

**The University of Tulsa Digitization Initiative:
A Blueprint for EAD Implementation in the Small Academic Library**

**Amigos Fellowship Final Report
September 2002**

Submitted by

**Gina L. B. Minks, Principal Investigator/Project Director
and
Lori Curtis, Project Administrator
The University of Tulsa**

Table of Contents

1. Overview of Project
 - 1.1 History
 - 1.2 Rationale for project
 2. Survey
 - 2.1 Methodology
 - 2.2 Survey Results
 - 2.3 Final Thoughts
 3. Site Visits
 - 3.1 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
 - 1.1.1 Overview of Institution
 - 1.1.2 The Visit
 - 1.1.3 Why chosen
 - 3.2 Washington University at St. Louis
 - 1.2.1 Overview of Institution
 - 1.2.2 The Visit
 - 1.2.3 Why chosen
 - 3.3 American Institute of Physics
 - 1.3.1 Overview of Institution
 - 1.3.2 The Visit
 - 1.3.3 Why chosen
 4. Applying Theory to Practice
 - 4.1 Addressing our Fellowship Objectives
 - 4.2 Reviewing our Finding Aids
 - 4.3 Technology
 - 4.4 Best Practices
 5. Summation
- Appendices
- A. Survey
 - B. Survey Tally Form
 - C. Question 11
 - D. Question 26

1. Overview of Project

1.1 History

The University of Tulsa is a private university affiliated with the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. located in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Originally founded in 1882 as a Presbyterian School for Indian Girls, the University of Tulsa today offers bachelor's degrees in 89 areas of study, in addition to 33 master's degrees and 12 doctoral degrees including a law school. TU is also Oklahoma's oldest private university and has an enrollment of approximately 4,200 students from all over all over the world.

The Department of Special Collection in McFarlin Library is home to more than 120,000 print volumes and 4,000 feet of manuscripts. The department is internationally recognized as a literary repository of 19th and 20th-century British, Irish and American literature and Native American history. Collections include the papers of 2001 Nobel Laureate V. S. Naipaul, an extensive James Joyce archive, as well as the papers of Richard Ellmann, Richard Murphy, Jean Rhys, Paul Scott, Stevie Smith and Rebecca West. The Native American holdings feature the papers of Alice Robertson, the John W. Shleppay Collection and the J. B. Milam Library. In 2000, TU added the personal library of English publisher Sir Rupert Hart-Davis, which contained approximately 19,000 volumes strongly focused on English literature. In addition, the department also administers the University of Tulsa Archives.

Due to the international appeal of many of the department's collections, most of the department's finding aids were already available online in 2000 via the campus GOPHER. However, many of these online finding aids no longer accurately reflected the organization of the collections; many changes to finding aids were simply "penciled in" to the printed guides and there was little time for maintenance to the online resources. The one professional and one library technician were overwhelmed with trying to find a way to provide better online access to collections as well as finding a way to improve overall searching, display, navigation and maintenance.

In January 2000, a new Special Collections Librarian was hired into the department to coordinate digital projects including the implementation of EAD. This position was responsible for establishing an encoding process and working through any technical concerns related to publishing the finding aids online. However, as the new Special Collections Librarian started working on a project plan for the EAD implementation, it became apparent that there were many factors that needed to be considered before any work began on the project. It was at this time, that the department became aware of the annual Fellowships granted by Amigos Library Services. This Fellowship seemed like the perfect vehicle to allow our department to do some research into the implementation of EAD.

1.2 Rationale for project

In early 2000, when we applied for the Amigos Fellowship, it appeared that much of the work done in the area of Encoded Archival Description had occurred at large state institutions with considerable help from outside funding sources. While the experiences of these large institutions was invaluable to others wanting to launch a digitization initiative, it was difficult for the smaller institution to translate and adapt their recommendations to a much smaller workforce and a smaller budget. By means of the Amigos Fellowship, "The University of Tulsa Digitization Initiative: A Blueprint of EAD Implementation for the Small Academic Library", the University of Tulsa's Department of Special Collections proposed to survey its own collections for existing finding aids suitable for EAD encoding, survey institutions already involved in EAD encoding (particularly targeting Amigos member libraries), and visit a select few institutions to talk to experts in the EAD implementation process. At the

conclusion of the project, the University of Tulsa planned to develop a best practices document for the small academic library and would seek to become a resource for other small academic libraries in the Amigos region and throughout the nation as they embarked on their own digitization initiatives.

2. Survey

2.1 Methodology

A national survey was constructed that would collect both demographic information and specific information about an institution's implementation of EAD. All the general demographic questions were designed to identify institutions and collections that were similar to the University of Tulsa including questions about the size of an institution, staff size, patron base, number of finding aids, percentage of MARC records, collection information and status of their EAD project. If an institution was not involved with EAD, there was a list of possible reasons and an opportunity for the institution to comment freely on their decision. (See Appendix C) The section of the survey that concentrated on EAD implementation contained questions about training, funding, finding aids, software, conversion and collaboration. This section also included an area for the responding institution to list additional institutions that were using EAD. This question was included as a method of discovering other implementations that were perhaps not as well known and had been missed in the initial survey mailing. Finally, there was a place to indicate any interest an institution might have in collaboration as well as space for the respondent to add any additional information about their implementation. (See Appendix A)

