

When Preservation Moves Off Campus

Trends and Effective Practices in ARL Libraries

By Cathleen Martyniak

Preservation librarians face both practical and fundamental challenges when moving preservation operations from the main library to an off campus location. Practical issues include transporting materials and staff safely and securely between facilities, hiring and retaining student employees, and communicating effectively between geographically dispersed library units. Fundamental concerns include how to continue providing high-quality services and maintain productivity in the remote location. The author conducted a survey of Association of Research Libraries preservation librarians who are discussing a potential move, planning to move, or have moved previously and analyzed the responses. This paper reports on findings from the survey and effective practices identified both in the survey and during follow-up interviews.

When informed by library administration that they will be moving from the main library to an off campus location, preservation librarians can face a number of difficult issues. How do they transport books and journals back and forth safely between the library and the off campus location? Will they lose all their student workers? How do they continue to provide high-quality services to their users if they are so far away? How do they continue to collaborate and communicate with other staff at the main library? When the decision was made by library administration in 2008 to move the University of Florida Preservation Department from the main campus library to a book storage facility approximately four miles away, the author began to gather data regarding these and other concerns associated with moving a preservation operation away from the main library. The author surveyed 123 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) preservation librarians. Ninety-four librarians responded, 19 of whom had moved or were planning to move to an off-site location. The goals of the research reported in this paper are to gather data on the frequency and circumstances of preservation units moving off campus and the consequences of establishing these facilities. The data cover four areas: collection maintenance, security, employee recruitment and retention, and advantages and challenges. An additional objective was to develop a set of effective practices obtained from one-on-one interviews with preservation librarians who are located geographically distant from the main campus library. The author hopes that these proven solutions can alleviate some of the anxiety these moves cause for preservation librarians as well as support planning efforts for those units moving off-site in the future.

Cathleen Martyniak (cmook@ufl.edu) is Preservation Librarian, Smathers Library, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Submitted December 13, 2009; returned to author December 29, 2009 with request to revise and resubmit; revised and resubmitted February 27, 2010, reviewed and accepted for publication.

Literature Review

The author found no articles that directly addressed the relocation of a preservation unit away from the main campus library. Numerous articles have dealt with relocating other types of library units, either within their original building or geographically distant from the main library, both temporarily and permanently. Dickinson, Martin, and Mering discussed a temporary 1999 move of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln (UNL) Cataloging Department to a warehouse on the edge of town while the main Love Library was being renovated.¹ The authors, professional catalogers at UNL, examined the phenomenon of being located away from an institution's main collection. Their aim was to discover, by means of a questionnaire, the effect of such a move on the workflow of professional catalogers. They received fifteen responses from six institutions, three of which were ARL libraries. Required population parameters for respondents were catalogers who held masters degrees in library science and professional positions at university libraries with at least one branch. All of the cataloging operations moved between 1998 and 2001. Survey questions focused on details of the move, communication issues, workflow, and respondent job duties. The authors made numerous recommendations that they felt could positively affect the outcome of relocation, such as a reliable and carefully planned delivery system, early move planning, and a supportive administration.² Williams and colleagues outlined the challenges, changes, and opportunities they faced during a 2000 relocation of the Resource Services Department (RSD) at the University of Florida.³ While the relocation of the RSD, which consisted of contributed cataloging, acquisitions, and central bibliographic services units, was within one building and not off campus, the staff of the department faced many of the same issues confronting those making a more significant geographical change. The authors discussed space planning, workflow interruptions, and the deeper issues of personal loss and other emotions engendered by such a move.

Olsgaard reported on a presentation by three librarians given at the 1999 Charleston Conference, in which they described moving their units and how they handled the challenges.⁴ The first move discussed was within the same building at the University of Florida, the second was a temporary move out of the library during a major renovation at the Boston Athenaeum, and the third was a permanent relocation to an off-site facility at the Florida State University Libraries. Speakers touched on topics such as examination of workflows for potential improvements, the need to maintain services for patrons during the move, and the importance of communication with administration and the staff in the unit being moved. Two speakers provided lists of important considerations. Atkins and Hain Teper, at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, conducted a 2005 survey of ARL libraries assessing their current practices for planning

and managing moves of collections, staff, and services.⁵ They gathered data on many topics including the frequency of large collection moves, how the collections are transported, and what kinds of requesting, delivery, and access mechanisms are established for the collections. While the focus of the article was on temporary moves of collections and the discussion regarding staff was minimal, preservation librarians would benefit from reading the Atkins and Hain Teper's article to provide context and perspective when faced with their own move.

The author identified one article that addressed designing a conservation treatment facility. Rowley and Hanthorn from Iowa State University focused on conservation functions, planning issues, and the planning process.⁶ The authors did not address the challenges of a remote location, but their advice is pertinent to those planning a new conservation facility, regardless of where it is located.

While the topic of this paper is moving a preservation unit away from the main campus library, other related topics in the literature are relevant. Addressing staffing issues is central to the success of any library operation or organizational change. Williams and colleagues noted that relocating an entire department can be very difficult on employees.⁷ Kelly provided insight into managing the important aspects of coordinating a team of geographically remote information specialists and suggested practical tips for those who may be part of a geographically dispersed team.⁸ She discussed the importance of effective communication, including weekly e-mail updates, conference calls when appropriate, and face-to-face contact when feasible. She noted that the need for professional development opportunities continues regardless of where an employee is located. Ensuring access to training and workshops for off-site staff is important. She also addressed making appropriate use of new technologies and suggested video conferencing and team intranets. Siebrat, Hoegland, and Ernst acknowledged that even small levels of dispersion can affect team performance substantially.⁹ They discussed the difficulties of collaboration across distance including communication problems, reduced trust, and an increased difficulty finding common ground. Using a survey, they compared the performance of dispersed versus collocated teams. While the teams that they surveyed were quite dispersed geographically, their findings are applicable to teams that are split between the main campus and an off-site facility, separated by ten miles or less. They discussed key lessons that can maximize performance, including "Don't underestimate the significance of small distances," "Emphasize teamwork skills," and "Promote self leadership."¹⁰

