

Preservation Workshop Evaluation

Christine Wiseman and Sharla Darby

Preservation education programs are increasingly focused on the impact of training on improving and implementing preservation practices in cultural institutions. In spring 1996, the Southeastern Library Network's (SOLINET) Preservation Services launched a Workshop Follow-Up program designed to measure the effects of training, provide ongoing support, and develop a long-term ongoing mechanism for evaluating workshop effectiveness. After collecting more than three years of qualitative and quantitative data, the study found that 94% of the follow-up program participants performed some type of action to improve the care of their institution's collections in the months following the workshop. In addition, the program created an atmosphere that encouraged participants to use workshop information to effect change in their institution and to contact SOLINET for further assistance. In fact, information and referral queries received by Preservation Services increased during this period due to questions generated from the follow-up contacts. Participants continually express appreciation about being contacted after the workshop, which serves as a reminder of the importance of preservation activities.

Continuing education in library and archives preservation is essential. It strengthens staff's knowledge base, improves on and teaches new skills, and provides up-to-date information about new developments in the profession. The high demand for preservation training is apparent from the many listings for single and multiday workshops, intensive institutes, coordinated workshop series, conferences, seminars, and distance education courses advertised in the preservation literature. With the proliferation of new technologies and the additional demands for scarce resources, the need for training is unlikely to diminish. Continuing education for preservation professionals is offered by a wide variety of organizations including regional conservation centers, bibliographic networks, library and information science schools, and state, local, and regional associations.

Training is costly both from the perspective of the provider and the learner. Attending a workshop often requires travel, time off from work, and a registration fee. The effectiveness of preservation training in conveying new skills and improving preservation practices at the institutional level has not been thoroughly examined in the preservation literature. It is equally important for training providers to ascertain the value of their training, as it is for consumers of training to justify the time and expense required.

Preservation education programs are recently being required by funding sources to determine their impact on improving and implementing institutional preservation practices. There is no existing model for measuring the effectiveness of continuing education in the library preservation field. The need for more systematic evaluation programs, however, is recognized in the field of adult education (Garavaglia 1993; Smith and Delahaye 1983). Although there is a great deal of information on evaluation, including program models, in-depth evaluation programs are rarely implemented due to time and financial constraints (Brookfield 1976; Campbell and Cheek 1989). Furthermore, many of the exist-

Christine Wiseman (christine_wiseman@solinet.net) is Preservation Education Officer at the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET) in Atlanta.

Sharla Darby (sharla_richards@hotmail.com) is Senior Librarian at Tucson-Pima Public Library in Arizona, and was Preservation Field Service Officer at SOLINET from 1995 to 1998 during the research and implementation of this project.

Manuscript received March 22, 2000; accepted for publication August 28, 2000.

ing models are derived from secondary school settings and are not necessarily applicable to adult learning environments or specifically to preservation continuing education (Brookfield 1976).

A 1991 survey in England rated the value of short courses for the continuing professional development of librarians. Respondents gave low ratings for immediate application of skills taught at the workshop (Okey et al. 1992). Respondents were not successful in applying what they learned during the months following the workshop. They set work objectives, but there was no continued support provided to aid in meeting those objectives.

Project Background

In spring 1996, the Preservation Services program at SOLINET launched a Workshop Follow-Up program (funded in part by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities) designed to measure the effects of training at the institutional level. The three goals of the Workshop Follow-Up are:

- to provide ongoing support and information to workshop participants as they try to modify institutional behavior to effect change;
- to provide Field Services staff with a long-term, ongoing mechanism for evaluating workshop effectiveness and to make modifications as necessary; and
- to promote and strengthen the network of competent preservation practitioners in the Southeast.

SOLINET Preservation Services regards the provision of ongoing assistance to individual workshop participants as a crucial component of preservation education. It facilitates the integration of preservation practices into ongoing routines in order to promote institutional change.