As we developed our questionnaire, we also began developing a database of our survey base. Because we were trying to identify specific institutions to visit, we determined that it was not possible to keep the survey results completely anonymous. In addition, although we wanted a national survey, we felt obligated to concentrate more closely on institutions that were members of Amigos Library Services. Because most Amigos libraries are located in the southwest United States, we decided to survey every Amigos institution that had an archives or special collection department. In late 2000, those included institutions in the states of Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas. Also, due to the constraints of our small travel budget, we included all institutions with archives or special collections in states surrounding Oklahoma. This added Kansas, Missouri, and Colorado not including the already added Amigos member states. We also added all institutions listed on the EAD Help Pages – EAD Sites Annotated web page (<http://www.iath.virginia.edu/ead/sitesann.html>). Finally, because it appeared that many implementations were occurring at large state institutions, we added all state institutions in the rest of the 50 states. We hoped that by including space on the survey to identify additional EAD implementations, we would be able to pick up any smaller implementations that had escaped notice.

However, before we sent out the survey, we decided to do a pretest of 10% of our anticipated audience. Because of very limited funding, we knew that we would be unable to send out an initial letter alerting our audience to the survey that they would be receiving. By administering a pretest we hoped to identify potential problems that might decrease response rate. Fifteen (15) surveys were sent to different institutions, both Amigos member and non-member libraries, and we received 12 responses. These responses helped us refine wording and the layout of our questions as well as include additional choices for answers. After this final revision we mailed out 160 surveys in January of 2001.

2.2 Survey Results

At the end of our survey, 191 total surveys had been sent out. At the conclusion of the survey period, we had received 100 surveys, a response rate of 52%, including responses from 29 states and 4 foreign countries. Of the respondents, 31 (31%) were not at all involved with EAD and 69 (69%) were involved with EAD at some level. Overall, the survey responses showed some interesting trends in the general profile of the institution that was implementing EAD.

The overall results show that the average responding institution, regardless of EAD implementation, has an average department staff of 15 people including full-time equivalents (FTE), part-time employees and students. The average number of professionals in these departments is five. The average collection size is 62,093 volumes with 10,686 linear feet of material. Fifty percent of the collections have a MARC record and the average number of finding aids 556. However, institutions that *have* implemented EAD have a total staff of 18 and average 6 professionals. In addition the overall collection size is larger at institutions implementing EAD with collections averaging 13,799 linear feet of material and 77,263 volumes. EAD implementers also have a slightly greater number of collections with MARC records with 53% and average a total of 712 finding aids. (See Appendix B)

2.3 Final Thoughts

The survey results allowed us to build a general profile of the EAD user. There were 69 respondents that were involved with EAD at some level and although some institutions could not answer all the questions because they were still in the planning stages of their project, there was a general consensus on what the typical EAD implementation looked like.

The typical EAD implementation is occurring at an institution of over 20,000 students and the implementation is considered high priority. The implementers have attended the training offered by the Society of American Archivists and are using regular department funds for their EAD project. The majority of institutions are re-keying their documents in-house and are using XML. Most departments are linking their finding aids to their online catalog. The majority of institutions are already involved in a multi-institutional EAD project but there is still overwhelming interest in developing more partnering opportunities. (See Figure 1)

Figure 1 - The Typical EAD Implementation

| | Percent Responding |
|--|--------------------|
| Institution size over 20,000 | 59% |
| EAD conversion is high priority | 51% |
| Attended SAA training | 68% |
| Used regular department funds | 75% |
| Re-keying is done in-house | 59% |
| Using XML | 49% |
| Finding aids linked to OPAC | 52% |
| Involved in multi-institution project | 52% |
| Interested in partnering opportunities | 70% |

3. Site Visits

3.1 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

3.1.1 Overview of Institution

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is home to the third largest academic library in the United States. Containing nearly 17 million items, only Harvard and Yale have larger collections, thereby making UIUC the largest library at a public university in the United States. More than a million patrons worldwide log on to their on-line catalog each week.

The University of Illinois Archives was established in 1963 and includes over 17,000 cubic feet of office records, publications, and personal papers from the University and the Urbana-Champaign campus. The files are described in over 12,500 pages of finding aids and have been subject-indexed. Series level descriptions and box and folder listings are available through a searchable database. The University of Illinois is also the official repository for the American Library Association Archives.

Gina Minks met with Christopher Prom, Assistant University Archivist, on Tuesday, February 19, 2002.

3.1.2 The visit

The visit with Chris Prom was very informative because of his goal of developing “a low-cost, high-efficiency workflow for the delivery of archival finding aids and associated digital documents. . . . [using methods that are] compliant with metadata standards, easily transferable to other institutions, and adoptable without technical expertise.” (<http://web.library.uiuc.edu/ahx/ead/tech/default.asp>)

Prom has developed documentation for his department that explains how EAD Cookbook works with both WordPerfect and Note Tab to create both XML and HTML versions of the files. His thorough understanding of WordPerfect and the use of macros have allowed him to automate parts of the tagging process especially the insertion of components. (i.e. c01, c02, etc.). There are also macros to ease the tagging of <abstract>, <origination>, <physdesc>, <unitdate>, biohist, <note>, <odd>, <scopecontent> and <chronlist>. He has also sought to ease the formatting of text through macros. These macros and their documentation have helped standardize encoding practice within the department and provide guidance for student workers to participate in the encoding process without having to know all the particulars about EAD and XML.

