents. For example, students might compare John Smith’s Generall Historie of Virginia with accounts of the new world from Smith’s time found in Early English Books Online and explore commentary by Early Modern writers and modern scholars. Librarians wanted to emphasize that different types of sources and scholars are in conversation with one another and that students working with the sources are part of the scholarly conversation as well.

As in Lab 1, Lab 2 concluded with discussion of a series of questions:
- Based on the research you have done so far, what are some areas for further research that might interest you?
- What research questions would you articulate?
- What disciplines would be relevant for researching those questions in your areas of interest?
- Based on the disciplines and questions you’ve identified; what resources might be useful in pursuing research in your areas of interest?
- What research strategies make the most sense at this point?

Lab 3, taught by Rosenkranz and Burrow, focused on tools and techniques for research, developing more complex search strategies and selecting among databases, books, and archives as research sources. Lab 3 also offered opportunity for discussion about publishing in the digital age, emphasizing issues
of copyright and open access, and demonstration of options for managing re-
search using tools like Zotero.

The lab series pilot was very successful, with ten graduate students who
responded to a call for volunteers by their early modern studies faculty advi-
sor. Their experience in the early modern studies graduate program ranged
from two students in their second semester to one student who had completed
coursework and was writing her dissertation. Questions from their follow-up
evaluations offered rave reviews, such as “Wish I had this lab when I started
in the program!”

Here are two questions posed to participants in the pilot lab series, fol-
lowed by summaries of their responses.

1. **What did you find most beneficial in the lab series?**
   - Guidance offered by the worksheets
   - Working with primary sources in context
   - Learning about pagination, binding, etc.
   - Exploring historical and cultural contexts of the sources
   - Identifying appropriate databases and effective search strategies
   - Citing Early Modern sources
   - Having hands-on experience

2. **What in these labs would have most benefited you in your first year as
   a graduate student?**
   - Realizing that the physical book itself, not just its contents, reveals
     important information
   - Understanding where to look and what to look for
   - Realizing the value of different editions of “my” source and the value
     of sources contemporary with “mine”
   - Learning how to handle special collections materials
   - Using questions from worksheets 1 and 2 as guiding questions for
     doing research—excellent starting points for scholarly inquiry for
     new graduate students
   - Learning more about database selection and search strategies
   - Being introduced to new research sources, tools, and practices: re-
     print series (e.g., Selden Society publications), the BASE open access
     search engine, citation management software, open access

**Conclusion**

As the labs have developed, librarians have changed specific components, but
each version has had one constant: starting with physical primary sources in
special collections. Throughout the lab series, moreover, librarians have em-
phasized that primary sources, whether physical or digital, serve as the inspiration for research.

One of the goals of the lab series was to enable students to see themselves as part of relevant scholarly conversations and, just as importantly, to recognize the give and take, non-linear nature of research itself. With this in mind, the primary source lab model reverses the assumption topics should come first, instead letting the topics emerge during active engagement with sources. In this model, research is experienced as a process, with research questions defined—and changed—as the scholar encounters different sources. Rosenkranz coined the phrase “process research” inspired by the term “Process Philosophy,” a school of philosophy most often associated with the philosopher Alfred North Whitehead that emphasizes “the dynamic nature” of being and reality, emphasizing change.

This holistic approach integrates exploration of special collections sources, digital primary sources, and scholarly secondary sources. In the lab series students and faculty get to see the full range of resources available to them. When students (and faculty) begin with primary sources in special collections—a 1611 King James Bible, Holinshed’s Chronicles from 1586, Shakespeare’s 1632 second folio—they get excited about research. It is also an approach that could only come from collaboration between subject specialist librarians and librarians in special collections, making the fullest use of their differing domains of knowledge and expertise.

**Impact**

As this project continues to grow and evolve, lab series planners continue to adapt the workshop to the needs of specific courses and academic levels. Rosenkranz is learning more about the topics and materials special collections has to offer. Crane is learning more about the electronic databases for research in both primary and secondary sources. Recently, Crane has been assigned the duties of subject specialist for United States History and American Studies. Her participation in this lab series and collaboration with other subject specialists has provided a strong foundation as she begins her subject specialist duties. Burrow, who is both a subject specialist librarian and a special collections librarian, is able to facilitate the process and help expand the knowledge base of her colleagues. Her participation in the labs also facilitated her transition into a new position as a special collections librarian two years ago. Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow have begun to collaborate on projects outside of the primary source workshop including collection development for both open stacks and special collections materials. Recently, an international travel and movie archive was offered to the library. These three librarians were able to pull from their respective backgrounds to write a proposal to successfully fund the acquisition.
The biggest winners of all, therefore, may be the collaborators. In developing these workshops, Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow have learned about each other’s respective domains of knowledge and broadened awareness of collections, empowering them to offer better reference and instruction. They have integrated elements from the workshops into their general undergraduate instruction, further offering the benefits of this more holistic approach to a larger audience, and enabling undergraduates to do more original research. They have also shared the process with colleagues at the library, adding to the variety of instruction options. They hope that the full benefits they have received from their collaboration will gradually spread among their colleagues.

**Lessons Learned**

In response to evaluations from participants in the 2014 pilot lab series and the librarians’ own experience in teaching the labs, labs 2 and 3 have been combined into a single lab. Tools and techniques are now integrated throughout research in the digital environment. As of 2016, the full lab series includes two three-hour labs, allowing even more time for engagement with the primary sources in special collections.

In 2014, Marsh moved into the new position of Director of Special Collections & Libraries, leaving Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow to continue to adapt and develop the lab series. Since then, the lab series has been adapted and taught for a graduate history class, a graduate class on Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, and undergraduate history and religion classes.

In general, the early modern studies labs had a strong focus on book history, which is a central theme of the Early Modern period. When offered for other classes, such as History 300, an historiographical course required of all beginning graduate students in history, Lab 1 focused less on book history and offered a wider range of primary sources: books, manuscripts, archival files, and other objects from different time periods in history, based on research interests of the students.

Iterations of the Lab 1 worksheet for other groups, such as that for History 300 (see Appendix 12C), asked students to explore their document(s) for hints on the purpose: intended audience, what the document “is trying to do,” and why the writer created “the document.” Concluding discussion also focused on three questions:

- What do you know of your topic based on these documents? How do you know these things?
- What problems do the documents help you solve?
- What question(s) are, to you, left unanswered?

As with the concluding discussion for Early Modern Studies Lab 1, this discussion led history students to think about how an investigation of rele-
vant primary sources could inform their research topics (see Appendices D and E).

As previously stated, the learning outcomes for the labs were largely based on the 2000 ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. Librarians have come to realize the labs also reflect the core concepts of the much newer ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education.3 (See Appendix 12F for how the lab series integrates concepts from the Framework.)

Challenges Posed

Challenges for the primary source lab include adaptability, limitations of the collection, and sustained student engagement. The primary source lab worked very well with Early Modern Studies graduate students because a good part of their research focus is “the book as an artifact.” The history of an item—its provenance, its publisher, its patron—is just as important as the contents of the item. But “the book as an artifact” isn’t always so important with other classes, especially undergraduate courses. Adapting the lab series to these other classes has required the focus of Lab 1 be topical, based on the subject matter of class or individual interests, furthering the importance of collaboration between subject specialists, special collections librarians, and faculty.

A second challenge is limitations of the collections. As with most libraries, special collections do not have the financial, spatial, or human resources to collect everything that might be taught at the Claremont Colleges, nor materials which cover all research interests of students at the Claremont Colleges. It is this challenge that underscores the importance of collaboration between subject specialists and special collections librarians. Subject specialists can provide topical insights for a particular class or subject as well as identify targeted electronic primary sources. Special collections librarians rely on their intimate knowledge of their collections to find related, even tangentially, materials when their collections lack materials for a specific research interest or class topic.

Rosenkranz observed that the underlying excitement and sense of novelty that students brought to the physical sources explored in Lab 1 did not always carry over to the digital sources explored in Lab 2. A challenge is how to sustain the excitement when making the transition from the three dimensional sources of special collections to the flatland of PDFs and digital text. Of course, the challenge of having students remain interested when doing digital research is one with which most librarians teaching research instruction are familiar. In Lab 2 it is especially important to include strategies that maintain engagement, something that Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow will continue to develop. For example, having images of the physical items explored in special collections
during Lab 1 might reengage the senses. It is also important for lab leaders to introduce relevant, less familiar databases and online resources, ask challenging questions related to class and/or individual research topics, guide students in discovering the intricacies of effective searching in individual search engines, and model more complex search statements.

Challenges for the collaboration between subject specialists and special collections librarians rest primarily in the division of duties. While there has been increased collaboration incorporating special collections visits and materials into subject specialist information literacy instruction, librarians continue to focus on tasks specific to their knowledge base and skillset. Subject specialists focus more on the digital environment and electronic database search skills. Special collections librarians continue to perform material selection due to their knowledge of the special collections and guide students’ exploration of physical primary sources. More integration of knowledge and skills is desirable, closing the gap between respective domains.

Another challenge rests in the faculty perception of the amount of library time they feel their students require. Often it is difficult to convince faculty that their students would benefit more from two visits—one for a special collections hands-on session with primary sources and another for subject intensive instruction in the use of electronic resources. As such, librarians are often required to combine what should be covered in two sessions into a single seventy-five-minute class session at the library. On the other hand, it is this necessity for a condensed lesson plan that has resulted in increased collaboration between subject specialists and special collections librarians.

Next Steps

In summer 2014, following the primary source lab pilot, lab planners presented a workshop to Claremont librarians on the development and implementation of the series and encouraged all librarians to incorporate aspects of the lab series into their instruction. The original worksheet for the primary source workshop has been adapted for a variety of courses and student information literacy levels. Faculty have shown an increased interest in exposing students to primary sources in special collections, especially in first-year writing courses. Special collections class visits for these courses are in demand and require more subject specialist librarians and information literacy librarians to incorporate these visits into their information literacy teaching curriculum. This has increased collaboration as these librarians partner with special collections librarians for material selection and lesson-planning. Subject specialists are starting to attend and participate in special collections class visits and special collections librarians are starting to attend and participate in the information literacy instruction sessions. Frequently, librarians express how surprised and
impressed they are by the breadth and depth of the library’s special collections and archives.

In addition to the variety of worksheets and other tips that have been shared, special collections librarians would like to offer more instruction to subject specialists on searching for special collections materials and material selection for class visits. For example, the recent migration from Archivists’ Toolkit to ArchivesSpace offers a more user-friendly interface for searching archival collections within special collections. Similarly, special collections librarians need to become more familiar with the electronic databases for primary and secondary sources.

Ideally, collaboration between subject specialist and special collections librarians should extend beyond simply dividing instruction time equitably and attending each other’s instruction sessions. Developing truly integrated lesson plans and building course specific research guides incorporating relevant special collections materials would benefit students, regardless of whether a class visits special collections or not. Research guides have typically been created without a special collections component; yet as a result of recent increased collaboration, special collections librarians have been more involved in adding research guide content for special collections materials related to a class. Additionally, it would be great if all librarians could be involved in suggesting relevant acquisitions for special collections based on their subject expertise.

For Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow, this collaboration has been both rewarding and fun. Despite the significant time real collaboration requires, they feel it has been well worth the effort for themselves and for the students and faculty they work with. They will continue to work together, offering the full lab series for as many graduate and upper-division undergraduate classes and groups as possible, and incorporating segments of the lab into other instruction sessions as the opportunity arises. They will also look for ways to make it easier for other subject specialist/teaching librarians to participate in the labs and to adapt segments from the labs to fit their own teaching.
Appendix 12A: CGU Primary Source Lab 1, Early Modern Studies

How to Read Primary Sources

A primary source is a document or object which was written or created during the time under study. It was present during an experience or time period and offers an inside view or firsthand account of a particular event. Primary sources are imbued with the spirit of the time in which they were written. Secondary sources interpret and analyze primary sources.

I. Record the following information about the document with which you are working; this information will help you build your citation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position of author/creator (if ascertainable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date(s) of Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Information that will be helpful to note:
Archive/Institution Name
Collection Name
Number (Box/Folder/Collection)
Document Type

II. Unique physical characteristics of Early Modern printed books

Binding style
- What story does the binding tell about the book?
- In what ways does the binding affect your experience of using the book?

Illustrations
- What illustrations are present?
- Number of illustrations?
- Size of illustrations—how important is the scale of the illustrations?
Developing a Primary Source Lab Series

How significant is the placement of the illustrations within the text of the book?
How do the illustrations relate to the text?
How do the illustrations enhance (or not) your knowledge of the book’s subject?

Typefaces
What style of typeface is used in the book: Roman, Italic, Gothic, or ?
How many typefaces are used in the book? If there is more than one typeface used, what might be some reasons for the printer to use different typefaces?
Are there other ink colors used in the book besides black and to what effect?

Pagination
Which type of sequence mark(s) is used in the book? Where is it on the page? Follow the sequence mark(s); do you find any errors?
- Foliation—numbering of the “leaves” in a signature. Signature marks can be letters, numbers, and sometimes symbols, usually located at the bottom of the first portion of gatherings; they were used to help binders assemble the sheets of a book into the right order. * When a printed book isn’t paginated, recto and verso are important to note. E.g. for a non-paginated octavo: signature A, leaf 3, recto side would be cited as A3r.
- Pagination—numbering of the pages e.g. 1, 2, 3, 4.
- Catchwords—Printed at the bottom of a page, the catchword links the text at the bottom of one page with the start of the next.

*Signatures—distinguishing the printed sheets which constitute two or more pages of a book, depending upon format. Most often signatures are noted by capital letters A, B, C, and so on. Early modern books typically use a 23-letter alphabet, treating I/J as one letter, U/V as one letter, and omitting W.

III. Title pages in Early Modern printed books

IV. Questioning Early Modern primary sources
Argument of the document:
What is the document trying to do? How does the document make
its case? What is its strategy for accomplishing its goal?
Who is the intended audience of the document? How might this
influence the writer’s rhetorical strategy?

**Purpose of the document:**
Why did the writer write/create the document?
Does the writer have a thesis? What is it? How important is it to your
understanding of your research/topic?

**Bias of the document (writer):**
Do you think the writer/creator is credible and reliable? Why or why not?
What is the relationship of the author/creator to the events and
issues described and does the author/creator have a stake in how the
events/issues are remembered? What judgments or assumptions are
embedded in his or her choice of words?
What presumptions and preconceptions do you have as the reader?
How do you compensate for bias?

**Knowledge from the document:**
How typical is this document for your research/topic?
How widely was this document circulated?
What problems, assumptions, arguments, ideas and values, if any,
does it share with other documents you’ve examined about your
research/topic?

**The Ultimate Questions…**
- What do you know of your topic based on these documents? How
do you know these things?
- What problems do the documents help you to solve?
- What question(s) are, to you, left unanswered?
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Early Modern Studies

GLOSSARY

Archive: a collection of primary source documents that have accumulated over the course of an individual or organization's lifetime; materials are generally not organized by standard library classification systems.

Bookplate: also known as ex-libris, is usually a small print or decorative label pasted into a book, often on the inside front cover, to indicate its owner.

Catchword: a partial or complete word located at the lower-outer corner of a page corresponding to the first word of the first line of the following page.

Chainlines: the lines left on a sheet of laid paper caused by the pattern of wires in the paper mold.

Colophon: a brief statement containing information about the publication of a book such as the place of publication, the publisher, and the date of publication.

Duodecimo/12o: a format in which each sheet is typically folded and cut to produce one twelve-leaf or one four-leaf and one eight-leaf gathering.

Edition/Variation > Impression > Issue > State

Facsimile: a copy or reproduction of a book, manuscript, map, art print, or other item of historical value that is as true to the original source as possible.

Finding Aid: a document containing detailed information about a specific collection of papers or records within an archive.

Folio/2o: a format in which each sheet is folded to produce a two-leaf gathering.

Gathering: a sheet folded to produce a particular number of leaves according to the chosen format.

Gutter: the space between columns of printed text, including the gap at the inner edge of a book where leaves come together and where typically the book is sewn.

Incunabula (incunabulum; incunable, incunables): a book, pamphlet, or broadside that was printed—not handwritten—before the year 1501 in Europe; from the Latin for “Swaddling clothes” or “cradle”.

Justify: to adjust the spacing of a line of type so that the left, right, or both margins align.

Leaf: one piece of paper in a book containing a recto and verso page.

Ligature: two or more characters combined into a single type, for example, æ or Æ.
**Majuscule**: capital, or upper-case letters.

