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DAVID GRACY AWARD

The executive board of the Society of Georgia Archivists has established the David Gracy Award—a $50 prize to be presented annually to the author of the best article in *Provenance*. Named after David B. Gracy, founder and first editor of *Georgia Archive* (the precursor of *Provenance*), the award will begin in 1990 with volume VIII. Judges will be the members of *Provenance’s* editorial board. An anonymous donor has agreed to match funds put up by the society to a maximum of $250 in order to endow the award.
Until the 1970s, work experience was the singular training venue for most American archivists. A proto-archivist came to the field with background education in the humanities and learned on-the-job. However effective a method for instilling institutional practices, OJT (on-the-job training) has its limits as a vehicle for professionalization. Practitioners were rarely steeped or even informed about the theories and complexities of information systems or the auxiliary sciences of history. Most archivists were constricted by the pragmatic realities of their daily work schedule; hence, they were without the time or "leisure" to theorize about their problems in an abstracted fashion. During recent years, archivists have begun to break out of this circular trap due in part to the rise of graduate archival education programs. Archival education now stands as the major transportation on the
road from an apprenticeship-based craft to a profession, but this road is still very new and full of bumps.¹

Education programs should teach general principles and theoretical structures, as well as instruct on cutting edge developments and induct initiates into the jargon and history of the field—necessary elements that are not easily garnered while processing collections fulltime. The amount of applicable knowledge—"what we did not know we should have known"—is truly awesome. Not only have archivists just begun to penetrate the mysteries of automation and to test information science paradigms, but they are still woefully unaware of their own history.

Although with roots to Ernst Posner and programs in the 1940s, the effective birth of a continuing tradition of archival education dates more properly to the early 1970s. Since then, education has made rapid strides and is currently in a period of rapid transition. For the first time, the potential exists for a true research agenda and pushing the knowledge base of the field along true experimental lines. Yet despite advances, the archival educator must acknowledge a basic dilemma. One does not become an

¹ Primary background research for this article was conducted through personal files of the SAA’s Continuing Education and Profession Development Committee and through informal discussions with archival educators. Frank B. Evans and Robert Warner, "American Archivists and Their Society," American Archivist 34 (1971): 169, reported that sixty-four percent of the archivists responding to their 1970 survey had graduate degrees—two thirds in history—but less than fifty percent had even a single course in archives administration.
archivist by ingesting classroom knowledge alone. Just as doctors become doctors by practicing medicine, historians by conducting research and writing, lawyers by standing before the bar—archivists become archivists by actually working in archives.

Field experience is axiomatic in all current education programs of any worth. Assuming one is not entering a program with prior or ongoing work experience, the major method for including a practical component is the appropriately named "practicum" or internship. Although this addition is obvious and ubiquitous, it is still quite troublesome and strangely has rarely been even mentioned in archival literature. William LeFurgy noted some of the problems in 1981 in a three-page note, which still stands almost alone. According to LeFurgy, the practicum suffered from two major factors: 1) the lack of realistic standards and requirements to guide the on-site managers and 2) the absence of adequate administrative oversight by the educators. In 1990, it is fair to say that difficulties with the practicum still exist.²

To understand the nature of the practicum, one needs to be aware of the changing face of archival education in the 1980s (that is, a historical framework). Current tools date only to the 1977 Society of American Archivists's (SAA) "Guidelines for Graduate Archival Education

² William LeFurgy, "The Practicum: A Repository View," *American Archivist* 44 (1981): 153-55. In addition to this article, a more in-depth study of the practica is in the offing from Richard Cox as his proposed dissertation topic at the University of Pittsburgh.
Programs," which helped establish a three course sequence, including a practicum. The importance of the last was further established by the subsequent issuing of SAA's "Program Standard for Archival Education: The Practicum." This statement was partially based on the then dominant trend of linking archival education to the shops of the archivists teaching in the programs: among them, Ruth Helmuth at Case Western Reserve, Philip Mason at Western Michigan, and Gerry Ham at Wisconsin. Those archivists were pioneers with great abilities to structure meaningful experiences for their students.

The practicum guidelines codified the educators' own practices and a 140 hour work load, but were also intended to provide supplementary aid for students assigned to other, normally less educationally-structured archives than their own. The guidelines supposedly championed flexibility, yet were in fact quite rigid. They proclaimed it "essential that the practicum provide the student with experience in all major facets of an archival program" and specifically prescribed acquisition, processing, preservation, and reference as the four areas of coverage. Those with more specialized interest were simply directed to take additional practica.

---


Yet archival education itself was soon embarked on a more expanded journey. The number of practitioner-based three-course offerings grew, but some courses were offered by regular full time faculty without their own archives. More importantly, "sans-archives" educators were hired on tenure lines by history and library science departments to build independent archival programs: McCrank/Stielow/Burke at Maryland, Terry Eastwood at British Columbia, Michael Lutzker at New York University, Bert Rhoads at Western Washington, David Gracy at Texas, Bob Williams at South Carolina, and onto Stielow at Catholic University, Richard Cox at the University of Pittsburgh, and, most recently, Greg Hunter at Long Island University.\textsuperscript{6}

The old guidelines were no longer totally suitable in this changed environment. For example, the practica that were once the cornerstone of a three-course sequence soon became the fourth option or one out of a panoply of a dozen or more courses—some of which include a practical experience component of some forty hours as a course requirement or option. Moreover, students began to specialize—not just in college and university, but business, science, and religious archives or in preservation or

\textsuperscript{6} Timothy Ericson, "Professional Associations and Archival Education," \textit{American Archivist} 51 (1988): 298-311, provides a breakdown of the changing face of archival education as reflected in the SAA’s 1986 \textit{Education Directory}. 
automation. Students thus increasingly desired work experience in equally specialized archives.

The spread to outside archives also meant less control. As LeFurgy suggested, the needs of the host institution might mean that students could not expect the general introduction to processing assumed in the guidelines. Educators have had to realize that students might also benefit by working in an institution because of its prestige or specializations and not for any ability to provide a general overview of practice. In addition, all parties should be aware that training in areas like automation, cataloging, and preservation management might also mean that the interns were actually more expert in some topics than their practitioner mentors. Some cognizance was also demanded of returning students with prior experience, those working in archives while in school, or those who have a post-graduation job which includes basic in-house training.7

Thus by the mid-1980s, the old education guidelines could no longer encompass the reality of the practicum or the drive for what amounted to a Master's degree in archival studies. SAA's Continuing Education and Professional Development Committee (CEPD) responded with an updated 1988 SAA "Guidelines for Graduate Archival Education Programs." The new edition included a demand for a regular faculty member at the head of a full archival education program, and, more importantly for this discussion, it added a needed acknowledgement and definition of archivists who guided student interns as

educators/mentors: "Advisors and Supervisors—The persons who advise and supervise practical field experiences should be archivists with professional experience in the area of the practicum." 

The practicum itself was recognized as essential: "Students should be required to participate in practica of 140 hours or more that provide experience, particularly in the full range of the basic archival functions." However, the 1988 guide also equivocated when it stated that "the decision about the nature of such practica should be dependent upon the student's career goals and interests and the availability of suitable archival repositories." Thus, a call was also issued for new practicum guidelines, as a party to the education publication.

Unfortunately, two CEPD subcommittees later the profession is still without new practicum guidelines. Beyond bureaucratic inefficiencies, the reasons for this delay reflect the complexity just described. Other factors include the variety of departmental structures to control the practica. History departments, for example, generally have less familiarity with a field experience component than library schools, but generally seem content to leave the management in the hands of the archival educator. On

---


9 Ibid.
the other hand, library schools already had practica as part of their curricula before the addition of archives. Thus, the archival practicum became one option within an existing framework.\textsuperscript{10}

In a recent survey, J. Gordon Coleman noted that, although fifty-five of the sixty library schools had practica in their catalogs, only six reported the offering as a required course for the MLS with less than forty percent of the MLS graduates actually taking it. Practica coordination was equally divided between schools where one faculty member coordinated activities at all sites and those where the coordination was based on faculty specialization. Student hour requirements vary from 84 to 225, and performance criteria also included a report at 46 schools, a diary or journal at 36, and a distinct project at 19.\textsuperscript{11}

The variety can be seen in a brief comparison of three programs. Catholic University maintains a list of potential

\textsuperscript{10} The call for new practicum guidelines arose coevally in CEPD with SAA Council's request for new education guidelines in 1986. Terry Eastwood was charged with developing the first plan, and he was followed by a data collection effort in the charge of Julia Marks Young. In late 1989, a third campaign was launched with Constance Schulz at the helm.

The Practicum

sites and runs the practicum as a course under the direction of a nonarchival educator. The intent is to marry specific (often prestigious) institutions to the students’ particular needs as an introduction to work in archives, but not necessarily a general overview of all practice elements. The experience can be repeated up to three times at different sites. Students can take the class at any time after the completion of three required general MLS courses and either Archival Management or Information Resources and Records Management, but are not allowed to work for money. The University of British Columbia mandates the practicum at the end of the student’s first year of study and generally supports work for pay. The program helps place the students and develop the work schedule with the employers, who are made aware of the training of their interns. The University of Maryland has two major options. One is under the History Department and can be for money; it incorporates the practicum as the second of the basic two-course introduction to archives sequence during the summer session. The other is the not-for-pay library school internship course run by a faculty member and the head of the school’s library that is quite similar to Catholic’s offering.\(^\text{12}\)

In addition to the variety of structures, archivists must also recognize the emergence of an educational elite without need of recourse to the SAA. SAA’s guidance,

while useful at the start and valuable as a debating tool, holds little sway in the face of departmental policies. The potential for tension among educators and practitioners and their professional associations is almost a given at this stage of development of the archival field. Paul Conway, for example, while still working for SAA wrote of the need to have independent full-time faculty members, because of the "drag" or inertia that results from tying education "too closely to the very practitioners it serves."\(^{13}\) Indeed, archival education programs with well established practica do not require SAA pronouncements; moreover, they evince little interest (nor have the ability to pay the thousands of dollars) for the clout that the professional body could receive from accreditation. In the future, archival education may even evolve away from a practical experience component—perhaps, toward post-graduation internships, but that time is far off.