Research Method

The author drafted the survey questions and vetted them

through the University of Florida Institutional Review Board during the spring of 2009. The Institutional Review Board determined that the protocol was exempt from review. The author selected an online survey tool, Survey Monkey, to gather the initial numerical data. The survey consisted of thirty-eight questions with 89 percent of the respondents needing to answer only twelve or fourteen questions because the survey used several skip logic questions. A typical skip logic question is “If you answered yes to question #5, please skip to question #22.” Survey questions were grouped into five categories: background, collection maintenance, security, employee recruitment and retention, and advantages and challenges. The author attempted to define the terminology to be used within the survey clearly and carefully. A preservation program, as described in the introduction to the 2006–7 ARL preservation statistics survey findings, is a distinct administrative unit, which is separately staffed, funded, and administered.¹¹ Those libraries that indicated they did not have a preservation program were deemed to have distributed preservation units. The phrase “main preservation unit” (MPU) was defined and used within the survey to denote the unit within the library responsible for the majority of preservation activities. The online survey instrument was pretested on a small group of preservation librarians to ensure that it worked correctly. The survey is presented in appendix A.

The author’s decision to focus the survey on ARL libraries was purposeful. While not all preservation units within the United States and Canada are located within an ARL member library, many ARL libraries do have preservation units. Most of these preservation units document their preservation activities each year via the ARL annual preservation statistics survey. This group of libraries with preservation expertise was readily identifiable and similar to the author’s home institution (also an ARL member), making comparison with the local operation easier. The author asked for and obtained contact information from the ARL for the 123 libraries who reported 2007–8 ARL preservation statistics. The author e-mailed each 2007–8 ARL preservation survey respondent in June 2009 to determine if that person was the correct person to fill out the preservation move survey. This e-mail message prenotified the individual that a survey was coming. Another benefit of this prenotification step, advocated by Dillman, was to confirm that the author had the correct person at the library to answer the survey.¹² In many cases, the name and address of the person to contact was changed to the local preservation administrator from an administrative assistant.

Three weeks later, the e-mail message containing the link to the survey was sent with a request to complete it. Initial response to the survey was 55 percent. The author was able to increase the response rate to 77 percent (97 out of 123) with a series of subsequent e-mail messages

and phone calls. The author completed hour-long follow-up phone calls with the librarians who indicated that their preservation unit already had moved off campus. These interviews allowed the author to clarify any questions from the survey as well as get more detailed information about the situation at that particular library. No follow-up interviews were conducted with libraries that had potential or planned moves. All individual survey data were held confidential. Finally, several respondents indicated that they did not want their library identified in the paper. Thus a set of alphabetic codes was devised to help identify and track relevant data for each library without naming any library specifically.

A significant amount of data was gathered during the course of the survey and the follow-up interviews. Only a portion of this information was required to discuss the circumstances, frequency, and consequences of preservation moves off campus and gather the list of effective practices developed by preservation librarians who are located geographically distant from the main campus library. The remainder of the collected data will not be analyzed in this paper.

Findings and Analysis

Of the 123 individuals who received the survey, 97 started it during the four weeks that the survey was open. Of the 97 initial respondents who described the type of preservation department they had, 66 percent had a standalone preservation program while 33 percent had a distributed structure for carrying out preservation activities. Of those same respondents, 89 were from the United States and 8 were from Canada. No units in Canada had moved, although 1 Canadian library was planning a move. Three of the surveys were not completed successfully and thus those responses were not analyzed, leaving 94 valid responses. Of these, 75 had not moved, had no plans to move, and were not discussing the possibility of a move, resulting in a study group of 19 respondents.

Of the 19 libraries in the study group, 10 had moved their preservation departments off campus, in whole or in part, 4 had definite plans to move off campus, and 5 were discussing such a move. Information gathered from the 9 respondents who indicated that they were in discussions regarding a potential move off campus or had definite plans to move off campus will be examined first. The 10 respondents who indicated that they had already completed their moves will be discussed in the following section. With only 19 out of 94 respondents indicating that they did, will, or may move their preservation department off campus, the response group may be too small to report statistically valid results. The author believes, however, that the data gathered are “intentionally valid” because the survey and follow-up interviews adequately assess what the research intended to study.

Survey Findings and Analysis of Potential, Planned, and Completed Moves

Table 1 summarizes the 19 responses to survey questions regarding frequency and circumstances of potential, planned, and completed moves. Frequency relates to the timing of the potential, planned, or completed moves, while circumstances pertain to the reasons behind the moves. Respondents were allowed to select as many responses as appropriate for the circumstances question. One of the respondents who reported a potential move within two years mentioned that their library is conducting a preservation needs assessment to develop a stand-alone preservation department that will be consolidated from a currently distributed operation, with the possibility that this new unit would be located in an existing book storage facility. The other respondent who reported a potential move within two years reported that his preservation operation is currently in two locations: conservation work is located in an off campus book storage facility and preservation work is in the main campus library. His goal is to combine both operations at the storage facility.

One respondent planning a move within two years will be shifting a portion of her operations to a purpose-built facility immediately adjacent to the current library. Conservation and digitization will move to the new facility, while binding and shelf preparations will stay in the main library. The other respondent in this category will be splitting the preservation operations between three distinct and widely distributed physical locations. One respondent projecting a move more than two years from now reported that her unit will become part of a university-wide facility combining all preservation and conservation operations from the libraries and the museums on campus in approximately ten years. The second respondent planning a move more than

two years from now will be relocating the entire preservation operation to an off-site book storage facility approximately four miles from the main campus library in 2014.

Four preservation librarians indicated that they are definitely planning a move off campus, 2 in the next two years and 2 at least two years from now. Of the 5 respondents who indicated they are discussing a move, 2 are discussing this move within the next two years and 3 are considering a move two or more years from now. Nine of the 94 total respondents are in discussion of or actively planning for a preservation unit move off campus. The frequency of the completed moves also is noted. Ten moves were reported between 1998 and 2008, an average of 1 per year. While the author refrains from using the word “trend,” these data, along with the observations provided in the section on potential and planned moves off campus, suggest that movement of preservation departments away from the main library has been steady for a decade and could be increasing.