As suggested above, the adult learning literature recognizes the importance and also the challenges of providing follow-up after training. Well-organized training programs include appropriate content that is professionally presented. However, post-training follow-up activities, while necessary, are seldom undertaken (Campbell and Cheek 1989). The primary challenge is to provide training that results in increased job performance. A central goal of SOLINET's follow-up program is to devise a means for gauging the impact of training programs at the institutional level. Requiring learners to establish specific objectives is emphasized in the adult education literature as effective criteria for evaluation (Brookfield 1976). Another key element is to involve the support of the learner's supervisor. Without this support, it is very difficult to transfer newly acquired skills to the workplace (Campbell and Cheek

1989). Supervisory input is necessary to ensure that participants choose realistic, attainable objectives. For these reasons, SOLINET's Workshop Follow-Up program requires participants to set objectives (related to the workshop content) for the months following the session. They are also asked to involve their supervisors when choosing appropriate objectives.

Building a network of preservation contacts in the Southeast is another goal of Preservation Services training and outreach program. The follow-up program aids in building this network. Participants are urged to contact Preservation Services with questions and comments. Taking interest in participants' progress and serving as a reminder of the importance of preservation issues are added benefits to follow-up. "Follow-up is a reminder that counters the 'attend and forget' syndrome. In addition, it can generate a 'Hawthorne effect'—the phenomenon whereby a desired behavior increases simply because an individual knows that somebody cares and is paying attention" (Campbell and Cheek 1989, 23).

Methodology

Prior to initiating the follow-up program, Preservation Services staff had numerous discussions about data collection and reporting. During the design phase, staff established that the primary purpose of the follow-up is to provide ongoing support to workshop participants. The collection of quantitative data is secondary. Limiting the data collection to the quantitative would limit measurement of the transfer of training, which is the capacity of a training program to transfer new skills and knowledge to the learner. The degree to which a workshop and subsequent follow-up achieves transfer of training is evident through the rate of goal achievement and through anecdotal comments gathered during telephone conversations. Given the complexity and variety of SOLINET workshops and the diversity of the level of preservation programming at participating institutions, both qualitative and quantitative data were necessary to obtain a complete picture and measure the transfer of training in a meaningful way.

Examples of the value of the qualitative data collected are illustrated by anecdotal comments from a Fundamentals of Book Repair Workshop Follow-Up. The following changes occurred as a direct result of workshop attendance: budget increases for supplies, improvements in book repair techniques, provision of additional space for book repair operations, increased awareness among upper level staff about the importance of book repair, and increased support for further training. This data, gathered during e-mail and telephone communications, represents significant progress in a variety of institutions. Data collection and reporting

techniques continue to be modified throughout the course of the follow-up.

The Pilot Project

Designing a pilot project required Preservation Services staff to search the relevant literature for similar programs. At that time no sufficient models were identified for measuring transfer of training in library continuing education, or specifically in preservation training. Input was gathered from colleagues about both informal and formal follow-up activities for similar training programs, as well as from the adult education literature.

Since the research phase of the pilot project was conducted, a project began in Africa to examine the effects of conservation education in museums seven years after the training was held (Antomarchi 1999). Results are not yet available.

The primary challenge to follow-up evaluation of training is to determine methods for measuring and defining indicators of change, then to connect that change in some way to the training program provided, i.e. transfer of training. Methods for evaluating transfer of training commonly include interviewing supervisors, conducting surveys and questionnaires, developing action plans based on goal setting and achievement, interviewing trainees, and direct observation (Garavaglia 1993; Smith and Delahaye 1983). Considering the size of the SOLINET region and the membership (as of January 2000, membership numbered 803 libraries in 10 states and the Caribbean), direct observation is not practical. Consequently, the program was designed to utilize a combination of the following elements: questionnaires, interviews with participants, and tracking goal setting and achievement. Based on the information gathered, Preservation Services staff designed a framework for the follow-up program that could be modified on an ongoing basis as needed.

A pilot project was conducted from May 1996 to April 1997. It included six workshops led by SOLINET Preservation Services staff. Forms and procedures were pre-tested and a tracking database developed. Preservation Services staff initiated all follow-up communication. To aid in tracking communications, compiling data, and generating form letters and reports, all information collected was entered into a Paradox database.