Fortunately, all sides still need each other, and even the most advanced educational programs rest in part on the practica. The best offerings still can benefit from an exchange of ideas on this topic, as could other less developed programs and those just starting. The question must not be "turf," but cooperation and the nature of practica guidelines to help coordinate the current reality.

The first point, however, is to do away with any prescriptive notions. Instead, guidelines should be truly flexible aids to better the present situation and not to

dictate from a narrow, unenforceable base. One useful flourish, for example, could be clearly delineated models that replicate an ideal situation as a point of reference, but also suggest the acceptability of more specialized experiences. Flexibility must also extend to the potential recognition of credit for the returning practitioner or students working in the field while they study, as well as to allow more than one practical experience. In addition, the document might acknowledge the utility of shorter (forty hours or so) practical exercises as alternatives or supplements to a full 140 hour practicum. Sample evaluation forms for the student and the site, plus a model contract between those two parties should also be included.

Above all, any practicum guidelines need to represent the shared interests of the profession and the three key players in the experience: the student, the educator, and the onsite trainer/supervisor. Students must be recognized for the advanced theoretical knowledge that they can bring to the site. Although relative neophytes on the bench, these are graduate students who have had the leisure to study abstract concepts, which could aid the repository. They should not be exploited as cheap labor (save that for undergraduates, who also should be dealt with in the guidelines), but managed to ensure the development of pleasant and effective future colleagues. Educators are the intermediary and final quality control. Their role is to help place the student in the most advantageous locations for the student’s educational program, as well as to monitor the student’s progress and the site’s contributions.
And finally, there are the forgotten players in the extant practicum guidelines—the onsite supervisors. The educator should help to inform them of the nature of the practicum as it relates to the student in question and any preparatory coursework. The guidelines could help immeasurably by explicating the supervisors’ own unique roles and contributions and helping them through the very difficult tasks of acting as manager, mentor, and trainer at the same time. In addition, such a recast document could aid bureaucratically by providing an explanation of the professional nature of such service to any nonarchival employers.

New guidelines and an understanding of the principles and realities cited above are a practical necessity. Given proper review and the possibility of input from all sides, new practicum guidelines could even help mitigate against the centrifugal forces that come with professionalization and the growth of an educational sector. Here is a path for continuing cooperation to aid the field along the awkward road to maturation.

Frederick J. Stielow is associate professor of library science at the Catholic University of America. A version of this article was presented at the 1989 annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists in St. Louis.
Evolution of the *Thesaurus of University Terms*

Jill M. Tatem

Three years ago the Society of American Archivists published a modest pamphlet—*Thesaurus of University Terms* (TUT). This thesaurus was developed at Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) by Jeff Rollison and Jill Tatem, with the assistance of Ruth W. Helmuth, then university archivist, and their colleagues Fred Lautzenheiser and Bob Psuik.

In agreeing to publication of TUT it was hoped that the thesaurus might contribute to the discussion about the ways archivists analyze and describe college and university archival materials. A secondary goal was that other similar repositories might be able to use TUT as a starting point to develop or examine their own descriptive vocabularies. Almost as an afterthought it occurred to the compilers that other repositories might actually use TUT to describe their records.

*PROVENANCE*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Spring 1990
Experiences during the intervening years have led to the conclusion that college and university archivists are either very kind or very desperate. The anticipated criticisms and suggestions were not forthcoming. The responses have been almost entirely of the "We've bought your thesaurus and we really like it, but we're not sure we're doing it right. How do you use it?" type.

The purpose of this article is two-fold: to complete an obligation to all those gentle or desperate college and university archivists who have invested seven dollars to purchase TUT and costly hours to figure out what to do with it. A selfish motive, and second purpose, is that, in explaining what CWRU was and is attempting to accomplish, someone will be prompted (perhaps through irritation at seeing the thing done badly) to suggest a better way.

TUT began life in 1983 as an experiment based on a notion of Jeff Rollison's. Specifically, he wanted to build a mechanism to describe CWRU's archival records based on the functions carried on in the university. It was to be simple to create, simple to use, and detailed. What the experiment became was a vocabulary used in two online files. One is a post-coordinate folder-level index to records. The other is a description of record-creating entities. It was hoped that this would become an important part of a total descriptive system.

Of course, the notion of explicit access to records based on function was not new to the archives. The classification system developed by Ruth Helmuth in the mid-1960s had served as the foundation of arrangement and, consequently, of access to archival records since the archives was
established. Briefly, this system classifies university offices by their functional responsibilities, not by administrative hierarchies. The notation, because it represents a given type of office such as a registrar the same way in each record group, links offices with similar responsibilities across record groups. Thus, the first step in retrieval, that of linking a topical request to the most likely relevant sources via knowledge of the primary function of a record creator is well supported on a macro level.

The classification system was supplemented by other more detailed finding aids, of course. Rarely could the archives not provide some information about a topic within its collection scope. But there was a growing unease on the part of the staff about its ability in, say five years, to continue to provide the level of service users had grown to expect without devoting every working hour to reference.

In 1983, the archives's last staff increase was seven years old. While the staff was not growing, the collection and the number of service requests were—at an alarming rate. As an institutional archives, the universe the archives documents is small and cohesive. An overwhelming majority of collection use is by the staff of the archives providing research services for university administrators who need detailed but comprehensive answers, not references to likely sources. Typically, these answers are needed yesterday. Very little document retrieval—what librarians refer to as "known-item" searches—occurs. And visitors who require only that they be shown possibly relevant records series and left to browse dozens of boxes of correspondence files are rare.
The immediate need was for a kind of information retrieval disaster prevention plan. The more long-range goal is to build a descriptive system that 1) actively helps users define (and continuously refine) their information needs, and 2) locates information or sources of information relevant to their needs. Ideally, this should be a progressive process, not a series of frustrating dead-ends and false starts. And this leads to the third goal: from the users' perspective the system must be consistent and predictable, that is, what is learned in one search should be useful in subsequent attempts. Under no circumstances should users have to "unlearn."

The compilers worked from several basic hypotheses (none of them new insights, but mentioned to explain the context in which TUT is used). First, different users have different perceptions of the nature of the collection. A corollary is that often the same user has different perceptions of the nature of the collection at different times. Second, users have widely differing precision and recall requirements. And, third, most of the time, in stating their information needs, users are trying to define the unknown.

One path through this maze of ambiguities and unknowns is to present multiple views of the collection. Variables determining these views include which portions of the collection are described (both as physical and intellectual entities), by what criteria are those portions linked, how detailed/comprehensive is the description, and for what kinds of users is it meant.

In this context, the files the archives is building using TUT form two layers of a multi-tiered system of finding
aids. Too, among many of the biggest problems in this approach, are identifying useful perspectives for which and from which to create collection "views", and integrating or linking the different views so they form a coherent and navigable whole—not a mess of pieces and parts.

The classification system provides one useful tool as a skeleton which links offices horizontally through functional relationships. TUT could provide a way to put flesh on the skeleton both as a translation into English of the functional concepts embodied in the classification schedules and as a way of extending those linking concepts into more specific descriptions of detailed activities of which functions are composed.

The compilers tried, however, to be realistic about what they could achieve. For current users, finding aids are irrelevant. For the price of a phone call they are accustomed to receiving answers at the exact levels of precision and recall they require. Any descriptive system that did not either make users less dependent on the archives staff and more willing and able to conduct their own research, make the archives staff more efficient without sacrificing quality, or both, would be a wasted effort. As appealing as the first possibility was, the compilers knew it would have to be an awfully sexy system to lure people away from those phone calls. So they concentrated on working out some way to help themselves first, secure in the virtuous knowledge that, in helping themselves first, they would really be helping their university.

On this noble and altruistic note, they set about the task of deciding what was unpleasant and time-consuming about the way they currently worked. Surprisingly enough,
they managed to compress what started as a very large list into two problems:

1) Everyone hated scanning pages and pages of box lists to extract the few folders that looked promising;

2) A way was needed to break out of the cycle of starting most searches with the same record series, because those were the ones this staff knew best, even though there might be better sources. Of course, the more the best-known ones were used, the better-known they were, and the more they were used, the less the rest of the collection was exploited. And there was that awful dreaded wondering about what might have been missed.

After weeks of brainstorming, the first wheel had been reinvented. (There were to be more.) Anyone familiar with information retrieval theory will recognize that the first problem was a need to improve precision, that is, the number of relevant documents retrieved as a proportion of the total documents retrieved. The second problem was the need to improve recall, that is, the number of relevant documents retrieved as a proportion of the total relevant documents in the system.

Invigorated by the realization that their experience had validated thirty years of research in information science, the compilers forged ahead to determine how best to solve these two problems—problems that had stymied some of the best minds in the field. Unfortunately, the experts claimed that both these problems could not be solved at
once. It was possible to have better precision or better recall but not both—choose one.¹ Not liking the sound of this, the archives staff ignored it. (This was not to be the last good advice they ignored.)

Instead, they opted to turn the precision problem over to the computer. It should be noted that the archives had decided very early to build an online system. In 1983 microcomputers were quite expensive and turning one into a $7000 typewriter, instead of exploiting its powerful retrieval capabilities, appealed to no one. The computer was ideally suited to scanning pages of descriptions and would do it faster. The humans would then devote their energies to the recall problem, which sounded more interesting, as it would probably involve the rediscovery of forgotten treasures.

This is an oversimplification, of course. Because of the kind of information that was to be extracted from the collection, several decisions to aid precision were made. One of these was to focus on folder-level descriptions. It would have been simple to have cleaned up the substance of the existing finding aids and left the basic structure alone. For example, storing accurate box lists in machine-readable form for online searching would certainly speed the process of scanning folder titles. Unfortunately, easy-to-use but sophisticated text retrieval software for microcomputers was not available in 1984. And the use of existing folder labels would not solve language problems.

While increasing the depth of indexing at the series level would certainly direct staff attention to less frequently used but possibly useful records, it was concluded that a great deal of work would produce very little advantage.

