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Executive Summary

The American Theological Library Association (ATLA) 2012 Preservation Survey, available to the association’s 282 institutional and affiliate member libraries in the United States and Canada, from October through December 2012, was accessed by ninety-six libraries, a 34.0% response rate, and completed by ninety-five, a 33.7% completion rate. Throughout this report, percentages will be based on ninety-five responses.

Historically, ATLA’s preservation activity focused on partnering with member libraries on preservation strategies centering on microfilming of collections held by member libraries. As ATLA and its membership moved into the 21st century, microfilming initiatives wound down, and now ATLA and its membership are examining next steps for the association’s preservation program. To inform program development, ATLA undertook a web-based survey of preservation interests and needs.

Overwhelmingly, respondents agreed that preservation should continue to be a priority activity for the American Theological Library Association. The survey showed a strong interest from the membership for preservation education, funding, and collaboration activities becoming centerpieces of ATLA’s evolving preservation program. Members’ responses also showed a growing concern for and involvement in the digitization of materials and digital preservation. Responses indicated that a lack of environmental controls, space, and funding and personnel for preservation were considered by member institutions as their most serious preservation problems.

Based on findings from the preservation survey, the American Theological Library Association will explore several of the recommendations submitted by members. Efforts will focus on five key areas.

**Education:** ATLA will develop an educational program to address preservation training needs for members, including webinars, workshops, and conference programs. Popular topics for coverage will include:

- Advocacy, fundraising and grant-writing
- Digitization
- Digital preservation
- Disaster preparedness and recovery
- Preservation management
- Collections conservation

**Promotion:** ATLA will collect and promote resources to further members’ preservation efforts, including development of a dedicated space on the ATLA web site where model policies, templates, resources, reports, and directories of support organizations may be housed. ATLA will also develop a system of communications to keep members aware of preservation news and activities within the association and profession.

**Consultation:** ATLA will explore options for providing consulting services to libraries, especially in the areas of collections surveys, creation of formal preservation plans, and continuing education. ATLA can leverage existing programs to provide hands-on support to members.

**Funding:** ATLA will explore funding to support the preservation work of member libraries and seek opportunities for savings on preservation products beneficial to members.

**Leadership:** ATLA will leverage its collaborative role within the profession to lead the development of directories of denominational materials and preservation copies of last resort, creating forums for the exchange of ideas, and promoting the importance of preservation to the wider theological and religious communities.

The 2012 ATLA Preservation Survey was conducted by consultants Tom Clareson (LYRASIS) and Liz Bishoff (The Bishoff Group), with the assistance of Brenda Bailey-Hainer, ATLA Executive Director, and Miguel Figueroa, ATLA Director of Member Programs.
Part I: Participant Characteristics

Respondents were asked several questions to help characterize their library.

The majority of respondents (68 or 71.5%) were from an independent library chiefly serving their institution. The next largest segment (9 or 9.5%) included libraries integrated with a larger university or college library system. Also among the respondents were departmental branch libraries within a larger university or college library system (8 or 8.4%), organizations that were part of a library system jointly administered and/or funded by more than one educational institution (6 or 6.3%), and those who classified themselves as other (4 or 4.2%).

A majority of libraries reported mid-sized budgets, with the largest portion (23 or 24.2%) in the $100,001-$250,000 budget range, followed closely by twenty-two libraries (23.1%) in the $250,001-$500,000 range, and twenty-one libraries (22.1%) in the $500,001-$1,000,000 range. At the lower ranges, five libraries (5.3%) reported budgets of $0-$50,000 and seven libraries (7.4%) reported budgets in the $50,001-$100,000 range. At the higher ranges, twelve libraries (12.6%) reported budgets of $1,000,001-$5,000,000 and two libraries (2.1%) reported budgets above $5,000,001. Three libraries skipped this question.

A majority of responding libraries (50, across all budget sizes, except the two largest categories over $1,000,001) employ 2-5 paid full-time staff, with an average of 3.3 staff. Those with budgets between $1,000,001 and $5,000,000 most often had 11-20 paid staff; those in the highest budget category, over $5,000,001, had fifty-one staff members and above.

For paid part-time staff, most organizations responded that they had 1 FTE, but the average was 2.27 staff in all but the largest budget category, where the average was 5.5 paid part-time staff members.

Part-time student assistants numbered between 2-5 at a majority of responding libraries, with an average of 3.58. Those libraries with budgets of $1,000,001-$5,000,000 had 6-10 part-time student assistants. At institutions with budgets over $5,000,001, fifty-one and above part-time student assistants were reported.

While the majority of institutions (43 or 45.3%) had no unpaid or volunteer full-time staff, the number of those staff averaged 1.64 across all responding institutions.
In addition to their American Theological Library Association membership, thirty-two (34.4%) respondents belonged to the American Library Association and six (6.5%) to the Society of American Archivists. Other organizations where responding libraries are members included OCLC, state-based organizations such as OhioLINK and CARLI (the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois), the Catholic Library Association, the Association of Christian Librarians, and some state-based theological library groups. Many respondents belonged to three or more library-related organizations.

