VERONICA M. BULLOCK
Significance International Pty Ltd
Canberra, Australia
info@significanceinternational.com
www.significanceinternational.com

COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT: ITS VALUE AS A UNIFYING CONCEPT

ABSTRACT

Over the last two decades collections management policy and practice in museums has expanded to include collection development, care and use functions. Or has it? A survey of tertiary education course coordinators in 2010 showed that most aspire to the expanded view, but are challenged in conveying it to new generations of museum workers. It appears there may be value in devising an agreed curriculum for collections management training to ensure that students arrive at employing organisations with a deep commitment to cooperate openly with colleagues of diverse professional backgrounds to achieve organisational goals, high workplace productivity and contentment, and sustainability of the museum. This paper proposes that the museum domain's best chance of remaining relevant in the face of an uncertain future is to use the now accepted central role of collections management to unify as a 'museum profession', and together with colleagues from the broader embattled cultural heritage sector, respond coherently to arising challenges.

RÉSUMÉ

Au cours des deux dernières décennies, les politiques et les pratiques de gestion des collections des musées se sont élargies de façon à inclure les fonctions de développement, de soin et d'usage des collections. Est-ce vraiment le cas ? En 2010, un sondage auprès des coordinateurs de cours du troisième cycle a montré que la plupart aspirent à cette vision élargie, mais rencontrent des difficultés à la transmettre aux nouvelles générations de professionnels des musées. Il apparaît qu'il serait souhaitable de concevoir un curricu-

PREAMBLE

The curator reports to the director and is responsible for the collections in his/her charge. Duties include the care, development, study, enhancement and management of the collections of the museum. (Ruge 2008, 16)

The conservator, working with the curator, carries out all operations related to the maintenance, preventive conservation or restoration of museum collections. (Ruge 2008, 19)

These [museum] professions are undergoing constant change due to the evolution of the structures. (International Council of Museums, http://icom.museum/what-we-do/professional-standards/professions.html).

INTRODUCTION

The status of conservators in the [Victoria and Albert] Museum had certainly risen during the 25-year period. This was confirmed when at a discussion on flooding in the Museum, the Chief Warder remarked that in the event of emergency the security staff were obliged to contact conservation staff 'because now Conservation has got up with the Keepers'. (Ashley-Smith 1985)

… there is growing evidence of serious discontinuity among museum workers. (Williams 2005, 88)

… as conservators we are 'often too focused on the how and not why'… challenge… to reduce the gaps between conservators and curators. (Lowenthal 2010, 6)

In his 2005 article 'Growth and Development of the Conservation Profession: a matter of degrees', Stephen L. Williams examines the degrees of professionalism in the conservation, library and museum communities in the United States. He identifies the conservation model as the most robust of the three, encouraging libraries and museums to follow the conservation example in order to address such issues as falling membership numbers and educational standards. Ideally, Williams suggests, an organisation should be created that 'unifies individuals from the conservation, library and museum fields'.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN CONSERVATION

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

LISBON 2011

lum faisant consensus dédié à la formation en gestion des collections, afin de garantir que les diplômés qui sollicitent une embauche auprès d'une organisation soient réellement désireux de coopérer avec leurs collègues provenant de différents milieux professionnels. Le but est d'atteindre les objectifs de l'établissement, de faire preuve d'un niveau élevé de satisfaction et de productivité sur le lieu de travail, et de contribuer à la pérennité du musée. Cet article suggère que le meilleur moyen de rester dans la course face à un futur incertain, dans le domaine des musées, consiste à tirer parti du rôle central désormais admis de la gestion des collections de musées pour former une « profession des musées » unie et, avec les collègues du secteur plus large du patrimoine culturel en difficulté, de répondre de manière cohérente aux défis toujours plus nombreux.

RESUMEN

En las últimas dos décadas se han ampliado las políticas y las prácticas de gestión en museos para incluir funciones relacionadas con el desarrollo, cuidado y uso de las colecciones. ¿O no es así? Una encuesta entre los coordinadores de un curso de educación superior efectuada en 2010, reflejó que la mayoría aspira a conseguir una perspectiva más amplia, pero les resulta difícil transmitirlo a las nuevas generaciones de trabajadores de los museos. Parece que podría ser valioso formular un curriculum acordado para la capacitación en gestión de colecciones. Esto garantizaría que los estudiantes lleguen a las agencias de empleo con un compromiso sólido para cooperar abiertamente con colegas de profesiones diversas, para cumplir los objetivos organizativos, lograr una alta productividad y satisfacción en el lugar de trabajo y la sustentabilidad del museo. Este artículo propone que, frente a un futuro incierto, la mejor oportunidad dentro del ámbito museístico para seguir siendo relevantes consiste en aprovechar el reconocido papel central de la gestión de colecciones y unificarlo en el concepto de una "profesión museística" y, junto con otros colegas del asediado sector del patrimonio cultural, responder de manera coherente a los retos que surjan.

