Final Report
Academic Program Review
Special Collections

Review Process

Four special collections within the Library and Learning Resources (Center for Archival Collection, Government Documents, Music Library and Sound Recording Archives, and the Popular Culture Library) prepared self-study reports following program review guidelines. A four-person external review team visited the campus to meet with members of the Program Review Committee (PRC), members of the University community working within these special collections, and University administrators. The members of the PRC reviewed and discussed the lengthy self-study, the reports prepared by the external consultants, and the framing memo prepared by the Interim Dean of the Library. Based on this peer review process, the observations and recommendations of the PRC are summarized below.

CENTER FOR ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS

Self-Study

History and Mission

The primary mission of the Center for Archival Collections (CAC) is to acquire, preserve, and make accessible to researchers documentary materials in four areas (Northwest Ohio, University Archives, Rare Books and Special Collections, and Great Lakes). This collection, established in 1968 and transferred to Libraries and Learning Resources in 1975, includes archives/public records, manuscripts, printed materials, books, audiovisuals, cartographics, and newsprint. These materials, according to the self-study, reflect the interests of faculty and support established degree programs. In addition, the CAC works programatically to "promote a research environment on campus as well as to educate the northwest Ohio and Great Lakes community as to the research importance and preservation needs of primary source documents."

Professional and Support Staff

The CAC has a total of thirteen professional and clerical staff (twelve professional_contract and one clerical support staff). Each employee has an undergraduate degree and eight have at least one Master of Arts degree. All are professionally active in a wide variety of activities, including lecturers, workshop leaders, and more traditional academic venues (publication and University service).
In 1983 the Dean of Libraries and Learning Resources divided the local history archives into two distinct research areas, each administered by an independent Director. The Institute for Great Lakes Research was established and in 1986 was moved to newly renovated facilities at Levis Park in Perrysburg. In 1997 the Institute for Great Lakes History was dissolved and the personnel, collections, and budget were assimilated into the CAC.

Programs

A detailed listing of all of the varied programs operating within CAC is provided within the self-study under broad descriptive headings. Major areas designated within CAC are 1) acquisitions (areas of strength include Civil War, Higher Education, Local and State History, Great Lakes Maritime History, University Archives, Rare Books and Special Collections); 2) preservation microfilm; 3) public outreach programs; 4) presentations, seminars, and conservation workshops; 5) grant writing; 6) endowment/financial support; 7) records management; and 8) reference service.

- Acquisitions: Areas of strength include Civil War, Higher Education, Local and State History, Great Lakes Maritime History, University Archives, Rare Books and Special Collections. All collections are deeded to the University using Instrument of Gift forms and are recorded through the Development Office. Many donations come through "quiet" solicitation and personal contact or through University alumni. As a founding member of the Network of American History Research Centers, the acquisition of materials in the area of local history and Great Lakes maritime history is of national stature. According to the self-study, the CAC enjoys an excellent reputation as a leader in the acquisition of historical materials. However, the authors of the self study do suggest that "more discretion is needed in the selection of materials" for all of these collections and "appraisals need to be comprehensive and streamlined." In short, acquisitions need to be "focused and deliberate."
- Preservation microfilm: The CAC has administered a nationally recognized preservation microfilm program for twenty-five years. It is the largest in the state. It is a revenue enhancing program. The self-study points to the changing nature of preservation technology (ie, scanners, copiers, compact disc, computer output microfilm systems) and the need for training and equipment.
- Public outreach programs and Presentations: Innovation and expertise characterize the public outreach programs sponsored by CAC. The recent creation of the Northwest Ohio Public Records Alliance has brought about increased acquisitions and preservation microfilm contracts. Other outreach programs include the annual Conference on Local History, the publication of The Archival Chronicle (three times each year and distributed to 1,800), and various presentations, seminars and workshops on and off campus.
- Grant writing: The CAC has been active in securing grants to support the various activities of the unit. Proposals have been submitted to local, federal and state agencies for financial support.
- Endowment/financial support: The CAC has been active in working with various groups to increase funds in this area. According to the self-study, over
the past seven years the CAC has realized an 85% increase in endowment funds. Currently the total endowment is at $285,953.

