

2010

Lost gems: Identifying rare and unusual monographs in a university's circulating collection

Michael Barnes

Eastern Michigan University, mbarnes1@emich.edu

Robert G. Kelly

Eastern Michigan University, robert.kelly@emich.edu

Maureen Kerwin

University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, mkerwin@emich.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.emich.edu/lib_sch



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barnes, Michael; Kelly, Robert G.; and Kerwin, Maureen, "Lost gems: Identifying rare and unusual monographs in a university's circulating collection" (2010). *University Library Faculty Scholarship*. 9. https://commons.emich.edu/lib_sch/9

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Library at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Library Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

Lost Gems: Identifying Rare and Unusual Monographs in a University's Circulating Collection.

*Michael Barnes, Assistant Librarian Eastern Michigan University

Halle Library 955 W. Circle Drive

Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

mbarnes1@emich.edu

*Robert G. Kelly, Assistant Librarian Eastern Michigan University

Halle Library 955 W. Circle Drive

Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Robert.kelly@emich.edu

Maureen Kerwin, School of Information University of Michigan

Halle Library 955 W. Circle Drive

Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

mkerwin@emich.edu;

*Contact Authors

Abstract

Identifying and evaluating the oldest published content held by the library using a set of transfer criteria provided a means to systematically evaluate and, if necessary, move rare or unusual content into a more secure location. The process enabled us to correct cataloging errors, identify and address items with condition issues, be familiar with the library's unique holdings and finally, to identify and add content distinctly associated with EMU's history to the University Archives and Special Collections.

Eastern Michigan University (EMU) was founded in 1849 as the first teacher's (Normal) school west of the Alleghenies. During this 160 year history the library and its collections have played an important role in the life of the university. As the facility moved to various locations around campus, collections were evaluated and weeded before being moved. Currently, the Halle facility contains a 100,000 title browsing collection, an Automated Retrieval Collection (ARC) that holds the bulk of the older circulating monograph collection, and an archive where a small rare book collection and other materials associated with the history and development of EMU are preserved. However, there is no record of a systematic review to identify rare or unusual content within the nearly one million items that now make up the collection. After being prompted by a student concerned about finding a book published in 1860 on the browsing shelves and discovering a rich array of pre-1900 field guides, we became interested in learning more about how the earliest published titles owned by the University Library were being handled.

In January 2009, we compiled a list of over 40,000 titles with imprint dates prior to 1940 from the catalog. After benchmarking two hundred of the oldest titles against criteria such as local/national holdings and how titles were being handled by other regional libraries, we decided that the collection should be evaluated for rarity and unusual content. The Rare Books Review Team convened in May 2009. The Collection Development Librarian was selected as the leader of the project. The Cataloging/Metadata Librarian was added to the Team to correct the cataloging errors which were discovered as a byproduct of the review process. Since these items were already in-hand, the library would have no better time to correct the errors which would provide a more accurate description of the library's holdings. Using our initial investigative results, the Team also developed an internship position for a student enrolled at the School of

Information at the University of Michigan (UMSI) to assist us in developing policies and procedures for systematically reviewing the collection (Appendix 1). Throughout the project the University Archivist was consulted to help make decisions regarding space for the rare book selections and to help review the overall condition of the items in question. However, the overall mission of the University Archives is to collect and retain official records of Eastern Michigan University as well as collect records created by the University's faculty and staff, and finally, to not collect non-University related family papers, ephemera, and other materials. We therefore determined that this project was outside their mission. The Team laid out the following objectives to guide the project and help insure it would be completed by August 2009:

1. Conduct a literature review to determine if and how other institutions had performed a systematic review of their early content.
2. Identify criteria upon which titles would be benchmarked for inclusion in the archives, tailoring the criteria specifically to address the issue of protecting rare and/or unusual content.
3. Develop and refine the process based upon the above criteria by assessing 1000 of the earliest imprints.
4. Draft a journal article describing, evaluating, and assessing the value of this project.

Process

Beginning with Library Literature, we searched for journal articles that provided criteria for identifying rare books or special collections materials and immediately located a document that seemed to be directly suited to the project—the ACRL's "Guidelines on the Selection and

Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections.”¹ It discusses the need for a written transfer policy, methods for identifying items to be considered for transfer, and examples of criteria that a library may wish to use to determine what is rare. Near the end, the article provides a set of sample transfer criteria for “a public research university library established in the mid-19th century and located in the Midwest United States”, which appeared tailor-made for developing a transfer policy for Eastern Michigan University.