It is unclear at what point the project focused on vocabulary control as the most useful beginning or how seriously other possibilities were explored. Because discussions frequently returned to vocabulary problems, this was undoubtedly seized as the solution very early. It was necessary to circumvent problems created by using folder titles of originating offices and, frankly, some very eccentric processors. Some of the worst of these were extensive use of proper names without any context, changes in terminology both over time and across the university, and the ubiquitous non-descriptive horrors like "correspondence, 1954." The biggest language problems were the need for descriptive descriptions and generic posting.

In spite of the fact that experimental testing of information retrieval systems has been going on for thirty years, there is more information on what is not known than what is known about what factors make for good systems. While conclusions of many of these studies have limited generalizability or are simply not reliable because of flawed methodologies, they have produced a small body of conventional wisdom. Some of the pieces of wisdom are that complex descriptive structures do not work much better than simple ones and that artificial indexing
languages do not work much better than natural language.\(^2\) Clearly, controlling the descriptive vocabulary was not a panacea. From the research findings reviewed (by no means an exhaustive review), the most useful conclusion found was that natural language and controlled vocabularies each aid precision and recall, but in different ways, and that many other system variables have at least as significant an effect on information retrieval performance as does the descriptive language. It is generally acknowledged that vocabulary control aids recall by controlling synonymy and relatedness, and that precision problems with controlled vocabularies stem from lack of currency and specificity.\(^3\) The need for control of synonymy and relatedness were two of the most


troublesome problems, so this became a priority in spite of the discouraging research findings. The staff reassured themselves with the hope that between their ability to modify the thesaurus quickly and easily, reliance on folder level descriptions, and the relatively stable terminology, adequate precision levels could be maintained.

Having decided on a controlled vocabulary of some species, it was a relatively simple matter to decide on a thesaurus using minimal precoordination. It was important to keep the list of terms small. The compilers also wanted to avoid all the aggravation of striving to maintain consistency of word order that comes as a necessary consequence of high levels of precoordination. And since this was to be an online index, the combination of terms necessary to achieve desired levels of specificity would be handled at the time of searching.

Finding the words was easy. Putting them into some useful kind of order was not. The staff attempted to apply the principles and techniques of facet analysis to functional descriptors as a means of imposing order. The first difficulty was in defining a function. If it is simply a purposeful, authorized action, then the restricting vocabulary describes concepts like FUNDRAISING, AUDITING, ESTABLISHING, TERMINATING. Some of these are understandable on their own, but many do not really mean anything useful until the object of the activity is known. Programs, departments, employees (which is usually called firing, if its involuntary or resignation or retirement if it is not) can all be terminated. Students are terminated (usually by graduating or withdrawing), as are buildings (usually thought of as demolition). In order to
clarify these syntactic relationships, functions can be redefined as purposeful, authorized actions upon objects. In constructing a vocabulary, however, the result is a very long list of pre-coordinated descriptors. The staff then turned to facet analysis.

Facet analysis identifies the fundamental aspects of a subject and then organizes the subject’s descriptive terminology into groups or facets. The trick is determining what aspects of a subject are fundamental. A number of criteria have been used over the years in developing different thesauri. They generally are variations on entities, processes, properties, space, and time.

All members of each group (called a focus) of terms under the main facets share a single explicit characteristic. For example, entities might be grouped into abstract concepts, inanimate objects, etc. Accordingly, the first-level division of TUT into four sections was made without much difficulty: form of record, places, individual record-creating entities, and everything else. The first three are straightforward alphabetical arrangements with related and preferred term cross-references. Since the last section is the heart of the thesaurus it was here that organizing terms was most important.

The difficulty was in identifying criteria for division that were sufficiently detailed to create cohesive groups,

---

without being so detailed as to render the concept too specific. This is basically a problem of perspective. For example, DORMITORIES are both a type of building and a type of student service. Many thesauri solve this difficulty with polyhierarchies. The term appears in both foci, the notation identifying their different meanings. This approach was rejected in order to keep TUT small. Another concern was that this would require either greater precoordination or reliance on the notation to preserve the meanings of terms in use. Each term needed to be understandable out of context, and it was important to have minimal precoordination and a high degree of specificity. These are not complementary goals. A compromise was struck by reducing the clarity of distinctions among facets and foci. The result is that the characteristics by which terms are grouped are neither intuitively obvious nor made explicit.

This is TUT’s most serious flaw. It not only limits ease of use of the existing vocabulary, but it will create obstacles to future modifications. In all fairness, however, neither of these problems has surfaced yet. TUT has been used, with some degree of success, for five years. (To what degree of success is not yet certain because controlled experiments on retrieval effectiveness have not been completed.) Nine new staff and eight students (one of whose primary language was not English) have been taught to use it without difficulty, and descriptors have been added successfully and easily.

Other problems which are being addressed include changing the display to improve ease of use. Since TUT’s publication, efforts have been made to add scope notes and
cross references and to expand the entry vocabulary. It was clear four years ago TUT was lacking in these areas, but the primary concern was to get a working version ready for use and not to develop a definitive vocabulary.

TUT was an attempt to relate activities to the functions they support isolated from administrative structures, in such a way that each activity fit under one and only one function. This was probably an attempt to impose a two-dimensional model on a multi-dimensional world. What was achieved was a set of terms that describes activities and topics commonly found in the administrative records of colleges and universities. And TUT does that fairly well, because it is easy to use and fairly flexible. What TUT does not do is to aid retrieval by using the structure of a vocabulary to build paths through the mass of documentation that, because they are based on links that are inherent to the record and concepts that are part of the every-day work life of the intended users, are easy to follow.

Anyone contemplating a similar endeavor would do well to reflect on the croquet game Lewis Carroll’s Alice played with the Queen of Hearts. It should be remembered that the croquet balls were live hedgehogs, the mallets live flamingoes, and the arches, soldiers doubled-over. As Carroll explained the procedure: "The chief difficulty Alice found at first was in managing her flamingo: she succeeded in getting its body tucked away, comfortably enough, under her arm, with its legs hanging down, but generally, just as she had got its neck nicely straightened out, and was going to give the hedgehop a blow with its head, it would twist itself round and look up into her face, with such a puzzled
expression that she could not help bursting out laughing: and when she had got its head down, and was going to begin again, it was very provoking to find that the hedgehog had unrolled itself, and was in the act of crawling away: besides all this, there was generally a ridge or a furrow in the way wherever she wanted to send the hedgehog to, and, as the doubled up soldiers were always getting up and walking off to other parts of the ground, Alice soon came to the conclusion that it was a very difficult game indeed." 

Jill M. Tatem is assistant university archivist, Case Western Reserve University. This article was originally presented at the 1989 Society of American Archivists annual meeting in St. Louis.

---

Adding Electronic Records to the Archival Menagerie: Appraisal Concerns and Cautions

Michael E. Holland

Electronic records are significantly different from most of the records held in institutional archives and, thus, they must be appraised and evaluated for accessioning with different and additional factors in mind.¹ The archival predilection for discussing electronic records only within

¹ Electronic records for the purposes of this paper are defined as records that are stored or maintained in a machine-readable form and require the intervening use of a computer to render the information in human readable form. Electronic data is encoded in binary code and includes, but is not limited to, the following physical forms: magnetic tapes, magnetic tape cartridges, disk packs, floppy diskettes, magnetic cards, hard disk drives, and optical disks.
the context of preservation issues fosters the misconception that—given optimum environmental conditions—electronic media may be considered an archival or long-term storage format. This is not a realistic assessment. Electronic media should be approached as a transitory information format in the archives. The mistaken beliefs that electronic recording formats are long-term storage media and that the readily apparent and sometimes superficial advantages of the volume-to-data ratio of electronic records when compared to other formats have led to the excessive accessioning of machine-readable records into some institutional archives with inadequate reasons to justify the transfer.

It is difficult to discuss the preservation of machine-readable records, because the professional literature is replete with warning and cautionary statements about physical control and care, but spare in discussing the decision-making process that will result in the presence or absence of electronic records in the archival repository. It is the appraisal process that must be given more and earlier attention, if archivists are to add the proper and most valuable electronic records to their holdings and devote to them the proper amount of resources and care. If marginally valuable records are accessioned and preserved at great cost to the archival program, the result is the denial of resources and care to other records already within the archives or the inability to accept worthy records into the repository because of inadequate resources. Or if historically valuable records are accessioned into the archives in machine-readable form, but over time become inaccessible to the user, the result is
the same as if the records had been disposed of prior to being brought into custody.

Electronic record media—upon or prior to removal to the archives—requires either immediate transfer of information to more physically stable and long-lived media or periodic and scheduled recopying onto fresher stock of the same medium. Accessioning electronic media into an institutional archives requires either an investment of resources at the time of accessioning in order to transfer records stored on transitory media to more stable media or the continuing investment of resources to maintain records in electronic or machine-readable format. It is thus critical that an archivist contemplating the accessioning of electronic records consider a minimum of five fundamental factors. These factors will be dealt with in more detail later in the article and will be posed in the form of interrogatives to make them easier for the archivist to apply to individual record series.

In discussing physical and technical factors that will affect the appraisal of electronic records for archival disposition, it is essential to consider briefly the physical forms of the records. Tape is still the most heavily used storage medium for large data files. Its primary use is in database applications, and it is used as both an input and output source for mainframe computers. Half-inch computer tape comes in a variety of data density and tracking formats: 7, 9, and 11 track tapes, and 800, 1600, 6250, and 9300 BPI (bits per inch) data density. Tape is the oldest memory format still in use, paper punch tapes having gone the way of the stegosaurus... to the Smithsonian. Tape has developed into a fairly long-term
and reliable magnetic storage medium. Fresh tapes routinely last as long as ten years with proper care and storage, without loss of data due to print-through, magnetic fading, or spontaneous magnetic reversion. Maximizing the life span of linear computer tape requires not only cool temperatures, sixty-two to sixty-eight degrees Fahrenheit with a tolerable diurnal variation of plus or minus five per cent and a relative humidity (RH) of thirty-five to forty-five per cent and a diurnal variation of plus or minus five per cent, but also occasional cleaning and rewinding at normal tape speed to relieve and redistribute winding tension. Tapes should be stored in the tail-out orientation, and reels maintained vertically in special non-conducting tape racks. The maintenance of such an environment and care schedule is neither simple nor inexpensive.