Interoperability is a key concept for Prom and he seeks to make EAD more interoperable by using the EAD Cookbook and the EAD Application Guidelines 1.0 as standards. He also seeks to encode metadata in his HTML files using Dublin Core. Although currently EAD is only used for “special” or “important” finding aids within the department, Prom is committed to providing as much online material as possible without sacrificing the quality of the information or adherence to standards. When asked what the “next step” of their EAD implementation will be, Prom answered that he is planning on converting all of the department’s finding aids to EAD using some type of automated conversion. In addition he has been exploring different software options that would allow him to develop a search function that would search across all of their finding aids.

3.1.3 Why chosen

Chris Prom is well known throughout the archival community for his work with Encoded Archival Description. He has devoted a lot of time to developing tag libraries to work with Note Tab and is a very active presenter on issues surrounding EAD and how it works with other digital initiatives such as EBind, an XML electronic binding format, and the Open Archives Initiative (OAI).

The following demographic answers on their survey contributed to this institution being chosen for a site visit:

- Four professionals on staff
- None of their collections had MARC records
- Approximately 2,000 finding aids
- 90% of collections had finding aids
- Have EAD encoded finding aids available to the public
- Departmental decision to implement EAD

In addition, the following information was considered when selecting the institution:

- Self taught EAD
- Project funded through both private and department funds
- Used various scripts and macros for the conversion of their paper finding aids to an electronic format
- Marking up finding aids in WordPerfect 9.0
- Using XML
- Delivering EAD encoded finding aids via HTML converted from XML
- Using the EAD Cookbook

3.2 Washington University at St. Louis

3.2.1 Overview of Institution

Founded in 1853, Washington University in St. Louis is a medium sized independent university of approximately 13,000 students. A highly regarded research institution located in metropolitan St. Louis, Washington University offers more than 90 programs of study. Located in Olin Library, Washington University's Special Collections contains over a quarter of a million items including approximately 10,000 linear feet of manuscript. Their Modern Literature Collection contains the papers of 124 British and American writers of the 19th and 20th century. The Rare Books division contains approximately 46,000 printed pieces and includes incunabula as well as Western European imprints from the 16th, 17th and 18th century. British and American Literature holdings are especially strong for the 19th century.

Gina Minks and Lori Curtis met with Chatham Ewing, Curator of Modern Literature and Manuscripts, on August 1, 2002 at Olin Library on Washington University's main campus in St. Louis. Mr. Ewing has been at Washington University since 2000 and gained experience using EAD while working at the New York Public Library on the Performing Arts Finding Aid Project.

3.2.2 The Visit

The visit with Chatham Ewing was interesting because it re-enforced our own discoveries about the necessity of a archival content standard. He brought up the fact that although EAD is a descriptive standard, it does little to provide guidance in terms of what content should be included within its tags. This was especially a problem when dealing with legacy finding aids. Because of the lack of a content standard, finding aids contained different information depending on who had written them. Throughout the years, different people working in the department had used different methods for titles and other structures through the finding aid. Even basic name authority was often forgotten.

For dealing with these legacy finding aids, Ewing looked to the EAD-MARC crosswalks available in the EAD Application Guidelines Version 1.0. By constructing a large Access database which allowed the finding aid information to be dissected into fields that corresponded to MARC fields, Ewing was able to bring some extent of content control over his finding aids. In addition, the friendly forms allow students to enter data without having to know anything about EAD or tagging. This database in turn can be used to generate portions of his EAD encoded finding aids. However, he still stressed the need for a more appropriate content standard and he anxiously awaits the work of the CUSTARD (Canadian-U.S. Task Force on ARchival Description), an NEH-funded project that will reconcile APPM, the Canadian Rules for Archival Description (RAD), and the General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G)) to create a set of descriptive rules that can be used with EAD and MARC21.

3.2.3 Why was this institution chosen?

The following demographic answers on their survey contributed to this institution being chosen for a site visit:

- Three professionals on staff
- 80% of collections had MARC records
- Approximately 300 finding aids
- Have EAD encoded finding aids available to the public
- Departmental decision to implement EAD

In addition, the following information was considered when selecting the institution:

- Self taught EAD but then attended SAA training
- Project funded through department funds
- None of the finding aids were in electronic format at the beginning of the project.
- Re-keyed in-house and outsourced the conversion of their paper finding aids to an electronic format
- Using XML
- Using the EAD Cookbook
- Linking their finding aids to the OPAC

3.3 Center for the History of Physics

3.3.1 Overview of Institution

The Center for the History of Physics was established in 1961 by the American Institute of Physics. Located in College Park, Maryland, the Center's mission is "to preserve and make known the historical record of modern physics and allied sciences. To meet this mission, the Center for the History of Physics not only collects the correspondence, notebooks, and other un-published materials of the scientific community but promotes the preservation of historical records by individuals, corporations and the government. They also have their own library, The Niels Bohr Library, which has an excellent collection of materials on nineteenth and twentieth century physics and allied sciences.

Katherine Hayes, Associate Archivist, and Clay Redding, Automation/Systems Archivist, at the Center for the History of Physics met with Lori Curtis and Gina Minks on August 6, 2002 at their College Park facility.

3.3.2 The Visit

The Center for the History of Physics was an interesting implementation to visit as they had not only encoded their own finding aids but had also worked with the encoding of finding aids from fifteen other repositories. Their experience from this process gave them a wealth of knowledge about the complexities of EAD implementation.

Like Washington University, an underlying problem with the implementation was how to deal with legacy finding aids. Variant structures and description posed many problems. In addition, the donor institutions had varying degrees with which they could reengineer their finding aids. These and other complications led Hayes and Redding to decide that they would no longer encode legacy finding aids in EAD.

