Notes on Operations

Recording Conservation Information

The MARC 583 Field in Practice

Elizabeth Hobart

Conservation documentation provides important information about a library's collections, including condition assessments and treatment decisions. Paper files or local databases, however, can make this information unavailable to most library staff and create problems for searching and preservation. To avoid these problems, in 2016, Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) started using the MARC 583 field to record conservation documentation for items in the Special Collections Library. By placing this information in the catalog record, conservation information was publicly viewable, searchable, and protected by regular database backups. This article describes the process of implementing the MARC 583 field at Penn State for conservation documentation, including selecting standards, encoding the field, and outcomes from the project.

Conservation documentation provides important information about items in a library's collection, but is often inaccessible. Documents stored in a file cabinet or on a local hard drive are unavailable to most library staff. Local files are often difficult to search, especially if they are analog. Preserving documentation stored in local files is also problematic and typically requires additional work for conservation staff.

In fall 2016, the Senior Book Conservator at Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) approached the author to discuss the possibility of using the MARC 583 field in the bibliographic record to preserve conservation information for items in the Special Collections Library. The MARC 583 "Action Note" field may be added to bibliographic or holdings records to record information about actions taken on library materials. In this case, the MARC 583 field was used to record conservation actions, including rehousing, condition appraisals, and conservation treatment. They implemented the MARC 583 field, beginning with a sample batch of items conserved during the fall semester. The goals were to note the condition of an item at the time of examination; to document conservation treatments, housing, and other decisions; to record specific materials used for housing and conservation; and to enable staff to find and collocate items that were treated in a certain manner. This paper describes the process used to implement the MARC 583 field to record conservation documentation in the library's bibliographic records, including selecting standards, encoding the field, and problems encountered.

Elizabeth Hobart (efh@psu.edu) is the Special Collections Cataloging Librarian at Pennsylvania State University in University Park, Pennsylvania.

Manuscript submitted October 20, 2017; paper returned to author for revision February 2, 2018; revised manuscript submitted March 5, 2018; paper accepted for publication March 28, 2018.

Literature Review

The author surveyed literature in the fields of preservation, conservation, library science, and museum studies to familiarize herself with current practices for recording conservation documentation with particular emphases on electronic

documentation and encoding conservation information in the MARC 583 field. The foundational guidelines for conservation documentation are from the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works' (AIC) "Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Practice."[1] They state "The conservation professional has an obligation to produce and maintain accurate, complete, and permanent records of examination, sampling, scientific investigation, and treatment."[2] Additionally, the "Code of Ethics" includes a paragraph on preserving the documentation, stating that it "should be produced and maintained in as permanent a manner as practicable."[3] The "Commentaries to the Guidelines for Practice," also published by the AIC, further expand on this: "A written record should be made any time that cultural property is examined, analyzed, sampled, treated, altered, and/or damaged and when the cultural property is temporarily under the care or study of the conservation professional."[4]

Although the "Code of Ethics" and "Commentaries" provide substantive information on what information to include in conservation documentation, they provide little guidance about format, directing conservators to "follow recommendations developed by AIC specialty groups."[5] For book conservators, this guidance is found in the "Written Documentation" section of the *Paper Conservation Catalog*.[6] The *Paper Conservation Catalog* provides extensive information, including intended use, audience, and future access. It touches briefly on electronic documentation in section 6, "Permanence of the Written Record," suggesting that promising uses for computer storage include saving space, and ease of access, duplication, and dissemination.[7] The *Paper Conservation Catalog* notes that preservation is a concern, but that similar concerns for the preservation of paper records exist. Further, the *Paper Conservation Catalog* states that optical media can help to guard against data loss. However, it does not explicitly recommend electronic documentation or suggest a particular format for electronic documentation.

Since the early 2000s, literature about conservation documentation has increasingly focused on the benefits and risks of recording documentation electronically. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation convened the meeting "Issues in Conservation Documentation: Digital Formats, Institutional Priorities, and Public Access" to address this topic; first in New York in April 2006, and then a follow-up meeting in London in May 2007. Both meetings focused on conservation practices in museums and for works of art.