Good ANSI (American National Standards Institute) standards exist for computer tape and its storage.  

---


3 The list of specific standards for the manufacture and testing of magnetic formats is far too extensive to discuss here. The most useful standards are the ANSI/EIA X3 series which deal exclusively with data processing issues.
Manufacturing standards are widely followed throughout the industry. The existence and application of standards by manufacturers mean that computer tape longevity predictions are reliable when the medium is properly stored and protected. The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) recommends a program of tape replenishment based on a ten-year cycle.4

Cartridge tape is a newer and more convenient version of the magnetic reel tape. The format was developed by the 3M corporation during the last decade. The concept is similar to the idea behind the cassette audio tape—the tape cassette is inserted into a streaming tape drive and either a PC hard disk, a file server, or an entire network may be backed up with one or several of these cartridges depending upon the size of the file stored. Streaming tape drives and tapes come in units of ten to eighty megabytes. The tape stock is thinner and narrower than magnetic reel tape and, thus, is more fragile and subject to physical damage, as well as maladies associated with improper storage. Cartridge magnetic tape is more prone to magnetic print-through and linear distortion due to environmental changes and infrequent rewinding or retensioning.

Many users refresh cartridge tapes much more frequently than is necessary for half-inch tapes. General industry agreement is that data should be stable on this format for at least two years.

The optical digital data disk (OD3) is a mass data storage format that has received considerable attention

nationally during the last decade. OD3 systems convert electronic impulses produced and processed by the computer into central processing unit laser pulses which encode a laser-sensitive rotating disk by a variety of methods.

Developing a generally applicable care statement for the optical disk presents some difficulties. There is no single or generic optical disk. The manufacture of these devices and media is a highly competitive, research and development-driven, and proprietary enterprise. Some optical disks are made of tellurium, an extremely unstable rare earth metal, sandwiched between glass plates, and some are constituted of plastic containing embedded polymer compounds that undergo a chemical-kinetic reaction when exposed to laser energy to form a dye spot. As a consequence of this diversity, there are no material or manufacturing standards for optical disks and, because of the newness of the technology, there are no reliable figures on the storage conditions that need to be maintained nor any reliable prediction of the longevity of this recording medium.5 Vendors claim a longevity of thirty to one hundred years; all claims are equally groundless and lack scientific verification. With the exception of the glass disks, there is some indication that the OD3 medium is physically durable, it will likely stand up to wear and tear, and it is very resistant to environmental adversity.

5 Linda Helgerson, Introduction to Optical Technology (Silver Spring, Md.: Association for Information and Image Management, 1987), 15-18.
Optical disks have another and more serious problem which can only be alluded to here. Unlike computer systems, the operating systems of OD3 memory systems are highly proprietary and are held as trade secrets. There is no compatibility standard that will allow one vendor's OD3 system to read another vendor's data disk. This presents a considerable problem for the archivist who must provide access to the optical media in their holdings. With current technological diversity, the archivist is placed in the impractical position of having to accession the system and not just the information medium.\(^6\)

Floppy diskettes, the most familiar magnetic storage medium, have a number of problems from the archival point of view. They suffer from great diversity in the quality of medium available, and there is no prevalent manufacturing or material standard for floppy diskettes that is respected by all manufacturers of the medium. The medium is very prone to environmental damage and is not a very durable or permanent storage format. Neither NARA nor NAC will accept data stored on this transitory medium, nor is the author aware of any state records and archives program that accedes data files on floppy diskettes.

---

\(^6\) The issue of data and application portability is under intensive study by both NARA and the National Archives of Canada (NAC). The clearest and most useful document relating to this issue to date is a report of 6 February 1989 (PSC-ARC003-1) prepared by Protocols Standards and Communications, Inc. for NAC entitled, "Application Portability."
Much of the data recorded on floppy diskettes consists of text files which are clearly more appropriately stored for the long-term in human-readable form. While some important databases are stored on floppy disks, it is difficult and may be beyond the technical capacities of the resources of many institutions to convert database files stored on floppy disks into flat or software-independent files for long-term storage and access.

Hard magnetic disks or disk packs are integral parts of a computing systems’ internal and rapid access memory (RAM) and will not be considered as an archival medium for electronic data. Only data processing shops regard such devices as storage units for long-term data. And the data processing definition of ‘archival’ is significantly different from the definition used by archivists. EDP specialists generally use the verb "archive" to indicate the removal of data from the active on-line environment to a storage or inactive environment.

In concluding the discussion of the physical forms and shapes of electronic records, it is necessary to mention the three principal types of electronic records by their functions and structures. This is important because the type of file and its access characteristics will have varied strategies for long-term preservation and reference.

The operational/program file contains sets of machine instructions which tell the CPU (central processing unit) how to deal with and manipulate input and output. An
example of this type of file is DOS for PCs or the application programs sold as dBase or WordPerfect.'

The database file is a collection of data elements assembled to document a similar phenomenon, population, etc., in relatively uniform file structures and composed of like data elements. Database files may be manipulated and reformatted to make certain correlations and relationships more evident. Thus, retaining database files in a machine-readable form, with the proper program, may allow interactive or intelligent inquiry that is highly desirable for the researcher.

There are two ways in which data files can be prepared for archival storage. Data files may be left in software-dependent form and placed in archives along with the version of the software used to structure and manipulate the data files and all supporting documentation. The other alternative, which is somewhat more practical, yet requires more effort to access, is to store the files in a software-independent format, also known as blocked or flat files. These files can either be reconverted to software dependence with programming expertise or may be used in flat form with several statistical analysis packages in wide use. The best known of these packages is SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) available for both mainframes and PCs. The PC-based Statistical Analysis Package (SAS/PC) is growing in popularity. These programs work with flat files in either ASCII or EBCDIC

* dBase is a registered trade name owned by Ashton Tate Corporation; WordPerfect is a registered trade name owned by WordPerfect Corporation.
binary formats to restore a portion of an electronic file's interactive capabilities.

The text/document file contains documents created for reading and communications between humans. These documents are created in human-readable language and are stored by the computer in binary code on a magnetic storage device. This file structure is produced primarily by word processing software and electronic mail programs. It is also software dependent and files may be difficult to convert back into a hardware dependent format for use. These files are usually not used for intelligent inquiries; they are simply read, edited, and printed out, or transmitted for reading by others.

Using this information about the primary forms of electronic information storage and the basic types of file structures, it is possible to make some observations about appraising historical records that happen to be in machine-readable form. It is not possible to consider here the content or historical appraisal process. There are as many standards for appraising records for historical value as there are archivists. It is possible to look at some of the technical factors which affect the decision to accession

---

historically significant records that are in machine-readable form.\textsuperscript{8}

The physical and access peculiarities of electronic records do make them different from most other types of information formats in institutional archives and influence appraisal decisions. As previously mentioned, there are five general appraisal factors or considerations that may be useful in making appraisal and accessioning decisions about electronic records for an institutional repository. These technical considerations or inquiries will provide the appraisal archivist with direction in determining whether to discard, accession in machine-readable form, or reformat the records series into a more stable, human-readable form. Perhaps it is preferable to think of these appraisal considerations as inquiries which may have a practical affect upon a historical appraisal and accession judgment.

The first inquiry to make about an electronic records series is whether this particular form of the record constitutes the most complete version of the records series that is practical to obtain. This will require data processing knowledge and institutional experience in order to determine if this series exists as a part of another electronic system or exists in another output form, such as hard-copy printout or computer output microform (COM). If the electronic format is the only form of the record series

or the form which contains the most complete version of
critical historical information, then its preservation must
be seriously contemplated. If the most important part(s) of
the record series is duplicated or maintained in a more
stable format, then the preservation decision will largely
rest upon the anticipated type of use the record will receive
and the cost of preserving the records series in electronic
form.

The second inquiry the appraiser should make about
the series is whether it constitutes the most stable form of
the record available. Closely related to the question of
whether the electronic form constitutes the most complete
version of the records series is whether the series or similar
record series exist elsewhere in a more stable form such as
hard-copy printouts or COM. And, if more stable formats
exist, can these records be acquired or are they more likely
to be preserved (and available for use)?

The third inquiry relates to the question of whether the
electronic record series constitutes the most accessible form
of the series, once it is brought into the archives. In other
words, does this electronic record series represent the most
useful form of the record from the researcher’s point of
view? A knowledge of the file’s initial readability at the
time of appraisal and its probable future readability given
proper care is fundamental. In addition to investigating its
physical integrity, it is essential that the appraiser
ascertain whether the series will require the support of
such specialized or proprietary software and/or hardware
that at the time of accessioning or afterwards it will not be
readily accessible to users. Also, if the documentation of a
record series or support system taken into the archives is
not complete and clear, then the record series is in danger of losing all accessibility to potential researchers.

Certainly, it is understood that, if the electronic record series is not the most accessible of its alternative forms, then it will not likely be considered for accessioning. Alternatively, if the series in its machine-readable form is the most accessible record series that is available, but not very accessible at the time of appraisal, then series conversion to a more fixed, stable, and human-readable form should be considered prior to accessioning. It is, of course, more justifiable to have a record series that is accessible to users in a non-interactive and human-readable form than to provide to a potential user a format with limited or no accessibility in either human- or machine-readable form.

The fourth inquiry to be made about the electronic records series by the appraiser is whether its current format constitutes the most likely use of the information contained in the records series. More simply, is it more likely that the series will be needed in intelligent and interactive form or will as much or more use be made of the record series in a fixed or non-intelligent format? If the record series is likely to be used for statistical analysis through SPSS, SAS, or other statistical software applications, then as much of the records' value may lie in its format as in its specific content, and accessioning machine-readable formats will be most justifiable. If the records in the series are more likely to be accessed on a single-case basis, then an alternative and fixed format might be considered appropriate. To use the files in this
non-interactive way more closely resembles the use made of textual files than data base files.

