

Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists

Volume 25 | Number 1

Article 7

January 2007

Provenance XXV

Reagan Grimsley
Columbus State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/provenance>



Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Grimsley, Reagan, "Provenance XXV," *Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists* 25 no. 1 (2007).
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/provenance/vol25/iss1/7>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu.

PROVENANCE

volume XXV, 2007



**Georgia's Circuit Rider Archivist Program:
A Trip through Learning and Service**

Editorial Staff

Editor

Reagan L. Grimsley
Columbus State University

Associate Editor

Linda Davis
Columbia Theological
Seminary

Associate Editor

Meg Moughan
College of Building Arts

Managing Editor

Susan Dick Hoffius
Medical University of
South Carolina

Reviews Editor

Randall S. Gooden
Clayton State University/
Georgia Archives

Indexer

Russell James
Independent Archivist

Copy Editor

Stephen G. Hoffius
Independent Editor

Editorial Board

Nancy Davis Bray
(2007–2009)
Georgia College and State
University

Donnelly Lancaster
(2005–2007)
Auburn University

Christine de Cantazaro
(2004–2007)
Georgia State University

Sheila McAlister
(2006–2008)
University of Georgia

Pam Hackbart-Dean
(2006–2007)
Southern Illinois University

Laura Micham
(2006–2008)
Duke University

Herbert J. Hartsook
(2004–2007)
University of South Carolina

Constance B. Schulz
(2005–2007)
University of South Carolina

Joan Krizack
(2006–2008)
Northeastern University

PROVENANCE

Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists

Volume XXV, 2007

CONTENTS

If One Wants a Good Result, One Needs a Good Consult	
Pam Hackbart-Dean	3
Designing a Preservation Survey: The Digital Library of Georgia	
Sheila McAlister	15
Georgia's Circuit Rider Archivist Program: A Trip through Learning and Service	
Randall S. Gooden	35
Reviews	59
Information for Contributors	70
Index	72

Reviews

- Lowell and Nelb**, *Architectural Records: Managing Design and Construction Records*, 59
reviewed by Carol Bishop
- Harris**, *Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective*, 61
reviewed by Michelle Light
- Gracy**, *Film Preservation: Competing Definitions of Value, Use, and Practice*, 63
reviewed by Kara M. McClurken
- Ritzenthaler and Vogt-O'Connor**, *Photographs: Archival Care and Management*, 65
reviewed by Jody Lloyd Thompson
- Wilsted**, *Planning New and Remodeled Archival Facilities*, 66
reviewed by Nora Lewis
- Book Notes**, compiled by Randall S. Gooden 68

Provenance is published annually by the Society of Georgia Archivists. Annual memberships: Individual, \$25; Student, \$10; Couple, \$20; Contributing, \$25; Sustaining, \$35; Patron, \$50 or more. *Georgia Archive*, Volumes I–X (1972–1982), is available in 16 mm roll film or in microfiche, five volumes per set. *Provenance*, Volumes I–XIII (1983–1995), is available in 35 mm roll film. Contact Administrative Assistant, SGA, P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, GA 30333, or via the SGA web site <<http://www.soga.org>>.

Potential contributors should consult the Information for Contributors found on the final pages of this issue. Advertising and orders for back issues should be sent to the Managing Editor, *Provenance*, SGA, P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, GA 30333, or via the SGA web site <<http://www.soga.org>>. Membership and subscription correspondence should be addressed to the Administrative Assistant, SGA, P.O. Box 133085, Atlanta, GA 30333, or via the SGA web site <<http://www.soga.org>>.

Provenance and the Society of Georgia Archivists assume no responsibility for statements made by contributors.

The paper in this journal is of an acid-free, high-quality stock, with a pH rating of 7–7.5, in accordance with the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council of Library Resources.

This issue of *Provenance* was published in September 2008.

Cover: “A Methodist Circuit Rider,” drawing by A. R. Waud. Courtesy of the Library of Congress.

If One Wants a Good Result, One Needs a Good Consult

Pam Hackbart-Dean

Imagine having all the staff, time, knowledge, and resources to work on those long-awaited projects that keep getting put on the back burner. Although the staff of any archives would like to do it all, from planning to execution, this may be beyond its normal workload. In this situation, a qualified, specialized consultant can make the completion of one or more projects a reality. A consultant can deliver specific work or a certain product in a shorter time frame than may be possible in-house.

What exactly is a consultant? According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, it is one who gives professional advice or services. The *Online Dictionary for Library and Information Science* is more specific: a consultant is “a person with knowledge and experience in a specialized field, hired by a library or other institution to analyze a problem and provide professional or technical advice concerning possible solutions, especially when the required level of expertise is not available within the organization or the opinion of an outsider is desirable. A consultant may

also participate in the planning and implementation phase of a recommended change.”¹

Richard J. Cox summarizes the consultant’s function as: “At the most fundamental level, consultants are about problem solving.”² Usually there are three types of consulting functions: evaluation, planning and development, and project rescue. Evaluation, the most typical, generally involves analysis of background materials, a site visit, and the creation of a final report. In planning and development, the consultant is hired to help shape a desired change or to create something new. Project rescue calls for corrections in a stalled or foundering project or program.³

Consultants often serve in an advisory role to make recommendations and provide options. One of the options a consultant may suggest is to hire an outside firm or a project archivist/contractor to undertake a specific activity. In such a case, the job would be specified with time frames, deliverables or action items, and a payment plan.

Archival consultants, specifically, can offer expertise in the general institutional evaluation of an archives, archival program planning, and space planning and management, as well as assist in the design and implementation of special projects that involve the use of archival records and manuscripts. They may be trained and experienced in the appraisal of the research and institutional (evidential, fiscal, or legal) value of paper and electronic records and all things that make up special collections.⁴ They also may be knowledgeable in the processing or cataloging of these unique materials, including the creation of finding aids

¹ Joan Reitz, *Online Dictionary for Library and Information Science*, 2006 (online resource) <http://lu.com/odlis/search.cfm> (accessed June 13, 2007).

² Richard J. Cox, *Archives & Archivists in the Information Age* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 2005): 36.

³ Virginia Stewart, “Transactions in Archival Consulting,” *Midwestern Archivist* 10 (1985): 107.

⁴ Karen Benedict, “The Records Management and Archives Consultant,” in *Using Consultants in Libraries and Information Centers*, ed. Edward D. Garten (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1992): 130.

or guides to collections. Finally, consultants may be familiar with preservation or conservation of rare historical records.

ADVANTAGES

Consultants or consulting firms may offer experience or specialized expertise that is not available in one's own institution. They may have successfully completed a project similar to the one under consideration and can therefore offer information based on that experience: what worked, what was achieved, and what problems were encountered. Furthermore, a consultant may be more aware of outside resources that could help in the successful completion of the project. This gives the consultant a broader, more comprehensive basis for making recommendations.

Consultants may specialize in a particular area or type of collection (such as digital projects or political papers). This allows them to gauge potential problems and troubleshoot them when making recommendations.

One often-overlooked advantage that consultants bring to the table is they do not have preconceptions and biases and can usually see the overall situation objectively. This means they can say things that may be interpreted as critical within an institution without fear of being penalized. A consultant is more likely to point out situations that need to be changed even if the change is an unpopular one. Likewise, a consultant is not limited or hampered by the political situation of an institution.⁵

Often an outside consultant has external credibility with both the staff and administration. The consultant is regarded as an authority, someone to be listened to. As John T. Phillips maintains, "Consultants add value to an organization that is, for some reason, beyond the capability of existing employees or contractors."⁶

The most significant advantage to using a consultant is acquiring not only a much higher level of talent quickly, but also someone who can see that the job is done in a timely manner. That translates into best value for your money. A consultant can be

⁵ David Batty, "When to Call in a Consultant and How to Choose the Right One," in *Using Consultants in Libraries and Information Centers*: 18-19.

⁶ John T. Phillips, "Preparing to Be a RIM Consultant," *Information Management Journal* 34 (January 2000): 58.

scheduled to come at a certain time and is expected to complete the project by a specific date.

DISADVANTAGES

As is usually the case, along with advantages, there are some disadvantages to utilizing a consultant for a project. For instance, a consultant may not be familiar with the history or institutional framework in which situations exist. Unfamiliar with institutional traditions and idiosyncrasies, a consultant may make recommendations that are unrealistic or beyond the scope of the institution.⁷

Of course, hiring a consultant requires an outlay of money for consulting fees. This money simply may not be available. Budgets may be tight and readily available funds may just not be present to pay for a consultant.

Finally, consultants cannot perform miracles and they cannot solve all problems. Simply having a consultant recommend a change or suggest a resolution to a problem will not make it happen. As Richard J. Cox suggests, "Consultants are facilitators and sources of knowledge, offering their expertise for hire. They are there to evaluate a situation and to make recommendations, but it is ultimately the responsibility of the organization to implement the recommendations in a manner that is meaningful to their own corporate culture."⁸

WHAT CONSULTANTS CAN DO

Experienced and knowledgeable consultants can act as technical expeditors or as political activists. As technical expeditors, a consultant can guide the administration in identifying what it wants a consultant to accomplish. Anne Ostendarp, an archival consultant, observes, "Working with smaller organizations, such as a small New England church with no trained archival staff, he or she may need to educate the group on what they need from and the skills required of a consultant."⁹

⁷ Gordon W. Fuller. *Getting the Most Out of Your Consultant: A Guide to Selecting and Choosing* (New York: CRC Press, 1998): 44.

⁸ Cox, *Archives & Archivists*, 36-37.

⁹ Anne Ostendarp, telephone conversation with author, September 12, 2007.

Similarly, a consultant might be working with an organization that realizes there is a problem which needs to be fixed, but is not exactly sure what the issue is or what the result should be once it is resolved. The consultant can help that organization understand what is needed for success by evaluating what is being sought and why.¹⁰

In the role as political activist, the consultant's strength may be that he or she has authority with the administration. Better yet, consultants can ask embarrassing questions and take the heat.¹¹ A good consultant can also be used strategically to advance any number of controversial causes. For example, the staff may know what to do, but cannot convince upper management to follow their ideas or that the projects warrant support. According to Anne Ostendarp, consultants can help staff be heard. "There are times when an archives staff realizes that changes can only be made if advocated by an external voice. Administration will take notice of a consultant's recommendation."¹² Archives can also use their consultant's expertise and credentials to build consensus.

CASE STUDY: SPECIAL COLLECTIONS, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Special Collections at Georgia State University (GSU) holds the papers of American songwriter and singer Johnny Mercer. This collection is endowed by the Johnny Mercer Foundation. It was the desire of the Foundation that this collection would include anything and everything created by Johnny Mercer and that this unique resource would be actively promoted for research use.

In the spring of 2004, Special Collections hired a consultant to design a business plan to strategize on: 1) how to acquire additional materials related to Mercer not already in the collection (sheet music, sound recordings, even movies), 2) creating a discography for the artist, and 3) developing an outreach plan to incorporate public school students and teachers to utilize primary sources from this collection. After meeting with

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Beverly A. Rawles and Michael B. Wessells, *Working with Library Consultants* (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, Inc., 1984): 4-5.

¹² Ostendarp telephone conversation.

the consultant and learning of her recommendations, Special Collections staff felt strongly that they would need another consultant (temporary position) to make these suggestions a reality. The original consultant advocated for a temporary position to carry out the business plan when meeting with the library administration, as well in the final written report.

Thanks to the well-designed business plan and advocacy of the consultant, Special Collections was able to add a temporary position to complete the Mercer project. This final project included publishing a discography online, updating the Special Collections Website, purchasing missing sound recordings, sheet music, and movies, and developing an outreach plan associated with this collection. The Johnny Mercer project was a success due to the work of the consultant who designed the initial business plan and advocated for additional help.

WORKING WITH A CONSULTANT

To begin any project, the archives needs to elucidate the scope of work and the expertise required of a consultant. Clarifying what is to be accomplished and why, as well as a potential timetable for completion, is essential.

Other issues to spell out include: Does this project require one—and only one—assignment to be performed or is the job more complicated? Is a professional required? (Sometimes this is not known until after talking to the initial consultant.) Should the person or consulting firm be required to have many years' experience on the job, especially when it comes to managing groups of people, or is the undertaking simple enough for someone new to the profession?

Next, the project should be broken into segments. Each phase needs to have an outlined schedule, identified deliverables, and a method of estimating how much time and money are available for the consultant's services to be performed. Also, it is important to determine the staff's involvement with the particular project.¹³

Finally, a time frame must be created. According to Alexander Cohen and Elaine Cohen's article, "How to Hire the

¹³ Mary Duffy, "Define the Consulting Project," *WebJunction* (May 2003) <<http://webjunction.org/do/DisplayContent?id=1151>> (accessed May 18, 2007).

