Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists

Volume 6 | Number 2 Article 2

January 1988

Fund Raising for Historical Records Programs: An Underdeveloped Archival Function

Richard J. Cox
University of Pittsburgh

Fund Raising for Historical Records Programs: An Underdeveloped Archival Function[1]

Richard J. Cox

The scenario is a familiar one, recounted numerous times at gatherings of archivists and sometimes taking on mythological

---

[1] The views in this essay are drawn from the author's experience as project archivist for the New York Historical Records Program Development Project, funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) and operating out of the New York State Archives and Records Administration from 1986 to 1988. Part of this project was devoted to improving the financial resource development capability of the Empire State's historical records programs and included interviews with resource allocators, workshops on fund raising, and the preparation of a section on fund raising in a self-study manual for administering historical records programs to be published by the state archives in 1989. Many of the ideas in this essay were drawn from working with Judy Hohmann, an individual with fund-raising consultation experience and who drafted most of the material on fund raising in the self-study guide. For more information about fund raising for historical records programs, refer to section three of *Strengthening New York's Historical Records Programs: A Self-study Guide* (Albany: New York State Archives and Records Administration, 1989). This essay represents the author's views and not those of the New York State Archives and Records Administration.

PROVENANCE, Vol. VI, No. 2, Fall 1988

proportions. An archivist eagerly assumes a new position, excited by the anticipation of a new challenge, the interesting records under his or her care, the prospects of new and more significant acquisitions, the endless possibilities of research use, and the promises of support for building a strong historical records program.[2] The eagerness turns to discouragement and sometimes disillusionment as the promised support is actually revealed. There are no resources for new staff, the "increased" funds for supplies and equipment are inadequate for any real improved maintenance of the historical records, other money-burning problems--such as major design and construction flaws in the repository's building--suddenly appear, and there are threats to divert funds from the historical records program to other "more important" functions of the institution. The "promising" historical records program becomes but another example of the underdeveloped and underfunded operations that archivists have pessimistically and consistently described throughout the 1980s.[3]

There are, of course, at least two ways that archivists caught in this situation can assess their position and take action. This

---

[2] The emphasis of this paper is on programs such as historical societies, local public libraries with historical records holdings, college and university special collections units that acquire historical records, and the like. Although many of these programs are government supported, they are also generally encouraged to seek additional external funding support. This paper is not addressing the needs of federal, state, and local government records programs or other institutional records operations, such as business archives, that must concentrate on winning support from their own parent agency.

[3] The greatest source of information on the condition of America's historical records programs has been the final published reports of the state assessment and reporting projects, conducted from 1982 to 1986, and partially summarized in Lisa Weber, ed., *Documenting America: Assessing the Condition of Historical Records in the States* ([Albany]: National Association of State Archives and Records Administrators in cooperation with the NHPRC, [1984]).

takes no deep insight to figure out, for it requires little more than determining whether the proverbial glass is half empty or half full.

A not uncommon approach is a sort of paralyzing discouragement that causes the archivist to leave the repository or to focus inwardly on other important functions that can be accomplished without significant new infusions of monies. The archivist, and his or her staff, may even become "valued" members of the institution if they follow that latter route, but not in a way they hoped or intended. They are perceived to be hardworking staff who can make important contributions with very little financial or other support, although they are often "out of sight, out of mind," seem to "hark to the past and seem passive and stored compared to more current, ongoing, aggressive demands on the budget," and "lack political clout."[4] The archival staff may be treated respectfully, but their program has little hope of advancing with a modicum of resources or without demonstrated comprehension by institutional administrators and resource allocators of the nature and importance of the historical records function.

