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CREATING A SEMI-PROFESSIONAL PROFESSION: ARCHIVISTS VIEW THEMSELVES*

Peter J. Wosh

Although archivists vigorously assert and defend their own professionalism, this rhetoric often betrays self-doubts and uncertainty. In recent years, debates concerning the proper path to greater professionalism have escalated. Are archivists established professionals, emerging professionals, craftsmen, scientists, or artists? Should archivists control entry into their select group? If so, how? What role can the Society of American Archivists play in encouraging professional development? All of these questions provoke controversy and disagreement.

Wilfred I. Smith has observed that "a consistent theme in the history of this society has been the interest, perhaps even the obsession, with the idea of professionalization." How have archivists viewed themselves and their colleagues? Have they formulated a coherent definition of professionalism? What factors do they emphasize in moving towards a greater professionalism? Are changes perceptible over time? America's founding archival fathers and mothers offer some preliminary insights into these issues.

The fledgling Society of American Archivists faced a serious question at its 1938 annual meeting. Responding in very familiar fashion, the assembly quickly established a special committee to review this particular problem and to issue recommendations. Thus, "it was unanimously voted that the president appoint a committee to recommend to the society the proper

*The author is indebted to Frank G. Burke for directing his research and offering suggestive comments.
pronunciation of the following words: archives, archivist, archival." The Pronunciation Committee, chaired by Edwin A. Davis, dutifully met, presumably considered all available options, and issued its final report on 13 October 1939. In a commendable, though rare, display of unanimity, the general gathering received the report, discharged the committee, and moved on to other business.

This brief extract from the society's proceedings graphically illustrates the primitive state of the archival art in the 1930s. Before defining their activities, establishing a sound theoretical literature, developing standard and universally applicable practices, and issuing educational guidelines, archivists needed to learn to pronounce their own name. Clearly, they confronted some very basic problems.

Between 1909 and the early 1930s, the American Historical Association (AHA) defined archivists' principal concerns and nurtured their development. A generation of American historians, trained in the German seminar tradition, began developing a new scientific history based on exhaustive primary source research and characterized by narrow, meticulously researched monographs. They successfully revolutionized their craft and, incidentally, created an unprecedented demand for archival and manuscript material. Thus, the AHA stimulated the creation of new repositories, promoted the preservation of endangered source materials, and sought to develop an archival profession to service its members' research needs.

The establishment of the national archives in 1934 satisfied these scholars' dreams and fundamentally altered archivist-historian relationships. Suddenly, American archivists faced monumental problems. Who would staff the new institution? How might archivists achieve quick control over massive federal records? Where could they turn for appropriate guidance? Did European professional literature contain relevant advice? Would limited in-service training or formal degree programs better prepare the national archives staff for their new responsibilities?

Clearly, these problems required innovative thought.
and rapid solutions. Archivists convening at the AHA's 1935 meeting, including Albert R. Newsome, Margaret Cross Norton, and Theodore C. Blegen, agreed that they had outgrown their rudimentary organization and lamented their lack of clearly defined methodological techniques. Their discussion resulted in the creation of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) the following year. Interpreting its constituency broadly, the SAA invited archivists, manuscript curators, historical administrators, records surveyors, historians, and librarians to join. In 1938, the American Archivist began appearing quarterly, and archivists started generating their own professional literature.

Archivists had mobilized in response to an immediate crisis—the creation of the national archives—and this crucial fact defined their early professional concerns and development. Its almost immediate status as the world's largest record repository insured that federal concerns would receive primary attention. Indeed, despite a theoretically broad-based membership policy, fully 43 percent of the SAA's members labored at the national archives, and the term archivist often appeared to be synonymous with public records administrator during the 1930s. Achieving rapid control over massive federal records and satisfying historians' appetites for quick access consumed these professional pioneers' energies. Not surprisingly, archival writings addressed basic nuts and bolts issues during the 1930s. The national archives' staffing needs and the absence of formal training programs created a demand for technical knowledge. Instant archivists, trained as historians and needing guidance in basic archival functions, appeared. These developments required a rapid exposition of existing techniques and archivists quickly constructed a useful bibliographic base.

Early issues of American Archivist focused on "the concrete and practical rather than the general." Practicing archival administrators generated how-to case studies to assist their novice brethren and surveyed contemporary public record practices in Europe for further guidance. Future generations bore the burden of analyzing, synthesizing, and building upon their efforts.
Public record policymakers developed appraisal principles and arrangement techniques for their bulky institutional holdings and codified their practices as professional standards. Record group, inventory, and provenance entered the archival vocabulary. Yet, a significant constituency remained outside this archival mainstream; historical societies and manuscript repositories received little guidance or attention from the burgeoning profession. Cataloguing, calendaring, and cross-indexing continued at the local level, and manuscript curators working with small, diverse collections of personal papers fashioned their own utilitarian practices. Archival leaders generally dismissed their operations as antiquarian or of minor significance and concentrated on refining techniques for controlling the bureaucratic records they considered most useful for historians.

Attempts to establish standard educational and training guidelines during the late 1930s further reflected these biases. The SAA's Committee on Training, chaired by Samuel Flagg Bemis, emphasized the necessity of attracting "erudite and critical historical scholars" into archival work. Basing its recommendations largely on European precedents, the committee urged strong preparation in history and political science, suggested an American history Ph.D. as an essential qualification for major national positions, and rejected the applicability of library science.10

Other historically trained archivists, including Albert Newsome and Solon J. Buck, applauded Bemis's guidelines and underscored the importance of formal training.11 America's first professionally conscious archivists thus sought to prepare their successors primarily for processing massive governmental records and produce colleagues conversant with historiographical trends and scholarship.

In fact, however, few formal archives courses developed during the 1930s. Columbia University offered a two-semester course in 1938-39 and a 1940 summer course, but discontinued the experiment thereafter. Buck began a series of courses at American University in 1940-41, with Ernst Posner eventually assuming the
teaching duties. These latter courses, aimed at funneling students into the national archives, proved a lasting educational achievement.  

Archival leaders had established a broad professional consensus on most major issues by the early 1940s. Trained as historians and generally concerned with modern public records, their interests and backgrounds were relatively homogeneous. They had developed basic processing and preservation techniques for coping with massive bureaucratic records. They agreed on the importance of university-based graduate history training for future archivists. While mindful of the need for more abstract, conceptual thought, they began developing a basic American archival bibliography upon which others might build.

By 1970, the broad consensus of a generation earlier had evaporated. Archivists failed to resolve their professional problems during the intervening years. In fact, virtually every move toward greater professionalism generated disagreement and dissent. Archivists no longer shared common perceptions and well-defined goals. The SAA's broad membership policies contributed to this development. Frank Evans's and Robert Warner's 1970 member survey revealed the profession's immaturity. Reciting archivists' wide ranging educational and occupational backgrounds, these surveyors concluded "the bounds of the profession still remained undefined, and the professional identity of the members is uncertain." Similarly, Gerald Ham characterized his colleagues as "a broad-based society of individuals who deal primarily with nonbook, documentary material regardless of format." One fundamental conclusion of the SAA's Committee for the 1970s involved making "the Council more representative of and responsive to the diverse interests" of society members.

Clearly, National Archives and Records Service employees no longer dominated SAA membership, though they retained significant power within the organization. A colorful mosaic of archivists, record managers, manuscript curators, librarians, historians, and information
specialists now composed the organization. Public records, once considered virtually synonymous with archives, were of only peripheral interest to many members of SAA.

Diversity fostered problems. Ham voiced concern over members' emphasis on their own uniqueness and failure to perceive common concerns and problems. James Rhoads termed SAA members "professionally schizophrenic" in 1976, lamenting their loyalty to several other professions and organizations. Within the SAA, members formed smaller regional organizations and professional affinity groups. Was the SAA really a coherent professional body? What basic principles and elements bound archivists together? Could they develop meaningful professional standards at the very moment when the society boasted its most diverse membership? These provocative questions defined the major archival challenges of the 1970s. Three related themes now dominated archival discussion: professional literature, standardization, and training.

Leading archivists expressed continual frustration over the scarcity and quality of theoretical writings. Ham observed in 1971 that the previous generation failed to develop any "discernable...archival theory and the concomitant refinement of practice." By 1974, he criticized archivists' obsession "with the 'nuts and bolts' or craft aspects of our work" and the persistence of the "custodial image." Case studies and technical advice still dominated archival articles.

While the SAA hierarchy echoed Ham's judgments and regularly lamented "the scarcity of our professional literature," the 1970s produced little substantive improvement. Though Elizabeth Hamer Kegan called for more professional publications in her 1975 presidential address, she also revealed that "some how-to-do-it pamphlets are my priority items." The Basic Manual Series did constitute a notable SAA achievement in the late 1970s, but these publications again illustrate archivists' very elementary concerns and the embryonic state of the literature.

The American Archivist has consciously broadened its criteria for full-length articles, but its regular
contributors possess more interest in presenting their own institutions and techniques as models than in conducting critical analysis and offering original, provocative thought. Frank Burke concluded persuasively in 1981 that "to date, there has been no elucidation of archival theory in the United States and little, if any, in the rest of the world."$^{21}$

Archivists' attempts to standardize practices achieved some results during the 1970s. Thus, a Committee on Terminology published "A Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers" in 1974. A Committee on Finding Aids prepared *Inventories and Registers: A Handbook of Techniques and Examples* in 1976. Other committees have developed a code of ethics and established standards for college and university repositories.$^{22}$

In spite of their utility, these efforts reveal a greater professional problem than the ones they resolve. The fundamental flaw is the SAA's inability to enforce its own standards. Voluntary compliance has not produced acceptable results. While a faithful few seriously consider and implement society standards, the curatorial masses politely ignore SAA pronouncements.$^{23}$ Individual archivists vary descriptive techniques according to local needs. Even seemingly concrete, straightforward information, such as size of collection produces extraordinary institutional variation. The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, which offers free publicity to all participating institutions, has elicited responses from a relative handful of repositories. Clearly, the SAA message has not penetrated the hinterlands.

Ultimately, archivists' inability to create a more stimulating theoretical literature and achieve greater methodological standardization manifests a graver professional failing. After nearly a half century, debate concerning archival education rages. In many ways, this issue underlies all others. The failure to institutionalize training in an academic setting has retarded archival theory. A lack of standardized training also contributes to anarchic procedures and a reluctance to embrace externally imposed professional practices.

Unfortunately, the Bemis committee's 1939 statement...
largely defined the boundaries of subsequent discussion. Archivists agonized over whether library schools or graduate history departments offered the better educational environment. While this generally unproductive debate monopolized attention, archival training drifted in several directions. Individuals and institutions initiated diverse programs throughout the 1950s and 1960s. The SAA exercised neither an aggressive nor a regulatory role, but remained passive and officially silent. 24

Its Committee for the 1970s, appointed in 1970 to analyze future professional needs, recognized the inadequacy of this situation and urged the parent body to exert more forceful leadership in this area. 25 Accreditation and official sponsorship appeared impractical, since the SAA lacked the financial resources and accepted standards to effect such reform. Members endorsed the concept of sequential, multicourse archival offerings attached to M.A. and Ph.D. programs in other disciplines. Before the SAA could monitor programs, however, it needed to "define minimum standards" and apply them to existing offerings. 26

While the committee accurately summarized professional options and shifted discussions away from the traditional history department versus library school debate, substantive accomplishments appeared negligible. Archival training courses multiplied during the 1970s, while SAA leaders bemoaned their own minimal impact. Their failure to initiate programs left them with only a regulatory role and continuous disagreements hindered their effectiveness.

The society's council finally endorsed specific educational guidelines in 1977, recommending a graduate concentration or minor in archives and outlining a basic curriculum which included theoretical, practical, and experiential components. Still, the recommendations appeared vague, and the SAA provided no real enforcement mechanism. Institutional evaluation, educational program approval, and individual certification proposals have not won wide acceptance. Though the forum and many of the issues have changed, disagreement and diversity still characterize the discussion of archival
In the title of his state-of-the-art article in the *American Archivist* in 1957, Ernst Posner asked, "What Then Is The American Archivist, This New Man?" His inquiry remains relevant in 1981. Archivists have not resolved their identity crisis. The first generation constructed a limited definition of archival work. They addressed the immediate, urgent issues which emerged during the 1930s. Their common training and shared concerns enabled them to form a broad professional consensus concerning technique and training.

As the profession diversified, archivists broadened their definitions and outlook. Manuscript curators and records managers inserted their ideas and experiences into the literature. Paradoxically, professional expansion often encouraged individual myopia. Archivists emphasized their differences and divided into smaller, narrowly conceived groupings. Their literature betrayed an unwillingness to address broad issues and examine universal similarities. Their world fragmented and their illusory consensus vanished.

Archivists in 1982 exhibit many characteristics of emerging or marginal professions. Whether they emerge or remain marginal depends on the maturing generation. They can take comfort from the fact that other emerging professions have encountered similar problems. They can take less comfort from the fact that many have never solved them.

Archivists cannot apply cosmetic cures to serious illnesses. Codes of ethics and booster rhetoric do not nurture professional consciousness. All archivists share a responsibility to think critically and constructively about their craft and colleagues. They cannot approach the 1980s with the same confidence their predecessors brought to the 1940s. Yet, if prospects are uncertain, the potential is exciting. If archivists can harness their diversity, and reach beyond Washington and Wisconsin for their ideas and principles, they may define and create a brand new organism—a meaningful archival profession.
Notes


6 McCoy, The National Archives, p. 92.


Archival Administration," AA, July 1941, pp. 149-58.


17 Ham, "Secretary's Report," p. 111; Rhoads, "The President's Page," p. 276. Regional groups include: Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, Southwest Archives Conference, New England Archivists. Professional affinity groups classified archivists by functional (appraisal, processing, etc.) and institutional (college and university, religious, etc.) interest. Further fragmentation within these subgroups has already begun as Catholic Diocesan Archivists, for example, have formed their own body.