Williams acknowledges the political value of the establishment of the Institute of Museum and Library Services and points to recommendations for the unification of academic programs for museums and libraries (Sheehan 2006). With regard to education and training, Williams and others have also usefully investigated the integration of academic and non-academic programs in collection management and care, primarily in museums (Cato et al. 1996, Williams 2006).

Williams' suggestion to unify efforts across these traditionally separate yet allied fields is made in awareness of both the theory of the 'New Museology',[1] which promotes 'more cohesive and integrated institutions' (Stam 1993, 267), with information rather than collections as their focus (Gurian 1995),[2] and the now omnipresent 21st century commitment to sustainable development.

While newer professions began to form to aid the museum of the later 20th century to meet its full societal obligations, curators struggled to accept their changing role and fought a rear-guard action.[3] As 'collections care' and other aspects of collections management were wrested from exclusive curatorial control by the professionally strengthening preservation/restoration, later 'conservation' community, it became an obvious target of frustration.

'MATERIAL WORLD' VERSUS 'KNOWLEDGE WORLD'

For convincing reasons (Stefan Michalski 1999) re-labels the traditional philosophical dichotomy of the objective and the subjective as the 'material world' and the 'knowledge world':

> The material world is that which we can reliably deduce as existing independently of human knowledge (and its input device, perception) – chemically changing bits of mixed molecules (ageing, coloured paint in the knowledge world), additional layers of molecules (dirt in the knowledge world) and spaces between clusters of these molecules (cracks in the knowledge world).

> Modern "scientific" conservation in its naïve moments claims the purity of the world of materials, and curatorship in its naïve moments claims the purity of the world of knowledge…

> Conservation has always found itself shuttling between the two worlds and informing specialists of each world about the concerns of the other… (Michalski 1999, 290)

The initial success of the conservation profession lay in its close alignment with science. It chose to express its purpose in terms of the empiricist-positivist (objective/material world) tradition (centring on the 18th century), upon which the scientific method is ultimately based.

From the time of the establishment of the first conservation professional organisations in the 1950s, conservation was presented as a 'closed system'.[4] It used certain scientific conceptualisations and means of expression (e.g.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN CONSERVATION

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

LISBON 2011

chemical equations, flow charts), and mis-used some of these as basic tenets of the profession. For example, the 'all objects are of equal value and should be treated as such' (Cane 2009, 163) approach to treatment is an extrapolation of molecular equity, while the touchstone of reversibility is now finally accepted as thermodynamically impossible – although still a worthy aspiration.

A hallmark of the new conservation profession was the development and achievement of new standards for training and education which did not rely on the traditional in-house, trade apprentice model.

Williams presents evidence to suggest that museum curators have been less successful at organising themselves professionally. Although curators had access to science, at least through curators of scientific/research collections, mainstream curatorial debate appears to have been dominated by the curators of historical collections. Training and education in curation was less rigorous, relying ultimately on the personal cultivation of connoisseurship.

Professional (and job) insecurity, as well as an over-emphasis on the term 'curator' as an indication of administrative authority,[5] resulted in two fundamental workplace reactions to the evolving situation, with many shades of grey in between:

- Curators refused to accept the new-found professionalism of conservators, continuing to treat them as junior technical assistants.

- Curators accepted the new-found professionalism of the conservator, on the understanding that the curator remained administratively superior.

Collecting institutions either formulated policies to address the changing role of museums in society, including revised staff relations and the relative importance of such approaches as collections management, or they ignored the issue. To a certain extent institutional approaches conditioned staff interactions, but individuals could still act according to their professional or personal feelings.