It is also useful to remember that many if not most archival customers are trained in the liberal arts and not the methodologies and techniques of the social or mathematical sciences. Machine-readable formats may intimidate many traditional historical researchers, and they will not use series that they might have consulted if available in non-interactive, human-readable forms.

It is also critical to know if the information will have to be sanitized or bracketed before it can be accessed by the researcher. If sanitizing is required, this may not only affect the series's research value, but also the cost to provide reference service to the series in its machine-readable form. Sanitizing a data file will require the expertise of a data processing specialist and machine time. The need to sanitize a series may render the reformatting of a series and storage in a fixed form more economically justifiable than taking in a more flexible and interactive machine-readable form.

The fifth and final inquiry to be made about the electronic records series under consideration by the

---

9 Sanitizing or bracketing is a data processing term for eliminating specific data fields or data elements from a data base file. Data elements may either be removed from the data file or access to it may be simply prevented on the user's copy. This procedure allows researchers to utilize data bases for statistical analysis which would ordinarily be restricted to all researchers because of privacy rights or other legal restrictions.
The appraiser is if its current format constitutes the most cost effective and efficient form of the series that is available. This is perhaps the most cumbersome and the most often disregarded appraisal inquiry. In the case of machine-readable records, this may be one of the most important technical inquiries, as the preservation and access costs of such series can easily drain a small department's budget.

To ascertain a weight for this consideration, the archivist has to devote time to performing some cost calculations and making reference and use predictions for the electronic format and the alternative forms of the series. It is critical to know the annual cost of maintaining the series in electronic form. The cost simply to maintain proper environmental and storage conditions, rewind and recopy data on a scheduled and routine basis is not inconsequential; some authorities estimate the cost for a reel of half-inch computer tape at between eighteen and twenty-six cents per day. This cost must be weighed against the cost to reformat the records series and transfer it to more stable, human-readable, and, in the case of hard-copy printouts, more voluminous, form. COM may be more expensive to produce than paper printouts but will take up significantly less space in the stacks of the archives and probably last considerably longer. The cost to produce

---

10 These figures are derived from a paper presented by Walter Meyer zu Erpen of the British Columbia Archives and Records Service at a joint meeting of the Association of British Columbia Archivists and Northwest Archivists in Vancouver, BC, 27 April 1990.
and maintain alternative and more stable forms must be weighed against ongoing maintenance and recopying costs inherent in all machine-readable formats.

In addition to the cost considerations to store and maintain a series in an alternative form, it is important to estimate accurately whether anyone will use or be able to afford to use the series. The computer time and expertise necessary to use, and perhaps sanitize, the records in electronic form is a considerable cost to a potential user. While the cost to store machine-readable formats is not low, the cost to use intelligent records in an interactive manner is considerably more expensive. The cost to copy, sanitize, and process data files when the records series is composed of multiple tapes will relegate such research to researchers holding sizable research grants. The cost of processing such data is falling, but it is not now and will probably not be inconsequential in the near future. In some cases printouts and COM versions of electronic records series may be more accessible and widely available to users than the same record series in electronic form. However, the user's level of creativity and degree of sophistication of analysis may be significantly reduced by the loss of data filed in an interactive and intelligent form.

This article discusses only a few of the questions that are important in the archival and historical appraisal of records in electronic form. It was not intended to be exhaustive, conclusive, or all-inclusive, but merely to consider some issues of fundamental importance in appraising machine-readable records.

Only by examining the practical and ethical questions of reference access and program economics can a balanced
and practical program of electronic record preservation be achieved. Archivists have too often been intimidated by an alien and rapidly-changing technology and by the threat that in the future an increasing quantity of their holdings will be found on electronic formats.

The implication that archivists will be buried under an avalanche of electronic records and that they must be able to care for and provide access to mountainous quantities of this delicate format implies that a critical assumption has been made, a consideration that cannot be taken for granted. The assumption that archivists must accession or anticipate accessioning massive quantities of such exotica as machine-readable records into institutional archives cannot be accepted as axiomatic.

An essential step in determining the proper archival role of machine-readable formats is to determine if archivists can in reality provide them with the storage environments and care which will allow a maximum and a productive life and simultaneously provide potential users with adequate access. This decision is critical and must be evaluated with a full knowledge of the budgetary, technical, and ethical consequences it entails. Archivists and curators must first address the factors inherent in appraising electronic records before accessioning and dedicating themselves and their resources to caring for and feeding these creatures once they are added to the growing archival menagerie.

Michael E. Holland is university archivist at Oregon State University. This article is adapted from a paper given at a meeting of the Society of Southwest Archivists in Austin, Texas, 17 May 1990. The author would
like to thank the Budgets and Institutional Planning Office of Oregon State University for supporting the work involved in delivering this paper to the Society of Southwest Archivists and its subsequent adaption for publication.
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Archives at the University of Oxford

Ned L. Irwin

Access. Conservation. Records management. Limited resources. It is not surprising to find that archivists at the University of Oxford are confronted by many of the same issues as their counterparts in the States. In some cases, the issues are intensified in a way not known in America. With records dating into the twelfth century housed often
in equally ancient buildings, the management of archives at Oxford proves formidable. ¹

A "boom"² of sorts in archives and the modernizing of archival management appears in full swing throughout Oxford at present. Trinity College opened its new archives in May 1989. Colleges, St. John's being the most recent, are emphasizing the need to engage a professional archivist. Other colleges, having outgrown library space or original archives room space, are seeking additional housing wherever it can be found. New College has begun plans to construct archives storage space within the bell tower of its chapel.³

The need for records management as the first phase of an archival program is being recognized. A consultant recently completed an examination of the records management need of the entire university. It is highly possible that in the near future a records management component will be implemented to complement the university's archival program. This will help prevent the maintenance of non-permanent records which has probably happened in the past, increasing the storage problem.

¹ The author expresses his thanks for assistance in his research at Oxford to W. H. Clennell and Stephen Tomlinson of the Bodleian Library; Mrs. Elizabeth Boardman, Brasenose College; Mrs. Caroline Dalton, New College; and Dennis Porter, Manchester College.


An implication in this rise of archival interest is that problems long neglected in the management of Oxford archives are being addressed. This follows centuries of growth in records and the peculiar aspects of their control.

Unlike American universities where colleges are usually mere administrative units of the school, Oxford's some forty colleges largely manage their own affairs. So it must be noted that when speaking of Oxford archives one is speaking of two distinct sets of records.

While Paul Morgan notes sizable archival holdings for twenty-seven colleges, each college has its archives. Many have histories and house records preceding Columbus's discovery of the New World. Most of the early records in the college archives are concerned with property rights, which provided either direct income or protected such income. For example, Merton College's archives contains a license from Edward II dated 1331.

Records began to accumulate early on, the earliest storage of the university archives being elusive. Reginald Poole suggests records were kept in a chest in the congregation house in St. Mary the Virgin, the university church built about 1320. The site is across from the present day Radcliffe Camera.

---


The early university chests had multi-key locks for security. Locks were usually of a four or five key type. The university chancellor held a key, as did selected heads of colleges. This arrangement did not encourage widespread or frequent use of the records. (A situation which no doubt aided in their long-term preservation.) The early emphasis was not on access (since for security and fire risk reasons most records were kept in thick-walled, difficult-to-reach tower rooms), but on storage. This emphasis has largely prevailed very nearly up until today. It helps explain one of the problems now being addressed—making records readily accessible to researchers through the creation of guides or a union catalogue.

In 1634 a university statute was approved which created the position of keeper of the archives in an early attempt to centralize control of the university records. In theory this should have promoted access and use since only one person would have to be contacted to obtain records. However, beginning with the first archivist, Brian Twyne, a fellow of Christ Church College, the pattern of electing a college fellow to head the university archives developed and continues to this day.7

Because fellows have teaching responsibilities, they have usually been forced to limit the time and effort given to archival work. This has led to another characteristic problem, what one might call the benevolent neglect of

---

7 The current keeper of the archives is Jeffery Hackney, law tutor and fellow of Wadham College, who does, in fact, have some prior archival experience.
archival management inherent in having people in charge of records whose principal occupation was not maintaining records.

The same can be said in general about the colleges, whose archives are usually administered under the auspices of its library, the librarian usually being a fellow of the college. At New College, for instance, the archives are in the custody of the college librarian, who is also the keeper of the college archives. The actual management is left to a professional archivist. This is not always the case. At Hertford College the archives are in the custody of the college bursar.

A sub-librarian, who generally is professionally trained, is often appointed to manage the library’s normal operations. If there is no college archivist, this function is often filled as well by the sub-librarian or a designated assistant. 8

A certain pattern of change is discernible in recent developments. Colleges have begun to hire a professional archivist from outside the institution on a part-time basis to study and advise college administrators on what direction should be taken in regard to their records. This may close the long period of "benevolent neglect" noted above. Many of these colleges are discovering that the mass of records will be an enormous undertaking. Thus

8 Morgan’s book notes sixteen colleges where the librarian is in charge of the archives. Other colleges cited are headed by either archivists (nine), bursars (four), or other college officers (three).
some of these part-time advisors are becoming full-time archivists.\textsuperscript{9}

Today the university archives are supervised by the keeper of the archives, who is assisted by a deputy keeper. This deputy is always a member of the Bodleian staff because much of the archives space is located in buildings of the Bodleian Library.\textsuperscript{10} The deputy keeper acts as a liaison between archives and library. Day-to-day management is the responsibility of a full-time professional archivist and an archival assistant.

As is often true in archives, much of the staff's actual working time is taken up with "housekeeping duties," such as checking climate controls and retrieving records. This limits time for the processing and cataloging of material or for long-range planning.

Access to most college archives is available to any researcher with a legitimate purpose, and those of the university are generally available to researchers under the guidelines for using the Bodleian Library facilities. Whoever tries to do research in the college archives faces a problem. There are few archives with any thorough catalogue or guide to the material available. No union

\textsuperscript{9} Caroline Dalton's career at New College is a good example. Beginning as a part-time consultant, over a period of two years she became the college's full-time archivist.