Prior to the New York meeting, surveys were distributed to participating institutions, and the answers were shared so that meeting participants would arrive with knowledge of other participants' attitudes. Rudenstine and Whalen summarized this meeting.[8] They noted that "since the 1980s, many museums have established digital collections management systems. . . . But conservation information typically is not yet incorporated into these internal management systems—either because it has not been digitized at all, or because it is held in stand-alone databases or files—and it is therefore likely to be increasingly isolated and unavailable for study."[9] Regarding paper versus digital records, they found that "most museums are now to some degree engaged in digitizing," and that "all participants considered this activity was desirable and inevitable, while conceding that it was unlikely that digital records would entirely replace paper in the foreseeable future."[10]

The following year, Roy, Foister, and Rudenstine published a paper about the London meeting.[11] The follow-up meeting placed greater emphasis on European institutions' conservation documentation practices. Meeting participants noted that their institutions were enthusiastic to pursue digital documentation, which would increase discoverability and aid in preservation. Analog photographic documentation proved to be particularly problematic for both access and preservation, and meeting participants hoped that digitization could mitigate these problems. However, some participants, particularly those from European institutions, expressed concern about available resources, especially in light of decreased public funding. Participants from the United Kingdom further noted the "galvanizing effect" of the Freedom of Information Act: "Since the public are now about to request to see museum records including conservation information . . . it is expected that institutions should survey their records and be readily able to locate requested information."[12] A number of meeting participants "confirmed their belief in the value of making [conservation] documentation remotely available to enquirers, preferably in mediated or interpreted form in instances where enquiries were likely to come from the general public."[13]

Documentation of Conservation Data via the MARC 583 Field

Library science papers addressing the topic of conservation documentation specifically discuss electronic documentation using the MARC 583 field. The earliest instructions for use of the MARC 583 field for conservation documentation is "Standard Terminology for the MARC Actions Note Field," published by the Library of Congress (LC) Network Development and MARC Standards Office in 1988.[14] This relatively short document outlines fifteen terms that can be used in the "Action" subfield of the MARC 583 field. It lists thirty-eight terms that can be added to subfield $l ("Status") with the action term "condition reviewed." "Standard Terminology for the MARC Actions Note Field" also lists twenty-eight terms to encode in subfield $i ("Method of action").

In 2004, LC published "Preservation & Digitization Actions: Terminology for MARC 21 Field 583" (PDA), which superseded "Standard Terminology for the MARC Actions Note Field."[15] As noted in PDA, "with the passage of time, however, the list of preservation terminology [as recorded in "Standard Terminology for the MARC Actions Note Field"] has become outdated and the inability to record digital reformatting and digital transformation actions has become a hindrance."[16] PDA greatly expands the terminology available. The terminology for the "Action" subfield now includes seventeen actions, nine prospective actions (e.g., "Will conserve"), and seven negative actions (e.g., "Will not conserve"). Following this, PDA provides guidelines for each action term, including mandatory and recommended subfields, and lists terminology appropriate for each.

"Standard Terminology for the MARC Actions Note Field" and PDA provide practical instructions for encoding the MARC 583 field, but neither is mandatory. Libraries can implement the MARC 583 field using either terminology list or without one. In "Conservation Documentation in Research Libraries: Making the Link with MARC Data," McCann studied conservation documentation practices at research libraries, including use of the MARC 583 field.[17] In a survey and follow-up phone interviews with conservation professionals, she asked how conservators document their treatments, how this documentation is used, and where this information is recorded. McCann particularly asked about the use of the MARC 583 field. Institutions using the MARC 583 field were asked if conservation documentation was also stored in other systems. Libraries not using the field were queried about possible future use.