The majority of respondents (75 or 78.9%) reported that their library was open to the public forty-one or more hours per week. A few organizations (7 or 7.4%) reported thirty-one to forty open hours per week.

**Part II: The State of Preservation**

**Materials**

ATLA member organizations hold a wide variety of materials. Several formats were held by over half of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Number of Responding Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage of Responding Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books/Monographs</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials/Periodicals</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound manuscript materials (ledger books, minute books, scrapbooks)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Synagogue records</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilms</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominational records</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival records and manuscripts</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded sound collections</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbound sheets</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital collections</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other materials</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other formats held included artworks, paintings, video recordings, and pamphlets.
“We are committed to preserving core materials in physical media with proven records of historical longevity. It is hoped that ATLA will recognize the importance of traditional and proven preservation media while continuing to explore and make available the latest advances in digital preservation.”

Staffing and Budget for Preservation

Respondents were provided an opportunity to report the staff time (in FTEs) spent by paid or volunteer staff on collections care activities such as repair, rebinding, or rehousing of collection materials. At twenty-three institutions (24.2%), no FTE time was spent on preservation activities. Fifty-nine (62.1%) respondents reported that up to 1 FTE’s worth of time was spent on collections care. Very few reported higher numbers (8 reported 1-2 FTE; 1 reported 3-5 FTE; and 2 reported 6 or more FTE).

![Figure 3: Staff time (in FTE) spent on collections care activities (repair, rebinding, or rehousing)](chart)
Expenditures on preservation supplies revealed some differences — with a core of responding libraries (32 or 33.7%) selecting the lowest response level, but a more balanced spread of respondents selecting the remaining four expenditure categories.

As expected, those libraries that indicated no FTE time spent on collections, also indicated the lowest level of expenditures for preservation supplies, with just five of the libraries that allotted 0 FTE to preservation selecting an option other than $0-$500 in preservation expenditures.

“We have no money to do the ‘regular’ work of libraries - not enough time or staff to do much bibliographic instruction, for instance - so things like preservation of special collections end up being treated as Luxuries. We do the best we can with very little knowledge and no funding.”
The survey dug deeper to look at the sources of funding for conservation/preservation. The majority of respondents (82 or 86.3% across all institutional budget sizes) reported that preservation funding came from the institution’s own budget. While this demonstrates institutions’ commitment to preservation, it also reveals an opportunity for funding levels to rise or fall based on the overall budget picture for the institution.

Other funding sources included donor funding (18 or 18.9%), no preservation funding source (8 or 8.4%), foundation or corporate grants (6 or 6.3%), federal grants (4 or 4.2%), state grants (2 or 2.1%), and institutional use or license fees (also 2 or 2.1%).

Libraries in the lower-ends of the budget spectrum reported few instances of external funding for preservation. None of the twelve institutions reporting operating budgets in the $0-$50,000 or $50,001-$100,000 brackets reported external funding for preservation and just three of the twenty-three institutions in the $100,001-$250,000 bracket reported external funding.

To gain further insight into funding of conservation/preservation projects, the survey asked about sources from which libraries had received funds to implement conservation/preservation projects in the past five years. Respondents were allowed to indicate multiple sources. While a majority (44 or 46.3%) said they had not received funding from listed resources, thirty-eight (40.0%) of the respondents had used line items in their institution’s operating budget. Other popular funding sources for preservation/conservation, across institutions of all budget sizes, included individual contributions dedicated to conservation/preservation projects (9 or 9.5%); private foundations (8 or 8.4%); interest from in-house endowments (7 or 7.3%); National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) larger grants (4 or 4.2%); NEH Preservation Assistance Grants (2 or 2.1%); Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Funding (2 or 2.1%); Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) direct grants to recipients (2 or 2.1%); other federal funding programs (1 or 1.0%); and corporate or business contributions dedicated to conservation/preservation grants (1 or 1.0%). Other funding resources mentioned included funding from collaborative digitization projects.
Preservation Policies and Practices

Respondents provided positive indicators of the importance of preservation to the mission of the institution. The majority of respondents (45 or 47.4% across all budget sizes) reported that their library mission statement supports the preservation of collections. Thirty respondents (31.5%) do not have preservation in their mission statement, but it is addressed in the institution’s overall long-range plan. Eleven organizations (11.6%) do not have an institutional mission statement and seven respondents (7.4%) did not know.

Moving beyond the role of preservation in the institution’s mission statement, the survey sought to learn more about the extent to which preservation was supported by institutional policies and practices, including institutional collections/acquisition policies, long-range preservation/conservation plans, preservation surveys, and emergency and disaster plans.