\textsuperscript{10} The current deputy keeper, Stephen Tomlinson, is a member of the Bodleian Library's Department of Western Manuscripts.
catalogue exists for the archives at Oxford. What efforts have been made by archivists over the years depended largely not only on their training but upon personal interests and whims. Catalogues exist for most collections (chiefly from the last century). These are updated to an extent in certain colleges by card indices or supplemental access aids.

The university archives includes financial and administrative records of the university vice-chancellor’s office (Oxford’s chief administrator); of the university chest (treasury); surveys, deeds, and other legal documents related to the university’s holdings; graduation records, etc. The types of records housed in the colleges are similar, being concerned with the college’s governance, its financial development, its academic functions, and its domestic arrangements. These records can be arranged into several general series and into sub-series by office or function under the series heading. Series would include 1) government of the college, 2) financial records, 3) academic records, 4) domestic records, 5) social records, 6) external records (those dealing with outside institutions such as the university), 7) personal papers, and 8) miscellaneous records and artifacts.

Poor planning has also created the necessity of scattered records storage. For instance, the university’s archives are currently housed in the two tower rooms of the Bodleian Library’s Tower of the Five Architectures (the upper room also providing archival work space), in two basement rooms of the Faculty of History Library across the street, and in cellar rooms in a building on High Street. This "scattering" does not promote use of records.
Storage is varied. It is possible to follow the whole history of conservation methodology in Oxford's storerooms. Records may be housed in tower rooms such as those of the university in the original wooden cabinets, or as at Brasenose, in a great wooden chest built in situ in 1509. Envelopes lie in both glass-covered drawers and acid-free folders. More recent records are being stored in acid-free boxes. These are custom-made and purchased through the conservation department of the Bodleian. Movable, high-density storage shelving holds much of the material located in the Faculty of History Library facility. Large conservation retroconversion projects to rehouse older records present daunting tasks for present and future college archivists.

Attempts are being made to provide optimum climatic conditions in regard to temperature and humidity levels. In the tower rooms this is fairly easily controlled. Basement rooms, such as those in the history library prove more difficult. These rooms are located on either side of the building's boiler room, where temperature fluctuations are often acute.11

However, the ancient storage rooms have certain advantages not often realized. Climate is more nearly appropriate to current standards then more modern, unadapted rooms. The rooms are cool; there is little circulating air to dry out records; humidity levels approach acceptable levels; there is little exposure to light. The thick stone walls provide security. And the moderate English

climate is less extreme in temperature and humidity than is found in continental North America.

It can be said that the archives at Oxford are organic rather than synthetic in their development\textsuperscript{12}—their processing and management was not planned, but was developed as a necessity long after the fact of creation. The same could be said for most archives in the United States. Characteristic problems have developed from the inheritance of records generated over eight hundred years of "organic management" by the university and colleges at Oxford. The personal individuality of the early masters and students which made Oxford a seat of learning in the Middle Ages bred the individuality of the colleges. This helps explain why so little cooperation or coordination between archives has occurred.

The quality of archival management (usefulness of descriptive aids, storage facilities, arrangement or lack thereof, etc.) varies from one archives to another, and from those of the university's central administration. Individually, both the university archives and the college archives are attempting to develop a modern archival management system for their records. However, there remains little indication that the interaction between these archival institutions will increase in the near future.

Efforts of current and future archivists at Oxford are likely to provide solutions to many of the problems noted here. It will not be an easy task. They have inherited the

\textsuperscript{12} Because records have many of the qualities of living organisms (growth, age), it has usually been as an organic (pre-existing) entity that archivists have treated them.
common problems of the modern archives in the unique situation found at Oxford. The ancient nature of college buildings limits their usefulness for expansion or ease of access to it. The ancient nature of many records predates the concept of retention and disposition schedules which would have helped reduce the size of records needing permanent preservation. Cuts in government funding\textsuperscript{13} limit resources for archives. As in the United States there will be a need to increase funding from non-traditional, that is, private sources.

All of this will force Oxford archivists to be more imaginative in planning and more innovative in procedure, so as to make of the rich research material in their charge the "convenient form of artificial memory"\textsuperscript{14} the doyen of English archivists, Sir Hilary Jenkinson, saw as the purpose of archives.

Ned L. Irwin is special collections librarian and archivist at the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Bicentennial Library. While in England for a seminar about English libraries and librarianship co-sponsored by the Bodleian Library and the University of Oklahoma, he visited the archives at Oxford.

\textsuperscript{13} The University of Oxford, like all English universities, is in the midst of a five-year retrenchment in funding from the national government.

News Reels

The Archives of Appalachia has announced the donation of the Mary Barnicle-Tillman Cadle Collection, an important group of field recordings, on 23 October 1989. The late Mary Elizabeth Barnicle was one of a handful of early American folklorists who realized the importance of field recordings. A teacher at New York University for over thirty years, she eventually met and married Tillman Cadle, a miner/union organizer originally from Claiborne County, Tennessee. In the 1930s and 1940s, Barnicle and Cadle made hundreds of recordings in the Pineville, Kentucky, and Townsend, Tennessee, areas and also recorded the emerging luminaries of the New York folk scene when they lived in Greenwich Village in the 1940s.

The collection consists of over five hundred field recordings which include original recordings of such folk music legends as Leadbelly, Woody Guthrie, Sarah Ogan Gunning, Aunt Molly Jackson, Sonny Terry and Brownie
McGee, Jim Garland and others, as well as recordings of the Adams family—the first commercially recorded sacred harp singers. The great variety of expressive forms include Holiness Primitive Baptist services, ballads, dance music, sea shanties, Bahamian tales, tall tales from Appalachia, ghost stories, anecdotes, riddles, bawdy songs, and descriptions of labor activities.

For more information about the Mary Barnicle-Tillman Cadle Recordings or other materials in the archives’s collection, contact the Archives of Appalachia, Box 22, 450A, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee 37614, (615) 929-4338.

* * * * *

Tougaloo College has received a $108,000 two-year grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to process its major civil rights collection. The 1200 linear feet of materials include papers of Aaron Henry, Edwin King, Rims Barber, Fannie Lou Hamer, the Delta Ministry, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and other significant participants in the civil rights movement. Directing the project is Virgia Brocks-Shedd, Tougaloo Library Director, Tougaloo, Mississippi. Jo Ann Bomar, former special collections archivist at the Alabama Department of Archives and History, is senior project archivist.
The New York State Archives and Records Administration has issued "Basic Elements of Historical Records Programs," an eight page brochure that summarizes the guidelines and canons of good practice for the sound administration of a historical records program. The brochure divides the basic elements into two main categories: administrative and operational. The administrative category includes discussion of such essentials as a mission statement, adequate financial support, and secure storage facilities. The operational category encompasses the actual work of dealing with historical records and discusses five elements, including appraisal and selection of records, finding aids, and preservation.

Anyone interested in historical records programs will find useful information in this brochure. The information should be of particular importance to custodians of historical records programs who are interested in strengthening their programs to meet these guidelines. For trustees and resource allocators of historical records programs, this brochure will help them appreciate and understand the kinds of resources that should be invested in a soundly administered program.

Copies have been distributed to the state's historical records programs, local government historians, historical service agencies, library resource councils, public library systems, college libraries, and other state archives.

"Basic Elements of Historical Records Programs" may be used in conjunction with SARA's self-study manual, *Strengthening New York's Historical Records Programs: A Self-Study Guide* (Albany, 1989) which provides a more
detailed explanation of historical records program elements and a set of self-study questions for use by repositories in evaluating their own programs. Both the self-study guide and the brochure were printed with funds from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

Copies of "Basic Elements of Historical Records Programs" and Strengthening New York's Historical Records Programs may be obtained from SARA, 10A46 Cultural Education Center, Albany, NY 12230.

* * * * *

Now available from Brown University is the Research Guide to the Christine Dunlap Farnham Archives by Karen M. Lamoree. The guide analyzes and describes archival, manuscript and University Archives holdings in Special Collections at Brown for women's history research. More than one thousand collections are described in this illustrated, indexed reference tool. The holdings are especially strong in the areas of higher education, literary work, religious activities, philanthropy, clubs, employment, and reform movements. It is available for $35.00 ppd. from Brown University Archives, Box A, Providence, RI 02912.

* * * * *
The Documentary Heritage Program for Western New York helped to celebrate the second annual New York State Archives Week, 1-7 October 1990, by co-sponsoring a series of training workshops for administrators, curators, librarians, archivists, volunteers, and others who collect, care for, and use historical records that form part of the region's cultural resources. The workshops have been developed in support of the state archives's mandate for the Documentary Heritage Program: "to ensure the continued preservation, access and use of our state's documentary, cultural and informational resources." For more information about Archives Week in Western New York contact Heidi Ziemer, Regional Archivist, WNY Documentary Heritage Program, 180 Oak Street, Buffalo, New York 14203.
REVIEWS, CRITIQUES, AND
ANNOTATIONS


This is an excellent single-volume treatment of the ever-broadening range of archival functions and activities in the United States for both beginner and experienced archivist. According to Frank B. Evans in his foreword to the book, Managing Archives and Archival Institutions takes the place so long held by Theodore R. Shellenberg's Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956). By today's standards, Shellenberg's archival world is a very limited one, not only smaller but also concerned primarily with public records in paper form. Managing Archives and Archival Institutions provides a larger view of the archival scene, including manuscripts and new media and technological
developments as well as a concern for professional development, outreach, and effective management.

*Managing Archives and Archival Institutions* is presented as a "handbook," one which is "broad enough to apply to all types of archival institutions and custodians of archival materials" and also "general enough to be useful to records and information managers, historians, librarians, and anyone with an interest in archival materials." In keeping with this objective, the editor, James Gregory Bradsher, has concentrated on major theories, principles and practices, issues, problems, and challenges.