Before delving into the survey results, McCann discussed options for using the MARC 583 field, including the use of a "pointer" model or a "comprehensive" model.[18] She offers the following examples: with the pointer model the bibliographic record includes minimal information and directs users to a more complete source:

> 583 1# $a conserved $b 04-074 $c 20041221 $z For treatment information, contact the Conservation Division $2 pda $5 DLC

The comprehensive model places detailed information directly in the bibliographic record:

> 583 0# $a conserved $c 2004 $x treatment included washing, deacidification, page and spine repairs $2 pda $5 NIC

McCann discussed using indicator values to make the note public or private and adding the MARC 583 field to either the holdings record or the bibliographic record.

Survey results indicated that conservators routinely documented conservation activities for special collections materials. Fewer created this documentation for general collections. While use of the MARC 583 field to record conservation information was relatively low (only 12 percent of respondents always or usually used the MARC 583 field), there was "strong interest" in using it.[19] However, 86.8 percent of respondents using the MARC 583 field also maintained separate systems for recording conservation documentation. McCann suggested that this "implies the use of the pointer model for encoding rather than the comprehensive model."[20] McCann's follow-up interviews confirmed this: "the pointer model was unanimously preferred over the comprehensive model" due to the "rich descriptive nature of special collections conservation data."[21]

McCann asked respondents using the MARC 583 field which descriptive standards they used for recording conservation information. Only eight of fifty-three respondents used PDA. "Standard Terminology for the MARC 21 Actions Note Field" was used by eighteen respondents. Others used local terminology or free-text terms. McCann noted that the infrequent use of PDA is "surprising considering the terminology was designed for use in the MARC 21 field 583."[22] Although respondents who used locally defined terminology were asked to enter the terminology they used, no participants entered it.

Examples of local terminology may be found in "Documenting Library Conservation Treatments: Using the 583 Action Note Field in the MARC Record."[23] In this paper, Hinz and Gehnrich argued strongly in favor of recording conservation documentation in the MARC 583 field. They outlined several benefits of using the MARC 583 field, including searchability, visibility to library staff, and regular database backups. They also describe the use of the MARC 583 field at their respective institutions, the Hagley Museum and Library (Hinz), and the American Antiquarian Society (Gehnrich). Both authors provided brief documentation for their local procedures, accompanied by examples. They concluded the paper with sample vocabularies that might be employed in the MARC 583 field, and instructions for linking to visual documentation using the MARC 856 field. The instructions and examples provided by Hinz and Gehnrich are valuable, but a major oversight is their assertion that "there is currently no predetermined conservation terminology in MARC," as PDA was published two years prior.[24]

To gain a better sense of the MARC 583 field's practical application, the author examined publicly available documentation from libraries and consortia. Member libraries in a consortium often use this field to note retention decisions, thereby documenting agreements for an institution to retain certain items. In the documentation examined,

the phrase "committed to retain" was recorded in subfield $a ("Action"), often paired with an additional 583 to record "completeness reviewed." Examples of this include the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries and the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries.[25] In both cases, no standard terminology was used. The Maine Shared Collections Cooperative (MSCC) likewise uses the MARC 583 field for "committed to retain" and "completeness reviewed" notes, and also adds "condition reviewed." Although the MSCC does not use a standard terminology, "condition reviewed" is an action term in both "Standard Terminology for the MARC 21 Actions Note Field" and PDA.[26]

Of the library documentation examined, only the Folger Shakespeare Library uses standard terminology in the MARC 583 field.[27] The Folger uses this field to capture information about both cataloging and conservation, drawing conservation terminology from PDA. The library uses a limited list of action terms, yet the list is more extensive than seen in other libraries. In total, the Folger's list includes seventeen action terms to describe conservation activities. Additionally, they provide a list of statuses to encode in subfield $l with the action term "condition reviewed." The Folger provides instructions for encoding other subfields. Some are mandatory in PDA, including subfield $c ("Time/date of action"), subfield $2 ("Source of term"), and subfield $5 ("Institution to which field applies"). Others include subfield $b ("Action identification") to record the conservation database number, subfield $h ("Jurisdiction") to record a project code, subfield $k ("Action agent") to record the name of the person performing the action, and subfields $x and $z to record notes.