Examining the circumstances behind the 19 potential, planned, and completed preservation moves off campus can be informative because they outline comparable situations that other libraries could face in the future. Libraries will continue to address difficult space-allocation decisions in the coming decades. While respondents from only 3 of the 10 units that had completed a move off campus indicated that they moved to free campus space, 3 of the 4 units actively planning a move indicated this as one of the reasons they are doing so. During the follow-up interview, one preservation librarian said, “Campus space planning is changing and libraries are not entitled to central campus space. Each unit pays for their own space and libraries will be charged [for their space] by the square foot.”

All 5 libraries discussing a potential move of their preservation unit off campus are planning to move to a purpose-built facility. Five of the 9 potential or planned moves are

Table 1. Frequency and Circumstances of Potential, Planned, and Completed Moves Off Campus

	Frequency (When will/might they move?)		Circumstances (Why will/might they move?)					
	0 to 2 years	2 or more years from now	Free up main campus space	Consolidate one or more operations	Move preservation/conservation operations to a purpose-built facility	Move noncore operations off site	Loss of current facility	
Discussing a potential move (N = 5)	2	3	1	4	5	1	1	
Planning a move (N = 4)	2	2	3	1	3	0	0	
Completed move (N = 10)	Frequency (When did they move?)			Circumstances (Why did they move?)*				
	0 to 2 ago	2 to 5 ago	5 or more ago	Free up main campus space	Consolidate one or more operations	Move preservation/conservation operations to a purpose-built facility	Move noncore operations off site	Major renovations in current facility
	1	3	6	3	1	4	2	3

* More than one reason possible

intended to consolidate 2 or more preservation operations. In some instances the move off campus was or will be caused by a renovation of the current facility. Unfortunately, the survey failed to clarify whether the 9 potential or planned moves were permanent or temporary. The temporary nature of 2 units' moves off campus became clear during the follow-up interviews.

Despite the small sample size, some observations can be made about the frequency and move circumstances data that were gathered. These observations could be helpful to readers who are currently discussing a move of their preservation units and even for those librarians who have not yet had to consider the possibility of moving their units off campus. When faced with a challenge, many libraries look to comparable libraries that have faced similar difficult situations, were successful, and can serve as models.

Findings and Analysis of Data for Preservation Units Moved Off Campus

Background Information on the 10 Off Campus Preservation Units

Ten respondents had moved their preservation operations away from the main library prior to completing this survey. Because these respondents had completed their moves and had firsthand knowledge of the consequences of establishing off campus facilities for preservation functions, the author conducted follow-up interviews. Topics addressed in these interviews expanded on the survey categories of background, collection maintenance, security, employee recruitment and retention, and advantages and challenges. These interviews supported the additional objective of the research: to collect effective practices in the survey categories that would be

made available via this paper to provide guidance to other preservation units as they plan for a move off campus.

Each library had a specific circumstance surrounding its particular move. Of the 10 who reported a move off campus, two clarified that those moves had been temporary. Library E moved its standalone preservation unit off campus more than five years ago. However, due to budget cuts over time that diminished the number of staff assigned to preservation, the unit was disbanded, remaining were staff moved back to the main library, and all preservation functions were distributed across the libraries. The preservation unit at library D moved to several rooms in the administration building of the theatre department while the main library was renovated and moved back into the main library after the construction was complete. For the purposes of this research, these 2 participants reported how their preservation operations functioned while located off campus. Summary data for these 10 respondents' preservation units and libraries are presented in appendix B.

Nine of the MPUs that moved away from the main campus library are (or were, in the case of an MPU that moved on a temporary basis) collocated with a book storage facility. Libraries may locate a MPU close to a large collection of library materials for several reasons. The location may be in a new facility in which space for a MPU can be purpose-built, being close to a large legacy collection may be advantageous, or the off-site library facility may simply be cheaper in terms of cost per square foot.

The MPU was defined as the unit within the library responsible for the majority of preservation-related functions. This definition was provided in the survey. The 10 possible preservation functions listed in question 7 were determined by the author after examining numerous preservation unit websites. Table 2 indicates that many activities traditionally associated with MPUs are being handled outside that main

Table 2. Responsibility for Preservation Functions ($N = 10$)

Function	Main preservation unit	Other unit	Not applicable; function not performed
Commercial library binding	7	3	0
Book repair (care of the circulating collections)	9	1	0
Conservation (care for materials in special collections)	8	2	0
HVAC monitoring	5	5	0
Disaster preparedness, response, and recovery	8	1	1
Digital preservation	3	7	0
Physical processing (may include affixing barcodes, tattletape, call numbers, stamps)	4	6	0
Shelving	2	8	0
Education and training/advocacy	9	1	0
Scanning/digitization	2	8	0

Table 3. Physical Location of Preservation Functions (N = 10)

Function	Main library	Off site, not located with collections	Off site, located with collections	Mix of on campus and off site locations
Commercial library binding	3	0	5	2
Book repair (care of the circulating collections)	2	1	6	1
Conservation (care for materials in Special Collections)	0	2	5	3
HVAC monitoring	4	0	4	2
Disaster preparedness, response and recovery	3	0	5	2
Digital preservation	3	0	3	4
Physical processing (may include affixing barcodes, tattletape, call numbers, stamps)	4	0	5	1
Education and training/advocacy	2	1	4	3
Scanning/digitization	4	0	4	2

unit. These include monitoring humidity, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), commercial library binding, physical processing, shelving, and scanning and digitization. Library units outside the MPU that handle traditional preservation functions include acquisitions, facilities, library information technology, imaging center, technical services, special collections, and the digital library. Whether these activities are being handled outside the MPU because of the move off campus or for other reasons is not clear.

Table 3 contains information regarding the physical location of many preservation-related operations. Included is information on preservation support for both circulating and special collections materials. Follow-up interview questions about location for the 10 preservation librarians whose units had moved off campus covered topics such as security, timeliness, efficiencies, care and handling while collections were being transported, and the implications of these on collection management and security.

Collection Maintenance

Another topic of concern for preservation staff faced with relocation is the effect the move would have on the types of preservation-related services (identified as “collection maintenance” in the survey) offered to the library system. Responses to survey question 20 on types of services provided to the library for various preservation functions after moving off campus are listed in table 4. The information provided by the 10 respondents suggests that the collection maintenance services provided when a preservation unit moves off campus remains unchanged for most functions.