Ibid., pp. 207-209.

Bernard Barber, "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," *Daedalus*, Fall 1963, pp. 669-688, discusses emerging and marginal professions. Applying his model, archivists appear to constitute a marginal or emerging profession. As he indicates, professionalism is a matter of degree. For an interesting comparison with librarians, see *The Library Quarterly*, XXXI, 4 (October 1961). Archivists may be roaming where librarians trod twenty years ago. Yet, some might seriously question whether librarians have solved their professional dilemma in 1982.
ACADEMIC ARCHIVISTS AND THEIR CURRENT PRACTICE: SOME MODEST SUGGESTIONS*

Patrick M. Quinn

College and university archives comprise the largest category of archival repository in the United States. Over a thousand repositories at institutions of higher learning are listed in the Directory of College and University Archives.¹ The College and University Archives Professional Affinity Group (PAG) of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) includes over four hundred members. Despite the fact that so many archivists work in the same field, their endeavors have remained largely unsystematized. Only recently have academic archivists begun efforts to synthesize their practice.

The two most important contributions to this process have been the publication of College and University Archives: Selected Readings in 1979 and the appearance in 1980 of "Guidelines for College and University Archives." Both produced by the College and University Archives Committee of the SAA, the Selected Readings brought together the most salient literature pertaining to academic archives published prior to June 1978 while the "Guidelines" provided an operational framework for such repositories.² More recently, Maynard Brichford placed the origins, evolution, and function of academic archives in historical context; Mary Janzen addressed questions concerning the papers of academics; and Jane Wolff discussed the relationship between academic archives and special subject repositories.³

In our culture, institutions of higher learning serve

*The author is indebted to Kevin B. Leonard and Mary E. Janzen for their thoughtful contributions to the article in its present form.
as primary transmitters of prevailing cultural, economic, political, and social values, of intellectual and technical knowledge, and of research methodologies. The role of archivists in documenting the functions of academic institutions has become increasingly more complex and challenging. Thus, it becomes even more imperative that academic archivists transcend their present practice, isolated and idiosyncratic as it often is, and begin to cope collectively with common problems by developing common approaches.

This article identifies several such problems, most of which are admittedly quite practical, and offers some suggestions for dealing with them. It does not pretend to be a sustained discussion of either current practice in academic archives or the entire range of problems confronting academic archivists. Such a discussion is at once necessary and desirable. It would be of immense benefit to academic archivists as would publication by the SAA of an introductory manual on college and university archives that would be similar to but broader in scope than those authored by Edie Hedlin for business archives and August Suelflow for religious archives.  

Records Management

Optimally, the academic archivist's involvement in the life cycle of the records that will ultimately comprise the permanent documentary record of his or her institution should begin with the generation and active phase of the life of records. Experience at most colleges and universities, however, reveals that this is a largely utopian ideal. The creation and maintenance of records, and often their disposition, too frequently is determined by the caprices of administrative and clerical personnel. At the departmental and committee level faculty members often have little or no appreciation of the status and value of their files as official university records. Thus, in all too many instances, the archivist simply inherits records that happenstentially manage to survive destruction. In the relatively few institutions where records management programs exist, records managers often are preoccupied with disposing of bulky fiscal records, clearing filing space without adequate
appraisal of file contents, or engaging in microfilming projects of questionable value.

In the majority of institutions—i.e., those where no records management programs exist—the archives staff typically is stretched too thin to take an active role in developing a records management program. There are, of course, some exceptions to this rather bleak picture: Yale, Cornell, Wayne State, the University of Wisconsin—Madison, the University of Illinois, the University of California—Irvine, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. ⁵

Most academic archivists must depend upon the voluntary cooperation of records-generators in order to carry out their mission effectively. Accordingly, the archivist should strive to establish and maintain good working relationships with persons who control the university's active records. Most important among these are legal counsels, business managers, fiscal officers, heads of public relations departments, registrars, directors of alumni affairs, development officers, administrative assistants, and departmental secretaries. A crucial aspect of these relationships is reciprocal information sharing. To their consternation, many archivists have found that they were not consulted when legal counsels and registrars began to interpret and implement the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (popularly known as the Buckley Amendment). The manner in which student records are maintained and disposed at most colleges and universities is often uninformed by archival considerations. At a minimum, archivists should provide appropriate academic officers with copies of Charles Elston's lucid discussion of this murky piece of legislation as well as the statement "The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and the Research Use of Student Records" issued by the SAA Committee on College and University Archives. ᵆ Similarly, registrars would benefit from having access to Donald D. Marks's excellent critique of the archivally flawed Retention of Records: A Guide for Retention and Disposal of Student Records, published by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. This guide emphasizes the
administrative value of student records without giving adequate consideration to their future value for sociologists, demographers, genealogists, and historians.\(^7\)

At many academic institutions, microfilming operations are initiated by individual departments and administrators without consulting or even informing the archivist. The quality of the products of these microfilming ventures is at best uneven. Whenever possible, archivists should attempt to monitor such operations and provide administrators responsible for them with state-of-the-art literature that emphasizes the importance of high standards of quality control and the desirability of depositing security copies of all films and other microformats in the archives.

Where the transfer of noncurrent official records to the archives depends almost entirely upon the voluntary cooperation of creating offices, archivists will be most successful if they synchronize their solicitation efforts with the academic calendar. Traditional periods of staff turnover (the close of quarters, semesters, academic years) are times that records are most likely discarded. Scheduling may facilitate orderly transfer of routine records of midlevel administrative offices. Biographical files on deceased alumni or noncurrent faculty, for example, are particularly suited to annual retirement to the archives. Higher level administrators, however, are likely to retain their files throughout their tenure in office. Archivists should be alert to major turnovers in the administration, changes in department chairs, and the abolition of programs, departments and other records-generating offices.

Lack of space is, of course, a chronic problem for most academic archives as it is for other repositories. In areas where two or more repositories exist, archivists might wish to explore the feasibility of cooperatively renting or leasing off-campus space to store little used records.

Most importantly, academic archivists must continue the long-range process of developing generally applicable records retention and disposal schedules for commonly generated bodies of records. Such schedules must be flexible enough to accommodate the specific
needs of private colleges and universities as well as those supported by public funds. Hopefully, archivists can benefit from pioneering efforts recently completed at Cornell and Yale and presently underway within the University of Wisconsin system.

In repositories with only a small staff augmented by student assistants, it is usually impossible for the archivist to engage in extensive records management activities in addition to soliciting voluntary transfer of papers and records, processing, and providing reference service. Archivists may wish to consider encouraging their institutions to contract for records management services, even if this entails a one-shot effort to create and implement a university wide schedule. Once such a schedule is in place, it can provide a supportive framework for voluntary cooperation of records-creating offices.

Appraisal

Determining which records among the massive amount of documentation generated by academic institutions are of enduring value is perhaps the most vexing ongoing problem confronting academic archivists. Although Maynard Brichford, Nicholas Burckel, and others have addressed this problem, approaches to appraisal at various repositories are, on the whole, still exceedingly eclectic. In developing appraisal strategies for individual repositories, it is useful to separate factors in forming appraisal decisions into internal and external categories. Among internal factors which mitigate against the development of more uniform practices are such obvious considerations as staff, space, and budget limitations; the particular institution's age, size, and means of support (public or private); and the archives' age, mission, and reporting locus (whether the archives is a component of the library or the central administration).

Most academic archives fall between a pure archives which houses official records exclusively and a manuscript repository which, while campus based, may assign documentation of the university community a subordinate role. More often than not, college and
university archives combine an essentially administrative archival function with a broader cultural and historical collecting mandate. Official records are accessioned along with such nonofficial documentation as the papers of faculty, the records of student organizations, and, in some instances, the papers of alumni. Many academic archives house regional or thematic manuscript collections and even public records. Such archives serve primarily as broadly based research centers and their institutional archival function is secondary. Even without having a broad collecting mandate, academic archivists frequently find that nonarchival duties devolve upon them, including quasi-museum responsibilities for artifacts and the care of rare books and other special collections.

As repositories age, appraisal decisions usually must become much more rigorous. A newly established repository tends to accession most records and papers that become available. However, records and papers of a value comparable to those initially accessioned may be rejected as the repository matures and its shelves become crowded. Appraisal criteria are never static. They must constantly be modified in consonance with changing internal requirements.

External factors that help shape appraisal decisions are more tenuous. Largely, they relate to the acquisition of discretionary documentation, i.e., papers of faculty, trustees, and alumni, records of student organizations, and other nonofficial materials which complement the official records that comprise the core holdings of most academic archives. This is an area where cooperation among academic archivists would be most fruitful. Obviously, it is not necessary to preserve the papers of every professor of educational methods at each school in a ten-institution network of state-supported colleges or of every teacher of French at small liberal arts colleges in the midwest. Hopefully, networks such as the University of Wisconsin System Archives Council will be able to devise appraisal guidelines that can be applied in other states where large statewide educational systems exist. Moreover, the SAA College and University Archives PAG should assign
a high priority to investigating whether it is possible to develop cooperative appraisal strategies for collecting faculty papers or whether internal appraisal factors preclude such cooperation.

**Accessioning**

As adverse economic conditions continue to erode staff and funding at academic repositories, efficient accessioning procedures assume an even greater importance. Cutbacks in staff, increases in workloads, and the unending and increasing flow of records and papers into the archives combine to produce larger and larger backlogs of unprocessed records that are often inaccessible.

In order to save space and increase access to backlogged holdings, each accession should be thoroughly *presorted* before it is placed on shelves. Publications, duplicates, and other extraneous materials should be removed. Colleges and universities tend to produce proportionately more multiple copies of documents than most records-creating entities, including corporations and government bodies. This is because of their hierarchical structure, which encompasses large numbers of records-generating units and individuals, and the ready availability of photocopying machines. Almost invariably, copies of documents dispatched from central administrators may be found in the files of faculty members. Likewise, copies of agenda, minutes, newsletters, and reports issued by faculty governing bodies and university wide committees abound. Following the pre-sort, it is very helpful to prepare a rough *preliminary container list* that can provide a summary of the contents of each box in the accession.

College and university archives also receive large numbers of serial, occasional, and single-issue publications daily. These must be compared with existing holdings and filed with appropriate bibliographic and location control information recorded. An automated serials check-in system could save staff time that, before long, would more than offset start-up costs. The system recently adopted at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale might well be implemented elsewhere.⁹

Indeed, it is in the accessioning process that
minicomputers and word processors could be of enormous assistance to academic archivists. In addition to expediting control of publications, computers could facilitate quick access to the location of both organized and unorganized holdings, maintain statistics, and monitor available shelf space. By eliminating arduous and time-consuming manual accessioning procedures, larger and more accessible backlogs could be accommodated. Accessions of indeterminate value could be held for deferred appraisal awaiting the arrival of additional contextual records.¹⁰

**Arrangement and Description**

Given recent constrictions of staff resources, previous levels of processing may have to be scaled back. Since access to most holdings of academic archives is based upon the organic structure and interrelationships of generating offices, it may be possible to dispense with the administrative history components of descriptive inventories if container lists include meaningful folder titles and accurate span dates. Similarly, summary narrative descriptions of series may also be pared down, and the biographical section of inventories of faculty papers may be confined to a narrative chronology highlighting the faculty member's career.¹¹ The use of word processors in preparing descriptive inventories would also save considerable staff time.

**Use**

In many repositories, core usage involves only the epidermal layer of its total holdings. Student newspapers, yearbooks and directories; faculty biographical files; catalogues and bulletins; campus architectural and other subject reference files; and photographs—consulted briefly and unsystematically—comprise the most heavily used materials.

At many repositories, diminished scholarly use of holdings had coincided with a continuously increasing demand by administrators; development, public relations, and alumni affairs offices; and genealogists and other members of the public for information. Many academic archives have become in essence retrospective information service centers. They preserve a core of papers and records in order to meet their host institution's
administrative needs and to insure that there will be ample source material available for future institutional histories. Documenting the role that institutions of higher learning play in the larger social fabric is often an ancillary consideration. Providing information services, however, has placed an even greater burden on archivists, since general reference work requires far more staff time and effort than accommodating sustained research needs. Patrons seeking information expect instantaneous responses, while sustained researchers mine their own information once papers and records are made available to them. Moreover, serving as information specialists may be for some academic archivists as alienating as being a directory assistance operator for the phone company.

To be sure, the problems briefly addressed above are but a few of the many and complex ones facing academic archivists. The Society of American Archivists College and University Archives Professional Affinity Group is the logical vehicle for a more sustained and systematic consideration of these problems. As part of the ongoing process of developing a more rational collective practice, the "C & U" PAG hopefully will continue to build upon the solid contributions of its predecessor, the SAA College and University Archives Committee.

As academic archivists strive to overcome parochial institutional practices, they must also guard against a tendency to become estranged from other archival subfields. Solutions to problems relating to appraisal, arrangement and description, and use frequently can be adapted to most archival situations. Archival practice at academic repositories has much in common with practice at other types of repositories. In that sense, the groves of academe are just another part of the forest.

Notes

1 SAA Committee on College and University Archives, comp., Directory of College and University Archives in the United States and Canada (Chicago:
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ORGANIZING LARGE CONTEMPORARY MANUSCRIPT AND ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS: IDEAS FOR PLANNING WORK

John Dojka

The challenges posed by the volume of contemporary documentation have become familiar to all archivists. The district congresswoman, retiring next year, seeks a repository for the four or five tons of records documenting her thirty years in Washington; a once important local industry closes its doors, leaving five or six thousand feet of production, accounting, and personal records mouldering in a leaky warehouse; a local social service agency is moving to new quarters and wonders whether a research institution would be interested in taking the several hundred feet of case files stored in its basement.

The decision to accession all or even part of such a body of records will have serious consequences for the future of a repository, especially in terms of budget, staffing, and collection policy. Yet, the alternative is to stand by and watch an important part of a town's or region's past be turned into landfill or sent off to the paper recycling plant.

