

Robbin A. Zirkle. Collection Development Policy Addendum: American Philatelic Research Library Special Collections and Archives. A Master's Project for the M.S. in L.S degree. November, 2013. 31 pages. Advisor: Rebecca Vargha.

This document follows the development of a collection development policy addendum for the American Philatelic Research Library's Special Collections and Archives. After a review of the organization's existing collection development policy, a thorough review of pertinent literature was undertaken to inform practices for developing an addendum for these collections. Next, a community needs assessment was performed and similar policies for other small special and/or public libraries were reviewed. All of these steps guided the creation of a proposed collection development policy addendum submitted to the APRL at the conclusion of this project.

Headings:

Collection development (Libraries) – Policy statements.

Libraries – Special collections.

Archives.

Special libraries.

Stamp collecting.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICY ADDENDUM: AMERICAN PHILATELIC
RESEARCH LIBRARY SPECIAL COLLECTIONS AND ARCHIVES

by
Robbin A. Zirkle

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

November 2013

Approved by

Rebecca Vargha

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Literature Review.....	4
Overview of Collection Development Policies.....	4
Controversy: Why Collection Development Policies Are Needed.....	5
Controversy: Why Collection Development Policies Are <i>Not</i> Needed	6
Collection Development Policies and the APRL.....	7
Components of a Collection Development Policy	8
Special Collections Addendums	11
Looking to the Future.....	12
Community Needs Assessment.....	13
Review of Collection Development Policy Elements.....	16
Collection Development Policy Proposal: American Philatelic Research Library	20
APRL Mission	20
User Community.....	20
Scope.....	21
Purpose of Collections	21
Emphases and Limitations	21
Specific Archival and Special Collections.....	22
Acquisitions	24
Entity Responsible for Collection	24
Types of Materials Collected and Excluded	24
Circulation, Use, and Reproduction of Materials	25
Digitization	26
Bibliography	27

1. Introduction

Founded in October 1968 to support members of the American Philatelic Society, the American Philatelic Research Library is the largest public philatelic library in the United States. It is located in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania, and in addition to supporting the surrounding community, the library supports the more than 34,000 members of the American Philatelic Society (American Philatelic Society, 2013a).

During the summer of 2010, the APRL welcomed a new Director of Information Services and Librarian, Tara Murray, who worked to revitalize many aspects of the library, including its collection development policy. A collection development policy was created, approved, and adopted in 2011 and encompasses the mission, goals, and policies of the APRL as a whole (Murray, 2011).

The APRL manages 21,000 book titles and 5,700 journal titles, most of which are addressed in the APRL's current collection development policy (American Philatelic Society, 2013b). A consultation with Ms. Murray revealed that this policy does not currently address the needs of the APRL's Special Collections and Archives. Many of the items included in these collections are unique or rare, and as such, deserve a collection development policy addendum that will guide their care and curation.

The process of developing a collection development policy for the APRL's Special Collections and Archives began with a review of the current collection development policy as well as an extensive review of relevant literature. Next, a

community assessment was performed to better-articulate the needs of patrons locally as well as internationally. After this, a review of policies of similar institution was undertaken to inform which elements ought to be included in the APRL's collection development policy for its Special Collections and Archives. Finally, the proposed policy was submitted to the APRL for approval on October 9, 2013.

2. Literature Review

In creating a collection development policy for the American Philatelic Research Library, the first step is a definition and examination of the policy. What is it? What is its purpose? What causes the relative controversy surrounding collection development policies in general? Considering that controversy, why is creating a collection development policy for the APRL's special collections appropriate? And finally, what will such a policy look like? A review of pertinent literature aids the researcher in answering these questions.

Overview of Collection Development Policies

The first question to answer is what exactly is a collection development policy? Or, more basically, what is collection development in an age in which most patrons think they will find everything they need through Google? Librarians throughout the United States agree that regardless of trends toward technology, knowledge of patrons and local needs ought to shape their collections (Stoller, 2005). In practice, these goals are achieved in part through the process of collection development. Odini defines collection development as a multi-part process that includes "assessing user needs, evaluating the present collection, determining selection policy, coordinating selection of items, weeding and storing parts of the collection and planning for resource sharing" (Odini, 1994).