Background on Use of the MARC 583 Field at the Penn State Libraries

Prior to this project, Penn State used the MARC 583 field to record conservation information in a limited fashion. The field was used for two main activities: to record information about resources conserved off-site and to describe enclosures and de-acidification for cartographic resources. For items conserved off-site, the notes included an action term (either "Rebound" or "Deacidified"), date, method of deacidification, and the vendor's name and address. Notes for items conserved off-site lacked standard terminology. The notes created for cartographic resources used PDA. These notes included an action term ("Housed" or "Conserved"), method ("Encapsulation" or "Deacidified"), a public note to record the item's barcode, source of term (PDA), and the local institution code.

Conservation notes for special collections items require more detail. As Baker summarized: "Special collections conservation usually reverses the basic approach of general collections conservation. Instead of fitting an item to be treated in the available specifications of treatment, this type of library conservation tailors the available treatment options to the particular item."[28] As a result, each conservation note must be constructed individually to fully record the details of the treatments.

At Penn State, on-site conservation work is conducted by the Preservation, Conservation, and Digitization Department (PCD). When the Special Collections Library sends an item to PCD, staff discharge the item and print a call slip using Aeon, a computer program for automating patron requests in special collections libraries.[29] As PCD staff construct housing or perform conservation treatments, they annotate the Aeon call slip in pencil with notes about their work, including condition assessments, treatments performed, and materials used. At the end of fall 2016 semester, the Department had accumulated thirty-three of these annotated call slips, which became the "Batch I records" for the new workflow.

Formulating the MARC 583 Field for Penn State's Special Collections

A primary goal was to collocate items conserved or housed in a certain manner. Using a standard terminology helped to accomplish this as it ensured that notes were entered consistently. Although some institutions create local terminologies, participants used a pre-existing one to save time and reduce the need to create local documentation. The existing terminologies that can be used are from "Standard Terminology for the MARC 21 Actions Note Field" and PDA. PDA was chosen as it was already being used locally for cartographic resources conservation notes. Although McCann's research suggested that PDA was not widely used by conservation professionals, as noted earlier, it is more current than "Standard Terminology for the MARC Actions Note Field" and expands the number of action terms available from fifteen to thirty-three.[30] PDA also includes detailed instructions. Each action term includes both mandatory and recommended subfields plus additional terminology appropriate to the action. The level of detail and use guidance in PDA and its more current vocabulary led us to select it over "Standard Terminology."

Although recommended subfields vary throughout PDA, four subfields are mandatory: subfield $a ("Action"), subfield $c ("Time/date of action"), subfield $2 ("Source of term"), and subfield $5 ("Institution to which the field applies"). Subfield $a will always contain one of the action terms listed in PDA. Following the MARC format standards, time and date are encoded in subfield $c using the ISO 8601 format, omitting hyphens (YYYYMMDD or YYYY).[31] Subfield $2 is always "pda," and subfield $5 uses

the institution code from the *MARC Code List for Organizations* (in this case, "PSt").

Certain action terms in PDA include recommended subfields, typically subfield $i ("Method of action") or subfield $l ("Status"), with suggested standard terminology. PDA allows for internal notes (subfield $x) and public notes (subfield $z) as needed. Both subfields can be used to record information beyond the standard terminology, such as materials used to construct housing or details of a condition assessment. The author decided to include public notes to capture this information. Internal notes are only viewable in the staff client. Since information recorded in internal notes risked being overlooked, a decision was made not to implement them. To fulfill local policies and AIC guidelines, participants routinely add a few other subfields. In accordance with local practices in the Special Collections Library at Penn State University, all MARC 583 fields start with subfield $3 ("Materials specified") to specify to which copy the note referred. Adding $3 supports the goal of enabling staff to find items that have undergone certain conservation treatments since it pairs the 583 field with a specific item. Additionally, the "Commentaries to the Guidelines for Practice" lists the name of the documenter as part of their minimally accepted practice for documentation.[32] This information can be recorded in subfield $k ("Action Agent"). However, because some conservation work at Penn State is performed by student interns, not professional conservators, initials are recorded, rather than full names.