Another approach is the one in which the archival profession needs more successes. Archivists see the situation as a challenge to be faced with imagination, hard work, and devotion to tasks not normally associated with historical records administration. Their focus is shifted to capturing the attention of those who control and allocate financial resources, both within their own institutions and from external sources, in a way that will gain the support necessary to build a solid program enabling the effective management, preservation, and use of the historical records holdings. The archivist adopts a holistic view in which functions such as public programming, outreach, advocacy, and fund raising--the latter activity being dependent on the effectiveness of the former functions--are properly connected to the more basic archival endeavors of appraisal, arrangement, description, preservation, and

---

[4] See the summary of research carried out by Sidney J. Levy and Social Research Inc. on the attitudes of resource allocators toward archives and archivists in the Society of American Archivists (SAA) *Newsletter*, August 1985: 5-7.

reference. And most importantly, perhaps, the archivist views the acquisition of outside funding as always secondary to winning financial support from within the institution of which the historical records program is one part. Archivists should not seek to substitute efforts of winning internal support by raising funds externally, and, in fact, programs that fail to have strong internal support will likely fail at external fund raising.[5]

The archival profession has already begun to address its lack of success at building first-rate, well-funded historical records programs, primarily by acknowledging that activities such as publicity and fund raising are crucial and need to be fitted into an overall program design. The Society of American Archivists's (SAA) recent report on archival goals and priorities stated that "few archivists receive any training in administration, planning, fund raising, or public relations. If there is to be enlarged public support and financial resources, the training and skill of archivists as managers must be improved."[6] Such awareness, on the part of at least a portion of the profession, has led to increasing attention on archival image and societal worth,[7] efforts to define and track

---

[5] This is because fund raising is dependent on *strong* governing board support and effort, from being involved in self-study that leads to plans that identify funding priorities to soliciting from private sector sources the necessary funds. For an interesting recent essay on working to gain increased internal support, see Harley P. Holden, "Athens and Sparta: The Archivist and Resource Allocators," *Provenance* 5 (Fall 1987): 37-46.

[6] *Planning for the Archival Profession: A Report of the SAA Task Force on Goals and Priorities* (Chicago: SAA, 1986), 18.

[7] David B Gracy, II, "Our Future is Now," *American Archivist* 48 (Winter 1985): 12-21, and "What's Your Totem? Archival Images in the Public Mind," *Midwestern Archivist* 10 (1985): 17-23.

the values and significance of use of historical records,[8] and some descriptions of means by which to acquire additional financial resources.[9] But, at best, such attention by archivists is in a nascent stage, and the profession needs more tools, analysis, and guidance. This is especially true with fund raising, both in conceiving and carrying out this function.

Archivists' misconceptions have influenced, often adversely, their acquisition of funding. The archival profession's primary focus on raising funds has been in the public sector, mainly the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) and the various programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Preoccupation may be a better term than focus, since many archivists seem to think only about these programs when seeking external funding, despite their limited availability, duration of support, restricted uses of funds, and the intense national competition for the awarding of grants. The two million dollars available for records grants from the NHPRC will barely begin to meet the needs of New York state's two thousand or more repositories, let alone the thousands of other repositories scattered through every state in the nation. The problem of the limited funds significantly weakens the potential value of the public sector

---

[8] Elsie T. Freeman, "In the Eye of the Beholder: Archives Administration from the User's Point of View," *American Archivist* 47 (Spring 1984): 111-23; William L. Joyce, "Archivists and Research Use," *American Archivist* 47 (Spring 1984): 124-33; Paul Conway, "Facts and Frameworks: An Approach to Studying the Users of Archives," *American Archivist* 49 (Fall 1986): 393-407; Bruce W. Dearstyne, "What is the Use of Archives? A Challenge for the Profession," *American Archivist* 50 (Winter 1987): 76-87; and David B. Gracy, II "Is There a Future in the Use of Archives? *Archivaria* 24 (Summer 1987): 3-9.

[9] Examples include Timothy Walch, "The Archivist's Search for Grant Fundings," *Provenance* 1 (Spring 1983): 71-79; Jeffrey Field, "The Impact of Federal Funding on Archival Management in the United States," *Midwestern Archivist* 7 (1982): 77-86; and Charles F. Downs, II, "Sources of Funds to Meet NHPRC Matching Grants," *American Archivist* 42 (October 1979): 466-68.

grants and, thereby, the opportunity for professional staff to contribute to the financial base of their programs and to gain funds that provide a catalyst for continued program development.[10] The point is really very simple: archivists must correct some common misconceptions they have had about the nature of fund raising and tap private sector sources of funding in order to ensure that America's documentary heritage is adequately preserved.