Unfortunately, the Team had limited success in locating other relevant articles. Samuel A. Streit’s article, “Transfer of Materials from General Stacks to Special Collections”², which had been based on the ACRL guidelines, while covering much of the same content does add valuable suggestions about both the policy and procedures. A third article, entitled “What Be Rare?”³ provides a brief description of rare book criteria, reinforcing the elements mentioned by Streit and the ACRL guidelines.

We also consulted with the University of Michigan Special Collections unit, whose curator referred us to the ACRL transfer document as the profession’s statement on the issue. She noted that while U of M did not have a written transfer policy, additional factors they would consider included the intellectual, historical, or scholarly significance of the text, edition, printer, or author; significant features in illustrations, art, binding, printing, or materials of construction; scarcity of the title locally, regionally, and globally; the importance of the item in building a particular collection; fragility; the overall significance of the item as an artifact; the market value

of the item; and age. She suggested that age and fragility may be good places to start but warned that age alone could not qualify an item as rare.

We conducted a second literature search after completing a review of 1008 titles, reasoning that given our experience, we would be more successful in locating articles on this topic. However, the results were essentially the same as before with no new content being discovered. We speculated that this lack of relevant literature on the topic could be because what constitutes a “rare or unusual book” is uniquely defined by each institution. ARCL’s publication *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* has an entire issue devoted to the concept of what constitutes a rare or unusual item which could be helpful in defining the specific parameters for individual libraries. (*RBM* v. 5 no2 (Fall 2004))

After completing the literature review, we drafted a transfer policy (Appendix 2) with an initial set of criteria and proceeded to test it against small batches of monographs. The criteria were revised several times with the understanding they needed to be modified to meet the specific needs of Eastern Michigan University. Once finalized, the criteria placed items reviewed for transfer in one of three categories:

1. Items that should remain at their current location
2. Items that should be transferred from the browsing collection to the ARC
3. Items that should be transferred to the Archives and Special Collections

In order to determine the category in which an item belonged, two levels of criteria were applied. It was decided that every item should remain at its original location unless it met the criteria to be transferred. Items that passed the first set of criteria, or were already located in the

ARC, were tested by the second, stricter set of criteria to determine if they should be recommended for transfer to the University Archives and Special Collections.

The first set of criteria was largely developed from suggestions in the ACRL guidelines. The Team added the attribute “special significance to EMU” to refer to content related to the history of EMU, the state of Michigan, early training or normal schools, works by people that have taught at EMU, and special collections in the archives associated with Thomas Edison, Motown Records, and early children’s literature. Additionally, the Team decided to include the specific holdings of the respective titles in Michigan and worldwide as a transfer factor. The local holdings were benchmarked against the collections held at the following Michigan institutions: The Detroit Public Library, Wayne State University, the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Central Michigan University, and Western Michigan University.

To be considered for transfer to the ARC from the browsing collection, items must have at least one attribute from both of the following categories:

- Fewer than 30 holdings reported in OCLC worldwide, for all copies of the same title in similar editions; fewer than four holdings reported in OCLC at the above Michigan institutions, original binding.
- Published in the United States, Latin American or Africa prior to 1850, in the original binding; published prior to 1825, in the original binding; children’s books published prior to 1920, in the original binding; travel books published prior to 1900, in the original binding; published in the Confederate States of America (CSA), 1860-1865, in the original binding; market value over \$300; special physical characteristics such as original

artwork or fine binding; non-standard formats, sizes, materials, or shapes; handwritten, typed or fragile; significant provenance; signed copies.

Browsing collection items meeting the criteria for transfer to the ARC and items already in the ARC having two or more of the following attributes were considered for transfer to the Archives and Special Collections:

- Fewer than 10 holdings reported worldwide for all copies of the same title in similar editions; fewer than three holdings reported at certain Michigan institutions;
- Market value over \$500; or special significance to EMU.

Appendix 3 summarizes the criteria used to identify materials that would be transferred either to the ARC or, more restrictively, into the Archives and Special Collections.