In total, the MARC 583 fields include the following information:

> 583 $3 [Collection name] $a [action] $c [YYYYMMDD] $k [initials] $z [public note] $2 pda $5 PSt

Note that subfield $i ("Method of action") or $l ("Status") is added as needed.

After making these decisions, it was time to start encoding MARC 583 fields for the first batch of records. To begin, the author examined the annotated call slips to determine which action terms to encode. In this initial group, two terms from PDA stood out: "condition reviewed" and "housed," both of which were used in twenty-eight of the thirty-three items conserved. Other MARC 583 action terms were considered as needed.

"Condition Reviewed" Action Data

For "condition reviewed," PDA recommends including subfield $l ("Status"), and provides a list of thirty-four standard terms for this subfield. PDA also recommends including subfield $x ("Nonpublic note") or $z ("Public note") to include terms beyond the standard terminology, or to provide additional details. The MARC 583 field for "condition reviewed" would be constructed as follows:

> 583 $3 [Collection name] $a condition reviewed $c [YYYYMMDD] $k [initials] $l [status] $z [public note] $2 pda $5 PSt

Recalling that the Batch I records come from Special Collections Library materials that received housing and/or conservation treatments from PCD, of the twenty-eight items in Batch I that had condition notes, twenty-three included qualitative assessments, such as "Excellent condition." Of these, seven included additional details to justify the assessment, such as "Book in good condition; foxing (slight) on most leaves," or "Fair condition—small markings (stains) on book's cover + back." The remaining five items provided factual information about the book's condition without a qualitative assessment (e.g., "Torn paper"). One note provided more detail: "Book checked for mold as per request—deemed to be grime + not mold."

For the items described by interns as excellent condition, the MARC 583 was constructed as:

> 583 $3 Rare Books Fine Printing copy $a condition reviewed $c 20160923 $k abc $l undamaged $z Excellent condition. $2 pda $5 PSt[33]

In cases when interns described the condition as "Good condition" with no additional qualifiers, subfield $l was omitted, as it was not clear what damage was present. PDA includes the generic term "damaged," which could be used in this case, but in the absence of other information, it could also be misleading.

When provided, details of existing damage were recorded in subfield $l. For instance, for an item with slight foxing, the MARC 583 field was constructed as:

> 583 $3 Rare Books Fine Printing copy $a condition reviewed $c 20160916 $k abc $l foxed $z Good condition; slight foxing evident on most leaves. $2 pda $5 PSt

Although somewhat repetitive, the subfield $z in this case provides additional details about the extent and location of the foxing. Subfield $1 may also be repeated, as needed:

> 583 $3 Rare Books copy $a condition reviewed $c 2016 $k abc $l loose $l stained $z Back cover loose; spots on pages. $2 pda $5 PSt

While subfield $l is optional, its inclusion is recommended by PDA. Using standard terminology in this subfield ensures that items in a similar condition will be

retrieved in a search, regardless of the text in the public note. For example, if the conservator wanted to train interns on flat paper mending, the presence of the word "torn" in the subfield $l would quickly identify books needing that particular treatment, regardless of keywords used in the public note.

The PDA terminology for subfield $l does not cover all possible scenarios. In these cases, this subfield may be omitted:

> 583 $3 Rare Books Goodman Collection copy $a condition reviewed $c 20161104 $k abc $z Book checked for mold; deemed to be soot and grime, not mold. $2 pda $5 PSt

Here, the intern's assessment provides valuable information. In the future, staff will not have to send this book to PCD for another assessment; they can confirm from the bibliographic record that the item has been examined and was determined not to be moldy. This assessment could not be easily captured using the subfield $l terminology, but can be expressed clearly and concisely in a public note.