To anyone already familiar with collection development policies, Odini's definition seems quite logical; these are all steps that occur in collection development

policies. Collection development policies are simply formal documents whose purpose is to support collection development practices and to inform acquisitions (Doiron, 2002). This is not where these documents stop, however. Collection development policies may serve many functions, from a management or public relations tool (Pickett et al., 2011) to a description of policies for various collections as well as policies for excluding items from those same collections (Cassell, 2005). The primary purpose of these policies, however, is to intentionally and formally articulate manners in which the library will support the needs of its users and/or governing institutions (Dean, 1986).

All of the aforementioned authors make excellent points about what a collection development policy can do, but they may neglect the question of why it is necessary to *have* collection policies. Librarians and collection managers effectively perform their jobs on a day-to-day basis, which poses the question of whether it is truly necessary to formalize collection development through a policy at all. This is where the controversy regarding the necessity of collection development policies emerges; some professionals find collection development policy statements to be redundant. Vickery explains this controversy eloquently, writing that, “The argument is not about the need for collection policies or strategies...but their formal expression in print.”

Controversy: Why Collection Development Policies Are Needed

By virtue of completing this project, it is implied that there is a strong case for the relevance of collection development policies. Many librarians have dedicated vast quantities of ink to the subject, holding that they are essential to development, management, and conservation of collections (Dean, 1986). Despite a great deal of high-

level discussion, Vickery outlines the case for collection development policies quite clearly, identifying four primary factors supporting these policies.

As mentioned, these documents can guide acquisitions, but Vickery points out that good collection development policies delineate the depth and breadth of collections, and therefore to aim to reduce personal bias. Furthermore, these policies explicitly outline the priorities of libraries, aiding in activities such as cataloging, preservation, storage, and weeding. These policies also serve as useful tools for public relations, improving communication and creating a social contract between the library and its users. Finally, a collection development policy fosters mutual knowledge, making cooperation between institutions possible (Vickery, 2004).

In these regards, the benefits of collection development policies are far-reaching, but it seems that Peggy Johnson labels their benefit even more clearly, comparing a library without a collection development policy to a business without a business plan: “[without a policy], an owner and his employees lack a clear understanding of what the business is doing now and what it will do in the future, and potential investors have little information about the business’s prospects” (Johnson, 2009). To paraphrase, forgoing a written collection development policy is just bad business practice.

Controversy: Why Collection Development Policies Are *Not* Needed

Before diving into the Collection Development Policy Camp, it is important to recognize that these policies are *not* a necessity, although they are appropriate and important documents for reasons to be outlined later. The truth of the matter is that collection development policies have not been historically necessary; they did not emerge until after World War II ended when academic libraries experienced a relative explosion

(Johnson, 2009). Even well into recent history, many libraries did not use policies, with less than a third of major libraries surveyed by the Association of Research Libraries reporting a formal policy in 1977 (Vickery, 2004).

In support of this historical data, Vickery goes on to point out that collection development policies are generally written to appease some bureaucratic ‘other,’ and that the main benefit of these policies comes from writing these statements, not using them (Vickery, 2004). Indeed, many librarians point out that the process of *writing* these policies is of paramount importance (Johnson, 2009). It is also important to note that policies struggle to balance the level of detail required by librarians with the ease of digestion necessary for them to be a useful tool for patrons (Vickery, 2004)

Collection Development Policies and the APRL

Considering what is now known about collection development policies, the question truly becomes, is one really going to benefit the APRL? In short, yes. While they may not be a part of the historical norm, written collection development policies are more important now than ever. First and foremost, a collection development policy “[describes] an individual library’s objectives in developing its collection,” (Pickett et al., 2011). These objectives are essential to identifying priorities, initiatives, and goals in particular (Odini, 1994). As any practicing librarian will articulate, the ability to articulate priorities and purpose in uncertain financial times is invaluable, as it helps to demonstrate accountability (Vickery, 2004). These policies communicate to administrators within and outside the library that funds and resources (capital and social) are being used effectively (Pickett et al., 2011)