The software choices of the Center were also very interesting. Because Clay Redding was very comfortable with technology, their EAD implementation has taken advantage of freeware and shareware programs such as Note Tab and Search and Replace to make the encoding process easier. However, their structured workflow and use of the MIT processing guidelines helps produce a solid finding aid before the EAD encoding process begins. This commitment to structured data provides a solid backbone for their searching and indexing. Currently, the Center is using Verity for their searching because it is the product used by their parent organization, the American Institute of Physics. However, they are exploring the use of Harvest, an open source application, that will allow the finding aids to be decentralized from the AIP.

If they had to do their project over again, Hayes and Redding commented that they would never have tried to do legacy finding aids and would have paid more attention to the quality of description. They also would take advantage of many of the newer XML concepts such as schema which allow the mixing of different data types.

3.3.3 Why was this site chosen?

In 2000, Katherine Hayes and Clay Redding spoke at the annual conference of the Society of American Archivists at a session called "Everything but Encoding: Costs and Benefits of EAD Consortia". Hayes' paper, "Nine Tenths Planning, One Tenth Tagging: The Physics History EAD Consortium", was very influential as we developed our initial survey for distribution.

In addition, the following demographic information from their survey contributed to the selection of the Center for the History of Physics:

- Non-profit professional organization
- 90 %+ of their collections have a MARC record
- Approximately 460 finding aids
- EAD finding Aids available to the public
- Departmental decision to implement EAD

Other answers on their survey that contributed to their selection include:

- Self-taught EAD but also attended SAA and Rare Book School training
- Using regular and grant funds for the implementation
- Re-keyed in-house, outsourced, and used OCR software to convert paper finding aids into electronic format
- Using Note Tab Pro, WordPerfect, SP & XT for their implementation
- Part of consortia

4. Applying Theory to Practice

4.1 Addressing our Fellowship Objectives

The process of applying for the fellowship also gave shape to eight overall objectives of our EAD implementation process.

Objective 1: Conduct a survey of documentation describing the manuscript and book collections at the McFarlin Library Department of Special Collections that can be converted to EAD.

Objective 2: Ensure that all collections have a USMARC collection-level record in the local online catalog and on OCLC.

To complete these two objectives, our department did an in-depth inventory of our finding aids and catalog records to note current descriptive structures as well as any missing information. We also collected very basic information such as the number of collections with MARC records, number of finding aids, number of finding aids available in electronic format. We also found it necessary to note the different types of electronic files that existed as many of the files were for software no longer used in the department or on campus.

Objective 3: Develop a standardized PC-based SGML conversion and authoring environment.

Objective 4: Develop a standardized process for mounting encoded finding aids on the Internet.

Providing a sustainable working environment for our implementation was very important because our library did not have a systems department that would help maintain any hardware or software that we would choose. One decision that was made immediately after receiving the Fellowship is that we should not limit ourselves to only viewing SGML EAD implementations. It became clear as we monitored the EAD listserv that XML was quickly becoming the new markup language of choice for EAD.

Objective 5: Train Special Collections staff in encoding.

We were aware of the training available through the Society of American Archivists and Rare Book School but we didn't know what training would fulfill our needs. Both training options were rather expensive and required travel and we wondered if there were other training options that were less expensive but still contained the quality and content that we needed.

Objective 6: Encode the finding aids selected for the pilot project.

We felt that selecting the right mix of our current finding aids with their varying structures would be very important as we developed a workable EAD template that could fit all our collections.

Objective 7: Identify possible partner institutions for cooperative projects.

By including a question on the survey, we were able to find out that the majority of responding institutions were interested in cooperative projects.

Objective 8: Attract additional private funding based on the strength of the successfully completed project.

Although, we are very pleased with our project, we no longer feel the push to secure private funding to move forward with our EAD implementation. The prevalence of free and/or inexpensive tools that can be used for markup make the encoding of EAD much more cost friendly than we originally imagined.

4.2 Reviewing our Finding Aids

Perhaps the most time consuming part of the application of EAD is taking the information that is in one's finding aid and fitting it into the various elements of EAD. As we learned during the site visit portion of our project, having good content was essential to having a good finding aid. We carefully selected collections of different types of materials and reviewed the structure of our departmental finding aids.

Although our container lists were generally excellent, our collection description information was often lacking in information. Sometimes this was due to an absence of information describing the collection such as no provenance. However, by making the decision to implement EAD, it became necessary to decide upon a set template that we would apply to all our collections. As we begin our EAD encoding, we are going back through our files to fill in the gaps in our finding aids. This process of revising and reengineering our finding aids to make better search instruments is perhaps the most important part of our EAD implementation.

4.3 Technology

When we originally applied for the Amigos Fellowship, we had thought that we would be encoding our finding aids using the SGML version of EAD. Because of this, we were looking at the software Author/Editor 3.5 for the markup and Panorama for the publishing of our finding aids. The move to using XML made the whole process of implementation easier. Because XML is "web-friendly", we could use XMetaL (the software used by the Society of American Archivists in their EAD training) for the entire process.

Perhaps the most exciting piece of software that we found was Note Tab. Note Tab is available as a free program or as Note Tab Pro for a nominal fee. It is easily downloadable online and is relatively straightforward to use. A set of the EAD tags has been customized to work within Note Tab and this "clip library" makes the encoding of EAD much easier if still tedious.