In addition to conceiving of fund raising primarily as writing grants to public funding agencies, what are the other major misconceptions by archivists about fund raising? First, archivists tend to approach fund raising as another research oriented activity rather than an advocacy effort. Archivists seem to want to do research in foundation indexes or study how-to books rather than do what needs to be done, communicating to and winning over a large portion of the public about the values of historical records and the programs that care for them. Research is very important for fund raising. But, presentations on fund raising at conferences and meetings often are little more than lessons in public agency grant writing or introductions to references such as published foundation indexes, valuable for those who have had no exposure

---

[10] This statement is not meant to imply that the NHPRC and NEH programs are unimportant sources of support for the archival profession and an important part of the effort to preserve America's documentary heritage. Indeed, in some areas--such as NHPRC and local government records programs--these funding agencies have provided crucial leadership. What is being suggested is that these funding sources are not adequate to provide anywhere near the assistance required by this country's historical records programs. Such public funding agencies will have to become more cautious in their allocation of funds, seeking projects that promise to create tools or conduct research that benefit the broader historical records community. This probably requires providing less and less support for the basic functions of state and local historical records repositories, even if the funding levels of NHPRC and NEH are significantly increased. The probable decrease of monies here makes it even more important for archivists to determine alternative sources of funding.

to such activities and references, yet barely scratching the surface of the dynamic nature of effective fund raising.[11]

Second, archivists often take it for granted that what they do is important and assume that all society should think the same way. Successful fund raising is dependent on the public understanding something about the archival mission and why historical records are worth preserving. This requires significant planning, effort, and patience.[12] Historical records repositories likely to have the most success in fund raising are those well known in their community with clear missions and publicity and other materials demonstrating that these missions are being taken seriously. Institutions that do not possess a community profile and the instruments necessary for building such a profile will face a lot of "catch-up" work in readying for fund-raising initiatives.

The third misconception is that there are "magic" formulas for fund raising, rather than hard work and commitment to the resource development function that will bring in funding. Resource development is just as serious a responsibility as any other aspect of archival management. Archival administrators who contend that they do not have the time for such work because of processing backlogs or reference demands will need to reevaluate their priorities. Investing in public outreach and in developing a stronger profile of the historical records program within its larger

---

[11] Research in such indexes is even more problematic since such sources generally describe only larger foundations and funding sources that are generally unavailable to the majority of historical records programs and are not easily indexed for effective use by archivists since there are so few grants for archival work.

[12] An informal 1986 survey of private sector donors in the region around Albany, New York revealed that such donors had not supported historical records programs because they had not been asked to contribute and because the donors lack understanding of what historical records programs are about or their value. Successful examples of fund raising were for museums and historical societies that had raised funds for their facilities and had not used their historical records holdings as a major argument for such fund raising.

institutional setting, with an aim toward enlarging the program's base of support, seems the better investment over the long haul. Although there may be temporary frustrations because of shortfalls in efforts to keep pace with the more traditional archival activities, historical records programs may eventually gain the resources necessary to resolve many of these constant backlogs of work and the expensive efforts to preserve and manage their fragile holdings. One archival manager has predicted that the need in this area will be addressed and resolved in the future:

> There will be a gradual diminution in the perception that there is a conflict between being a professional archivist and being a manager or program developer, or that becoming an effective program developer implies leaving the archival community. Building program development skills [program planning, advocacy, communication, basic management, and leadership skills], and thereby stronger archival programs, can lead to the more tangible rewards that will retain competent archivists in archival programs.[13]

Finally, archivists seem to have ignored the largest source of prospective funds, the private sector. The private sector encompasses individuals, businesses and corporations, and foundations on local, state, and national levels, and accounts for billions of dollars in contributions to worthy causes.[14] These individuals and institutions only remain to be convinced that historical records are worthy of support. Doing this convincing may require a reconfiguration of how many archivists spend their time, but no

---

[13] Larry J. Hackman, "Toward the Year 2000," *Public Historian* 8 (Summer 1986): 95.