What about the APRL in particular, though? Surely, a highly specialized collection such as this is not really privy to the stresses of, say, public libraries? The fact of the matter is, that as a not-for-profit special library, the APRL is dedicated to a narrow focus, but may still encounter significant challenges both internally and externally (Garg & Gupta, 1986). Furthermore, the APRL possesses an existing collection development policy; the document in question is an addendum, a collection development policy for the APRL's special collections. Berger points out that cultivating special collections is of particular significance for libraries now, as archival materials can become frequently utilized through digital reproductions, and – quite bluntly – special collections are impressive for stakeholders (Berger & Cloonan, 2003). In this regard, dedicating energy to ensure that the APRL's special collections are well-cultivated for years to come can be assumed to be a worthwhile endeavor.

Components of a Collection Development Policy

Before a collection development policy addendum is created, it is important to dissect the proverbial policy to figure out what goes into it in the first place. Indeed, these policies may seem theoretical and enigmatic after tugging at them from all different sides, but they also serve a practical purpose. Hoffman and Wood identify a long list of components of collection development policies (Hoffmann & Wood, 2005):

- Purpose statement
- Background statement
- Responsibility for collection development
- Mission, goals, objectives
- Target audiences
- Budgeting and funding
- Evaluation criteria
- Format

- Government publications
- Treatment of specific resource groups
- Special collections
- Resources sharing
- Services
- Selection aids
- Copyright
- Intellectual freedom
- Acquisitions
- Gifts and exchange
- Collection maintenance
- Weeding
- Collection evaluation
- Policy revision
- Definition of terms and glossary
- Bibliography
- Appendixes

Johnson cites Hoffman and Wood's list, but notes that most libraries will not find all of these components relevant to their collection (Johnson, 2009). Other librarians suggest that policies should include a description of user needs, which could arguably be included in any number of Hoffman and Wood's categories (Vickery, 2004), although Johnson suggests that this should fall into "Target audiences" (Johnson, 2009).

Literature related to collection development policies also goes so far as to closely examine some of these components and the necessity of their inclusion in collection development policies, most notably in regard to weeding, selection and gifts as three often-intertwined fields of collection management. Dean notes that "Research library collections...have usually developed in ways which are idiosyncratic rather than systematic; involving the acceptance of inappropriate gifts, entire collection purchases, and staff and faculty purchases reflecting personal interests and eccentricities instead of adherence to institutional objectives" (Dean, 1986). As such, gifts may be addressed through either selection of materials or through weeding. Selection policies are ideal in

that they control what materials are permitted to enter collections, and many new policies also include weeding guidelines that are labeled “deselection” (Doiron, 2002). In some cases, collection development staff may create criteria for “automatic adds” or “automatic discards” to streamline the process (Bishop, Smith, & Sugnet, 2010). The goal of guiding gifts policies, and selection and weeding policies insofar as they concern gifts, is to permit the inclusion of materials that will enrich the collection and the experience of users, but will not provide the backbone of collection development (Grgic, 2011). Furthermore, a great deal of literature addresses how to evaluate the effectiveness of selection and weeding policies (Dinkins, 2003), which would eventually provide insightful feedback on these policies.

One aspect of special collections in particular is conspicuously missing from Hoffman and Wood’s list of components: digitization efforts. Arguably, this could fall into the realm of “Resource sharing,” but as it is not outlined in the description of the list, it is important to point out that such a component is an important part of most collection development policies. While collection development policies can by no means envision a movement toward digital collections, providing a framework to support future work in that area is important to any current policy (Baker & Evans, 2007). If nothing else, it is realistic to set up a process in which library staff can systematically review special collections and “try to identify those items which can best be preserved by reprographic means, those which must be preserved in original format, and those which should be transferred to some other institution better able to care for them” (Dean, 1986).