4.4 Best Practice

When we began this project, our final objective was to develop a set of best practices that could be easily implemented in the small academic library. Now at the finish of our project, it has become completely clear that the key to an effective implementation of EAD is the standardization that it promotes. This standardization is important not only in terms of creating continuity within one's own institution but it is also important to promote standardization within the entire archival community. Many of the searching features that are enabled by the use of XML and EAD can only be realized if there is a standardization across finding aids as a whole. This standardization is already taking shape in several initiatives promoting a descriptive standard. The most exciting of these descriptive content standards, CUSTARD (Canadian-U.S. Task Force on ARchival Description), is still in development. However, the Resource Library Group (RLG) has created new best practices developed by 10 leading archivists working with EAD. This document's objectives are to:

1. To facilitate interoperability of resource discovery by imposing a basic degree of uniformity on the creation of valid EAD-encoded documents and to encourage the inclusion of elements most useful for retrieval in a union index and for display in an integrated (cross-institutional) setting.
2. To offer researcher the full benefits of XML in retrieval and display by developing a set of core data elements to improve resource discovery. It is hoped that by identifying core elements and by specifying “best practice” for those elements, these guidelines will be valuable both to those who create finding aids, as well as to vendors and tool-builders.
3. To contribute to the evolution of the EAD standard by articulating a set of best practice guidelines suitable for inter-institutional and international use.

(<http://www.rlg.org/rlgead/bpg.pdf>)

We have reviewed this RLG document and have decided that it fits with the guidelines we developed independently for the retrospective conversion of our legacy finding aids to EAD and can also be used in the creation of new finding aids within our department. Instead of creating our own individual set of best practices, we feel that it is the most beneficial to adopt the RLG’s guidelines as our own. By using and promoting the RLG standard to other institutions, we will be able to show how adopting a national standard EAD template will increase access and searching to archival records as a whole.

Although we have decided to adopt the RLG Best Practice document for our EAD template, we have made further decisions as to how to deal with the information contained within the various tags of the template. For example, not only do we need to standardize where dates are located within the finding aid description, we also need to standardize the formatting of the dates themselves. In addition, now we have written standards for the use of abbreviations (i.e. nd verses n.d., Als verses A.l.s.), typographical formatting for titles and spacing. We have also eliminated the non-standard use of punctuation and have instituted name authority control.

5. Summation

The more surveys we received the more we discovered that many institutions still need more information about EAD and the importance of a descriptive standard. It is important for the archival community to realize that EAD is more than a way to publish finding aids online; it is a descriptive standard that improves access to the many materials available in archival collections. Some institutions have technical concerns for questioning the use of EAD, but as new training emerges on planning, encoding, and publishing finding aids, and as XML browser support increases, the number of institutions implementing EAD should increase.

As we analyzed the survey responses, we realized that as we planned our own implementation, we also needed to look at why people were not implementing EAD. While most institutions cited “other priorities” as the main reason for not implementing EAD [See Figure 4], we find that many of the other answers described issues that we face in our own department. For example, 21% of respondents gave the reason “not enough staff” and 16% list “not enough funding”. Both of these were concerns for our small department as we began studying the implementation process.

The survey allowed us to identify other institution's successes but also allowed us to validate our own problem areas. At the beginning of our project we felt that only large institutions could easily implement EAD because they had more money, more time, and more skilled staff. These assumptions proved false. Seventy-two percent of institutions surveyed reported using regular department funds for their EAD project as opposed to outside grant funding. And, although 51% of institutions rated their EAD implementations as "high priority", the anecdotal survey answers revealed that most institutions were strapped for time and were constantly fighting the loss of skilled personal.

It is correct that the majority of EAD implementations are occurring in large institutions, but many of these institutions still struggle with the same concerns that small institutions face such as restrictive budgets, multiple responsibilities, and lack of access to skilled technical people. We now realize that each institution faces its own unique problems and that the implementation of EAD is not a "cookie-cutter" process that has one correct plan of action. However, the implementation process is not the impossible and chaotic task that many institutions seem to believe.

Appendix A. Survey

Use of Encoded Archival Description (EAD)

Please complete the survey to the best of your ability and return in the enclosed pre-paid envelope. Your answers are very important to us *regardless* of your use of Encoded Archival Description (EAD).

Institution: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Department: _____

1. What is the size of your institution? (i.e. number of students or employees)
 1 – 999 5000 – 9999 15,000 – 19,999
 1000 – 4999 10,000 – 14,999 over 20,000
2. How many of each of the following make up your departmental staff? (Please state number of each)
 Professional (archivists/librarians/etc.) Students Volunteers
 Support staff (FTE) Interns Other _____
3. What is the total size of your department's collections? (Fill in appropriate size or check "Don't know")
 Linear feet Volumes Don't know
4. Who are the users of your collections? (Please use percentages adding up to 100%)
 Undergraduate students Faculty Public
 Graduate students Staff Other _____
5. Please describe your department's collections: (Please use percentages adding up to 100%)
 Institutional archives Manuscripts Maps
 Rare books Photographs Other _____
 Special collections
6. What percentage of your collections have MARC records? _____
7. How many finding aids are there in your department? _____
8. What percentage of your collections have finding aids? _____
9. How are the finding aids currently available to the public? (Check all that apply)
 Paper form Via the OPAC Other _____
 Via the Internet Via campus network
10. Is your department involved in an Encoded Archival Description (EAD) project?
 Not at all (Please answer Question 11)
 Just in the planning stages (Skip to Question 12)
 Have EAD encoded finding aids but none available to the public (Skip to Question 12)
 Have EAD encoded finding aids available to the public (Skip to Question 12)
11. If your department is NOT involved with EAD, why? (Please check all that apply)
 Not enough staff Other priorities
 Insufficient training Just haven't gotten around to it
 Insufficient funding Insufficient institutional support
 Insufficient partnering institutions Other (Please explain below)