Security and Transportation Considerations

Although an ever-increasing percentage of library materials

is now purchased or available in electronic format, the number of print volumes that must be managed physically each day by human hands is still significant in many ARL member libraries. New and previously acquired materials move between all areas of the library, from the mail room to acquisitions, from acquisitions to cataloging, from cataloging to preservation, from preservation to the stacks, and from the stacks or special collections directly to preservation. One of the main concerns faced by preservation departments that are geographically distant from the main campus is transferring materials safely between multiple locations. The movement of circulating and special collections materials is discussed below.

Security and Transportation Considerations for Circulating Collections

Transporting large quantities of circulating collection materials safely and efficiently can be a challenge particularly in the typical multibranch structure common in ARL organizations. Damaged materials sent to a conservation unit for repair, newly purchased materials heading to a preservation unit for treatment before being shelved, and loose periodical issues sent for commercial binding are just three of the categories of circulating collections that require intralibrary transportation.

Although reduced in recent years because of the move to electronic journals and the poor economy, the amount of personnel and fiscal resources dedicated to commercial library binding operations still can be considerable. Seven of the commercial library binding operations reported to the main preservation unit; the remaining 3 reported elsewhere. Of the 7 MPUs that are directly responsible for commercial binding operations, 5 reported that they process binding at their off-site facility, 2 reported placement of

Table 4. Extent to Which Levels of Services Have Changed ($N = 10$)

Function	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the same	No applicable; function not performed
Commercial library binding	0	1	9	0
Book repair (care of the circulating collections)	0	2	8	0
Conservation (care for materials in Special Collections)	2	0	7	1
HVAC monitoring	0	0	9	1
Disaster preparedness, response and recovery	2	1	7	0
Digital preservation	3	0	5	2
Physical processing (may include affixing barcodes, tattletape, call numbers, stamps)	0	1	9	0
Education and training/advocacy	2	2	6	0
Scanning/digitization	2	0	7	1

their commercial binding operation at the main library, and I split the work between the main building and the off-site facility. Several of the questions asked during the follow-up interviews focused on the implications of having the loose periodical issues at the main library while the staff performing the majority of the binding operations may be located at the off-site facility.

The commercial binding workflows at all 10 libraries that indicated their preservation department was located off-site were different but with enough similarities to begin to gather a set of effective practices for distributed binding operations. The 7 MPUs who exercised administrative authority over their commercial binding operations each had a slightly different workflow in place. In 5 libraries, nonpreservation staff in the main library pulled, packed, and transported periodical materials to the off-site facility for processing by preservation staff. Library I had one preservation staff member who was located at the main library and was responsible for both pulling and processing. Library D, a unit that moved off-site on a temporary basis, assigned preservation staff to work on campus two days per week pulling loose periodicals and damaged monographic materials and work the other three days at the off campus facility performing the remaining processing. Damaged circulating monographs needing treatment were generally boxed by access services staff at the main library and shipped to the off-site facility. In 4 instances, the acquisitions or cataloging departments or both were located in the off-site facility with the preservation unit, so that newly acquired or cataloged monographs needing conservation or binding could be retrieved by preservation staff using book trucks.

The amount of library materials that needs to be transported between the main library and the off-site facility before and after commercial binding can be considerable. The preservation officer from library H indicated that his

staff used plastic totes with nonlocking hinged lids to move loose periodicals from the main library to the commercial library binding operation and to move newly bound periodicals back to the main campus. The problem of storing hundreds of plastic shipping totes between shipments was a significant issue for his department. When asked if he could use book trucks, he reported that the loading docks at both the main library and the off-site facility were not covered and materials had gotten wet while being removed from the library delivery van during rain. He decided that while the totes were difficult to store when not in use, the safety of the materials was too important to compromise. He also noted that slow turnaround time of materials coming back from the bindery to be reshelved could be a public service issue and that using the totes was faster than using book trucks with either bungee cords or stretch plastic wrap.

While one library placed loose periodicals on book trucks, wrapped them in stretch wrap, and rolled the trucks into and out of a shuttle van under the control of the library, other libraries used plastic, hinged-lid totes, usually to protect the volumes from rain, snow, or sleet damage. In summary, binding workflows for the 7 movers who are organizationally responsible for their libraries' commercial binding operations tend to use nonpreservation staff to pull the loose issues and send them to the off-site facility for processing by preservation staff. Most used hinged-lid plastic totes.

Security and Transportation Considerations for Special Collections Materials

Data in table 3 indicate that in all cases conservation services for special collections materials are located away from the main library. Moving materials needing any level of preservation treatment between the main library and the off-site facility can be a major workflow and resource issue.

Unlike circulating materials, security for rare and valuable items is vital. In many instances, the amount of resources expended to transport special collections materials safely between the main library and the off-site facility is tremendous. Discussions during the follow-up interviews on moving these materials focused on two areas: (1) the kinds of housing used to pack the materials in order to protect them during the transfer process and (2) how the materials, once packed for transport, were moved.

Appropriate housing of special collections materials during transport depends on the materials themselves. Materials can range from regular book-like materials to huge rolled maps and blueprints. One library used a variety of totes, boxes, and padded bags depending on materials being transported. In another, the preservation officer traveled to the main campus and packed the material using bubble wrap and double-walled cardboard boxes, if asked by the collection manager. Another library did not provide special packing materials for transporting special collections materials and used regular cardboard boxes, while another wrapped rare and unique materials in bubble wrap and placed the items in locking plastic bins. The rest of the respondents stated that packaging for transport depended on the item and was decided on a case-by-case basis.

Once packaged, the special collections materials need to be transported from the main library to the off-site facility and returned after treatment. Based on the follow-up interviews, transportation options for rare materials generally fall into three categories: a shuttle service, a personal vehicle, or a mix of both. The preservation department at library B is located in the same facility as the regional depository. Staff transfer materials, both circulating and special, in a shuttle operated by the library twice a day. The van is driven either by preservation or depository staff or, rarely, students. At library G, normal special collections materials are moved by a shuttle operated by the university on a thirty-minute route connecting libraries. If collection managers are particularly concerned about an item they call the preservation librarian, and she meets the van personally to bring materials directly to preservation rather than having the item delivered to the off-site facility mailroom. However, if an item is especially valuable, the associate dean for Technical Services will hand-carry the item to the off-site facility in his personal car.