**Manicule**: originating in medieval manuscripts, the manicule or “little hand” points to noteworthy passages in a text.

**Marginalia**: scribbles, comments and illuminations in the margins of a book.

**Miniscule**: lower-case letters.

**Octavo/8o**: a format in which each sheet is typically folded to produce one eight-leaf gathering.

**Provenance**: the chronology of the ownership, custody or location of a historical object; in the case of books, provenance refers to the study of the ownership of individual copies of books, and usually includes study of the circumstances in which individual copies of books have changed ownership, and of evidence left in books that shows how readers interacted with them.

**Quarto/4o**: a format in which each sheet is typically folded to produce one four-leaf gathering.

**Quire**: 1) *n.* one or more gatherings; 2) *v.* to collect multiple gatherings into a single binding unit.

**Recto**: front side of a leaf.

**Rubrication**: text in red ink added by hand, for decoration or emphasis.

**Sans Serif**: letterforms without serifs.

**Serif**: block or flared extensions to strokes on a letterform.

**Signature**: reference text at the bottom of a recto leaf identifying the gathering and leaf.

**Transcription**: a written or printed representation of something from another medium.

**Type**: Blackletter, Gothic, Roman, Italic.

**Verso**: reverse side of a leaf.

**Watermark**: a recognizable image or pattern in paper visible when viewed by transmitted light caused by variations in thickness or density of the paper; in laid (handmade) paper, watermarks are created by a wire profile “sewn” onto the face of a paper mold.

For additional information on books and printing, see:
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How to Read Primary Sources

A primary source is an original document relating to a particular subject, time period, or event. Primary sources enable the researcher to get as close as possible to what actually happened during an historical event or time period. Primary sources were either created during the time period or were created at a later date by a participant in the events (as in the case of memoirs) and reflect the individual viewpoint of a participant or observer. Primary sources are imbued with the spirit of the time in which they were written.

Secondary sources interpret and analyze primary sources.

I. Describe your item
   → Basic bibliographic information:
      Author/Creator:
      Position of author/creator (if ascertainable):
      Printer/publisher:
      Place:
      Date(s):

   → Other information that will be helpful to note, especially if you are not describing a book:
      Archive/Institution Name:
      Collection Name:
      Number (Collection/Box/Folder):
      Document Type:

   → Physical description
      What type of item do you have? What is the format? Provide a full physical description of your item.
      Do the bibliographic or physical characteristics of your item raise any questions? Is any information missing or incomplete?

II. Questioning the primary source
   → Author/creator
      Are you familiar with the creator? What do you already know about her/him?
      What is the relationship of the author/creator to the events and issues described? Does the author/creator have a stake in how the
events/issues are remembered? What judgments or assumptions are embedded in his/her choice of words?
Does your knowledge of the author create expectations or assumptions you may have about your item?

→ **Purpose and argument of the item**
What is the item trying to do? What strategies does the author/creator use to accomplish the goal?
Who is the intended audience of the document? How might this influence the writer’s rhetorical strategy?

→ **Argument of the item**
What is the item trying to do? How does it make its case? What is its strategy for accomplishing its goal?
Is there a clear thesis? What is it?
In what ways might you read this that weren’t intended by the writer/creator? How would you read this “against the grain”?

### III. The historical perspective

→ **Cultural milieu**
What do you already know about the cultural milieu surrounding this item? How does this item fit into that environment?

→ **Audience reaction**
Based on your current knowledge of the time, what would audience reaction have been? How would reactions have been expressed?

→ **Relationship to other sources**
How does this source relate to other materials you are familiar with in your area of research?

### IV. The Ultimate Questions

→ What have you learned from this source? How have you learned these things?

→ What problems does this source present?

→ What did you find about this source that surprised you?

→ In what ways can you read this that weren’t intended by the writer/creator? How would you read this “against the grain”?

→ What questions related to your research interests does this item raise?

→ What question(s) are, for you, left unanswered?
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Research Strategies, Tools, & Techniques

In this lab we will focus on expanding your understanding of primary sources by using contemporary related sources and secondary scholarship.

Primary sources
What primary source(s) support your topic?
If there are alternate editions or variations, what do these tell you?
How do modern print or electronic versions illuminate or detract from the original?

Contemporary responses and related sources
What types of responses/reactions would you expect?
What contemporary issues might be related to the issues in your primary source?
What would you like to find?
Look for responses and related texts
  • What contemporary responses and related texts do you find?
  • What related issues do you find?

Search strategies
Keyword searching
Full text searching

Scholarly conversations
Where would you look?
What, if any, scholarly conversations do you find?

Areas for further research
Based on the research you have done so far, what are some areas for further research that might interest you?
  • What research questions would you articulate?
  • What disciplines would be relevant for researching those questions in your areas of interest?
  • Based on the disciplines and questions you’ve identified; what resources might be useful in pursuing research in your areas of interest?
  • What research strategies make the most sense at this point?

Publishing in the digital age
  • Copyright
  • Open access

Managing your research
Zotero
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Research Sources

Search tools for primary sources (books, documents, archives, etc.)

Reprint Sources
Early English Text Society
Hakluyt Society
Parker Society
Selden Society
Historical Manuscripts Commission
Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores (Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland During the Middle Ages)

Calendars of State Papers
State Papers Online (British State Papers of the Tudors, Domestic, 1509–1603, and Stuarts, Domestic, 1603–1714)

Selected library catalogs and web sites:
Blais library catalog (includes special collections)
   blais.claremont.edu
WorldCat
   libraries.claremont.edu/resources/databases/dbr.asp?id=214
National Archives UK
   www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/
Gallica—Bibliothèque nationale de France
   gallica.bnf.fr/?lang=EN
British Library
   www.bl.uk
BASE (Bielefeld Academic Search Engine)
   www.base-search.net/about/en/
Search Engines for Open Access Scholarship
   bit.ly/MR4Cps
Search Engines for Open Access Images, Video, Other Media
   bit.ly/1gV66by
Wikimedia Commons
   commons.wikimedia.org
Internet Archive
   archive.org
Google and Google Books
  google.com
  books.google.com

**Selected databases from the Library’s database list:**
- American Periodical Series
- ARTFL–French texts from 12th to 20th centuries
- Early American Imprints
- Early American Newspapers
- Early English Books Online
- Eighteenth Century Collections Online
- Making of the Modern World (documents from 1500–mid-19th century)

**Search tools for modern scholarship**

**Library catalogs**
- Blais library catalog
  blais.claremont.edu
- WorldCat
  libraries.claremont.edu/resources/databases/dbr.asp?id=214

**Main Subject Databases**

For **history**
- America: History & Life (for U.S. and Canadian history)
- Historical Abstracts (for the rest of the world)
- History of Science, Technology, & Medicine

For **literature**
- MLA International Bibliography

For **religion**
- ATLA

**Other Disciplines**
- Academic Search Premier
- Econlit
- JSTOR
- Periodicals Index Online
- Project MUSE

For a more complete list and more detailed guidance, see these subject portals:

**For history**: libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/historyportal

**For literature**: libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/languageportal

**For religion**: libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/religionportal
Appendix 12F: The Lab Series & the Framework for Information Literacy

Examples of the Frames seen in the lab series include:

- “Authority is Constructed and Contextual”: Students explore the cultural construction of authority through both primary and scholarly sources.
- “Information Creation as a Process”: Students consider the creation of information in the primary and secondary sources they work with and begin to develop an awareness of their own creation process.
- Students also engage in deep exploration of the frame “Research as Inquiry” (http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework#inquiry), which emphasizes, “experts see inquiry as a process that focuses on problems or questions in a discipline or between disciplines that are open or unresolved.”
- Above all students in the labs focus on the frame “Scholarship as Conversation,” recognizing that scholarly conversations may extend from the distant past into the present, and will include their own contributions to those conversations.

Notes
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CHAPTER 13

From Papyri to Penguin Books: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO TEACHING THE TRANSMISSION OF TEXTS THROUGH TIME

Alison Clemens, Elizabeth Frengel, and Colin McCaffrey

Introduction

*From Papyri to Penguin Books* is a partnership between Yale University’s Directed Studies (DS) program and the Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library that, through a series of library study sessions, uses material examples—papyri fragments, medieval manuscripts, printed books, archives of modern publishers and translation projects—to illustrate the transmission, reception, and variation of texts through time. The partnership is exceptional because its ambitious presentation of the history of ideas and objects relies upon the coordinated collaboration of archivists, curators, faculty, and subject-specialist librarians who represent a range of departments, disciplines, and roles throughout Yale University. The study sessions, four in total, take place outside of regular class time during key points in the DS curriculum.
with which they are aligned, enhancing the students' learning experiences in the program.

This chapter presents a case study of how From Papyri to Penguin Books was conceived, how it continues to evolve, and how collaboration among library professionals contributes to students' understanding of the ways in which works of Western civilization have been passed down through generations and across material cultures. The partnership between DS and the Beinecke Library arose organically from a faculty inquiry in 2013. Although the individual professionals who have contributed to From Papyri to Penguin Books have shifted over time, the collaboration has pivoted on the work of one special collections librarian. The Beinecke Library’s research librarian, Elizabeth Frengel, has been with the project since its inception and combines her expertise in the history of the book and knowledge of the library’s holdings to act as the primary selector of materials for the sessions. Two other long-time collaborators include Alison Clemens, an archivist for the Beinecke Library, who contributes extensive knowledge of manuscript culture and archival work, and Colin McCaffrey, Yale University’s classics librarian, who contributes expertise in the classical tradition and the transmission of Greco-Roman texts. This chapter will provide background on DS and the Beinecke Library at Yale; describe how the collaboration between DS and the Beinecke Library began; examine a typical session of From Papyri to Penguin Books; describe each collaborator’s role; analyze the impact of the collaboration; and, finally, provide sources for further reading, with the hope this project will inspire librarians at other institutions to undertake similar collaborative projects involving teaching with special collections in more than the one-off session. The DS program at Yale has analogues at many other institutions that focus on intensive engagements with historically significant texts, and which could be enriched by similar collaborative introductions to relevant special collections.

Institutional Background

Directed Studies Program

Directed Studies (DS) is an interdisciplinary humanities program for freshmen that emphasizes, examines, and embraces difference within the Western canon. In particular, the program aims to help students learn to closely analyze complex texts and put them into conversation with one another across time and genre. This focus on difference has allowed faculty and students the opportunity to consider the mutability and transmission of texts (and, therefore, the canon). As the DS website notes, “These sessions at the Beinecke encourage dialogue about the material fragility and survival of individual works that sometimes tend to be viewed as constituting an apparently ‘seamless’ tradition.
Thus, the Beinecke sessions serve as jumping off points for a year-long discussion about questions of ‘canon’ and ‘tradition.”

The DS students attend lectures and work in discussion seminars, and the small program size creates the possibility of a close relationship among the faculty, students, and texts. The students in DS do not write research papers and do not explore secondary scholarship; therefore, a common door for library instructional collaboration (i.e. research education) is not readily available. The teaching team’s engagement with the program takes another tack, drawing on a range of varying knowledge and expertise: using special collections to expose students to the material textual record of the Western canon.

The Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library

The Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library is Yale’s primary repository of rare books, manuscripts, and ephemera. The collections are notable for their strengths in early books and manuscripts and in modern literary papers and afford special opportunities for research and interdisciplinary study in fields such as medieval, Renaissance, and eighteenth century studies; art history; and the history of printing and modernism in art and literature. Although it has its own endowment and operating budget, the Beinecke is part of the Yale University Library (YUL) system, which encompasses almost twenty individual collections and repositories, including the Classics Library, the Divinity Library, the Haas Arts and Architecture Library, and the Irving S. Gilmore Music Library. YUL employs approximately five hundred staff members, including librarians and technicians who bring to the system a wide range of experience and subject knowledge. Its strong collections and staff expertise in the bibliographic record of Western civilization make YUL a natural partner for DS.

Impetus for Collaboration

From Papyri to Penguin Books grew out of a routine email from the director of the DS program to the Beinecke Library in the spring of 2013. DS was in the mid-point of its year-long curriculum. Students had read Shakespeare and Milton for the literary portion of their studies, and the English Romantics were next on the syllabus. The director proposed a visit to the library to see highlights from the early modern collections, including Shakespeare’s First Folio and the first edition, first printing of Milton’s Paradise Lost. The curator of the early modern collections, Kathryn James, mentioned the proposed visit to the Beinecke’s research librarian, Elizabeth Frengel, whose responsibilities include coordinating and planning teaching sessions using Beinecke materials. The librarians conferred and came up with the idea of presenting a session
illustrating how canonical texts, such as Shakespeare's plays or Wordsworth and Coleridge's *Lyrical Ballads*, had a long and sometimes perilous path to the paperback editions DS students were reading. The session included, in addition to the First Folio, several quarto editions of plays whose texts varied substantially from the folio edition; the earliest extant manuscript of *Macbeth*, with stage directions presenting the familiar play in an entirely new light to many students in the room; and manuscript page proofs in Wordsworth and Coleridge's own hand of the 1800 edition of *Lyrical Ballads*, which included many emendations and substitutions, as well as references to a poem Coleridge never finished in time for publication. Everything the students looked at that day, from the First Folio to the paperback edition of *Lyrical Ballads*, was a material instance of that text, subject to the fallibility of human interpretation and translation, as well as the ravages of time. This session left the students with the strong impression that the authoritative Penguin, Oxford, or Riverside editions of the great works they were reading for class were not necessarily as stable or immutable as they first appear.

*Figure 13.1. Title page of Macbeth: A Tragedy, It Is Now Acted at the Duke's Theatre, 1674. Beinecke GEN MSS VOL 548.*
The first visit in spring 2013 was met with overwhelmingly positive feedback. The students’ amazement at being able to look closely at and even touch a Shakespeare First Folio passed from awe to critical inquiry. Several students asked questions about the plays that Ben Jonson decided to include in the 1623 edition. Others remarked on how easily they could read the copyist’s hand in the manuscript pages of *Macbeth*. Two students diligently compared Coleridge’s manuscript corrections to the 1800 printed version of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*. Unlike the students reading the *Macbeth* manuscript, these students had to work much harder at deciphering the author’s hand. The remarks opened the floor to a short discussion on the importance of paleographical skills in primary source research. The visit was so well received that the Beinecke’s curator and research librarian were asked to do a reprise of the session later that week. During both sessions, the classroom was filled to capacity.

In fall 2013, an Assyriologist in Yale’s Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures took over as director of undergraduate studies for DS. When the new director joined, DS, Frengel met with her to discuss ways they might expand the one-off visit to a series of sessions presenting books and manuscripts from the Beinecke Library’s holdings that illustrate every major phase in the DS curriculum: papyri fragments of Homer and Thucydides; Byzantine and medieval illuminated manuscripts of Homer, Tacitus, and Aristotle; biblical incunabula; modern literary works; and archives of modern translators. During the course of four Beinecke Library visits throughout their program of study, DS students could see how these seminal works of Western civilization have been transformed from papyrus manuscripts to the (in many cases) Penguin editions they read for class.

*From Papyri to Penguin Books*, as it is imagined now, was born from that planning meeting between the new director of DS and the Beinecke’s research librarian in fall 2013. Given the new DS director’s interest in antiquity and the research librarian’s role that spans curatorial areas of the Beinecke’s collections, the program was set to take off as a thoughtful, integrated means of engaging students with material examples of the texts they read throughout the course of DS in different formats and translations. In hindsight, the change in DS leadership presented a serendipitous opportunity for a unique collaboration that would reach beyond the research librarian’s role and involve subject specialists and other library professionals.

Simply hosting more visits and putting more materials on display was not enough to meet the goal of giving DS students the chance to think critically about and engage actively with the texts. It became apparent the research librarian would need the help of subject specialist librarians, archivists, curators, and faculty to share their expertise and enhance the library visits.

The significant change to what was to become *From Papyri to Penguin Books* was the addition of two library sessions that looked back to antiquity
and the Middle Ages to explore the materiality of ancient texts and early printed books. Frengel consulted with a papyrologist on the Beinecke Library’s staff and McCaffrey, who provided guidance in using papyrological databases and made recommendations for papyrus fragments, medieval manuscripts, and early printed editions most germane to the DS curriculum.

At about the same time that *From Papyri to Penguin Books* began to take shape, Clemens began to take part in a cross-training pilot program in which she spent 20 percent of her time working in research services, including training in teaching with special collections. The program was designed to encourage collaboration between the technical services and public services units of the library, and it provided the mutual benefits of professional development, training, and shared expertise. Clemens joined the collaboration with McCaffrey and Frengel. From 2014 to the present, each library visit that DS students make to *From Papyri to Penguin Books* is the result of consultations among Clemens, Frengel, and McCaffrey. The three librarians meet to discuss materials lists and the ways they will lead the discussion in each session.