The volume succeeds quite well in fulfilling its stated purpose. It is a good one-volume endeavor and concern. The chapters are almost all uniformly well done and fit well together, though they are designed to be read separately. All are well indexed, facilitating the identification of certain subjects in more than one chapter (for example, there is coverage of magnetic media in the chapters on audiovisual archives and security as well as in the one on machine-readable archives). Complementing the chapters (which are footnoted sparsely, if at all) is a list of sources for further reading which is arranged by chapter topic, with an average of about fifteen to twenty entries for each one. All of these elements make *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions* a very useful resource.

The volume starts out with an excellent brief introduction to archives and is followed by a history of archives administration from ancient times to present day. Succeeding chapters cover the relationship between archivists and records management; records appraisal and
disposition; arrangement and description; the management of different kinds of archival material—personal papers, cartographic and architectural archives, audiovisual archives, machine-readable archives, and oral history records; new automation techniques; reference service and access; ethics; preservation; security; public programs; exhibits; management; and effectiveness. This is certainly significant coverage of archives administration. Deliberately left out, however, because of space limitations, are such topics as printed archives, reprography, and buildings and supplies. Because the emphasis of the volume is modern archives, specialty areas such as paleography, diplomatics, chronology, and toponymics also are not covered.

Of the eighteen contributors to this volume, twelve are on the staff of the National Archives and Administration. The others are from a variety of other institutions: New York State Archives, Catholic University’s School of Library and Information Science, the United States Senate Historical Office, the National Gallery of Art, the John F. Kennedy Library, and the Smithsonian Institution. One is an archival consultant.

While it is perhaps possible to find fault with the contributors’ being so overwhelmingly from NARA and other federal institutions, the volume does not really suffer from any significant limitations as a result. To the contrary, most of the topics are treated from a very open and broad-based perspective, rather than "this is the way we do it at the National Archives." The broad range of
coverage may mean, however, that those in some smaller or specialized repositories may not find the volume entirely to their liking. And some specialists will undoubtedly take issue with some of the viewpoints or techniques recommended. This is to be expected in a volume such as this. A more serious shortcoming, however, is the lack of any illustrative material such as photographs and forms or of references to case studies or "real-life" situations and examples. These would certainly make the presentations considerably more attractive and useful (though also requiring another volume and additional cost as well). Considering the volume as a whole, however, archival educators and their students, resource allocators, archival administrators, and beginning and experienced archivists seeking information on the field and recent developments will be pleased with this publication.

Of special note regarding the topics covered is the emphasis on archives administration as a complex, dynamic, and evolving field. In addition to identifying, arranging, describing, protecting, and preserving archival materials, archivists must also be concerned that those materials be used, that the wider world is made aware of their purpose, value, and usefulness. To ensure that all of this dissemination is successful, the final two chapters deal quite well, if briefly, with two subjects that have recently become of more widespread concern in the profession: archival management (including planning and reporting, management and measurement, budget, and personnel) and archival effectiveness (planning, organizing, leading, controlling).
While the volume does not cover the entire gamut of archival activity, it does, as stated earlier, cover all the major areas of concern in this country. With this in mind, *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions* bears a favorable comparison with another very useful recent one-volume treatment, Ann Pederson, ed., *Keeping Archives* (Sidney: Australian Society of Archivists, Inc., 1987). While *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions* lacks the basic, practical how-to approach of *Keeping Archives* (along with its fine illustrations and examples), it is nevertheless more comprehensive in its coverage, especially in the areas of archival background, nontextual media, technological developments, and management issues. It also speaks more directly to archival functions and activities in this country. Given the nature and pace of change in archives administration, it is impossible to predict how long *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions* will enjoy its eminence as the successor to Shellenberg's *Modern Archives*. For now, however, it should be in the hands of every serious and aspiring archivist.

Roy H. Tryon
South Carolina Department of Archives and History

When the National Archives was first organized in 1934, the early employees recognized the importance of getting control of documents as soon as possible after their creation. They knew from experience the problems neglect could create. Horror stories abound of the deplorable storage conditions afforded the nation's most valuable documents up to that time and of the loss to our heritage because significant portions of the early records of our republic did not survive this lack of care.

As the documents that remained were found and brought into the archives, it was discovered that a great quantity of material had survived, in fact, so much that the new archives building—meant to last decades into the future—was quickly filling up. The problem was not the quantity, but the quality. A significant portion of what had been lost was the valuable documentation needed to write the history of the United States, while some of what was saved was not nearly as significant.¹ And not long after

¹ Decisions as to what is "historically significant" can be debated for years, and the author would be loath to argue that the documents saved are not significant. Yet few would argue that the journal of the First Continental Congress is less historically significant than the stamp sales reports of the postmaster of Bent Elbow, West Virginia, for the years 1933–35.
this problem surfaced, the United States entered World War II. The need for additional office space impelled many formerly reticent agencies to "dump" on the National Archives huge quantities from their files. The haste enforced by war meant there was no time to sort and dispose of unwanted material, and soon the wartime agencies took much of the experienced talent from the National Archives, further compounding the problem. A backlog of processing developed from which the National Archives has not recovered to this day.

While working for the various services during the war, former National Archives employees began to develop the fundamentals of records management. The concept was simple: if a determination of what was historically valuable could be made at the time of creation, if a decision could be made on how long the rest of the materials needed to be kept, then the result would be beneficial to all. The archives would automatically get the historically valuable materials, and great savings would be realized in office and file space by keeping other documents only as long as they were actually needed.

Following World War II many former employees returned to the National Archives and worked with the two Hoover Commissions to get this new concept, records management, accepted by the United States government as the standard. The National Archives formed a unit to assist agencies in evaluating their files and writing the schedules necessary to implement a records management program. One of the leading exponents of this new
approach, Robert Bahmer, became the fourth archivist of the United States. There was a general understanding of the need to work with the files from the moment of creation to ensure that proper documentation reached the archives and that the government operated efficiently.

Unfortunately, as that generation of archivists passed from the scene, their replacements began to stress more and more the savings government could realize from good records management practices and less and less the importance of the proper documentation of agency activities. As this change in emphasis developed, the two branches began to grow further and further apart. The net result was the development of two professions—archivists and records managers—and a growing estrangement between the two.

Thus it is significant that the Records Management Handbook for United States Senate Committees should be written by an archivist in the Senate Historical Office. Further, it is "U.S. Senate Bicentennial Publication #5"—part of a historical series, reinforcing the emphasis on the need to save the proper documentation of senate committees' activities for the historical record. This motivation primarily, rather than the efficiency of Senate operations, provides the impetus for this records management program.

Yet this handbook is neither an unreasoned harangue from the archives to save everything in sight nor a stab at records management by the uninformed, but a balanced, professional presentation that provides for not only permanent retention needs but also disposition and
sampling guidelines, instructions for filing and filing codes, indexes and standard topic or keyword lists, system documentation, and tips on effective ways to establish a viable program. It is written in common, nontechnical language that can be easily understood by secretaries with little or no records management experience. (This is important, because more often than not the secretary is the person who implements the records management program.) In short, it is a well-rounded document that provides adequate guidance to the user and establishes reasonable schedules for disposition of the records.²

One of the most interesting portions of this handbook is the attention paid to automated records. As is effectively pointed out, the successive drafts of legislation and committee reports are particularly important in later determination or legislative intent. Making changes easily is the nature of word processing, but it poses a difficulty for the retention of copies, as (depending on the system) the last copy, or the next to the last copy, is automatically erased. Unless something is done to preserve these successive copies, they will be lost forever, with the result

² No attempt has been made to evaluate the retention times in schedules or disposition instructions. These instructions seem generally sound, and there is every expectation that adequate documentation will survive without undue excess paper being saved overlong. Furthermore, these obviously are the result of a good deal of negotiation to reach this consensus. No one familiar with this process would consider criticizing such a product.
that future historians will be unable to trace the thought process that went into the final product, and who made which input.

The *Handbook* addresses this issue and calls for Senate committees to work with the archivist to establish ways to capture important changes in drafts of bills, reports, and statements. Users are advised how automated systems can be linked to traditional paper filing systems and the same criteria for retention and disposition applied. And the staff is advised to consult with the archivist to determine which medium (paper, microfilm, or tape) will be used for permanent storage.

While a laudable amount of attention has been paid to the question of automated systems, it might have been helpful to have a few more examples of how the capture of this information could be facilitated. Perhaps there simply has not been enough experience in this area to provide samples, but the balance of the *Handbook* has so many clear, concise, and easily understood exhibits that the reader almost feels cheated that there are not as many to provide guidance in this new and difficult area.

Dealing with individuals about their records is always a difficult task requiring tact, sensitivity, and diplomacy. If average people are difficult to deal with regarding their papers, one can imagine what the super-sensitive, highly political, pressure-packed world of the United States Senate is like. This handbook provides an excellent example of a workmanlike, straightforward, simple way to approach such a situation.
There are many things that can be learned from this publication. Records managers and archivists dealing with legislative bodies at all levels will find the common-sense approach helpful, and should be able to copy this approach. Manuscript repositories that hold papers of current or former United States senators ought to consult it to make certain they have not inadvertently received federal records along with the senators' materials. Historians and other researchers could profit by learning what documentation will and will not be available to them in the future from Senate committees. The appendixes provide excellent examples that can be copied profitably and a useful collection of federal laws and executive orders relating to records. And it is written well enough that it is enjoyable for the casual reader.

But the success or failure of this volume will be found in the archives of the United States Senate. If the Handbook does its job, historians of the future will have the documentation they need to write the history of United States Senate committees. If not, we will all be the poorer. I suspect the former will be the case.

Donald B. Schewe
Carter Presidential Library

Editor's note: See the Spring 1989 issue of Provenance for another review of the preceding publication.
Increasing the visibility and encouraging the research use of archives continues to be a major goal of the archival profession and should be, as well, an important goal for any individual archives. The second edition of *A Guide to the Records Relating to Winthrop College* should prove to be a useful tool in promoting and facilitating the understanding and use of this particular college archives.