As expected, a very high number of libraries had collections/acquisitions policies in place. Seventy-six institutions (80.0%) had a collection development policy and thirteen (13.7%) additional respondents were developing such a policy. Only five organizations (5.3%), three of them from the lower range of operating budgets in the $0-$50,000 or $50,001-$100,000 ranges, did not have a written institutional collections/acquisitions policy.

As can be expected, there was a strong correlation between an institution’s budget size and the presence of a written collections/acquisitions policy.

Figure 7: Library respondents with a written institutional collections/acquisitions policy

Figure 8: Library respondents with a written institutional collections/acquisitions policy by library budget
A smaller number of libraries reported having long-range preservation/conservation policies in place. Only eighteen institutions (18.9%) reported having such a preservation/conservation plan and another seventeen (17.9%) were developing a preservation/conservation plan. Almost two-thirds of responding libraries (57 or 60.0%, across all budget sizes) did not have a written long-range preservation/conservation plan for the maintenance, care, repair, and protection of their collections. None of the libraries in the lowest operating budget tier, $0-$50,000, reported having a preservation/conservation plan.

“Since there is no profit motive to digitize religious information, no commercial demand to drive the digitization of materials [as there is for science and medical information], theological libraries really need an organization like ATLA to help insure that materials are conserved and content is preserved for future generations.”
“We are small. It is difficult to spare a person's hours for preservation. A position would have to be created (unlikely) and would need to be shared. Money beyond the budget would have to be obtained in order to carry out preservation initiatives.”

A similarly small numbers of libraries reported having conducted a preservation survey. Just fifteen organizations (15.8%) had conducted a preservation survey (many either in the last three years or in the mid-1990s). Three quarters of the respondents (71 or 74.7%, regardless of budget size) had not undertaken a preservation survey. Once again, none of the libraries in the lowest operating budget tier, $0-$50,000, reported having conducted a preservation survey. Eight institutions (8.4%) did not know if a preservation survey had been conducted.
While libraries in the very highest operating budget tiers might be assumed to have the best preservation policies, response to the survey indicates that assumption may not always hold true. All fourteen libraries from the $1,000,001 - $5,000,000 and $5,000,001 and above budget tiers indicated that the library’s mission statement supported the preservation of collections or that preservation was addressed in the institution’s long-range plan. Similarly, all of these libraries indicated that they either had a written institutional collections/acquisitions policy or that one was being written. Responses were more mixed when asked about a written, long-range preservation/conservation plan — only four of fourteen reported having such a plan — and a formal preservation/conservation survey — only four of fourteen reported having had such a survey.

Emergency and disaster plans are important resources towards the preservation of materials, as demonstrated by the many emergencies and disasters the cultural heritage community experienced in 2012 and in recent years. Just forty-three responding libraries (45.3%) indicated that they had an emergency or disaster plan that addressed collections, but of those, twenty-four (25.3%) indicated that their plan was not up to date. Ten responding libraries (10.4%) indicated that while they did not have a plan in place, one was being developed. The remaining forty-two libraries (44.3%) indicated they did not have a plan, did not know if there was a plan, or skipped the question. Here again, larger operating budgets did not always result in more prepared policies. Those libraries reporting higher operating budgets provided mixed responses regarding emergency plans, with nearly as many indicating having plans as reporting either not having a plan or having an out-of-date plan. At the lower end of the budget spectrum, those libraries in the $0-$50,000 or $50,001-$100,000 operating budget ranges almost universally responded that they did not have an emergency plan.

“Smaller libraries need guidance in how to collaborate locally, regionally and within the denomination for print preservation.”

Figure 13: Library respondents with a written emergency or disaster plan that includes collection materials.
For those organizations that did not have a disaster or emergency plan, the most frequently cited reasons for not having a plan were not having the time to write a plan (24 responses), not an institutional priority (21 responses), and not having the expertise to write a plan (12 responses). Four respondents indicated that they were unaware of the need for a disaster or emergency plan.

Libraries were asked how many copies of a publication are sufficient for a last copy repository, whether print or electronic. The majority (54 or 56.8%, across all budget size categories) said two to three copies, sixteen or 16.8% said one copy, ten or 10.5% said four to five copies, and ten or 10.5% said they did not know.

“Coordination of projects, like a joint periodical facility for last copies, so we can feel secure that materials are being preserved would be a huge stress relief.”

Figure 14: Library respondents with a written emergency or disaster plan that includes collection materials by library budget
**Collections Management and Access**

Processing and cataloging collections can often provide institutions with better intellectual and inventory control of their collection materials, allowing for improved collection management and preservation.

Responses to the survey’s questions about collection processing, cataloging, and indexing showed mostly positive results. When asked about the estimated percentage of their library’s special collections that have been processed (meaning arrangement and/or description of archival collections) thirty-three respondents (34.7%) said 75-99% of the collections had been processed, and three (3.3%) said 100% were processed. However, there were also six organizations (6.3%, from lower budget levels) where none of the collections had been processed, twenty-two (23.2%) where only 1-24% had been processed, thirteen (13.7%) with 25-49% processed, and twelve (12.6%) with 50-74% of their special collections processed. A majority of the organizations with less than 75% of their collections processed were independent libraries chiefly serving their institutions.