Right Consultant,” it is good to ask for a three-month turnaround for results, and a good consultant should have no problem meeting this deadline.¹⁴ For large tasks, such as an intricate digitization project or processing/cataloging projects, the deadline could be several years away.

CHOOSING THE RIGHT CONSULTANT FOR THE JOB

Where does one start looking for a consultant? Reputation! There is no better way to find a high-quality consultant than to call one’s peers and ask them about their consultant experiences and for their recommendations. Keep in mind, though, that this does not eliminate the need to check references.¹⁵

There are resources available to find consultants in addition to peers’ recommendations. One source to identify consultants is the lists maintained by various state agencies, libraries, and national, state, and local library/archive associations. The names of consultants who address specific subject matters can be found on the Websites of organizations such as the American Library Association, the Special Libraries Association, the American Institute of Conservation, and the Academy of Certified Archivists. Some of these lists are maintained by publishers and by universities. One could also use the *Consultants and Consulting Organizations Directory* or the *Directory of Library and Information Professionals* (both published by Gale).

Once one has identified the names of prospective consultants, they should be contacted and told what the project will entail. These five questions can help narrow down the choices:

- Do you understand the project?
- Do you have the subject matter expertise and qualifications relevant to the project?
- What would be your methodology/work plan to accomplish these tasks?

¹⁴ Alexander Cohen and Elaine Cohen, “How to Hire the Right Consultant for Your Library,” *Computers in Libraries* (July/August 2003): <<http://www.infotoday.com/cilmag/jul03/cohen.shtml>> (accessed September 17, 2007).

¹⁵ Batty, “When to Call in a Consultant,” 20.

- Do you (and your staff) have adequate time to meet our deadline?¹⁶
- Can you provide us with references on your work?

Do not engage any professional consultant without first doing the necessary homework. Jane Kenamore, of the Kenamore and Klinkow consulting firm, suggests that when hiring a consultant an archives needs to verify the consultant's credentials and experience.¹⁷ This would include validating the consultant's body of work, years in business, previous successful relevant assignments completed, references, and activity in professional organizations. In regard to references, it is important to interview the consultant's previous clients, and, if possible, view his or her previous work. Furthermore, check consultants' proof of insurance including liability insurance and workmen's compensation.¹⁸ If the consultant will be working onsite, he or she will need a certificate or proof of insurance. Most importantly, do not hire anyone who is not genuinely interested and eager.¹⁹

Depending upon its parent institution, an archives may be able to hire a favored consultant directly. More often than not, the regulations of one's institution will require a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) or Request for Proposal (RFP) to be sent to several consultants. It is always necessary to have a budget in mind, and the RFP should reflect that budget.²⁰ Several library associations and state libraries maintain sample RFQs and RFPs so that one can get a good idea about how to write one. If an archives is in an academic, public, government, or corporate library, the institution or funding agency's purchasing department may use a standard form to which one may append

¹⁶ Cohen and Cohen. "How to Hire the Right Consultant."

¹⁷ Jane Kenamore, telephone conversation with author, September 27, 2007.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ David Brudney, "Managing the Consultant: Careful Not to Doom the Project," *Ideas & Trends* (September 2006) < http://www.hotel-online.com/News/PR2006_3rd/Sep06_ManagingConsultant.html > (accessed May 24, 2007).

²⁰ Rawles and Wessells, *Working with Library Consultants*, 39.

a narrative explaining the work the consultant is to undertake. It is always important to work with the institution's financial officer to make sure the paperwork gets done correctly from the beginning of any project.

Whatever the type of institution and its requirements for hiring a consultant, make certain to have a detailed, written contract.²¹ This agreement should clearly specify the expected outcome of the project (including a written report and time frame), proof of insurance, the price, and payment terms. Other things to consider in this contract are identifying who will be the contact at the institution, any privacy and confidentiality agreement, and whether progress reports will be required.²² This contract is an understanding between the institution and the consultant that is designed to keep everyone on the same page.

PREPARING FOR THE CONSULTANT

Once a consultant has been hired, it is important to take all the necessary steps to ensure a successful project. In many ways working with a consultant requires the same good managerial skills that one uses in running any department or program.

The first thing to do is to assign a point person or project manager who will work directly with the consultant. Then prepare for the consultant's arrival in advance by meeting with the archives staff to describe the project. The staff should understand the purpose of using the consultant and why the project cannot be done by staff. The reasons may be lack of time; the need for special expertise on a short term basis; the need for an outside, objective analysis of the problem; or the experience and skills current staff does not have. This discussion should help minimize any potential negative reactions by staff personnel.²³

Subsequently, be certain that staff is advised about any disruptions that may interrupt their workflow, the time period in which this may occur, and what efforts may be required from their units. The project manager should tell the consultant

²¹ Elizabeth Yakel, *Starting An Archives*, (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1994): 12.

²² Kenamore telephone interview.

²³ Rawles and Wessells, *Working with Library Consultants*, 55-56.

what the staff has been advised regarding disruptions. If other disruptions are anticipated, they need to be cleared by the project manager.

Be sure to provide information, documentation, and answers to consultants' questions concerning the project. This may include reports, manuals (such as processing manuals or disaster plans), and organizational charts.

Finally, provide assistance in scheduling staff, space, and resources required for the project. It is important to organize the project from start to finish.

MANAGING THE CONSULTANT

The project manager can help ensure a successful project by establishing a working partnership with the consultant. This should include maintaining frequent communication with the consultant; actively guiding, participating in, and facilitating the effort; and using a systematic means of monitoring progress.²⁴

Updated reports at major milestones are an excellent instrument for monitoring the progress of the consulting effort. Although these need not be complicated presentations, they should detail what activities have taken place, summarize preliminary findings, alert the archives to possible problems or issues, and outline the next steps.

There should also be regularly scheduled project update meetings to allow for the archives staff and the consultant to talk about the status reports, exchange views, and offer feedback on any issues that may be relevant to the work. There has to be both written and personal interaction.²⁵ Sometimes things may be too sensitive to be put in writing, but the issues will still need to be discussed. Remember, consultants do not want a lot of meetings—to them, time is money. However, keeping track of the progress of the project and any concerns is essential. Communication is important!

It is necessary to provide quick feedback to the consultant, both positive and negative. Time and resources are wasted if the archives does not provide guidance. Throughout the project,

²⁴ Benedict, "The Records Management and Archives Consultant," 135.

²⁵ Rawles and Wessells, *Working with Library Consultants*, 112.

the project manager and archives staff must be candid and forthcoming about the challenges the project presents. Though it may be difficult, an archives must also put aside its embarrassment and fears and tell the consultant the entire story.

The major deliverable is the final report, often accompanied by an executive summary that focuses on the findings, conclusions, recommendations, and proposed implementation plan. “The report should be a clear and concise statement of each step to be taken to implement a program or complete a project.”²⁶ Remember, the consultant may offer new perspectives for the archives’ consideration. He or she may also answer the question, What is next?

BRINGING THE PROJECT TO CLOSURE

The report is usually the tangible product of consultation. This should include a variety of options. If this is a planning consultant, the archives should use the report to guide the programs or changes implemented as a result of the consultation. As soon as the project is finished, take time to evaluate the report. Can or will the archives implement the consultant’s recommendations? What should have been done differently? Were all the goals and objectives met?

Provide the consultant as much honest feedback as possible. That is as important to him or her as the payment. Do not hesitate to call weeks or months later if there is a question or if further clarification is required. One cannot expect consultants to provide more service without an additional fee, but they should be willing to answer questions on what has been completed.²⁷

Where to go from there? Ultimately, the archives must review the options or recommendations provided by the consultant to determine what is best for their organization. “The question to ask: what tools does the archives give itself to enact change?”²⁸ It is the responsibility of the consultant and the archives to establish realistic benchmarks for assessing progress, as well as to decide what tools will be used to make the necessary

²⁶ Benedict, “The Records Management and Archives Consultant,” 136.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ostendarp telephone conversation.

changes. The success of any consultation will be determined on the completion of long-range changes.²⁹

CONCLUSION

Most archives that have used consultants have found this to be a positive experience. Archives do not have all the resources and time to complete all the projects and programs that they would like or need to do. Utilizing consultants can provide guidance and/or help projects get done in a timely manner.

The lesson learned is that having the ideal consultant means having identified an individual with the expertise and education required for a specific project and a record of completing similar projects. It is effective for both the archives and the consultant when there are well-defined needs, goals, and timelines. Continued communication during this process is vital between the consultant, administration, and archives staff. When one wants a good result to a successful completion of a project, then deal with a quality consultant.

Pam Hackbart-Dean is the director of the Special Collections Research Center of Morris Library at Southern Illinois University Carbondale. She has served as a consultant on various archival projects.

²⁹ Cox, *Archives & Archivists*, 57.

Designing a Preservation Survey: The Digital Library of Georgia

Sheila McAlister

Since the mid-1990s, libraries have been digitizing cultural-heritage resource materials for access purposes. The digital medium provides additional opportunities for innovative approaches to scholarship and the creation of new collections through the aggregation of geographically distributed materials of similar provenance or theme. According to Donald Waters, formerly head of the Digital Library Federation, “the promise of digital technology is for libraries to extend the reach of research and education, improve the quality of learning, and reshape scholarly communication.”¹ Accordingly, the cultural-heritage community has widely embraced digitization. In 2002, Clifford Lynch pointed to this widespread acceptance:

We’re getting pretty good at digitizing material at scale. We have a wealth of experience and a large number of successful projects (not to mention some highly educational failures) to build upon.... [T]he research

¹ Donald Waters quoted in Abby Smith, “Why Digitize?,” Washington, D.C.: Council of Library and Information Resources, February 1999, <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub80-smith/pub80.html> (accessed November 30, 2007).

questions are less about how to do it at all and more about how to optimize—how to do it more efficiently or effectively, how to be sure that you’ve chosen the most appropriate strategies and technologies. We are training a large cadre of people qualified to plan, manage, and execute digitization projects through vehicles like the Schools for Scanning. Best practices are becoming well established—consider the work that IMLS [the Institute of Museum and Library Services] has done in this area, or the Digital Library Federation, or the forthcoming *Guide to Good Practice* in preparation by the National Coalition for a Networked Cultural Heritage (NINCH). Costs are becoming more predictable for these projects. There are commercial and non-commercial mass production operations that are becoming well established to support organizations that want to do large-scale digitization; one no longer has to do it in house as part of a research and development effort.²

Consequently, digital files are now counted among an institution’s assets and must be considered as part of its strategic preservation planning.

As Paul Conway says, “[t]he essence of preservation management is resource allocation. People, money, and materials must be acquired, organized, and put to work to ensure that information sources are given adequate protection.”³ In an era during which libraries and other cultural-heritage institutions are increasingly building digital collections, the question of resource allocation for preservation becomes increasingly complicated. Preservation of digital objects is an ongoing and potentially labor-intensive endeavor that is centered around short “preservation

² Clifford Lynch, “Digital Collections, Digital Libraries and the Digitization of Cultural Heritage Information,” *First Monday* 7, no. 5 (May 2002), <http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue7_5/lynch/index.html> (accessed November 30, 2007).

³ Paul Conway, “Preservation in the Digital World” (Washington, D.C.: Council of Library and Information Resources, March 1996), <<http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub63.html>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

cycles.” Currently, cost models for such endeavors are few.⁴ As such, the incorporation of digital preservation needs into an institution’s preservation-management plan is necessary for balancing resource allocation.

As a first step in the re-examination of preservation priorities, the needs-assessment survey provides the raw data necessary for creation of a strategic vision for preservation. Shereilyn Ogden explains:

A survey must evaluate the policies, practices, and conditions in an institution that affect the preservation of all the collections. It must address the general state of all the collections, what is needed to improve that state, and how to preserve the collections long-term. It must identify specific preservation needs, recommend actions to meet those needs, and prioritize the recommended actions.⁵

Most survey instruments currently available are geared towards more traditional collections. For example, Beth Patkus’s 2003 self-survey guide addresses paper-based materials both bound and unbound, photographs and negatives, oversized and framed materials, newsprint, scrapbooks and ephemera,

⁴The Florida Center for Library Automation received an IMLS grant to develop a working digital preservation archive to be used by the Florida public universities. See their final report at <<http://www.fcla.edu/digitalArchive/pdfs/FinalReport.pdf>> (accessed May 28, 2008). See also Tony Hendley, “Comparison of Methods & Costs of Digital Preservation,” 1998, at <<http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/services/elib/papers/tavistock/hendley/hendley.html>> (accessed May 28, 2008); Steve Chapman, “Counting the Costs of Digital Preservation: Is Repository Storage Affordable?,” *Journal of Digital Information* 4, no. 2, <<http://jodi.tamu.edu/Articles/v04/i02/Chapman/>> (accessed May 28, 2008); Shelby Sanett, “The Cost to Preserve Authentic Electronic Records in Perpetuity: Comparing Costs across Cost Models and Cost Frameworks” *RLG DigiNews* 7, no. 4 (August 15, 2003), at <<http://digitalarchive.oclc.org/da/ViewObjectMain.jsp?fileid=0000070511:000006283731&reqid=92451#feature2>> (accessed April 8, 2008). In July 2005, the Digital Preservation Coalition held a workshop on cost modeling the preservation of digital assets.