In 2010 there is ample evidence that museums are still struggling with their changing role in society. David Lowenthal describes museums, and in fact all heritage, as being in a 'perpetual state of emergency' (2009, 19). On the one hand it appears that between the onset of the New Museology in the 1970's and 2010 some important steps have been taken, as many institutions have devolved curatorial power and have adopted collections management as the hub of museum operations. On the other hand Lowenthal (2010, 6) is still calling for the closing of a gap between conservators and curators. This plea confirms that residual tension remains between these two professional groups, despite (or perhaps because of) the adoption of a shared collections management focus, and despite much discussion and debate about how the museum can survive, and how each profession can survive and grow.

To survive, it now seems clear that each entity needs finally to define itself in terms of an 'open system',[4] which sheds the security-giving constructs of the empiricist-positivist approach to both material and knowledge worlds,

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN CONSERVATION

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

LISBON 2011

in favour of the 'fuzzy' world of post-modernism.[6] Calls in conservation for the 'development of a discourse that will hopefully lead us towards a dynamic contemporary theory of conservation' (Cane 2009, 174) are echoed in curation. The obvious characteristic of such an open system is to be open at least to what each profession, and even allied collecting domains have to offer – an ease with the merging of material and knowledge worlds.

SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT AND RISK ASSESSMENT

A contemporary definition of collections management is: '…a new, integrated approach to developing and caring for collections, creating information about collections and enabling the public to access use and learn from them' (Hillhouse 2009: 2). This definition represents an 'open system' approach to collections management in which the cooperation of a wide range of museum professionals is implied.

'Closed system' definitions of collections management are about 'establishing and maintaining order in a collection' (Simmons and Muñoz-Saba 2006, 88) or, in slightly expanded form 'the organisation, documentation and tracking of collection materials, and… improved techniques for handling and preserving specimens [i.e. collection care]' (Danks 1991, 105). In the case of the first definition the curator, and then the registrar, are traditionally responsible; in the case of the second definition the conservator joins in.

Techniques to elucidate meaning from collections or collection items differ according to the specific professional traditions. This is usually because each is searching for different information from the same source, using complementary skill sets. Significance assessment and risk assessment are two techniques that fit with open definitions of collections management.

Significance assessment is the traditional preserve of the curator. Many curators would argue that it goes to the heart of connoisseurship – the body of acquired and instinctual knowledge about the observed and comparative qualities of an item/object/specimen or collection. Traditionally, significance assessment represents expert opinion and is regarded as a subjective decision-making process. Since the early 20th century attempts to codify significance assessment have been made in the best empiricist-positivist (objective/material) traditions – mainly in the fields of built heritage and archaeological sites (Tainter and Lucas 1983).

The shortcomings of such decision-making frameworks have been debated for decades and it appears that consensus now favours a more open decision-making system. Although it is still being refined, the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter provided a helpful example of a more open, significance based decision-making framework in 1979. By 2001 this approach was tested and adapted for movable cultural heritage in Australia (Russell and Winkworth 2001).[7] Both Australian approaches recognise the relevance of contributions by all 'stakeholders' – not only expert opinion.

Risk assessment is a comparatively new approach used by conservators (since the late 1980s) to characterise the environment in which a collection is located.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN CONSERVATION

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

ICCOM
CC

LISBON 2011

It requires an understanding of a range of natural and artificial environmental processes and their interactions, the gathering of observations, and usually also some degree of subjective assessment by people working with collections. It does not necessarily require (object) material specific knowledge.

It could be argued that conservators and their forbears always practised a kind of risk assessment, but without the mathematical and methodological rigour that comes with the modern label. In its fully developed modern form risk assessment is increasingly regarded as a quantitative decision-making technique. Comprehensive cultural heritage risk assessment methods incorporate concepts of significance ('value' or 'loss of value'), but significance assessment is not influenced in any way by risk assessment.

AN INVESTIGATION INTO 'INTEGRATED COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT'

Taking all of the above into account, a research proposal to investigate the extent to which significance assessment and risk assessment are taught in museum studies and conservation tertiary courses was accepted by the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property as the subject of a four month Fellowship in 2010.

Given that a feature of professions is to influence education and training standards in their field, it was expected that responses to a small survey would yield information about the use and understanding of the two collection management techniques across each of the two fields. It was hoped that the information gathered would be useful in determining whether external help was needed to bring these two important decision-making frameworks to students, and also that degrees of openness to complementary professional approaches might be indicated.