The project was carried out by examining candidates for transfer in chronological order of their date of publication using a spreadsheet of all the monographs in the collection published prior to 1940 that was generated from the catalog. Information about the books was recorded in the spreadsheet using codes for the specific factors to assess (i.e. under the category "Condition", the reviewer noted RB to indicate that a book was rebound). (Appendix 4). The procedure was:

1. Retrieve a selection of books from the ARC or browsing collection
2. Verify that the publication information from the catalog entry is correct
3. Note the condition of the book
4. Locate the OCLC entry and record the holdings information
5. If necessary, estimate the market value by checking various Internet sites for similar items
6. Assess significance to EMU

7. Considering scarcity, condition, market value, and other factors as listed in the two sets of criteria above, make a recommendation for the item to be transferred or to remain in its current location by indicating in the appropriate section of the spreadsheet
8. Return the books and continue.

The spreadsheet was reviewed by the Collection Development Librarian and the Head of Cataloging for final decisions and transfer actions.

Results

Of the 1008 items reviewed, 6% (63 items) were from the browsing collection and 94% (945 items) were from the ARC. When applying the transfer criteria, five titles were recommended for transfer from the browsing collection to the ARC and none were recommended for transfer directly to Archives. Of the items located in the ARC, 34 titles were recommended for transfer to the Archives and Special Collections, representing 3.37% of all titles reviewed. There were 837 titles (83.4%) that remained in their current locations and 132 titles (13.1%) had no decision on whether to change their location as they were missing, not on the shelf, etc. No titles were reverse transferred from the ARC to the browsing collection. (See Table 1)

Table 1:

	Items from 3 rd Level	Items from ARC	Total # of Items	% for Items from 3 rd Level	% for Items from ARC	Total % of all Items Reviewed
Total # of items initially reviewed	63	945	1008	6.25%	93.75%	100.00%
Change Location to ARC	5	0	0	0.50%	0.00%	0.50%
Change location to	0	34	34	0.0%	3.37%	3.37%

Archives						
Keep In current Location	14	823	837	1.39%	81.65%	83.04%
No decision on location change	44	88	132	4.37%	8.73%	13.10%
Totals:	63	945	1008	6.25%	93.75%	100.00%

Analysis of the five items transferred from Browsing to ARC revealed that three titles were moved due to the limited number copies, one title was in poor condition (brittle cover) and one title, if it had not been rebound, would be worth more than \$600. The dates of publication ranged from 1800 to 1860. All five items had circulated a total of 15 times with one title having six checkouts.

Examining the 34 ARC titles recommended for transfer to the archives, the most common element was scarcity (fewer than three copies in Michigan) and items containing rare color plates. The date of publication ranged from 1800 to 1855. 30 of the 34 items had no circulation and the remaining four titles had a total of ten circulations (ranging from one to six checkouts).

A fair number of items (24%) were identified as having cataloging issues. Further review of these titles revealed that 104 (10%) items were cataloged as originals when they were actually reprints or reproductions. Only one item reviewed was cataloged as a being a reprint, when it was actually the original publication. It should be noted that the Team found that there are fewer cataloging issues with monographs published after 1900.

Not surprisingly the majority of titles (83%) were kept in their current location. We investigated why a significant majority of the browsing titles (44 out of 63) did not have a recommendation. Five titles were already in the Cataloging Department for review; one title is checked out; nine are missing; a 26 volume set is in technical services waiting for cataloging; three titles require consultation with UM Music Library.

Once we finalized the criteria, the intern tracked the amount of time required to process the materials from retrieving from the shelf to evaluation. A typical section of 27 books consisting of both single item titles and multi-volume titles took a total of about one hour and forty minutes to process; that is, eight minutes to request the books online, 22 minutes to retrieve them and check them out, and an hour and ten minutes to individually assess them. Because multi-volume titles require the same amount of investigation as single item titles, they generally allow many books to be processed quickly. The time to assess a book was between less than a minute (7 minutes to assess an 8 volume title) and 15 minutes. When averaged, it took about 2.5 minutes to make a decision.

Discussion

The criteria for transfer evolved throughout the course of the project. After the initial literature review, the transfer policy document had been written almost completely based on suggestions from the ACRL guidelines, which was essentially a list of qualities (travel books published before 1900, special physical characteristics such as original artwork or fine binding, etc.) that

may qualify an item as a "rare book". After actually working with the collection it became clear that only very basic criteria (scarcity, value, and significance to EMU) were important when considering items for transfer to the archives, while the list of more specific attributes was appropriate for browsing collection materials being considered for transfer to the ARC.