12. The decision to implement or not to implement EAD was made on what level?
 Institutional decision Departmental decision Individual decision
13. Is your institution a member of AMIGOS Library Services? Yes No
14. Have you or your staff attended any EAD specific training? (Please check all that apply)
 Yes, attended Society of American Archivists (SAA) sponsored EAD training
 Yes, attended other EAD training _____
 Self taught
 Plan on attending training in the future
15. How is the EAD project funded? (Please check all that apply)
 Regular department funds Private funding
 Special institutional funds Grant/Fellowship
16. At the beginning of the project, the finding aids were in what electronic format?
 None MS WORD WordPerfect
 WordStar text/ASCII Other _____
17. How does your department convert paper finding aids to an electronic format?
 Re-key in-house Outsource OCR Other _____
18. What software is used to mark-up or validate the finding aids in EAD? _____
19. Which version of the EAD DTD is being used? SGML XML
20. Does your department use the EAD Cookbook? Yes No

21. How are the EAD encoded finding aids delivered to the public?

- native SGML native XML HTML on the fly
 Other _____
22. What priority is the conversion of finding aids to the EAD format in your department?
 Top priority Low priority
 High priority Working on it as we can
23. Are the finding aids linked to the OPAC?
 Yes No Will link to OPAC in future

24. Is your department currently involved with a multi-institution project involving EAD?

- Yes No
 If "Yes", please list institutions: _____

25. Would your department be interested in working with other institutions on an EAD project?
 Yes No
26. Is there anything else you would like to share about your institution's experience with EAD?

27. Would your department be receptive to an on-site visit to learn more about your EAD implementation?
 Yes No
28. May we contact you concerning the answers on this survey? Yes No
 If Yes, do you prefer being contacted by
 Phone (preferred number: () _____)
 E-Mail (preferred address: _____)

Thank you for helping support our research!

Appendix B. Survey Tally Form

AMIGOS Survey Results 12/01/01

Sample Population

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Original Mailing | |
| • Amigos members (academic with Special Collections) | 43 |
| • Additional institutions from surrounding states | 35 |
| • EAD Implementers from EAD Help Pages | 33 |
| • Major state institutions from all 50 states | <u>49</u> |
| TOTAL: | 160 |
| Second Mailing | |
| • Other institutions requesting to be part of this study | 5 |
| • Referred institutions | <u>26</u> |
| TOTAL : | 191 |

*Responses from 29 states and 3 foreign countries.

Question 1: What is the size of your institution?

Total Survey Results:

- 2 % (2) 1 – 999
- 13% (13) 1000 – 4999
- 10% (10) 5000 – 9999
- 21% (21) 10,000 – 14,999
- 12% (12) 15,000 – 19,999
- 29% (29) over 20,000
- 13% (13) Non-academic institutions

EAD Implementers Survey Results: (results rounded to nearest whole percent)

- 1% (1) 1 – 999
- 9% (6) 1000 – 4999
- 4% (3) 5000 – 9999
- 18% (12) 10,000 – 14,999
- 12% (8) 15,000 – 19,999
- 35% (24) over 20,000
- 19% (13) Non-academic institutions

Question 2: How many of each of the following make up your department staff?

Total Survey Results: (mean average)

- Professional 4.98
- Support Staff (FTE) 3.54
- Students 5.54
- Interns .43
- Volunteers .65
- Others .26

FTE Project Archivist
 Historian
 Contract Processor
 Grant related staff
 Archival Technician
 Programmers
 Research Faculty
 Research Assistant
 Temporary Medieval Manuscript Cataloguer
 Temporary

Total Staff Average 15.42

EAD Implementers Results:

- Professional 6.21
- Support Staff 4.10
- Students 6.22
- Interns .54
- Volunteers .94
- Other .31

Historian
 Contract Processor
 Grant Related Staff
 Archival technician
 Programmers
 Research Faculty
 Research Assistant
 Temporary

EAD Total staff average: 18.32

Question 3: What is the total size of your department's collections?

Total Survey Results: (mean average)

- Linear Feet 10,868
- Volumes 62,093
- Don't know 13 (actual number)

EAD Implementers Results: (mean average)

- Linear Feet 13,799
- Volumes 77,262
- Don't know 6 (actual number)

Question 4: Who are the users of your collections?

Question 5: Please describe your department's collections?

Question 6: What percentage of your collections have MARC records?

Average number of MARC records:

- Total survey results: 50%
- EAD Implementer results: 53%

Question 7: How many finding aids are there in your department?

Average number of finding aids:

- Total survey results: 556
- EAD Implementer results: 712

Question 8: What percentage of your collections have finding aids?

Average percentage of collections with finding aids?

- Total survey results: 61%
- EAD Implementer results: 59%

Question 9: How are the finding aids currently available to the public? (Multiple answers)

- Paper form 97%
- Via the Internet 79%
- Via the OPAC 46%
- Via campus network 13%
- Other 6%

Collaborative Project page (2)

XML files on WWW

Email attachment

Links from Registry

Question 10: Is your department involved in an EAD project?