Research in the ICCROM library and archive was combined with expert consultation to produce a largely self-contained 10-question online survey instrument in English titled 'Collections Management in Focus' (please see Appendix).[8] After identifying information requests, two questions enquired about definitions and components of collections management education. Remaining questions focused on significance and risk assessment. hirty (30) invitations to seven (7) countries/zones yielded eighteen (18) responses from six (6) countries/zones – nine (9) each from museum studies and conservation programs. Responding countries/zones were: Australia, Canada, Scandinavia, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The usual method employed to obtain survey participant suggestions was to make enquiries of museum and conservation professional bodies in each country. The survey was designed to be 'exploratory'. Given the small number of participants the results are neither statistically valid nor generalizable, however, confidence in the results is high as the same population tested again is likely to give very similar responses. What follows is a condensed report of survey results. A fuller account of survey results is available in the *Bulletin*

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN CONSERVATION

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

LISBON 2011

of the Australian Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Material, 2011. Survey results showed substantial agreement about the essential components of collections management education – often tending to 'closed system' definitions – while awareness of more 'open system' pressures were acknowledged through such suggestions as the need to produce 'all-round professionals'. Around half of conservation respondents allowed graduate students to create their own definitions of collections management.

Museum studies program coordinators were more interested in overview subjects (e.g. role of the museum) and traditional curatorial subjects, and expressed little interest in valuing collections or preparing statements of significance. They were quite interested in risk assessment, but otherwise appeared to be happy to leave conservation and registration type topics to those specialist areas. This may account for their total lack of interest in the physical and chemical analysis of object and collections. It is surprising however that the object itself, as the truest form of primary evidence (Caple 2009, 21), does not appear to be explored in museum studies programs.

Conservation program coordinators were predictably very interested in the physical, chemical and risk aspects of managing collections, but also in overview subjects (including general decision-making about objects and collections in museums). They expressed considerable interest in a range of curatorial topics, including, surprisingly, the writing of statements of significance and valuing collections, and were more willing to account for and communicate collection needs than their museum studies counterparts.

The term 'significance assessment' was not necessarily familiar to UK or US respondents, but they nevertheless completed the survey on the basis of their understanding of what the term represents – which was broadly correct. Significance assessment and risk assessment therefore appeared to be valued decision-making frameworks commonly taught in each of the two sub-disciplines. Significant numbers in both groups regarded each assessment technique as qualitative.

Differing degrees of familiarity with the principles and various methods of the two frameworks, in addition to lack of time to prepare and present these subjects in already crowded curricula, provides a challenge for both groups – particularly regarding risk assessment.

From this survey it can be suggested that conservation and museum studies educators would benefit from more coordinated and detailed guidance on significance and risk assessment, as well as priority-setting with the burgeoning topics of collections management.

CONCLUSION

The reported investigation was small and exploratory. There may be value in conducting a more comprehensive investigation into the feasibility of standardising collections management curricula at the global level.[9]

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

ICOM-CC

LISBON 2011

Why do this?

In 1974 B. Waller (1974, 28) stated 'conventional programs producing conventional people may not prepare museums to meet the demands of the future.' The upheaval experienced in museums since the 1970s appears set to continue. New approaches are needed if museums (as opposed to their traditional professional groups) are to survive and successfully adapt.

In the field of conservation Clavir (2009, 147) has called for a 'broadening of the conservator's lexicon (e.g. "analysis", "examination") as represented in codes of ethics to include reflection on social and cultural concepts as debated in other disciplines, enabling conservators to better participate in decisions in the preservation of "cultural significance"'. Clavir also states that the training of librarians is better in this regard (2009: 141).

Ashley-Smith (2000) encourages conservators to grow more comfortable with uncertainty, and to help objects 'reveal their hidden stories' (2009, 19). Conservators 'read' the object as the primary source material but they can also potentially contribute usefully to significance assessments of objects and collections – if permitted. The willingness of conservation course coordinators to think in the 'curatorial space' was particularly demonstrated in the 'Collections Management in Focus' survey, while museum studies coordinators showed some interest in risk assessment.

The promise of greater collaboration between these two professional traditions is that better quality object based research will be achieved, in addition to more harmonious decision-making in the workplace as each professional understands and respects the parameters of others' backgrounds and talents, and learns to work with them.

Engaging cultural heritage audiences in more open investigations should lead to the perception of a united 'museum', and even 'cultural heritage' profession. I would argue that the professional divisions of our past have been at the heart of the poor to patchy funding that cultural heritage has received and which threatens its sustainability.