As the process moved forward, trends appeared that led to questions about certain aspects of the criteria. For instance, when we came across both rebound books and those in their original bindings we had to determine how the condition of the book should factor into its assessment. The Team wondered if frailty should be a factor for inclusion in the archives as some of the books in their original bindings were nearly falling apart but did not otherwise warrant special protection. We also noticed that one of the criteria, material "significant to EMU", had not been defined. After discussing both the fragility and significance to EMU elements with the University Archivist, we revised the Transfer policy to incorporate her suggestions.

The Team also resolved several questions about how to assess holdings. Firstly, we wondered if an item were available online (for instance, through the Google Book Project) should it be a factor when determining how scarce the item is? Secondly, if an item were also held at a large, nearby institution like the University of Michigan or the Detroit Public Library, should it affect the way EMU would choose to deal with it? For example, if U of M held an item in the Bentley Historical Library, where it would be very secure, perhaps EMU need not take up space in its limited archive. The Team decided that neither having potential Internet access to an item nor knowing that it was held somewhere nearby is equivalent to actually having the book in the library. However, seeing that an item is held somewhere like the Bentley Historical Library may serve as an indication that EMU ought to transfer their copy to its archives. While this was not

written into the official transfer criteria, we began to record a note in the spreadsheet if we noticed that an item was held in a special location at another institution. Finally, the Team wondered whether or not we should take into consideration the specific Michigan institutions when checking holdings. It was concluded that this clause of the criteria should be to consider books with holdings at fewer than three of a selection of institutions (the University of Michigan, Wayne State University, the Detroit Public Library, Michigan State University, Central Michigan University, or Western Michigan University) rather than to consider books that are the only holding reported in Michigan.

Once the Team reached the point at which using the criteria alone was sufficient to determine whether titles should be transferred, the work became much easier and faster. For instance, when looking at books from the ARC (the vast majority of books reviewed), if OCLC showed there were many copies of a book it was not necessary to spend time trying to determine their monetary value. The attributes that make an item a candidate for transfer to the archives are for the most part easy to identify: significance to EMU (which includes a fairly small range of topics), scarcity, and books in original binding that may be in such good condition or be scarce enough to have market value.

Musical scores offered their own set of challenges. There are a number of early musical scores in EMU's collection and it proved difficult to determine their scarcity by checking OCLC holdings—scores tend to have many different listings for what may or may not be similar printings and it is challenging to verify which listing is correct since most of the scores do not have dates in them. Furthermore, it seems that scores may be generally under-reported in OCLC. We contacted the director of the University of Michigan Music Library about this issue

and he offered some comments about specific titles, but did not identify any straight-forward criteria for evaluating the scores.

One critical issue we encountered when evaluating the collection was the surprising number of cataloging errors. Many items were cataloged as being an original publication when they were either reprints or reproductions. A number of titles had incorrect publication data which needed updating. At this point we now understood that the project's scope went well beyond identifying rare and unusual titles and now included a major effort to address legacy cataloging issues.

As the project was nearing completion, we considered ways to improve the process. Recording the standardized data entries on an Excel spreadsheet provided the ability to do rough sorting but not always at the level we needed. After further discussion, we decided that we could work around this limitation. However, for us and others pursuing a similar project, no matter what system is used for recording data, we recommend that the spreadsheet be reviewed on a weekly or bi-weekly basis, while the decisions about the items are still fresh in the minds of the reviewers. To expedite handling, we recommend setting up a project work station near the storage area or circulation area which would enable one to quickly retrieve and review books and eliminate the need to check them out, transport them and check them back in when finished with their review.

Undertaking a project of this scope is not without cost. While we did not do a formal cost/benefit analysis, we have several reasons to believe it should continue.

- A. Accuracy counts: Earlier we identified 104 titles that were listed as original publications but turned out to be reproductions. If any of these items had turned up missing in

inventory, the perceived monetary loss would be based on this inaccurate information. Further, knowing that we do have reproductions we can confidently make the materials available to our users. Conversely, in those instances where originals were listed as reproductions, we faced the potential loss of valuable content without us ever being aware of its existence. We were able to review the items to assess their value to our collection as original publications.