- Not at all 31%
- Just in the planning stages 15% (22% of EAD responses)
- Have EAD finding aids but none available to the public 16% (23% of EAD responses)
- Have EAD finding aids available to the public 37% (54% of EAD responses)
- No longer involved in an EAD project 1% (1% of EAD responses)

Question 11: If your department is NOT involved with EAD, why? (Multiple answers)

- Not enough staff 21%
- Insufficient training 19%
- Insufficient funding 16%
- Insufficient partnering institutions 5%
- Other priorities 22%
- Just haven't gotten around to it 6%
- Insufficient institutional support 11%
- Other 11%

**See Question 11 Appendix

Question 12: The decision to implement or not to implement EAD was made on what level?

- Institutional decision 30%
- Departmental decision 55%
- Individual decision 12%

Question 13: Is your institution a member of AMIGOS Library Services?

- Yes 42% (54% of EAD users)

For all following percentages, 69 institutions are using/ have used/ will use EAD

Question 14: Have you or your staff attended any EAD specific training? (multiple answers)

- Attended SAA sponsored training 68% (47)
- Attended other EAD training 35% (24)
 - RBS 14% (10)
 - RLG-Fast 4% (3)
 - OAC 4% (3)
 - Other 7% (5)
- Self-taught 25% (17)
- Plan on attending training in the future 10% (7)

Question 15: How is the EAD project funded?

- Regular department funds 75% (52)
- Special department funds 19% (13)
- Private funding 6% (4)
- Grant/Fellowship 42% (29)

Question 16: At the beginning of the project, the finding aids were in what electronic format? (multiple answers)

- None (paper format) 35% (24)
- WordStar 1% (1)
- MS WORD 52% (36)
- Text/ASCII 20% (14)
- WordPerfect 38% (26)
- Other 22% (15)

Question 17: How does your department convert paper finding aids to an electronic format?

- Re-key in-house 59% (41)
- Outsource 30% (21)
- OCR 23% (16)
- Other 12% (8)

Question 18: What software is used to mark-up the finding aids in EAD?

- Answered (Planning stages) 28% (16)
- XMetaL 33% (23)
- WordPerfect 9% (6)
- NoteTab 7% (5)
- Word 6% (4)
- Pro Cite 1% (1)
- Internet Archivist 1% (1)
- Author/Editor 7% (5)
- Fox Pro Database 1% (1)
- Text editor(s) 9% (6)
- Other 10% (7)

Question 19: What version of the EAD DTD is being used?

- SGML 39% (27)
- XML 49% (34)

Question 20: Does your department use the EAD Cookbook?

- Yes 38% (26)

Question 21: How are the EAD encoded finding aids delivered to the public? Multiple answers

- Native SGML 22% (15)
- Native XML 14% (10)
- HTML 62% (43)

Question 22: What priority is the conversion of finding aids to the EAD format in your department?

- Top priority 6% (4)
- High priority 51% (35)
- Low priority 9% (6)
- Working on it as we can 30% (21)
- Done with all encoding 1% (1)

Question 23: Are the finding aids linked to the OPAC?

- Yes 52% (36)

Question 24: Is your department currently involved with a multi-institution project involving EAD?

- Yes 52% (36)

Question 25: Would your department be interested in working with other institutions on an EAD project?

- Yes 70% (48)

Question 26: Is there anything else you would like to share about your institution's experience with EAD?

See Question 26 Appendix

Question 27: Would your department be receptive to an on-site visit to learn more about your EAD implementation?

- Yes 80% (55)

Appendix C. Survey Question 11

Question 11 Appendix
– Other “explanations”

| ID Number | Explanation | Added to Form |
|-----------|---|---------------|
| 5 | EAD is premature. Not enough browser support. Even after browsers can read it, there are no search engines that will search EAD Finding Aids. | 2/12/01 |
| 13 | Really have not been made aware. | 2/12/01 |
| 16 | Don't know anything about it. | 2/12/01 |
| 53 | Don't [know] enough about it | 2/15/01 |
| 56 | We haven't as yet been presented a situation where this was needed. In the sense of “technical” support, I think. | 2/15/01 |
| 74 | Managerial decision by University Archivist to cease the EAD project – no reason given! ** See “Question 26” | 2/12/01 |
| 102 | EAD has not yet demonstrated its usefulness to researchers, particularly considering its additional costs to the repository. | 2/12/01 |
| 113 | I am not convinced of the need to uniformize finding aids when access is provided using HTML based systems. | 2/12/01 |
| 140 | Statewide project is limited to ARL libraries at this point. We may participate later. | 2/12/01 |
| 150 | The idea has not been introduced by since MARC records are the traditional way we have done it. | 2/12/01 |
| 152 | Don't really know much about it. Have never seen one. | 2/12/01 |
| 157 | Waiting to benefit from the experience of other EAD users. | 2/12/01 |