**Project Scope**

**Materiality and Transmission**

The library visits draw students’ attention to the variety of material forms the texts they are reading have taken through time, and illuminate the material character of the creation, dissemination, and preservation of books through thematically connected examples. The teaching team encourages students to examine these books closely and consider what the material evidence suggests about how the books were handled, used, and read. The roles that scribes, craftsmen, printers, publishers, booksellers, as well as readers and authors, have played in the life of the book is emphasized by drawing students’ attention to the physical traces these agents have left behind. Students are also asked to consider the ways books are valued as commodities and symbols communicating socio-economic and religious status and privilege, in addition to their function as carriers of texts. Finally, the textual variation that is endemic to manuscript traditions is pointed out, a mutability the transition to print may have reduced but not eliminated. Establishing precisely what an author, particularly an ancient author, wrote often requires significant scholarly effort and cannot always be achieved with certainty. This is stressed to students by pointing out variations in texts in multiple formats from across the centuries. Students examine papyrus fragments to consider and discuss reading practices in antiquity, and print and manuscript examples provide traces of evidence in book history, broadly conceived. They look at significant editions that illus-
trate printing history, early manuscripts that provide evidence pertaining to manuscript culture, manuscript traces on books that indicate reading practices, and archival materials that demonstrate links between and among various instantiations of texts, as well as the creative and interpretive process of individuals and publishing operations.

Creating sets of teaching materials centered on a particular work, author, or theme provides students with avenues of entry into the collections. The array of books and manuscript material used to lead students through these considerations develops from session to session drawing on the expertise of the collaborators and the interests and feedback of students and teaching faculty. Rather than provide a broad summary, this case study focuses on some of the major thematic strands from two sessions that brought together a number of specific examples.

With the exception of Machiavelli’s *The Prince*, all the works read in the first semester of DS antedate the invention of printing—the majority are Greek and Latin classics, though read in recent modern translations. Hence, the classics librarian took the lead role in the first session, presenting a capsule history of the transmission of classical texts from their composition on papyrus rolls to their contemporary dissemination as (relatively) inexpensive paperbacks and digital texts in translation. Together, McCaffrey and Frengel led students through the examination of manuscripts and printed books dating from the early common era to the present; in a sense providing the Penguin, and other editions they are reading, with a genealogy tracing them back to the papyrus scrolls on which they were written and read in antiquity. Since the Beinecke’s papyri collection was not available due to ongoing renovations, librarians have been able to present digital surrogates to students with some success.

Both the DS literature syllabus and the first Beinecke session begin with Homer: in the Beinecke’s case, with an early second century CE papyrus fragment of the first book of the *Iliad* from Roman Egypt (P. Yale 4).4 This fragment provides an example of the form the *Iliad* and other Greek and Latin texts took through most of classical antiquity: the papyrus roll. Like most other texts from this period, the *Iliad* is written without regular punctuation, word division, or distinction between capital and lower-case letters—something students found very striking. While the physical features of the papyrus book remained fairly uniform throughout the classical period, the texts those books contain often vary significantly between copies. For contemporary editors, establishing “the” text required substantial work, and uniformity could not be taken for granted. Presenting students with physical examples of such variations gives them an intuitive sense of the dynamic textual traditions underlying the works they are reading and the editorial scholarship on which the form of those works is dependent.
Nearly a millennium separates the papyrus from the session’s next fragment of Homer, this time from a Byzantine parchment manuscript (Beinecke MS 478). This manuscript illustrates a number of important developments that occurred in the intervening centuries: the transition from roll to codex and from papyrus to parchment, as well as changes in orthography including the introduction of regular word division and punctuation. Students considered what these changes imply about the changing uses of books and were asked to estimate the amount of labor and skill that went into their production. The survival of the text from the time in which the papyri would have been read to its production in medieval Byzantium required copying and recopying, indicating continued interest in the text while also introducing further textual variations. Students commented on the differences in orthography, on how strikingly different the same text could look in different scripts, and how they did not see a steady progression to what, to their eyes, was a more legible form. Even without word divisions, it was easier for them to pick out letters on papyri than on the Byzantine manuscript.
The session then considered a mid-fifteenth century manuscript of a Latin translation of Plato’s *Phaedo* and Xenophon’s *Hiero* by Leonardo Bruni, one of the first Italian humanists to achieve fluency in classical Greek (Marston MS 78); a text whose script students could decipher with relative facility—some even tried out their Latin and offered translations. Even after the spread of printing in the latter half of the fifteenth century, it took some time before Greek authors began to be printed in any quantity in the original. Aristotle, for example, had been read widely in Latin translations in western European universities for several centuries. This is reflected in the two incunabula of Aristotle in Latin that students examine: one printed in Strasbourg around 1469, the other printed in Venice in 1482. These items contrast with the humanist manuscript. Students considered the difference in materials, ownership, and reading context. By the end of the fifteenth century, a substantial market for Greek literature had developed making the achievements of scholar-printers, such as Aldus Manutius, possible. This was illustrated with Aldus’s 1504 edition of Homer—an example of what, with significant reservations, might be considered an early modern Penguin edition. It’s an attempt to make canonical
texts available in a relatively inexpensive and portable format to a wide audience, an anticipation of the students’ own encounters with the texts in more recent instantiations.

Students were enthusiastic about the opportunity to handle the material provided and by the fact that this physical interaction offered insight about the way the texts they were studying had been read and valued in the past. Faculty and instructors in attendance brought their own expertise into the conversation: for example, pointing out the variations in book division in classical works such as Plato’s Republic and the interpretative stakes of such variation.

The teaching team also presented archival material during the DS sessions. These presentations have several goals. First, the sessions aim to demonstrate the diversity and variability of sources of canonical works. Second, they aim to teach students about book history, broadly conceived: how one may go about seeking evidential traces, both physical and intellectual, on particular instantiations of works. Finally, the teaching team aims to make the material truly accessible. Although the bulk of the sessions focus on direct engagement with the material, the team also demonstrates search and retrieval techniques for archival and other special collections material. The team always emphasizes these collections are there for the students and encourages the students to continue to inquire within them. Many take advantage of these opportunities.

The students also view and interact with the personal and professional papers of translators and other transmitters of texts. For instance, the Beinecke holds papers of translators including Alexander Pope and Robert Fitzgerald. In the Pope portion of the presentation, students read aloud from the manuscript of Pope’s translation of the Iliad and compare it with the modern translation of Robert Fitzgerald. The Fitzgerald Papers are especially rich for this kind of comparison, as they include various versions and drafts of his translations, with corrections and annotations by Fitzgerald and his colleagues. Through examining Fitzgerald’s drafts of and work plan for his Iliad translation in juxtaposition with earlier translations and printed editions, students get a first-hand look into the mechanics of translation and consider how the texts they are reading may have been affected by relatively contemporary influences and circumstances. Clemens emphasizes the nature of archival papers and archival processing work; she also emphasizes this work is done to make material accessible to students and other scholars.

An additional example of sets of teaching objects focuses on the works of Chaucer, from an early Chaucer manuscript to Chaucer’s works as printed at the Kelmscott Press. Viewing an early manuscript of Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales (circa 1440–1460) allows students to examine elements of early manuscript culture including illuminations, historiated initials, scribal hands, and evidence of reading practices present in the manuscript. This early Chaucer manuscript, known as the Devonshire Chaucer or the Gentleman’s Chaucer,
contains some of the bawdier tales that were omitted from other manuscript versions. This allows students, again, an opportunity to think about variability within the canon.

The teaching team often pairs this manuscript with a presentation of items from the Kelmscott Press’s printing of Chaucer’s works. Beinecke has many items pertaining to the Kelmscott printing of the works of Chaucer, including a six volume set of the works of Chaucer as edited by Walter W. Skeat of Oxford and used and annotated by William Morris in the creation of the Kelmscott Chaucer. Beinecke also has page proofs for the Kelmscott Chaucer, as well as a copy of the final printed volume. A particularly illuminating example is one showing Morris’s negative reaction to a proof of one of the Kelmscott Chaucer’s pages created by the printer. Morris is clearly dissatisfied and asks, at the bottom of the page, “This of course is the wrong measure. What is the use of sending me things which are obviously wrong? William” This item, paired with the Oxford volumes and the early manuscript, allows for the demonstration of the process of creating a monumental edition. Indeed, the colophon for the Kelmscott Chaucer reads: “The hearty thanks of the editor and printer are due to the reverend Professor Skeat for kindly allowing the use of his emendations to the Ellesmere ms. of the Canterbury tales, and also of his emended texts of Chaucer’s other writings […]” This makes the connection between this work and the Oxford volumes explicit.

Through these teaching strategies, the team is able to demonstrate the variability and changeability of the Western canon. These strategies allow for the facilitation of a discussion about book history and evidential traces that provide the basis for that history. The Beinecke class sessions serve as an opening for students to realize the material is accessible to them and that it can provide them with insight into the past. The team always closes the session by providing their contact information and allowing time for informal, one-on-one conversations among the students, the librarians, and the faculty members.

Conclusion

While this endeavor capitalized on the fortuitous conjunction of the DS program and the rich collections of the Beinecke, much of what the teaching team learned and accomplished would be applicable at other institutions. DS grew out of a general movement in undergraduate education that sought to build curricula around close engagement with canonical works. This movement has had its ups and downs, nevertheless courses of study having much in common with DS, in content and inspiration, can be found at a range of institutions. They offer fruitful areas for instructional collaboration between special collections librarians and subject librarians.
Moreover, extensive rare book and manuscript collections are not necessary to provide an artifact-centered learning experience that would enrich courses of study. As noted, in 2015, the team was unable to use material examples of papyri from Beinecke’s collection, and so illustrated the initial leg of the DS book historical tour with projected digital images. The team found mixing physical objects and digital surrogates worked smoothly. Institutions with less extensive physical holdings could use high-quality digital surrogates, which are becoming increasingly common in both open and licensed forms. While the richness of the Beinecke’s collection allowed the team to match the materials fairly closely with the works read in the DS program, such close matches are not essential. Since the team asks students to focus on the physical form of the book, using more illustrative examples would certainly be satisfactory.
Impact

For Frengel, one of the greatest rewards of the From Papyri to Penguin Books collaboration has been the opportunity to develop deep professional connections to Yale's DS program, which have extended beyond the four library sessions. The DS director has invited all three collaborators’ input in planning a DS at 70 symposium and celebration, scheduled for October 2016. This experience left the collaborators feeling their work is integral to the undergraduate experience, and that it is important for alumni engagement and the support of DS for years to come. Clemens has appreciated the opportunity to engage undergraduates with archival material and establish conversations with students and faculty members regarding archival work, access, and use. McCaffrey found students’ immediate interest in the connections between special collections materials and disciplinary understandings of literary culture and history especially rewarding.

Lessons Learned

Upon reflection, the teaching team has learned several valuable lessons from this ongoing collaboration. First, collaborative teaching is time and resource intensive. This can be mitigated by changing organizational strategic thinking to develop a service model that is programmatically responsive, collaborative, and creative, rather than reactive to short-term demands that tend to result in one-off library visits. This kind of collaboration fulfills a key part of Beinecke’s mission: to systematically bring undergraduates into the Beinecke and expose them to its collections. This approach facilitates sharing complementary and synergistic expertise to make the most of institutional resources. The time-intensiveness of collaborative teaching can also be mitigated by developing thematic sets of teaching objects—such as the Devonshire Chaucer, Kelmscott page proofs, and Kelmscott Chaucer—that can be reconfigured based on class needs to provide avenues of entry into collections. Second, the teaching team benefited from formal structures for collaborative instruction already in place before innovating on the collaborative model. Clemens’s 20 percent time assignment to instruction and reference work helped establish a valuable relationship and structure that facilitated the DS collaboration. Third, the team learned it is crucial to balance planning ahead with maintaining a flexible mind, ensuring student's interests can lead the way in the discussion sessions.

The success of this ongoing collaboration stems from a shared critical concern with the textual record of western civilization—with books—and from the shared goal of introducing students to them. However, the program’s success was also the result of what the authors did not share: special collections librarians, archivists, and subject specialists, as well as the teaching faculty, all
approach books in different ways and with different concerns. The team's work with the DS program allowed them to make the most of their shared interests and distinct standpoints to provide students with instructive opportunities to engage with noteworthy books, both as meaningful artifacts and as intellectual achievements.

**Next Steps**

For future sessions of *From Papyri to Penguin Books*, the collaborators have already been asked by the DS program director to capitalize on the Beinecke Library's extraordinary holdings to draw attention to less frequently represented voices in the western tradition. The library is fortunate to hold the papers of Mary Barnard, who has translated the works of Sappho. DS has also requested the library team explore ways to incorporate items from collections representing W.E.B. DuBois, Virginia Woolf, Iris Murdoch, and others in upcoming instruction. In the future, the team may also wish to display and discuss digitized facsimiles of the Ellesmere manuscript as a teaching tool, particularly to see how it may vary from the Devonshire Chaucer and how it influenced the Kelmscott printing. The teaching team sees this as a natural extension of their efforts to use special collections to explore textual transmission and mutability of the canon.

**Notes**

6. As an aside on another benefit of collaboration among librarians, the authors initially located these volumes with the help of another Beinecke archivist who spotted them on the shelf and recommended them for inclusion in the class.
7. Page proofs for the Kelmscott Chaucer. General Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
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CHAPTER 14

AIDS Education Posters Translation Project:

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS IN LANGUAGE LEARNING CURRICULUM

Lori Birrell and Kristen Totleben

Introduction

The AIDS Education Posters Translation Project began in fall 2015 in an effort to better integrate resources from special collections into University of Rochester curriculum and to provide experiential learning opportunities through a collaboration among librarians, instructors, and students. The AIDS Education Posters Collection$^1$ has been digitized, described, and was first made available online in 2011, is international in scope, and continues to grow with new donations of physical posters. Posters in foreign languages are largely untranslated and/or untranscribed, limiting their accessibility and research potential. Lori Birrell, special collections librarian for historical manuscripts, and Kristen Totleben, modern languages and cultures librarian, saw an opportunity to work with language instructors and their students to contribute their language skills both to increase the collection’s use in
classroom teaching and to increase the collection’s accessibility to an international user base.

Prior to undertaking the AIDS poster translation activity as a course assignment, many students’ primarily experienced language learning through traditional passive modes such as vocabulary and grammar studied from a textbook, reading websites, listening to music, and watching films in their language(s) of study. In the classroom, instructors and students speak in the target language, the “foreign language which it is aimed to learn or acquire,” as much as possible. Short of immersion in a culture to learn a language, students often experience learning a language in an artificial setting, with few opportunities for applied use towards a tangible purpose. Daily practice of listening, speaking, reading and writing a language, while important to the learning process, offers students a limited experience in cultural immersion. In contrast, this project provided an experiential learning opportunity for students. For the purposes of this project, experiential learning is defined as learning through experience, with reference to David Kolb’s definition of learning as “…the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience.” In this assignment, the application of language skills and analysis of cultural contexts offered students an opportunity to practice skills not typically included in the curriculum. As a result, students further developed their language skills as they considered the literal meaning of the text on a poster, as well as the figurative, context-appropriate translations that “fit” each poster.

Institutional Background

The University of Rochester is a private, non-sectarian R1-Doctoral University and is comprised of three main campuses, which include a School of Medicine and Dentistry and an expanding hospital complex, the Eastman School of Music, and the River Campus which serves undergraduate and graduate students in the arts, sciences, and engineering. The River Campus Libraries encompass three buildings and include two science libraries, and Rush Rhees Library, the main branch on the River Campus. With the arrival of a new vice provost and dean of the libraries in 2012, staff embarked on a year-long strategic planning process. Working across departments, integrating unique collections into the university’s curriculum, and celebrating student work became several outcomes of the River Campus Libraries’ Strategic Priorities. A key area of the strategic plan is an increased focus on highlighting the libraries’ unique collections, mainly housed in the Department of Rare Books, Special Collections, and Preservation (RBSCP). A new director of the department encouraged interdepartmental collaborations to integrate special collections into the curriculum. In spring of 2014, librarians in Outreach,
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Learning, and Research Services (OLR) and RBSCP began experimenting with team-teaching classes as a way to underscore a research continuum that includes general collections and special collections, both accessible to students in their research. Approaching faculty together, developing lesson plans for instruction sessions to scaffold information literacy skills throughout the semester, and bringing individual expertise into the classroom resulted in offering students a new way of understanding the research process, and a new appreciation for the relevance of diverse holdings in the libraries.