One additional aspect of Hoffman and Wood’s list worthy of consideration is “Policy revision.” On this, librarians are universally agreed: it “should be reviewed at

regular intervals to ensure that changes in defined goals, user needs and priorities are recognized” (Odini, 1994). This is especially relevant for a library such as the APRL which is staffed by a small number of librarians, and has a sharp collection focus that must be maintained through constant evaluation (Allen, 2003).

Special Collections Addendums

While the previous discussion provides a reasonably comprehensive overview of collection development policies as a whole, it is important to recognize that the project that this literature review supports will result in a collection development policy addendum for the APRL’s special collections. In this regard, Peggy Johnson provides a guide to detailed policies within collection development policies that can focus on “subjects, user communities, or special collections” (Johnson, 2009).

Johnson identifies three formats for detailed policies: narrative, classed analysis, and a combination of the two. Narrative policies give a focused view of the subject and subdivisions of the scope of the collection in question. These will follow an outline in which they discuss the user community, along with limitations, emphases, types of materials collected and excluded, and party responsible for management among others (Johnson, 2009). In a departure from this familiar format, classed analysis describes the collection and current collecting levels “in abbreviated language and/or numerical codes” (Johnson, 2009).

What is the benefit of dedicating a great deal of time and energy to the creation of a special collections policy? Conway and Proffitt point out that research libraries may focus on “exposing collections of rare and unique materials and collections of ‘local’ importance” to demonstrate relevance (Conway & Proffitt, 2012). It is also worth noting

that a number of items in the APRL's special collections could be called "ephemera," requiring that they are treated with more care, as they are generally unique and provide illumination to other publications. Acquisition of these materials is important, but "simply acquiring ephemera in an *ad hoc* manner and leaving some of the more difficult questions of access and retrieval up to future generations to solve" is, quite frankly, an unacceptable practice for materials whose longevity is not guaranteed (Drew & Dewe, 1992). The creation of a collection development policy addendum specifically addressing this body of materials will aid the library in ensuring that special collections are preserved and useful for patrons.

Looking to the Future

While the value of a written collection development policy may not be immediately obvious, it is clear that such policies hold value for many libraries, including the APRL. Vickery notes (in agreement with a large number of colleagues) that collection development policies do not necessarily allow understanding or communication between a library and its stakeholders. This is only ensured if it adopts a broad statement of purpose, is flexible and continually-revised, and made readily available (Vickery, 2004). Whereas in the last twenty to thirty years, the fate of the collection development policy has been shaky, a revitalized policy that focuses upon the user as well as the organization as a whole holds great promise.

3. Community Needs Assessment

The American Philatelic Research Library is located in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania, and can boast that it is the largest public philatelic library in the United States. While its primary constituents are members of the closely affiliated American Philatelic Society, the APRL is a public library that is registered as a non-profit corporation. The APRL's collection includes "books and journals about stamps and postal history, as well as the history of philately and related subjects like transportation and geography" (American Philatelic Society, 2013a)

The users of the APRL and its collection can be separated into two groups: APS members and the public. The APS boasts membership of close to 34,000 members in countries around the world (American Philatelic Society, 2013b). Moreover, it is the largest non-profit organization for philatelists in the world and has existed since 1886. The APS established a central office in nearby State College, Pennsylvania in 1945, and has moved to a number of different locations in the area. The APRL began to share space with the APS upon its move to the first American Philatelic Building in 1968.

Apart from its 34,000 patrons from more than 110 countries all over the world, the APRL also provides services to the public. According to the United States Census Bureau's American FactFinder, the borough of Bellefonte, Pennsylvania has a population of 6,187 people. Of this population 5,049 people (81.6%) are over the age of 18, and 1,055 (17%) are aged 65 or older. Only 90 of these people reported themselves as "foreign born," and 96.9% reported that they only spoke English at home. Roughly

11.9% of people in the borough live below the poverty line, the median household income is \$51,033, and 59.2% of adults have at least some college education (United State Census Bureau, 2013).