⁵ Shereilyn Ogden, “What is Preservation Planning” in *Preservation of Library and Archival Materials: A Manual*, ed. Shereilyn Ogden, 3rd ed., rev. and expanded (Andover, Mass.: Northeast Document Conservation Center, c1999), <http://www.nedcc.org/resources/leaflets/1Planning_and_Prioritizing/01WhatIsPreservationPlanning.php> (accessed November 30, 2007).

audiovisual materials as well as reformatted objects.⁶ Yet Patkus's treatment of reformatting through digitization is very general, and the volume as a whole does not consider some of the special requirements for digital collections. Furthermore, the survey does not address many specific needs, such as those of a state-wide digital project, which may be charged with safeguarding the digital assets of distributed institutions.

Therefore, I propose to use Patkus's preservation needs-assessment survey as a framework for use by digital projects, with special reference to the digital collections of the Digital Library of Georgia (DLG). The digital-preservation needs-assessment survey is intended to be used over a series of years, so it will contain questions that do not apply to the current state of the DLG. In order to adapt the survey effectively, it is important to survey both the institutional context of the Digital Library of Georgia and the current digital-preservation landscape. Issues such as the barriers to digital preservation, requirements of digital-preservation systems, the current preservation strategies employed, and best practices with regards to metadata and digital object creation must be considered. A thorough understanding of these aspects of the problem is necessary also for the eventual evaluation of survey responses.

I. THE DLG'S INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Based at the University of Georgia Libraries under the auspices of GALILEO, Georgia's Virtual Library, the DLG is a collaborative digital-library program that assists Georgia libraries, archives, and cultural-heritage organizations in digitizing and publishing online resources related to life in the state. The DLG actively develops, maintains, and preserves digital-library content and provides access to Georgia-related, digitized resources. With the help of Georgia HomePLACE (Providing Libraries and Archives Electronically), the Digital Library has recently reached out to public libraries to assist them in making their local-history resources available online. The Digital Library's infrastructure includes a state-wide metadata catalog and archival storage for the master files of the HomePLACE partner institutions and other

⁶ Beth Patkus, "Assessing Preservation Needs: A Self-Survey Guide" (Andover, Mass.: Northeast Document Conservation Center, 2003), <<http://www.nedcc.org/resources/downloads/apnssg.pdf>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

grant-funded collaborative projects. As of November 2007, DLG is responsible for the stewardship of thirty-five digital collections and approximately eleven terabytes of master files.

II. THE DIGITAL PRESERVATION LANDSCAPE

Barriers to Digital Preservation

When considering the technological barriers to digital preservation, many experts identify three aspects of the problem: media longevity, and software and hardware obsolescence. Media longevity deals with the lifespan of the digital information's carrier. Over time, the device will deteriorate. Because of the nature of digital storage, one small flaw or scratch can be catastrophic. If a sector of the media is damaged, one may be unable to access any information from it. The proper care and handling of digital media has a direct effect on its longevity. In 1996, a National Media Lab study said the average digital media device had a lifespan of less than five years.⁷

The commercial and changing nature of technology also affects hardware and software. In 1976, 10,000 records of the 1960 Census were lost during the migration process because the data was stored on an obsolete tape drive. Many of the Vietnam War-era electronic documents are unusable because they can only be accessed by obsolete hardware.⁸ It is neither feasible nor cost effective to attempt to maintain museums of antiquated computer equipment for preservation purposes.⁹ Software, too, poses similar challenges. Popular desktop applications are only engineered to be backward compatible by a few versions. Software encryption can also be a preservation barrier.

The easy mutability of digital objects or lack of fixity also may be problematic. In order to demonstrate that a digital object has not changed over time, checksums and digital signatures

⁷ Jeff Rothenberg, "Avoiding Technological Quicksand" (Washington, D.C.: Council of Library and Information Resources, 1999), 7, <<http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/rothenberg/pub77.pdf>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

⁸ Susan S. Lazinger, *Digital Preservation and Metadata: History, Theory, Practice* (Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 2001), 9.

⁹ Rothenberg, "Avoiding Technological Quicksand," 12-13.

may be used as a means of verification.¹⁰ Additionally, one must be able to ensure that a digital object is authentic or, as Peter Graham says, one must ensure “intellectual preservation.”¹¹ In discussing the authenticity issues related to electronic records, Anne Gilliland-Swetland and Philip B. Eppard describe the base-level requirements for establishing authenticity: “[They] may be very similar to the heuristics that information literacy programs seek to inculcate in end users working with any type of information—that is, establishing the who, what, when, where, how, and why associated with that information.”¹² Additionally, the reliability of a digital object can be demonstrated through systems controls during its life-cycle.

Requirements For Digital Preservation Systems

In 1990, the Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems (CCSDS) began to create a reference model for developing archives of digital data. The model, known as the Open Archival Information System (OAIS), delineates the basic functions and responsibilities of an archive dedicated to the long-term storage of digital data. The five functions of the system are to ingest data or accept submission information packages (SIP), archive data objects known as archival information packages (AIP), manage data including descriptive data as well as handling day-to-day management of the archive, and provide users access to the repository’s data objects sent in the form of dissemination

¹⁰ Because it is easy to change digital objects, digital preservation must demonstrate that an object has *fixity*, i.e., that it has remained unchanged from the original. *Checksums* are values created by adding up the bytes of a message. They are used to ensure that a file has not been altered or corrupted.

¹¹ Peter S. Graham, “Issues in Digital Archiving” in *Preservation: Issues and Planning*, eds. Paul N. Banks and Roberta Pilette (Chicago, Ill.: American Library Association, 2000), 101.

¹² Anne J. Gilliland-Swetland, and Philip B. Eppard, “Preserving the Authenticity of Contingent Digital Objects: The InterPARES Project,” *D-Lib Magazine* 6, no. 7/8 (July/August 2000), <<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july00/eppard/07eppard.html>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

information packages (DIP).¹³ In discussing the AIP in further detail, the standard describes the necessary components to preserve a digital object over time. The AIP consists of the digital object itself as well as any representation data (in the case of emulation¹⁴ this would include emulators and their own suite of metadata), preservation description information (PDI), packaging information (PI), and descriptive information (DI).

The impact of OAIS was deepened through the development of the concept of trusted digital repositories. These repositories are committed to providing reliable, long-term access to digital resources for a specific community of users. In order for a repository to be “trusted,” system requirements include financial security and sustainability; standards-based methods for the ongoing management, access, and security of deposited materials; and auditability and procedures for systems evaluation. Responsibilities of such archives include ingesting, controlling, and maintaining data and their accompanying metadata; following well-documented policies and procedures for collections development, access control, storage, and updating of procedures over time; providing access to the community of users; and encouraging content providers to follow current best practices for digital object creation.¹⁵

Preservation Strategies

A wide variety of digital-preservation strategies exist currently, and most repositories employ a combination of

¹³ For a fuller discussion of OAIS, see Brian Lavoie’s “The Open Archival Information System Reference Model: Introductory Guide,” <http://www.dpconline.org/docs/lavoie_OAIS.pdf> and the standard itself, the most current version of which may be found at <<http://public.ccsds.org/publications/archive/650xob1.pdf>>.

¹⁴ *Emulation* is a digital-preservation strategy that employs programs to translate another computer environment into a newer one. Emulation attempts to imitate the original functionality and look-and-feel of a system. For a fuller discussion, see Rothenberg, “Avoiding Technological Quicksand.”

¹⁵ RLG/OCLC Working Group on Digital Archive Attributes, “Trusted Digital Repositories: Attributes and Responsibilities: An RLG-OCLC Report” (Mountain View, Calif.: Research Libraries Group, 2002), 55-56, <<http://www.oclc.org/programs/ourwork/past/trustedrep/repositories.pdf>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

them. Each method has varying success addressing viability, renderability, and the understandability of digital objects. At the most basic level of preservation is *redundancy*. Primarily used as a disaster mitigation strategy, redundancy or *bitstream copying* is the creation of an exact copy of the object. Often accompanied by remote storage, bitstream copying is also employed by the consortial project LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe). Redundancy does not ensure that a digital object can be rendered properly or that it can be understood. It provides only a back-up copy.

By contrast, *refreshing* addresses issues of media decay and obsolescence. During refreshing, one moves the data from one durable or persistent storage medium to another without altering the bitstream. However, refreshing alone is not a viable approach as it does not address hardware or software obsolescence. Even though the media is not decayed, it may be impossible for the digital object to be understood by humans or computers.

Several other strategies have been proposed to combat technological obsolescence of hardware or software. While altering the digital object to transfer it from one technological environment to another, *migration* attempts to ensure that the object continues to possess its essential characteristics. For example, one performs migration when one updates a file that utilizes an obsolete version of Word Star to the current incarnation of Microsoft Word. During the transfer process, there may be some loss of data, and it may be difficult to identify these losses. Moreover, critics point out that it can be not only a time-consuming and complex proposition, but that because of the speed at which technology advances, it is difficult to predict how often migration may need to be performed. A corollary to migration is *canonicalization*, a strategy designed to test migration integrity through the comparison of a migrated object to a “canonical” version that describes its key features.¹⁶

Digital programs may also rely on the use of file formats that are standards. It is thought that widely adopted standards-

¹⁶ For more information of canonicalization, see Clifford Lynch, “Canonicalization: A Fundamental Tool to Facilitate Preservation and Management of Digital Information,” *D-Lib Magazine* 5, no. 9 (September 1999), <<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september99/09lynch.html>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

compliant file formats are more likely to be viable over the long term. The sheer mass of users will push the market to address such a file format in new technologies. Repositories may choose to rely on a handful of standard file formats and convert all other formats to these preferred standard ones. This strategy is known as *normalization*.

A final strategy is *emulation*. It seeks to mimic the original technological environment of a digital object and to allow it to behave as it did with its original platform, software, and hardware. It employs programs to translate one computer environment into a newer one. Emulation attempts to imitate the original functionality and look-and-feel of a system.

Metadata

Metadata (commonly known as “data about data”) aids in the discovery, longevity, and interoperability of digital objects. Commonly divided into three categories—descriptive, structural, and administrative metadata—it plays an integral role in any digital-preservation strategy.¹⁷ Administrative metadata, the broad type within which preservation metadata falls, governs the data needed to manage a digital object over its entire life-cycle. Preservation metadata provides “the information necessary to maintain the viability, renderability, and understandability of digital resources over the long-term.”¹⁸ It may document the digital object’s source, content, and structure and elucidate the relationships of the various parts of a digital object as well as technical information about its creation and life cycle. It uniquely identifies the object, documents its history and context, and creates an audit trail to demonstrate fixity. The data assists

¹⁷ According to scholars, the categories of metadata vary. Some relegate technical, preservation, and administrative metadata to separate categories. See, for example, Cornell University’s Moving Theory Into Practice tutorial. Others add usage metadata as a separate category. See Anne Gilliland-Swetland’s “Setting the Stage” in the Getty Research Institute’s “Introduction to Metadata,” <http://www.getty.edu/research/conducting_research/standards/intrometadata/setting.html> (accessed July 7, 2008).

¹⁸ OCLC/RLG Working Group on Preservation Metadata, *A Metadata Framework to Support the Preservation of Digital Objects* (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC, 2002), 1, <http://www.oclc.org/research/pmwg/pm_framework.pdf> (accessed November 30, 2007).

managers in making appropriate preservation decisions and supports the rendering and interpretation of a digital object despite technological changes. The metadata may encapsulate the digital object.

In 2000, Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) and the Research Library Group (RLG) drew together an international team to compare the preservation metadata elements employed by a variety of digital-preservation projects from around the world. Using OAIS as the basis for their enquiry, the team enumerated an extensive list of elements; however, the project did not provide the practical tools and methods for data capture and management. Since the development of the OCLC/RLG framework, several projects have begun to explore the practical side of preservation metadata including the PREMIS (PREservation Metadata: Implementation Strategies) Working Group and the National Library of New Zealand. The PREMIS Working Group identified the core elements necessary for digital-preservation activities along with examples of the data dictionary's use in its May 2005 final report.¹⁹ Free tools for capturing technical and other preservation metadata include DROID, JHOVE, and the National Library of New Zealand's Metadata Extractor.²⁰

Digital Object Creation

One of the responsibilities outlined for trusted digital repositories is advocacy for creation of digital content that follows best practices and standards, for "the preservation and archiving process is made more efficient when attention is paid to issues of consistency, format, standardization and metadata

¹⁹ PREMIS Working Group, "Data Dictionary for Preservation Metadata: Final Report of the PREMIS Working Group," <http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/pmwg/premis-final.pdf> (accessed November 30, 2007).