- B. Assessing condition and updating the catalog record: The Team felt that pulling the title to evaluate its condition and review its bibliographic record provided an opportunity to thoroughly assess the title. Since the title has been pulled and is in-hand it is easily viewed for condition issues as well as quickly compared to its bibliographic record for errors. If the project relied solely on the cataloging information to determine the item's uniqueness or rarity, the quality of the project would greatly diminish.
- C. Learning opportunities for university interns: Eastern Michigan University is situated between the two Schools of Information in Michigan: Wayne State University and the University of Michigan. This fortunate geographic positioning provides us with a steady stream of interns to work on projects that directly benefit the Library. For Eastern the cost of continuing this project is significantly reduced by "sourcing" the review effort to these upcoming professionals. The hands-on nature of this project attracts highly motivated students who have the latest training in archival skills and are ready to test them in a real world setting working with other professional librarians. Further it offers them the chance to include this "practicum" experience on their resumes as well as network with working professionals.

D. Cost implications: This project utilizes existing staff and budgets. Should staffing and/or funding fall short, the work could be suspended at any time. If that occurs, we could pursue grant opportunities to finalize the project.

Conclusion

Identifying and evaluating the oldest published content held by the library using a set of transfer criteria provided a means to systematically evaluate and, if necessary, move rare or unusual content into a more secure location. The process enabled us to correct cataloging errors, identify and address items with condition issues, be familiar with the library's unique holdings and finally, to identify and add content distinctly associated with EMU's history to the University Archives and Special Collections. Even though only a small number of titles (34 out of 1008) were recommended for transfer to the Archives, this core set of rare and important historical titles will now be located in a secure location and confirms that we should continue the project, especially now that we have the transfer criteria tailored to our specific needs in place and experience with the process enabling us to make decisions more effectively and quickly. Consideration of titles published after 1940 would be a part of any expansion of this review.

Nevertheless, this is a time consuming process and should be approached as a long term project requiring the coordinated involvement of different departments (cataloging, circulation, collection development, etc.). Even after finalizing our collection evaluation criteria and putting it into use, the experienced Team still faced long hours reviewing each set of titles. However, as noted above, it is possible to increase the efficiency of the project by adjusting the procedure-- for instance, placing the review area in a convenient location where checking items in and out is

not necessary. Perhaps a grant proposal or other outside funding could be found to support the project until its completion.

Libraries with collections established in the 1800's and suspect that valuable content is hidden within its walls, would be well served to explore using the Transfer Document as a means to initially assess if a review is needed. As we discovered at EMU, this initially simple project resulted in a major effort to correct records, develop enhanced review procedures, and ultimately resulting in moving valuable titles to a secure location.

¹ Association of College and Research Libraries (July 1, 2008). Guidelines on the Selection and Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/selecttransfer.cfm>.

² Streit, S. A. (1985). Transfer of Materials from General Stacks to Special Collections. *Collection Management*, 7(2), 33-46.

³ Valliant, M. W. (2003). What Be Rare? *Colorado Libraries*, 29(1), 42-43.

Appendix 1: University of Michigan School of Information Project Description

Works 20 hours per week from May through August 15 for total of 300 hours.

Specific charge:

Library Intern will develop and implement a program to identify rare, unusual, or expensive monograph titles owned by Halle Library. Titles will be evaluated on a case by case basis to determine if they should be move to the arc storage or archives. The Library started a pilot project that confirmed the collection does contain valuable content and this person would fully develop this into a systematic review of the circulating collection with the purpose of identifying the content and determine which collections it will be placed. The intern and librarians would document the various stages and issues that arise throughout the project with the purpose of writing a journal article describing the value of reviewing the collection in this manner.

Responsibilities:

- Ability to identify rare and/or valuable monograph materials using generally accepted criteria. (10%)
- Develop and implement a process to identify, withdraw, and evaluate potentially valuable content. (65%)
- Work closely with Collection Development, Head of Cataloging, and University Archives librarian in all stages of the project.
- Co author, with the EMU Librarians, an article describing and evaluating this project. (15%)
- Other duties as assigned. (Meetings with Library department supervisors, selectors, catalogers, archives, etc.) (10%).

Skills

- Familiarity with Excel Spreadsheets, online catalogs, data manipulation.
- Ability to develop, plan, organize, execute, and complete projects which involve working with materials, librarians and support staff.
- Positive attitude and approach to problem solving along with excellent communication and interpersonal skills.
- Good attention to detail. Ability to use new technologies and innovations.