[14] For more information on patterns of giving in the United States refer to the annual report of the American Association of Fund-raising Counsel. *Giving USA Annual Report 1987* reports that $87.22 billion dollars were contributed to nonprofit programs. Over eighty percent of this money came from individuals.

archivists would suggest that their records are not worthy of such support.

Although convincing individuals and other funding sources that they should part with their money for the benefit of historical records requires hard work and excellent interpersonal skills, there are some basic principles for fund raising that largely determine whether a historical records program will be successful in this area. What follows has been gleaned from a variety of manuals by fund-raising experts, advice from a fund-raising consultant, and experience in adapting this information for use in fund-raising workshops for historical records programs held in New York.[15] The principles and fund-raising steps described present only the opinions of one archivist who worked with an individual experienced in fund-raising consultation. They need to be tested by historical records programs and reported back to the profession in case studies of successes and failures in building financial support for these programs. Then the profession will not only have stronger programs but possess tools that can be used effectively in building operations to manage the nation's documentary heritage.

Principle One: *The historical records program should understand its own business and needs before ever seeking monies from the outside*. Successful fund raising is dependent on the historical records program governing board and staff knowing the program's mission, long-term goals and objectives, and needs. Funds should be raised to meet priorities; priorities should not be dictated by

---

[15] There is a vast literature on this subject, but the following publications will provide a good start: Thomas E. Broce, *Fund-raising: The Guide to Raising Money from Private Sources* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979); Joan Flanagan, *The Grass Roots Fund Raising Book* (Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1984); Mellon Bank Corporation, *Discover Total Resources* (Pittsburgh: Mellon Bank Corporation, 1986); Frank Setterberg and Kary Schulman, *Beyond Profit: The Complete Guide to Managing the Nonprofit Organization* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985); and Paul Schneiter, *The Art of Asking* (Amber, PA: Fund Raising Institute, 1985). Individuals interested in additional publications on fund raising should contact the Foundation Center, a nationwide organization headquartered in New York City which also has many branch libraries throughout the country.

funding opportunities. Letting this occur can produce a malformed and weak program, one with lots of activity (some of it even good activity) that is not directed to any specific purpose or with any measurable result. Seemingly prosperous programs can exist that are seriously neglecting, or at least not gaining the necessary resources for, the management and preservation of their historical records holdings.[16]

Historical records program governing boards and staffs considering embarking on a fund-raising campaign or establishing fund raising as an ongoing function should conduct some self-evaluation that results in a long-range plan for the development of the program and, at the least, results in a solid mission statement. The archival institution should be measured against existing professional practices in the areas of identification and retention of historical records, preservation, availability and use of historical records, and public programs and advocacy.[17] Going through such

---

[16] The necessity of carefully using the financial resources available to a historical records program is partly a factor of the immense resources needed for managing and preserving the materials of the documentary heritage. For a disturbing assessment of this, see Howard Lowell, *Preservation Needs in State Archives* (Albany: National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators, February 1986).

[17] Although the modern archival profession has a way to go in terms of developing standards in many of these basic areas, there nevertheless exist many solid descriptions of practice that represent for most repositories, especially small local programs, admirable targets that would considerably strengthen their operation. Moreover, there are important activities underway that are moving the profession toward better articulated standards, such as the use of automated bibliographic systems and the US MARC Archives and Manuscripts Format for description of historical records. See Steven L. Hensen, "The Use of Standards in the Application of the AMC Format," *American Archivist* 49 (Winter 1986): 31-40 and *Toward Descriptive Standards: Reports and Recommendations of the Canadian Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards* (Ottawa: Bureau of Canadian Archivists, December 1985).

a process, employing any of the many institutional planning methods that have been well-developed and described by public administration experts,[18] should enable the identification of program priorities for development and funding. It should be a logical step, knowing these priorities and needs, to identify prospective funding sources (both public and private)[19] to strengthen the historical records program and to help it meet its mission.