²⁰ DROID, created by the National Archives in the United Kingdom, identifies file formats through a batch process (see <http://droid.sourceforge.net/wiki/index.php/Introduction> accessed May 28, 2008). JHOVE identifies, validates, and characterizes file formats (see <http://hul.harvard.edu/jhove/index.html> accessed May 28, 2008). The Metadata Extraction Tool extracts preservation-related metadata from digital files and outputs it in XML (see <http://www.natlib.govt.nz/about-us/current-initiatives/metadata-extraction-tool> accessed May 28, 2008).

description in the very beginning of the information life cycle.”²¹ A variety of standards and guidelines exist, including *Moving Theory into Practice*, the NINCH Guidelines, and the Northeast Document Conservation Center *Handbook*. At creation, the digital-preservation cycle begins and thus the context of creation should be captured through appropriate metadata.²²

III. SURVEY DESIGN

Now that both the DLG’s institutional context and the overarching issues of the preservation of digital objects have been examined, it is time to consider the survey itself. Patkus’s survey examines the institution and its collections, the building plant, environmental control and conditions, and disaster planning and security, all of which must be considered for both analog and digital collections.

Institutional and Collections Overview

When beginning a preservation survey, one considers the institutional context and the holdings of the institution. In the case of digital library projects, particularly those with issues of distributed ownership, a careful analysis of the relationships between repositories may be necessary. The DLG, for example, digitizes materials held at other repositories and, save the microfilm for the Georgia Newspaper Project, has no analog collections. What licensing agreements for the digital content exist and what do they allow? Who has chief responsibility for these digital assets and to whom do the assets belong? Are preservation responsibilities spread across institutions and departments? Will

²¹ Gail M. Hodge, “Best Practices for Digital Archiving: An Information Life Cycle Approach” *D-Lib Magazine* 6, no. 1, <<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/january00/o1hodge.html>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

²² Anne Kenney and Oya Rieger, *Moving Theory into Practice: Digital Imaging for Libraries and Archives*, (Mountain View, Cal.: Research Libraries Group, 2000); *The NINCH Guide to Good Practice in the Digital Representation and Management of Cultural Heritage Materials* (Washington, D.C.: National Initiative for a Networked Cultural Heritage, c2002), <<http://www.nyu.edu/its/humanities/ninchguide/>> (accessed November 30, 2007); and Maxine K. Sitts, ed., *Handbook for Digital Projects: A Management Tool for Preservation and Access* (Andover, Mass.: Northeast Document Conservation Center, 2000), <<http://nedcc.org/oldnedccsite/digital/dighome.htm>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

any activities be outsourced? Have these tasks been delineated? Is the service fee-based or will other revenue strands provide funding? The Florida Center for Library Automation, for example, developed a model contract between the libraries and the Florida Digital Archive to clarify such issues.²³

Issues of ownership and intellectual property rights do not extend only to the content of the objects. Some methods of digital preservation, such as emulation, require knowledge of proprietary information. If using emulation, a project may need to identify such rights holders and secure their permission to copy, alter, and emulate. Also, accessing copy-protected materials may be problematic. For example, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act prohibits the “circumvention of technological access controls” and the distribution of programs that do so.²⁴ These rights holders may include not only the content creators, but also software, hardware, and platform developers. In response to such issues, the Library of Congress’s National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program and the U.S. Copyright Office convened a group of copyright experts to recommend how Section 108 of the copyright law might be altered for the digital age. At this writing, the Section 108 Study Group has held three public roundtables to gather comments.²⁵

In considering the basic composition of collections for digital-library projects, recording information on the types of materials, quantity, and units of measurement may not be enough. Digital objects may be composed of many individual files and file types. For example, the digital object for a digitized book may include several hundred master tiff files, derivative jpgs and thumbnails, and a full-text searchable XML file encoded using the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) schema or DTD. For the purposes of considering the scope and volume of the DLG’s collection, one would want to consider “material” types (i.e.,

²³ Florida Digital Archive, “Interim Report 2,” Florida Center for Library Automation, 2003, <<http://www.fcla.edu/digitalArchive/pdfs/interimReport2.pdf>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

²⁴ June M. Besek, “Copyright Issues Relevant to the Creation of a Digital Archive: A Preliminary Assessment” (Washington, D.C.: Council of Library and Information Resources, January 2003), 13, <<http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub112/pub112.pdf>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

image, text, sound, moving image, or multimedia), file formats, numbers of digital objects and files, and the total volume of data. In addressing selection, the format and purpose of files as well as institution of origin also should be considered. In the current version of the DLG's "Archival Master Data Storage Policy," for example, priority for preservation is given to master files of Georgia HomePLACE-funded projects.

Surveying the Building: The Physical Plant

Digital libraries may need to consider more structures than just their own buildings. As redundancy of data is a hallmark of digital preservation, one may also want to consider off-site storage facilities as well. The University of Michigan's Digital Library Production Services, for example, stores three copies of any file: one on a production server, one in offline storage, and a third on magnetic tape.²⁶ Other than consideration of the redundancy issue, no changes would be made to Patkus's building survey.

Environmental Conditions, Storage, and Handling

As with more traditional library collections, digital-library media longevity is dependent on environmental factors including climate and light exposure. For optical media such as CD-ROMs and DVDs, stable relative humidity and temperature is necessary. ISO 18925 recommends that for both types of media temperatures range between 14°F and 73°F with a relative humidity of 20-50 percent that cycles no more than ±10 percent.²⁷ The Association for Moving Image Archivists (AMIA) recommends that polyester-based magnetic tape be stored at either 20°C (68°F) and 20-30%

²⁵ Section 108 Study Group Web site, <<http://www.loc.gov/section108>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

²⁶ Maria Bonn, "University of Michigan Policies and Practice for the Long Term Retention of Locally Produced Digital Projects and Materials: A Report Prepared for the Joint RLG/TASK Force on Digital Preservation" (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Digital Library Production Services, 1998), <<http://www.lib.umich.edu/lit/dlps/pubs/um-rlg.html>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

²⁷ Fred R. Byers, "Care and Handling of CDs and DVDs" (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, October 2003), 16, <<http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub121/pub121.pdf>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

RH; 15°C (59°F) and 20-40% RH; or 10°C (50°F) and 20-50% RH. For optimum long-term storage, tapes should be stored at approximately 8°C ±2°C (46°F ±4°F) and 25% ±5% RH.²⁸ The Digital Preservation Coalition also provides guidelines for environmental conditions based on the British Standards Institution's BS4783 that takes into account the level of access required for the media.²⁹ Servers and on-, off-, and near-line storage also require stable, cool temperatures.

CD-Rs' longevity is compromised by prolonged exposure to both ultraviolet (UV) and infrared light. Sunlight increases the rate of degradation of CD-Rs' dye layer; whereas DVDs and CDs-RW are more prone to damage through heat build-up from infrared light. Likewise, magnetic tape is damaged by UV light so it should not be exposed to direct sunlight or other sources of UV light.

While optical media are immune to the effects of magnetism, magnetic tape may suffer from exposure to strong magnetic fields. AMIA recommends "that a tape can be stored safely in a magnetic field with a maximum strength of 1/10 of the tape's coercivity. A more conservative figure of 1/20 provides a safer margin of error. To determine a tape's coercivity, refer to the product's specification sheet available from the manufacturer."³⁰ Nonetheless, Cornell University's tutorial "Digital Preservation Management: Implementing Short-Term Strategies for Long-Term Problems" recommends avoiding such exposure.³¹ Storage cabinets should be electrically grounded.

²⁸ Association of Moving Image Archivists, "Fact Sheet 8—Environmental Conditions," 2003, <http://www.amianet.org/resources/guides/fact_sheets.pdf> (accessed November 30, 2007).

²⁹ Maggie Jones, and Neil Beagrie, eds., "Environmental Conditions" in *Preservation Management of Digital Materials: A Handbook* (Digital Preservation Coalition, 2001), <<http://www.dpconline.org/graphics/orgact/storage.html#enviro1>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

³⁰ Association of Moving Image Archivists, "Fact Sheet 6—Common Tape Problems," 2003, http://www.amianet.org/resources/guides/fact_sheets.pdf (accessed November 30, 2007).

³¹ Cornell University Library, Instruction, Research, and Information Services, "Digital Preservation Management: Implementing Short-term Strategies for Long-term Problems," 2003, <<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/dpm/dpm-eng/oldmedia/mediathreats.html>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

When storing media, one should control contaminants and pests by avoiding exposure to dust and fumes (including cigarette smoke). Additionally, there should be no food or drink in the storage areas. The media should be stored vertically, and hardware must be maintained. One should use lint-free gloves or clean, dry hands when handling media, and the exposed media should not be handled. Optical media should not be labeled using pens, pencils, or adhesive labels.

Disaster Planning and Security

Digital libraries need to consider threats to their collections, including natural or man-made disasters. Through adequate planning and consideration of security and other external threats, one may more successfully mitigate emergencies. Staff members should be trained to respond appropriately, and off-site storage and redundancy of data is essential. Likewise, security procedures safeguard the digital resources from unauthorized changes, deter hacking and other security invasions, protect authenticity, and provide for accountability through audit trails or random checking. Physical access should be limited by storage in a protected area, and virtual access should be protected through passwords and other network security procedures such as write-once policies.³²

CONCLUSION

While many of the elements of preservation planning for digital objects mirror those of more traditional library materials (i.e., security, disaster planning, environmental controls, etc.), issues related to ownership, mutability, and the speed of technological change make planning all the more important. Institutions must balance not only resources and technological capacity, but also an adequate policy framework to adequately address long-term stewardship of digital objects.³³ A preservation

³² Jones and Beagrie, "Security," <<http://www.dpconline.org/graphics/orgact/storage.html#secur2>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

³³ On Cornell's "three-legged stool," see Cornell University Library, Instruction, Research, and Information Services, "Digital Preservation Management: Implementing Short-term Strategies for Long-term Problems," 2003, <<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/dpm/dpm-eng/conclusion.html>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

needs-assessment is a critical piece in benchmarking a repository's readiness for such activities and its areas of concern. A modified version of Beth Patkus's preservation needs-assessment survey, as suggested by the adapted questionnaire in the Appendix, can serve as a basis for such activities. Self-assessment is key in the iterative process of digital preservation. An institution must understand not only its own context, but also the critical issues facing digital content. Thus, an institution must look internally and to current and future developments in the technological landscape.

Sheila McAlister is the assistant director of the Digital Library of Georgia. Prior to her arrival in DLG, she worked as the electronic access coordinator for the Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

Adapted from Beth Patkus, "Assessing Preservation Needs: A Self-Survey Guide" (Andover, Mass.: Northeast Document Conservation Center, 2003).

GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL, COLLECTIONS, AND PRESERVATION MANAGEMENT

Overview

- Describe the institution conducting the survey including its history and significant collections. Also include its mission.
- What are the staffing and professional levels? Which staff members are responsible for which collections? What percentage of their time is devoted to each of these?
- What is the institution's overall budget for all of its activities? What part of the budget is devoted to preservation activities? Is funding ongoing or one-time? Will cost-sharing assist in preservation activities?
- What is the long-term strategic vision and how does preservation fit into it?
- Does the institution have plans for expansion or renovation in the foreseeable future?
- Who are the partner organizations and how may they be categorized?

Collections

Describe the collection(s) being surveyed. For each category of material, estimate and use the unit of measurement that is most convenient (exact counts are not necessary).

Type of material	File formats	Numbers of digital objects	Storage Media	Proprietary/ Encrypted	Number of files	Total volume
Full text						
Image						
Numeric						
Sound						
Moving Image						
Multimedia						
Other						

- What does the institution consider the most important areas of these collections?
- What types of formats or collections are prioritized for preservation?
- Do policies for selection and acceptance of digital objects exist? Who has chief responsibility for these digital assets and to whom do they belong? Are there format requirements? Is normalization to be used?
- Are re-appraisal guidelines available? Do all collections fit within the collection-development policy?
- What is the expected rate of growth for collections by media type, etc.? by type of donor?
- What are the types and levels of usage?
- Are systems in place to evaluate rights issues which may be barriers to preservation? Do appropriate workflows already exist? What licensing agreements for the digital content exist and what do they allow? Are there costs associated with securing these rights? Can they be sustained?