All follow-up program participants were contacted four times over a period of one year following their registration for a workshop. Contacts were made by telephone, e-mail, and U.S. mail. The initial contact was the Pre-Workshop Form (appendix A), which was mailed to workshop registrants several weeks prior to workshop attendance. In addition to answering standard institutional profile questions about collection size and staffing levels, registrants established objectives to work on following workshop attendance.

To ensure that realistic objectives were chosen and to strengthen administrative support, registrants were encouraged to discuss their objectives with their supervisors.

Participation in the follow-up program was, and continues to be, voluntary. Only those workshop attendees who turned in a completed pre-workshop form at the workshop were considered to be "participating" in the program. Two subsequent follow-up calls were conducted at three and six months after the workshop to provide an opportunity for participants to request further information and to discuss obstacles and successes with Preservation Services staff. A summary of the conversation was entered into the database. For certain workshops, participants had the option to send examples of their work, such as repaired books, for feedback from Preservation Service staff. One year following the workshop, each participant was mailed the Final Evaluation Form (appendix B) to complete and return to SOLINET.

Preliminary findings during the pilot project were positive, with a 62.7% rate of goal achievement. The rate of goal achievement and comments gathered from telephone calls with participants indicated that the program had proven effective in improving preservation practices at the workshop participants' home institutions. Several participants noted that institutional changes or new practices were implemented as a direct result of workshop attendance. For these reasons, Preservation Services staff decided to implement a few revisions in the follow-up program and expand it to encompass all preservation workshops advertised on SOLINET's Web site and in the "Quarterly Workshop Schedule" (a print publication mailed to member libraries).

Program Revisions

Building on the framework and experience of the pilot, modifications were made to streamline the process so that the follow-up is useful but not burdensome to either SOLINET staff or the participants. Major changes implemented following the pilot project include form revision, reducing the time span for final follow-up from one year to three months, and reducing the total number of contacts.

The program time span was reduced since experience revealed that a significant number of staff change jobs or leave an institution within a one-year period. Also, institutional demands and priorities fluctuate, causing participation rates to drop off after six months. In addition, it is common for one staff member to take multiple preservation workshops in the period of a year, and it proved burdensome to be involved in follow-up for several workshops at once. To avoid these problems and to streamline the process, three months was determined as a sufficient period of time to measure progress on objectives, and for Preservation Services staff to establish an ongoing, supportive relationship with workshop participants. After the three-month period, participants are

1. Prior to attending workshop:

Pre-workshop evaluation form and cover letter are sent to workshop participants. Participants are expected to complete the form with their supervisors and to bring it to the workshop.

2. Three weeks following workshop:

Field Services staff call participants to see if they need any additional information or assistance to help in achieving their objectives. Calls are scheduled via e-mail if possible.

3. Three months following workshop:

Participants are mailed the "Final Evaluation Form," to complete and return to SOLINET.

Figure 1. Summary of Contacts

encouraged to continue contacting Preservation Services for additional assistance. A summary of follow-up contacts, after revisions, is presented in figure 1.

Results

The most recent results, compiled in June 1999, provide more than three years' worth of data. Between May 1996 and June 1999, 21 workshops were included in the follow-up program with a total of 335 participants. Participation in the program, indicated by submitting the pre-workshop form at the workshop, was 60% (204) of total workshop attendees. Completion of the follow-up program requires at least one contact with Preservation Services staff subsequent to the training session and completion of the final evaluation form. Of the 204 participants, 31% (68) completed the program.

The 31% rate does not adequately reflect the impact of the program. It is evident upon closer examination that 25% of participants merely neglected to return the final evaluation form. A participant may have had contact with SOLINET staff during a follow-up call, met the objective, and requested additional information subsequent to a workshop, yet was excluded from the final statistics because the final form was not returned. Looking at participation rates, whether or not the final form was submitted, revealed that 84% of the 204 total participants benefited from follow-up at some point in the program. Submitting an incomplete pre-workshop form or failing to submit a final evaluation form were the primary reasons for exclusion from the program. See table 1 for a complete breakdown of reasons for exclusion.