A repository's response to such a situation should be determined by collection policy, stack space, budget and staffing priorities. Another factor, the significance of which is frequently unacknowledged or unperceived, is the way in which a repository has organized its processing operations.

If processing procedures are organized on a model geared to arranging and describing records at the document level, an archivist might reject automatically large bodies of contemporary documentation. Such collections would pose a major threat to a repository, placing unbearable demands on its resources. On the other hand, if processing operations are flexible so that
they can be used imaginatively with a variety of documentation, the challenges posed by contemporary records will not appear insurmountable. Collection policy and other priorities, not processing operations, should be the determining factor in accessioning decisions.

What follows, in the form of several premises and a brief work plan or model, are some ideas on how processing operations can be organized to deal effectively with the problems posed by the volume of contemporary documentation. The model can be applied to personal papers and archival records as well as to organizational records whose archival integrity has been destroyed. It can be used by archivists and manuscript curators in a variety of settings.

The work model is both a planning and an implementation tool. It provides guidelines for projecting and planning the priorities and flow of work. It offers a framework for breaking the work into its component parts to estimate staffing, budget, supply, and time requirements as well as to allow easier supervision of staff and assessment of work progress. Furthermore, if assessment of existing resources indicates that one must look outside the parent institution for funds and staff, the work plan will help to demonstrate to a funding agency one's capability for organizing and successfully carrying to conclusion a large processing project. In short, it is a means of conceptualizing processing operations that enables one to see the potential order in unprocessed collections and to plan how that order will emerge. It is not meant to be a detailed discussion of specific processing mechanics. Those procedures and the necessary supplies have been well described by Kane and Duckett.

The premises underlying the model are, first, that although manuscript collections are the unique creations of a unique individual or institution, standard processing procedures can be applied to collections without destroying their integrity. The argument that collections are unique has too often kept archivists from focusing on common elements and planning processing operations accordingly.

Second, at the outset the archivist must have a
clear view of the goal—the level of control and description it is feasible to achieve in a reasonable period of time with limited resources. It is not necessary to read or even handle each document in a collection to obtain adequate intellectual and physical control of the materials. The size of contemporary collections mandates a turning away from a document level mentality of processing to a view of processing as part of a repository’s total mission to collect, preserve, and make available a representative record of human experience. There is a sort of equation here—the more a repository uses its budget and staff time to process to the document level, the less of its total resources it is able to spend for collecting and making other materials available to researchers. A conscious balance must be struck between each of these priorities; the processing of contemporary collections must be viewed as inherently a compromise. This may mean control and description at folder or even series level for an entire collection.

Even within the same collection different series may warrant greatly varying levels of description. For example, in a body of congressional papers the personal correspondence of the legislator may well warrant folder or even document level description while a series composed of several hundred feet of case files or public opinion mail might be adequately described in a paragraph or two.

The danger is, of course, that when approached with a document level mentality, one 300-400 foot collection (by no means uncommon for a contemporary figure) poses a major, even crippling, commitment for a repository. In the end, that repository will have either a huge backlog of material, unprocessed and unavailable to researchers, or it will curtail its collecting scope to exclude large contemporary collections. For most repositories, neither of these alternatives should be acceptable. A well-designed processing operation can head off such problems.

Third, reviewing records for potential weeding and sampling projects should be incorporated into processing operations as a routine step. Fear of using
weeding and sampling techniques often seems based on a fundamental misconception of the role the archivist plays in the production of historical knowledge. On a workaday level archivists are inclined to forget that history is a human creation based on a selection of events woven into an operational explanation of the past. The archivist's goal, as Gerald Ham has stated, is "an informed selection of information that will provide the future with a representative record of human experience in our time." 2

The most significant aspect of the archivist's work is that through collection, preservation, and reference policies one selects evidence from which the researcher in turn makes a selection. Weeding and sampling projects, imaginatively conceived and proficiently carried out (perhaps with the aid of historians and statisticians), are by no means inconsistent with this goal. In fact, a good deal of contemporary documentation may not even be usable by researchers prior to a sampling project that reduces it to manageable proportions.

Fourth, because a major portion of processing large contemporary collections is very routine, work should be planned and structured to allow delegation of as many repetitive tasks as possible to part-time assistants. This does not mean that the archivist's own hands do not get dirty or that the job becomes merely supervisory. Rather, it implies an awareness of which decisions and procedures call for professional expertise and which may be handled more efficiently by someone with less training.

The processing operation should be seen as a series of steps, the aim of which is to gain successively more sophisticated, intellectual, and physical control over the material being organized. The implementation of the work plan is the unfolding, in stages, of the inherent order in an unorganized body of records. There are six major phases of work:

1. Background research
2. Inventory of records and preliminary grouping
3. Identification of series and arrangement on paper
4. Review for weeding and sampling
5. Physical arrangement and processing mechanics
6. Preparation of the finding aid

Background research does not mean an exhaustive investigation. Instead, the aim is to construct a brief, chronological outline of the pertinent points in a person's career or an organization's development. In the case of an organization or institution an effort to construct an organizational chart may be worthwhile. Gathering the data may be as simple as consulting a volume of Who's Who, or it may require a search of more comprehensive reference tools.

What this outline of information provides is a potential map of the collection. It alerts the archivist to the type of materials one may reasonably expect to find, gives an explanation of materials that might otherwise seem inexplicable, and provides information for later arranging the collection into meaningful series. After acquiring experience in dealing with a variety of collection types, given knowledge of the person's career, the type of business or institution, one should be able to predict the type of materials that will be encountered and the potential series.

Moving through the next phases of processing, the archivist fills in the biographical or organizational outline with relevant information. These data will form the nucleus of the biographical or historical sketch that will introduce the finding aid.

The next priority is to produce an inventory that will provide an overview of the records. The archivist may be confronted with one of three situations: (a) the records or personal papers will be found with overall order intact--i.e., filing units, groups of correspondence, photographs, financial records preserved; (b) the records or personal papers will be in such disarray that any once-existing order is not apparent; or (c) a combination of a and b.

When the original order of the records or personal papers is intact, conducting an inventory is a rather straightforward task of moving through the records, boxing them if necessary, and listing the following information for each box, file unit, or group of material: type (correspondence, incoming; correspondence,
outgoing, copies; printed material; subject files; research notes; financial records); organization of the records (portion of an alphabetical subject file, chronological); broad subject area of the material; inclusive date span; and estimate of work to be performed (preservation, photocopying, refolding, alphabetizing).

When the records are in complete disarray, a preliminary sorting will be necessary before likely file units or series appear. Essentially, the archivist must impose an order on the records by rough sorting of all materials into categories and boxing or reboxing them according to groups. Many contemporary collections are foldered, with captions, making an inventory fairly easy. However, folders should be spot-checked to ensure accurate captions. If materials are loose and unfolded, sample handfuls to obtain the necessary information.

It is imperative to resist the temptation to do extensive sorting at this point; merely block out the main types of material, sorting into major groups. In the case of institutional or business records, the major groups will be minutes, constitutions, voting records, correspondence, project files, financial and production records. With personal papers, likely groups will be correspondence, photographs, financial records, subject or research files, and memorabilia. Care must be taken to avoid breaking up units which have an obvious relationship so that they may be preserved for more thorough inspection. Another useful procedure is to physically lay out the records, looking for similar filing tabs that represent a once-existing filing scheme. It is important, however, not to get bogged down trying to reestablish filing schemes.

The archivist should also be wary of another danger present at this stage—the temptation to begin minute sorting within the major groups. Most major groups can obviously be broken into finer units; for example, the financial records of an industrial institution can be divided into accounts receivable, invoices, payroll. Don't give in to the temptation! Remember that the goal at this point in the work is to establish a broad, primary control over the records. Reserve more detailed
sorting for later. Once the major sorting is completed and records are boxed, information on type, organization, subject area, inclusive date span, and processing mechanics should be listed for future reference.

Finally, the archivist may confront records or papers in which portions of the collection have their original order intact and other portions are in disarray. In this case, sort out and preserve the intact units and, then, apply rough sorting procedures. In all three situations, the goal is the same—a list of broad groupings or units from which series can be constructed.

Once the inventory is completed, materials in the collection can be manipulated on paper to form a preliminary arrangement by series. The purpose of this step is to refine the groups identified in the initial inventory, breaking them down into series and sections of series to establish finer control. This is essentially a process of examining the inventory for patterns and either grouping material that can be related on the basis of subject or form or deciding to preserve the original order of the records intact.

In the case of an organization's records, for example, correspondence can frequently be divided into series of incoming and outgoing according to discrete alphabetical runs covering different date spans. Policy records can be broken into series of annual reports, committee minutes, planning reports; financial records into series according to form (daybooks, ledgers, audit reports); organizational publications and printed material into chronological runs.

Once this further refinement has been accomplished, review the internal organization of each series. By referring to inventory notes, make lists of the type of conservation and processing mechanics that must be performed on each section—refolding, breaking boxes of loose correspondence into chronological runs, alphabetizing runs of subject files. On the basis of the data gathered, review any earlier decision about the level to which records will be organized and described: Does the material warrant description at the folder or the series level? Hard and fast rules cannot be established. The level of description will depend on the resources...
and time available and on the condition of the records. In regard to organization, imagination should be given free rein to consider the elimination of as many work procedures as possible. Do staples, unless rusty, have to be removed; if folders are in good condition, are acid-free ones really necessary; is it imperative that materials be arranged chronologically in folders? If certain series on low quality paper are to be filmed for conservation, can staples be cut off in large batches with a paper cutter instead of being removed one by one?

The next step is to appraise each series for possible reduction of bulk by weeding and sampling. By weeding, can duplicates, envelopes, memorabilia, printed matter, and photographs be removed for processing in another section of the repository or for destruction? Does the amount of bulk that will be reduced by removing ephemera warrant the time involved?

The purpose of this paper is not to discuss specific sampling techniques in detail. Rather, it is to point out when sampling should be considered to reduce the bulk of a series, what the basic types of sampling are, and what problems may be involved. The two general types of sampling that can be applied to records series are qualitative (selective) and quantitative (statistical) sampling. It is vital to recognize the characteristics and limitations of each method. There is no such thing as a sample of general utility that will satisfy the needs of all prospective researchers. The sampling method chosen will limit and determine how the material sampled can be used for research purposes.

The possibility of sampling will arise when a large series of records, similar in form, is present--case files, forms, correspondence, financial records. The question is basically one of appraisal: Are the contents of each folder unique, and does that uniqueness have significant historical value? If the answer is yes, sampling should be ruled out.

The sampling method used will depend on anticipation of the potential use of the material and its degree of homogeneity. If, for example, the contents of the series are homogeneous and the aggregate of the information contained in the records, not the individual record
itself, will be of importance to researchers, quantitative
(statistical) sampling methods can be applied to obtain a
sample that will reflect the characteristics of the whole
group. Two methods exist for obtaining this type of
sample: Systematic (choosing samples in a predeter-
mined numerical sequence, say every tenth, fifteenth,
or twentieth file) and true random sampling (using a
table of random numbers to insure efficient distribution).

Systematic sampling, if administered correctly on
a large series, will yield a sample that is essentially ran-
dom and representative of the characteristics of the
whole. However, a potential problem with its use arises
in the case of files arranged in some numerically repet-
itious pattern or cycle, so that perhaps every twentieth
file is somehow similar throughout the whole series of
records. Potential bias can be avoided by using true
random sampling with numbers selected from a table of
random numbers, such as the Rand Corporation's *A Mil-
ion Random Digits.* Properly administered, this will
guarantee a highly reliable sample and is the preferred
method.

On the other hand, if appraisal indicates that the
potential value in a series is specific material, not the
information in aggregate, qualitative (selective) sampling
may be used as a means of separating desired informa-
tion from the series. Qualitative sampling involves
selecting material to be preserved on the basis of some
predetermined criteria of significance or atypicality--
economic status, ethnic group, geographic distribution,
importance of a person or group. The basis of possible
selection is almost limitless, and very sophisticated
strategies can be developed.

The problem with this type of sampling is that it is
in effect a calculated risk or gamble--in many cases
justifiable--that the only research potentials the records
have are those that the sample is designed to select and
preserve. Experience has shown that the research
potential of records is notoriously difficult to predict.
Needless to say, a decision to selectively sample records
demands a thoughtful and imaginative appraisal with the
realization that certain research potentials will be des-
troyed, among them the general quantitative use of the
series.

In large contemporary collections sampling can dramatically reduce the bulk of materials that have been appraised at low value, such as routine requests for information, letters of congratulation, Christmas cards, certain types of form letters, invitations. In such cases a selective sample—one year's worth or one letter of the alphabet—can be obtained to show that this type of material was present in the collection or that a particular function it represents was carried out.

Once sampling mechanics have been designed and the size of the sample determined, assistants can select numbers, number folders, and do the actual pulling of the sample. Notes on methodology should be kept for the register. Sampling procedures can be very simple or complex. The archivist may feel more comfortable having a sampling project reviewed by a historian or statistician. It is one potential tool to deal with the bulk of contemporary collections that should be carefully considered.5

Referring to the plan of arrangement, begin the physical arrangement of the material into the appropriate series and series sections. In some cases, this may merely involve manipulating the records boxes into appropriate order; in others, it may mean rough sorting contents of boxes to gather material for the various series. Continue to avoid the temptation to begin detailed organization of records within series and sections. The object is to group materials physically in a pattern conforming to the plan of arrangement and to renumber and shelve the cartons so that the processing work space is cleared.

One can now begin distributing series or sections of series to assistants who will perform the more routine mechanics of processing. A checklist of the procedures to be performed on each series should be prepared for assistants by revising the worksheet compiled for each series during the initial inventory. Complete any work involving decisions on arrangement prior to turning the materials over to the assistants. Tasks for assistants should be simplified to the point that they require relatively little instruction and can be performed by two or
more people working at the same time or on different schedules.