- Records management: The CAC is responsible for managing the University’s Records Management System and provides reference service (and shredding) for the BGSU administration and office of legal counsel. The unit averages 175 requests for public documents each year and administers a 15,000- cubic foot records storage facility.
- Reference service: The CAC averages 2,400 walk-in patrons each year with an additional 3,400 phone requests for information. Sixty percent of the reference requests are from BGSU students; forty percent come from off-campus.

**Information Resources and Services**

Approximately one third of the CAC holdings have been preserved through its preservation microfilm program. The CAC fully participates in all electronic databases (internet access, email services, BGlink and OHIOlink). Its cataloging services are consistent with LLR policies and procedures. The unit has also developed a web page. The CAC also provides paper conservation services for all in-house documents.

**Fiscal Affairs**

More than half of all CAC operational revenues are generated from off campus sources. The CAC is supported by seven independent endowments established through the University’s Development Office. It maintains two endowments, one each for Local History and Great Lakes Maritime History. CAC has two, two-year, assistantships with the Department of History. The CAC Preservation Microfilming Program generates approximately $40,000 each year.

**CAC Planning**

Facilities and equipment needs are stressed in the self-study. Concerns with environmental controls are carefully and clearly stated: Jerome Library does not meet national standards for the proper preservation and care of archival materials. The self-study urges immediate action, beginning with a professional consultant who should be hired to give recommendations as to the structural feasibility of Jerome as an archive center.

Additional acquisitions will be sought to maintain and strengthen the current holdings. Funds must be found to support these efforts. Acquisition decisions will be guided by the Director of CAC, the Assistant Director of CAC, and the Great Lakes Archivist. This committee will also oversee all decisions concerning donated material as well. Plans to support the Northwest Ohio Records Alliance will also be followed.

Given the demands of the records management function of CAC (University records), the CAC requests approximately $5000 per year to administer this program. This budget increase would be used to employ student assistants to help operate the program.
The CAC has articulated plans to better coordinate their internal fundraising efforts with the Development Office.

Although the financial aspect of the CAC microfilm program is solid through 2003, much must be done to balance internal needs for this service and the requirement of maintaining a revenue enhancing program. Similar concerns surround the staffing and mission of the paper conservation program. According to the self-study, a “clear precise paper conservation program needs to be in place by 2001.”

For the next three years the CAC will appropriate additional resources in the form of released time for Ms Bowers given her recent appointment as editor of Northwest Ohio Quarterly.

The first priority in the area of reference and research services is to find out how to service more efficiently the Great Lakes Collection. This includes issues of staff time, imaging equipment, and storage.

Within the next seven years the CAC will replace all top administrative staff. The Director and Assistant Director will probably retire within the next three or four years. The self-study suggests these hires have joint appointments with History, American Culture, or Women’s Studies, and have fund raising and development experience.

**External Report**

The external report clearly stresses the quality of the CAC in terms of holdings and staff. The report, pointedly titled "A Heritage Preserved / A Heritage at Risk", concluded that the physical facility is "inadequate" for the storage and preservation of the archival materials: "...there is no higher priority than providing adequate space to ensure the continued availability and long-term preservation of the Center for Archival Collections’ holdings." Specific recommendations include: 1) install a fire suppression system in Jerome Library or build a new special collections facility; and 2) install a new HVAC system to protect materials stored in the special collections area (the current system does not meet national standards).

Recommendations for issues of mission/acquisition and development, records management, personnel and services, and preservation include the following:
1. appoint a "collection development committee" consisting of director, assistant director, Great Lakes Archivist, reference archivists, and faculty representatives in discussions concerning focus of all collections;
2. seek internal sources of funding for collection development; seek external funding for collection processing;
3. coordinate a working relationship with the Center for Great Lakes Culture (Michigan State University);
4. reduce acquisition work in rare books, or realign efforts so they intersect more closely with collecting strengths in the manuscripts and archival collections;
5. work towards a cooperative approach to the management of electronic records with other central administration offices;
6. increase efforts to secure external funding to support activities;
7. continue contracted micro-graphic work and seek out additional contracts;
8. coordinate work within LLR to take advantage of the CAC’s preservation lab and seek funding to make this a continuing program;
9. reference staff should take responsibility for the Great Lakes Collection, thus releasing the Great Lake archivist for other tasks (such as fund raising);
10. update website for the Center only as useful and reallocate reference staff time to other duties;
11. seek campus-wide approach to the development of a cooperative digital image data base.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Self-Study