Findings were quite similar when libraries were asked the estimated percentages of their special collections that are books and manuscripts that are cataloged. More had the works cataloged in an online system than on paper, with thirty-two having 75-99% cataloged, seven with 100% cataloged, seven with none of their special collections cataloged, fourteen with 1-24%, eleven with 25-49%, and fourteen with 50-74% cataloged.

**Figure 15:** Estimated percentage of respondents’ special collections that have been processed (arrangement and or description of archival collections)

**Figure 16:** Estimated percentage of respondents’ special collections that have been processed (arrangement and or description of archival collections) by library budget
Current Conservation and Preservation Practices

Respondents were asked what preservation and conservation activities their institution currently performs. In the majority of cases, paid staff performed preservation activities including:

- Rehousing (refoldering, reboxing)
- Moving collections
- Disaster preparedness and recovery
- Care and handling of collections
- Preservation reformatting (photocopying, microfilming)
- Preservation management (administration, planning, assessment)
- Collections conservation (physical treatment)
- Environmental monitoring
- Advocacy/fundraising/grant-writing
- Digitization/imaging
- Preservation of digital files, including databases, websites, and image files
- Exhibits
- Pest and mold management
- Use of preservation-standard storage furniture (shelving and cabinetry)

Unpaid staff and volunteers were most active in rehousing (18 institutions) and care and handling of collections (12 institutions).

External providers (outsourced or vendor services) were most active in pest and mold management (27 responding institutions), but also in building design/construction/renovation (13), digitization/imaging (12), preservation reformatting (12), and contracted services (12), as well as preservation of digitized files (11). There were two areas, contracting for preservation services and building design/construction/renovation, where a majority of responding institutions said those activities were not applicable at this time.

Conservation/Preservation Priorities

Finally in the preservation policies and activities section, institutions were asked to list the three most serious conservation/preservation problems at their library. Far and away, a lack of environmental/climate control was seen as the biggest concern, with forty-three out of 247 “votes”. Other concerns included a lack of space (24), lack of funds (22), lack of personnel (20), brittle and deteriorated paper (11), and mold/mildew (10).
Part III: Digitization and Digital Preservation

As digitization plays an important role in the preservation efforts of libraries, this survey provided an opportunity for respondents to share information about their libraries’ digitization efforts.

Digital Formats

ATLA member libraries were asked about the types of born-digital formats they collect and what types of materials they are digitizing/reformatting. Different levels of activity were seen with the different formats.

Other born digital formats currently being collected include institutional publications, theses and dissertations, and some e-mail communications. Only libraries with budgets less than $1 million indicated that they were not collecting any digital formats, with the majority of those libraries reporting annual operating budgets less than $250,000.

Table 2: Born-digital formats collected by responding Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Number of Responding Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage of Responding Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound recordings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video/Audio</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites and social networking sites</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other materials being digitized include periodicals, theses and dissertations, and yearbooks. Here again, only those libraries with budgets less than $1 million indicated that none of their materials had been digitized. 54% of the libraries (19 of 35) that reported annual operating budgets less than $250,000 reported that none of their materials had been digitized.

The materials listed above can be represented by a variety of digital file formats. When asked about the file formats currently represented in respondents’ digital collections, the most prevalent formats included PDF/PDF-A (50 or 52.6%), JPEG (42 or 44.2%), TIFF (32 or 33.7%), WAV (20 or 21.1%), MPEG (16 or 16.8%), and JPEG2000 (11 or 11.6%). Eighteen respondents (21.7%) did not know the formats currently represented in their digital collections, and others noted MOV, SWF, GIF, MP4, and EPub.

**Policies for Digital Holdings**

As digital holdings continue to play a significant role in the future of library collections and services, the development or modification of written policies to address digital materials takes on new significance. Results of this survey indicate that in all of the indicated policy areas, a majority of responding libraries did not have policies which addressed digital materials.
Figure 17: Library respondents with written policies addressing digital materials in indicated policy areas

- **Collection Development**
  - Yes: 22%
  - No: 42%
  - No, but one is being developed: 27%

- **Emergency Preparedness**
  - Yes: 8%
  - No: 79%

- **Exhibits**
  - Yes: 13%
  - No: 7%

- **Digital Preservation**
  - Yes: 9%
  - No: 69%

- **Rights and Licensing**
  - Yes: 15%
  - No: 61%

- **Digital Curation**
  - Yes: 14%
  - No: 5%

- **Strategic Planning**
  - Yes: 19%
  - No: 56%

- **E-records**
  - Yes: 12%
  - No: 70%

Legend:
- Red: No
- Blue: Yes
- Green: No, but one is being developed
Only in collection development, when the numbers of institutions with digital-related plans and those developing them are combined, do more institutions have a plan in process or completed than do not have a plan. This trend is true across all budget sizes.