Demographic Data

The pre-workshop form consists of eight demographic questions that serve to gauge the size and nature of the participants' institutions and the level of preservation activity. The

final question asks the participant to set objectives related to the workshop topic that are reasonably attainable within the three-month period following the workshop. Sample objectives include: update library binding contract, purchase better book repair supplies, develop resource list for disaster plan, update disaster plan, and hold fire safety training for staff.

The majority of the 204 participants who submitted the initial pre-workshop form were from non-ARL (Association of Research Libraries) university libraries (21%), public libraries (20%), and college libraries (18%) (table 2). In other words, smaller institutions (non-ARL university, college, and public libraries) that are less likely to have a well-developed preservation program are the largest groups taking advantage of the follow-up program.

The preservation activities question (Pre-Workshop Form Q-4) was included to provide an overview of the most

Table 1. Reasons for Not Participating in the Program

Reason	%
Incomplete pre-workshop form	33.9
No final evaluation form	25.5
Multiple attendees from same institution	12.7
No response to both contacts	10.5
Left position	5.0
Graduate LIS student	4.0

Table 2. Pre-workshop Form, Q-1, Institutional Breakdown

Institution Type	No.	%
University (non-ARL) library	43	21
Public library	42	20
College library	38	18
Special library	20	9
Other	19	9
Archives	17	8
ARL library	13	6
State library	12	5

Table 3. Pre-Workshop Form, Q-4 Involvement in Preservation Activities

Activity	No.	%
Book repair	165	80
Library binding	141	66
User/staff education and training	112	54
Disaster planning	105	51
Preservation photocopying	104	50
Environmental monitoring	97	47
Pamphlet binding	91	44
Conservation Treatment	84	41
Microfilming	68	33
Digitization	54	26

common activities in which institutions are involved. This information aids in modifying existing curriculums and leads to the development of other needed training topics. The responses are listed in table 3. Of the 204 respondents, 80% perform some type of book repair. The fact that a large percentage of libraries perform some type of book repair reinforces the need for proper training. The next three most common preservation activities reported are library binding (66%), staff and user education (54%), and disaster planning (51%). Accordingly, Preservation Services' workshops on book repair, library binding, and disaster preparedness are some of the most often requested and among the most well attended.

Responses to Pre-Workshop Form Q-5 reveal that 78% of the institutions represented by follow-up participants do not have a department solely responsible for preservation activities. This is quite common in small and mid-sized libraries where preservation activities are often decentralized and occur in different departments. Only 13% reported having a full-time staff person responsible for preservation activities. For the heaviest users of the follow-up, small to mid-sized, it is much more common to have no one directly responsible for preservation (44%) or someone with part-time preservation responsibilities (40%) (Pre-Workshop Form, Q-6).

Final Evaluation Form Results

The final evaluation form provides an opportunity for participants to record changes in the level of preservation activity since the workshop and evaluate the usefulness of the program. Responses to the final evaluation form were positive: 26% saw an increase in the level of support for preservation since the workshop; 17% noticed an increase in their institution's annual budget allocated for preservation; and 79% of respondents achieved their workshop objective. Primary reasons for not meeting objectives were not surprising. Lack of time (50%), lack of staff (38%), and lack of funding (25%) were the most common responses (table 4). An unexpected obstacle mentioned during phone contacts was the frequency of building renovations and collection moves taking priority, thus interfering in completion of objectives.

Of those who completed the final evaluation form, 85% agreed that the continued support offered by SOLINET Preservation Services assisted in meeting their objectives. Figures 2 through 4 show selected comments from the form's three open-ended questions.

Conclusions and Trends

Information gathered from the follow-up helps in evaluating workshop effectiveness and has resulted in workshop con-

tent revisions and identification of additional topics of interest. Qualitative data collected from the open-ended questions and from comments during the phone calls were some of the most valuable information gathered. An interesting trend identified during the follow-up contacts was the large number of building projects, renovations, and collection moves occurring in participants' institutions. Nearly 18% of those unable to meet their objective pointed to building projects as the reason. These large-scale projects take priority and hinder the completion of workshop objectives. Renovation or building projects can have a tremendous impact on the care of collections since materials can be damaged during a move and emergencies are more likely to occur. Consequently, SOLINET Preservation Services has targeted this topic for development of training and print informational resources.