Learning Outcomes:

Completing the project which establishes the criteria and a process/program for identifying, evaluating and relocating, rare and usual content owned by the EMU University Library.

Journal article published describing the above process/program and the value of this activity to EMU and the Library.

Fuller understanding of the different units of a library and how they interact to support the mission of the library.

Appendix 2: Eastern Michigan University Library Transfer Policy

Eastern Michigan University Library Transfer Policy

Description and objectives

The Eastern Michigan University Library Transfer Policy was created to locate rare or valuable items in the general circulating collection that should be transferred to the Archives and Special Collections or to the Automated Retrieval Collection (ARC). According to the library's collection development policy, the Special Collections section is to house materials that would be difficult or expensive to replace, while the ARC is to house materials that are older, less used, fragile, or prone to theft. The transfer policy intends to serve several important purposes: to identify and fix erroneous catalog entries, to identify items that have gained value since their acquisition, and to ensure that valuable items are stored in a secure, controlled environment. Placing valuable items in the appropriate location will protect them from both theft and unnecessary physical deterioration. By implementing the transfer policy, the library will preserve the university's unique content.

Criteria for transfer

Items that are reviewed for transfer will be placed in one of three categories: items that should remain at their current location, items that should be considered for transfer from the browsing collection to the ARC, or items that should be considered for transfer to the Archives and Special Collections. In order to determine the category in which an item belongs, two levels of criteria

will be applied. It will be assumed that every item should remain at its original location unless it meets the criteria to be considered for transfer. Items that pass the first set of criteria, or are already located in the ARC, will be tested by the second, stricter set of criteria to determine if they should be considered for transfer to the Archives and Special Collections. The set of criteria for transfer to the ARC was largely developed from the suggestions in the ACRL publication “Guidelines on the Selection and Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections.” The term “special significance to EMU” refers to content relating to the history of EMU, the state of Michigan, early training or normal schools, Thomas Edison, Motown Records, early children’s literature, and works by people that have taught at EMU. The Michigan institutions considered when assessing holdings information are EMU, the Detroit Public Library, Wayne State University, the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, Central Michigan University, and Western Michigan University.

Items from the browsing collection having one or more attributes from the first category and one or more attributes from the second category will be considered for transfer to the ARC:

First:

- Fewer than 30 holdings reported in OCLC worldwide, for all copies of the same title in similar editions
- Fewer than four holdings reported in OCLC in Michigan, for all copies of the same title in similar editions;

Second:

- In original binding and published in the United States, Latin American or Africa prior to 1850
- In original binding and published prior to 1825
- Children's literature in original binding published prior to 1920
- Travel literature in original binding published prior to 1900
- In original binding and published in the Confederate States of America (CSA), 1860-1865
- Market value over \$300
- Special physical characteristics such as original artwork or fine binding
- Non-standard formats, sizes, materials, or shapes
- Significant provenance or signed copies
- Handwritten, typed, or fragile

Items meeting the criteria for transfer to the ARC and having one or more of the following attributes will be considered for transfer to the Archives and Special Collections:

- Fewer than ten holdings reported in OCLC worldwide, for all copies of the same title in similar editions, and either worth more than \$500 or significant to EMU

- Fewer than three holdings reported in OCLC at certain Michigan institutions, for all copies of the same title in similar editions, and either worth more than \$500 or significant to EMU.

Procedures

The transfer policy is implemented by systematically examining candidates for transfer using a spreadsheet of pre-1940 monographs generated from the online catalog. The procedure is to:

1. Request and retrieve a selection of books from the ARC or third floor shelving
2. Request the next section of books so that they will be ready
3. Charge the books using the Voyager circulation program
4. Verify that the publication information from the catalog entry is correct
5. Record in the spreadsheet if the catalog entry appears incorrect
6. Notice the condition of the book and its binding and record it in the spreadsheet if it may be relevant
7. Locate the OCLC entry and record the holdings information in the spreadsheet, also taking into consideration other entries with the same title and author from the same time period
8. Estimate the market value by checking for similar items at Internet sites such as <http://used.addall.com>, which searches many Internet booksellers at once. If it may be important in evaluating the item, record it in the spreadsheet