Connected to policies for digital files, the survey sought to learn more about the frequency for libraries' back-up of digital files. There were both positive and negative results to report. Thirty-six institutions (40%, across all institutional budget categories) back-up daily, but seventeen (18.9%, also from all budget categories) don't know their library's back-up frequency and fifteen (16.7%) never create back-up files. Six institutions back-up weekly, one monthly, and five said they have only backed-up once. Others report that the back-up schedule varies among systems/functions/services/records, that back-up is done as new content is added, or that it is handled by the campus information technology department.

Survey responses about the back-up file locations are promising. Digital preservation experts now recommend multiple storage sites to avoid data loss from building, local, or regional disasters. Of the sixty-two libraries that responded to this question, a majority of them (25 or 40.3%) are storing digital materials in multiple locations and twelve (19.4%) are storing offsite. Nineteen (30.6%) institutions store digital collections onsite and sixteen (9.7%) don't know where their back-up digital files are stored.

A series of questions related to copyright issues and digitization revealed some strengths and a few weaknesses in libraries’ responses to copyright issues. For each of the following statements, the majority of respondents indicated a strong inclination (a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) toward “very accurate“:

- We always consider copyright and intellectual property concerns in managing digital materials (73 respondents; 76.8% of the survey’s respondents)
- We are very confident making copyright, licensing, and digital copyright decisions about our digital collections (52 respondents; 54.7% of the survey’s respondents)

With somewhat less consensus, the majority of respondents indicated a strong inclination (a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) toward “very accurate” for the following statement:

- Copyright and licensing concerns are significant deterrents for us in creating digital collections (40 respondents; 42.1% of the survey’s respondents)

Additionally, respondents said that the statement, “We always record and use rights metadata to control delivery of collections to authorized users” was either not applicable (38 or 41.8%) or not at all accurate (17 or 18.7%). And, while some organizations said the statement, “We always acquire digital preservation rights of born-digital materials that are in our collection” is very accurate (16 or 17.6%), almost as many say the statement is not at all accurate (15 or 16.5%), and the majority (38 or 41.8%) say the statement is not applicable.

The Future of Digital Preservation

Respondents were asked if their library had a plan to preserve the unique websites they are developing regarding theological content: Sixty-four or 67.3% said no; ten or 10.5%, yes; eight or 8.4% said one is being developed; and eight or 8.4% did not know.

Participants were also asked if they had plans to preserve unique denominational content in digital form beyond websites. Fifty-five or 57.9% said no; seventeen or 17.9%, yes; eleven or 11.6% have a plan in development and seven or 7.4% did not know.
Part IV: Preservation Support and Training

Preservation Support

Survey participants were asked to indicate their library’s level of need—an urgent need, a need, or no need — for several support services related to preservation.

While no topic saw a majority of libraries identifying an “urgent need” for support (environmental control received the most “urgent need” votes with 26 or 27.4%), there were several topics where a clear majority of libraries indicated a “need” for support. Over half of the responding libraries indicated a need for support in several areas, including staff training (63 or 66.3%), emergency preparedness/disaster planning (61 or 64.2%), conservation treatment (58 or 61.1%), collection assessments/collection surveys (58 or 61.1%), collection policy/procedure creation or updating (55 or 57.9%), cataloging or finding aids for collections (49 or 51.6%), preservation of digital collections (49 or 51.6%), and preventing light damage (46 or 51.1%).

Table 4: Level of need for preservation support services (majority highlighted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>No Need</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Urgent Need</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging or finding aids for collections</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition assessments/surveys of collections</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training in preservation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron training in preservation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation treatment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental controls (temperature/humidity)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing light damage</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of digital collections</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated pest management</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness/disaster planning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection policy and procedure creation or updating</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Training Sources and Needs**

Given the clear indication that staff training is one of the primary areas where libraries need support, the responses to the survey’s questions about training topics are particularly important.

Respondents were asked to indicate if there was an urgent need, a need, or no need for training in various topics. The trend of responses to this question indicates that, while not urgent, there is a need for training in several important preservation topics.

**Table 5: Level of need for training topics (majority highlighted)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>No Need</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Urgent Need</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehousing (e.g., refolding, reboxing)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage furniture (e.g., shelving, cabinetry)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving collections</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster preparedness and recovery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care and handling of collections</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation reformatting (e.g., preservation photocopying, microfilming)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation management (e.g., administration, planning, assessment)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections conservation (e.g., physical treatment)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting for conservation/preservation services</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental monitoring</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy / fundraising / grant writing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building design / construction / renovation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitization (reformatting)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of digitized collections</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of born digital files (e.g., databases, websites, image files)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository development</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest management/mold</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only one topic, advocacy/fundraising/grantwriting (23 respondents or 24.2%), was selected by over 20% of respondents as an area in which there is an urgent need for training. Both digitization (reformatting) and digital preservation each received fifteen votes (15.8%) as areas where training was an “urgent need.” All three topics also received a large number of votes as areas where there was a need for training.