During the follow-up, participants also discussed progress on their objectives and informed SOLINET staff about the status of preservation activities in general, which was extremely useful in the development of regional preservation contacts. For example, Preservation Services has expanded its roster of contacts in the event of a regional disaster, and identified new contacts for future workshop host

Table 4. Final Evaluation Form, Q-6 Obstacles Encountered in Meeting Objectives

Obstacle	No.	%
Lack of time	34	50
Lack of staffing	26	38
Lack of funding	17	25
Lack of admin. support	4	5
Other	4	5
Lack of training	4	5
Resistance to change	3	4
Lack of information	1	1
None	10	14

Did following up with you after the workshop aid in implementing preservation practices?

- [The Follow-Up program] answered some questions I had when we actually started doing repairs.
- [The Follow-Up program] served as a good reminder of stated goals.
- [The Follow-Up program] prompted action toward a written policy.
- If I had problems or questions they were able to help.
- Continual reminders of the need for preservation help us to stay motivated and reminded [me] of the importance and necessity for good preservation practices.
- I very much appreciated receiving more literature on particular areas of concern. [The Follow-Up program] has helped refine my plans in several ways.

Figure 2. Final Evaluation Form, Q-9, Sample Responses

What aspects of the follow-up program were the most useful?

- If I had forgotten procedures or had questions about repairs I had performed, I was able to telephone [SOLINET] and get clarification and more information.
- Continued contact with workshop instructors helps to keep lines of communication open in case there are questions.
- The contact, support, and the ability to verify techniques. I doubt I would have taken the trouble to set and meet objectives.
- The continued support from [SOLINET] Field Service Officers. I know that I can call on them at anytime...[for an] accurate and thoughtful response.
- [The Follow-Up program] allowed me to do a self-evaluation of our program, and we have been able to use suggestions. I felt someone was interested in what we were able to accomplish.
- Materials sent to me as result of question I raised.
- A timely reminder to get busy.
- Because of the continuous support contact with the workshop instructor, accomplishing this goal stayed on my list of things to do.
- Being able to ask instructors questions that have arisen since the workshop.
- Having a resource person I can contact when I have questions, this I really appreciate.

Figure 3. Final Evaluation Form, Q-10, Sample Responses**What was least useful about SOLINET contacting you after the workshop?**

- Specific skills follow-up is not relevant to my job as preservation administrator.
- Nothing, all aspects were useful.
- Follow-up really not necessary to complete objectives.
- The evaluations, they are helpful to SOLINET but not to me.
- I felt I had wasted the contact person's time. I had not implemented any of the information that I had gained from the workshop.
- You weren't able to give us a lot of help because we were very behind in implementing our goals!

Figure 4. Final Evaluation Form, Q-11, Sample Responses

sites. Future training can be targeted to meet needs identified through follow-up contacts.

Many participants posed questions during follow-up conversations. Preservation Services staff answered about 60 additional questions generated from the follow-up that otherwise may have gone unanswered. Some questions were related to the workshop topic specifically; others were about associated preservation issues. Phone contact was found to be an effective way to keep in touch with workshop participants and to become familiar with the preservation activities at a wide range of institutions.

One of the key questions this project hoped to answer was whether SOLINET's preservation training was having an impact on the preservation of cultural resources in the Southeast. Were participants leaving SOLINET workshops with the tools and knowledge needed to improve the care of their collections? According to comments collected during the calls and data about objectives, 94% of follow-up program participants performed some action to improve the care of their institution's collections in the months following the workshop. Even small improvements measured cumulatively represent significant advances in the care of collections in the Southeast. Having participants identify objectives before the workshop helps instructors focus attention on individual

needs and helps participants relate the information provided in a workshop to a specific problem or need at their library.