History and Mission

Primarily a processing unit, the staff of Government Documents is responsible for acquiring, processing, maintaining, and accessing federal, state, and local government materials. The University became a federal depository in 1933, an Ohio depository in 1953, the city of Bowling Green depository in 1983, and an official Canadian Documents depository in 1999. The unit provides information and resource services during most hours the libraries are open. Staff arrange for use of materials, including two CD-ROM work stations for government documents online. The unit also maintains a webpage. It should be noted that library staff from this unit present instructional sessions each year (fifteen one-hour sessions) and GradSTEP sessions each fall. Last year the unit received 16,456 federal documents, and 1,015 Ohio publications.

In November 1999 the unit was awarded $131,674 (subject to annual renewal for the next four years) by the Ohio Department of Development to establish a Government Contract Assistance Center in Jerome Library. The purpose of the Center (GCAC) is to provide government procurement assistance and counseling to businesses in 22 counties in Northwest Ohio.

The most recent review by the Government Printing Office (February 1998) concluded that the unit was in compliance in all areas (collection development, bibliographic, control, maintenance, human resources, physical facilities, public services, and cooperative efforts). During the most recent review, the unit was commended by the GPO for the "excellent written collection development policy" designed to profile users to guide acquisition decisions.

Staff and Facility

The unit has two classified staff members and one faculty member (Coordinator of Government Documents), one half-time media technical assistant, six or seven student employees, and a small group of volunteers. Government
Documents is located on the first floor of the Jerome Library next to the Documents Office. Materials are stored in various locations, including the Northwest Regional Book Depository in Perrysburg. Format (microfiche, books, pamphlets, etc) and subject of the document stored determines the location of storage. The unit has two public workstations (one 486 PC, and one Pentium 133), four staff workstations (one Pentium 75, two Pentium 133, and one Pentium II) and four student workstations (one Wyse terminal, and three Pentiums).

**Fiscal Matters**

The annual book budget is $500. Student employee budget is $6000. General supplies cost around $200 each year.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of Unit**

The unit identifies the following as programmatic strengths: dedicated faculty and staff trained to process a wide array of materials and document formats, an improved and improving service record and facility, and a varied and responsive mission (including the recent GCAC grant and Canadian documents initiative, among others).

The unit identifies the following as programmatic weaknesses: the lack of a full-time, tenure-track assistant documents coordinator, the lack adequate paper preservation services, inadequate discretionary budget (funds needed to replace and expand microfiche collection and build historical collections, etc), and the need for updated workstations.

**Unit Planning**

The staff of Government Documents lists bibliographic control as a continuing priority. They have established clear and effective procedures to catalog all incoming materials in a timely manner. As federal and state publications move to web-based resources, continued and increased work will be done in this area. Given the increase in public access to materials in the collection (and the limited space for expansion in the current location) it will be necessary to tie acquisitions to demand, devote time to weed superseded and unwanted materials from the collection, and send older titles to remote storage. Issues of preservation must be addressed, including scanning, imaging, and other technological advances.

During the next seven years a regular, comprehensive evaluation of service (user satisfaction with the Reference staff) will be planned. Upgrade of public workstations and training of staff in technology will be a priority.

Continued development of the Government Contract Assistance Center during the next four years should lead to additional sources of external funding and enhanced community service opportunities.
External Report

The external reviewer noted that the self-study was "comprehensive" and that the unit head provides effective leadership of the area; in addition, area staff represent a significant strength.