"Housed" Action Data

For "housed," subfield $i ("Method of action") is recommended but not required. PDA provides a short list of terms to use in subfield $i: box, encapsulation, envelope/sleeve, folder/container, or jacket. Additional information, such as details on the type of housing constructed or materials used, would be added to subfield $z as needed. Put together, MARC 583 notes for "housed" would be constructed as follows:

> 583 $3 [Collection name] $a housed $c [YYYYMMDD] $i [Method of action] $k [initials] $z [public note] $2 pda $5 PSt

As documented in the Batch I records, the interns constructed only two types of enclosures: phase boxes and book shoes. In both cases, the term "box" was added to subfield $i. PDA defines "box" as: "Custom-fitted board stock enclosure, preservation quality materials & construction, often used for rare book collections."[34] This definition was a clear fit for phase boxes. However, for book shoes, which are four-sided enclosures that leave the spine and top edge of the book visible, it was less clear. Since PDA does not specify that the box must enclose the item on all sides, we decided to also use the term here.

In total, twenty-four of the interns' notes described phase box construction. One of these notes stated only "Phase box constructed," without additional information. One described the box's shape as it had been custom-built to support a trapezoidal-shaped book. The remaining twenty-two notes included information about materials used to fill the box: thirteen used ethafoam (an archival-quality polyethylene foam), and nine used corrugated board. For these items, we added notes in subfield $z to describe the type of box, materials, and other details as needed:

> 583 $3 Rare Books Fine Printing copy $a housed $c 20160921 $i box $k abc $z Phase box with ethafoam filler. $2 pda $5 PSt

None of the book shoe notes included additional details. In these cases, subfield $z was used only to note the type of box constructed:

> 583 $3 Rare Books copy $a housed $c 20161104 $i box $k abc $z Book shoe. $2 pda $5 PSt

Other Notes

Four items included notes stating "Replaced red string w/ Velcro." The wording varied for each item. Sometimes "cloth" was provided instead of string, or the mention of the color was omitted. After consulting with the conservator who supervised the students' work, the author learned that these were items with loose covers that had been tied with red string for stabilization. The strings had left impressions on the bindings, and therefore needed to be replaced. The interns had built bands out of acid-free material, which they secured with Velcro.

For these items, we used the action term "stabilized," defined in PDA as: "Non-invasive procedures used to minimize deterioration and maintain the integrity of the item."[35] As with "housed," subfield $i ("Method of action") is recommended but not required. For this action term, PDA includes three standard terms for subfield $i: cleaned, shrink-wrapped, and tied. Since none of the terms fit precisely, we omitted subfield $i and used substantive public notes, instead:

> 583 $3 Rare Books Fine Printing copy $a stabilized $c 2016 $k abc $z Replaced red string with Velcro. $2 pda $5 PSt

One remaining note still needed to be encoded: "Need to fix/touch-up leather." This note fit well with the "prospective actions" in PDA. Since it pertained to conservation treatments needed in the future, "will conserve" was chosen as the action term. PDA's recommended subfields for this term are $x ("Nonpublic note") or $z ("Public note"); unlike the other action terms discussed, "will conserve" uses neither subfields $i ("Method of action") nor $l ("Status"). This field was encoded as:

583 $3 Rare Books copy $a will conserve $c 20161104 $k abc $z Need to fix/touch-up leather. $2 pda $5 PSt

Project Assessment and Next Steps

Adding the MARC 583 field for the first batch of records was successful. All the initial project goals were fulfilled. However, there were a few problems, mostly the result of the handwritten notes. Some of these problems included spelling errors (e.g., "ethyfoam" instead of "ethafoam"), inconsistently adding initials, and variations in date information (full dates, year only, or omitting dates completely). Spelling errors were the easiest to address, particularly as only one cataloger was entering data, and therefore able to quickly spot variations. Lack of initials or incomplete dates were harder to catch and correct, especially since, in some cases, the interns wrote the notes several months before the information was handled by the cataloger.