It is worthwhile to note that while the APRL is part of a standalone complex with ample parking, it offers daytime hours and is not necessarily convenient to pedestrians. Furthermore, it is located less than one mile from the Centre County Library, which is convenient to pedestrians although parking can be troublesome. Due to its proximity to the CCL, daytime hours, and narrow collection focus, it is unlikely that the APRL is used heavily by the non-APS member public. While the APRL is undoubtedly a public library, its specific focus and “special library” status differentiate its *practical* user community from its *potential* user community.

Returning to the most active users of the APRL – APS members – a 2007 member survey aimed at generating new membership provided a great deal of demographic information about members. The median amount spent on stamp collecting over a one year period was from \$750-\$1000, indicating that many of the APS’s members have a reasonable amount of funding to dedicate to their hobby. This was supported by the finding that the median household income for respondents was \$75,000-\$100,000. Of respondents, 89% were male, 73% were college graduates, and 53% were retired. APS member data shows that 68% of all members were aged 60 or older. Of members, 69% had heard of the APRL before the survey, and 63% have a high-speed Internet connection (Hart Business Research, 2007).

The demographic information provided by this APS survey is enlightening in that it shows that the group that comprises what we can assume is the “active” user

community is dissimilar from the surrounding population in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania. Most notably, APS members self-report as educated and (for the most part) over the age of 60, in contrast with the surrounding Bellefonte population which, while well-educated (as compared to the rest of the United States), has a relatively small constituency of older residents.

Based on demographics, place data, and the mission statement of the APRL, it is reasonable to assume that the narrow collecting focus is effective, but that other needs of patrons may need to be addressed. While no geographic member data is publicly available, patrons in other locales will make use of electronic material delivery. Additionally, the high incidence of APS members possessing at high-speed Internet encourages digitization efforts so that materials may be accessed at a distance. The high incidence of college education among both potential and practical users indicates that materials appropriate for advanced reading levels may be appropriate. Due to the large portion of male users, it may be beneficial to provide websites that cater to issues such as color blindness, which generally occurs in men. Finally, because the user population is older on average than what might be encountered in another public library, investment in assistive technologies for the visually impaired, hard-of-hearing, and physically impaired are worthwhile.

4. Review of Collection Development Policy Elements

Collection development and use policies feature any number of potential components. The contents of these policies vary depending on the needs of the library. Peggy Johnson points readers to Hoffman and Wood's comprehensive list of components of these policies and supplements them with her own discussion of the components of an *addendum* to those policies. An overview of a number of institution's collection development and use policies, however, demonstrates a significant departure from these structures. Notes on sample policies are included below.

Hoffman & Wood

- Purpose statement
- Background statement
- Responsibility for collection development
- Mission, goals, objectives
- Target audiences
- Budgeting and funding
- Evaluation criteria
- Format
- Government publications
- Treatment of specific resource groups
- Special collections
- Resources sharing
- Services
- Selection aids
- Copyright
- Intellectual freedom
- Acquisitions
- Gifts and exchange
- Collection maintenance
- Weeding
- Collection evaluation
- Policy revision
- Definition of terms and glossary

- Bibliography
- Appendixes

Johnson's Overview of Narrative-Style Special Collections Addendums

- Text-based
- Includes a series of narrative descriptions for sections (Humanities, Sciences, etc)
- Purpose: give focused view of subjects/subdivisions and of collection mgmt.
- Advantage: use of terms to describe programs/collections that are "local and immediately familiar"
- Generally follow outline/content of the overview
- Discusses specific user community
- Specific limitations or emphases
- Types of materials collected/excluded
- Library unit/selector responsible for collection
- Interdisciplinary relationships
- Additional resources
- Local factors

American Philatelic Research Library Collection Development Policy

- Scope
- Acquisition
- Donation
- Purchase
- APS Affiliates
- Retention of materials
- Books
- Periodicals
- Auction catalogs
- Price lists
- Show programs and palmares
- Catalogs
- Websites and online publications
- New issue announcements
- Indexes, databases, censuses
- Postage stamp albums
- Stamps
- Format of materials

University of North Carolina School of Information and Library Science Library Collection Development Policy