Library J has a long-standing special collections transfer policy. According to the policy, two people in a personal car transport rare materials between the main library and off-site facility. One must remain with the item at all times. Usually one is the relevant collection manager and the other is a conservation staff member. The preservation officer indicated that this can be a hardship for her staff and she has tried to revise the policy, but at this time the policy is still enforced. Materials going to the preservation department at library H are transported via a regularly scheduled shuttle operated

by the library or the personal car of the selector. Finally, at library F, where the off-site facility is only a ten minute walk from the main library, collection managers will drive or walk to deliver rare books or manuscripts needing treatment.

Library A had a unique system to transport rare materials between the main building and the off-site facility, which was more than thirty minutes away due to distance and traffic patterns. The preservation librarian instituted a "Rare Book Run" every Wednesday as requested by the selector. As long as enough notice was given by the selector, a two-driver shuttle associated with the parent organization would drive to campus, pick up the materials from the administration office, and bring them directly to the preservation department. If in any given week no selector requested a pickup, the run was not held. If it was raining and a pickup had been scheduled, the run was cancelled and automatically rescheduled for the next week. The system has been in place for several years and works very well.

During these interviews, the author learned that as the value, size, and complexity of the materials to be transferred increased, the special collections transfer policies became more focused and specific. Effective practice in this area seems to be a mix of shuttles operated by the library and personal cars, particularly depending on the rarity and value of the materials needing treatment.

Numerous other factors discussed during interviews affected the collection maintenance and security of those 10 preservation units that moved off-site. The desire to carefully track the physical location of materials, especially rare and valuable items, was strong when materials had to travel outside of the main library building. Of the 8 preservation librarians who responded to the survey questions regarding how special collections materials are moving between the main library and the off-site preservation facility, 7 indicated that an online method, usually the integrated library system, was used to track the movement of the materials. One used paper forms.

Also discussed was the amount of material damaged or lost during the transfer process. While no preservation librarian reported anything being damaged during transfer, several did concede that loss of collections was inevitable because of the large volume of the work moving into and out of their facilities. The interviewed librarians did not have data on lost or misplaced materials.

During the interviews, respondents made the following observations about collection maintenance and security:

- The library (or parent institution) insurance policy should cover the movement of materials in personal cars.
- Having oversized doors throughout the off campus facility is valuable for ease of moving materials on pallets.

- Ensuring that a large freeze dryer or a walk-in freezer available in the off campus facility to facilitate treatment of wet or moldy materials is desirable.
- Ready access to the best loading dock possible is essential.

Staff Recruitment and Retention

Another major concern of the author upon learning of her unit's planned move off-site was the effect it would have on her staff and student workforce. Many preservation departments depend heavily on student labor to support and back up their fulltime staff. Question 27, "Is hiring student labor harder, easier, or the same now that you are located off campus?" aimed to address this concern. Of the 9 respondents who answered the question, 5 indicated it was harder, 3 indicated that it was the same, and 1 reported that hiring students was easier because the pay rate for students was so much higher off campus. Many student employees work for short shifts, perhaps two hours or less, during their school day. If they now have to walk an extra fifteen minutes or take a twenty-minute round-trip shuttle ride to get to work, their availability could change dramatically. The assistant dean for Collections and Access at 1 library reported that her library has some trouble recruiting students because they needed to have a car to get to the depository where the preservation unit was located. Another preservation librarian noted that, while her unit is not located near the main library, it is near a residential neighborhood heavily populated by students. A significant percent of her student workers live very close to her facility. For the two years that library D was off campus, the preservation librarian employed a fairly nontraditional student worker structure. He wrote,

We started altering the schedules of our student worker contingent a couple of semesters before we departed campus. We went from fifteen students working short shifts in Shelf Preparation, Commercial Binding, and Conservation to just three or four working longer shifts. They specialized less in one of those three areas so that they could be shared. Minimum shifts were three hours, but some would work eight-hour shifts a day or two a week when schedules allowed.

The preservation librarian at another library wrote,

We are now one mile from the main campus, about a five minute drive, plus parking. There is a metro train, which the students can ride for free with a pass (but requires a five minute walk up at the main campus end to get to and from the train) as well as some shuttles. To just walk between the two

campuses takes about fifteen minutes. We don't get the "in between class" students much anymore (like we used to when on the main campus). Students tend to work fewer hours/week, although there are exceptions. Also, it is our observation that students try to schedule longer shifts because we are at a distance. Often this is not convenient for us. A number of students will not consider taking a job here at our end [of the campus] because of the distance.

Pay rate was also a key factor in student worker availability and retention. Question 28 asked if pay rates for students were the same or higher after the move off campus. Of the 9 respondents, 5 indicated that pay levels remained the same while 4 reported that they increased their student pay rate in response to difficulties filling student positions once off campus. Typical increases were between \$1 and \$2 per hour. Staff at 1 library decided to abandon the practice of hiring student workers entirely. Three preservation departments located on campuses that also had library schools had no trouble getting student workers, particularly for their conservation lab, because many library school students wanted to gain experience in the preservation department.

Transportation of staff and students also is a tremendously important issue. Staff and students at the 10 off-site preservation departments employed a variety of transportation methods, including personal cars, shuttles, walking, bikes, and public transportation. The main aspect of transportation discussed during the interviews was getting both staff and student employees back and forth between locations in a timely manner. Walking in pleasant weather was mentioned as a frequent choice for off-site facilities that were one mile or less from the main library. If the distance was not too great, bicycling was an option for both staff and students. When asked how preservation department staff members traveled to the main library during the work day, 7 reported that they used their personal cars. Many interviewees mentioned that while parking at the facility was relatively easy, parking a personal car on campus could be difficult. Several respondents indicated that when they parked their personal cars on campus, they used a special parking pass provided to them by library administration.

Having a shuttle bus, generally under the authority of the library, was frequently mentioned as a popular option for transporting both staff and student workers between the main library and the off-site facility. Having the shuttle operated by the library allows for the best possible use by library employees, particularly in the areas of frequency of the shuttle and the placement of the stops. Obviously, having the library operate the shuttle has significant implications, cost being the main issue. The preservation librarian at library H was on a committee that set up the shuttle system, and he noted that during off-peak times, carrying one library

staff member one way could cost as much as \$12. In many instances, the library shuttle transports people and collection materials at the same time. In 2 instances where the preservation unit and the book storage facility were in the same building, preservation staff could easily “catch a ride” back to the main library in the van used by depository staff to move materials back and forth.