After the initial shock of the introduction of 'collections management' in the late 20th century, its value as a central tenet of museum work is now obvious – its capacity as a unifying concept in the 21st century is powerful. Learning to think in terms of 'open systems', and of more successfully straddling 'material' and 'knowledge' worlds, will be the hallmarks of the newest museology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN CONSERVATION

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

ICOM
CC

LISBON 2011

NOTES

[1] '"The New Museology" specifically questions traditional museum approaches to issues of value, meaning, control, interpretation, authority and authenticity' (Stam 1993, 267). It was defined and labelled in the 1970s, although Stam traces elements of this thinking to the Annales school of historians of the 1950s, more strongly to debate of the 1930s, and even back to 1889.

[2] According to E.H. Gurian these 'memory' institutions will include 'libraries, archives and schools…technologically-based storehouses such as databases, distance-learning sites and film, video and recording storage facilities…religious centres and language classes.' For a more recent discussion of convergence in the collections sector see Bullock, V.M. and M. Birtley. 2008. Will collections vanish in the urge to converge? Observations on convergent evolution in the collections sector. *Archives and Manuscripts* 36(2): 102–117. Available at: http://www.archivists.org.au/sitebuilder/onlinestore/edownload/9/willcollectionsvanish-bullockbirtley.pdf

[3] For example see: Reynolds, B. 1974. Are curators second-class citizens? *Museum News*, 52(8): 33–35; Anderson, D. 1990. What shall we do with the curators? *Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship*, 9: 197–210; Miller, S. 1992. Endangered species. *Museums Journal*, 92(10): 32; Bryk, N.V. 2001. Reports of our death have been greatly exaggerated: reconsidering the curator. *Museum News*, 80(2): 39–41, 67, 69, 71.

[4] In physics, a closed system is permeable to energy but not to matter. Closed systems are created in experimental situations to simplify interactions, as an aid to understanding those interactions. Essentially, a closed system is a controlled environment. By contrast, an open system continuously interacts with its environment, and therefore more closely represents reality. Adapted from definitions at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_system_(system_theory).

[5] Chambers, E.A. 2006. Defining the role of the curator. In eds. Hawks and Williams: 47.

[6] Miriam Clavir (2009, 141) quoting David Leigh, "Closing Remarks, IIC Congress 2006, The Object in Context: Crossing Conservation Boundaries" as adapted in IIC Bulletin 5, October 2006: 2.

[7] This publication is now available as a second edition. Russell and Winkworth 2009 *Significance 2.0 – a guide to assessing the significance of collections*. Adelaide: Collections Council of Australia. Available at http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/publications/significance2-0/.

[8] Many thanks to pilot testers for their time and valuable suggestions: Agnes Brokerhof, Instituut Collectie Nederlands; Jean Brown, Convenor ICOM-CC Education and Training Committee; Nick Poole, CEO, Collections Trust; Rob Waller, President, Protect Heritage Corporation; Isabel Wilson, Museums, Libraries and Archives Council.

[9] Perhaps the ICOM-CC Education and Training Group could work with ICTOP to revise and provide more detailed support materials in a revision of the 1981 'ICOM Basic syllabus for professional museum training in collections management', or more guidance might be offered under the 2008 'ICOM Curricula guidelines for professional development'. http://ictop.alfahosting.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=50:guidelines-for-professional-development&catid=38:projects&Itemid=58

REFERENCES

ASHLEY-SMITH, J. 1985. The development of conservation. Unpublished manuscript. Available at: http://www.jonsmith.demon.co.uk/AS_Family_Site/JAS_Site/publications.htm.

ASHLEY-SMITH, J. 2000. Developing professional uncertainty. In eds. Roy, A., and Smith, P. *Tradition and innovation: advances in conservation*. IIC Melbourne Congress, 10–14 October 2000: 14–17. London, International Institute for Conservation.

ASHLEY-SMITH, J. 2009. The basis of conservation ethics. In eds. Richmond, A. and A. Bracker: 6–24.

CANE, S. 2009. Why do we conserve? Developing understanding of conservation as a cultural construct. In eds. Richmond, A. and A. Bracker: 163–176.

CAPLE, C. 2006. *Objects: reluctant witnesses to the past*. Oxford, Routledge.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN CONSERVATION

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

LISBON 2011

CATO, P.S., R.R. WALLER, L. SHARP, J. SIMMONS, and S.L. WILLIAMS. 1996. *Developing staff resources for managing collections*. Martinsville, Virginia: Virginia Museum of Natural History, Special Publication 4.