Impetus for Collaboration

RBSCP and OLR staff had previously collaborated with faculty in several disciplines and classes, including history, religion & classics, and freshman primary writing requirement classes. In summer 2015, staff from OLR and RBSCP met to discuss collaborative instruction possibilities for the upcoming fall semester. Birrell compiled a list of potential classes on which staff might collaborate, aligned with specific special collections that could complement course contents. On this list were several instructors teaching language-learning classes, who might be interested in developing an assignment to translate posters from RBSCP’s AIDS Education Posters Collection.

Dr. Edward Atwater, Professor Emeritus of Medicine and the History of Medicine at the University of Rochester Medical School, began collecting AIDS education posters in the early 1990s. Today the collection includes over eight thousand posters. In 2007, Atwater began donating the posters to RBSCP. The Center for Disease Control, state-level and international Departments of Health, well-known artists such as Keith Haring, all chronicle the awareness and activism campaigns that promulgated in the 1980s and 1990s and continue today. In addition to several thousand English-language posters, the collection includes posters written in over seventy-five languages with nearly one hundred and thirty countries represented. Given the rich nature of this collection, and its connection to language-learning classes offered at the university, Totleben and Birrell teamed up to approach instructors about the opportunity to create a translation assignment for their students.

Building on the integration of the posters in previous semesters through in-class visits to RBSCP and course assignments developed by faculty teaching public health, visual and cultural studies, and gender studies classes, this project provided an opportunity for librarians, faculty, and students to collaborate and enhance the use of the collection. Prior to the start of this project, foreign language posters were mostly untranslated, and many non-Latin alphabet language posters remained untranscribed. Without translations, users who speak and/or read only English had difficulty using the international portions of the collection.
Similarly, without transcriptions of the foreign language posters, the site’s usefulness was limited for those users primarily interested in non-English content.

Project Scope

To initiate the project, Birrell and Totleben emailed seven instructors who teach intermediate and advanced-level language-learning classes, explaining the potential scope of this translation project and how an assignment might be integrated into their curriculum. In these messages, to illustrate an example of how this assignment might be placed in their classes, Birrell and Totleben included a co-created sample lesson plan (see Appendix 14A: Sample Lesson Plan). Part of the project included consulting with library catalogers, who would add translations and student names to the online database record, publicly attributing the work of student translators. To celebrate the students’ work, the librarians offered instructors the possibility of mounting a library exhibit and hosting a public reception and presentation, showcasing students’ work and providing both students and instructors the opportunity to share their experiences.

Four of the seven instructors contacted chose to participate. Eight intermediate French and Spanish classes, and two advanced-level German and Japanese language classes participated in the project, for a total of one hundred and sixty four students. Having intermediate to advanced language skills, these students were well-equipped to translate into English the more basic and intermediate level texts in selected posters.

Planning

Next, Birrell and Totleben met with each instructor to discuss how this assignment would fit into their curriculum, including the learning outcomes they hoped students would gain. This enabled the librarians and instructors to establish shared learning objectives and to determine when to schedule the library translation workshops in RBSCP, with original physical posters on hand. Both the instructors and librarians agreed studying the physical posters first, as the public originally encountered them, would add value to the students’ experience. The librarians also discussed the importance of having instructors assist students with translations, vetting the work before putting the translations into the public online database. Both instructors and librarians recognized translation is a skill not to be approached lightly:

Translation becomes relevant when it is recognized that there is a need for expertise to enable intercultural communication…Thus translation is always more than simply ‘writing’
in the sense of putting words to paper. It is the constructive shaping of a multi-medial situation as a whole...  

In this assignment, each student would be making textual and intercultural decisions when translating poster text into English, with instructors facilitating and vetting the process.

Birrell and Totleben used a Google spreadsheet for their project management tool. They selected language-level-appropriate posters for each class, asked instructors to verify that the text on the posters fit the language skills of their students, and then copied the URL for each poster and its ID number into the spreadsheet. Together the librarians and instructors ensured there were enough to choose from, so students could select posters of interest to them. Organized by class, the spreadsheet included columns for each student to sign up for his or her poster, provide an email address, draft translations and transcriptions of the poster, and respond to four assessment questions.

After meeting with the librarians and discussing how this assignment could provide students with a real world application of their language skills, nine of the ten classes included this assignment in their syllabi for credit, with six Spanish sections using it as a replacement for a composition assignment. The Japanese class added this as an extra-credit assignment, with all students deciding to participate.

Each instructor made decisions about where in their curriculum the translation assignment best fit. Most Spanish sections embedded it into a chapter where students learn medical and health-related vocabulary. An instructor for the other Spanish sections assigned the translation during a chapter with biomedical and other health-related technological vocabularies. The more advanced-level language sections of French, German and Japanese devoted a small portion of their curriculum to the translation, including historical and cultural activities to introduce students to information about the AIDS epidemic in their countries of study. Such activities included watching documentaries, reading articles and other subject-based texts in the target language, and writing reflections in the target language on what they learned about cultures, the AIDS epidemic, the language, and other insights into their translation processes.

To complement this assignment, Birrell and Totleben considered ways to integrate resources from both special collections and the general collections to suit the students’ needs. Totleben included Birrell’s profile in each course LibGuide, indicating that both are librarians for the class. Embedded in Blackboard for each course, guides for these classes typically include dictionaries, websites, and resources highlighting culture, grammar practice, and other course-related themes. For these classes, Totleben and Birrell created and embedded a video tutorial to guide students and instructors to the digital portal to view the post-
ers, and showing them how to locate specific foreign-language posters. They were encouraged to view the video prior to their workshops in RBSCP. In the LibGuide, Totleben also included links to the AIDS Education Posters Collection website and the Google spreadsheet, where students would select a poster to translate and later contribute a draft of their work for instructor review.

To further prepare students, Birrell and Totleben offered class “drop in” sessions, visiting each class in the weeks before their workshops in RBSCP. During these five-minute sessions, they introduced themselves, showed students the digital project they would be contributing to, and the link to the Google spreadsheet within the course’s LibGuide. They explained how the spreadsheet would be used for the project. Birrell and Totleben also promoted the public reception timed for the start of World AIDS Week, encouraging students and instructors to attend and consider speaking about their experiences in working on the translation assignment.

Figure 14.1. Course LibGuide example with signup sheet and video tour of digital project.
**Workshop**

Together, Birrell and Totleben led a seventy-five-minute workshop for each class. At the beginning, they reminded students about the workshop's learning objectives (Appendix 14A, Sample Lesson Plan). Next, Birrell gave them a brief introduction to RBSCP, including specific procedures concerning safe and secure handling of sometimes-fragile oversized posters.

As translation is not a cut-and-dried process, Totleben led them through a couple visual and cultural analysis exercises, in which students first examined a poster in English, focusing on the poster's images. Students were asked questions such as: What is this picture of? What does the image, colors, angle, etc. indicate about the poster? Who is the audience (age group, sexual orientation, etc.)? What is the tone? Then the class examined the English poster text and discussed aspects of the poster in comparison to posters in their target language. Instructors participated and shared their ideas throughout the exercises to further prompt discussion.

Students worked on their translations for the rest of the workshop, leaving five minutes at the end for answering assessment questions. Students, instructors, and the librarians engaged in conversations about tone, register, choices in grammar, slang, and what each might communicate. Both instructors and librarians were fascinated as they watched the students consider how to shift from thinking literally about language to how to shape the translation to represent the poster's provenance, intended audience using, for instance, colors and imagery as clues. While instructors assisted the students with their language use and choices, Birrell and Totleben circulated around the room, assisting with technical questions, such as how to properly order the text in the spreadsheet for catalogers to enter into the database record. They also assisted with research questions concerning poster content, some of which included references to popular culture or other indicators of historical context. Librarians asked the students to transcribe their poster in its original language to facilitate its discovery and use as a digital resource. By the end of class, students submitted their first drafts to the instructors, who would then make suggestions to improve the translation. The students would then edit their work, turn in the final draft, and update the Google spreadsheet with their final text.

The librarians and instructors agreed on the Monday of Thanksgiving week as the deadline to submit the final translations and transcriptions. This enabled the library's catalogers to upload the students' work to the AIDS Education Posters Collection website in time for December 1, World AIDS Day (WAD). Birrell and Totleben consulted with their Cataloging department, as well as library IT staff who maintain the project site. Staff members added metadata fields into the website's database to more easily populate the site with the students' work. They shared the Google spreadsheet with the catalogers.
so all staff could view the final versions of the students’ work as it came in. By semester’s end, out of one hundred and sixty four students, there were one hundred and forty completed translations and transcriptions.

Displays, Events and Reception

Each year to coincide with World AIDS Day and Week, RBSCP displays posters in both physical and electronic form from the AIDS Education Posters Collection. Due to the increasing number of students majoring in public health and other pre-med disciplines at UR, the collection has become increasingly well-known on campus. Outreach efforts in recent years have included integrating the collection into public health and gender studies classes, as well as reproducing posters for relevant student events throughout the year. As a result of these efforts and increased awareness about the collection, the education coordinator at University Health Services (UHS) reached out to collaborate with the library and include the posters and description of the translation project in their promotional materials for WAD.

As planning for WAD progressed, Birrell decided to focus outreach efforts on the international posters that students had been translating and transcribing. She chose eight original posters to display in the RBSCP gallery with student translations and an explanatory text panel describing the project and
the collaboration with the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures. In addition, Birrell and Totleben selected forty posters to be reproduced and displayed across campus. Working with the exhibits manager, they chose to use reproductions rather than original posters to increase the number of possible locations where student work could be displayed without concern for climate control and security. The exhibits manager mounted displays in RB-SCP, in both science libraries on River Campus, in the library of the School of Medicine and Dentistry, and at the entrance to the student union. Birrell and Totleben also curated a two-case display of ephemera materials from the collection, primarily in the languages from which students had translated posters, placed on the first floor of Rush Rhees Library.

To kick off World AIDS Week, on Monday, November 30, the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures and the River Campus Libraries co-sponsored a reception to display and celebrate the students’ work. In addition to librarians, three instructors and four students spoke about their experiences working on this project. About thirty people attended the reception. Before and after the event, there was a slideshow playing on a large screen that included the completed student translations alongside the posters. The bottom of each slide included the name of the student translator. The exhibits manager displayed reproductions of several posters throughout the room and relocated the two-case display of AIDS-related ephemera from the library lobby into the event space to further acquaint participants with the collection.

In addition to the physical displays of the posters and student work across campus, the libraries’ collaboration with UHS resulted in two digital slide shows that displayed on large LED screens. One was in the student union, running during World AIDS Week. The second ran during a tabling event, in which student groups and UHS shared information about HIV/AIDS and prevention methods. A community organization, GR Soccer, run by University of Rochester undergraduates who use soccer as a platform to deliver HIV/AIDS health education, also showed the slideshow during a fundraising event to share the collection with their community youth participants.

Each of these outreach events raised awareness about the unique collections at the library, and an example of how to provide students with experiential learning opportunities that help to meet course objectives and learning outcomes.

**Results and Analysis**

During initial lesson planning and discussions with instructors, Birrell and Totleben expressed interest in asking students to reflect on their experiences contributing to the translation project. Together with the instructors, Birrell and Totleben developed four questions to collect students’ responses, to assess the project:
1. When translating this poster what challenges did you encounter?
2. What surprises did you encounter?
3. In what ways did this translation assignment affect your understanding of the language you're studying?
4. In what ways did this translation assignment affect your understanding of the culture you're studying?

To track the data, Birrell and Totleben asked students to enter their responses in the Google spreadsheet, or if they preferred to remain anonymous, to write and hand in separate responses. After the project ended, Birrell transferred all of the data collected into a single document, organized by question. Birrell and Totleben then reviewed the responses to each question, coded student experiences by theme, and analyzed the data.

To frame the analysis of student responses, Birrell and Totleben considered the research question: How do students develop language skills through an experiential learning opportunity of a culture-based translation project? Using a qualitative coding approach, they reviewed the data and established thematic categories for responses to each question. These categories included the impact of visual and text-based clues in the posters; the ease or difficulty of translation; experiential learning as part of scaffolding research skills to guide greater study; an increasing awareness of cultural difference as it relates to education about the epidemic; and the increasing connections between lived experience as students in the United States and experiences of those living, and learning about AIDS, elsewhere. From those categories, Birrell and Totleben derived three main themes: limits of literal translation, experiential learning as research process, and cultural awareness.

**Limits of Literal Translation**

When considering the impact the AIDS Education Posters Translation Project had on students and their translation skills, one student commented, “It was difficult for some French expressions to translate, especially when there wasn’t an equivalent expression in English.” Students across different language classes expressed this idea. Students began the project seeking a one-to-one relationship between foreign language words and equivalent words in English. As the work continued, both during the workshop in RBSCP and with their instructors after, students began to understand that ideas expressed in one language may require more or fewer words when translated into English. Another student reflected on this process and shared, “You can’t translate it literally, or word for word. You have to look at the text as a whole and then think of how you would say the same thing in English.” Throughout the project the instructors encouraged students not only to use and develop their language skills, but
also to incorporate research practice, decision-making, and critical thinking into the translation process.

**Experiential Learning as Research Process**

In her evaluation of the project, the French instructor reflected:

Students discovered a direct application of French language in a real life context. This had a very positive impact on their understanding of target language and culture, as well as their understanding of grammar structures and syntax that they were learning in class.

Several students commented on the experiential learning opportunity made possible through the direct application of their language skills. For pre-med or public health students, this project offered a direct connection to their science and social science backgrounds. One student reflected, “Particularly as a Pre-med student and biology major, I was able to cross-apply my scientific background with my humanities interests, and enjoyed learning how public health issues like AIDS are handled in foreign countries.”

**Cultural Awareness**

Unlike other collaborations with faculty, where the library session or assignment may feel divorced from or an add-on to the course content, several instructors placed tremendous value on integrating the translation project into a specific unit related to the epidemic. The instructor for two of the Spanish sections, who incorporated the assignment into a unit about health and technology, commented, “The theme fit well into our unit on inventions/health/scientific discoveries. I’m glad we were the final group to go to the library, because had we gone earlier, I don’t know how we would have made a connection between the chapter unit and AIDS.” By integrating the assignment into specific units, students gained a deeper understanding of the cultural context of their poster’s origin. One of the students studying Spanish concluded that the assignment “put some of the words that we are learning about now in class into context… it makes me feel connected to the world because I realize that people everywhere deal with the same issues that America does.”
Conclusion

Impact

INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT IMPACT

Through this project, instructors became aware of one of the library’s unique resources, enabling them to integrate an experiential learning opportunity into their classes. In addition to contributing their developing language skills to a digital project, and enhancing the discoverability and usability of a special collection, students also exercised critical thinking skills and made textual and intercultural decisions to convey what they interpreted as the “meaning” of their translated poster. The assignment deepened their understanding of the art of translation, that interpreting language is only part of the process. The majority of student assessment responses attested to the idea of learning how to shift from literal to figurative transfer between languages:

Language is not just a tool that we learn to use; it also ‘uses’ us. It moulds and modifies our thinking in the same way as many other cultural artefacts when integrated into an activity in such a way that they themselves seem to disappear. However, translators are not simply common users of language… This is why we have to differentiate between common language as an artefact and the reflective ‘tools of the trade’-the toolkit of linguistic, cultural and occupational norms available to an individual translator.8

Through the workshops, and in conversations at the reception, librarians and instructors witnessed a shift in students’ perceptions of language usage, from something merely functional to something more malleable and interpretive.

LIBRARIAN IMPACT

For Totleben, collaborating on this project improved her collaborative relationships with Birrell, with RBSCP, and with modern languages and cultures instructors and faculty. She is more likely to work on future projects with Birrell, and in turn, has increased her understanding of special collections, kindling her interest in working with other unique collections. From this experience, she learned about multiple available avenues to publicize this project and similar curriculum-based projects on-campus and off. Opportunities to promote collaborative projects beyond campus occur less frequently for librarians who work outside of special collections.
After this project, an increasing number of faculty and instructors expressed interest in continuing to work with both librarians on this project, as well as inviting Totleben more often to other classes for future research workshops. Experiences working on this project enhanced her learning as a previous language instructor and as a subject specialist for literary translation studies.