The follow-up provides important information about the progress of preservation activity in participating libraries. However, it is difficult to solely attribute this progress to the SOLINET training. Determining whether a training program resulted in new on-the-job practices on the part of the participants is one of the most difficult and time-consuming aspects of evaluation to measure. It requires a scientific approach and an objective means of measuring before and after job performance (Kirkpatrick 1979). The follow-up project was designed foremost to provide continued support to as many workshop attendees as practically possible; the collection of scientific data was a secondary objective. Perhaps a more in-depth study of a smaller population of participants would yield more quantitative results connecting the training to a change in behavior. In addition, certain topics were found to be more appropriate for measured evaluation than others. Workshops that teach specific skills, such as Fundamentals of Book Repair, tend to be more appropriate for follow-up than conceptual workshops such as Preservation Management. It is easier to choose attainable goals and measure change through training that teaches a specific skill.

Participation in follow-up activities requires a level of commitment on the part of the participant. Time is required to complete the forms, which includes devising appropriate objectives and answering multiple choice and open-ended questions. Also, participants have to allocate time to achieve their objectives and to discuss matters with Preservation Services staff. However, the time investment is relatively small in terms of making progress toward implementing preservation practices. Participation in follow-up focuses the participants' attention on the benefits derived from the workshop that can be applied to job performance. Follow-up activities also require a great deal of SOLINET staff time. A staff member spends an average of two hours per participant to collect information, provide assistance, and track data.

Preservation Services recently implemented additional revisions to the program. Quantitative data and comments collected by the open-ended questions on the final evaluation form clearly demonstrate the value of continuing a basic level of follow-up for all open-schedule one- and two-day workshops. The major obstacle to program completion remains the low percentage of final forms returned. For this reason, and to reduce the burden on the participant, the final evaluation form has been discontinued. Preservation Services staff continue to conduct telephone interviews of follow-up participants that follow a standard format for data entry purposes. The original goals of strengthening the network of preservation practitioners in the Southeast and providing continued support to workshop participants will continue to be supported by the revised follow-up program. Since this change was implemented in September 1999, participants continue to express appreciation about being contacted after the workshop. The contact serves as a reminder of the importance of preservation activities, and there has not been a decrease in the rate of goal achievement.

The Workshop Follow-Up is now an integral component of Preservation Services training and outreach program. Conducting follow-up creates an atmosphere that encourages participants to use workshop information to effect change in their institution, and to contact SOLINET for further assistance. In addition, the program provides preservation information and support to a wide range of institutions, including small and mid-sized libraries that are less likely to have a well-developed preservation program. The program fulfills the three original goals: to provide ongoing support and information to workshop participants; to create an ongoing mechanism for evaluating workshop effectiveness; and to promote and strengthen the network of preservation practitioners in Southeast.

Works Cited

- Antomarchi, Catherine, and Terry Little. 1999. 2007: Exploring the impact of the Prema training program on the conservation of cultural heritage. In *Defining and measuring effectiveness in education and training*. Proceedings of the interim meeting of the ICOM-CC working group on training and education in conservation and restoration, April 16–18, 1998. Edited by Kathleen Dardes. Vantaa, Finland: Evtek Institute of Art and Design.
- Brinkerhoff, Robert O. 1987. *Achieving results from training*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. 1976. *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, Clifton P., and Gerald D. Cheek. 1989. Putting training to work. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 13: 32–36.
- Conway, Paul. 1989. Archival preservation: Definitions for improving education and training. *Restaurator* 10: 47–60.
- Garavaglia, Paul L. 1993. How to ensure transfer of training. *Training and Development Journal* (Oct.): 62–68.
- Kirkpatrick, Donald L. 1979. Techniques for evaluating training programs. *Training and Development Journal* (June): 78–92.
- Library Association, Sub-Committee on Training. 1986. The evaluation of staff training. In *Guidelines for training in libraries*. London: Library Association.
- Okey, Andrew, Frances Wood, and Anne Lawes. 1992. Surveying the effectiveness of short course-provision in the professional development of library information specialists. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 33 (summer): 249–53.
- Smith, Barry J., and B. L. Delahaye. 1983. Designing follow-up activities. In *How to be an effective trainer: Skills for managers and new trainers*. New York: Wiley.
- Walters, Tyler O. 1995. Breaking new ground in fostering preservation: The Society of American Archivists' preservation management training program. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 39: 417–26.