Preservation Management Issues

- Have preservation priorities been established? Is there a preservation plan?
- What preservation activities are already taking place? What strategies are being employed?
- What are the staffing levels devoted to preservation? Are preservation responsibilities spread across institutions and departments? Will any activities be outsourced? Have these tasks been delineated?
- How will preservation activities be managed? Do regular procedures and timetables exist?
- Does staff possess adequate preservation-related training? If not, is such training available?
- Is there an institutional commitment to preservation activities? Fiscally? Sustainable?

Building Survey

Use Patkus's survey and consider applying it to off-site storage areas as well.

*External Threat And Water Protection Worksheet**Fire Protection Worksheet*

Use these worksheets without change.

Disaster Planning

Use the questions outlined by Patkus and add the following:

- If using third-party services for off-site storage, can the institution be considered a “trusted digital” repository? Is it bonded?
- What is recovery turn-around time?
- How often are systems backed up? By whom?

Security and Access Worksheet

- What methods are currently in use to ensure authenticity and integrity? Checksums? Other methods? Is this validation information stored in the preservation metadata? What is the schedule for such verification?
- Is there an audit trail? Is the change history and technological context recorded?
- Is there write protection?
- How is virtual access protected?

File formats

- Are the file formats proprietary? Are they encrypted?
- Are the file formats well defined by file format viability services?³⁴
- What versions are they?
- Is the format acceptable according to archive specifications? Do they fit in with best practices in the community?

Media

- Is media suitably durable and persistent?

³⁴ Some file format registries include PRONOM <<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pronom>> (accessed May 28, 2008), sponsored by the National Archives in the U.K.; the Global Digital Format Registry <<http://hul.harvard.edu/formatregistry>> (accessed May 28, 2008), and the Library of Congress’s “Sustainability of Digital Formats: Planning for Library of Congress Collections” <<http://www.digitalpreservation.gov/formats/index.shtml>> (accessed May 28, 2008). The Florida Center of Library Automation’s Digital Archive maintains a preferred format list <<http://www.fcla.edu/digitalArchive/formatInfo.htm>> (accessed May 28, 2008).

- Is media stored under appropriate environmental controls? In appropriate housing?
- Do policies for handling media exist? Are they followed?
- Is equipment clean and maintained?
- What is the general condition of the media?

Creation of the digital objects

- Were the files created following best practices and guidelines? Which set of guidelines?
- Who was responsible for the creation of the files?
- Was enough detail captured to warrant long-term retention?
- Were longevity issues considered during the course of creation?

Metadata

- What types of metadata are available for the digital library objects? Descriptive, technical, administrative, etc.? Does the metadata follow best practices and guidelines?
- Is there a metadata specification and agreed-upon implementation?
- Do the objects have unique, persistent identifiers? Locally? Globally? What type?
- Is metadata accessible through encapsulation³⁵ or by linking? Is it easy to identify, extract, and associate with digital objects? Is it extractable? Is it easily associable with the digital object?
- How is it managed?
- What metadata is included for preservation purposes?
- Is adequate information recorded?

Strategies

- What preservation strategies are currently employed? For what type of objects? Does documentation for these decisions exist?
- Is outsourcing an option?
- What are the significant properties of the objects? What must they retain for appropriate preservation?
- Is staff monitoring changes in the field to adapt to new preservation strategies?

³⁵ *Encapsulation* is the “wrapping” or “bundling” of a digital object with all the information or tools needed for its access. See “Encapsulation” in *Preserving Access to Digital Information*, <<http://www.nla.gov.au/padi/topics/20.html>> (accessed November 30, 2007).

Georgia's Circuit Rider Archivist Program: A Trip through Learning and Service

Randall S. Gooden

The term “circuit rider” harkens back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when judges rode from county seat to county seat and preachers took to the pulpit of a different church each Sunday. In 2005, a new kind of circuit rider appeared on the scene—the circuit rider archivist.

The Circuit Rider Archivist (CRA) Program is a creation of the Georgia Archives and the Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board (GHRAB). It serves an outreach mission to local governments and historical repositories throughout Georgia in the continuing efforts of the two associated state government organizations to increase their range of service. The program provides on-site consultation on archives and records issues by a professional archivist.

This concept is rooted in two theories. The first recognizes the responsibility of service among members of the archival profession. The modern archivist recognizes that in order to gain support for programming goals, attract researchers, and compete for funding from both public and private sources, his or her world must extend beyond the limited confines imposed not only by physical surroundings, but often by one's own imagination. Service cannot be limited to the occasional committee meeting,

conference session, or journal article with only the satisfaction of fellow archivists or institutional expectations in mind. It must reach a broader community and bring to bear the true value of the profession for our society.

The second theory takes into account the diverse nature of archives and the ambiguity of the archivist's role. Archives do not exist only in repositories that follow the standards of the profession. They also lie in corrugated boxes in buildings without air conditioning where ceilings leak and silverfish roam. Yet, those surroundings do not diminish the value of the material as sources of state, local, family, and even national history. The people who care for these materials may lack knowledge of sound archival practices but share the professional archivists' appreciation for the records under their care. They may be people who hold other responsibilities—for instance, curating museum exhibits, cataloging library books, or recording city council minutes—besides archival functions, but their part-time role does not reduce the importance of the records they keep. These people acquire records and arrange, describe, and preserve them, just as professionals do. They provide access to researchers who want information no less than do the researchers in the professional archives.

David W. Carmicheal, director of the Georgia Archives, has captured the essence of these theories:

If we are to unlock the treasures that lie buried within the collections of local historical societies, public library history rooms, and countless other repositories, we must provide tools that can be applied by people who will never receive graduate degrees in archival education. To ignore this group is to write off as lost the majority of our country's historical records. There will always be a place for the professionally trained archivist, but that does not preclude our need to recognize the contributions of non-professionals and assist them with better tools....¹

¹ David W. Carmicheal, *Organizing Archival Records: A Practical Method of Arrangement and Description for Small Archives*, 2nd ed., American Association for State and Local History Book Series (Walnut Creek, Cal.: AltaMira Press, 2004), vii.

While professional archivists have an obligation of public service that extends to assisting non-professionals in local repositories, that service is meaningful only if it is accepted. Lack of information or resources does not excuse amateur or part-time archivists from their own obligations. They must continually seek to increase their knowledge and resources and accept the help that is offered. The American Association for State and Local History has outlined these obligations:

If you are responsible for historical records, you are probably doing at least some of the work of an archivist. You may not be professionally trained or have the job title, but you are caring for and protecting some pieces of the fabric of the historical record. With that role comes a responsibility to gain and use the knowledge, resources, and tools that are available for historical records care and preservation.²

Though some employees and volunteers in local repositories do not grasp their responsibilities, the majority of them do. Professional archivists are mistaken if they equate inability to meet professional standards with lack of concern or failure to realize responsibility. An inability to meet professional standards often signals a lack of “knowledge, resources, and tools.” When offerings of support from the professional community have been made available to them on a practical basis, non-professional archivists have taken advantage of them. However, these offerings must be practical and not encumbered by unrealistic prerequisites, tangles of red tape, or professional or bureaucratic jargon. Professionals must take into account the budget realities, travel distances, and time constraints that many non-professionals face in their work.

The combination of professional archivists' responsibilities to assist those lacking information and resources and an understanding of the importance of local collections led the Georgia Archives and GHRAB to take steps to assist local archivists and their repositories. The impetus was provided by the experiences of the two organizations between 1996 and 2004.

² American Association for State and Local History, *The Basics of Archives* (CD-ROM) (Nashville, Tenn.: American Association for State and Local History, [2006?]).

In 1996, three years after its creation, GHRAB received a two-year grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) and the Georgia legislature to support thirty-seven local government archival and records-management projects. These included work in inventorying, preservation microfilming, training, and creating regional records centers, as well as the development of records-management software and organization of records-management programs. During this period, GHRAB found a wide range of quality in the design of these projects. Some smaller organizations had difficulty developing their projects or had problems implementing them.

A second effort followed in 1998 with an NHPRC grant that targeted historical repositories. Forty-one organizations received assistance with program development, preservation, access, and outreach. Staff at the Georgia Archives and GHRAB coached the employees of these repositories on their applications and fulfillment of their projects. The staff saw the need for professional guidance at the project sites.

Recognition of the need for on-site assistance increased with the start of the state-funded Historical Records Project Grant program under GHRAB in 2001. From 2001 to 2004, GHRAB funded fifty-eight archival projects through this program. Most of these dealt with access and preservation and implementation of new technologies. Staff at the Georgia Archives worked diligently to aid grant applicants, but were limited by time. "Archives staff have found it increasingly difficult to devote the necessary time to work with prospective applicants and grantees which has led to a necessary reduction in services," GHRAB explained in its proposal for the Circuit Rider Archivist Program. "Archives have found it especially difficult to meet the needs of smaller organizations."³

Organizations continued to face problems in planning and implementing archival projects as assistance from the Georgia Archives became more and more limited. Staff at the archives pinpointed several common experiences among organizations: many felt uncertain about their needs and were unsure how to

³ Georgia Office of the Secretary of State, Georgia Archives, "Georgia Circuit-Rider Archivist Regrant Project Application for Federal Assistance," June 1, 2004, 7.

improve their programs. The evident solution was professional guidance, but such guidance from within the state was lacking. In the case of the Lower Muscogee Creek Tribe, help was needed to preserve twenty-two linear feet of records and to establish an on-going archival program, but with limited available assistance in Georgia an out-of-state consultant had to be hired.

In other cases, organizations lacked basic knowledge of archival and records-management practices. While visiting one board of education office, a member of GHRAB discovered sensitive student data and personal financial information in an open, unprotected area.

Other organizations did not implement grant projects as intended because of the need for professional guidance. In one example, a city government fell behind on a records inventory, and without available staff from the Georgia Archives had to turn to the local regional development center for assistance.

Still other organizations hesitated to apply for available grants because the application process seemed daunting. This proved particularly true among smaller organizations with limited staffs and budgets, many of them in South Georgia. The problem was exacerbated by the fact that agencies in the southern part of the state often had neither the time nor the money to send people to grant-writing workshops, which often were held in the Atlanta area.

In this context, GHRAB unveiled a new strategic plan in 2002. It identified three issues and a series of actions to address those issues. The board observed in Issue 2 that “those who manage historical records must understand their responsibility and competently be able to preserve and provide access to the records.”⁴ As an action item under this issue, GHRAB set the goal to “hire regionally based ‘circuit rider’ archivists to provide technical assistance and training in every region of the state.”⁵

The concept of the Circuit Rider Archivist Program arose from an understanding on the part of GHRAB and the Georgia Archives that members of the archival profession must reach out to a broader community where the nature of archives is diverse and the role of the archivist can be ambiguous. In its 2004

⁴ Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board, 2002 *Strategic Plan*.

⁵ *Ibid.*

proposal to the NHPRC for support for starting the program, GHRAB outlined the short-term goal to “provide much needed assistance” through the work of the circuit rider archivist. The board also set the long-term goal of increasing the number of professional archivists in the state, and enlisted Clayton College and State University (now Clayton State University) as a partner to explore ways to provide formal archival education in Georgia.⁶

As outlined in the application to the NHPRC, Clayton College and State University, the Georgia Archives, and GHRAB set aside money to provide for salaries and benefits for the people who would be involved in the project, plus office supplies and phone costs. The NHPRC was asked to provide funding for meals and automobile costs for the circuit rider archivist’s travels to visit organizations across the state, as well as printing and postage costs. The organizations that would be visited were asked to pay for lodging for the archivist.⁷

A major part of the request to the NHPRC involved funding for regrants to local governments and historical repositories to help them complete archival projects. The Georgia Archives and GHRAB expected that the work of the circuit rider archivist would guide the organizations which he or she visited toward appropriate and realistic projects. The application included a request for \$110,000 to fund such projects and an additional \$3,750 that could be used to supplement local organizations in the purchase of small amounts of archival supplies.⁸

SEEKING A CIRCUIT RIDER ARCHIVIST

The Georgia Archives received the requested NHPRC grant and began seeking a circuit rider archivist late in 2004. Brenda Banks, deputy director, and Anne Smith, assistant director for public services, represented the Georgia Archives, and Gene Hatfield, chair of the Department of Social Sciences, and Ray Wallace, dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, represented Clayton College and State University on the search

⁶ Georgia Office of the Secretary of State, Georgia Archives, “Georgia Circuit-Rider Archivist Regrant Project Application,” 9.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

committee. The advertisement for the position called for an archivist to conduct site visits to historical repositories and local governments throughout Georgia and to provide assistance with archival processing and preservation. The circuit rider archivist also would aid organizations in determining if grant assistance were needed and help them obtain and implement grants. The responsibilities outlined for Clayton State included teaching an introductory class in archives at the undergraduate level, developing recommendations for a graduate program in archives, promoting the graduate program within the state, and seeking input from archival educators for the program. The committee sought a mix of archival and academic experience and qualifications, including a Ph.D.⁹ The committee conducted two rounds of searches and interviews in an effort to find a candidate with the “knowledge, skill, and ability that best matched the job requirements.”¹⁰ In May 2005, final interviews were held, and a circuit rider archivist was hired to begin work in July.