Through her work on the project, Birrell had the opportunity to introduce the AIDS Education Posters Collection to a new user group. Without previous experience working with the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures, Birrell gained a deeper appreciation for the kinds of connections to language-learning curriculum made possible through an international collection. Co-planning and co-teaching workshop sessions eased the instructional burden that is often felt when working independently. Serving as a co-project manager with Totleben enabled Birrell to experience special collections in a new light, and to recognize new connections between these unique holdings and the broader general collection offerings. As they selected items to show for each workshop and set up the workshop space, Birrell and Totleben frequently commented on the differences and similarities between instruction sessions focusing on primary or unique collections, and those sessions relying on secondary sources, typically through access to library databases.

**Lessons Learned**

As with any pilot project, Birrell and Totleben experienced bumps along the way related to the mechanics of completing assignments, student adherence to deadlines, and cross-campus collaboration. Managing the Google spreadsheet where one hundred and sixty students and several instructors added or edited content proved challenging. Several students entered their translations or transcriptions in the wrong cells, accidentally overwriting another student’s work. Thankfully, most students created their first draft in Microsoft Word or another text editing program, and so could resubmit their text. For future workshops, Birrell and Totleben will create separate spreadsheets for each class.

As the deadline drew nearer, it became more difficult to ensure quality control for the translations and transcriptions. Birrell and Totleben encouraged students to upload their final drafts once their instructors had given them corrections and feedback. However, since they used the same spreadsheet for both drafts and final versions of their work, it was difficult at times to determine who had completed the assignment and who had not. Instructors felt more comfortable grading final assignments submitted through a Microsoft Word document, or their Blackboard course page. As a result, Totleben spent considerable time following up with instructors and students to ensure final
versions were made available to library staff for entry into the online database. In future semesters, they will encourage instructors to introduce this assignment earlier in the semester, to allow for more time to give and receive feedback on drafts. They will also encourage students to submit final drafts jointly to both their instructor and to the librarians, to ensure quality control and follow-through. The librarians will also check in more frequently with instructors to monitor any issues that arise, and to learn how the assignment inspires additional coursework or discussions about the impact of HIV/AIDS in a culture, involving the target language. This follow-up will enable more integration of unique resources, and the active involvement of librarians, into the course.

At the reception, Birrell and Totleben learned that both Japanese and German classes had used the translation assignment as a springboard to research the impact of the AIDS epidemic in their countries. The Japanese class used this research to improve their translations and place their translation work into a greater cultural context. The German students watched a film documenting the government’s response to the health crisis in the 1980s. Building on the translation assignment in these ways increased the impact this project had in the course curriculum. Driven by curiosity and a desire to engage, students and instructors sought further information to better contextualize the impact of the epidemic on specific countries. Birrell and Totleben are interested in encouraging instructors in future semesters to delve deeper into the AIDS epidemic through research and multi-modal learning activities.

**Next Steps**

Birrell and Totleben continue to work on the AIDS Education Posters Translation Project, inviting instructors to collaborate. The following semester, they worked with an upper-level *French Literature in Translation* class. These posters included text-heavy content such as narratives and extensive comic strips. This assignment was a warm-up activity to consider tone, use, types of language (formal versus familiar, slang, etc.), and intended audience as they prepared to translate excerpts from literary works. Birrell and Totleben hope to include student work from the spring semester in the 2016 display of posters for World AIDS Day. They have also started working with an Italian instructor to include this assignment and develop a corresponding final class project for his Intermediate Italian class. As a further result of this collaboration, an undergraduate student in Russian studies learned of this project and, as a volunteer, translated the Russian language posters in the collection. Her positive experience inspired her to successfully apply for a Discover Grant from the Office of Undergraduate Research*, giving her two thousand dollars to research.

* [https://www.rochester.edu/college/ugresearch/dg_proposal.html](https://www.rochester.edu/college/ugresearch/dg_proposal.html).
the Russian language posters in the collection and compare them to English language posters during the summer of 2016. The translation project provides a model for future experiential learning collaborations between librarians and faculty as they work together to provide enriching experiences to students using the library’s unique collections.
Appendix 14A: Sample Lesson Plan

AIDS Education Posters Translation Project (sample lesson plan) with you (instructor), Kristen Totleben (ktotleben@library.rochester.edu) and Lori Birrell (lbirrell@library.rochester.edu)

Objectives

- Students practice translation skills to contribute to a digital humanities project.
- Display student translations with posters to empower them in their language learning and research abilities.
- Connect library’s unique collections to course curriculum.

Pre-lesson: In class, introduce/show screencast, detailing how and where to find AIDS Education Posters. How to do a search for relevant language or country. Sign up to translate a poster in Google Doc. Which posters are of interest? Video and sign-up sheet are located in Library Resources course page (LibGuide).

Next: Visit class, distribute prompt (also in Blackboard), describe translation assignment with instructor. Solicit questions (10 minutes)

Class Visit: Department of Rare Books, Special Collections and Preservation (2nd floor, Rush Rhees).

Anticipatory Set: Show poster in English. Facilitate a visual analysis of the text and image. Colors, images, text—what do they tell us? Who is the target audience? Who produced this poster? What does this poster tell us about U.S. culture and history of AIDS epidemic? (5–10 minutes). Translation is more than relaying literal text.

Activities: Show poster in target language and translate as a class, reading out loud, one that’s already been translated. Connect it back to your class (examples: chapter about health, cultural issues, other language learning topics). How does it help you understand the language and culture(s) you’re learning? (5–10 minutes).

Assignment: Choose one or more posters. Translate the text in the poster to meaningfully capture the message. Instructor vets translations and consults with students to improve the quality of translations. Does it fit with the image and “intended” message? Grammar and mechanics. (50 minutes)
Assessment: Written reflection or video recording in class about translation process and how this process made them think about how the AIDS epidemic has had an impact on the culture they’re studying. Possible reflection questions include: Why would this poster have been made? What is the central meaning of the text and image? Who created this poster? Is there a particular time period attributed to this poster? How does this poster compare with the message in the U.S. posters? (5–10 minutes).

1. When translating this poster what challenges did you encounter?
2. What surprises did you encounter?
3. In what ways did this translation assignment affect your understanding of the language you’re studying?
4. In what ways did this translation assignment affect your understanding of the culture you’re studying?

Finished products: student translations in poster records, exhibit, reception, displaying student translations of posters to coincide with World AIDS Day, December 1.

Notes
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CHAPTER 15

OkstateShakespeare: BRINGING SPECIAL COLLECTIONS AND DIGITAL HUMANITIES INTO THE UNDERGRADUATE CLASSROOM

Andrew Wadoski, David D. Oberhelman, and Sarah Coates

Introduction

This case study outlines a collaborative, semester-long instructional project for an upper-level undergraduate Shakespeare course at Oklahoma State University (OSU) utilizing the library’s rare book resources and digital humanities techniques to teach students the history of print culture in Renaissance England. In the fall of 2014, English professor Andrew Wadoski collaborated with OSU Library Special Collections and University Archives (SCUA) librarian Sarah Coates and English liaison librarian David Oberhelman to design the “OkstateShakespeare” assignment. His students created an online exhibit and critical companion to the three-volume, 1587 edition, of Raphael Holinshed’s Chronicles of the History of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales—the source of Shakespeare’s history plays and other works such as King Lear, Macbeth, and Cymbeline, and one of the oldest titles in the institution’s rare book holdings.
Students learned about the history of print and the basics of Renaissance English historiography through Shakespeare’s drama, and, in groups, developed a website devoted to Holinshed exploring the text in terms of Tudor politics and the role it played as source material for Shakespeare. This project leveraged rare, fragile print sources; digital surrogates from subscription collections, such as ProQuest’s Early English Books Online (EEBO); primary and secondary sources from research databases; and web development platforms, such as WordPress, to enable students to create a supplement and educational guide to Holinshed. This guide provides access and enables members of the OSU and wider scholarly community to learn about the importance of this work for Shakespeare studies and early modern publishing. This case study will give an overview of OSU and its library’s SCUA division, and then discuss the Ok-stateShakespeare digital project and its impact on student learning. It will also address the project’s impact upon the faculty-librarian partnership and how it served as a springboard for future instructional collaborations.

Institutional Background

OSU is a public, land-grant university located in Stillwater, Oklahoma in the north central region of the state. As of the 2014–2015 academic year, it had a total undergraduate enrollment of twenty thousand eight hundred and twenty-one and graduate enrollment of five thousand thirty-three. The OSU English Department offers bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees in British and American literature as well as other areas. Until the arrival of Wadoski, there had been turnover in the department in the Renaissance/Shakespearean specialist position.

The OSU Library has 3,468,428 volumes in its holdings, and also offers a full array of primary text and secondary research databases. It uses a subject liaison model to work with academic departments for collection development, research support, and library instruction. Oberhelman, who serves as liaison to English and other humanities and performing arts departments, had worked with English since 1997, but before this project had not incorporated special collections materials into his library instruction efforts except for a few courses on Oklahoma or Western U.S. literature.

The SCUA division at the OSU Libraries consists of two separate departments: Special Collections and the University Archives. SCUA contains “material focusing on the history of Oklahoma State University, its employees, and graduates. Rare books, manuscripts, photographs and research material related to Oklahoma women, history, politics, business and natural resources have also been acquired.” The department began as a rare books section in the 1930s when the university acquired several incunabula and other volumes
published in Europe up to the 1700s, including the 1587 edition of Holinshed’s *Chronicles*. These volumes received little use in subsequent years, and lack of a true special collections unit caused them to be somewhat orphaned in the university library’s holdings. The section grew with the acquisition of the first archival collection—the Otto M. Forkert Collection of early print fragments and facsimiles, such as a reprint of Gutenberg’s Bible—purchased in 1951. In the late 1960s-early 1970s, a special collections librarian was hired and the rare books section turned into the department now known as SCUA, and the new department focused more on collecting in other areas.

**Impetus for Collaboration**

The acquisition of collections early in the school’s history and the research interests of faculty and librarians on staff in the 2010s laid the groundwork for this collaboration. The collaboration between the OSU English liaison librarian and SCUA librarian working with the Shakespeare class grew out of single-session presentations on the library’s rare book holdings and print samples from the Otto M. Forkert Collection for Wadoski’s classes. These sessions laid the groundwork for a partnership that promoted student engagement with rare primary sources. In 2011, Oberhelman, first met with Wadoski, then a new professor of early modern literature. In the meeting, Wadoski asked if the library held any early books he could show in his courses to teach the history print culture to his students. While Oberhelman knew about a few of the library’s rare books, he was unfamiliar with the full extent of the collection’s holdings and approached Coates to inquire about rare books that had not been extensively used. Coates prepared a preliminary bibliography and Wadoski was impressed with the titles OSU owned, something he had not expected at a medium-sized state university. This question thus sparked a multi-year initiative with Wadoski, Oberhelman, and Coates focused on integrating the library’s database and special collections/archival resources with daily classroom instruction and assignments.

**Instruction for Classes Before Fall 2014**

Early library instruction for Wadoski’s Shakespeare classes, prior to the fall of 2014, focused on exploring the ways databases such as EEBO, the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED) Online*, and the *Dictionary of National Biography* could enrich the undergraduates’ understanding of print culture. The initial emphasis was introducing students to various historical contexts within which Shakespeare’s plays and language were situated. In addition to traditional papers and examinations, these classes had short database searching and writing assign-
ments in which students developed their skills in information gathering, synthesis, and summary. They used database resources to create a bibliography of all the printed editions of a given Shakespeare play consisting of all the quarto editions, up to and including the 1623 First Folio. Students then wrote a brief biography of one of the printers responsible for one of the early quarto editions to understand the context of publishing and the book trade in that era. (See Appendix 15A for sample assignment involving editions and printers of *Romeo and Juliet* quartos). Some courses had a variant on that assignment: students would take keywords from the literary texts and search *EEBO* for other texts using those words, as well as search the *OED Online* for historical usage of the words. Oberhelman offered instruction on using these tools for researching early printers and their role in the Tudor book trade, and assisted students as they explored the tools. A writing task focused on description and summary, rather than argument and analysis, creates a writing venue that allows less experienced writers to focus on the basics of their prose; over time, this has flattened the skill gap between the top and the bottom of classes. Furthermore, these assignments inculcate basic research skills and introduce students to a crucial historical context through which to understand Renaissance literature.

While these short assignments themselves focused on engaging with digital resources, students handled and examined the early books from SCUA, as well as the early print fragments in the Otto M. Forkert Collection. The courses featured one or two show-and-tell sessions, where Coates shared primary source materials and gave a brief Prezi presentation on the history of the book in the West. These sessions enabled students to inspect items firsthand and develop a tangible sense of the world of early modern books the writers they were studying inhabited. They engaged with the details of printing, paper, and binding in a way neither modern critical editions nor digital images could ever provide. This, in turn, allowed them to learn about the material aspects of the early modern book trade and to understand the complex transactions and transformation between old books and modern critical editions used in classrooms. Seeing the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century books immediately captured students’ attentions. In the case of Holinshed, the simple presence of something materially connected with Shakespeare's London, combined with the fact that they were allowed to handle it, developed an immediate connection.

**Project Scope**

The culmination of these instructional efforts involving rare books was the *OkstateShakespeare* research project involving Holinshed’s *Chronicles*, the primary source in SCUA most closely tied to Shakespeare, undertaken by un-
dergraduate students in Wadoski’s ENGL 4723: Shakespeare and History class during the fall 2014 semester. (See Appendix 15B). In this project, students conducted original research leading to the creation of an online exhibition and educational resource focused on the book in relation to Shakespeare’s histories and tragedies. Through the construction of an online supplement, this project created a venue for members of the OSU and wider communities to access and learn about this document and how Holinshed informed the creation of some of Shakespeare’s best known plays.

In April 2014, Wadoski talked with Oberhelman and Coates about having his students in next fall’s Shakespeare class create an exhibit of rare books held in SCUA and highlighting the Holinshed volumes. This exhibit, as originally planned, would have remained on display for an extended period of time. However, due to concerns about the fragility of the items, security, and the lack of display cases, this initial plan quickly evolved into the idea of having students create an online exhibit or website instead. This new idea led to several meetings wherein various platforms, such as Omeka, CONTENTdm, and Tumblr were discussed as a way to display these student exhibits. However, it was quickly decided that using Omeka or CONTENTdm would be too complicated for this project; students would have to learn about Dublin Core metadata standards and scan in the materials in addition to curating the exhibit. Likewise, Tumblr was also taken out of consideration because of the informal fashion in which the exhibit would be displayed. The online exhibit idea then transformed into having students create an online supplement to Holinshed, thus using Shakespeare’s histories and tragedies as a way to interact with Holinshed, early modern historiography, and the history of the book. Coates began investigating digital blogging platforms, evaluating them on ease of use and flexibility. The librarians chose WordPress as the content platform for several reasons: (1) it was free to use, (2) it was easy to use and had an excellent WYSIWYG editor with minimal/no HTML experience needed, and (3) it had many themes that could be used to change the website’s appearance.

**Instruction Sessions for the Project**

For the OkstateShakespeare project, groups of three or four students conducted original research with the guidance and assistance of Wadoski, Oberhelman, and Coates. This research, which was both grounded in and informed daily discussion in ENGL 4723, was undertaken in the special collections holdings, in specialized databases such as EEBO and *Iter Gateway* to the Middle Ages and Renaissance, and within the wide array of primary and secondary sources available in the library and through its journal subscriptions. Student groups created both analytic and descriptive information modules offering focused accounts of a range of topics pertinent to Holinshed and his book’s place in Tudor England.
Topics addressed included the book’s creation and production; Holinshed’s religious and political affiliations; the practices of history writing in the Renaissance; and the specific uses of Holinshed’s *Chronicles* by English Renaissance writers, including William Shakespeare, Edmund Spenser, and Samuel Daniel.

The library component of the course consisted of a total of five sessions held at the OSU Library computer training lab. Wadoksi and the librarians designed the first session to accompany the first assignment, which had the students trace the usage of certain political keywords from *Troilus and Cressida* and *Richard II* (the first of the plays they had read derived from Holinshed’s historical account) in the *OED Online* and in contemporaneous texts from EEBO. (See Appendix C). In this session Oberhelman also showed the students the EEBO online copies of Holinshed’s *Chronicles* to introduce them to that text. At the second session, a few weeks later, the students viewed the library’s rare books and learned about the Holinshed group project they were to undertake. Coates gave her presentation on the history of the book and exhibited some of the library’s incunabula and other rarities as she had done before. This session, though, highlighted the Holinshed volumes so the students could see the original after having viewed the digital surrogate in EEBO. Then Wadoski, Oberhelman, and Coates discussed the group assignment, the creation of an online companion to Holinshed and Shakespeare, and the librarians got into the mechanics of the WordPress site they would be making.