- Administration
- Purpose
- Population
- Responsibility for Selection
- Policies pertaining to all subjects and all types of material
- Added copies
- Titles already available in other libraries on campus
- Reserve materials

- Retrospective collection development
- Gifts
- Materials outside of information and library science
- Replacements
- Monographs
- Information and Library Science
- Related fields
- Children's and Young adult materials
- Reference materials, indexes, abstracts, and encyclopedia
- Publications of major professional societies
- Serials
- Journals
- Annual reports and newsletters
- Irregulars and annuals
- Media resources
- Equipment compatibility
- About information and library science
- Other types of materials
- SILS master's paper and doctoral dissertation
- These and dissertations
- Publisher's catalogs

Library of Congress Ephemera Collection Development Policy

- Scope
- General policy
- Selection principles for collecting ephemera
- Representative groups from which materials may be collected
- Review and evaluation of ephemera projects

New York University Libraries Special Collection Development Policy

- Purpose
- Scope
- Types of Materials
- Background of the collection
- Other resources

UNC Southern Historical Collection, Collection Development Policy

- Introduction
- Collecting scope
- Collecting area
- Mission
- Collecting rationale
- Relationship to other repositories
- Collecting methods

Getty Research Institute Special Collections Use Policy

- Broad description of holdings
- Access information

- Request
- View
- Reading room practices
- Handling guidelines
- Copies, copyright, permission to publish
- Guidelines for closed records

Luther College Archives Use Policy

- Reading room limitations
- Behavior in reading room
- Store items
- No food/drink/gum
- Pencil only
- White gloves
- Ordered use
- Reproduction guidelines

Smithsonian Institution Collections Use Policy

- Use in reading rooms
- Policies concerning access/restrictions of use
- Loans/charge-outs
- Copyright/citation
- Copying/reproduction services
- Rights & reproduction policy

5. Collection Development Policy Proposal: American Philatelic Research Library

APRL Mission

The American Philatelic Research Library (APRL) was founded in 1968 to accumulate, organize, and preserve philatelic information including publications and other data relating to the stamp collecting hobby and to make it available to American Philatelic Society (APS) members, staff, and the public.

Today the APRL is the largest public philatelic library in the United States. Its mission is to gather a comprehensive collection of philatelic reference and resource materials, to organize it efficiently in useful and accessible ways, and to make it available to interested users both within the hobby and outside it, now and for generations to come.

User Community

The APRL is a public library, located in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania. The primary user community of the APRL is comprised of APS members, however, due to the narrow focus of the library's collection. The APS boasts membership of roughly 34,000 people in 110 different countries, and all of those members are encouraged to make use of the APRL. As a result of the wide geographic range of APS members, many users are not able to physically visit the APRL and may rely heavily upon materials available through either the World Wide Web or upon request via phone call.

Scope

Purpose of Collections

Materials for the collection are selected based on their value as research and reference tools, not for collectability. The APRL collects literature and research material on philately and postal history comprehensively.

The APRL collects collateral material in subjects such as transportation, geography, history, design, paper, and numismatics selectively, based on usefulness for philatelic research and availability at other libraries. The APRL maintains a small reference collection including dictionaries and other frequently-used sources but in general does not keep materials widely available in more general collections.

The APRL holds the archives of both the APS and APRL, as well as the archives and libraries of other philatelic organizations.

Emphases and Limitations

The APRL's Special Collections and Archives maintain the focus of the rest of the APRL collection in that all of its materials are related to philately. Emphases of Special Collections and Archives include air mail history, postal service history, and philatelic ephemera such as ceremony programs and press releases.

Several of the archives maintained by the APRL may also have a geographic focus, such as the Colombia Panama Study Group (COPAPHIL) Library collection and Czeslaw Slania Collection. Still others include

correspondence and manuscripts related to the hobby, such as the Elliott Perry – Cyril dos Passos Files.

While the APRL's collections include a variety of media and emphases, Special Collections and Archives will not extend to include stamps themselves. It is reasonable to assume that limitations and emphases may expand along with the growth of digitization initiatives and electronic archives, thus, emphases and limitations of the collection is contingent upon approval from APRL staff.