Appendix A. SOLINET Preservation Services

Follow-Up—Pre-Workshop Form

Title of Workshop: Preservation of Photographic Materials Date: May 28, 1999
 Name _____
 Job Title _____
 Institution _____ OCLC Code _____
 Address _____
 Phone Number _____ Fax _____
 E-mail Address _____

Please complete the following questionnaire with your supervisor and bring it to the SOLINET workshop listed above. Circle appropriate responses.

Q-1. Please classify your institution into one of these categories:

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1. ARL Library | 4. College Library | 7. Public Library |
| 2. University Library (Non-ARL) | 5. Archives | 8. Other |
| 3. State Library | 6. Special Library | |

Q-2. Approximately, what is the size of your institution's collection in bound volumes?

- | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Less than 25,000 | 3. 150,001–1,000,000 | 5. None |
| 2. 25,001–150,000 | 4. More than 1,000,000 | 6. Don't Know |

Q-3. What is the size of your manuscript/archival collection?

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Less than 1,000 Linear Ft. | 3. More than 5,000 Linear Ft. | 5. No Archival Collections |
| 2. 1,001–5,000 Linear Ft. | 4. Don't Know | |

Q-4. Here is a list of common preservation activities. Which, if any, of these is your institution likely to engage in during a typical year? (Circle all that apply)

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Conservation Treatment | 6. Preservation Photocopying |
| 2. Book Repair | 7. Digitization |
| 3. Library Binding | 8. Pamphlet Binding |
| 4. Microfilming | 9. User/Staff Education and Training |
| 5. Disaster Planning | 10. Environmental Monitoring |

Q-5. Does your institution have a department solely responsible for preservation activities?

- | | |
|--------|-------|
| 1. Yes | 2. No |
|--------|-------|

Q-6. Does your institution have a staff member who is responsible for managing preservation activities ? (as defined in Q-4)

1. Yes, the staff member has full-time responsibilities for preservation
2. Yes, the staff member has part-time responsibilities for preservation
3. No

Q-7. In your opinion, what level of support does preservation receive from your institution's administration?

- | | | |
|---------|------------|--------|
| 1. High | 2. Average | 3. Low |
|---------|------------|--------|

Q-8. Approximately what percentage of your institution's annual budget is allocated for preservation activities? (as defined in Q-4)

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|------------------|
| 1. No Funds Allocated | 3. 1%–5% | 5. More than 10% |
| 2. 1% or Less (but not zero) | 4. 5–10% | |

Q-9. Please indicate below, an objective that you plan to work on during the next three months. Please consult with your supervisor in selecting an appropriate objective; examples are provided.

Objective (attainable within 3 months)

Examples: Conduct a collection survey, identify problematic materials, improve storage environment, improve collection housing, develop handling policy, incorporate photographic materials into disaster plan.

**Appendix B. SOLINET Preservation Services
Follow-Up—Final Evaluation Form**

ID#: _____ WSName: _____ WSDate: _____ WS#: _____

The following questions will help us evaluate the effectiveness of our workshops and the Follow-Up program. Your thoughtful answers are greatly appreciated.

Q-1. Has there been a change in staffing levels for preservation activities during the past six months?

- 1. Increase
- 2. Decrease
- 3. No Change

Q-2. Indicate the change in the level of support for preservation over the past six months?

- 1. Increase
- 2. Decrease
- 3. No Change

Q-3. During the past six months has there been a change in the percentage of your institution’s annual budget allocated for preservation activities?

- 1. Increase
- 2. Decrease
- 3. No Change

Summary of Contacts

1. Prior to attending workshop:
Pre-workshop evaluation form and cover letter are sent to workshop participants. Participants are expected to complete the form with their supervisors and to bring it to the workshop.
2. Three weeks following workshop:
Field Services staff call participants to see if they need any additional information or assistance to help in achieving their objectives. Calls are scheduled via e-mail if possible.
3. Three months following workshop:
Participants are mailed the “Final Evaluation Form,” to complete and return to SOLINET.