At the beginning of the semester, Oberhelman and Coates had created a course LibGuide that contained links to various library resources for their assignments and contained information and instructions on their digital project. Coates set up the course’s WordPress.com site, created the main subpages for the topics in which the groups would enter their content, and wrote a manual for the students to help them get their work into WordPress. After showing the rare books in the second library session, Coates presented on using WordPress, and gave the students instructions on creating subpages (child pages in WordPress) into which they would deposit their text and media. At the end of the semester, three class sessions were held in the library’s computer lab; these class sessions were “open lab days” where groups of students worked on their project webpages with Wadoski and the librarians available to answer questions about the project, finding sources, using WordPress, and related topics such as Creative Commons licensing for images. Students found these sessions immensely helpful. Many of the questions asked fell into two categories: specific questions about aspects of the assignment itself and using WordPress. Students said that they found these sessions useful because they were able to meet with their group members in person, something they found difficult to do with conflicting schedules. They also said they appreciated being able to ask for help with WordPress and having their questions answered immediately.
Digital Project Showcase

The project culminated in a digital showcase in the library’s Peggy V. Helmerich Browsing Room during their class time in late November 2014. Flyers and email notifications advertising the event were sent out to faculty in the English Department, the library, and other related departments and colleges across campus. There were approximately thirty-five attendees consisting of teaching faculty from English and other departments, OSU librarians, and other students not in the Shakespeare course. The showcase allowed students to present their work and discuss their process to the OSU community. For this one showcase session, Coates brought the library’s copy of Holinshed’s *Chronicles* out of storage and carefully displayed it on book cradles so attendees could see the physical book, then learn more about it and its influence on Shakespeare from the groups. Each group of students was provided a laptop to show their pages on the WordPress site. Attendees wandered through the exhibit, and the groups would give a brief (generally one minute) summary of their topics and answer questions. Finally,
students would talk about what they had learned in the course of developing this site, and how presenting their research in an online document with several co-authors differed from the individual papers most students in an upper-level English class were used to writing. This showcase helped the students learn how to present their work to an audience, and several students indicated it helped them gain confidence and poise they could use in other settings.

Figure 16.2. Andrew Wadoski and student inspecting the four volumes of Holinshed’s Chronicles at the digital showcase event.

Figure 16.3. Students discussing their project webpages with faculty at the digital showcase.
Conclusion

Impact

The results of the OkstateShakespeare project were most positive for all involved. They demonstrated that creating an online guide to a work like Holinshed’s *Chronicles* could enhance the students’ engagement with the history of print culture and the historiographic issues in Shakespeare’s plays.

STUDENT IMPACT

A formal assessment of the class was conducted via the university’s official course evaluations and by an informal verbal survey of the students Coates conducted at the final showcase. Students noted in their course evaluations that they were particularly enthusiastic about learning the basics of web design. Coates found, in her informal verbal survey of the students, many felt more comfortable using WordPress and that they could apply what they had learned about displaying information on the web to other classes and potential career. Furthermore, several students found these projects to be formative for their professional development, as they consider either applying or have been accepted to, IT-intensive library science graduate programs.

In addition, many students told Coates they had been scared of using an online platform to display their work, but after having “open lab days” they felt much more confident. They also learned about copyright (some of the students chose to embed images or YouTube clips into their pages) and Creative Commons licenses. Many said they had not been aware of copyright/licensing issues in designing web content and that they now understood copyright protections better.

Group projects are rarely used in English classes at OSU, most infrequently in upper-level courses. The students said they were concerned at first about working in groups, but nearly all of them appreciated that they had done so, as it made sharing the workload easier. Also, they said they could divide and conquer tasks: if one person was better at doing research, they did more of the research; if one person was better with WordPress, they would help their group members use the site. The students learned about delegating tasks and working together through this project.

LIBRARIAN AND FACULTY IMPACT

Pedagogically, the librarians would make changes before beginning a new collaboration with a similar project outcome to ensure a smoother experience. Since this was a new project and other online guides were written at a more
advanced level, the librarians found it difficult to describe the expected project outcomes to the undergraduate students. They characterized it as an online supplement at the beginning of the semester, a paper in the middle of the semester, and “think like a Wikipedia page” towards the end of the semester. With a clearer description of the project, the librarians could have alleviated student anxiety as they were working on the WordPress site.

Concrete deadlines and additional instruction on developing a WordPress site would have alleviated student anxiety and made the process more organized and consistent for all. Breaking the project into smaller chunks with due dates would have made the end of the semester scramble less stressful. In fact, many of the students had not uploaded their work to the WordPress site until the night before the digital showcase, despite repeated reminders not to wait until the last minute in case something went wrong. In addition, while students were encouraged to visit with Oberhelman and Coates for assistance outside of class (meetings with Wadoski were a requirement), very few students did so. Mandatory meetings with the librarians would have made it easier to address issues and concerns about research and WordPress earlier in the semester and would have made “open lab days” more productive. The manual created for WordPress was sufficient for the basic editing the students were required to do, but from the lab sessions, it became apparent the sections on uploading images and determining copyright should not have been left as links to WordPress’ own manuals. Those sections should have been expanded with screenshots from WordPress inserted directly into the manual created for the students, as was done for the basic editing.

Next Steps

The OkstateShakespeare project has borne fruit in the form of subsequent classroom digital collaborations involving the English subject librarian and special collections. Notably, a follow-up version of this project was undertaken in Wadoski’s metaphysical poetry class in the fall of 2015. Students in this class examined a seventeenth-century manuscript collection of devotional verse supposedly written by an otherwise anonymous English woman, Elizabeth Newell, is housed in Yale University’s Beinecke Library and available on their early modern paleography website. In the course of their investigations, one of the students made a discovery leading to the uncovering of the printed sources from which this verse miscellany was culled. This project started with the working premise—based on the work of earlier scholars and the attribution by the Beinecke itself—that this document was composed, and not simply transcribed, by Newell herself around 1668. As Wadoski and the students began digging into the poems as well as archival databases like EEBO, they revealed that these were, in fact, transcriptions of works by other authors and were able to reconstruct all
the attributions as well as adjust the dating of the manuscript by over a decade.\textsuperscript{10} This, of course, led to a major mid-stream reconfiguration of the assignment. However, it was an object lesson in the process of scholarly discovery; the project began with a working hypothesis that was completely altered once students began delving into uncharted territory. The students then got to go through the processes of re-orienting their individual projects and of reframing the questions they were asking as they shaped their projects around this new discovery. In this project, the professor and librarians took some of the lessons learned about incremental deadlines, additional open lab sessions, and clearer prompts to describe the format of the website project to students. The results were even better in terms of student engagement with the source material. Wadoski and the librarians are further planning to use Holinshed, and other rare books in SCUA such as the 1493 Liber Chronicarum (Nuremberg Chronicles), in a graduate early modern literature course to be taught in the fall of 2016.

As this collaborative endeavor has developed, it has become a forum for promoting undergraduate research, and it has also underscored the contributions special collections can make to library instruction and undergraduate teaching. The OkstateShakespeare project allowed students to create viable public digital humanities projects through which the public can engage with and learn about otherwise hard to access historical texts, a key component of the university’s land-grant mission.\textsuperscript{11} Through this work, students also developed basic research skills, experience working with primary and secondary sources, a deeper knowledge of Renaissance literary culture, and a range of widely applicable skills in archival and database navigation, basic web development, and web design. What began with a new faculty member’s simple query about old books at the library transformed into a full-semester digital humanities initiative centered around OSU’s underutilized rare book holdings. There were many benefits from this collaborative relationship, for each of the partners brought their own expertise to the table. Indeed, it is the fusion of the English professor’s knowledge of the history of print culture and Renaissance historiography, the English liaison librarian’s experience with research resources and digital humanities methods, and the special collections librarian’s knowledge of the library’s rare book holdings and the curation of online exhibits and digital platforms that made this project so unique.
Appendix 15A. Printer’s Biography Assignment

This assignment is intended to give you a sense of the print history of Shakespeare’s plays; a better understanding of the Renaissance English book trade and period print culture; and the chance to hone your research skills as you navigate and synthesize a variety of online resources. It will also give the chance to see (at least in online scans) what printed texts looked like in Shakespeare’s time.

1. Using EEBO, compile a bibliography of the printed editions of Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet up to and including the 1623 Folio.

2. Using the Dictionary of National Biography and the Dictionary of Literary Biography, find out information about the PRINTER of one of these editions and write a short (-1 page) synthesis and summary of the DNB/DLB articles that focuses on the most relevant, pertinent, and interesting information. If your first choice of printer does not yield results in these two works, find another printer to write about. Be careful—there may be a number of people in these dictionaries with the same name. Just because you are writing about John Q Smith, do not assume that the first John Q Smith you come across in the DNB is the one you are looking for. Pay attention to dates and details (i.e. doe the bio mention that this individual was, in fact, a printer? Was this person alive at the time these works were being printed? Etc.) Be especially careful about fathers and sons, who often shared both names and professions.
Appendix 15B. ENGL 4723: Shakespeare Assignment 1: EEBO/OED

Political Keywords

This assignment is an exercise in the closest kind of interpretation. I want you to attend to Shakespeare’s texts at the level of individual words and their variable meanings. Pick any passage of roughly 4–8 lines from one of the works we have read (Troilus and Cressida or Richard II). What this passage needs is at least one of the political key words listed below. Then go to the Oxford English Dictionary (online) and find out all you can about the word, most importantly its etymology and origins, and the range of meanings that would have been available to Shakespeare when he wrote the work. Your next step will be to go to the Shakespeare Concordance (in the library) and find the various times Shakespeare used the word and its variants (and perhaps its cognates) to get a sense of the specific shades of meaning that informed Shakespeare’s uses of this word. Then, using the advanced search option on EEBO, I would like you to find 4–5 works printed in the same year as the play you are studying that also contain that word.

Using this information, you will then develop an approximately 3–4 page essay that presents a close reading of that passage that considers the multiple interpretations made possible by the various meanings associated with this word, the various shades of meaning rooted in its origins and cognates, and Shakespeare’s (and, perhaps, his contemporaries’) other uses of the word. As you analyze the passage, it would be useful to see if there are certain words that tend to cluster around the word you are focusing on.

Please attach to the essay a bibliography listing the 4–5 contemporary works that use the word you are studying.

Some words to use:

- Valour
- Bond
- Discretion
- Treason
- Commonwealth
- Slander
- Degree
- Honor
- Oath
- Mercy
- Sovereign
- Duty
- Reverence
- Liberty
Appendix 15C. ENGL 4723: Shakespeare Term Project: Digital Holinshead

In this project, we will create an online companion to Raphael Holinshed's four volume edition of the *Chronicles* (1587) housed in the Library Special Collections archive. This companion will consist of a general overview and outline of Holinshed's text along with more detailed presentations examining specific aspects of the text such as its background and production, its reception and influence, and the intellectual and political contexts within which it was produced and received. We will seek to create a supplement and online exhibit about this unique text and its relation to Shakespeare. We will use this project as a platform to situate both writers within the context and practices of the early modern study of history (i.e., before the modern disciplinary/professional model that we might find in a modern day university classroom develops in the 18th to 20th centuries).

In order to complete this task, we will break up into groups of approximately 3 students (we have 10 possible topics and 25 students). Each of these groups will research one of the presentation/display topics listed below and create a webpage based on that research.

As a basis for the research, we will use the *Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, which will be on reserve at the library, as well as databases such as EEBO, DNB, DLB, and ITER, and sources available in the library stacks and special collections.

Overview: general description of work/who was Holinshed (perhaps generated more generally by the class wiki style based on the knowledge developed in their particular group projects)

1. Production:
   a. Printers/publishers/networks of writers, polemicians, etc. within which it was produced
   b. Illustrations/physical form
2. Work's politics:
   a. Political themes (providence / monarchy / visions of social order)
   b. British / Archipelagic cultural identity
3. Historiography
   a. Historiography vs. chronicling
   b. Holinshed's sources
   c. How book relates to / adapts contemporary historiographical practices
4. Literary Holinshed
   a. Style and rhetoric in Holinshed
   b. Uses by other poets such as Spenser and Daniel
Notes


6. Ibid., 162–63.


9. The URL is https://earlymodernpaleography.library.yale.edu/.

10. As of the writing of this chapter, an article by Andrew Wadoski on the literary attribution discoveries made in this course will appear in a forthcoming issue of *The Library: The Journal of the British Bibliographical Society.*

11. For an overview of OSU’s mission as a land-grant institution, see Institutional Accreditation, Oklahoma State University, “University Mission,” 2015, https://accreditation.okstate.edu/Mission.
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CHAPTER 16*

Closing the Loop:
CREATING DELIVERABLES
THAT ADD VALUE

Prudence Doherty and Daniel DeSanto

Introduction

As special collections librarians and liaison librarians work together to create innovative experiences working with primary source material, it is important to remember students have much to offer in the collaborative design process. In this case study, Prudence Doherty, a special collections librarian, and Daniel DeSanto, an instruction librarian, describe a project they initiated and implemented with upper-level education majors at the University of Vermont (UVM). The students were pre-service teachers (student teachers working toward degree and licensure) enrolled in Social Education and Social Studies, a course that focuses on teaching methods, assessment alternatives, and resources used in the elementary (K–4) classroom. The project gave the pre-service teachers an opportunity to work with three digital collections in order to design lesson plans for elementary-aged students. The project closed the loop of learn, create, and teach by requiring students to learn evaluative approaches to working with historical material and then create lesson plans based on those approaches. By creating professional resources for other teachers, the students added value to the digital collections.

* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License, CC BY-NC (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).
Institutional Background

Experience-based learning opportunities are an important part of a UVM undergraduate education. The university’s College of Education and Social Services, which enrolls about seven hundred undergraduates, offers curricula that connect theory and practice. The elementary education program provides students with numerous opportunities “to participate in collaborative learning, authentic planning and many projects that will result in a deeper understanding of pedagogy, lesson/unit planning and assessment.”1

The three departments of the UVM Libraries involved in this project, Information and Instruction Services (I & IS), special collections, and the Center for Digital Initiatives (CDI), have a strong commitment to collaborating with colleagues in other departments and with teaching faculty. A robust liaison librarian program provides the frame for subject librarians in I & IS to partner with faculty to deliver discipline-specific information literacy initiatives and implement innovative instructional design. Special collections also has a significant instructional focus, and special collections librarians routinely provide students with opportunities to learn about and work with primary sources. On multiple occasions, special collections librarians have worked with faculty to offer semester-long, experience-based learning opportunities. For example, first-year students in a digital history class created online exhibits using political and literary papers as well as diverse documents about Vermont cheese2; forty students in a Vermont history class arranged and described small manuscript collections; and seniors in a printmaking class created broadsides to help special collections celebrate its fiftieth anniversary.

The Center for Digital Initiatives, situated within special collections, makes unique digital resources freely available online, including many Vermont primary sources. Since its inception in 2009, the CDI has offered a collaborative environment that encourages students, faculty, staff, and community members to participate both as users and creators of digital collections.3 In 2010, the CDI outreach librarian collaborated with an anthropology professor to teach a course that involved students in curatorial activities for a new digital collection.4

Impetus for Collaboration

UVM librarians began working with students in Social Education and Social Studies in 2010, when the course instructor, Binta Colley, inquired about opportunities for pre-service teachers to learn more about using primary source documents. Professor Colley particularly wanted students to develop skills using primary source documents and develop lesson plans around history, community, individuals, and events. The special collections librarian and the
Center for Digital Initiatives outreach librarian organized a three-hour session that included an interactive introduction to primary sources, a hands-on workshop with selected resources in special collections, and an exploration of teaching with primary sources. When the CDI librarian left the university in 2011, the history librarian joined the special collections librarian to offer the session again. Although both of these sessions were successful and well received by the instructor and the students, the librarians saw the potential for creating a more robust experience by connecting the library session directly to a class assignment or project.

In the fall of 2013, special collections librarian Prudence Doherty and the new education librarian, Daniel DeSanto, met with the instructor and suggested a project that would transform the pre-service teachers into collaborators and change the library visit from a field trip to the first phase of a semester-long project. The librarians proposed that the students incorporate primary sources from the library’s digital collections into the lesson planning assignments that were already part of the course. Lesson plans based in the digital collections would then be posted to the Center for Digital Initiatives website, making the plans freely available to any educator. The lesson plans would also help the CDI meet a programmatic goal to provide resources for K–12 educators. The project was incorporated into the course in 2013 and again in 2014.