While no topics were identified by the majority of respondents as areas where there is an “urgent need” for training, a majority of respondents expressed a “need” for training on a variety of preservation topics. Topics where over 50% of respondents indicated a need for training included disaster preparedness and recovery (59 or 62.1%), preservation management (56 or 58.9%), collections conservation (54 or 56.8%), and metadata for digital collections (50 or 52.6%). Additional topics with strong support for needed training included care and handling of collections (47 or 49.5%), usability for digital collections (47 or 49.5%), preservation of digitized collections (44 or 46.3%), digitization (42 or 44.2%), digital repository development (42 or 44.2%), exhibits (41 or 43.2%), advocacy/fundraising/grantwriting (41 or 43.2%), preservation reformatting (preservation, photocopying, microfilming) (40 or 42.1%), and environmental monitoring (38 or 40.0%)

Generally, the greater a library’s operating budget, the more frequent the appearance of “no need” in response to training in specific topics, though most libraries selected at least three topics where training was at least needed. The two libraries with the highest operating budgets — $5,000,001 and above — both indicated “no need” to nearly all of the training topics (only one topic, preservation of born-digital files, was selected as a topic for which training is a need).

Libraries were asked to indicate the types of preservation training programs, services, and self-studies they have participated in over the past three years. Respondents could select multiple answers. Peer advice was the top response with forty-one respondents (43.2%), followed by workshops (33 or 34.7%), online training including webinars (28 or 29.5%), conferences/meetings (23 or 24.2%), assessments/surveys (16 or 16.8%), mentoring/site visits (13 or 13.7%), and self-paced training (7 or 7.4%). Thirty-three (34.7%) respondents said they had not participated in any type of preservation training programs, services, or self-studies over the last three years. Among libraries with operating budgets less than $250,000, 57.1% (20 of 35 libraries) indicated that they had not participated in any type of preservation training programs, services, or self-studies.
Part V: The Future of ATLA’s Preservation Program

ATLA’s Preservation Mission

Respondents were asked to share, in their own words, what ATLA’s preservation mission is or should be. There was a high degree of agreement among the fifty-six institutions answering this question.

Choosing some of the best “preservation mission statements” from the open-ended responses to this question, the top choices include:

• “Education of member institutions on preservation initiatives, methods, etc.” (13 respondents)
• “To ensure that all materials entrusted to libraries are maintained and made accessible to future generations of researchers in a timely and efficient manner.” (13 respondents)
• “To support cooperation and collaboration among members seeking to create or enhance preservation programs in their libraries.” (7 respondents)

When asked to name the three most important preservation-related issues for ATLA in the next three years, there was less agreement among answers than when institutions were asked to identify three top preservation concerns at their institutions. In fact, the 181 answers supplied to this question were able to be grouped into fifty-five distinct categories via content analysis. The categories receiving the most votes as top ATLA preservation issues included training (23 votes); digitizing materials (13 votes); digital preservation (13 votes); funding for preservation (13 votes); building awareness of the importance of preservation (7 votes); and collaboration on preservation activities (7 votes).

ATLA’s Preservation Program

Nineteen respondents (20.0%) had utilized ATLA’s preservation program or services in the past. Seven organizations were extremely satisfied with ATLA’s preservation services and initiatives; four very satisfied, seven satisfied, five somewhat satisfied, and one not at all satisfied.

Respondents were asked, if ATLA was able to offer preservation services to members, which services their library would use. The most popular potential services included ongoing association-wide support for preservation grants to individual institutions (58 or 61.1%); association-sponsored preservation workshops (56 or 58.9%); and assistance with disaster planning and recovery (50 or 52.6%)
In an interesting trend, the great majority of organizations with budget sizes of $500,001-$1,000,000 were interested in almost all of the services listed above. Other programmatic suggestions included hosting of a shared digital repository, digitization services, awareness and access to digital collections through a service similar to the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA), ongoing association-wide support for cooperative grants, resources to help train part-time students in handling items, and purchase of microfilm materials as a preservation measure.