The present location of the documents promotes user access to the collection and to the staff. While the location of the unit is useful, solutions must be found to address issues of document preservation (including electronic access and storage). The external report supports the various options provided in the self-study, including the need for a 485 workstation (with a high-speed web terminal added) and the need to cooperate with other depository libraries in the area as a means to meet these information needs. And finally, the reviewer notes that the electronic collection requires considerable management and expertise. In order to maintain a demonstrated "commitment to continued excellent service, meeting the needs of this collection is imperative in the next few years."

An assistant coordinator, if added as a professional staff member, could provide help in teaching library user education classes, expand outreach to academic departments, and provide additional expertise in the "burgeoning electronic documents" area. The external report concludes that the "two-tiered reference system" seems to work well and should be continued.

MUSIC LIBRARY AND SOUND RECORDING ARCHIVES

Self-Study

History and Mission

The Music Library and the Sound Recording Archives consists of two separate, yet symbiotic, functional areas - units combined administratively and physically. The primary mission of the Music Library is to support the programmatic needs of the various programs within the College of Musical Arts, including the archives of the CMA Recording Studios and the Archives of the MidAmerican Center for Contemporary Music. A secondary mission is to support the other music needs of other campus units. The Sound Recording Archives' stated mission is to support the "recorded sound needs of departments other than the College of Musical Arts," particularly the Department of Popular Culture and the American Culture Studies Program. The Archives, founded in 1967, holds the largest known archive of popular music in an academic institution (more than 650,000 items - recordings in all known formats and supporting print and ephemeral materials).

Services provided by the ML/SRA include reference, instruction, listening, course reserves, and a limited taping service for classroom teaching and student presentations. Circulating material is available statewide through OhioLINK. The head of the ML/SRA teaches the required, 2-hour, graduate music education course in research techniques (MUCH 602) every fall and alternate summers. Other staff members participate in the orientation program for new graduate students.
Facility and Staff

During the fall of 1999 the Listening Center was completely refurbished with new equipment and furnishings (the first renovation done in 20 years). Although various changes in the physical arrangement of the ML/SRA have been tried to increase the efficient use of space and to enhance service to patrons, limited space continues to be a major concern. The ML/SRA occupies the third floor of the Jerome Library, a space consisting of approximately 8400 square feet (20% used for study, 10% for staff offices and work areas, and 70% for storage - both open and closed stacks). According to the self-study, space is a grave concern to the ML/SRA staff. For example, the closed stack area is well past capacity and the public areas are barely adequate. Climate control is also a serious problem.

As the number and variety of electronic resources have increased, users' needs for staff have increased as well, placing more demands on MS/SRA staff for public service. The ML/SRA staff includes 2.6 FTE faculty librarians, 2.5 classified staff members, 1 music graduate assistant, 3 graduate supervisors, and 20-25 student assistants.

Fiscal Matters

Budgets have been flat since 1992. The allotment for SRA firm orders is $7200 per year; $16800 is allotted for Music Library firm orders and score approval plans. The SRA budget is augmented by funds from the annual sale of duplicate materials donated to the collection; these form funds earned through the InfoLINK (75% of InfoLINK billings is available for SRA purchases and 25% is transferred to the LLR operating budget). A special fund was established in 1999-2000 to support extraordinary purchases within the Special Collections departments. In addition, the ML/SRA recently participated in a Canadian Embassy matching funds grant and from 1994 through early 1997 benefited from an NEH grant used to catalogue 16,000 items prior to OCLC.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The quality of the staff and the richness of the unique holdings within the SRA are noted as unit strengths. Weaknesses noted within the self-study focus on lack of adequate budget, space, environmental controls for storage, and adequate staff to maintain the operations of each area.

Unit Plans

Space and environmental conditions are a major concern. The staff will continue to transfer low-use, open-stack books to the Depository; however, it should be noted that this is not a workable solution for all materials, including scores. The closed stack area (for the SRA) is of particular concern (aisles and hallways have already become permanent storage areas). The unit does not support the idea of refusing additional donations and/or narrowing the focus of the
collection. To do so is viewed as "draconian" and would involve "significant investment in staff time" and result in "adverse publicity for BGSU."