In the area of employee recruitment and retention for off-site facilities, some effective practices are emerging. Those preservation departments moving off campus might consider raising their standard wage by at least \$1 to attract a sufficient labor pool. They also might think about the implications of having fewer workers who each work more hours per shift. If a discussion regarding the implications of operating a library shuttle service between the facility and the main library has not already begun, the preservation librarian might want to suggest that such a conversation be added to the planning agenda.

Advantages and Challenges

All 10 units that had moved off-site indicated significant advantages with this change. These advantages included a cleaner, larger space than previously occupied; a space better suited to preservation functions, particularly for conservation; a quieter space with fewer disruptions; closer working relationships either within preservation or with other occupants of the off-site facility; and easier access to parking. The preservation librarian at library H indicated that his staff loved being off campus. Several respondents noted that close physical proximity to other technical services departments, particularly cataloging and acquisitions, was beneficial. The amount of interactions between these 3 units can be significant, and being able to discuss a matter face-to-face can be very helpful. The location of cataloging and acquisitions units, compared to preservation, was discussed by 9 of the 10 respondents that had moved. Four preservation departments were not located in the same facility as cataloging and acquisitions unit, while 5 were collocated with these units in the same off campus building.

Another advantage all 8 preservation departments that moved off campus permanently enjoyed was proximity to their book storage facility. Several respondents noted that being in or near the book storage facility allowed for quick and easy review of a significant portion of their collection. The preservation librarian at library J noted, “We are on the spot for issues that develop in the remote storage stacks.” The librarian at library F felt that because much of library administration and staff is at the main campus, the opportunities for individual initiative are greater.

One of the last topics covered in the follow-up interviews was the challenge of communication with staff at the main library. Eight of the 9 respondents in this section noted lack

of visibility as an issue, more than half selected the “out of the loop” response, and one-third noted a drop in planned and impromptu tours of the department. Below are quotes that are pertinent to communication challenges:

- “It was easy to lose the connection to the main library.”
- “It was easy to be out of mind.”
- “Lost the politics of meeting people in the hallway.”
- “Takes much more effort and planning to attend meetings.”
- “Less opportunity for quick, in-the-hall consultations or instant solutions to small problems.”

While acknowledging the seriousness of these issues, respondents offered numerous possible solutions. Five of the respondents felt that increased use of face-to-face meetings could counteract some of the communication problems faced by off-site preservation departments. Other options included using more conference calls, making more of an effort to have main library staff visit the preservation unit, and using Web 2.0 technologies. One preservation librarian posted a quarterly report of activities within the unit and updated a department blog weekly. Several respondents indicated that they made a concerted effort to attend informal functions at the main library, such as forums and brown bag lunches, which they might not have attended if they worked in the main library. One librarian made a point to bring the entire preservation staff to two or three library events a year. He mentioned that while he traveled to the main library at least three times a week, some of his staff rarely did. He felt that walking in as a group of eight people left a memorable and positive impression on others at the events.

Several respondents indicated that schedules for standing meetings at the main library often were shifted to allow attendees from off-site locations to arrive or leave according to the shuttle schedule. One librarian observed that “travel time between lab and main campus creates much wasted time in the day.” She highly recommended that, if possible, the preservation unit keep a small foothold at the main library. She had a desk with a computer and a phone in the main library where she could sit and work while waiting for the shuttle. Others mentioned that time that otherwise might be wasted waiting for and riding on shuttles can be used wisely if one always carries some professional reading along or checks work e-mail on a Web-enabled phone.

Other challenges were noted by respondents during the follow-up calls. The senior associate dean for the libraries at one library mentioned that “the interactions between the preservation group and library selectors were difficult since selectors didn’t have the time to visit the facility.” This issue also was noted by another preservation librarian. This library solved the reluctance of selectors to travel off-site by establishing and obtaining selector approval of a brittle book

retention policy and set of selection criteria applied by preservation staff on all brittle books. Selectors were no longer asked for their retention decision for each individual title.

Effective Practices

Through follow-up interviews with the 10 respondents who had either temporarily or permanently moved off campus, a set of effective practices for preservation departments located off campus emerged:

- Safely transporting circulating collection materials between the main library and the off-site preservation department using a system of plastic totes with hinged lids materialized as a consensus of effective practice.
- Commercial library binding operations can be located effectively in more than one location, with nonpreservation staff gathering loose issues on campus and sending them to the off-site location, where they are processed by preservation staff.
- Effective practice in the area of transporting special collections materials is a combination of shuttles operated by the libraries and personal cars, with significant selector oversight, depending on the rarity and value of the materials needing treatment. No effective practices emerged regarding the housing of special materials during transportation. Most housing decisions were made on a case-by-case basis.
- Paying student workers between \$1 and \$2 more per hour to work in the preservation department, cross-training, and changing shift lengths can help with hiring and retention.
- Regularly scheduled transportation options, usually a library-operated shuttle service, allows for timely travel between library facilities and helps maintain professional working relationships.
- Respondents strongly advocated “staying in the loop” by regularly attending campus meetings, going to informal functions such as brown bag lunches, and using Web 2.0 technologies.

Areas for Further Study and Conclusions

The author advocates conducting this or a similar survey again in ten years to determine if ARL preservation departments are continuing to move off-site, if sufficient time has passed to establish best practices in the field of off campus preservation unit operations, and the effect, if any, that library space planning efforts have on preservation units. A related future study might survey ARL libraries about which operations, if any, had moved off campus, why they were moved, and what

the effects of the move were on services.

The two research objectives of this paper were to gather and present findings of a survey on the frequency, circumstances, and consequences of moving preservation departments away from the main campus library and offer effective practices that could inform others who are faced with operating a geographically distant preservation department. Data on the frequency of potential, planned, and completed moves suggest that the rate of preservation units moving off campus has held steady and is possibly increasing. Circumstances surrounding off campus moves centered around freeing up main campus space, consolidating operations, and moving to a purpose-built facility.