While this phase of the work is going on, spot-check for accuracy, review finished portions of the records, and take notes on subject content. Preliminary tasks on other collections can also be performed so that new material will be ready for assistants as soon as the collection they are working on is completed.

Work on large contemporary collections should be a team effort. At the center of the team is the archivist—planning, organizing, making decisions on questions of arrangement, and delegating appropriate tasks according to the abilities of the assistants. The key to successful processing in this fashion is a clear understanding of which decisions and procedures warrant the archivist's time and which can be delegated.

In many cases reserving part of the processing budget for part-time help is a more effective way of dealing with quantities of routine work than hiring another full-time staff member. The reason for this is that once a body of records has been broken into series, most of the remaining work will involve routine tasks. Such labor can be amazingly tedious, and full-time staff members cannot be expected to work at maximum efficiency without becoming bored and making time-consuming mistakes. Part-time help by conscientious students or volunteers is a more promising alternative.

To avoid the pitfall of investing too much time in supervising assistants and structuring work schedules, block out work on the project into units requiring little initial instruction and supervision so that assistants can come and go according to their own schedules. Because of the routine nature of the tasks, assistants' working time, when possible, should be limited to two or three hour periods. Naturally, assistants' abilities and levels of interest will vary a great deal, and some can eventually be given much more responsibility. However, the general guideline should be to keep the work as simple as possible, requiring the minimum amount of supervision.

Avoid taking on students under the guise of teaching them the archivist's trade. Teaching processing
properly requires a major commitment of staff time and energy. Before a repository embarks on such a program, priorities must be weighed. Are part-time processing assistants to be viewed as an extension of the processor, hired to relieve him of much of the routine processing, or as apprentice archivists? To cope expeditiously with the volume of large collections, the priority may well have to be moving paper, not training archivists. Clear lines should be drawn between these two goals.

Another major factor to consider carefully in planning effective processing operations is the use of work areas and equipment. At large, well-planned repositories, processing areas are set up within easy access of loading docks, freight elevators, and commodious work spaces. Although such conveniences are in the realm of fantasy for most archives, much can be done to make optimum use of cramped work spaces in small repositories. For example, long corridors or aisles are ideal places to string out collections for inventorying. Equally important are such items as long collapsible tables, sorting bins, pigeon holes, and hand sorters. The most important factor, however, is the way equipment and furniture are arranged in the processing area; the tendency of staff to want fixed, immovable processing stations or desks should be fought. Flexibility is the key—tables, desks, and sorting equipment should be thought of as mobile components to be strung out to form large, extended work areas during the initial stages of processing and then contracted into compact units for assistants to work at once the collection has been broken into series and the parts not being worked on are shelved. In short, work procedures should dictate the layout of the processing work space, not vice versa.

The archivist begins to write the finding aid when doing the background research described in the first phase of this work plan. Note taking on subject content of series continues throughout all work phases. The format of the finding aid or collection inventory will depend largely on decisions regarding the level of description and arrangement.
Once work on all of the series of a collection has been completed and any final odds and ends integrated into the appropriate series, the collection can be put in order—series by series, folders numbered and stamped, and folder caption lists compiled by assistants. Assigning permanent numbers to folders and boxes must be the last step because of possible changes. Proofing by another assistant should follow each step. After a final review, the series content and physical description notes are pulled together and organized in final form for inclusion in the finding aid.

The above model is not meant to be applied dogmatically. Specific work procedures will necessarily vary from repository to repository and from collection to collection. The model is used to illustrate that large contemporary collections need not intimidate even a repository with modest resources if well-planned and integrated processing operations are developed. Above all, there must be the realization that imagination and compromise are essential.
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MINNESOTA: 
AN ARCHIVAL NETWORK IN TRANSITION

James E. Fogerty

As 1980 ended, the Minnesota Regional Research Centers network completed eight years of operation. The following year Minnesota, after having passed nearly unscathed through the several recessions of the 1970s, experienced its first genuine recession in two decades. With revenues in steep decline the state legislature slashed funding for every agency and dozens of programs. One casualty of the cuts was central funding for the network. This decision caused the Minnesota Historical Society to withdraw from its role as cosponsor and administrator. Barely a decade after its creation the network's future is clouded by questions of administration and budget; even its future as a network is uncertain.

These sudden changes have prompted much soul-searching at the society and in the two university systems that support the regional centers network. At issue is the degree of tangible support the society and the universities extended to the network and the depth of commitment each exhibited to its continuance. While the degrees of support will be debated for some time, the society and the universities face a number of immediate issues. Among these are the disposition of center collections owned by the society and the future of center programs controlled by the universities. A brief retrospective on the Minnesota network should place the present situation in perspective.

Since its creation in 1972, the network--built from two largely inactive centers--experienced dramatic growth. It quadrupled the number of its operating units and launched a variety of ambitious and successful collecting and public service programs. The network includes eight centers located at state university system
campuses in Bemidji, Mankato, Marshall, Moorhead, St. Cloud, and Winona, and at the Morris and Duluth branches of the University of Minnesota. The Mankato and St. Cloud centers were founded in 1968 and became part of the network at its establishment in 1972. At that time centers at Moorhead and Southwest State (Marshall) Universities were added, together with the center at Morris. The Bemidji center joined the network in 1973, Winona was added in 1974, and Duluth completed the system in 1977.

The Minnesota network has been distinguished by its administrative structure and by a number of its programs. It was created as a cooperative enterprise in which the Minnesota Historical Society, the state university system, and the University of Minnesota shared ownership of center operations. The network was intended to strengthen the society's manuscript collections documenting people and organizations of local and regional importance and to provide the universities with material for research in original documents. With the establishment of the Farm Holiday Association project at Southwest State University, oral history became an important part of center collections in 1973; that was followed by projects on Scandinavian heritage in the Red River Valley and the World War II home front in western Minnesota.

The contracts covering establishment of each center include provision for the society's ownership of all manuscripts and oral histories. Local government records—especially those of school districts, townships, and municipalities—have been placed in the centers since 1975, at which time the state archives became part of the society. Their ownership is not covered by contract since state law mandates their control by the state archives.

Within the society the network was operated as part of the Division of Archives and Manuscripts' Field Section. The field director had responsibility for network administration and was aided by a full-time coordinator of regional centers. All papers and records collected by each center are processed at that center, and training for student assistants and interns has been
conducted by society personnel at the centers and during practica in St. Paul. Processing on-site is not without its problems—such as the maintenance of consistent bibliographic quality—but these have been more than offset by the benefits of student education and rapid preparation of collections for public use. The latter factor is popular with the donors of collections as well as the users. Virtually all collecting for the centers has been done by center directors or by the society's field staff on their behalf.

Of the network's eight center directors, six are historians and two are librarians on university faculties. They have enriched the system, for each has brought his or her own research interests and expertise to bear on center collecting. The result is a total program of great variety and breadth, with depth added by a concentration on four subject areas.

The network has been governed by a board of directors, including the director of each regional center, the state archivist, and the field director. The board met twice each year, with one meeting in St. Paul and the other at a different regional center in the fall. To meet the administrative workload generated by detailed planning and management of a six-figure budget, the board created an executive committee in 1978. It included two center directors elected by the board for overlapping two-year terms and the state archivist and field director. The committee met at least three times each year to discuss matters of policy, planning, administration, and budget. It proved valuable in meeting the increased complexities of network management and gave center directors a mechanism for direct participation in shaping the network's growth and program development through allocation of the society's network funding.

Collection development in the various centers began with careful evaluation of the area served by each and with concentration on the sorts of records and oral history each might be expected to produce. The collecting programs thus developed were melded into a workable, systemwide structure. While it was—and is desirable—for each center to have the freedom to develop collecting
programs geared to special interests, it was even more important for the network to establish a basic group of collecting objectives to be pursued by each unit. These core collections include the papers of state legislators, a group never before collected in depth in Minnesota; the records of local and regional business and, in particular, agribusiness; records of political and social organizations; and the papers of individuals prominent in civic affairs. Though expanded as they have been by special subject collections such as those on the Great Lakes fishing industry (Duluth) and Scandinavian heritage (Moorhead), these basic groups have provided a solid base for research use. They are the "meat and potatoes" of the network's collections.

From the beginning the centers were viewed as having a mission beyond service to any single group of users. Specifically, they were seen as valuable bases for outreach programs aimed at the society's and the universities' statewide audiences--extending their resources and aid to an increasing number of communities. Recognition that genealogists constitute an important and growing group of users, for instance, spurred the acquisition and microfilming of church records, a project undertaken with the support of the society's manuscripts microfilm laboratory. This discovery of valuable caches of previously inaccessible records benefits local historians as well as genealogists. Similarly, accessions of local public records are a boon to both groups of users. The rapid growth of the network's holdings of manuscripts and government records is demonstrated in two published guides to its collections.¹

In addition to strengthening research holdings of value to identified groups of users, the regional centers managed to carry programs to many groups whose members had not previously used society or university facilities or collections. During the past several years community service and education programs sponsored by regional centers reached eighty-seven communities and more than six thousand people. Local history and genealogy classes, church groups, 4-H clubs, elementary and secondary school students, women's groups, and civic organizations are some of those reached directly
by the centers.

Center collections, particularly oral history, have also been used by broadcasters in the production of programs for educational radio and television and by journalists for a number of newspaper purposes including a recent feature magazine edition on the 1930s depression for the Minneapolis Tribune. During the national bicentennial year, a wide variety of regional projects were carried out by center personnel. These included two series of Bicentennial Minutes produced at the Bemidji center and carried on eight radio and television stations, reaching thousands of people with unique presentations of regional historical information. The series was later used by two school systems in educational projects. Also during the bicentennial, the Marshall center executed the Bicentennial Citizens Art Project with funding from a regional bank and participated in production of the "Bicentennial Time Machine," an ambitious traveling theatre production viewed in twenty-seven communities in southwest Minnesota. In addition, the centers have presented traveling photographic exhibits from the society's education division on a regular basis. These and other activities have brought the regional centers to the attention of a considerable public and have helped attract manuscript collections and oral histories and increase public use.

Aiding in this work has been an innovative program of special project grants, a valuable feature of the Minnesota network. In 1975 the board of directors set aside approximately ten percent of the society's regional center grant budget in a category designed to stimulate additional uses of center collections and resources. In many instances special project monies have been matched by the universities. The special project grants were administered by the executive committee, which solicited proposals from the center directors each February. The proposals were considered by the committee and grants awarded each May to allow for implementation during the summer.

The special project grants program supported a variety of useful activities that added to center resources and visibility. The projects have included
development of data bases for computer retrieval of information on ethnic groups in Stevens County and students at Winona Normal School; production of a series of "history spots" for radio and television; and preparation of an inventory and records schedule for Mankato State University, now used as a prototype throughout the state university system. There were also several oral history projects, such as documentation of women in Duluth politics, former students' recollections of life at Winona Normal School, a comparison of the views of clergy and members of urban and rural churches in central Minnesota, and a series of interviews with business and labor leaders in Duluth. Funding these and other special projects enabled the center directors to pursue research and assemble resources that could not have been provided from basic operations. This program proved one of the best investments made in the network.

In 1979 the Minnesota Historical Society undertook an intensive self-study of its public programs, of which the division's regional centers were a part. The study involved internal program analysis, external review, and preparation of a thorough planning document. A regional center director, elected by the board, was appointed to the Division of Archives and Manuscripts' self-study task force and participated in the review of network operations. The external consultants visited two of the centers and included review of the network in their final reports.

Following the self-study, the division appointed a task force to further study and refine plans tailored to its operations and their place within the society. Concurrently, a related task force on long-range planning for the network was formed. This included the state archivist, deputy state archivist, field director, and three directors elected by the board. The two planning processes were carefully coordinated and extensively analyzed subject strengths and weaknesses in division and network collections. On the basis of these studies, the network task force prepared recommendations on collecting priorities, space, staffing, funding, public records, and related concerns.
The division's long-range planning document was approved by the society's administration in the fall of 1980. The network's planning document was finished early the following year amid speculation that the society's network funding would be slashed and that university commitments to the centers would be reduced accordingly. The network board of directors approved the document after considerable debate; it was never presented to the administrations of the society or the universities. By mid-1981 the state's fiscal position had deteriorated alarmingly, university budgets had been cut at all institutions in the network, the society had lost its funding for network operations, and the position of network coordinator had been eliminated.

Those realities, together with the assessment that relief would not be available for an extended period of time, prompted the society's administration to notify the universities of its withdrawal from participation in the network. The society's departure, of course, effectively halted network activity since the society handled—and paid for—director's meetings, executive committee meetings, a network newsletter, ordering and distribution of archival supplies, and a variety of related administrative and technical services. All of the regional centers have continued to operate; but without central funding they exist as individual entities, and the network is effectively paralyzed.

Why did the Minnesota network encounter such serious problems so quickly? Given its demonstrated success and the ten-year commitment of university faculty and society staff, its predicament seems remarkably sudden. The suddenness may have been exaggerated by an eleventh hour effort made to save the network by preserving a nominal role for the society and at least token funding for basic central administration. Funding was not available, however, and without it the society's administration declined participation in the network.

Despite these setbacks, few of the participants believed that the society would totally withdraw from network involvement; its ownership of manuscripts and oral histories in the centers and its statutory responsibility for the government records they hold appeared...
to make that an unlikely option. Thus, the withdrawal caught even society staff members by surprise.

In retrospect, the suddenness and severity of the network's difficulties do not appear quite so surprising. The network's future, in fact, was linked to assumptions about the funding upon which it was built. The network was created by a grant to the society from the National Endowment for the Humanities, matched by an appropriation from the Minnesota legislature. Upon expiration of the grant the legislature made its first biennial appropriation to the society for network operations, a practice that continued until 1981.