Specific Archival and Special Collections

The Daniel Hines Air Mail Archives is the only known historical archives that extensively documents the pioneer period of United States air mail. The collection was compiled by the late Daniel Hines, who corresponded with pilots and their relatives from the early, hazardous days of the transcontinental airmail route (1918-1927). The letters, photos, and artifacts in this collection reveal the hazards and the joys of the airmail pilots who flew "Hell's Stretch" and refueled their planes at the Bellefonte airport. Browse through an inventory of this collection or search our online catalog for individual items.

The American First Day Cover Society Archives include cachetmaker files and taped interviews with cachetmakers.

The APRL Clipping Files include articles, press releases, photos, covers, first day ceremony programs, and other items. They are arranged by country, topic, or Scott Catalog number. Major portions of the collection came from Ernest A. Kehr (covering the world with emphasis on air mail, Switzerland, the Philippines, and Egypt), Forrest Ellis (new issues and designs for U.S. stamps

from the first half of the 20th century), John Stark (stamps with fluorescence), and Belmont Faries (U.S. stamp design).

The Elliott Perry – Cyril dos Passos Files include manuscripts and correspondence. Elliott Perry wrote extensively on all aspects of U.S. stamps, but much of his work focused on carriers and locals. Cyril dos Passos also wrote on many topics, including the 10-cent and 24-cent (1861-67) first and second issues, grills, and Bank Note issues.

Post Office Document Collections include forms from the Aaronsburg, Pennsylvania post office dating from the 1890's to 1930's and from the Milford, Iowa post office dating from 1891-1916.

The State Revenue Society Library was donated to the APRL in 2008 and the Postal History Society Library was donated to the APRL in 1980. Books and journals from these collections have been interfiled with existing APRL holdings.

The Colombia Panama Study Group (COPAPHIL) Library, the largest existing collection of references relating to the philately of Colombia and Panama, was donated to the APRL in 2008 and is located in 2 filing cabinets in the APRL.

Czeslaw Slania Collection, this collection of stamps and related material is devoted to the work of the Polish/Swedish engraver Czeslaw Slania. The stamps are primarily from Sweden and Denmark, with some also from Greenland and the Faroe Islands. More detail in the finding aid.

Acquisitions

Entity Responsible for Collection

Generally speaking, the Library Director is responsible for the development of the APRL's Special Collections and Archives. The APRL relies on donations for acquisition of additions to its Archives and Special Collections rather than purchasing materials. Processing of new or donated materials to be added to the collection can be both expensive and time consuming; it is therefore the responsibility of the Library Director and the APRL Staff to determine the relevance of donations to the collection before any additions are made.

Types of Materials Collected and Excluded

Literature is added to the collection if it fits within the scope of the APRL, is in good condition, and does not duplicate material already in the collection. The APRL proactively seeks to acquire collections of personal notes, data, correspondence, interviews, photographs, and other records of selected collectors and postal historians. Similarly, the APRL proactively seeks to acquire copies of philatelic exhibits.

Purchase of material at auction is generally limited to acquiring first copies of out-of-print philatelic literature, especially bibliographies, indexes, and other reference sources, as well as any significant periodical runs that will make our holdings more complete. The only auction catalogs the APRL will consider purchasing are "name sales." The APRL occasionally purchases new publications

not received as gift or review copies. Excluded material may be sold to benefit the APRL, offered to other philatelic libraries, or recycled.

Physical Collection

Generally speaking, original items added to the APRL's archives will be added to its physical collection as this is likely the only manner in which it is available. Items added to the physical collection will be processed and stored. The APRL may undertake digitization initiatives for its physical archival collections in the future (See Section VI: Digitization).

Electronic Collection

Many items considered for inclusion in the APRL archives will not be available in an original electronic format. For those that are, such as contemporary exhibits, the APRL prefers original electronic copies to physical copies. When neither an original electronic copy nor an original physical copy is available, the APRL prefers a color copy with no loan or access restrictions.