Begun as the Winthrop Training School in Columbia, South Carolina, in 1886, the school became a women’s public educational institution of the state of South Carolina, moved to Rock Hill in 1895, and became fully coeducational in 1974. The first half-time Winthrop College archivist was appointed in 1962. A separate archives department under the direction of a full-time archivist was established in 1974. As with many colleges and universities, decades of record keeping preceded the appointment of an archivist or the establishment of an archives. The hard work of the Winthrop College Archives to locate, acquire, preserve, arrange, and describe the records of its parent institution is evident in the wide variety of records from throughout the institution’s long history listed in this guide.

A detailed table of contents gives an overview of the organization of the guide, while a foreword lays out its purpose, acknowledges and accounts for many of the gaps...
in the records, outlines the scope of what is and what is not included, and interprets notations and measurements used. The organization of records into record groups, subgroups, and series is explained in a brief but understandable narrative description that spares the general reader too much detail or archival jargon. While much information can be gotten directly from the guide entries, a useful foreword is especially important in a guide intended for such nonarchivists as students and researchers from outside the institution.

Retained in the second edition is the interesting introduction to the first edition written by the late Arnold Shankman, Winthrop faculty member and longtime archives supporter. Dr. Shankman acknowledges that the use of college and university archives is frequently limited to those writing institutional histories, to genealogists whose ancestors were prominent faculty or alumni, and to students writing term papers on "the way college life used to be." He encourages broader use of academic archives and cites for exploration in the Winthrop College Archives such potential research topics as pay parity for women professors and the history of the home demonstration movement. In his introduction to this second edition, college historian Ross Webb offers general comments on the history of the institution and of the archives.

Interesting photographs throughout the guide range from historical images of students in college uniforms to modern pictures of activities in the archives and library. Useful appendixes consist of three chronologies listing
campus buildings, events in the history of the school, and events in the history of the Winthrop College Archives. Information on collecting policies and regulations for use of the archives would have provided other useful information for appendixes.

The guide is attractively and consistently presented, making good use of boldface type, upper-and lower-case letters, and spacing on the page to facilitate both detailed reading and scanning. Brief narrative notes give an overview of each record group, subgroups are clearly differentiated, and series entries include dates, extent, and usually brief identifying information. While more information might be desired, especially about such materials as photographs which are only briefly listed as a series in the audiovisual materials record group, one assumes the existence of detailed finding aids which can be used once the research appetite has been whetted.

Name changes for buildings, administrative units, and organizations are noted, administrative reorganization is explained, and any restriction on access is included. As with most college and university archives, record groups are a combination of those truly defined by provenance (Office of the President, Office of the Provost, School of Home Economics) and those that are collective in nature, bringing together many like series that do not truly share a common provenance (Student Organizations, Special Collections, Faculty, Audiovisual Records).

A particularly helpful feature of the guide is the index, which includes entries for proper names of departments, offices, individuals, buildings, publications, and
organizations; topics such as coeducation, uniforms, history, home economics, library, songs, and the school mascot, the eagle; and forms of materials such as Christmas cards, post cards, films, and floor plans. Researchers wishing to find related administrative records or scattered records relating to a single topic will be well served by using this index as a starting point for their research.

While there is practically no cross-referencing among related entries in the guide, and descriptions of records in formats such as films, videotapes, and photographs are not fully integrated into the guide, this valuable intellectual linkage may be found in the index. Form access points may be the most limited, for these entries seem to be confined to those around which series defined by form of material are organized. There are, for example, no entries for "diaries" or "speeches," two types of material frequently sought in a college or university archives.

This guide has been simply produced, using camera-ready copy from a personal computer, black-and-white illustrations, and a paperbound format. While this process has diminished the quality of photographic reproduction, it has nonetheless resulted in an attractive and readable product that should be easy to update in future editions. Especially when used in conjunction with guides to the Winthrop College Special Collections listed at the back of this publication, this guide to the archives is indeed a valuable tool in the aggressive outreach program of the Department of Archives and Special Collections, and it
obviously serves an important public relations role for the archives as well. It could also serve as a useful model for an archives or small manuscript department considering its own publication of a guide to its holdings.

Virginia J. H. Cain
Emory University


The *National Register of Historic Places, 1966–1988* is the long-awaited joint effort of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (represented by one officer per state and territory), the National Park Service (NPS) which oversees the National Register Program within the Department of the Interior, and the American Association for State and Local History, which coordinated the publication. Except for a brief introduction about the National Register program, the book is essentially a data listing containing approximately three lines on each of the more than 52,000 National Register listings as of the end of 1988. Each entry includes the name of the property and its address or general location. No data as to age, description, or significance is given.
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The information is a cumulative listing taken from that published each year in the *Federal Register*. While it gives a state-by-state, county-by-county listing, the entries are too brief to give much information to the reader about such important features as historic districts or multiple property nominations. There is no index, so there is no way to determine just how many covered bridges or Carnegie libraries, for example, are recorded throughout the nation.

The National Register, created to be a national planning tool, will never be a finite list, but one to which new properties will be added each year. This is because properties become eligible once they are fifty years old; thus more properties become eligible each year. When the program started in 1966, only properties built before World War I were eligible; now many of those built during the New Deal era have become eligible.

The soft-cover book carries a hefty price for anyone wanting a current listing for only their area—the Georgia section covers just twenty-one pages, yet the book costs over ninety dollars including postage. While the book is actually the latest update in a series of similar publications done in the 1970s by the National Park Service, no mention is made of these previous printings.

The cover carries an attractive color photograph of Glebe House in Arlington, Virginia, without mentioning that is also the headquarters of the National Genealogical Society.

The seven-page introduction outlines the National Register program and explains how properties qualify. The
National Register criteria for evaluation are given, and each state historic preservation office is listed for those who wish to make inquiries for future listings or seek copies of the nomination forms for those mentioned within. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the introduction is the statistics taken from the "significance" areas of each nomination. These reveal that architecture is still the most often selected "area of significance," with seventy-seven percent of the approximately 52,000 listings being significant in that area.

The book does not mention that the original copies of the National Register forms have been microfiched and deposited at the National Archives. While some states may have made similar donations to their state archives, Georgia's complete National Register files remain within the Historic Preservation Section of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, which also has computerized data from NPS for all of its nominations giving more data than appears in this book. The National Register data is also on microfiche and available for purchase, as mentioned within the seven pages of advertisements accompanying the book.

All in all, the book will be a useful reference work for interested parties, especially librarians, to get an initial idea if something in their county is on the National Register. But because this list, like all printed lists, will go out of date fast, it is important to always check with the
state's historic preservation office to be sure of the latest listings or work in progress in their particular area.

Kenneth H. Thomas, Jr.
Georgia Department of Natural Resources

* * * * *

A Guide for the Selection and Development of Local Government Records Storage Facilities (NAGARA Local Government Records Technical Publication Series, No. 1), compiled by A. K. Johnson, Jr., is the first publication in a series planned to make available to local governments the basic principles, criteria, and considerations for establishing and carrying out a sound records management program. Published by the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators (NAGARA) in cooperation with the International Institute of Municipal Clerks and the National Association of Counties, the twenty-page, 8½-by-11-inch booklet defines local records, discusses the benefits of preserving them, and describes criteria for layout, shelving, temperature and humidity control, fire protection, security, and vaults for
records center buildings (as opposed to archival storage facilities).

The appendices include model floor plans, a shelving plan for a small government, a checklist for evaluating potential storage facilities, and a bibliography. The manual is available for $5 a copy from Jeff Jagnow, Council of State Governments, P.O. Box 11910, Lexington, KY 40578. Discounts are available for ten or more copies.

* * * * *

Managing Cartographic, Aerial, Photographic, Architectural, and Engineering Records is the latest instructional guide published by the National Archives and Records Administration. The forty-four-page guide contains information on the creation, maintenance, use, and disposition of such records and also on their identification, preservation, and transfer to the National Archives. The illustrated guide is well designed for easy reference. Its two appendixes are "Disposable Records" and a glossary. Copies are available from the Records Administration Information Center, National Archives and Records Administration, NIA, Washington, DC 20408 (FTS or 202-724-1471). There is no charge, but quantities may be limited.

* * * * *
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State Government Records Programs: A Proposed National Agenda (NAGARA Government Records Issues Series, No. 2) describes the importance of state government records, the need for strong programs to ensure their adequate and systematic management, and the essential elements of a nationwide agenda to strengthen those programs. The four-page paper defines general objectives and expectations, provides a basis for interstate cooperation, and is expected to stimulate further discussion with and action by organizations concerned with state government records management. For information on its availability, write Bruce W. Dearstyne, N.Y. State Archives and Records Administration, 10A46 Cultural Education Center, Albany, NY 12230.

* * * * *

Developing a Premier National Institution: A Report from the User Community to the National Archives, by Page Putnam Miller, represents the views of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, a consortium of over fifty historical, archival, political science, library, and genealogical organizations. Based on research over a ten-month period and interviews with over 200 users and archivists, the report conveys the NCC's concerns about the National Archives and is intended to
increase "informed and constructive communication between the users and supporters of the National Archives, the management of the National Archives, and the congressional committees and to promote . . . joint endeavors for determining future directions for the National Archives." For information on the report, write Dr. Miller, NCC, 400 A St., SE, Washington, DC 20003.

* * * * *

The winter 1990 issue of For the Record, the newsletter of the New York State Archives and Records Administration (SARA), is devoted to the annual report of the Documentary Heritage Program (DHP). Under DHP, aid is made available to the Reference and Research Library Resources Systems to provide advisory services to historical records programs in their regions. Because of limited first-year funding, aid was provided to three systems, Western New York, South Central, and METRO (New York City and Westchester County). METRO has issued Our Past Before Us: A Five-Year Regional Plan for METRO's Archives and Historical Records Program, by Phyllis A. Klein. Strengthening New York's Historical Records Programs: A Self-Study Guide is designed to be used by governing boards, directors, staff members (paid and unpaid), and supporters of the state's historical records programs. Basic Elements of Historical Records Programs is an eight-page brochure that summarizes the guidelines
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and canons of good practice for the sound administration of a historical records program, dividing the basic elements into administrative and operational categories. Information on all the above publications is available from SARA, 10A46 Cultural Education Center, Albany, NY 12230.
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