Principle Two: *A historical records program must have support from its governing board and/or parent agency before embarking on a fund-raising effort.* Governing board members, resource allocators, and key administrative staff (such as an executive director) must always take responsibility to start and aid a continuing fund-raising initiative. Successful fund raising is dependent upon strong support from governing boards, especially in terms of both financial support and in seeking such support. Fund-raising experts consistently suggest that the chances of successful fund raising are severely diminished when there is no financial giving from governing board members and unless board

---

[18] There are a number of publications that archivists could consult that would provide some background in this area and that cite some of the other voluminous literature on this subject. A good starting point is Suzanne B. Schell, "Institutional Master Planning for Historical Organizations and Museums," American Association for State and Local History *Technical Report* II (1986). Other useful articles are Bruce W. Dearstyne, "Planning for Archival Programs: An Introduction," Mid-Atlantic Region Archives Conference *Technical Leaflet* 3 (1984) and Liisa Fagerlund, "Performance Planning for the Portland Program," *Georgia Archive* 10 (Fall 1982): 60-70. Volumes specifically designed to enable historical records programs to conduct self-assessments are the Society of American Archivists, *Evaluation of Archival Institutions: Services, Principles, and Guide to Self Study* (Chicago: SAA, 1982) and the more recent *Strengthening New York's Historical Records Programs.*

[19] Despite this essay's emphasis on private sector funding, historical records program governing board and staff members should bear in mind that some programmatic priorities might be best met by preparing a proposal for a short-term project from some source such as the NHPRC and NEH.

members take the active lead in seeking out and nurturing financial donors.[20] Historical records program staff are there to promote interest in raising additional resources for the management of their holdings, to provide information about the repository and its activities and needs for a well-developed and effective program for the management of historical records, and to assist the governing board and other fund raisers in their effort to increase the financial resources of the repository.

Principle Three: *Historical records programs should carefully consider their funding possibilities.* After determining their financial needs, historical records program governing boards and staff should identify prospective donors, from individuals to local corporations and businesses to local, state, and, if appropriate, national foundations.[21] Armed with such a list, the governing board members and chief repository staff should selectively interview prospective funding sources to ascertain the public perception of the program and degree of knowledge about the program's mission, activities, and needs. This interviewing should also provide the historical records program with a general idea of the level of financial support that might be available to it, determine the strengths and weaknesses of the repository as perceived by this select public, and

---

[20] For example, fund-raising experts note that individuals be contacted for financial donations by individuals, governing board members or persons associated with the repository, that have made donations of amounts comparable to that being solicited. Such a principle rules out staff solicitation since staff will likely not have made such contributions and because their positions may be dependent on the outcome of the fund-raising campaign. The concept to be followed here is for peer to peer solicitation.

[21] National foundations will be out of reach for the vast majority of historical records programs except for those that might have archival holdings of national or international importance. Most repositories should concentrate on the potential financial resources within their community, resources which can considerably improve their operations since these monies have largely been untapped by the historical records programs.

indicate what a donor might want to know before contributing money. No matter what this process tells the historical records program, including that it might not be prudent to embark on a fund-raising effort at this time, the repository will have built some additional public support by informing more individuals about its mission and activities.

Principle Four: *A historical records program should have a "case statement" to facilitate its fund-raising efforts.* A case statement is a formal, written (it can also be orally presented) presentation by a program addressed to prospective private sector sources to raise money. It is equivalent to the formal grant proposal submitted to public sector funding programs such as NHPRC or NEH and, as such, is crucial to any fund-raising effort. Case statements can vary in length (largely depending on whether their audience is the general public, corporations and businesses, or foundations) and appearance (they can be attractively published or neatly typed on repository letterhead).[22] However, they generally include a brief summary of the program's mission, a concise history of the repository, descriptions of the strengths and needs of the program, potential of the program and the use of the solicited funds, and a description of a vision for the program's future, including what the new funds can help the program accomplish and the difference that the new monies will make. The content of case statements must be endorsed by the repository's governing board or parent agency, since these individuals will often be the ones primarily soliciting the funds. Case statements must also be accurate and clear since they will help guide the