In the meantime, GHRAB solicited applications for circuit rider archivist visits and applications for regrant projects, as part of the Historical Records Project Grant Program, through a broad online and print media campaign.¹¹ The publicity and application form itself identified consultation from the circuit rider archivist as a grant. The application form asked for basic institutional and contact information and asked several open-ended questions: What is the specific activity that you want the circuit rider archivist to do for your organization? How will this activity enable your organization to better care for its records? What records are involved?¹²

The application also gave organizations the choice of listing the preferred month for their visit. The choices reflected

⁹ *Archival Outlook* (November/December 2004), 36.

¹⁰ “NHPRC Regrant Progress Report January 2005-June 2005,” <http://sos.georgia.gov/archives/who_are_we/ghrab/grant_programs/progress_report_june_2005.htm> (accessed July 1, 2007).

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² “Circuit-Rider Archivist Consultation Grants Application Form,” Circuit Rider Archivist Files, Georgia Archives, Georgia Office of Secretary of State, Morrow, Ga. (hereafter CRA files).

the original plan that the visits would be made between the first of May and end of August 2005.¹³

With the deadline to apply set for April 1, 2005, seventy-nine organizations applied. GHRAB chose fifty-seven of these to receive visits from the circuit rider archivist. The choices were based to a large degree upon recommendations from the staff of the Georgia Archives with a view as to whether the circuit rider could meet the organization's requests and whether other Georgia Archives staff might be better able to meet the organization's needs because of the staff member's specific expertise or prior experience with the organization.

Time also became a factor in choosing organizations to participate in the program. GHRAB had anticipated approximately forty applicants.¹⁴ With nearly twice that number applying, the timeframe for the visits was increased from four months to six months.

The chosen groups included sixteen historical organizations, five libraries, four museums, seven city governments, nine county governments, eleven court systems, three school systems, one college, and one state agency. The city of Statesboro and Georgia Southern State University Museum applied jointly, as did the Meriwether County Probate Court and Superior Court, and the Pickens County Government and the Marble Valley Historical Society. Most organizations requested assistance with program development, followed by microfilming or scanning, grant assistance, program review, inventorying, arrangement and description, storage, preservation, training, and indexing. One organization wanted help choosing and acquiring a movable filing system.¹⁵

Whitfield-Murray Historical Society in Chatsworth typified the situation of many of the organizations in its application. "Our records are not well organized nor well preserved," its president

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Georgia Office of the Secretary of State, Georgia Archives, "Georgia Circuit-Rider Archivist Regrant Project Application", 2.

¹⁵ "NHPRC Regrant Progress Report January 2005-June 2005."

wrote. "Most are at least 'sorted' but that's about all." He added that "they are not easily accessible for researchers either."¹⁶

Members of the GHRAB and staff at the Georgia Archives were pleased with the coverage that the Circuit Rider Archivist Program would provide across the state. The applications for visits represented forty-four counties, some of which had never been served by GHRAB programs.

"When Archives staff notified the organizations that they were approved for a CRA visit, it generated a lot of local excitement," GHRAB reported to the NHPRC. "Many of these organizations had never applied for or received a grant of any kind in the past."¹⁷

When the circuit rider archivist assumed his duties in July 2005, he immediately saw the excitement that GHRAB reported. The applicants expressed eagerness for assistance as he contacted them. Wilkinson County Historical Society in central Georgia was among them. "We look forward to seeing you . . . as we have much to learn on the organization and display of our collection," wrote the society's president.¹⁸

The circuit rider began contacting the organizations he would serve in July to make preliminary appointments to visit. He also met with colleagues in the Georgia Archives to learn about their experiences in serving local governments and historical repositories, become familiar with the requirements for government records management in Georgia, and coordinate his work plan. July also provided time for logistical arrangements such as lodging and vehicle use. During that initial month, the circuit rider also worked with archives staff to update resource materials for his visits. These included the resource manual "Preferred Practices for Historical Repositories" and a companion self-assessment form. These tools had been developed in 1999 after GHRAB had completed an NHPRC-funded effort

¹⁶ "Circuit Rider Archivist Program Application Form—Whitfield-Murray Historical Society," 2005, CRA files.

¹⁷ "NHPRC Regrant Progress Report July 2005-December 2005," <http://sos.georgia.gov/archives/who_are_we/ghrab/grant_programs/progress_report_dec_2005.htm> (accessed May 29, 2008)

¹⁸ Marty Dominy to Randall Gooden, July 15, 2005, CRA files.

that identified minimum standards for an active and effective historical records program. As a precursor to the Circuit Rider Archivist Program, that project also endeavored “to prepare to provide group training and individualized coaching focused on bringing historical organizations up to a minimum level. . . .”¹⁹

The circuit rider archivist approached his visits as part professional archivist and part small-town official. The professional perspective was needed to provide the core value of the program and to provide an ethos of respectability. The small-town and community perspectives allowed the archivist to earn the trust of his hosts as one who sympathized with their time and budget constraints and who would work toward practical solutions to their problems rather than the often-daunting professional ideal.

The visits began in August 2005 with a trip to the Washington Historical Museum in Washington, the county seat of Wilkes County, known as the site of the last cabinet meeting of the Confederate States of America. The gist of the visit involved the advisability of transferring original Civil War letters from an inaccessible bank vault to the secure museum building. The experience in Washington initiated a pattern of hospitality reflective of community and organizational pride on the part of the host institutions. The museum director, Stephanie Macchia, became the first of many to invite the circuit rider to lunch and she extended an invitation to return later in the year for the town’s Mule Days. Such experiences emphasized the need for the archivist to pay attention not only to the archival picture and the deficiencies which he might help to correct, but also to the strengths of the organizations, which included the support of the overall community.

The first set of visits demonstrated the invaluable support of GHRAB. While visiting Augusta, Thomas Dirksen, a member of GHRAB, welcomed the circuit rider archivist to his home for dinner and aided him in obtaining a local perspective of the area. Dirksen accompanied the circuit rider on a visit to the Lucy Craft Laney Museum of Black History and a side trip to the Augusta Genealogical Society. The regional representation of GHRAB has

¹⁹ Anne P. Smith and Jill Swiecichowski, comps., *Preferred Practices for Historical Repositories: A Resource Manual* (Atlanta: Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board, 1999), iii.

added significantly to the ability of the Circuit Rider Archivist Program to take a local perspective.

The first week of visits in the Savannah River region established routines for the circuit rider archivist and provided first-hand insight into Georgia's local governments and historical repositories. Preliminary contacts and the information on the written application provided him with a snapshot of each organization and the problems and concerns that it faced. Armed with that knowledge, the archivist sat down with the contact person at each site to discuss the organization's situation. He then toured the records-storage areas and examined the archival materials. In general, the contact people were aware that they suffered deficiencies; otherwise, they would not have sought consultation with the circuit rider archivist. An often-repeated question, posed with chagrin, was, "Have you ever seen anything this bad?" The circuit rider invariably assured his hosts that their situations were not unusual for organizations across the country with limited resources and that the worst archival settings he had seen were not in fact even in Georgia.

Following the tour, the archivist sat down again with each contact person and made preliminary observations and suggestions. Away from the archival materials, the circuit rider hoped this conversation would seem less critical than if it had taken place at the moment that a problem was observed. Once back in the office, the archivist drafted a final report for each site and incorporated research on special problems. He circulated each report among key staff at the Georgia Archives, including David Carmicheal, director; Brenda Banks, deputy director; Anne Smith, assistant director for public service; Andrew Taylor, assistant director for Records and Information Management Services; Elizabeth Barr, deputy coordinator for the Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board; Amelia Winstead, manager for state and local government records; and Christine Wiseman, manager of preservation services. Each of these people had the opportunity to provide input based on his or her experience and expertise before the reports were sent to the organizations.

In some cases, the circuit rider met with a group of officers or board members rather than a single contact person during his visits. These instances offered wonderful opportunities for training as the committee discussed their archives and records with the circuit rider. They also gave interesting views of the

complexion of the organizations, how the members or employees might work together, and their different expectations. For example, one county administrator in central Georgia guided the circuit rider through various government and court offices, which seemed open to cooperate with coordinated records management and storage efforts. In another county, a similar tour yielded no such cooperative spirit, with the reactions from officeholders ranging from tolerant attention to the guide and courtesy to the circuit rider to cold resistance to the notion of cooperation on records matters.

Another variation in the visits involved joint applicants. These differed considerably depending on the sites. In some places, the second applicant simply served as an overall partner in the records program of the organization of focus. This was the case in Statesboro, where the city government had applied jointly with Georgia Southern University Museum. The university's archival materials were not a focus of the circuit rider archivist consultation, but rather the museum provided advice to the city government in setting up a museum that would include a location for historical records. In another instance, the Marble Valley Historical Society and the government of Pickens County were joint applicants. Although the records concerned were county records, the historical society, with an interest in preserving the county's records, took the more prominent role during the visit. In still other cases, joint applicants each wanted advice on their own records, though they had common issues and concerns and shared a number of resources.

Meriwether County Probate Court and Meriwether County Superior Court were two such organizations. Judge Stiles Estes of the probate court and Louise Garrett, clerk of the superior court, both were interested in scanning and microfilming permanent and long-term records. During much of the visit, the two were present while the circuit rider viewed the other's records. A joint application for a Historical Records Project Grant seemed logical for funding the overall microfilming needs of the courts. Although the courts did not seek a grant, they have continued to cooperate on records-management issues. The superior court has received renovated space for records storage and use, and the probate court has worked to inventory records and dispose of eligible ones. Estes and Garrett also participated with Elizabeth Barr of the GHRAB staff and the circuit rider archivist in a session

about the Circuit Rider Archivist Program at the joint meeting of the Society of American Archivists, the National Association of Government Archivists and Records Administrators, and the Council of State Archivists in 2006.

After the initial visits in the Augusta vicinity in August, the circuit rider began a trip around the state that took him to North Georgia and Stewart, Meriwether, and Dooly counties later in the month. Georgia experienced fuel shortages in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in September, and the circuit rider curtailed his travel in support of calls from the governor and secretary of state to conserve gasoline. He limited his visits to the metro Atlanta area in September. October took the archivist to middle Georgia, the upper Oconee River basin, and back to the northern mountains. November returned him to the heart of Georgia, the Altamaha region, and to North Fulton County. He ended the year in South Georgia and completed visits along the coast in 2006.

CASE STUDY: ROME AREA HISTORY MUSEUM

The circuit rider's trek into North Georgia during his early trips provided a typical example of a visit to a historical repository. Katie Anderson, director of the Rome Area History Museum, had requested a circuit rider archivist visit to provide a general assessment of the museum's archival holdings. She had asked for advice on issues of storage, processing, finding aids, and preservation. She hoped to develop a plan for archival development and an updated inventory of the collections.²⁰

Preliminary conversations with Anderson showed her to be enthusiastic about her work but somewhat overwhelmed. Like many museum professionals, Anderson, who holds an undergraduate degree in anthropology and a master's degree in museum studies, appeared to have more archival knowledge than she gave herself credit for. The director's enthusiasm and professional knowledge provided a key leadership component, but the organization suffered from inconsistency.

The Rome Area History Museum is located in an old store building on a main business street in Rome. It was founded in 1995 to acquire artifacts and historical records pertaining to

²⁰ "Circuit Rider Archivist Consultation Grants Application Form—Rome Area History Museum, 2005," CRA files.

the history of Rome and surrounding counties. The community was for many years an industrial center, largely based on the textile industry. The decline of industry had raised awareness of its history, and the museum plays a role in the preservation of that historical record. Rome also has been a center for medical care, stemming from its use as a hospital site during the Civil War. The town was in the path of Union forces moving south from Tennessee during the war, and that event has impacted the historical interests of the city.²¹

When the circuit rider archivist visited the Rome Area History Museum, he found that Anderson was aware that archival practices differ from museum practices in many respects and she sought a greater depth of knowledge to govern the museum's archival collections. The museum had received a grant from the Institute for Museum and Library Services to hire an education specialist for the museum, and Anderson hoped that the addition of that staff person would free her to devote more time to collections, including the archives.