Another problem was variation in recording details about housing or condition assessments, which was particularly apparent with the phase boxes with corrugated filler. Of the nine notes about corrugated filler, two stated only "corrugated board filler," two specified "acid-free corrugated board," two stated that the "upper portion [was] filled with acid-free corrugated board," and the remaining three mentioned the flute size (E- or B-flute). While it might be clear to current employees that these are all acid-free fillers, it might not be so to staff in the future. Standardization could help to prevent confusion at a later time.

To mitigate these problems, the author created an online form, which interns will complete in lieu of handwritten notes. Certain fields, such as date and initials, are required, ensuring that this information is always provided. Additionally, catalogers will be able to see data entered into the form, enabling them to immediately address any problems or questions that arise. Student interns began using the form during the fall 2017 semester.

An additional problem was the need to display data from the MARC 583 field in our online public access catalog (OPAC). Following the examples in PDA, the MARC 583 fields were constructed without punctuation. However, this generated an incomprehensible display in the public view of the catalog:

Rare Books copy will conserve 20161104 abc Need to fix leather. pda PSt

In part, this was fixed by suppressing subfields $2 and $5 from display. Initially, the plan was to suppress subfield $k from display to protect the interns' anonymity. However, materials conserved off-site recorded the vendor's name in subfield $k. Setting this field not to display would have created difficulties for these items. Instead, the interns' initials are recorded in the subfield $x ("Nonpublic note"), which is likewise set not to display.

Readability was provided for the other subfields by adding punctuation. A colon is provided after subfield $3, and subfield $z is treated as a complete sentence, preceded by and followed by a period. Other subfields are separated with semi-colons:

583 $3 Rare Books copy: $a will conserve; $c 20161104. $x abc $z Need to fix leather. $2 pda $5 PSt

This creates the following public display:

Rare Books copy: will conserve; 20161104. Need to fix leather.

While some portions of this information may remain unclear to library users (particularly dates), it is much more readable.

Using the MARC 583 field and PDA enabled the author's library to capture all the information provided by interns in the Batch I records. However, adapting the MARC 583 field for more detailed documentation would likely be difficult. Although the notes created by interns included some added details, all of their condition assessments and conservation treatments could still be concisely summarized. Documenting more complex conservation treatments requires more detail. While the AIC "Code of Ethics" permits the extent of documentation to vary according to circumstances, a complete record would include details of examination, a treatment plan, and documentation of the treatment.[36] To fully capture this information, it is necessary to either create very long public notes or to add multiple MARC 583 fields. One of McCann's survey respondents described this as "exhausting to think about."[37] Additionally, the "Code of Ethics" further states: "When appropriate, the records should be both written and pictorial."[38] At this time, images cannot be embedded directly in a MARC record. It is possible to link to images using either the subfield $u or a MARC 856 field, but the image would need to be hosted elsewhere. Because of these limitations, documentation for items requiring lengthy notes and pictorial documentation will not be added to the MARC record. For the shorter notes prepared by our interns, however, the MARC 583 field was effective.

Conclusion

As a whole, the project was successful and met all the original project goals. We added conservation notes for special

collections materials to our bibliographic records. The notes were publicly viewable, allowing library staff to ascertain condition and conservation information about items in the collection, collocate items, and find the items using the call number and location information recorded in subfield $3. By using standard terminology, staff could search for items based on treatment or housing type. The new practices adhere to national standards, including MARC 21 format standards and PDA.

Some of the results exceeded the initial project goals. The interns' condition notes, in particular, will help to avoid repeating work in the future and allow staff to learn whether damage to an item occurred before or after the date of examination. One stand-out example is the intern who noted that an item was dirty, rather than moldy. By adding this information to the catalog record, her examination is preserved.