This funding base allowed substantial contributions to each center and provided funds for supplies, travel, administrative overhead, and other expenses related to network operation. The society's yearly grants to each center were used to fund student help, travel, and administrative support services. In addition, the society provided each center with basic supplies, from letterhead stationery to Hollinger boxes, acid-free folders, and recording tape. A full-time society employee was appointed to coordinate the network's activities. Because the regional centers were created in institutions that had no archives or archivists, the network was strongly centralized. All technical and most administrative decisions were developed by the society, which even assumed direct administration of one center for several months while waiting for appointment of a new director.

The universities contributed space, equipment, and up to fifty percent of the time of a faculty director. Several institutions made small and variable cash grants to their centers; others matched part of the society's grant funds with available state and federal money for student help.

Like most funding, that available to the Minnesota centers was never adequate, but the yearly award of operating funds to all centers and of special project funding to most of them allowed the directors to develop programs much more rapidly than would have been possible had they relied solely on the cash-strapped universities. The directors were particularly concerned
about maintaining their funding from the society, since it freed them from competition for scarce program funds within the universities.

This flexible funding base, with its genuine opportunities for creative program development, ultimately proved a weakness. The very fact that the directors were free to pursue off-campus collecting and promotion of center resources without direct participation by the universities engendered a perceptible disinterest in center affairs on the part of many university administrators and faculty. The regular arrival of outside funding from the society contributed to this view by emphasizing--to university administrators, in particular--the hybrid nature of the centers. The universities were happy to claim the centers in the aftermath of public relations successes; during budget preparation, however, the centers were often viewed as the society's responsibility. The society's administration, on the other hand, came to believe that public identification of center programs with the universities primarily benefited those institutions and that basic funding should come from that source.

The lack of full-time directors also proved a detriment in the long run as center directors with faculty appointments proved understandably reluctant to lobby vigorously for allocations from declining university budgets. While state budget difficulties worsened, the threat of faculty position cuts created further ambivalence by some directors toward their center responsibilities.

In fairness it must be noted that most of the directors provided significant strengths to collection development, outreach, and intern training programs. They were--and remain--innovators, but most were hampered by the dual affiliation of the regional centers and their own perceptions that neither the society nor the universities was willing to assume responsibility for providing a solid base for center operations.

A further weakness in the Minnesota centers was their lack of involvement with university records. Early prosecution of a records-scheduling effort, with its direct benefits to the universities, might have stimulated
greater support for the centers among key university administrators. Self-interest is a powerful motivator, and the centers undoubtedly served the purposes of their historian-directors and the society rather than the records management and archival needs of the universities. The society has since moved to remedy this omission within the state university system, but the effort came far too late to prove a tactical advantage in the budget crisis.

There is one major factor that in part explains this failure to deal with university records. Until 1975, the society's Division of Archives and Manuscripts did not include the state archives and, thus, had no authority over government records. The network had been in existence for over four years before the state archives joined the division, which then faced the formidable task of inventorying and moving 21,000 cubic feet of disorganized records. But once it had the state archives and, thus, authority over the records of the state universities, the society did not exploit that advantage.

The society's withdrawal from the network created two major issues currently being addressed. First, new contracts--covering future operation of the regional centers and the disposition of manuscript and oral history collections owned by the society--must be negotiated with each university. Second, the society must determine whether government records now in the regional centers may remain there.

It appears that the new contracts will include provision for continued society ownership of manuscripts and oral histories presently in the centers and for future collections to be owned directly by the universities. The society's collections would be placed on long-term deposit contingent upon maintenance of a functioning archives by each university. The question of government records has not been resolved, and there is sentiment both for their continued deposit in the regional centers and for their withdrawal to the state archives. Their status, including the possibilities for future deposit of government records in the centers, will be a difficult issue in the upcoming negotiations.

That difficulty may be mitigated somewhat by a
recent, favorable development. The relationship be-
tween the society and the state university system was
strengthened in 1982 by the award of a grant to schedule
the records of each of the system's seven institutions.
The grant application was first submitted to the National
Historical Publications and Records Commission in early
1980 and was intended to address the twin problems of
unscheduled records and the lack of official on-campus
repositories for them. One of the institutions--Metro-
politan State University in St. Paul--will deposit its
noncurrent permanent records at the society. It began
operation in 1971, occupies rented space, and does not
wish to form a university archives. The other six insti-
tutions, each of which has a regional center, will be en-
couraged to form university archives operations in con-
junction with their centers. Indeed, two universities
have already set up archives, and a third is preparing
to do so. Since disposition of the universities' perman-
ent records is controlled by the society under Minnesota
law, it plans to authorize their retention at each insti-
tution if an acceptable archival program is available to
administer them. The society, of course, maintains
central information files on all government records in
the regional centers and, thus, that particular rela-
tionship between the society and the state universities
remains intact. 2 If the regional centers are later com-
bined with university archives their programs and fiscal
stability will be enhanced.
It is a hopeful sign of strength that all eight cen-
ters have survived the shock of severe budget cuts and
withdrawal of the sponsorship that made them a network.
The university records-scheduling project has gener-
ated support from both the state university system
chancellor and the individual campus presidents, and
most of the directorships are in the hands of men and
women committed to the survival of the centers. With
some cooperation from the general economy it should be
possible to retain most or all of the regional centers;
the survivors will be a lean and hardy lot. As their
individual operations are refined and strengthened
they may, together, be able to renew the network.

2 The University of Minnesota, like the Minnesota Historical Society, is exempt from Minnesota law governing the disposition of government records.
At noon on 20 January 1981 the world's attention was focused on two dramatic events unfolding simultaneously: In Washington, D.C., a new president of the United States was taking the oath of office, completing a peaceful transfer of power that upheld a nearly two hundred-year tradition; while half a world away, Americans who had been held hostage for 444 days sat in an Algerian jet on the end of a runway in Teheran, waiting permission to depart on their journey to freedom. At the same time, but little noticed, nineteen tractor-trailer trucks were leaving Washington for Atlanta, Georgia, carrying out yet another historic transfer—the last presidential papers to leave the White House as the personal property of a former president.

When George Washington became the first former president in 1797, he established the precedent, taking with him to Mount Vernon the papers generated by his terms in office. In the succeeding years chief executives followed Washington's example, so that by the turn of the twentieth century, custom (and lack of any other policy) made it virtually unquestioned that former presidents took their papers with them as they left office. The result was an uneven recording of presidential administrations, sometimes because the papers were well cared for but largely closed to research—as in the case of the Adamses—but more often because the family lacked a clear appreciation of the historical importance of the materials they inherited. The Madison papers were sold in small batches to underwrite his stepson's gambling and liquor obligations. The Andrew Jackson papers were largely destroyed when the outbuilding...
they were stored in at the Hermitage burned. Some, such as the Harding papers, even suffered the depre­
dations of family members sorting through them to "clean up" the record.

In the early part of the twentieth century, histori­
cal scholars trained in the new school of scientific his­
tory with its emphasis on the use of original sources attempted to increase the availability of the records of past administrations. During the 1920s, this effort succeeded in getting money appropriated to the Library of Congress earmarked for the purchase of the papers of former presidents, specifically those of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison. They also succeeded in get­
ting several presidents to give their papers to an insti­
tution which would care for them properly--the Library of Congress, a university library, or a state historical society. This course proved unsatisfactory on two counts: There was a good deal of institutional rivalry, and the papers of presidents were growing in volume as the United States government grew in size and as the country emerged as a world power. The size and com­
plexity of the presidents' papers, more than anything else, militated against their being placed in existing facilities.

Franklin Roosevelt was well aware of these problems when, during his second administration, he asked a blue ribbon panel of historians and archivists to advise him. Roosevelt had a keen sense both of history and of the historical importance of his own materials. The recommendations of the panel were adopted, and the result set the example for handling presidential mater­
ials--private funds were secured to construct a building to house the presidential papers and display them to the public; and, once completed, the land, building, and papers were turned over to the federal government. Such a solution not only warded off the ravages of an uncaring or overprotective family, it also made open and equal access to the papers a reality. By 1950 (five years after his death), 85 percent of Roosevelt's papers as president were opened to research--the same year the first scholar received permission to use the Abraham Lincoln papers.
The system initially proved a great success, and each president following Roosevelt chose to adopt the same formula. In fact, Herbert Hoover thought it a good enough plan to build his own library in 1963, withdrawing his presidential papers from Stanford where he had earlier placed them. In 1955, the Presidential Libraries Act established a systematic way for former presidents to donate their materials and the federal government to accept them.

The question of presidential ownership of the papers of his administration was seriously questioned when Richard Nixon, leaving office under threat of impeachment, executed an agreement with the administrator of General Services which called for destruction of several segments of his materials, most notably the Watergate tapes. The outcry that followed resulted in Congress passing legislation which, in effect, seized the Nixon materials and established a National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Public Officials. While Mr. Nixon challenged the act in court, the Public Documents Commission began meeting, and it was clear from the outset that the tradition of presidential ownership of administration materials would come under heavy scrutiny.

Thus the situation stood as Jimmy Carter assumed the presidency in January 1977. Early in his administration, Carter indicated to the archivist of the United States his intention to donate his papers to the government and build a presidential library. By this time the Supreme Court had ruled on the Nixon case, expressly holding the seizure of Nixon's papers to be a class of one, thereby clarifying the legal position of President Carter's papers as his own property.

The national archives began to work with the Carter administration to plan for the placement of the papers and building of the library. A liaison office was established in the Old Executive Office Building, and plans for handling the massive volume of presidential papers were reviewed. Two archivists from the national archives were assigned to the liaison office: One would stay in Washington to assist the incoming administration, and the second, with his experience of
working with the materials from the time of creation, would go to the presidential library.

The liaison office worked with White House officials to bring a systematic approach to the handling and preservation of presidential material. John Dunn of the Georgia Department of Archives and History was invited to Washington to lend expertise similar to what he had provided Governor Carter in Georgia, and working together with national archives representatives, they established the first real system for both preservation and disposal of presidential papers in the White House. Using this systematic approach, much of what had been accumulated in previous administrations, only to be disposed of later by presidential library staffs after several costly moves and lengthy storage, was routinely sampled and disposed of by the White House central files staff.

These procedures need not be detailed here, but a few examples might serve to illustrate the types of material consigned directly to oblivion. The White House receives literally millions of Christmas, birthday, and anniversary greetings annually. Prior to the Carter administration, the secretarial staff had screened these against a master list of presidential friends and acquaintances. Those not on the list had been relegated to the files, usually unopened. During the Carter administration, the secretarial screening took place, but those not from friends or acquaintances were routinely sampled and the bulk ground into pulp for recycling. Another example, the White House is a target for "mail in" campaigns, often preprinted postcards to which the sender need only affix name and address. A highly organized campaign of this type can generate millions of such postcards. These, too, were routinely sampled and recycled. One such mail in campaign could potentially have caused a minor crisis had not this system been in place. In 1980, the buildings trades workers began mailing in short pieces of two-by-four testing the Carter administration's housing policy, and eventually four tractor-trailers full of these unusual "postcards" were disposed of without the cost of shipment to a presidential library. While exact figures of
amounts disposed of were not kept, perhaps a third, or roughly fourteen million pages (not counting two-by-fours), were thus eliminated before the materials even went to file.

The liaison office served another valuable function. It collected much of the material necessary in processing and providing reference service at a presidential library. These include White House telephone books that document office numbers and staff relationships; internal memoranda on policy and procedures; instructions to staff on actions during visiting dignitaries' tours; and instruction manuals, files manuals and the like. All of these ephemera might or might not be saved by clerks and secretaries but they will prove invaluable to archivists and researchers.

The Carter administration introduced another innovation to the handling of presidential materials—the computer. Starting with the basic filing system established during the Kennedy administration, the White House central files staff began recording on computer tape information about the myriad of documents in the subject file—a file that comprises about one-third of the president's papers. As the administration progressed, other valuable information was added to the computer tapes—file locations for presidential gifts, dates and times of presidential appointments and meetings, and the votes of congressmen on roll calls. By the end of the administration, plans were underway to control fully the flow of paper within the White House on the computer. This would have provided an invaluable historical record—who saw what piece of paper when. Unfortunately, this system (labeled C-Trak for correspondence tracking) was not fully implemented by 1981, and only a small part of Carter administration materials are covered.

By the time the Carter materials started on their journey to Atlanta, the archival staff that would be dealing with them had a better organized, more concise body of materials with a better retrieval system than any previous body of presidential papers. This does not mean that the processing of the Carter materials is done or will be accomplished quickly. While the computer and
White House filing manuals provide a hint where materials might be found, they are not the comprehensive finding aids necessary for day-to-day reference work. Additionally, they cover only about a third of the presidential materials. While the White House filing staff did an excellent job of arranging the materials, the arrangement was to facilitate retrieval for the day-to-day needs of the White House, not the needs of historical researchers. Virtually no preservation work on the materials was done, and none of the materials had been screened for donor restrictions of classified documents. This mentions only part of the work to be done on the paper records; there are also presidential gifts, photographs, motion picture film, audio tapes and video tapes.

To complicate matters further, the processing began at the height of a government retrenchment period, and the staffing level of the Carter project had not reached the level necessary to insure prompt processing of the materials. In spite of the difficulties with budgets and staffing, the work has had to continue. Some innovative approaches were needed to complete the processing in a reasonable time frame.

First, the Carter project had a distinct advantage in having a computer. While this cannot do the work of processing, it can help with the production of finding aids. So, instead of the more complex finding aids usual to archival depositories, the staff will be producing those of the shelf list variety. Using a check off sheet containing the sixty basic filing entries for the White House central files, the staff will compile information on the balance of the president's papers not already in the computer. This information will later be entered in the data base, and the computer will become the finding aid for all the collections, not just the one-third or so of the president's papers now covered. Thus, a conscious decision was made to provide a lower than usual level of finding aid to researchers initially, hoping to provide eventually a much more detailed finding aid through the use of the computer. Meanwhile, the check off sheets, which will be used to add information to the data base in the computer, will provide a form of finding aid.
which, if laborious to use, will still enable a researcher to find all the information he would normally seek.