The museum was completing the self-assessment phase of the American Association of Museum's Museum Assessment Program at the time of the circuit rider archivist's visit. The evaluation of that assessment and the review of a peer surveyor under that program was expected to give greater direction to the museum, which in turn would assist in managing the archival holdings.

Anderson wished to update inventories for archival material and to catalog them. One handicap was unconfirmed and missing accessions information for a number of items. Former museum workers did not recollect much information or left incomplete or inconclusive records. The director understood the need for an accessions and collection-development policy. She had discussed the problem with Berry College archivist Rebecca Roberts and had a sample of the college's policy.

The circuit rider toured the two records storage areas as part of the visit. The first was located in a closet on the first floor of the museum. The second was in a larger room on the third floor. The materials consisted of scrapbooks, photo albums, laminated

²¹ Circuit Rider Archivist Report, Rome Area History Museum, Rome, Floyd County, 2005," CRA files. All information on the Rome Area History Museum experience can be found in this resource.

newspapers, rolled photographs, and maps and other oversize items. Substantial amounts of sheet music and phonograph albums were among the collections on the third floor. Some items were housed in plastic sleeves in plastic binders. Other materials were loose in cardboard boxes. A handful of archival boxes and folders were in use. An estimated 2,400 cubic feet of archival material was stored in the two locations. While the exhibit areas of the museum were climate controlled, no air conditioning or humidity controls were in place in the storage areas. A problem with silverfish and rodent infestation existed on the third floor. Insect traps were used but not monitored. There had been past concerns with mold, though none was evident during the archivist's visit.

Plans existed to turn the third-floor area into a reading room and planned storage area, and renovation of the space had begun. Anderson solicited input on the arrangement of the reading room, researcher policies, and tasks necessary to compile a reference collection. She intended to include climate controls as part of the renovation of the third floor. A grant was being sought from the National Endowment for the Humanities to purchase filters for fluorescent lights and window shades.

The circuit rider reviewed the user registration, deed of gift, and loan forms used by the museum. He also presented Anderson with a copy of *Preferred Practices for Historical Repositories* and discussed the manual by section. The Rome Area History Museum had no disaster plan, but Anderson had samples of such plans and understood the need to draft a plan and the elements which should be included.

The circuit rider archivist assisted Anderson in estimating the amount of archival supplies that would be needed to process the holdings of the museum. Anderson asked for assistance in this in order to prepare for seeking possible grant funding for the supplies. She was familiar with suppliers and had a number of catalogs on hand.

The recommendations of the circuit rider archivist aimed at providing realistic suggestions for a small museum to achieve greater archival responsibility. The suggestions took into account the challenge of implementing textbook practices on a limited budget and with manpower limitations. The key to implementing good archival practices in a small repository is not to dwell on achieving a set of standards but to emphasize how

best to make improvements that are specific to the individual repository and will best serve the constituency that is particular to that repository.

For the Rome Area History Museum, the circuit rider showed how a number of museum practices could readily be adapted for archival management and suggested changes that would benefit the museum collections as well as the archival holdings.

As he did with other historical repositories, the circuit rider identified opportunities for continued training. One of these was “The Basics of Archives” online workshop, produced by the American Association for State and Local History; another was consultation with the Georgia Archives. The archivist also pointed to the museum’s relationship with the archives at Berry College as a resource in archival education.

The circuit rider archivist recommended that the Rome Area History Museum consider seeking a Historical Records Project Grant from the Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board to fund planning, policy development, training, inventorying, and processing, including the use of specialized consultants. The museum subsequently applied for a grant and received \$5,000.

The role of the NHPRC in the Circuit Rider Archivist Program included the funding of Historical Records Project Grants. This funding was aimed at circuit rider archivist sites, and the circuit rider suggested projects to thirty-two of the organizations he visited.²² Eleven chose to apply for grants and received them in 2006. Nineteen other institutions also received Historical Records Project Grants. Besides these grants, small sums of money were made available to seven organizations for the purchase of archival supplies. The awarding of this money was limited to organizations served by the circuit rider archivist and did not involve a lengthy application process, an obstacle for many organizations in applying for grants.²³

The inconsistency which Anderson had identified as a handicap was a result of changes in volunteer staff, officers, and

²² “NHPRC Regrant Progress Report July 2005-December 2005.”

²³ “NHPRC Regrant Progress Report January-June 2006,” <http://sos.georgia.gov/archives/who_are_we/ghrab/grant_programs/progress_report_june_2006.htm> (accessed May 29, 2008).

board members in a volunteer organization. It was also caused by frequent turnover in paid staff who moved from smaller organizations to larger ones. These occurrences prove common among small historical organizations, and the Rome Area History Museum experienced change once again in 2006 when Anderson left and a new director took over. Local governments also experience a great deal of change as elections bring new officials into office and new elected officials hire new appointees. In all, thirteen of the organizations served by the circuit rider archivist (23 percent) experienced changes in personnel involved with archives and records between the time that they applied for visits in 2005 and 2007. The consistent presence of the Circuit Rider Archivist Program, with its advice and support, offers a tool to aid in the transition of archival and records-management practices for these organizations.

While the experiences of the Rome Area History Museum are typical of the historical repositories in the Circuit Rider Archivist Program, government offices faced different issues. The Stewart County Superior Court provides an example of a government office.

CASE STUDY: STEWART COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

Patti B. Smith, clerk of the Superior Court, indicated in her February 2005 application for a circuit rider archivist visit that she would like to have four plat books (1962-1998) preserved and eighteen older deed books (1922-1942) reduced to smaller size for easier handling and preservation. She referred to deterioration in the plats, including loose bindings. In a telephone conversation with the circuit rider archivist, Smith expressed primary interest in work on the deed books. In another instance of the value of the local and regional contacts of the Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board, Ross King, a member of GHRAB, suggested that the circuit rider arrange a courtesy call to the Stewart County Commissioners' Office when making appointments to visit Stewart County.

The visit took place in late August 2005, when the circuit rider met with Diane Babb, county clerk. Babb had a question about efforts to locate a 1930 edition of a county highway map and was referred to the reference services staff at the Georgia Archives. This was one of the numerous occasions when the

circuit rider drew upon the resources and expertise of the state archives.²⁴

Court clerk Patti Smith and the circuit rider discussed records retention, and Smith indicated an understanding of retention schedules. She was intent upon disposing of records when they qualified.

The records of the court were housed in a vault adjacent to Smith's office. Nominal climate controls existed, but no monitoring of temperature and relative humidity took place. The records in the vault consisted of bound volumes on wall shelves, file drawers of loose papers, and loose records in boxes on the floor. Smith had made significant efforts to inventory and arrange loose and unorganized files.

The plat books in which Smith was interested were coming apart. She wished to store the loose plats in a vertical file rack where other plats already had been placed. The plats in the rack were enclosed in polyester sleeves.

A number of deed books had been photocopied and reduced to 8 1/2 x 11-inch size by a vendor. These were enclosed in plastic cases with metal bindings. The original volumes had been maintained. Smith wished to have an additional fifteen volumes photocopied and reduced.

The circuit rider also discussed with Smith the need for a disaster plan to include computer records as well as paper records. He provided her with a copy of the Northeast Document Conservation Center leaflets "Disaster Planning and Worksheet for Outlining a Disaster Plan" and discussed ways to adapt elements of the worksheet to her needs. The circuit rider and clerk completed the site visit interview for local governments, visited Web sites for several archival supply vendors, and discussed the use of acid-free boxes, folders, and polyester envelopes and sleeves.

In his report, the circuit rider emphasized that the disposal of records as scheduled would free Stewart County Superior Court from the need to preserve and care for unnecessary records. He urged that the loose records in boxes on the floor be housed in appropriately sized acid-free boxes and folders and that the boxes

²⁴Randall S. Gooden, "Circuit Rider Archivist Report, Stewart County Superior Court, Lumpkin, Stewart County," 2005. All information on the Stewart County Superior Court experience can be found in this resource.

and folders be labeled in pencil or with archival labels with a typewritten description of the contents. He recommended that folded items carefully be unfolded if it could be done without tearing the documents and that the boxes be stored off the floor.

The report suggested that if sufficient manpower and supplies became available Smith might wish to consider removing metal fasteners from the documents in file drawers and rehousing the records in acid-free, buffered folders or envelopes. The arrangement of the vault and office and available space would not allow for the files to be removed from the drawers and placed in archival boxes. The archivist also suggested that Smith consider placing deteriorating bound volumes in acid-free archival boxes to better preserve them. The archivist observed that Smith's plan to place the plats in the existing vertical plat file system should be satisfactory. He noted that it was important that polyester sleeves or envelopes continue to be used.

The circuit rider urged that the plan to photocopy and reduce the deed books be examined more closely. If the plan proceeded, he recommended the use of acid-free, buffered paper for the pages and the placement of the pages in binders made of acid-free, buffered archival board and adhered with adhesive or other binding materials that were pH-neutral and would not bleed, rust, or stain the pages.

Microfilming was recommended as an alternative to the reduction of the deed books for the preservation of the books. Stamps inside some of the books indicated that they had been filmed in a joint project of the Genealogical Society of Utah and Georgia Department of Archives and History in 1966. A check of both the catalogs of the Georgia State Archives and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints showed microfilm of deed and mortgage books from Stewart County covering the years 1828 to 1907. The archivist told Smith that copies of this microfilm would be available for purchase at a lower cost than refilming.

The circuit rider archivist recommended that the court seek a Historic Records Project Grant to purchase copies of the microfilm for use in the clerk's office, for microfilming permanent records that had not been filmed, for purchasing a microfilm reader, and for purchasing archival supplies as part of a preservation project. He wrote that Smith might wish to consider submitting a joint application with another county office in order

to qualify for a higher amount of funding. Stewart County chose not to apply for a grant.

RESPONSE AND IMPLEMENTATION

The experiences of the Rome Area History Museum and the Stewart County Superior Court provide snapshots of the fieldwork performed by the circuit rider archivist and the types of problems and concerns that he encountered. His visits generated energy among many organizations which used his recommendations to move forward with their archival programs and to leverage support from boards, officers, and constituencies. Among them was Paulding County School District. The superintendent's executive assistant described the response of district officials to the visit:

We knew where we should be with our records management program and felt we knew the steps to be taken to reach our goals. But, while we were looking at the overall situation which seemed overwhelming, Dr. Gooden offered us very sound and timely advice. He helped us to see practical solutions and made the task seem less daunting. Since that meeting, I have called and emailed him several times with questions and he has been very quick in his response.

Dr. Gooden assisted us in the writing of our Historical Records Project Grant, reading through our grant several times and offering suggestions for improvement.²⁵

Another organization which shared its reactions and follow-up to the circuit rider archivist's visit was the Peach Public Libraries (PPL) in Fort Valley:

Dr. Gooden's visit to Peach Public Libraries and his subsequent evaluation of our local history/special collections resulted in needed and much appreciated guidance and advice.... Dr. Gooden offered many possibilities to improve our collection's organization and preservation. Based on Dr. Gooden's guidance (and especially follow-up advice), we were better able

²⁵ Pamela Taylor to Randall Gooden, n.d., CRA files.

to determine the specific organizing and preservation materials to purchase to best reach our goals, as well as the work required to meet those goals. We are more aware of the work needed to best evaluate, organize, and maintain both our existing collection and subsequent donations. Dr. Gooden's encouragement also led to PPLs applying for and receiving supplemental funding from the Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board to purchase needed archival supplies.²⁶

The public-services librarian at the Peach Public Libraries also outlined goals which the organization had set after the visit. The library had determined to send a staff member to archival training workshops so that he or she could share information with other staff and volunteers, and take advantage of funding opportunities for archival processing and preservation, special projects, and exhibits, including online photo exhibits. The librarian commented:

Overall, Dr. Gooden's evaluation of our current collection and his subsequent recommendations have resulted in PPLs setting the goal to successfully organize and preserve our collections so that the resources are not only protected, but available and accessible to researchers, local community members, and library users, as well as our own library staff.²⁷

Not all organizations were able to implement the advice of the circuit rider archivist. Many expressed frustration with the lack of time which they could devote to archival work. In a survey completed in June 2007, 88 percent of those surveyed indicated that time was one of the biggest obstacles to their work in archives and records management.²⁸ In historical repositories, many leaders faced administrative, fund-raising, museum, and library duties exclusive of archives. For governments, records

²⁶ Sandra French to Randall Gooden, n.d., CRA files.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ "Survey of the Impact of the Circuit Rider Archivist Program," CRA files.

managers often doubled as purchasing officers, administrative assistants, public relations officers, and other positions. One librarian, with newly added responsibilities, voiced the problem, "I have little time for Archives since talking with you but plan to delve in after our holiday break."²⁹ Yet time commitment to primary duties kept people in a number of organizations from initiating applications for Historical Records Project Grants, even with assistance from the circuit rider archivist and GHRAB staff in planning and developing projects.