*Table 6: ATLA preservation services likely to be used by respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Service</th>
<th>Number of Responding Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage of Responding Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help with general conservation/preservation assessment surveys, including assessment of digital programs</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing association-wide support for preservation grants to individual institutions</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with disaster planning and recovery</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan of environmental monitoring equipment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place to contact for preservation information</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site visits by a preservation professional</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association sponsored preservation workshops</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of disaster recovery services (vacuum freeze drying and on-site cleanup)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation / disaster response supply discount pricing</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of collaborative collection storage, including print materials, photographic collections, moving image collections, recorded sound collections</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection transportation coordination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of discounted contracting for electronic data storage</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to rank areas where further development of ATLA’s preservation program would be beneficial to their library. Workshops were seen to be very beneficial by thirty-three institutions (34.7%) and a clearinghouse for information about digital and traditional preservation best practices and standards was seen as very beneficial by twenty-nine (30.5%) respondents and extremely beneficial by twenty-four (25.3%).
Table 7: Benefit of indicated enhancements to ATLA’s preservation program (majority highlighted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Extremely Beneficial</th>
<th>Very Beneficial</th>
<th>Beneficial</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clearinghouse for information about digital and traditional preservation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best practices and standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A resource to contact via e-mail or phone with questions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A facilitation role for member-initiated projects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant development assistance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting with digitization providers for discounted prices</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting with digital preservation providers for discounted prices</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting with microfilm providers for discounted prices</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an accessible directory of denominational repositories for archival</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials and last copies of print materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating guidelines, procedures, and safeguards for the transfer of materials</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between libraries, archives, historical repository sites, and museums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a forum for the exchange of ideas regarding preservation for the</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLA membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“What should receive priority attention in preservation are denominational and institutional resources. We need the ATLA to advocate preservation of theological resources.”
The majority of services received “beneficial” votes, with just a few receiving a majority of “very beneficial votes” and no services receiving a majority of “extremely beneficial” votes. Popular services included creating guidelines, procedures and safeguards for the transfer of materials between libraries, archives, historical repository sites, and museums (40 or 42.1% ranked as beneficial); creating a forum for the exchange of ideas regarding preservation for the ATLA membership (38 or 40.0% beneficial); creating an accessible directory of denominational repositories for archival materials and last copies of print materials (33 or 34.7% beneficial; 21 or 22.0% extremely beneficial); consulting services (32 or 33.7% beneficial); contracting with digitization providers for discounted prices (29 or 30.5% beneficial; 23 or 24.2% extremely beneficial); and grant development assistance (30 or 31.6% beneficial; 25 or 26.3% extremely beneficial).

Members were asked what actions or activities are needed to make ATLA’s preservation program sustainable. There was clear consensus that priorities include funding, central clearinghouses of information, and training.

Table 8: Actions or activities needed to make ATLA’s preservation program sustainable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New ATLA strategy for preservation</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of ATLA membership funds to preservation</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to support ATLA's preservation program</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium on new opportunities in preservation</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLA staff to support and train member staff on preservation activities</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLA staff to support and train member staff on digitization</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLA to provide clearinghouse on preservation</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the most positive findings from the survey came when respondents were asked if preservation should continue to be a priority activity for ATLA. Seventy respondents (73.7%) said yes, none of the respondents said no, and seventeen (17.9%) didn’t know.
When asked about other thoughts and ideas they had regarding their institution’s involvement and role in ATLA’s preservation initiatives, answers (and needs) were quite similar to responses about the assistance ATLA members need in order to participate in collaborative preservation projects. The needs for funding (15 responses), notification of preservation initiatives (11) and project coordination (5) were the top concerns for those becoming involved in ATLA preservation activities.

**Preservation and Collaboration**

To help determine interest in possible collaborative preservation projects, library respondents were asked to indicate their level of interest in an array of projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Interest</th>
<th>Some Interest</th>
<th>No Interest</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Already Participate in a Similar Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual assistance agreements (e.g., disaster response)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative exhibitions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative digital collections building</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative digital preservation program</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative grant projects</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared storage facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents expressed some interest in projects and programs, but stopped short of wholly endorsing any proposals with votes of “great interest.” Collaborative grant projects (32 or 33.7%), a collaborative digital preservation program (27 or 28.4%), and collaborative digital collections building (25 or 26.3%) received the most responses expressing great interest.

“Smaller libraries need guidance in how to collaborate locally, regionally, and within the denomination for print preservation.”
For most proposed collaborative projects and programs, the majority of respondents expressed “some interest.” Mentoring activities for preservation (48 or 50.5%), mutual assistance agreements for disaster response (46 or 48.4%), collaborative digital collection building (43 or 45.3%), collaborative digital preservation program (41 or 43.2%), and collaborative grant projects (40 or 42.1%) all received a large number of votes indicating “some interest.”

There were only two areas where a majority of respondents expressed no interest — collaborative exhibitions and shared storage facilities.

When asked about the organizations they collaborate with, forty-three (45.3%, including some in every budget category) said libraries and archives in their state; fifteen (15.8%) libraries and archives in their denomination; eight (8.4%) peer libraries and archives on a national scale; and seven (7.4%), other ATLA members. Other collaborations were on local, regional, and international consortial levels.