The ongoing concern for the SRA collection is the lack of any nationally coordinated effort to collect and preserve recorded popular music. The self-study asks the question: "Do we continue with broad emphases or do we begin narrowing our focus?" If the College of Musical Arts moves toward a doctorate in 20th Century music, holdings will need to be enhanced along with current articulated needs in world music (to support undergraduate programs).

Staffing plans include the anticipated retirement of at least one staff member and the request to pull the Special Collections Cataloger position (currently shared with the Popular Culture Library) into the ML/SRA full time. Additional staff are requested to "make significant progress" in providing bibliographic access the SRA collections.

The unit also notes that plans, not articulated in the self-study, must guide future decisions concerning the integration of electronic reference materials and the preparation of all staff members within the unit to access these new formats/materials. For example, the self-study asks: "To what degree should we expect MC/SRA staff to gain expertise in the wide range of resources available?"

**External Report**

The external report stresses the importance of the unique holdings of the SRA as an "internationally known" collection. The professional efforts of specific individuals on the staff are noted as contributing to this reputation. The staff of the ML/SRA is praised as "qualified, enthusiastic, and committed to providing service to their clientele." Specific findings from the external report are as follows:

1) Lack of adequate space: Plan and build a suitable building to house these collections.
2) Lack of appropriate environmental conditions. Immediate action is needed to address security issues, fire suppression needs, and temperature and humidity controls.
3) Need for more money to support research collections: Increase budget by $20,000 annually.
4) Need for adequate staff to process and provide access to these collections. Hire staff and consider grants or private development to provide cataloging support (combined with preservation plans). In addition, immediate attention must be made to document holdings unprocessed in the SRC.
5) Lack of collecting focus in the Sound Recording Archives. BGSU must lead the Association for Recorded Sound Collections to articulate a national plan for archiving popular music. The current "nine top subject priorities" for collecting begins with "popular music" - a vast subject area itself. With such a broad collection policy, future implications for access, staff, service and housing are daunting and beyond the current space crisis. There does not appear to be a coordination of collection and development efforts with the Popular Culture Archive.
6) Cataloging efforts are random - prioritized by need and reference questions. Errors can be found. There does not seem to be a focus or plan driving the majority of the cataloging efforts for the SRA. In addition, the staff appears to be overwhelmed by the task, although they seem to enjoy working with their clientele and with each other.

POPULAR CULTURE LIBRARY

Self-Study

History and Mission

During the past thirty years, the popular culture collection has grown to become the largest academic library in the United States devoted to the acquisition, preservation, and use of primary research materials documenting 19th and 20th century popular culture. Ninety percent of the holdings have been acquired as donations. The library holdings - over 125,000 books, more than 1,600 traditional and non-traditional serial titles, and hundreds of thousands of items in various special collections - cover subjects as diverse as popular fiction, television and film, graphic art, travel, cookery, material culture, manners and etiquette, parapsychology, sexuality, sports and games, hobbies and celebrities, fashion and home furnishing, humor, and related topics. The primary mission of the collection has been to serve the curricular and research needs of BGSU students and faculty and to serve as a resource for cultural studies scholars from around the world.

Faculty/Staff Resources and Fiscal Matters

The staff resources of the Popular Culture Library include three faculty members (2.4 FTE), two classified staff members (1.75 FTE), and limited graduate student and undergraduate student support. The self-study provides a detailed listing of funding and expenditures for this unit.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The self-study provides a clear summary of strengths and weaknesses: "The strengths of the Popular Culture Library include research-level collections of international stature; the weaknesses include inadequate building facilities, over-reliance on student employees for essential services, and staff resources that are over-extended."

Unit Planning

The self-study provides two 5-7 year plans: the first details how the University can support a comprehensive collection policy; the second plan details how the University can support a limited collection and mission policy (beginning with the resignation of the current director). The unit supports the first plan.
External Review

The external review confirms the quality and stature of the collection as a valuable research center and the effective leadership it has had in recent years. Recommendations include the following:

- Review and narrow the focus of the collection;
- Find resources to expend more money on primary and research documents, including international popular culture;
- Increase support to catalogue the collection;
- Give immediate attention to environmental and security concerns;
- Considering combining the reading rooms for PCL and CAC;
- Increase external funds to support the collection and address issues of housing the collection;
- Continue to serve as a resource for students as well as researchers.