---

[22] Case statements should always be prepared after initial contact with the targeted donor audience, although the repository should have identified its funding priorities and the purpose of its fund-raising effort. For example, if a repository is seeking funds from a number of businesses in its community, it might be surprised to learn how different are their requirements. Some may require only a simple letter, while others will expect some background information and detail about the expected use of the funds. Nevertheless, the structure of the case statement can be followed usefully in meeting these different needs.

fund-raising efforts by the governing board members and perhaps other interested volunteers, most of whom will not be professionally trained archivists.[23]

Principle Five: *The historical records program should tie its funding priorities to its best and most logical sources of funds.* Although this seems to be a fairly obvious principle, it is nevertheless an extremely important one to keep in mind and it reinforces how important it is that the program first determine its own needs and priorities. If a program's main funding objective is short-term and primarily encompasses the actions of professional archivists, such as producing a finding aid or reducing a backlog of unprocessed holdings, then a public sector funding source such as NHPRC might be most appropriate for an initial effort. (This does not rule out, of course, the possibility of seeking support from other private sector sources or the requirement that the funding agency might ask for substantial matching monies for the project.) If a program is after funding for a specific project, it might be able to match corporate donor prospects with the need: a desired exhibition on the history of banking and its archival sources just might interest a local bank or financial institution; a paper preservation project might attract a local paper manufacturer; or the need for renovating or constructing historical records storage facilities could be discussed with a local construction company.

Although a historical records program is wise to seek additional funds from public granting agencies and private sector foundations and corporations, the program should always put an emphasis on a broad-based fund-raising effort that seeks to build continuing support for the program and goes after the largest pool of outside resources--individuals. It has already been noted that individuals represent the largest portion of funds donated to worthy causes by the private sector. Individuals are also more flexible and potential-

---

[23] This fact certainly indicates the importance of involvement by archival staff in the determination of the priorities of the fund-raising campaign and the content of the case statement.

ly able to support everything and anything that a historical records program does or is interested in doing. Since many historical records programs already have memberships or friends groups and since all repositories have regular research clienteles, individuals are a logical and proper place for these programs to embark on fund-raising efforts. If a historical records program has done all its homework in preparation for raising monies, it will not be difficult to approach for assistance all the various individuals that it serves or wishes to serve.

Although it is impossible to lay out a precise or perfect set of steps that will guarantee success in the desired objective or that will not require some modification because of circumstances peculiar to the institution, a series of basic steps is a useful blueprint to have in mind. The process described below also rearranges the foregoing basic principles into a convenient and logical sequence of actions that historical records programs can experiment with and adapt as necessary.

Step One: *Know what the historical records program's mission is and what it is that the repository hopes to accomplish, in both the short and long-term.* Make sure that the program's governing board or parent agency supports the mission, the repository's plan, and the effort to raise additional funds from outside the program.

Step Two: *Identify prospective funding sources (in both the public and private sector) and their potential levels of support.* Match these sources against the priority needs of the historical records program.

Step Three: *Inform and involve potential funding sources so that they learn more about the historical records program and its activities.* For the public sector this includes phone calls and letters seeking the appropriate information and, in many cases, there are convenient opportunities for face-to-face meetings with representatives of those agencies. For the private sector this means the preparation of a case statement, whether for a general campaign for an endowment or a fund-raising initiative for a specific project, and the mobilization of governing board members and other volunteers for the asking of funds.

Step Four: *Ask for the money.* For the public sector, this requires preparing the grant proposal and submitting according to the funding source's guidelines. For the private sector, this means writing letters, making phone calls, making oral presentations, personal solicitation, and involving in all of these activities the governing board and volunteers.

Step Five: *Acknowledge the contribution.* For public sector grants this means publicity about the grant and recognition of its source on publications and in other ways; guidelines for such agencies are usually fairly explicit about what should be done. For the private sector this means a thank-you letter, press release, events such as repository open houses and tours, and token gifts such as plaques or publications. With private sector donors it is important to honor their wishes about recognition (some prefer to remain anonymous) and to keep them informed and involved in the historical records program. (The repository will more than likely be going back to these sources again in the future.)