CLAVIR, M. 2009. Conservation and Cultural Significance. In *Conservation. Principles, dilemmas and uncomfortable truths*, eds. A. Richmond and A. Bracker: 139–149. London: Victoria and Albert Museum.

DANKS, H.V. 1991. Museum Collections: fundamental values and modern problems. *Collection Forum* 7(2).

GURIAN, E.H. 1995. A blurring of the boundaries. *Curator: the museum journal* 38(1): 31–37.

HAWKS, C.A., and S.L. WILLIAMS, eds. 2006. *Museum studies: perspectives and innovations*. Washington D.C.: Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections.

HILLHOUSE, S. 2009. *Collections management: a practical guide*. London, Collections Trust.

LOWENTHAL, D. 2009. Patrons, populists, apologists: crises in museums stewardship. In *Valuing Historic Environments*, eds. L. Gibson and J. Pendlebury, 19–32. Farnham: Ashgate.

LOWENTHAL, D. 2010. 'The Forbes Prize Lecture', IIC Congress, as adapted in IIC Bulletin 20, October 2010: 6.

MICHALSKI, S. 1999. Conservation lessons from other types of museums and a universal database for collection preservation. In *Modern art: who cares*? eds. U. Hummelen and D. Sillé, 290–295. Amsterdam: Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage.

RICHMOND, A., and A. BRACKER, eds. 2009. *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heineman (Elsevier) and the Victoria and Albert Museum.

RUGE, A., ed. 2008. *Museum professions – a European frame of reference*. International Council of Museums website: http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/professions/frame_of_reference_2008.pdf

RUSSELL, R., and K. WINKWORTH. 2001. *Significance: a guide to assessing the significance of cultural heritage objects and collections*. Canberra: Heritage Collections Council/Commonwealth of Australia.

SHEEHAN, J.K. 2006. Pursuing a national agenda in academics: merging programs for museum studies and library science. In *Museum studies: perspectives and innovations*, eds. C.A. Hawks and S.L. Williams: 161–174. Washington, D.C.: Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections.

SIMMONS, J.E., and Y. MUÑOZ-SABA. 2006. The future of collections: an approach to collections management training for developing countries. *Collection Forum* 20(1–2): 83–94.

STAM, D.C. 1993. The informed muse: the implications of 'The New Museology' for museum practice. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 12(4): 267–283.

TAINTER, J.A., and G.J. LUCAS. 1983. Epistemology of the significance concept. *American Antiquity* 48(4): 707–719.

WALLER, B. 1974. Museum Training: who needs it? *Museum News* 52(8): 26–28

WILLIAMS, S.L. 2005. Growth and development of the conservation profession: a matter of degrees. *Collections - a journal for museum and archives professionals* 2(2): 91.

WILLIAMS, S.L., and J.E. SIMMONS. 2006. Curriculum Standards for Museum Studies Programs. In *Museum studies: perspectives and innovations* eds. C.A. Hawks and S.L. Williams: 129–149. Washington, D.C.: Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections.

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

LISBON 2011

APPENDIX

'Collections Management in Focus' questionnaire

1.* Please provide your locating information before proceeding to the short 8 part survey.

2.* What is the title of the teaching program(s) you represent? e.g. Master of Museum Studies, Master of Conservation.

3.* What definition of 'collection(s) management' do you provide to students? I am interested in both self generated definitions and definitions derived from the literature. If you use a definition from the literature, please cite.

4.* Please rate the emphasis you give to these collections management topics in your training program(s).
[Please enter one answer per topic. If you would like to explain how these topics relate to each other in your teaching program please use the 'Other' box at the bottom to detail, or to ask me to call you.]

	Strong	Less strong	Zero	Not Applicable
(i) the nature and protection of cultural property				
(ii) roles and structures of collecting organisations				
(iii) roles and structures of museums				
(iv) roles and responsibilities of museum professionals				
(v) decision making about objects and collections in museums				
(vi) collection management policies				
(vii) ownership/legal title				
(viii) security				
(ix) insurance and government indemnity				
(x) documentation				
(xi) content management systems				
(xii) ways of classifying collections				
(xiii) acquisition				
(xiv) researching collections				
(xv) physical and chemical analysis of collections				
(xvi) the statement of significance				
(xvii) ways of valuing collections				
(xviii) physical care of collections (including environmental control and conservation treatment)				
(xix) ceremonial use of collection objects				
(xx) identification and management of risks to collections				
(xxi) repatriation of collection objects				
(xxii) publishing information about collections				
(xxiii) public inputs to information about collections				
(xxiv) ways of counting collections				
(xxv) the cost of collecting (including storage)				
(xxvi) sustainable collecting				
(xxvii) de-accessioning and disposal				
(xxviii) copies/facsimilies/replicas of collection objects				
(xxix) accountability for collection management objectives				
(xxx) communicating collection management priorities to senior institutional managers				
Other (please specify and rate):				