The survey data suggest that moving a preservation unit off campus has consequences, including issues of security, transportation, and employee recruitment and retention, which need to be carefully and thoughtfully addressed. While advantages and challenges to being away from the main library were noted, the 10 preservation departments who completed a permanent off-site move were able to work through the challenges using effective practices while keeping the quantity of work produced by the unit relatively stable. This is welcome news for those preservation librarians who are actively planning or in discussion of a potential move, as well as for those preservation librarians who may face an off campus move in the future.

References

1. Jean Dickinson, Charity K. Martin, and Margaret Mering, “Falling In and Out of Love: The Impact of Moving to a Remote Location on Cataloging Workflow,” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 47, no. 3 (July 2003): 125–31.
2. *Ibid.*, 130.
3. Priscilla R. Williams et al., “Relocation or Dislocation: Optimizing Change in Technical Services,” *Technical Services Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (2002): 13–27.
4. Jane K. Olsgaard, “Relocation, Reorganization, Retrenchment,” *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services* 24, no. 3 (Fall 2000): 426–28.
5. Stephanie S. Atkins and Jennifer Hain Teper, “Survey of Library Practices in Planning and Managing Temporary Moves,” *Collection Management* 30, no. 4 (2005): 59–84.
6. Gordon Rowley and Ivan Hanthorn, “Designing a Conservation Treatment Facility: Charting a Course into a Less Familiar Region of Planning for Libraries,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 2 (Mar. 1996): 97–104.
7. Williams et al., “Relocation or Dislocation,” 14.
8. Tricia Kelly, “Where Is My Team? A Manager’s Point of View on Working with a Team of Remote Information Specialists,” *Quarterly Bulletin of the International Association of Agricultural Information Specialists* 50, no. 3/4 (2005): 119–24.
9. Frank Siebdrat, Martin Hoegl, and Holger Ernst, “How to Manage Virtual Teams,” *MIT Sloan Management Review* 50,

- no. 4 (Summer 2009): 63–68.
10. Ibid., 66.
11. Martha Kryillidou and Les Bland., eds., *ARL Preservation Statistics 2006–2007* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2009): 5, www.arl.org/bm~doc/pres07.pdf (accessed Feb. 7, 2010).
12. Don A. Dillman, *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method* (Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley, 2007).

Appendix A. Survey of Informed Consent

1. *PLEASE READ THIS CONSENT DOCUMENT CAREFULLY BEFORE YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

When Preservation moves off campus survey

We invite you to participate in a study designed to gather data on the possibility and frequency of moves off campus of library preservation departments and the consequences of establishing these facilities on collection maintenance, security, employee recruitment and retention, and communication. The data will be analyzed to identify trends so that relevant findings may assist in departmental moves in the future. The outcomes of this research may be applicable to other technical services functions that are moved off campus such as cataloging and acquisitions.

This study consists of completing a short survey which will take approximately 15 minutes. Approximately 100 librarians associated with the ARL preservation functions will be surveyed.

The responses to the survey will be kept completely confidential to the extent provided by law. All responses are accessed solely by the researchers involved in this study. Your responses will only be used for purposes directly pertaining to this study. Your responses are not accessible by other participants in the study.

Your participation is completely voluntary; there is no penalty for non-participation. Further, you may withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. There is no compensation to you for participating in the study. There are no anticipated physical, psychological or economic risks or benefits associated with participation in this study.

If you have any questions or comments about this research, please contact: Principal Investigator: Cathy Martyniak, Library Preservation, Room 7, Smathers Library East, Phone: (352) 273-2830, email cmook@ufl.edu.

For questions or comments about the research participants' rights, please contact: UFIRB Office, P.O. Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250, Phone (352) 392-0433

I have read the procedure described above, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

- Agree
 Disagree

2. *Name of person filling out the survey? _____
3. *Title of person filling out the survey? _____
4. *Name of College/University/Library that employs you? _____
5. May we contact you for follow-up information if necessary? If so please provide an email address or a telephone number here. _____
6. *Please describe preservation activities at your library
- Preservation activities at our library, such as commercial library binding or conservation/book repair, are coordinated by a distinct Preservation administrative unit that is separately staffed, funded and administered. This structure would traditionally be called a Preservation Department or a Preservation Unit.
- There is no stand alone preservation unit at our library. Preservation activities at our library, such as commercial library binding or conservation/book repair, are coordinated by a unit other than a Preservation unit. For instance, the commercial library binding operation is managed by Acquisitions staff or book repair is managed by Special Collections staff.
- Little to no preservation activities, such as commercial library binding or book repair, are undertaken at our library.

For the purposes of this survey, the phrase main preservation unit will be used to denote the unit within the library responsible for the majority of preservation activities.

7. *Which unit is responsible for which preservation functions at your library?

	Main Preservation Unit	Other Unit	Not applicable; we do not perform that function at this library
Commercial Library Binding			
Book Repair (care of the circulating collections)			
Conservation (care for materials in Special Collections)			
HVAC monitoring			
Disaster preparedness, response and recovery			
Digital Preservation			
Physical Processing (may include affixing barcodes, tattletapes and call number, stamping)			
Shelving			
Education and Training/Advocacy			
Scanning/Digitization			
If "Other Unit" selected for any above, please describe here:			

8. Size of print collection for which the main preservation unit is responsible?
 Up to 500,000 bound volumes
 500,001 to 2 million bound volumes
 2 million to 5 million bound volumes
 Over 5 million bound volumes
9. Annual budget for all preservation functions, regardless of which unit within the library performs them?
 Less than \$50,000
 \$50,001 to \$150,000
 \$150,001 to \$500,000
 Over \$500,001
10. Number of FTE staff in the main preservation unit? (Please include both professional and support staff.)
 1-2
 3-4
 5-6
 7 or more
11. *Physical location of main preservation unit?
 Library on main campus
 Off site facility with no book storage
 Off site facility with significant amounts of book storage
 Other (please describe) _____
12. *The main preservation unit _____.
 Moved in the past from main campus to an off campus location, in whole or in part
 Has definite plans to move
 Is in discussion of a move in the future
 Has no plans to move
13. *When will/might the main preservation unit move?
 0 to 2 years
 2 or more years