In the past, ATLA and its member libraries have partnered on preservation initiatives. One of the survey questions asked about the assistance ATLA members need in order to participate in future collaborative preservation projects. Through content analysis, the answers to this query were clear-cut: knowledge and notification of future preservation initiatives (13 mentions), funding for initiatives (also 13), and coordination of these projects (11) were seen as the most important forms of assistance.
Conclusion

In the American Theological Library Association’s 2012 Preservation Survey, many needs for further action and support of preservation activities were discovered.

Many ATLA member libraries included preservation in their mission statements (in fact, the percentage doing so was higher than in any other group this survey’s team of consultants have worked with). The number of organizations having a written collections/acquisitions policy was also high, which is important in focusing the collecting activities of an institution. But, preservation-specific policies were not as prevalent, and there is a strong need for long-range preservation/conservation plans, formal preservation/conservation surveys, and disaster plans and training to implement the plans.

In order to address preservation policy shortages, programmatic needs, and relatively low levels of preservation staffing and funding, ATLA will need to exert leadership to both promote the importance of preservation and seek adequate funding for this important activity.

A shortage of policies for the creation, maintenance, and preservation of ATLA member libraries’ digital collections is another need to be addressed. Adhering to digital preservation best practices in back-up frequency and storage in multiple locations also needs to be more widely adopted among the ATLA membership.

Training is needed to assist in all of these areas. Fourteen training topics were seen as areas of need by the respondents. There was also interest in disaster planning services, conservation treatment, and condition assessments/collection surveys.

There was near unanimous support for continuing preservation as an ATLA priority. The future mission of ATLA’s preservation program should focus on education, collaboration, and ensuring future preservation and access to theological materials. Additionally, key future issues for focus are training, digitization, and digital preservation.

To assist in doing these activities, ongoing association-wide support for preservation grants and association-sponsored preservation workshops is necessary.

ATLA member libraries are open to future preservation and digitization activities. Education, funding, and an underlying base of preservation policies will be helpful in building institutional and association-wide preservation programs.
Appendix I: Survey Participants

- Abilene Christian University
- Amridge University
- Anabaptist Mennonite Biblical Seminary
- Andover Newton Theological School
- Andrews University
- Aquinas Institute of Theology
- Asbury Theological Seminary
- Atlantic School of Theology
- Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary
- Baptist Missionary Association Theological Seminary
- Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
- Blessed John XXIII National Seminary
- Boston University School of Theology
- Bridwell Library - Southern Methodist University
- Byzantine Catholic Seminary
- Catholic Theological Union
- Catholic University of America School of Theology and Religious Studies
- Centro de Estudios Dominicos del Caribe
- Chicago Theological Seminary
- China Evangelical Seminary North America
- Christian Witness Theological Seminary
- Cincinnati Christian University
- Colorado Christian University
- Columbia International University
- Concordia Lutheran Seminary
- Concordia Theological Seminary
- Concordia University
- Covenant Theological Seminary
- Dallas Theological Seminary
- Eastern Mennonite Seminary
- Ecumenical Theological Seminary
- Eden Theological Seminary
- Emmanuel Christian Seminary
- Episcopal Divinity School
- Fresno Pacific University
- General Theological Seminary
- George Fox Evangelical Seminary Library
- Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary
- Grace Theological Seminary
- Hartford Seminary
- Harvard Divinity School
- Hope International University
- Howard University School of Divinity
- International Baptist College & Seminary
- John W. Graham Library, Trinity College & Wycliffe College
- Lancaster Theological Seminary
- Lexington Theological Seminary
- Logsdon Seminary - Hardin-Simmons University
- Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
- Luther Seminary
- Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg
- Methodist Theological School in Ohio
- Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
- Missionary Church Archives & Historical Collections at Bethel College
- Mount Angel Abbey & Seminary
- Naropa University
- Notre Dame Seminary
- Oakland City University/Chapman Seminary
- Oral Roberts University
- Phoenix Seminary
- Providence College and Seminary
- Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary
- Reformed Theological Seminary - Charlotte
- Regent College
- Regent University
- Saint Meinrad School of Theology Archabbe[y Library
- Salvation Army College for Officer Training - Booth University College
- Saskatoon Theological Union
- Seattle University
- Seminary of the Immaculate Conception
- Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
- Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
- St. John Vianney Seminary
- St. Thomas University
- St. Vincent de Paul Seminary
- St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary
- The Burke Library at Union Theological Seminary - Columbia University Libraries
- The JKM Library
- The Master’s Seminary
- The Seattle School of Theology & Psychology
- The United Library - Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary & Seabury-Western Theological Seminary
- Trinity Lutheran Seminary
- Tyndale University College & Seminary
- University of Chicago
- University of Notre Dame
- University of St Mary of the Lake
- Urshan Graduate School of Theology
- Vancouver School of Theology
- Vanderbilt University
- Wartburg Theological Seminary
- Wesley Biblical Seminary
- Western Seminary
- Western Seminary Sacramento
- Westminster Theological Seminary
- Yale University Divinity School