Second, the Carter project could not hire a staff like other projects had done. Staffing had to come through transfers from the national archives and other presidential libraries. This also has its advantages. The staff is experienced and does not need to be trained. By utilizing the experience of these staff members, the project combines the best features of other institutions and thus provides the best processing and reference service within limited resources.

The way processing work was allocated had to be rethought. Perhaps it would be possible to segment collections, use intermittent employees on some tasks, student interns and volunteers on others, and reserve the more difficult arrangement and review tasks for the few experienced archivists available to the staff. Further, collections themselves could be segmented so less experienced staff could perform tasks traditionally reserved for the most experienced archivists.

Before any of this processing could begin, a complete evaluation of the Carter materials was necessary. Not only would the staff have to assess the quantity of material and its physical state, they would also have to make some rather critical judgments about the types of restrictions likely to be applied. The complexity of arrangement and description problems to be encountered, the nature of preservation actions to be accomplished, and the level of processing necessary to provide reference service on the papers also had to be considered.

Once this evaluation was completed, a plan for processing the papers was laid out. First priority was given to those portions of the president's papers likely to receive the most reference inquiry. The one exception is the national security material which will probably have a 90 percent closure rate for the next few years. This material is receiving the minimal care necessary to insure its preservation and comply with the security requirements that must be applied.

Levels of processing were established, with those portions apt to receive heavy use slated for processing to a high level. Portions of some interest, but not likely
to generate heavy researcher demand—such as the files of the White House social office (who sat where at which banquet while such and such was served) or the files of the White House operating units (who ordered how many paper clips, from whom and when)—will not be processed until all other processing work is done. Still other portions lend themselves to an alternative of taking basic preservation actions but not reviewing until researcher demand mandates it. The White House name file is a good example of this—correspondence with untold numbers of Americans who wrote the White House and whose correspondence is filed alphabetically. When a researcher requests a particular name, the file will be reviewed before it is released to him.

Experienced archivists will recognize that the procedures outlined for processing papers are not innovations. However, the degree to which the Carter project staff is committed to these new ideas, and their commitment of time in the future to such activities as review on demand, is, perhaps, unprecedented. This seems the only alternative if processing and opening are to be achieved in a reasonable time.

Finally, the Carter project has one other significant advantage that future presidential libraries will not have. The Carter papers will be the last processed and opened as presidential papers. In 1977, the Public Documents Commission recommended a change in the laws governing presidential materials. The following year, Congress passed and the president signed the Presidential Records Act of 1978. The act is applicable to all materials created after 20 January 1981 and, thus, will be applied to Ronald Reagan's papers and those of his successors.

The act creates two categories of material: presidential records—by far the largest category of materials—which, from the moment of creation, are the property of the United States government; and presidential papers which, like the papers of former chief executives, the president owns and may dispose of at his pleasure. Presidential records are those documents created by a president or his staff in the course of carrying out the constitutional and legal duties of the office of president.
Presidential papers are those created in the political and personal roles he performs. A president may choose to donate his personal papers to the government and build a library, just as in the past, but the rules governing access to the two types of material differ. Presidential papers will continue to be controlled by the donor's deed of gift and the restrictions placed on them, just as in the past. Presidential records will be closed for a period of five years to allow archivists time to process them, and the president may place certain restrictions on them for up to twelve years, but thereafter the records will be controlled by the myriad of agency rules and restrictions applicable to all government documents.

Some complications face archivists processing presidential materials in the future: Is the document a record or a paper; if it is a record, is it subject to the donor's restrictions for the twelve-year period; if not subject to the donor's restrictions, which of the some two hundred agencies of the federal government have an interest in it, and what are their restrictions? Thus, while the Presidential Records Act provides no positive advantage at the present time with the Carter papers, the project staff feels fortunate to be processing the papers of the last president to transfer his materials to the United States under his own deed of gift.
The staff of the Portland (Oregon) Records Management Program was requested to prepare a performance plan for the 1980-81 fiscal year. Staff members were asked to chart plans for the year, describe goals and objectives, and to include the time frame for achieving various activities as well as the staff member or members responsible for accomplishing the tasks. Records management was not singled out in this activity. The director of the Office of General Services requested a work plan in line with overall city efforts at management planning from all of the bureaus and offices which he administered.

Portland, in company with many organizations and governments, has been attempting to improve the management of city government. Professionalization of management at most levels of city government has given rise to efforts to improve productivity, implement work standards, and develop public policy. These efforts were primarily directed toward the city budget process. Management analysts clustered in the budget office and the Office of Management Services promoted the development of goals and objectives and their by-product, performance measures.

The stated purposes of the goals and objectives program are broader than serving the budget function, however. They include providing management, planning, and fiscal information to managers, budget analysts, and
city council; and providing information to citizens on what city services are available and how the provision of these services is planned, budgeted, and controlled. Only a small proportion of the actual activities performed by an agency can be highlighted in a budget document and given the full treatment from goal down to measurable activity.

Not being thoroughly schooled in the theories and procedures of management by objective, the Records Management Program staff asked for briefing and assistance from the administrative services officer in General Services. After the initial instruction session, all of the professional staff members developed drafts of goals and objectives for their specific areas of responsibility as well as for the Records Management Program as a whole. In developing these drafts most of the staff approached the hierarchy from both directions—starting with a determination of the goals of the program and then laying out the intermediate objectives and the breakdown of activities to achieve the target goal.

At the same time, the staff examined their day-to-day activities trying to determine what objectives or goals these activities were serving to accomplish. If they had not already noted this as a program goal then it and the activity were added. With all of their drafts in hand, the professional staff met with the General Services administrative officer. On a two-yards-wide piece of paper the goals were laid out one by one with accompanying objectives and activities. All proposed goals were included except editing.

The next step involved categorizing goals, objectives, and activities to eliminate unnecessary overlap and duplication and distinguishing goals from objectives, and objectives from activities. It was not easy, although the staff had guidelines from the Bureau of Management and Budget. In the definitions provided, a goal is a statement of purposes directed toward an identified community need, whereas an objective is a desired result in which the achievement is measurable within a given time frame. As this was interpreted, it required a change in one of the goals which was to increase the use of records. According to the definitions, this was not really
a goal but an incomplete objective. Why did the record use need to increase and how did this relate to a community need? The goal was reformulated to read: "Maximize the value of records to the community through increased records use." In other words, give the community more value for the tax dollar used to create and preserve the records.

It is debatable whether the objectives that were developed to accomplish this goal are properly formulated, but they do set out desired results which can be measured (see accompanying appendix: Goal 2, Objectives 1-4). The primary criticism of these objectives is that they are general rather than specific. For objective 2, instead of reading "Increase community and scholarly awareness of resources"--which is general and does not define how it should be measured--it should have read,"Increase the number of visits from community and scholarly researchers by 20 percent in the second half of the year compared to the first half." For objective 3, concerning finding aids, our objectives should perhaps have read something like this: "Provide record group and series descriptions for 100 percent of permanent records, folder listings for 60 percent of all eligible records, and location listings for 100 percent of records in the records center."

The budget office instructions urged that the objectives be specific and understandable so that program administrators would be able to recognize when each had been met. A too general objective will define a direction, but will not establish how much progress toward the ultimate goal will be achieved. The objective should be feasible, however. Providing descriptions for 100 percent of all series may be a reasonable goal for a new project like Portland's, but for a historical society with a warehouse full of uninventoried records, such an objective would be unrealistic.

The final step in the process was to refine, define, and assign priorities as to time each activity would be accomplished. The staff was still working with its large sheets of paper, but numerous handwritten and typed sheets now overlaid the initial drafts, and it was quite a task to transfer the six-square-yard document
The Records Management Program has had a year in which to evaluate the usefulness of the performance planning process and the plans which resulted. The following benefits have been realized:

1. It served to demonstrate to the staff of the program that the various parts of the program carried out by each individual related to each other and were necessary to achieve the goals of the program. The plan clearly demonstrated the integration of archival and records management functions in the Portland program. It was useful to see that the archivist speaking to neighborhood groups served the same goal as the records management technicians conducting training sessions for city employees.

2. The performance plan gave the director of General Services a much clearer idea of what the records management program was all about. The program had been moved administratively from the Office of City Auditor to the Office of General Services, and the director had not understood fully what it was he was taking on.

3. It made the budget process much easier. By the time records management had to prepare its service level packages for the budget hearings, the staff knew what they were trying to achieve and merely had to select the most important goals, objectives, and activities and prepare performance measures for them to be used in the budget documents. The preparation made the program's services easier to defend in the budget hearings as well.

4. It provided a basis for evaluation; namely, is the program achieving the goals it set out to achieve? In this regard, however, it is well to exercise some caution to avoid being too tied to performance measurement as an evaluation of work performance. It should be used as guideposts for orienting the thrust of the program and for prioritizing—where the program is going to devote its resources and which activities should be emphasized to accomplish the highest priority goals and objectives. With this caution in mind, the performance plan can be used...
to look back over the year and see whether all the hard work has achieved the desired results. It is all too often the case that individual employees or an entire program staff can be busy, hardworking, and productive, but the essential services are not being achieved. Setting the goals and evaluating their accomplishment can remedy that situation.

The staff did not accomplish all they set out to do; in fact, the plan may be described as an inventory of what was intended. It was valid in all but the time frames. Therefore, it may serve better as a five-year plan. An example of this time frame problem was the archivist's intention to speak to neighborhood groups. In the performance plan, that activity was slated to start in the third quarter of the fiscal year. That had been based on moving into the newly remodeled Portland Archives and Records Center in January 1981. The move was not actually made until June. Thus, the move and related activities more properly took place in the 1981-82 fiscal year rather than the previous year. The emphasis in 1981-82 has been in creating a finding aids system. The staff detailed a specific activity: "Produce an updatable, indexed archives guide." It is nearing publication, but it is considerably behind schedule. The guide and the records center are prerequisites to much of the other activity and should have been activities listed in the fiscal 1980-81 plan, saving the other activities for the next year and beyond.

When the director was asked whether the Records Management Program was going to do another performance plan, he said they would, but it would be less elaborate the second time around. The staff feels that performance planning has been valuable and will be of even greater value as they become more skillful in drafting and implementing the plan and in evaluating their progress toward established goals and objectives.

Because of the benefits they have gained from the use of a performance plan, the records management staff recommends the exercise for other institutions. One of the major steps is determining what should be included in the institution's hierarchy of goals, objectives, and activities. One suggestion for establishing the goals of
an institution is to review what professional organizations say the goals of a program should be. Though the archival profession may not have a statement of goals for an archival agency, the "Statement of Principles" and "Questionnaire" developed by the Task Force on Institutional Evaluation and published in the January 1980 SAA Newsletter provide an excellent framework for developing a performance plan for an archival institution, or for the archival element in a records management program. It was intended for evaluation, but it would work equally well for planning of activities and emphases.

Initially, it appeared that the evaluation standards provided goals for the Records Management Program, but on closer examination it was found that just as the Portland Records Management Program's first try toward establishing a goal ended up being an objective, so the "Statement of Principles" lays out activities for an archival institution, and the "Questionnaire" suggests activities to carry out the objectives. For example, "Statement of Principles" number 7 refers to physical facilities. If, in evaluation of one's program, physical facilities are found to be below standard, improvement may be felt to be a priority. The statement itself may be framed as an objective. In other words, what goals would it serve—stewardship of community owned resources or enhancement of preservation and access for community benefit? Each of the questions could be reframed as an activity in support of the objective; for example, reorganize furniture and work areas to provide receiving and processing areas.

Use of the evaluation standards will serve to start the performance planning project. Once the staff has had some experience in drafting and revising the hierarchy it will be easier to determine what program elements could be stressed and developed in greater detail. The experience at Portland with performance planning has been positive, and the planning will continue. Other archives and records institutions should try it and experience the benefits in improved management and increased program understanding by staff, sponsors, and users.

Liisa Fagerlund
RECORDS MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE PLAN

Mission Statement: Provide the city with efficient, cost-effective control and management of its information resources.

Goal 1: Improve the city government's ability to generate information in a more cost-effective manner.

Objective 1: Determine the need for a city-wide forms management program.

Activity Measure
1. Perform needs analysis.
2. If need identified, present cost/benefits to Council. Policy statement to pursue activity.
3. Establish activity if Council so directs.

Objective 2: Advise bureaus on methods to enhance efficient data gathering, recording, and dissemination.

Activity Measure
1. Identify appropriate technologies in records creation, e.g., possible word processing applications, computer applications, active office microfilm applications. Assist Planning Bureau's Historic Sites Inventory data gathering activity through SPINDEX use. Continue identification.
2. Assist bureaus design better records creation and management systems, i.e., workflow planning, correspondence control. Assist Metro Arts Commission in identifying cost-effective word processing applications for arts collection. Continue identification.

Goal 2: Maximize value of records through increased records use.

Objective 1: Increase employee awareness of records resources.
**Activity**  
1. Hold ten city-wide training sessions: 2 forms, 2 word processing, 4 disposition, and 2 open.  
2. Hold in-bureau training sessions.  
3. Develop training plans and aids.  

**Measure**  
Maintain 85% participant evaluation.  
One per targeted bureau.  
Produce necessary aids to support ten training sessions.

**Objective 2: Increase community and scholarly awareness of information resources in city government.**

**Activity**  
1. Give tours and talks for targeted service groups program outreach, e.g., neighborhood associations, scholarly community.  
2. Work with school district to develop curriculum packets.  

**Measure**  
Two tours and four Neighborhood Associations presentations.  
Develop prototype packet.

**Objective 3: Establish usable finding aids and retrieval systems for active and archival records.**

**Activity**  
1. Investigate alternative electronic transmission of data from Records Center.  
2. Provide centrally produced file labels and encourage use for administrative files.  
3. Produce an updatable, indexed archives guide.  
4. Serve as a central information point for records resources.  
5. Provide expertise on filing and automated indexing systems to bureaus, on a consultant basis if necessary, and improve filing efficiency through files reorganization.