14. *Why was/is this move planned? (Please select all that apply.)
- Financial savings
 - Free up main campus space
 - Consolidate more than one preservation/conservation operation
 - Move preservation/conservation services to better/purposefully designed facility
 - Part of movement of all non-core library functions to off site locations
 - Loss of current facility
 - Major renovations in current facility
 - Other (please describe) _____
15. *Has the main preservation unit, in whole or in part, moved off campus?
- Yes
 - No
16. *When did your main preservation unit move?
- 0 to 2 years ago
 - 2 to 5 years ago
 - More than 5 years ago
17. *Did the entire main preservation unit move off campus?
- Yes
 - No
18. Current physical placement of preservation functions:

	Main Library	Off site with no books	Off site with books	Mix of on campus and off site	Not applicable, we do not perform that function at this library
Commercial Library Binding					
Book Repair (circulating collections)					
Conservation (Special Collections care)					
HVAC monitoring					
Disaster preparedness, response and recovery					
Digital Preservation					
Physical Processing (affixing barcodes, tattletapes and call number, stamping)					
Education and Training/Advocacy					
Scanning/Digitization					

19. What percent of the staff assigned to the main preservation unit moved off campus?
- 100%
 - 50 to 99%
 - 0% to 49%
20. The level of services provided to the library for the following preservation functions have _____ since the move. (Please limit your answers to changes caused by the move.)

	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same	Not Applicable
Commercial Library Binding				
Book Repair (circulating collections)				
Conservation (Special Collections care)				
HVAC monitoring				
Disaster preparedness, response and recovery				
Digital Preservation				
Physical Processing (affixing barcodes, tattletapes and call number, stamping)				
Education and Training/Advocacy				
Scanning/Digitization				

21. *Do rare, unique and valuable library materials move back and forth between the main library and the preservation off site facility?
 Yes
 No
22. Briefly, how are the materials packaged for shipment?

23. How are the materials transported? (Please select all that apply.)
 Library vehicle
 Personal vehicle
 Other (please describe) _____
24. Who drives the vehicle used to transport rare materials? (Please select all that apply.)
 Preservation staff member
 Non-preservation staff member
 Other (please describe) _____
25. How are the materials tracked?
 Loaned to Preservation/Conservation in integrated library system
 Loaned to Special collection/Rare Books in integrated library system
 They are not tracked
 Other (please describe) _____
26. *Have any items in your collection been lost or sustained significant damage as a result of being transported?
 No
 Yes (please describe) _____
27. Since moving off campus, is hiring and retention of student workers:
 Harder
 Easier
 The same
 If you selected harder or easier above, can you please describe why here?

28. In order to retain student workers, do you find you need to pay them:
 The same as main campus
 More (If more, please describe how much more.)
29. Regarding dependability (i.e., Attendance) of student workers: Are they _____ then when they worked on campus?
 More dependable
 Less dependable
 About the same level of dependability
30. How does your staff get to the main preservation unit? (Please select all that apply.)
 Drive their own car
 Use public transportation
 Use library shuttle
 Walk
 Other (please describe) _____
31. How do your student workers get to the main preservation unit? (Please select all that apply.)
 Drive their own car
 Use public transportation
 Use library shuttle
 Walk
 Other (please describe) _____
32. Is there parking available at your off site location?
 Yes
 No

33. If main preservation unit staff need to go to main campus, how do they get there? (Please select all that apply.)
- Drive their own car
 - Use public transportation
 - Use library shuttle
 - Walk
 - Other (please describe) _____
34. Are there any advantages to having your main preservation unit located off campus?
- Yes
 - No
 - If yes, please describe. _____
35. Please list any challenges the main preservation unit has faced due to the move off campus. (Please select all that apply.)
- Lack of visibility
 - Felt forgotten
 - No longer in the loop
 - Lack of consultation
 - Not as many drop in or planned tours, so not as much publicity for the Department
 - Other (please describe) _____
36. If the main preservation unit was faced with communication issues after the move, how were they resolved? (Please select all that apply.)
- Communication was not an issue after the move
 - Increased use of conference calls
 - Inviting others to come to Preservation for more visits
 - Video conferencing
 - Increased frequency of face to face meetings on campus
 - Other (please describe) _____
37. Do you feel your role as an advocate for preservation has changed since you moved off campus?
- More successful as an advocate for preservation of the collections
 - Less successful as an advocate for preservation of the collections
 - About the same
38. Is there anything else about your off campus move experience that would be helpful for the surveyor to know?

Thank you for participating in our survey. I appreciate your time and energy.

Cathy Martyniak
cathy@uflib.ufl.edu

Appendix B. Summary Data for Main Preservation Units (MPU) that Moved Off Campus

Library code	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Preservation department type	Stand alone	Stand alone	Distributed	Stand alone	Stand alone	Stand alone	Stand alone	Stand alone	Stand alone	Stand alone
Collection size (millions)*	1.5	2.9	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.2	5.6	6.3	8.7	9.1
Annual preservation budget (U.S. dollars)	50,001 to 150,000	150,001 to 500,000	50,001 to 150,000	\$150,001 to \$500,000	No response available	50,001 to 150,000	150,001 to 500,000	Over 500,001	Over 500,001	Over 500,001
Number of staff within preservation unit	1-2	3-4	3-4	5-6	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	7 or more	7 or more
MPU collocated with book storage	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, from 2006-09 No, from 2009 on	Yes	Yes
Year of move	2008	1998	1999	2004	2000	2001	2002	2006	2002	2005
Distance to main campus library (miles)	10	5	12	2	1	1	3	2	2	.75
Location of preservation functions	All off site	All off site	Split	All off site	All off site	All off site	All off site	All off site	Split	All off site
Notes	MPU was ½ mile from library from 1970s to 2008		Special collections conservation lab located in off-site facility with books	Temporary move due to renovation of main library	Preservation unit was disbanded and off-site location now used only for books	Major renovation of main library, preservation unit moved off site		Major renovation, 2006-09 with books, 2nd move, no books	Binding at main, two conservation locations	Some off site since 1982, all off site now

* Martha Kryllidou and Les Bland., eds., *ARL Preservation Statistics 2006-2007* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2009), www.arl.org/bm-oc/pres07.pdf (accessed Feb. 7, 2010).