Program Review Committee Findings

Each of the special collections (Archival Collections, Government Documents, Music Library and Sound Recording Archives, and Popular Culture Library) appear to have similar needs/concerns:

- External reports confirm that each of the areas lack adequate space, adequate fire suppression systems and environmental controls.
- Although the Perrysburg facility is excellent for remote storage (for rarely used materials), reports suggest that it is also used for more valuable materials.
- Each area reports inadequate staff—especially the Music Library and Popular Culture areas — particularly in the areas of cataloging and conservation. (The external report noted that the Popular Culture Collection is "imperfectly cataloged" - consequently the University really doesn't know what it has and what is there cannot be assessed.)
- Each area could improve coordination with other research/collection centers (for example, the Center for Great Lakes Culture at Michigan State and the Association for Recorded Sound Collections).
- Each area (with the exception of the Government Document unit) needs to work for a more focused acquisition mission.
- External reports confirm that each area lacks adequate budgets, fund raising, and computer equipment.

Various sections from last year’s program review document serve as context for the findings and review recommendations focusing on Special Collections:

“The PRC sees the Library as a vital contributor to the mission of the University. Based on the experience of its members, as well as on the information provided in the self-study and the external review, the PRC agrees that a consistent strength of the Library is its staff. They not only provide a high level of service to library patrons, but they do so with good humor and collegiality. The commitment of the staff to the Library is plainly evident in the way they carry out their work. The PRC recommends that the administration should commit to investing in the
maintenance and improvement of the Library and its services. The central question is where that investment should go.

“The Library sees itself as serving as a Research Library, as an Instructional Library and as an Archival repository. A plan should be developed for determining how available resources should be distributed among the Research, Instructional and Archival needs. In addition, a plan should be developed for determining how the Library intends to divide its resources between acquisitions in electronic form versus local hard copy materials. The existing plan, through the year 2000, is a good one but a new plan needs to be implemented to set priorities for future resource use. These priorities will determine how the following recommendations are to be implemented. The success of the Library is a function of the strength of its collection and its ability to access electronic information...

“The PRC noted that the proliferation of rapidly changing information technologies means that Library personnel may find their training and skills inadequate for the needs of the 21st century library. The net result is that some job categories may become redundant or underutilized. LLR currently has some retraining programs in place to deal with this problem and these need to be maintained and expanded in some areas ...

Both the self-study and the external review team’s report remarked on the space constraints that the Library faces and the need to maintain and upgrade the physical facilities. The space constraints have meant that part of the collection is housed in the Northwest Ohio Book Depository... The time is approaching when these structures will either have to be renovated or replaced. Budgetary considerations preclude any significant efforts in this direction in the immediate future. Nevertheless, the PRC, in accord with the report of the external review team, felt that plans for this contingency needed to be developed. Given current demands on the capital expenditure budget, the Library should position its requests for implementation during budget cycles coming up in six to ten years” (pages 10-11).

We also make a number of findings pertaining specifically to the special collections.

1) The self-study did not provide a seven-year plan for all collections. We believe there would be great value in developing such a plan, particularly if it were coordinated among the several special collections.
2) The PRC finds that there is not a well-defined collection development plan for several of the special collections. It is clear from this review process that a clear and focused collections policy is lacking for the Archive of Recorded Sound and the Popular Culture Collection, in light of the changing “definition” of Popular Culture as taught and researched at BGSU. In addition, the external review team stressed the importance of limiting collection development in the Center for Archival Collections specifically to those areas (and items) appropriate to an institution like BGSU. Although many materials are acquired at no immediate cost, there are substantial space and personnel costs associated with cataloging and maintaining a collection. Hence, the absence of a well-defined and well-focused collection development plan has weighty consequences. In short, it is
not clear that the collection development plans in all of these special collections equally serve the research needs of BGSU faculty and students.