**Measure**  
Report to Director, OGS.  
Meet bureau requests for labels.  
Print guide.  
Provide successful identification for 90% of requests.  
Respond to requests and develop sufficient BUD-5s to meet city expenditures.
6. Maintain an accurate shelf list.

Objective 4: Provide physical access to city records.

Activity           Measure
1. Provide reference and retrieval service. Maintain a 24 hour retrieval time.
2. Train staff in reference techniques. Monthly review sessions.
3. Provide photocopy service. Comply with and produce receipts for 100% of requests.
4. Implement use of electronic transfer, if feasible. Implement Report to OGS.
5. Maintain reshelving backlog to a manageable size. To be determined.

Goal 3: Maximize benefits achievable through compliance to the city's records maintenance system (Ordinance 146843).

Objective 1: Secure bureau compliance with schedules.

Activity           Measure
2. Audit bureau records for compliance once every three or five years or as circumstances warrant. One model audit.

Objective 2: Maintain record schedules with accurate descriptive and retention data for each city agency.

Activity           Measure
1. Update schedules. Meet schedule change requests 100%.
2. Develop a more efficient cost-effective schedule Changed system.
maintenance procedure.
3. Develop schedules for newly 100% of needs.
created bureaus.
4. Reduce retention spans in Document reduced retention span
individual records series compared to original span.
while maintaining information integrity.

Objective 3: Reduce the cost of records retention by
timely disposition: centralizing non-current
records and eliminating valueless records.

Activity Measure
1. Establish annual file breaks Establish file breaks in targeted
in city files system. bureaus.
2. Transfer potentially archival Transfer 100% of identified eligi-
or administratively useful bles.
inactive records to Record
Center.
3. Recycle or destroy inactive 100% of destructible records.
records after they have reached the end of their
retention period.

Goal 4: Create a multi-faceted management program to
provide complete records management services.

Objective 1: Secure regional government use of
Records Center.

Activity Measure
1. Present to the various man- Target participation for 2nd
agements concerned the stage: PSU, PCC.
economic advantages of a centrally administered rec-
ords repository.
level of Records Center.
3. Plan, develop, and imple- Develop procedure for partici-
ment procedure for reg- pating jurisdictions.

Objective 2: Guarantee that records management
program meets city needs.
Activity

1. Design a feedback system for gathering information to ascertain the effectiveness of records management.

2. Further plan and develop procedures for the Record Center.

3. Develop with Budget Office participation a recognized benefit schedule for records management activities.

4. Increase bureau's use of Auditor's ordinance and resolution's files.

5. Increase Public Works use of Auditor's A, B, and C files to eliminate duplication of files.

6. Analyze cost-effectiveness of Auditor’s microfilm service.

7. Develop with Personnel Bureau the personnel cost in program transition, forms management, and increased program responsibility.

Measure

Secure necessary bureau concurrence statement.

Develop internal procedures manual.

Joint Budget Office/RM Report to Director, OGS and Budget Officer.

Determine cost of appropriate indexing system.

Determine cost of appropriate indexing system.

Report to Director, OGS.

Report to OGS Director and Personnel.

Objective 3: Secure outside funding for special projects.

Activity

1. Investigate the possibility of a grant to integrate PPS and Metro into city records system.

2. Investigate the possibility of a grant to provide an updatable and cost-effective ordinance index.

3. Investigate the possibility of a grant to assist Public Works and citizen use of Auditor’s A, B, and C files.

Measure

Grant proposal.

Grant proposal.

Grant proposal.
Grant projects in the Southeast which have been funded by NEH include: $19,965 to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Southern Historical Collection for cataloguing and rehousing 20,000 photographs; $20,154 to Birmingham Public Library (Ala.) for the arrangement, description and access to Birmingham Water Works Co. records, 1880-1955; and $7,452 to Hattiesburg, Miss., for the preservation, arrangement, description, and access to the city's non-current records. The South Carolina Historical Society at Charleston has received $1,000 for consultant services to improve archival methodology and $129,673 for the arrangement and description of numerous collections pertaining to the history of slavery and commercial and cultural activities.

* * *

The Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board has received reports from each task force assigned to the NHPRC needs assessment grant. The Manuscripts Task Force has surveyed repositories, compiled a directory, and made recommendations for programs to be implemented—primarily by the Society of Georgia Archivists. Based on its survey, the Local Governmental Records Task Force recommended training and records storage programs which will require the cooperation of state and local institutions. The State Governmental Records Task Force will provide the director of state archives with an assessment of the needs of that institution based on several types of interviews and surveys. The Coordination of Archival Functions Task Force has gathered collection and processing policies, found a means by which archives can order supplies in small quantities, and called for a council of Georgia archival repositories to pursue ideas of cooperation among archival institutions in the state.

* * *
The Western History Collections at the University of Oklahoma have received a unique grant that will provide increased access to their rich holdings. With $203,000 from the U.S. Department of Education, the center will enter 45,000 published holdings in a national on-line bibliographic service. "The effect of the national listing will increase the accessibility of the Western History Collections to national and international scholars," said John Ezell, curator of the collections, which are a part of OU's Bizzell Memorial Library.

★★★

Two separate funds have been established to promote the celebration of Georgia's 250th anniversary in 1983. The Semiquincentenary Commission has been appropriated $100,000 in state funds for projects sponsored by groups of individuals rather than state agencies. Those planning events should contact the commission at 501 Whitaker Street, Savannah 31499. In addition, the commission in conjunction with NEH is providing up to $32,000 in matching grant money to encourage projects on the theme "Founders, Followers, and Legacies in Georgia History." For information, contact the Georgia Endowment for the Humanities, 1589 Clifton Road, NE, Emory University, Atlanta 30322.

★★★

The Everett McKinley Dirksen Congressional Leadership Center has offered a challenging opportunity to institutions with congressional records. The center will provide matching funds to selected institutions for activities connected with acquisition, conservation, arrangement, description, and use of congressional archives. Those in the Southeast who are interested in submitting a joint proposal to the Dirksen Center contact Linda Matthews, Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga. 30322.

★★★

http://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/georgia_archive/vol10/iss2/11
Matching grants from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Georgia Council for the Arts enabled Georgia Department of Archives and History to co-sponsor an exhibit on the art of early Southeastern Indians, which opened 1 October 1982 at the High Museum of Art in Atlanta. The exhibit features 100 objects of embossed copper, carved wood, and polished stones from the archaeological collections of four museums.

* * *

The Association for Documentary Editing is currently conducting a membership drive. The group offers a quarterly newsletter, a job placement service, an annual fall meeting, and projects such as a forthcoming guide to the principles of documentary editing. For more information, contact Mary A. Giunta, ADE Membership Committee chairperson, at (202) 523-3092 or (202) 724-1090.

* * *

The archives department of Georgia State University in Atlanta will be moving in the fall of 1982 to the newly renovated Alumni Hall. The former Municipal Auditorium has undergone a $5 million program of alterations, and the archives will be occupying a 4,000 square foot area on the ground floor of the building, just inside its Piedmont Avenue main entrance. With expanded stack and office areas and laboratory and exhibit space, the new facilities will enable the staff of the Southern Labor Archives, the University Archives, and the Johnny Mercer Collection to better serve donors and researchers.
REVIEWS, CRITIQUES, AND ANNOTATIONS

[With this issue of Georgia Archive the responsibilities for the book review section pass to new editors: Darlene Roth oversees the longer reviews and critiques; Martin Elzy writes the short reviews, notes, and annotations. It is our hope that this section will retain its high quality while broadening its base to include not only published histories, genealogies, and archival guides, but also materials from exhibits, records management, EDP, tape and video programs, unusual anthologies, and other items of interest. We hope the readers will offer us suggestions and assistance, and we look forward to a rewarding period of editorial service. Eds.]


This attractive, information-packed book serves the interests of historians, archivists, and art lovers alike. While it does not describe the preservation and restoration techniques archivists require, it does document styles, techniques, and camera types used by daguerreotypists. Therefore, archivists who deal with this medium will have clues to date, location, and chemical contents of these rare records of the past.

For those who regard daguerreotypes as an art form, the Rinharts' book contains a plethora of full-sized color and black-and-white samples, from the mediocre to the unusual in photos and miniatures. In addition, the book includes chapters on the use of color tinting and art influences on daguerreotypists. Even without the text the book might be worth the price to those who
prefer to "read" a book through its illustrations. It will also appeal to readers who appreciate a lively history. The narrative, extracted from newspaper notices, journal articles, and books on photography, describes the countless experiments dreamed up by photo pioneers in search of a more perfect image. Because processes varied so widely during the relatively short time the daguerreotype was in common use, careful documentation of its technologies is as necessary to preservation as it is to the historical record. Only with full understanding of all the processes used can the best method be planned for archival conservation and restoration.

It is fortunate for Georgians that the authors included an unusually large number of photos from that state, recording as well the activities in Georgia of many itinerant daguerreotypists who regularly came south for the winter. The Rinharts acknowledge their debt to Georgia curators, photo specialists, and collectors who aided in their research. Given the quality of this volume, the reader owes a debt not only to the authors, but also to the imaginative daguerreotypists of the nineteenth century who made this unique work possible.

Richard B. Russell Memorial Library  Glen McAninch


The title of this manual implies a narrower focus than the content reveals. In the work, the authors define a public program as "any activity that contributes to a greater awareness of archives and what they do." This includes traditional efforts--such as oral history, exhibits, lectures, receptions, slide shows, mini-classes, workshops, and student programs--and projects not normally considered public programming such as publications, guides to collections,
and photographic documentation of current events.

Perhaps the greatest value of the book is its straightforward discussion of public programs as an integral part of any archives. Since archivists deal with the public, argue the authors, they are already involved in public programming and owe it to themselves and their constituents to develop activities appropriate to their institutions. These activities would support and enhance other archival functions, facilitate the delivery of core reference services, and fulfill the archival mandate to "make records accessible to the public."

Its breadth makes this a very useful, practical guide for public programming, though its broad focus does not allow for much depth of treatment. At times the reader wishes for fuller treatment of topics (especially school programs) and more examples of actual activities. Still, the manual serves as a sound tool for anyone initiating programs or expanding existing ones.

The first three chapters focus on redefining public programs, assessing institutional needs, and developing programs through a sensible "add-on" approach. Then, the authors move on to chapters on program "how-tos," instructional programs, consultants and volunteers, publicity, evaluation, and funding. The appendices contain very useful forms, and the extensive bibliography identifies resources by subject area. The only major omission noted is consideration of accessibility to handicapped individuals.

Archives and Manuscripts: Public Programs is a very valuable resource for the archivist beginning to consider this aspect of his/her profession and a useful refresher for those already committed to multi-faceted public outreach. The authors and the society are to be commended for their recognition of the importance of public programming in the functioning of archival institutions.

Georgia Department of Archives and History

Alice Knierim

Homecoming is the title for both an exhibition and a publication. The exhibit, prepared by the association under the direction of Carole Merritt and supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Georgia Endowment for the Humanities, was on view at the Atlanta Public Library, March 26 through September 30, 1982. It constituted a significant event in Georgia historiography and provided an enlightening, inspiring experience for all who saw its celebration of African-American heritage. It deserves highest praise.

The publication provides an essay which documents and interprets the exhibit and reproduces, nearly completely, its assemblage of maps, documents, artifacts, and photographs. The book is organized, as were the exhibit materials, around critical moments in the cycle of life through which most mortals must universally pass--birth, babyhood, childhood, coming-of-age, courtship and marriage, and death--utilizing data which relate the African experience to the African-American experience.

Historically, the text supports the Herbert Gutman interpretation of black family history and, sociologically, those analysts whose research attests to the health and viability of the black family. But family behavior patterns around critical moments in life are easier to infer than to demonstrate, and in this reviewer's opinion, the presentation lacks a concept of family sufficiently useful for historical and sociological comparisons across African-American or across African family lineage lines. Setting aside, however, the technicalities which affect scientific judgments, the interpretations of the author with respect to the persistence of African patterns of culture in adaptation to the new environment of Georgia are plausible and judicious. On the whole, the broad canvas painted will serve well those persons inspired to venture into the past of their own families.
The great strength of the exhibit and publication lies in the illumination of the material culture presented. (The excellent presentation of midwifery comes immediately to mind as an example.) It is appropriate to salute the contributions of all participants in making both exhibition and publication possible and to express the hope that both will have effects that are provocative, stimulating, and innovative for the recovery of this kind of history.

Atlanta University

Hubert B. Ross


In 1926, one hundred fifty years after America declared its independence, Congress authorized the first appropriation for a national archives building. Why did it take so long? Condos agrees with Ernst Posner that American archival development lagged behind European development because of the decentralized nature of American government. Increasing, specialized governmental functions led European nations to recognize that a central archival repository offered more efficient control over records than individual agency archives or registries, but until the growth of federal agencies during World War I, American government felt no such pressure. Instead, pressure came from the persistent demands of scholars.

From 1906 to 1926, no American scholar was more persistent in the movement for a national archives than J. Franklin Jameson, director of the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. He and his chief collaborator Waldo G. Leland, (coeditor of the Guide to the Archives of the Government of the United States in Washington, 1904) used their knowledge of federal records to promote, propagandize, and lobby for the idea, transforming the central warehouse concept into the National Archives--an
independent agency with a trained professional staff housed in a specially designed repository. The list of individuals and organizations Jameson recruited for his cause is remarkable—every president from Roosevelt to Roosevelt, Librarian of Congress Putnam, naval historian Mahan, newspaperman Hearst, and patriotic groups such as the American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Why did it take Jameson twenty years to succeed? At first legislators felt that they had more important matters to consider than archives. After World War I, when the need for an archives building could no longer be ignored, the question became tied to public works projects and was sidetracked by pork barrel politics. Only when the executive and legislative branches agreed on an omnibus bill putting federal buildings in congressmen's districts were any new buildings, the National Archives included, to be erected in the District of Columbia. Just before the passage of the bill, a frustrated Jameson wrote, "Because the national archives are everybody's business, they are in a sense nobody's business," a lament as true today as it was then. Jameson's efforts were hampered by the absence of an effective lobby, and today the National Archives operations are hampered for the very same reason.