Step Six: *Evaluate the funding effort.* At some time evaluation should occur to determine the effectiveness of the fund-raising effort and to begin to prepare for follow-up work for the next effort. Except for projects that have specific starting and ending points, fund raising will be an ongoing function for the historical records program. Public sector granting agencies usually provide guidelines that enable or require some evaluation. Evaluation of private sector efforts should enable the repository to consider the level of time and other resources expended in comparison to the financial gain to the institution.

Step Seven: *Plan for the next fund-raising effort.* Historical records programs will need to start the process over, continually trying to raise its level of financial support to the point that it can responsibly care for its valuable holdings. Each successful fund-raising initiative should lay the groundwork for a more effective effort the next time.

Since effective, ongoing fund raising is a function that has not become incorporated into the normal management of most historical records programs, a logical question to ask regards the use of fund-raising consultants. Although historical records

programs are very accustomed to having consultants to advise on archival functions,[24] the use of external advisors from other disciplines, such as fund raising and resource development, is a less common experience and needs to be addressed briefly.

Fund-raising consultants should not be necessary for most repositories, provided they have followed the kinds of actions described above. Consultants can be reassuring to program governing board members and staff, however, who have no experience in this area. Fund-raising consultants can be very valuable assets under these circumstances. Such individuals can help the repository consider whether it is ready to undertake a fund-raising effort; train governing board members, staff, and volunteers to raise monies; direct the actual fund-raising campaign for the institution; provide information on specific aspects of fund raising such as deferred giving and capital funds; and help the program lay the groundwork for a successful fund-raising effort through public relations and the preparation of materials such as case statements. Since most consultants will customize their services to the particular needs of the repository, fund-raising advice can be affordable to even the smallest historical records program.

Before the historical records program hires a fund-raising consultant, it should check the consultant's references, especially seeking out the recommendation of similar types of institutions with which the consultant has worked, and ascertaining whether the consultant is a member of either the National Society of Fund-Raising Executives or the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel. Both of these organizations have high standards of conduct and professional ethics and can provide additional advice on how to contract with a professional development person.

Incorporating fund raising into a historical records program's continuing activities will not necessarily be an easy task. For most programs this will require behavioral change and new commitments, although the potential paybacks should more than compen-

---

[24] See Virginia Stewart, "Transactions in Archival Consulting," *Midwestern Archivist* 10 (1985): 107-15.

sate for any short-term difficulties that the repository might face. Below is a brief list of questions that the governing board and chief staff of a historical records program should consider before embarking on a fund-raising effort:

1. Does the historical records program have a currently valid and appropriate mission statement?
2. Is there a current, appropriate formal statement of goals, objectives, and planned activities for a period of at least three years into the future?
3. Are the financial resources available to the historical records program sufficient to carry out, in a minimal way, its goals and objectives?
4. Has the program identified ongoing objectives and projects that are likely candidates for grant applications to public funding agencies or private sector fund-raising campaigns?
5. Has the program identified private and public sector funding sources in its community and elsewhere appropriate to its needs and projects?
6. Has the program sought to strengthen its financial support first from its parent institution?
7. Does the program have a governing board and other individuals willing to solicit donations? Is its staff adequate to support such a fund-raising effort?
8. Is the program and its mission well known in the community? Does it have an effective public outreach or advocacy program?
9. Is the program identifying significant uses of its holdings that can be used to promote the repository among potential contributors?
10. Does the program have a case statement and promotional materials that it can use for fund raising?

If the historical records program has addressed such questions, then it is probably ready to mount a fund-raising campaign. And, in the long run, it should be able to better preserve its historical records.

Richard J. Cox is a lecturer in Library Science at the University of Pittsburgh, where he is also working toward a Ph.D. Prior to that, he was Associate Archivist, External Programs, New York State Archives and Records Administration.