3) Particularly in the Archive of Recorded Sound and in the Popular Culture Collection, much material is “imperfectly cataloged”. Understanding of the relative worth of these collections can not be achieved until we know what we have. In addition, the worth of these materials as a research archive is limited by the lack of access. Effective coordination exists between the College of Musical Arts and the music collection in the area of collection development, particularly as it guides acquisitions in the Music Library. Collection development plans also guide acquisitions in Government Documents.

4) The PRC understands that BGSU is known for elements of the special collections. We have materials that bring scholars to campus to do research in these collections. These narrow areas of focus, yet to be identified in all of the collections, ought to be viewed as specialized research archives with clearly articulated processes for collection development. These focused research collections, tightly focused, ought to be maintained. As noted by the external reviewers, rigorous reflection and refinement in the area of collection development is needed, particularly in the Popular Culture Collection and in the Center for Archival Collections.

5) The PRC finds that the larger issue of providing adequate space and technology for these collections requires serious attention by the University administration. Some parts of these collections will be ruined if not adequately stored and maintained.

6) External funds should be pursued to support some aspects of collection maintenance.

Program Review Committee Recommendations

The following recommendations are listed in order of importance as determined by the PRC. Thus, the most important task, as determined by the PRC, is the development of a 5-7 year plan that will outline the priorities for the Library as it strives to maintain and improve services in an ever-changing technological environment.

1) Coordinated Planning. Given that only the Popular Culture Library self-study areas provided a 5-7 year plan (all other units provided a list of issues and concerns), it is imperative that all units in the Special Collections area work together to provide a comprehensive plan. The plan should be made available for review by Spring 2001. This plan should be submitted as part of the planning process recommended last year in the LLR’s program review.

2) Focused acquisitions policy. Last year’s recommendations included the following: “The PRC recommends that the Library develop a plan, in conjunction with the Vice Provost for Research, for focusing its research acquisition budget in identified research concentrations on campus, with additional consideration for support of the research needs of faculty” (11). The recommendations for the special collections echo that previous recommendation: The budget, staffing, and lack of focus within the Special Collections must be addressed. These concerns must be part of the larger conversation. In short, the PRC concludes
that a focused acquisition policy must be articulated for all of the Special Collection areas by Spring 2001. The process of updating and maintaining a focused acquisition policy should be revisited annually and detailed as part of the Program Review Annual Reports. We further recommend that the Executive Vice President and the Graduate Dean jointly appoint a faculty committee to work with the Special Collections staff to plan and review this acquisition plan.

a) The PRC agrees with the recommendation that the acquisition of rare books should not, in most cases, be a priority for the Center for Archival Collections.
b) Overall, the collection development priorities in these Special Collections must coordinate with the BGSU programs most likely to use the collections.
c) In order to make collections of distinctive value, the PRC urges the library staff to continue to seek out the guidance and cooperation of other archivists and specialists across the country in setting collection development priorities, specifically as a means of articulating the distinctive strengths of the BGSU collections. Part of this conversation should include open forum discussions with BGSU research faculty.
d) The resource plan for Special Collections should address how available resources could be redistributed between Special Collection areas to meet current staffing needs.

3) Catalog unprocessed material. The PRC recommends that the Library Dean take immediate action to shift resources within these units to catalog unprocessed material in the archive collections, particularly in the Archive of Recorded Sound and the Popular Culture Collection.

4) Prioritize the archival function for external audiences. It is imperative that the leadership within the library work with the Special Collections staff and BGSU faculty to prioritize expenditures on the Special Collections (including personnel and space needs) and work to refine and/or establish focused collection development plans. This must be done in the context of how the library plans to serve the research needs of scholars from outside BGSU, as well as BGSU faculty, staff, and students.

5) Space and technology. Providing adequate space and technology for these collections demands long-term planning by the University administration. Some parts of these collections will be ruined if not adequately stored. The PRC urges the University Administration to consider these space and technology needs within the context of University priorities, specifically as they connect to issues of maintenance and expansion within the Library complex.

6) External funding. The PRC urges the staff of the Special Collections to work together to establish clear goals for securing external funding to enhance the maintenance and visibility of these collections.

The Dean of Libraries and Learning Resources should report annually to the Executive Vice President, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.