Circulation, Use, and Reproduction of Materials

Most items in the APRL special collections do not circulate. Researchers are, however, welcome to use physical materials at the APRL in its reading room. Requests for access to items from the APRL's Special Collections and Archives are easily fulfilled when a request is submitted ahead of time.

Items that are used within the reading room should be handled with care, as more often than not, they are unique and thus, irreplaceable. Librarians may request that researchers handle materials in Mylar, or may provide instruction on how to best-handle materials which have been pulled out of storage for use. While handling archival materials, researchers are asked to use only pencils (no pens) and to stow any food or drink in a bag kept away from the materials.

While researchers may not reproduce items pulled from the APRL Special Collections and Archives, APRL staff can make copies of items upon request if copyright restrictions allow. Copies may be made either in color or black-and-white. A nominal fee may be charged to cover the cost of copying materials.

Digitization

The APRL is fortunate to have access to a [Flatbed Scanner Model Here] made available through generous donations [of whom?]. As funds and copyright restrictions permit, the APRL digitizes items in its physical collection in accordance with the priorities established by the APRL Digital Resources Committee.

Many digitized materials are available online through the APRL website (www.stamps.org) or may be accessed following a request to library staff.

Bibliography

- Allen, S. M. (2003). Special collections outside the ivory tower. *Library Trends*, 52(1), 60-68.
- American Philatelic Society. (2013a). About APS. Retrieved from <http://stamps.org/Our-Mission>
- American Philatelic Society. (2013b). American philatelic research library. Retrieved from <http://stamps.org/About-the-Library>
- Baker, D., & Evans, W. (2007). From holdings to access – and back. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 35(2), 85-91.
- Berger, S. E., & Cloonan, M. V. (2003). The continuing development of special collections librarianship. *Library Trends*, 52(1), 9-13.
- Bishop, J., Smith, P. A., & Sugnet, C. (2010). Refocusing a gift program in an academic library. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 34(4), 115-122.
- Cassell, K. A. (2005). Handling gift books in libraries: A view from the US. *New Library World*, 106(9/10), 450-453.
- Conway, M. O., & Proffitt, M. (2012). The practice, power, and promise of archival collections assessment. *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage*, 13(2), 100-112.
- Dean, J. F. (1986). Conservation and collection management. *Journal of Library Administration*, 7(2-3), 129-142.

- Dinkins, D. (2003). Circulation as assessment: Collection development policies evaluated in terms of circulation at a small academic library. *College & Research Libraries*, 64(1), 46-53.
- Doiron, R. (2002). An administrator's guide to collection development. *School Libraries in Canada*, 21(4), 18.
- Drew, P. R., & Dewe, M. D. (1992). Special collection management: The place of printed ephemera. *Library Management*, 13(6), 8-14.
- Garg, K. C., & Gupta, S. P. (1986). Collection development and management in special libraries in india. *Collection Management*, 8(2), 103-112.
- Grgic, I. H. (2011). Gifts in croatian public and academic libraries. *Collection Building*, 30(4), 167-171.
- Hart Business Research. (2007). *APS stamp collector survey 2007 report: Paths to membership growth*. ().
- Hoffmann, F., & Wood, R. J. (2005). *Library collection development policies : Academic, public, and special libraries*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press.
- Johnson, P. (2009). Policy, planning, and budgets. *Fundamentals of collection development and management* (2nd ed., pp. 66) American Library Association.
- Murray, T. (2011). *American philatelic research library collection development policy*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Odini, C. (1994). Collection development: The experience of kenya polytechnic library. *Library Management*, 15(4), 12-16.

Pickett, C., Stephens, J., Kimball, R., Ramirez, D., Thornton, J., & Burford, N. (2011).

Revisiting an abandoned practice: The death and resurrection of collection development policies. *Collection Management*, 36(3), 165-181.

Stoller, M. (2005). Building library collections: It's still about the user. *Collection Building*, 24(1), 4-8.

United State Census Bureau. (2013). Bellefonte borough, PA. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml

Vickery, J. (2004). Making a statement: Reviewing the case for written collection development policies. *Library Management*, 25(8/9), 337-342.