**Question 26 Appendix
EAD “Shared Experiences”**

| ID Number | Shared Experience | Added to Form |
|------------------|--|----------------------|
| 2 | See our website & project information, which includes papers from SAA 2000 session. http://www.aip.org/history/ead/about.html | 2/12/01 |
| 4 | We are just beginning a tri-university EAD/XML initiative that we hope will expand into a stateside project w/external funding. | 2/12/01 |
| 18 | Great care must be taken to make sure that the encoding is part of the processing. | 2/12/01 |
| 23 | The Special Collections Dept. has been involved in two EAD grant-funded projects. The first project was the GAMMA EAD project which built on a collaborative NEH-funded cataloging project. The GAMMA EAD project, funded by the Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board, entailed encoding 35 finding aids from 17 institutions. These finding aids are encoded using the EAD Beta version. During the project we used Author/Editor to author the files. The files are available on the GAMMA EAD website, but are presented only as SGML files. For more information see: http://sage.library.emory.edu/gamma/ The Dept. also received funding from RLG to participate in the Archival Resources conversion project. Through funding from the Gladys Kriebel Delmas Foundation, RLG provided matching-fund grants to 28 members to support Apex conversion of over 350 finding aids. Emory contributed sixteen finding aids. These finding aids were encoded using the EAD Version 1. We are now in the process of deciding what our in-house strategy will be regarding EAD. We have decided to forgo further use of Author/Editor – converting to XML rather than SGML. To that end we have purchased X-Metal. | 2/27/01 |
| 24 | At the Pepper Library, only very basic EAD markup has been done. At present, the Paul Dirac Papers are in EAD and online, but not publicly available. There are no other finding aids online. | 03/21/01 |
| 29 | It’s all on our website – see “History” http://oasis.harvard.edu | 03/21/01 |
| 36 | We do not have a formal project. I write EAD finding aids when I have time – which isn’t very often. | 2/12/01 |
| 40 | EAD migration process resulted in improvements to the organization and content of our finding aids. Our users seem very pleased with the new descriptive products. | 2/12/01 |
| 52 | Advanced display, advanced search engines are difficult to implement due to their complexity and expense. | 2/12/01 |
| 57 | For more info see http://oasis.harvard.edu | 2/15/01 |
| 61 | It’s been very slow going. | 2/15/01 |
| 67 | Very time consuming for smaller departments. | 2/12/01 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------|
| 74 | I have encoded approx. 25 finding aids using EAD via the Internet Archivist <EAD> software, we were one of the early users of the software. The encoded finding aids are online at http://archives.tamuk.edu/Finders.htm ** See "Question 11" | 2/12/01 |
| 80 | The project is very time consuming if it involves re-doing or creating new finding aids. Older collections generally needed their finding aids redone in order to be presentable for an EAD project. | 2/12/01 |
| 83 | Our data is stored in our database where it is printed to file using an EAD form – this does 90% of our work for us. | 2/12/01 |
| 89 | We desperately need a flexible, effective, automated tool for efficiently marking up lengthy, consistently structured container lists. | 03/21/01 |
| 92 | Our system was designed locally – it works very well but we are still waiting for our library programmers to build a local front end for search and display. Right now we can only deliver a SGML version to our users. | 2/12/01 |
| 123 | We are barely off the ground with our project, still ironing out some problems with container lists in our style sheet. When problems are resolved, I will probably spend about 25% of my time working on encoding finding aids. Ours is a "project of two" – myself and Terry Brandsma, my systems support person. Still, it's better than nothing. | 2/12/01 |
| 130 | We are only at the beginning stages of implementing EAD – First we are doing MARC AMC Cataloguing. | 03/21/01 |
| 131 | Difficult; too complex; no institutional expertise. | 2/12/01 |
| 148 | You can see the methodology we used at http://www.archives.state.ut.us/referenc/ead.htm | 2/12/01 |
| 151 | Having forms provided by one server makes entry much quicker. | 2/12/01 |
| 160 | Don't lose hope! It's worth doing – a critical mass of finding aids are now appearing online. RLGs Archival Resources is becoming the union catalog we've always hoped for. | 2/12/01 |
| 172 | The project manager for this Five College project is named Kelcy Shepherd. She is based at UMass/Amherst (email kshepher@library.umass.edu) | 2/12/01 |
| 177 | When OAC's grant funding ran out in December 2000 all encoding stopped. Because we have no one with the time or inclination to learn EAD, it is probable that no future encoding will be done unless an intern or grant money or a cooperative project with other institutions begins resuming the work. The only other option is an MSWord template that OAC was developing. Presumably it can output EAD Finding Aids but I never had time to learn or test the beta version properly. | 2/12/01 |
| 181 | Infrastructure/delivery issues under-represented. These also greatly affect how users access documents. | 03/09/01 |
| 186 | We have hired a full-time Project Director for the Bullock Archives with EAD experience. | 03/09/01 |
| 187 | We are at a relatively early stage of development. We suffer from | 02/19/01 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----------|
| 188 | <p>“loneliness”, as no other Portuguese institutions have awaked to the importance of EAD. We look forward to any kind of cooperation and would be part of any cooperative catalogues but [we] I’m afraid there aren’t international programs that would be interested in our data.</p> <p>We are anticipating generating EAD/XML versions of all collection/item/piece descriptions from our archival database, where we will continue to carry out description creation and maintenance and collection administration, to take advantage of the EAD structure for retrieval and XML/XSLT for presentation purposes – particularly for digitized collections.</p> | 03/09/01 |
| 191 | <p>EAD conversion is extremely time consuming & the cost/benefit from EAD is much less apparent than for html conversion; some existing finding aids are not of a high enough standard to convert without further work; difficulties solving encoding problems; difficulties solving workflow issues e.g. should work be down in-house or outsourced and how are additions to collections to be incorporated into SGML versions?; isolation from EAD expertise.</p> | 04/04/01 |