Some additional work is needed. As noted in the "Project Assessment and Next Steps" section, we implemented a form to mitigate problems created by handwritten notes. In fall 2017, after using the form for a semester, we evaluated its effectiveness. The form does ensure that dates and initials are always recorded. However, as this is a new step in the workflow, we are still working with interns and library staff to ensure that it is always completed. This project was conducted for a limited time period during which the interns only performed a small number of treatments. As a result, certain notes appeared frequently, but these same notes may not occur as often in the future. As interns handle other treatments, we will need to construct new notes to describe them. Despite these minor issues, overall the MARC 583 field is an effective means of recording conservation documentation. We plan to implement this field as part of our permanent workflow.

References and Notes

1. American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC), "Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Practice," accessed October 18, 2017, www.conservation-us.org/our-organizations/association-(aic)/governance/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice/code-of-ethics-and-guidelines-for-practice-(html).
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. The Book and Paper Group of the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, "Written Documentation," *Paper Conservation Catalog*, accessed October 18, 2017, www.conservation-wiki.com/wiki/Written_Documentation_(PCC).
7. Ibid.
8. Angelica Zander Rudenstine and Timothy P. Whalen, "Conservation Documentation in a Digital Form: A Dialogue About the Issues," *Conservation* 21, no. 2 (2006): 26–28.
9. Ibid., 26.
10. Ibid., 27.
11. Ashok Roy, Susan Foister, and Angelica Rudenstine, "Conservation Documentation in Digital Form: A Continuing Dialogue about the Issues," *Studies in Conservation* 52, no. 4 (2007): 315–17.
12. Ibid., 316.
13. Ibid.
14. Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, "Standard Terminology for the MARC 21 Actions Note Field" (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1988), accessed October 18, 2017, www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/stmanf.html.
15. Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, "Preservation & Digitization Actions: Terminology for MARC 21 Field 583" (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 2004), accessed October 18, 2017, www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/pda.pdf.
16. Ibid., 2.
17. Laura McCann, "Conservation Documentation in Research Libraries: Making the Link with MARC Data," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 57, no. 1 (2013): 30–50.
18. Ibid., 34.
19. Ibid., 41.
20. Ibid., 40.
21. Ibid., 40–41.
22. Ibid., 39.
23. Jim Hinz and Babette Gehnrich, "Documenting Library Conservation Treatments: Using the 583 Action Note Field in the MARC Record," *The Book and Paper Group Annual* 25 (2006): 59–64.
24. Ibid., 60.
25. Association of Southeastern Research Libraries, "Standards For Use of the MARC 583 Field," accessed August 21, 2017, www.aserl.org/programs/j-retain/standards-for-use-of-the-marc-583-field/; Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries, "Disclosure Policy," accessed October 18, 2017, www.coalliance.org/sites/default/files/DisclosurePolicyMay2015.pdf.
26. The Maine Shared Collections Cooperative, "Structure of Local Holdings Information, Fields and Examples (583, 561, 852, 866)," accessed October 18, 2017, www.maineinfonet.org/mscs/about/people/technical-services-subcommittee/583-subcommittee/583-852-and-shared-print-symbol-examples/.
27. Folger Shakespeare Library, "MARC 583 Action Note," *Folgerpedia*, accessed October 18, 2017, https://folgerpedia.folger.edu/MARC_583_Action_Note.
28. Whitney Baker, "The Hybrid Conservator: Challenges in a Research Library Environment," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 48, no. 3 (2004): 181.

29. Atlas Systems, "Aeon," accessed October 18, 2017, www.atlas-sys.com/aeon/.
30. McCann, "Conservation Documentation in Research Libraries," 39.
31. Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, "583—Action Note," *MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 2005), accessed October 18, 2017, www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd583.html.
32. AIC, "Commentaries to the Guidelines for Practice."
33. In all examples, interns' initials will be recorded as "abc."
34. Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, "Preservation & Digitization Actions: Terminology for MARC 21 Field 583," 28.
35. Ibid., 10.
36. AIC, "Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Practice."
37. McCann, "Conservation Documentation in Research Libraries," 41.
38. AIC, "Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Practice."