**Project Scope**

The lesson planning project was undertaken in several stages. For the librarians and the course instructor, preliminary preparation involved establishing learning outcomes, creating the assignment, and selecting digital collections. For the students, the project began with a library session that focused on working with and teaching with primary sources and then moved to lesson creation. Once the plans were submitted and graded, the librarians selected strong examples to include on the CDI website.

**Preparation**

Before the course began, DeSanto and Doherty and the course instructor established learning outcomes, created the lesson plan assignment, and selected digital collections.

**LEARNING OUTCOMES**

The librarians and the course instructor identified learning outcomes for the lesson planning project that focused on three areas. Pre-service teachers
needed to: (1) demonstrate critical thinking about primary source material; (2) transfer skills and knowledge to the elementary classroom; and (3) show pedagogical development as teachers. Student development in these areas was assessed using the deliverable—the lesson plans based on historical digital collections—and written student feedback.

Before college students could create lesson plans for their own K–4 students, they needed an understanding of the word “primary” and experience developing careful inquiry and observation as well as drawing inferences with primary material. Students were not expected to master these skills before they set off to create their lesson plans. Rather, the librarians and the instructor realized that the process would be iterative and that the students’ abilities would be under development as they developed their lesson plans.

Students were expected to demonstrate they could scale careful observation and inquiry for an elementary classroom, which is no small task when working with sources like Civil War letters or historical photos of obscure scenes. Scaling activities to this young age group was perhaps the issue that gave the librarians the most hesitation. Although students had no problem creatively finding ways to integrate primary sources into their lesson plans, doing so in a way that demonstrated depth of observation and inquiry did prove especially challenging.

ASSIGNMENT

The course instructor developed the lesson plan assignment in consultation with the librarians. In response to Common Core State Standards that stress an integrated approach to social studies as well as an increased emphasis on real world application, the assignment asked the pre-service teachers to incorporate elements of social studies into other disciplines, such as math, science, and language arts. This cross-disciplinary approach refined the instructor’s earlier focus on history, community, individuals, and events.

Students were asked to generate three lesson plans that included material from an assigned CDI digital collection (or supporting physical collection), demonstrated a critical approach to working with a primary object, and were rooted in a discipline other than social studies. Final lesson plans also had to include grade level, subject areas, resources, learning objectives, assessment of objectives, procedures or steps involved, mapping to appropriate state standards (most commonly, Vermont’s Common Core standards), and an estimate of time needed for completion. Students were encouraged, but not required, to differentiate instruction by creating levels of expectation for students of varying abilities.

As the team designed the assignment and library session, they attempted to model a project with a meaningful product as well as active, participatory learning during the session. For a group of pre-service teachers in a curriculum-focused course, this intentional modeling was particularly important.
DIGITAL COLLECTION SELECTION

Doherty and DeSanto selected the digital collections for the lesson plan assignment before they met with the students. They were careful to choose Center for Digital Initiatives collections that contained material appropriate for use in elementary classrooms. For the 2013 project, they asked the students to develop lesson plans for either the Porter C. Thayer Photographs, a collection of thirteen hundred photographs documenting rural life and landscape in southeastern Vermont between 1906 and 1920, or Vermonters in the Civil War, a selection of letters and diaries written by Vermont soldiers and their family and friends. The Civil War Collection includes transcripts, along with images of, the original documents. Partly because student feedback suggested it would be preferable to have all participants work with the same collection, in 2014, they selected only the Long Trail Photograph Collection, which includes nine hundred photographs of the hiking trail along the ridge of Vermont’s Green Mountains were taken between 1912 and 1937.5
Library Session

The class schedule allowed the librarians to plan a library session that ran from 8:30 in the morning until early afternoon and was divided into four sections. They started with an introduction to primary sources, then offered a primary source workshop with special collections material, followed up with a discussion about pedagogical strategies for working with primary sources, and closed with an exploration of the assigned digital collections and a review of the assignment. After the library session, the course instructor distributed a reflective writing assignment students to identify areas of the visit they found especially helpful and to make suggestions about ways the session might be improved.

INTRODUCTION TO PRIMARY SOURCES

Students initially met with DeSanto, to outline the definition of a primary source and to address the difficulties associated with distinguishing a primary from a secondary source. Even in this upper-level class of pre-service teachers, it was common for students to associate primary sources with a certain format. A great deal of time was spent unpacking the notion that what makes a source “primary” is largely contextual.

Students were then asked what work they had done previously with primary sources and how they remembered the work they had done. Some in the class volunteered their own experiences of memorable assignments that allowed them to view or touch a certain object. The class discussed primary sources as hands-on teaching tools that engage students in active learning. The pre-service teachers had an initial discussion of ways they might use primary materials in their own classrooms and how they might approach close reading and interrogating a primary source with a group of early elementary-aged students. This provided a natural opportunity to formally introduce the expectations for the project.

DeSanto reminded students, to be successful, they would need to be active learners rather than passive receptors. They would be responsible for using what they learned to create materials for their own would-be classrooms. This was also the first time the librarians delivered a message that would be repeated throughout the day: “Your work is important. It has an audience. Others teachers may use your lessons.” Completed lesson plans would be evaluated and the most effective would be included on the Center for Digital Initiatives website as teaching resources for other teachers. While the librarians were excited to have students help improve the usability and outreach resources for the UVM Libraries’ digital collections, the more important goal was to create a sense of purpose for the assignment and a feeling of ownership and pride about one’s work—something important to both the college-aged and elementary-aged student.
SPECIAL COLLECTIONS WORKSHOP

Although Special Collections at the University of Vermont includes a comprehensive Vermont research collection heavily used by faculty and students, as well as community members, most of the students enrolled in Social Education and Social Studies had never visited the department, and most had not used original primary sources for their own research projects. Given a growing emphasis in K–12 schools on having elementary, middle-level, and secondary students conduct inquiries with primary sources, it was important to bring pre-service teachers to special collections to work with primary sources related to the assigned digital collections, even for a short period of time.

For the workshop in special collections, Doherty selected materials in various formats related to topics covered in the selected digital collections. In 2014, for example, students examined letters, brochures, maps, trail photography, newsletters, and guidebooks that illustrated six Long Trail topics, including creating the trail and shelters, advice about hiking the trail, stories about notable hikes, land use planning and threats to the trail corridor, mapping the trail, and photographing the natural environment, facilities, and hikers. Five or six items were available for each topic. After a brief introduction, small groups of students examined items in at least two of the six topics for thirty-forty minutes. A worksheet (see Appendix 16A) posed questions to help guide their observations. The questions asked the students to describe an item, identify its creator and intended audience, summarize the content, and suggest themes and topics the item illustrates or supports. The students then shared their observations and ideas for how the items might be used in a classroom project.

The pre-service teachers learned firsthand how powerful it can be to work with historical documents, and how such documents can help their students connect with past people, events, and activities. As one student wrote in a post-library session reflection, “There just doesn’t seem to be a more engaging method of learning about history than physically handing something from the time period.” In the reflections, many students wished for more time to examine the special collections materials and for more time to talk about them. Some students returned later in the semester to look more closely at the selected items, and several used them to create the lesson plans they submitted.

WORKING WITH PRIMARY SOURCES IN THE CLASSROOM

Scott McLaughlin, an adjunct history professor and the co-director of Turning Points in American History, a Common Core, standards-based professional development program for pre-service and in-service Vermont educators, led the next part of the library session. McLaughlin presented strategies
to help the students incorporate primary sources into lesson plans. He shared several handouts that described qualitative and quantitative observations for different types of primary resources, outlined critical historical thinking skills, and listed various forms of historical analysis that included very helpful examples of questions to ask. He presented two widely used strategies for analyzing and interpreting primary sources: one aimed at middle and high school students (the “5 C’s”, for concentration, connection, context, conclusions, contingency) and a second, simpler approach for elementary students (“SOAP,” for source, occasion, audience, purpose). The students then worked together to apply the strategies to historical images from the Porter C. Thayer Photographs.

Figure 16.2. Students analyzed and interpreted this photo from the Porter C. Thayer Collection and determined that it depicts a farm auction.

McLaughlin’s presentation took the students from working with primary sources as learners, as they did during the Special Collections workshop, to working with them as educators. One student described this section as “very teacher-oriented.” Another student wrote that the presentation provided a process that she could implement to help her elementary students become critical thinkers and be actively engaged with the study materials. The librarians hoped students would incorporate similar observational and analytical methods into their lesson plans.
DIGITAL COLLECTION EXPLORATION

To wrap up the library session, the students met again with the education librarian and the class instructor to go over assignment expectations and to begin exploring the digital collections. DeSanto reiterated to students that the intended audience for the lesson plans was practicing teachers. He stressed that not all lessons would be chosen for inclusion; rather, the librarians would be very selective in choosing which plans to include. For a lesson plan to be included it would need to follow the required format, provide an engaging activity for elementary students, and demonstrate a critical approach to working with the primary source. The librarians and the instructor made it clear that there was a very high bar to be met in order for a lesson plan to be posted to the CDI website.

The final activity of the library session turned students loose in the digital collections to begin examining their lesson planning source material. Students browsed the collections and began a cursory review of the digitized photographs and letters that they might select. Some students began to brainstorm initial ideas for lesson plans. This last activity was informal and minimally facilitated by the education librarian, yet many students identified it as a highlight or culmination of the session. As one student wrote, “Throughout my time spent looking at the online primary sources, I learned tons of new information…I am eager to begin planning these lessons.” It was apparent by the end of the day, students had transformed their view of the collections from quirky, old documents to practical and powerful teaching resources.

Lesson Plan Selection and Posting

The education librarian conducted two follow-up visits with the students later in the semester. The first check-in was a time for the class to ask questions now that they had begun their lesson planning work. The librarian also brought collection-specific items to this session—in one instance, Civil War letters representing the Vermonters in the Civil War Collection, and in another, hand-colored glass lantern slides representing the Long Trail Collection. The intent was to rekindle students’ connection to the collections as well as excitement for the project. The second visit came a few weeks before lesson plans were due and provided a final chance for students to ask for help if they needed it.

Lesson plans were initially submitted to the instructor who graded them and then sent them to the education librarian. While the instructor was solely responsible for grading, the librarians were solely responsible for selecting lesson plans to be posted to the CDI website. The education librarian read all submitted lesson plans and selected an initial list for inclusion on the website. The special collections and education librarians then reviewed the initial list of selected plans and settled upon a final list to be included on the site.
During the selection process, DeSanto found that even the selected lesson plans needed some editing. He edited for voice, style, and grammar to ready the plans for dissemination. Students frequently shifted tenses, awkwardly used the passive voice, or continually repeated phrases like “The teacher then does…” or “The students then will…” This latter issue arose from a lesson planning convention students had encountered earlier in their coursework. The writing in the plans improved dramatically in the second year after providing students with models of successful lesson plans from the previous year.

Once lesson plans were selected, DeSanto emailed the student creators to obtain permission to edit the plans and post them to the site. The requests for permission began with congratulations, moved on to ask that students review and approve an edited version of their lesson plan, and concluded by providing an opt out if they did not want their plan included. If students did not respond after two email attempts by the specified date, DeSanto proceeded to post their lesson plans with the understanding that content could be removed at any time. In nearly every case, however, students responded and granted permission, usually with a reaction of excitement for having their lesson plan selected. One student responded, “I am honored. Glad you liked it. Thanks for letting me know,” and another, “Please use them! I’m very flattered and excited. Let me know when they’ll be published so I can send the link to my family.”

Two examples of student lesson plans selected for posting, “Packing Up and Adding Up” and “Graphing Text with Civil War Letters,” are presented in Appendix 16B. Both plans provide engaging, interactive activities for elementary students and encourage critical and reflective interaction with primary sources. The sample lesson plans also follow the assigned format and fulfill the expectation that skills from multiple disciplines would be incorporated. From a teacher’s perspective, they provide food for thought and a good starting point for a teacher to tweak, customize, and apply ideas to other primary resources or the needs of a particular classroom.

Conclusion

Impact

The lesson planning project made a meaningful impact on both the students and librarians involved. The project succeeded in changing student perceptions of primary sources, developing students’ regard for strategic approaches to teaching with primary sources, and modeling active and participatory learning. The project also made a lasting impact on the librarians by opening new avenues of collaboration, expanding possibilities for collection outreach, and encouraging further exploration into the best practices for teaching with primary sources.
STUDENT IMPACT

The librarians and the course instructor wanted students to improve their critical thinking about primary source material, transfer the skills and knowledge they gained in the project to their work with elementary-aged students, and develop their own teaching pedagogy. The student feedback and finished lesson plans demonstrate all the pre-service teachers made at least some progress in two of these three areas and some made progress in all three.

Most students indicated a change in thinking occurred regarding the usefulness and impact of primary sources. As stated earlier, much of the feedback pointed to the final session of the library visit day as especially eye-opening. The feedback indicated their heightened awareness of the collections as teaching resources and a shift in their perceptions of usefulness and utility.

Although students responded quite well to the introduction of teaching strategies for working with primary sources (SOAP, 5C’s), transferring those strategies to the elementary classroom was the most challenging aspect of the assignment for the pre-service teachers. Some student lesson plans were able to demonstrate careful critical engagement when scrutinizing a historical object with an elementary-aged classroom. However, many more lesson plans lacked this careful approach and opted instead for a quick introduction of the photo or letter before hopping to content-area activities. As one student reflected, “When using primary sources, we can’t just throw the materials at our students and expect them to know what to do with them or even what they are. We need to guide them through the process of closely examining and reading them to help them make connections.” It was heartening to see some students come to this realization during the course of the library session, but many students failed to include the “guiding them through the process” section in their lesson planning. While this was disappointing, asking undergraduates to transfer a teaching approach they have only just learned is an ambitious enterprise.

Student feedback generally pointed to an appreciation for the way the librarians modeled a participatory teaching environment. Some students provided positive feedback on these efforts, “[The librarians] didn’t just stand in front of the room and lecture to us. They engaged us in every step of the way. I felt involved in my own learning. I felt like there were plenty of times to participate and be an active learner.” Other students appreciated these efforts but were less specific in making the connection to their own learning. Whether consciously noted or not, the librarians’ purposeful modeling was important for this group of pre-service teachers. The more exposure students have to engaging, hands-on curricular design, the more likely they will be to implement an active-learning approach in their own classrooms.

Many students made claims about incorporating primary resources into their curriculum when they get the chance. “I can … see myself using pictures
and other artifacts in my lessons as a form of engagement and creativity.” “I want to integrate primary sources not just in the social studies aspect of the classroom but every other subject as well.” Hopefully, their experience with the lesson planning project will offer curricular tools to those who find themselves in their own classrooms one day. Throughout, the librarians treated the pre-service teachers with the same seriousness and respect they might afford a group of seasoned classroom teachers. In one of the most meaningful student comments, a student stated, “I felt as though the staff at the library saw us as a group of young adults that will someday be great teachers.” Setting this type of tone for the project was crucial to making progress with any of the outcomes described above.

LIBRARIAN IMPACT

The librarians undertook the lesson planning project to help pre-service teachers gain confidence and skills working with primary sources and to add content to the digital collections. In addition to meeting these goals successfully, the project expanded their teaching practices.

For DeSanto, the lesson-planning project opened new avenues for collaborative and innovative instruction with primary sources. After seeing how positively education students reacted to working with original primary sources, DeSanto recognized the multidisciplinary appeal of these sources and he and Doherty now routinely collaborate to share unique primary sources with undergraduates from different disciplines. DeSanto took one such collaboration a step further by creating an online tutorial for a class called “Interrogating White Identity,” in which students use primary material to contextualize readings on white slavery and subjugation.9

For Doherty, the lesson planning project confirmed the benefits of collaborating with students as creators. Following the lesson planning project, she initiated collaborative projects that asked students to provide deliverables using special collections materials. As part of a larger management plan for one of UVM’s natural areas, she worked with a team of graduate students who planned and completed a research guide.10 In another semester-long collaboration that included an instruction librarian and a geography professor, food systems graduate students created physical and virtual library exhibits as a capstone project.11

The lesson planning project also prompted Doherty and DeSanto to continue exploring best practices for teaching with primary sources, individually and with other instruction and special collections librarians. As a member of the library’s Educational Services Working Group, Doherty arranged a well-attended workshop for UVM faculty and librarians, where Robin Katz and Julie Golia presented the strategies they developed during the Brooklyn Historical Society’s Students and Faculty in the Archives Project.12
Lessons Learned

The authors’ list of lessons learned can be divided into two broad categories, project organization and pedagogy. In terms of organization, Doherty and DeSanto agree that the lesson planning project would benefit from a strong introduction, a clear conclusion, and in between, good communication channels. In the future, librarians would visit a class early in the semester to present the project. The instructor, the librarians and the students would then draw up and sign an agreement detailing roles, responsibilities, and deliverables. The collaborators also need effective methods to communicate following the library session. Librarians would work with the instructor to use the course management system (Blackboard) to check in, have discussions, and review and comment on draft lesson plans. A short program where students describe the project and share their work with a small group of librarians and education professors could mark the successful conclusion of the project and provide an opportunity for the students to deliver a professional presentation.