9. Considering scarcity, condition, market value, and other factors as listed in the two sets of criteria above, make a recommendation for the item to be transferred or to remain in its current location by indicating in the appropriate section of the spreadsheet
10. Discharge the books, return them to the ARC area with a note that they are ready to be re-shelved
11. The spreadsheet will be reviewed by the Head of Cataloging and the Collection Development Librarian for final decisions and transfer

Appendix 3: Criteria for Transfer to ARC or Archives

	Holdings	Condition/Content/Value
Transfer to ARC	Fewer than 30 OCLC holdings worldwide or fewer than 4 OCLC holdings at MI institutions	Published in the United States, Latin American or Africa prior to 1850; published prior to 1825; children's books published prior to 1920; travel books published prior to 1900; published in the Confederate States of America (CSA), 1860-1865; market value over \$300; special physical characteristics such as original artwork or fine binding; non-standard formats, sizes, materials, or shapes; handwritten or typed materials; fragile items; significant provenance and signed copies; special significance to EMU
Transfer to Archives	Fewer than 10 OCLC holdings worldwide or fewer than 3 OCLC holdings at MI institutions	Worth more than \$500 or significant to EMU

Appendix 4: Key Codes

Condition

OB—original binding

GC—in at least fairly good condition

P—poor condition

F—frail or delicate

X—significant foxing

RB—rebound

T—book is taped

B—stored in a box

S—special physical characteristics, for instance numerous plates or fold-out pages

A—autograph

Pam—booklet or pamphlet

N—additional comment in notes column

OCLC/Mich Holdings

x/y—numbers for the specific entry that EMU reports, x being worldwide holdings and y being Michigan holdings at EMU, Wayne State, the Detroit Public Library, U of M, CMU, or Western

A—additional copies for same title and author in similar printings

O—available online

CF—listed as a computer file holding

Mfrm—microform listing

S—the item is a score and difficult to assess through OCLC

NL—EMU does not appear to report item

OD—the item is also available printed new, on-demand

N—additional comment in notes column

Market Value

1—some copies may be worth \$300-\$500

2—some copies may be worth \$500 or more

N—additional comment in notes column

Specific Criteria

Date—published in the United States, Latin America, or Africa prior to 1850 [and original binding]

Child—children’s books published prior to 1825

Trav—travel books published prior to 1825

CSA—published in the Confederate States of America, 1860-1865

HW—handwritten or typed

SP—signed copies or items with significant provenance

N—additional comment in notes column

Significance to EMU

E—written by EMU faculty or directly related to EMU

S—related to one of EMU’s special collections: Edison, Motown, or children’s literature

TN—related to early training or normal schools, or education in general

M—related to the history of Michigan

N—additional comment in notes column

Cataloging

R—reprint

E—edition or date may be incorrect

N—additional comment in notes column

Recommended Action

Current— no action should be taken and item can remain at its current location

ARC—consider for transfer to the ARC

Archives—consider for transfer to the archives

Con—place in archival box or take other measures to conserve

Cat—check for cataloging errors

N—additional comment in note column

Notes

The notes field is used for supplementary comments

Color codes

Light green—books that have been assessed and recommended to remain in their current location

Dark green—books to consider for conservation measures

Tan—books that have the status of missing or lost or that could not be located

Pink—books to consider for transfer

Light blue—books that may be cataloged incorrectly

Dark blue--scores

Bibliography

Association of College and Research Libraries (July 1, 2008). Guidelines on the Selection and Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections. Retrieved from the World Wide Web:

<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/selecttransfer.cfm>.

Beam, K. L. (May 5, 2009). Personal communication regarding special collections criteria.

Eastern Michigan University (2007). *Automated Retrieval Collection (ARC) Policy*. Retrieved May 11, 2009 from the World Wide Web: http://www.emich.edu/halle/arc_policy.html.

Eastern Michigan University (2005). *Collection Development Policy Essentials*. Retrieved May 6, 2009 from the World Wide Web, http://www.emich.edu/halle/collection_development_policy_essentials.html.

Eastern Michigan University. *EMU Mission Statement*. Retrieved May 11, 2009 from the World Wide Web: http://www.emich.edu/president/emu_mission.html.

² Streit, S. A. (1985). Transfer of Materials from General Stacks to Special Collections. *Collection Management*, 7(2) 1985, 33-46

Valliant, M. W. (2003). What Be Rare? *Colorado Libraries* 29(1), 42-43.