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

LISBON 2011

5.* [Please note that multiple responses to the following question are possible. Please do not check (c), if (a) and/or (b) are checked.]
Do you teach...

| (a) a significance assessment method? |
| (b) a risk assessment method? |
| (c) neither a significance assessment nor a risk assessment method? |

6.* Please explain your answer(s) to Question 5 in terms of the professional role(s) you are educating your students to fulfil e.g. traditional roles like curator, conservator, registrar, or more general/emerging roles like collections manager, sustainable collections officer.

7. Which of the following do you regard as typical activities to be undertaken when assessing significance and exposure to risk of objects or collections?
[Multiple responses are possible for each topic. Please do not check the 'Not Applicable' option if you have checked other boxes in that row.]

	Significance Assessment	Risk Assessment	Not Applicable
(1a) Research and analysis of primary sources of information (i.e. original materials like collection objects)			
(1b) Research and analysis of secondary sources of information (i.e. written and oral accounts, including technical reports, management practices, surrounding environment)			
(1c) Research and analysis of tertiary sources of information (i.e. reference literature, including sales and exhibition catalogues and data from other collections)			
(2a) Documentation of history/provenance (including context and comparative examples)			
(2b) Documentation of nature or fabric			
(2c) Documentation of condition			
(2d) Documentation of surrounding environment			
(3a) Assessment and classification against criteria			
(3b) Assessment and classification against accumulated data/ information			
(3c) Assessment and classification against benchmarks			
(4a) Qualitative summarisation of results			
(4b) Quantitative summarisation of results			
(5a) Use of generated information to inform institutional policy revisions and future decision making			
(5b) Use of generated information to inform colleagues outside the institution			
(5c) Use of generated information to influence civic cultural policies and funding			

8. What do you regard to be the interplay between significance assessment and risk assessment?

EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN CONSERVATION

COLLECTIONS
MANAGEMENT:
ITS VALUE
AS A UNIFYING
CONCEPT

LISBON 2011

9. Which of the following difficulties have you faced in teaching significance assessment and/or risk assessment?

[Multiple responses are possible for each topic. Please do not check the 'Not a difficulty' option if you have checked other boxes in that row. If you would like to suggest extra topics, or, if you haven't yet taught in either of these areas and would like to suggest what you anticipate difficulties might be, please use the 'Other' box at the bottom to detail, or to ask me to call you.]

	Significance Assessment	Risk Assessment	Not a difficulty
(1a) Insufficient (not enough) collections focussed information available			
(1b) Inadequate (not good enough) collections focussed information available			
(1c) Fragmentary (good but patchy) collections focussed information available			
(1d) Conflicting (competing methods) collections focussed information available			
(1e) Overwhelming amount of good collections focussed information available			
(1f) Reliance on built heritage literature and methods			
(1g) Reliance on literatures and disciplines external to cultural heritage e.g. insurance, finance industries and economics			
(1h) Integrating theory with practice			
(2a) Locating and preparing specific technical information for delivery to students e.g. agents of deterioration, logarithmic scaling, ratios, probability mathematics, types of risks			
(2b) Student understanding of technical information provided			
(3a) Scalability between large and small collections			
(3b) Adaptability of methods across different collection types			
(3c) Instilling a sense of empowerment to effect improvements for collections			
(4a) Perception that significance assessment is of limited relevance to collections management			
(4b) Perception that risk assessment is of limited relevance to collections management			
(4c) Perception that participatory decision making is of limited relevance to collections management			
(4d) Perception that experts should make assessments			
(5a) Lack of time to prepare new components in the program			
(5b) Lack of time to deliver new components in the program			
(5c) Trade-offs between existing program components with newly proposed components i.e. having to take time from teaching one essential subject in order to teach some new 'essential' subject			
Other (please specify):			

10. Do you have any final comments?