Gondos' book skillfully details the establishment of the National Archives and Jameson's dedicated efforts to it. This was Gondos' dissertation, completed when he was sixty-nine years old and published posthumously with revisions by James B. Rhoads, formerly archivist of the United States. It is an important contribution to the field of archival history which should appeal to all historians, archivists, and librarians.

Carter Presidential Materials Project


This indispensable volume offers researchers in
Georgia history and genealogy good basic information and many shortcuts through the maze of public records at the Georgia Department of Archives and History, which is featured, and at several other research institutions in the state. The guide gives a brief history of the Georgia archives, introduces the reader to each major section of the state archives, explains how the archives is physically arranged, what the hours, locations, and usages are for each section, and what materials are available in each. Cleverly, Davis also discusses what is not available. In addition, he offers good bibliographic information (lists of county histories, standard reference works, and published archival guides), names of publishers of Georgiana, standard abbreviations used to identify county records, a glossary of legal terms, guides to census records (published, unpublished, and indexed), and, perhaps most valuable of all, exact and extensive listings of the available county and land records in the state.

The weakest sections of the book have to do with the other research institutions, whose listings are neither comprehensive nor very informative. The maps are not properly cited or well presented; they are poorly reproduced--too small to be very readable. The introduction urges readers to write the archives to encourage it to microfilm and make available the public records of post-1900 Georgia counties as it has done for pre-1900 county records; while an entirely laudable cause, it seems an odd way to begin a book.

As Davis suggests, Georgia "suffers" from an abundance of public records rather than from a scarcity. His book does much to help general researchers, students, genealogists, historians, and all other interested parties in Georgia history to utilize the records with intelligence and efficiency. Research in Georgia is highly recommended.

The History Group, Inc. Darlene R. Roth

Local History and Townscape Conservation: Opportunities for Georgia's Communities. Prepared by Robert
This publication is a product of a recent statewide public awareness program on the value of local history to small communities in Georgia, sponsored by the Georgia Downtown Development Association and underwritten by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs, the Georgia Endowment for the Humanities, and the cities of Athens, Canton, La Grange, Swainsboro, and Waycross. The purpose of the program was to heighten the awareness of the significance of each municipality's history and cultural resources and identify opportunities for improvement through historic preservation.

The text moves logically from a discussion of local history to an overview of historic preservation to an explanation of the value of townscape (as opposed to landscape) conservation. Next come profiles of the five Georgia communities, each of which provides a synopsis of historic development, an appraisal of current physical status, a discussion of the community's sense of its own past, and a review of local historic resources. These are followed by a listing of organizations which can provide preservation assistance.

The form and substance of this publication are simple but not simplistic; its organization is logical, its narrative clear, informative, and happily lacking in rhetoric and jargon. The tone is light, upbeat, and optimistic. The layout complements the text, breaking it up with photographs, maps, and tables. The photographs, though entirely in black and white, are exciting and well chosen. The maps are easy to read and uncluttered. The booklet is slim enough to be comfortably read in one sitting.

Through the effective use of honest comparison,
the compilers succeed in allowing the reader to comprehend differences and similarities among small towns. This implants in the reader's mind the understanding that while local history and townscape conservation provide great opportunities for small towns to develop their cultural resources, the uniqueness of each town's history will dictate varying development solutions.

The publication is a fine execution of the notion that a specific set of case studies can be shared accurately, pleasantly, and profitably with a broader community of readers. The thesis that citizens can use local history and townscape conservation to understand more about their town, even help revitalize it, comes through clearly. The work is a primer on preservation which pretends to be nothing more or less; as such, it serves its stated purpose very, very well.

Atlanta Bureau of Cultural Affairs Joe Garrison


In the introduction to the Ohio Municipal Records Manual, Governor James A. Rhodes emphasizes the value of information in the operation of government: "Good government requires sound management, and sound management requires efficient and effective record-keeping systems." The records manual prepared by the Ohio Historical Society is a commendable effort toward insuring the proper management of records from their creation, maintenance, and utilization to their eventual disposal or preservation.

The eighty-four page manual furnishes local government officials with a five-step plan for establishing a records management program and with suggested retention periods for over seven hundred record series commonly maintained by local government agencies. Because Ohio law requires each municipality to create a local records commission responsible for determining
retention periods for records maintained locally, this manual provides common direction in records management for the decentralized programs to follow.

The retention periods listed were developed from the concerted efforts of fifteen Ohio cities, where record series were appraised for their administrative, legal, fiscal, and historical values. Approximately twenty-seven percent were identified as having permanent, historical value. The schedules are arranged according to governmental function—such as airports, courts, fire and police, planning and zoning—in easily read, columnar formats which make them readily available for fast reference.

Although the manual recognizes the necessity of reducing the costs of record-keeping at all levels of government, it does not disregard records of enduring value. Permanently valuable information becomes, in essence, a long-term institutional memory which can be referenced for policy planning, implementation, and evaluation. Retention schedules make it possible for public information to be preserved. Thus, future generations of citizens can understand, in a historical context, the forces which shape their lives.

West Georgia Cooperative Educational Services Agency


Such a poignant, compelling yet unadorned collection of documents has seldom been published about a woman in the South—a nonsouthern, unknown, not altogether successful teacher, who rose very little above her educated, unwealthy station. The life of Amelia Akehurst Lines (Jennie), as revealed in these letters and diaries, is unenviable in its hardships but totally unforgettable in its humanity.

The papers carry Jennie from the time she begins
teaching in 1857 to her death in Georgia in 1886; they reveal much about the practices and problems in the classroom, family member interactions and social customs, female expectations and socialization in the nineteenth century, courtship, marriage, and "upward" mobility. The materials are rich in Georgia scenes, especially since Jennie undertook numerous relocations--Euharlee, Walton County, Oxford, Covington, Fayetteville, Newnan, Stilesboro, and Atlanta. The local color is often fresh, biting, and unusual.

Accompanying the letters and diary entries are a map, a chronology of events in Jennie's life, photographs of the principals, and an introductory text which outlines the biography. Sadly, there is not sufficient material or explanation given surrounding the death--timing, causes, and place--of Jennie's husband, Sylvannus Lines, which leaves the impact of that event on Jennie somewhat inconclusive. The volume is relatively silent on the Civil War (compared to other such collections) but rich and eloquent on prewar life and postwar adjustments.

The volume would have been more successful than it is had the editor taken to heart the lessons of Mary Beth Norton and Caroll Smith-Rosenberg--which he cites but does not apply--and had he presented not just Jennie, but Jennie's circle in full array. With the materials he had at hand, he could have demonstrated the complex world of love, ritual, network, and association between Jennie and her female kith and kin, as it occurred, and given the readers an excellent example of what is generally accepted feminist historiography: that is, that it is the collectivity of womanhood in the past which is historically more significant in explaining female experience than is, often, an individual life. As it is, Dyer uses materials from Jennie's correspondents when he needs to fill in her story line and not as an indication of their personal centrality to Jennie. He tells us, for instance, how important Jennie's sister-in-law Maria was to Jennie, but the collection fails to show that. Had he done this, Dyer could have made a much greater contribution to women's history than he has.

For his accomplishment in adding to Georgia and southern
social history, however, his volume is to be commended. 

The History Group, Inc. 

Darlene R. Roth 


This is a concise, thoughtful study of the Spanish royal treasury at St. Augustine during the time members of the influential Menendez Marquez family were proprietors in this exchequer. Not only is this monograph valuable in critically examining one of the important institutions in Spanish Florida, it also enables the reader to understand policy in New Spain better. 

Bushnell provides background on the establishment of the St. Augustine exchequer, detailing the difficult economic position of a colony without precious stones or metals. She then explains the economic burden of nobility and how social distinctions came to be more important at an isolated post than at the court in Seville. A discussion of proprietorship and how purchasing multiple offices was an accepted (and necessary) practice in Florida is followed by a chapter detailing treasury organization and the work performed by the various officials associated with royal finances. 

Successive chapters deal with the situado—yearly royal money used to pay all public expenses—and the sources of crown funds in the Indies, including St. Augustine. As Bushnell makes clear, not only was the situado—which was sent from Mexico City—often appropriated or lost at sea, but St. Augustine was largely unable to generate internal revenue, thus exacerbating a difficult colonial situation. Bushnell details the responsibilities of crown officials, although she says little about individual initiative in interpreting royal decrees. She concludes with a discussion of crown efforts to maintain fiscal responsibility in St. Augustine. 

As a narrowly focused monograph, this work succeeds very well and, as previously stated, provides valuable information on the Spanish Florida treasury.
King's Coffer illuminates some of the social fabric of early St. Augustine, a subject generally ignored by most Florida historians. It is a welcome addition to the slim literature in this area.

National Park Service, Denver Michael G. Schene


The Deputy Surveyor General of Georgia compiled this list from records in the Georgia Surveyor General Department. The names of cities, towns, and communities are listed alphabetically, followed by the county in which located and a date indicating the source of that particular entry. The volume includes seven maps dating from 1849 to 1932, but they are quite difficult to read.


This attractively illustrated brochure, of interest to tourists and professionals, has been a goal of the GAMG since its founding in 1977. Entries for more than 150 museums and galleries are arranged by seven regions of the state. Each entry includes name, address, phone number, hours of operation, subject (art, history, natural history, science), and a short description of fewer than fifty words. An alphabetical name index facilitates use.

Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the University of Wisconsin-Parkside Area Research Center. By the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and the University

One of the thirteen area research centers in the state network, the Parkside ARC holds the records and papers of individuals, organizations, businesses, and local governments from Racine and Kenosha counties. This description of the holdings as of January, 1982, arranges material in five groups: manuscript collections, county and local government records, newspapers, genealogical material, and cartographic records. There is no index.


This volume supplements The Manuscript Collections of the Maryland Historical Society (1968). In each of the three sections indicated by the title, collections are listed numerically, but there is also an index for the entire volume as well as an alphabetical list of interviewees in the oral history section. Substantial information is provided on each collection, such as size, dates, subject and type of materials, and restrictions on use and access. Maryland Historical Society holdings not covered by this volume include the archives of the Episcopal Diocese of Maryland and special collections of sheet music, photographs, and maps.


The family is traced from about 1200 in England.

Updating a 1971 publication, this work goes beyond the limits suggested in the title and provides a general guide to the use of microfilm for record-keeping. Pertinent state and federal laws and regulations are summarized.


During the spring of 1980, the South Carolina Historical Society sponsored a genealogical project including publication of this guide to local and family history sources in over eighty libraries, archives, and historical and genealogical societies. Entries cover published, typed, and mimeographed material and some collections of manuscript records, but most primary source material is not included. Location of an entry is included if the item is in fewer than four repositories. The index includes proper, personal, place, and institutional names, but not subjects.


This reproduction of the first state atlas prepared in the United States is preceded by an introduction by the director of the South Carolina Historical Society. Waddell traces the development of the atlas from its conception in 1815 to its publication by Robert Mills in 1825--an essential historical resource for nineteenth century South Carolina history.

The third in a series devoted to microfilming different types of material, this pamphlet covers basic information from preparation of material for microfilming to storage of microfilm.


Published by the MLA's Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession, this volume of articles and occasional poems by more than a dozen authors concerns not just professors, but also women students and women's studies. Of particular interest to archivists is an appended bibliographical essay, prepared by a graduate women studies class at Emory University, discussing primary and secondary sources on the history of higher education for women in the South.

NOTE: Southern Historical Press, Inc., has launched the Southern Historical Press Genealogical Book Club. Information may be obtained by writing to the press, Post Office Box 738, Easley, S.C. 29640.

NOTE: Copies of "Special Collections, an Annotated Guide..." to the archives at Washington University Libraries may be obtained free, as long as the supply lasts, by writing to Special Collections, Campus Box 1061, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 63130.
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Editorial Policy

- Members of the Society of Georgia Archivists, and others with professional interest in the aims of the society, are invited to submit manuscripts for consideration and to suggest areas of concern or subjects which they feel should be included in forthcoming issues of GEORGIA ARCHIVE.

- Manuscripts received from contributors are submitted to an editorial board. Editors are asked to appraise manuscripts in terms of appropriateness, pertinence, innovativeness, scholarly worth, and clarity of writing.

- Only manuscripts which have not been previously published will be accepted, and authors must agree not to publish elsewhere, without explicit written permission, a paper submitted to and accepted by GEORGIA ARCHIVE.

- Two copies of GEORGIA ARCHIVE will be provided to the author without charge.

- Letters to the editor which include pertinent and constructive comments or criticism of articles or review recently published by GEORGIA ARCHIVE are welcome. Ordinarily, such letters should not exceed 300 words.

- Brief contributions for Short Subjects may be addressed to Glen McAninch, Richard B. Russell Memorial Library, University of Georgia Libraries, Athens, GA 30602 or to Box 261, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303.
Manuscript Requirements

- Manuscripts should be submitted in double-spaced typescripts throughout—including footnotes at the end of the text—on white bond paper 8½ x 11 inches in size. Margins should be about 1½ inches all around. All pages should be numbered, including the title page. The author's name and address should appear only on the title page, which should be separate from the main text of the manuscript.

- Each manuscript should be submitted in two copies, the original typescript and one carbon copy or durable photocopy.

- The title of the paper should be accurate and distinctive rather than merely descriptive.

- References and footnotes should conform to accepted scholarly standards. Ordinarily, GEORGIA ARCHIVE uses footnote format illustrated in the University of Chicago Manual of Style, 13th edition.


- Use of terms which have special meanings for archivists, manuscript curators, and records managers should conform to the definitions in "A Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers," American Archivist, 37, 3 (July 1974). Copies of this glossary are available for $2 each from the Executive Director, SAA, 330 S. Wells St., Suite 810, Chicago, IL 60606.
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