Doherty and DeSanto learned a number of lessons about training pre-service teachers to work with primary sources. The lesson planning project demonstrated students are clearly motivated when asked to use what they are learning to make a professional contribution. Recognizing that knowledge transfer is hard and takes time, the librarians would like to explore ways to give students more practice at analyzing and interpreting primary sources after the library session. A short assignment asking the students to analyze one of the photographs or documents they are using for their lesson plans would be helpful. The librarians would also like to provide additional opportunities for the students to practice teaching with primary sources, emphasizing the importance of including a critical approach to primary material when designing their elementary classroom curricula. This could be as simple as asking students to submit draft lesson plans for review by the instructor, the librarians, and their fellow students. Some of this work might be done in online discussion forums.

The librarians recognize the project design needs to include more targeted and more frequent evaluations, both to support the students and to assess the project. To help guide the students as they create their lesson plans, the librarians would distribute an assessment rubric along with the assignment. They would use the rubric to select plans for inclusion on the CDI website and to give the students additional feedback about their plans. The reflective writing assignment about the library session provided much useful feedback, but the librarians would like to get formal student input again after the lesson plans are completed to help evaluate student progress during the semester. In 2013 and 2014, the librarians and the instructor evaluated the completed lesson plans separately; in the future, they should share their evaluations.
Next Steps

The education faculty member who taught Social Education and Social Development left UVM in 2015, ending the multi-year collaboration. Yet, because the lesson planning project demonstrated the value of improving education majors’ pedagogical skills with primary sources, DeSanto is currently making contacts with other faculty members in the Education Department to find a new cohort for the project. The lesson planning project could be even more effective if it focused on a cohort of pre-service educators who will be teaching middle and secondary school students.

As instructors, both DeSanto and Doherty are seeking effective ways to “teach the teacher.” The lesson planning project relies heavily on a relatively brief interaction during which pre-service teachers learn, adopt, and produce work based on the pedagogical model introduced by the librarians. To be as effective as possible during this short timeframe, the librarians are currently investigating innovative instructional design approaches such as flipping the classroom, designing post-session activities, and embedding online modules in the class LibGuide to make the most of their instructional time in the project’s next iteration.

Whatever form the project’s next iteration may take, Doherty and DeSanto will need to assess any new instructional situation for student motivation, appropriateness of collections, faculty buy-in, and the possible impact made on selected collections. The instructional situation described here provided a rich opportunity because student pre-service teachers came to the project with a vested interest in thinking and working collaboratively outside the walls of their classroom. The instructor believed in the value of the project, and the librarians were able to identify collections that would allow students to successfully complete the assignment and would benefit from the addition of teaching resources. Those looking to implement a similar project would do well to assess student and faculty motivation, as well as the fit of their own collections before moving forward.

If an instructional situation does present a good fit for incorporating this model, the results can be incredibly rewarding. When students are asked to “close the loop” and give something back to the resources with which they interact, they rise to the occasion by bringing their own expertise and creative approaches. Students are capable of making valuable contributions, given the opportunity. Although coordinating a project like this one may be time consuming, there are many benefits for student learning, collection outreach, and building collaborative partnerships.
Appendix 16A. Lesson Planning Project, Special Collections Worksheet

Topic: ________________________________________________________

1. List at least 4 items in the group. Pick one item to analyze—indicate it with an x.

2. What is the format of your item? Circle one: Book, article, photograph, brochure, letter, other.

3. Describe the physical characteristics of your item. Things to note: size, paper, format, number of pages, binding, typeface, color, illustrations, printed or handwritten, condition, legibility.

4. How did the item or come into being? Who created it? When? What was the purpose of creating it? Who was the intended audience?

5. What is the item about? Summarize the content very generally. Note any content of particular interest to you.

6. What themes or topics does the item illustrate or support?

7. How might you use the item in a classroom project? Or, what investigations does it suggest?
Appendix 16B. Sample Lesson Plans

Lesson 1

Title: Packing Up and Adding Up

Grade Level: 4

Topic: Social Studies, Mathematics

Resources Needed:

- Image from the Center for Digital Initiatives Long Trail Collection: Clarence P. Cowles on Stark Mountain http://cdi.uvm.edu/collections/item/hwccr03b02017
- Early 1900s Long Trail hiking supply list (can be found in the University of Vermont Special Collections)
- Pencils
- Thought journals
- Math journals
- Clip boards

Student Learning Objectives:

- Student will learn about what people needed to pack for a Long Trail hike in the early 1900s versus what they need to pack for a Long Trail hike today.
- Students will continue to learn about adding decimals.

Assessment of Stated Objectives: See rubric below.

Standards:
Vermont Grade Level Expectations
Subject: Mathematics
Grade: Grade 4
Standard/GE Stem: Standard 7.6: Arithmetic, Number, and Operation Concepts
Expectation: M4: 4 Accurately solves problems involving multiple operations on whole numbers or the use of the properties of factors and multiples; and addition or subtraction of decimals and positive proper fractions with like denominators. (Multiplication limited to 2 digits by 2 digits, and division limited to 1-digit divisors.)
Procedures:

INTRODUCTION (7–10 MINS):

a. The previous day was dedicated to introducing decimals and addition of fractions. Students completed a worksheet to test their skills and understanding. Students will begin by reviewing this worksheet to refresh their memory.

b. Copies of the image “Clarence P. Cowles on Stark Mountain” (in the “Resources” section) are passed around for all students. Students take 1 minute to silently observe the photo. Students take 2 minutes to record in their Thought Journals their ideas about what they see in the photo and what they can infer about the photograph. Students share ideas in a group or with the class for 2 minutes.

c. Introduce the lesson and the exploration of what hikers brought with them on the Long Trail back in the early 1900s (when this photo was taken) and what hikers bring with them today.

BODY (20–23 MINS):

a. Packing lists, both past and present, are handed out (attached). Students work in small groups (2–3 students) and write in their Thought Journals the similarities and differences between the historic and the modern-day packing lists.

b. Each group gets 1–2 categories (i.e. “Hygiene” or “Shelter/Sleep System”). Groups work together to add up the total weight in ounces they would need for their category(ies), both past and present (this part should take no longer than 15–20 minutes).

CLOSURE (10 MINS):

a. Students come back together with their weight amounts and they add up the totals together as a class to calculate the final pack-weight “then and now,” in ounces.

b. The instructor converts this number to pounds.

c. The class discusses the similarities and differences students noted in their Thought Journals as well as the weight differences of the gear used hiking in the early 1900s and hiking now.

d. The class finishes with a discussion of how important decimals are in our everyday life. If a hiker didn't know the exact weight of everything in their backpack, the pack could end up much, much heavier than anticipated.

Time Allotment: 1 class period of 40 minutes per class
Lesson plan created by Danielle E. Hall-Potvin 5/5/2014
## Packing Up and Adding Up Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Stated Objective</th>
<th>Not There Yet</th>
<th>Getting There</th>
<th>You’ve Got It!</th>
<th>Additional Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Student will learn about what people needed to pack for the Long Trail hikes in the early 1900s vs. what they need to pack for the Long Trail today.</td>
<td>1) Student will be able to explain the similarities and differences between what hikers packed for their Long Trail hikes in the early 1900s vs. today.</td>
<td>Student is unable to explain any similarities or differences between the packing lists of the early 1900s and present-day.</td>
<td>Student is able to explain some similarities and differences between the packing lists of the early 1900s and present-day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Students will learn more about adding decimals.</td>
<td>2) Student will be able to add several decimal numbers together accurately.</td>
<td>Student attempts to add decimal numbers together, makes a few minor addition errors but understands the concepts behind the process.</td>
<td>Student is able to add multiple decimal numbers together without error and with confidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Packing Up and Adding Up Gear List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gear List</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backpack</td>
<td>Gossamer Gear Mariposa Plus</td>
<td>21.5 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gossamer Gear 1/3 NightLight</td>
<td>1.1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gossamer Gear Medium Hip Pocket</td>
<td>0.7 oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Packing Up and Adding Up Gear List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Laurel Designs Medium Pack Cover</td>
<td>2.0 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossamer Gear Internal Pack Liner</td>
<td>1.7 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skunklight Skylight-Solar Powered LED</td>
<td>0.6 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini REI Thermometer</td>
<td>0.3 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelter &amp; Sleep System</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Easton Stakes</td>
<td>0.6 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea-to Summit 13L Waterproof Stuff Sack</td>
<td>1.1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REI Kilo 20 Down Sleeping Bag</td>
<td>28.7 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Wool Socks for Sleeping</td>
<td>2.6 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patagonia Capilene 1 Bottoms</td>
<td>5.8 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patagonia Capilene 1 Crew</td>
<td>6.0 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennessy Hammock Ultralite Assembly</td>
<td>22.7 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennessy Hammock Tarp</td>
<td>8.2 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennessy Hammock Undershield (Optional)</td>
<td>9.0 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennessy Hammock Overshield (Optional)</td>
<td>3.0 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 L Platypus Bladder</td>
<td>1.4 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 L Platypus Bladder</td>
<td>1.4 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Ecology First Need Water Filter/Purifier</td>
<td>15.9 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platypus Hose and Camelback Bite Valve</td>
<td>2.1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitchen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD Bear Bag System (Bag, Rope, Rock Sack, Carabiner)</td>
<td>3.1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSACK Odor Barrier Bag</td>
<td>1.1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Research Helium Stove Stuff Sack</td>
<td>0.5 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Peak 700 Titanium Pot and Lid</td>
<td>4.2 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Peak Gigapower Titanium Stove in Plastic Case</td>
<td>3.8 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toob Tooth Brush/ Paste (Full)</td>
<td>1.3 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Handled Titanium Spoon</td>
<td>0.4 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSR Pack Towel</td>
<td>0.7 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head Net Ditty Bag</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Packing Up and Adding Up Gear List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Polypro Glove Liners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mountain Hardware Polypro Hat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bandana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Research Windproof Balaclava</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra Clothing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cocoon Polarguard Pullover Vest with Helium Ditty Bag</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mountain Hardware Cohesion Rain Pant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Id/Cash/Coinage/Credit/Health Ins-Omniseal Ziploc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suunto a10 Compass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Camera</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brunton LED Lantern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Equinox Essential Bag</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescriptions/Nalgene Bottle (5 Days)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Pair Macs Ear Plugs in Snack Bag</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Dental Floss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photon Freedom LED Light With Hat Clip</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swiss Army Classic Knife</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grey Ditty Bag (Murphy)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gear Repair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Aid/Emergency Kit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Bottle Purell Hand Sanitizer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Bottle Dr. Bronner's Soap</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ben’s 100% DEET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Pack: Weight In Pounds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Plan 2

Title: Graphing Text with Civil War Letters

Grade Level: 3

Topic: Mathematics, Social Studies, Vermont History

Resources Needed:
- Pens, pencils, markers
- A flip chart
- Link cubes (if necessary)
- Letters from the Vermonters in the Civil War Collection

Learning Context:
As stipulated by the Common Core standards, students in the third grade are expected to understand and be able to collect, record and analyze data in basic forms such as a bar graph or line plot. Students will benefit from being able to practice these necessary skills through a historical lens. They will be asked to look for patterns and themes in the letter collection, which will improve their abilities to analyze data from multiple angles while simultaneously getting them to explore common concerns and opinions during the Civil War era. Ultimately students will be gaining perspective across subject areas. This will lead to future instruction on more complex forms of data analysis, possibly from a scientific standpoint as well.

Student Learning Objectives:
- Students demonstrate understanding of the texts’ content by extracting commonalities and patterns from the letter correspondences.
- Students will be able to represent data gathered from the collection’s letters and diary entries in a scaled bar graph.

Assessment of Stated Objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Below Expectation (1)</th>
<th>At Expectation (2)</th>
<th>Above Expectation (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate understanding of the texts’ content by extracting commonalities and patterns from the letter correspondences.</td>
<td>The student will read 1 or 2 letters from the collection, comparing what they find to their group members in order to gather data for the bar graph.</td>
<td>The student does not read their assigned letters or compare what he/she found to group members.</td>
<td>The student reads 1 letter from the collection and compares what they find with group members.</td>
<td>The student reads 2 or more letters from the collection and compares what he/she finds with group members, picking out themes on their own before sharing results with group members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The student will contribute to his/her group’s presentation of their data in a scaled bar graph by fulfilling his/her assigned role.

The student does not fulfill his/her role when gathering, analyzing and presenting data.

The student fulfills his/her role when gathering, analyzing and presenting data.

The student fulfills his/her role and proactively finds patterns in the data collected among group members.

Standards:
USA—Common Core State Standards (June 2010)

Subject: English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects
Grade: 3
Content Area: Informational Text K–5
Strand: Reading
Domain: Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity
Standard: 10. By the end of the year, read and comprehend informational texts, including history/social studies, science, and technical texts, at the high end of the grades 2–3 text complexity band independently and proficiently.

Subject: Mathematics
Grade: 3
Domain: Measurement and Data 3.MD
Cluster: Represent and interpret data.
Standard: 3. Draw a scaled picture graph and a scaled bar graph to represent a data set with several categories. Solve one- and two-step “how many more” and “how many less” problems using information presented in scaled bar graphs. For example, draw a bar graph in which each square in the bar graph might represent 5 pets.

Differentiation:
Struggling learners will be allowed to use link cubes as manipulatives in order to put together bar graphs before writing them down. Each link will represent one piece of data, which they can then link together like a three-dimensional bar graph to show how many of each pattern/theme they found after collecting their data. Advanced learners will calculate the mean, median, mode and range of their respective data sets.
Procedures:

ORIENTATION:
Students will presumably have been introduced to the collection already. They will be familiar with the content and understand what kinds of topics the letters generally cover. Students will be split up into groups of 4 or 5, depending on the class size. The class will review the concepts of basic data collection: looking for data, recording data, graphing data, and analyzing data for patterns and themes. Students will also be familiar with graphing in a bar graph. This lesson is aimed at practicing using a scaled graph.

Students will read pre-selected passages from each letter that have common themes such as battle, death, money, family, food, soldiers, etc. Helpful prompt questions will be used to direct students: “What do the authors write about most? What are they thinking about as soldiers or family members of soldiers? Do they mention things like battle, or family? What words do you see in the letters the most?”

Students in groups will read 10–15 letters altogether. They will read each letter through once, then go back and read it a second time looking for words or phrases that appear more than once, circling them as they go. For example, if the word ‘family’ pops up more than once, a student would circle it and keep track on a tally sheet how many times the word is mentioned. The group members will then compare data on which words are occurring most frequently.

Once each group has identified 5 or 6 words/phrases that appear frequently, the instructor will provide materials to graph the data.

The instructor will assign a role to each group member. One student will be the group manager to make sure group members are on task. One student will be the materials collector who will be in charge of the graphing materials, one member will be the recorder, and another group member will be the presenter.

TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESS:
The instructor will circulate the room as the students read their letters and look for common words/phrases. Students should be on-task identifying words/phrases, recording data in tally charts, and graphing their findings.

CLOSURE / WRAP UP:
Each group will be called on to present. The presenter will speak for their group. Each group will be asked which words/phrases they found most frequently and why they think these words are mentioned most often. Peers will ask questions as time permits.

Time allotment: a class period of 60 minutes per class
Lesson plan created by Kathryn Seelen 4/17/2013
Notes


7. The Five C’s worksheet was adapted from “The Six Cs of Primary Source Analysis,” developed by Nicole Gilbertson and David Johnson at the University of California, Irvine History Project, http://www.humanities.uci.edu/history/ucihp/wh/6cs_Primary_Source.pdf. SOAP (Source / Occasion / Audience / Purpose), SOAPS, and SOAPSTONE are variations of a graphic organizer adapted for primary document analysis.


12. Information about the Students and Faculty in the Archives project can be found at TeachArchives.org, http://www.teacharchives.org.
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