Another problem for many organizations was funding. Of those surveyed, 66 percent remarked that money was a significant obstacle to their archival and records management work.³⁰

Although some organizations have been unable to follow-up on the circuit rider's suggestions, 88 percent said that the circuit rider had provided useful assistance or information since his visit and that they felt that they could contact the circuit rider for assistance or information in the future. This undoubtedly had much to do with e-mail support groups that the circuit rider formed to share information about useful topics with the circuit rider sites and follow-up visits and phone calls as needed. Requests for information not only included archival topics, such as Crawford County Historical Society's questions about finding a conservator to restore an antebellum hymnal, but also included non-archival questions, such as one from the Aragon Historical Society for help in efforts to preserve a spring that figured in local Civil War action.

The ongoing relationship between the sites and the Circuit Rider Archivist Program led to the involvement of the sites in disaster-preparedness training offered by GHRAB in 2006. Two circuit rider archivist sites, Hall County Library in Gainesville and Thronateeska Heritage Center in Albany, hosted workshops taught by Christine Wiseman of the Georgia Archives.

In 2007 the continuing relationship with the contacts made at the sites visited in 2005 aided in laying the groundwork for a second round of visits. Ten organizations (Appling County Heritage Center in Baxley, Columbia County Government in Evans, Greene County Probate Court in Greensboro, Hall

²⁹ CRA Feedback," CRA files.

³⁰ "Survey of the Impact of the Circuit Rider Archivist Program."

County Library System in Gainesville, Lowndes County Board of Commissioners in Valdosta, Meriwether County Probate Court and Meriwether County Superior Court in Greenville, Rome Area History Museum in Rome, the City of Statesboro in Bulloch County, Stewart County Superior Court in Lumpkin, and Wesleyan College in Macon) offered locations for informational meetings at which organizations in the various regions of the state could learn about the circuit rider archivist program. Wiseman taught disaster-preparedness workshops on the same days as the informational meetings in Baxley, Greensboro, and Rome.

When the deadline for the 2007 round of circuit rider archivist visits arrived, fifty-two organizations applied. Of these, twenty-five had attended one of the informational sessions. Six of the applicants were referrals from organizations that had been visited in the first round.

The start of the second round of circuit rider archivist visits in July 2007 took the program from a pilot phase to one of constancy. With continued funding until 2010, the program has successfully shown how the two theories—the responsibility for service among professional archivists and the diversity of archival institutions and ambiguity of the archivists' role—outlined earlier can be joined. The outreach role of the circuit rider program has demonstrated that professionalism will be accepted or recognized by non-professional archival institutions if professionals treat the work of non-professionals as important and worthy of attention without condescension and with an understanding of the diverse level of resources with which archivists, professional and non-professional have to work. Unnecessary divisions between non-professional and professional archivists only prevent acceptance of sound archival practices and principles by those who need assistance and keep professional archivists from knowing and appreciating the archival resources present in local and regional institutions. This inevitably will lead to inattention and neglect of vast materials that form a part of the overall picture of our history.

The Circuit Rider Archivist Program serves as a bridge between the professional and non-professional archival worlds. It works in the spirit of outreach that many archivists have recognized and implemented in their work by providing a broad model for service that can be adapted by a variety of archival programs, government and private. In return, the organizations

that participate demonstrate their willingness to learn, to accept responsibility for their historical materials. They also serve as teachers in the realities of the diverse world of archives and offer laboratories for learning about archives in a variety of settings, conditions, and circumstances. It indeed is a partnership of learning and service.

Randall S. Gooden is an assistant professor of history at Clayton State University in Morrow, Georgia, where he teaches history and archives courses.

Book Reviews

Architectural Records: Managing Design and Construction Records. By Waverly B. Lowell and Tawny Ryan Nelb (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006. 250 pp.).

Too often manuals dealing with archival topics employ overly dry writing styles and a lack of imagination in their use of illustrations. *Architectural Records: Managing Design and Construction Records* is a welcome departure from that trend.

The first thing one notices when opening the book are the numerous graphics, many in full color. That difference, along with the authors' ability to relay their extensive knowledge of the subject, should entice even complete novices to learn more about the history and management of architectural records. The book's authors are Waverly B. Lowell, curator of the Environmental Design Archives at the University of California, Berkeley, and Tawny Ryan Nelb, an archivist, records preservation consultant, and historian based in Midland, Michigan.

Lowell and Nelb, who wrote alternate chapters, begin with an interesting general overview of the history of western architectural design. The book looks first at the design practices of the ancient Egyptians, who held architects in high esteem, and then

examines the work of architects in Greek, Roman, and medieval societies. Highlighted next is the Renaissance, a time in which the definitions of architect, client, and builder began to take on their modern-day meanings. Last, the focus turns to American design practices from colonial times through the changing technologies of the late-twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

Modern architectural archives often contain diverse groups of records and formats, ranging from sketches created early in a project to three-dimensional models representing the final design. The authors explain that archivists must understand the histories and contexts of all these records, along with the processes of design and construction, in order to be effective. They should develop consistent appraisal guidelines to deal with the unique nature and quantity of the records and not let what our culture sees as the “specialness” of drawings influence their decisions.

Additionally, archivists should strive to maintain the original order and provenance of their collections. They need to use standard methods of arrangement and description at series and sub-series levels, with the creation and use of multi-formatted descriptive finding aids as a final goal.

People who deal with design and construction records must consider the special preservation issues of their records. Architectural archives often hold large and diverse collections that may include a multitude of formats. By their very nature such archives present unusual challenges to archivists.

The book notes that varied groups of researchers use architectural archives. Users can range from those working on restoration projects to families researching the history of their homes. It is the responsibility of archivists to explain clearly the policies and procedures of their archives to these researchers.

One special concern pertaining to the use of architectural records involves the visual appeal of many of the drawings found within the collections. Materials such as presentation drawings are at risk for theft since there is a large market for them as art.

Rounding out the book are three appendices. The first two address procedures for documenting neighborhood histories and handling disasters involving water. The third lists common archival series and sub-series found in archives that hold design and construction records.

This well-written and beautifully illustrated manual is an excellent resource for both the novice and experienced archivist. *Architectural Records: Managing Design and Construction Records* is a welcome addition to any bookshelf.

Carol Bishop
University of Georgia

Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective. By Verne Harris with a foreword by Terry Cook (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2007. 476 pp.).

This past June, *New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd described archivists as “the new macho heroes of Washington” in response to Vice President Dick Cheney’s refusal to release classified documents to the National Archives. As American archivists stand by their professional obligations to preserve government records to promote accountability and support democracy, the selected writings of South African political activist and archivist Verne Harris are both timely and relevant. In the more than twenty essays, speeches, and newspaper columns in *Archives and Justice*, Harris repeatedly exhorts archivists to follow the “call to justice.”

Crucial to understanding his call is the concept that archives “open into (and out of) the future.” Record creators, record managers, archivists, and users all participate in making a record as they endow it with meaning and significance in multiple contexts. As such, “recordmaking” is determined by the relations of power in which the recordmakers find themselves; hence, archivists are inevitably complicit in the exercise of power in all aspects of their professional work. Harris explains the importance of not becoming a pawn of an oppressive power that privileges, marginalizes, and excludes, but rather of becoming an activist who engages with archives and records’ constructive powers. Foremost, archivists should extend “hospitality” to the marginalized. If justice is defined as our relation to “the other,” archivists should open up our principles, practices, institutions, and records to let in “radical otherness.”

The first section of the book, entitled “Discourses,” gathers together Harris’s postmodern meditations on archives. In

1995 Harris discovered Jacques Derrida, and he was “quickly seduced” by Derrida’s *Archive Fever*, likening it to the Song of Solomon. Derrida influences Harris’s conception of the archive, the record, the other, and justice as well as Harris’s playful, passionate style and deconstruction methodology. Harris challenges many fundamental archival beliefs and practices. For example, he deconstructs common definitions of the record and its supposed truthful representation of an event or transaction, but also offers new ways to think about the record. He deconstructs descriptive practices, particularly attempts to be objective or to obscure differences, and offers instead a model for a “liberatory” descriptive standard that reveals archivists’ intervention and biases and strives for openness to counter-narratives or sub-narratives. Harris’s call to justice in these two sections is largely about awareness, attitude, and engagement, and he later concludes that it is “without blueprint, without solution, without ready answers.”

In the third and fourth sections, “Politics and Ethics” and “Pasts and Secrets,” Harris brings to bear his experience as deputy director of the National Archives of South Africa and liaison to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and his work as director of the South African History Archives (SAHA), an organization dedicated to documenting struggles against apartheid and promoting freedom of information. Here, Harris offers critical analyses of South African archives under the oppression of apartheid (in which secrecy was an integral part), the destruction of state records before the fall of apartheid, the significance of the TRC’s attempts to investigate apartheid’s atrocities, and the work of SAHA in filing freedom of information requests. Although rooted in the historical and legal contexts of South Africa, Harris’s suggestions for defining a balance between the public’s right to know and the state’s need for secrecy are sure to resonate with archivists in other countries. Many times he returns to the point that allowing public access to official information is the lynchpin of a democratic society. He posits a politics for archives, which include the responsibility to understand the political nature of the recordmaker and the record, to disclose the “culturing” of the record and the recordmaker, to be hospitable to other ways of knowing and doing, and to be active and “engage openly the politics of the record” for when “we give up on activism, we give up on democracy.”

In the foreword, Terry Cook states that Harris “plays archives as a fine musician plays a beloved instrument, searching for harmonies, improvising sounds, inviting engagement.”

Indeed, Harris’s writings both inspire and challenge archivists to question their role in society, reexamine the nuts and bolts of their daily work, and consider how they can take action in their professional lives to help create a more just society.

Michelle Light
University of California, Irvine

Film Preservation: Competing Definitions of Value, Use, and Practice. By Karen F. Gracy (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2007. 296 pp.).

In the first part of *Film Preservation: Competing Definitions of Value, Use, and Practice*, Karen F. Gracy examines the history, economics, and organization of film preservation in the United States. Film preservation poses a particular preservation challenge because the costs of preserving film are so great—most film archives lack funding, staff, facilities, and equipment to care adequately for their collections. In the early chapters of this ethnographic study, Gracy traces the development and functions of film archives, the influence of the motion picture industry and other commercial interests on film preservation, and how deposit agreements and copyright holders affect preservation work. Commercial interests have different priorities than non-commercial interests; certain types of film, such as silent films, avant-garde, industrial films, and amateur/home films, are often neglected due to the lack of appeal to broad audiences and their inability to provide an economic profit.

The second half of *Film Preservation* is dedicated to narratives examining the preservation process. This section, especially the chapter documenting the process of film preservation, will prove the most useful to those actually implementing film-preservation activities. In this chapter, Gracy asserts that there are eight stages of film preservation: selecting film, finding funding, inspecting or inventorying the film, preparing the films for lab work, duplicating the film, storing master elements and access copies, cataloguing masters and access copies, and

providing access to the preserved film. Gracy provides details of how each of these steps can be accomplished. In the chapter on the evolving definitions of film preservation, she tries to untangle the ever-changing meaning of the phrase. There is not a consensus regarding what activities fall under the category of film preservation. Many film preservationists believe that their activities should include more than simply providing viewable copies and preserving items in their original format; these film archivists have expanded the definition of preservation to include cataloguing, providing access, and exhibition.

Chapter 8 of *Film Preservation* discusses the source of power and authority in determining what gets saved and what does not. For example, while the orphan film movement has helped to preserve items not under copyright by providing federal funding to preserve these films, it has shifted the focus of non-commercial institutions to focus on areas where they can get money instead of spending resources on the items that potentially are the highest priority for preservation. There are plenty of items under copyright that need preservation work as well, but because many institutions rely upon federal funding for their preservation work, they choose to follow the money and save what they can get money to save.

The final chapter of this work looks toward the future of the field of moving-image archiving, in which, Gracy believes, film archives will find “a balance between meeting cultural heritage needs and market forces” and where digital technologies will further alter the functions and activities that comprise film preservation.

Students at film or library and information schools will find Gracy’s study to be a good example of how ethnographic methods can be used to investigate what information professionals do—and how they do it—to ensure that materials remain accessible into the future. If you are looking for a practical, step-by-step guide to film preservation and collections care, this book is not for you; however, if you are interested in the origins of film preservation in the United States and how we arrived at many of the current issues and challenges of preserving films, then you will find this book a good guide to that exploration.

Kara M. McClurken
SOLINET

Photographs: Archival Care and Management. By Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler and Diane Vogt-O'Connor with Helena Zinkham, Brett Carnell, and Kit A. Peterson (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006. 550 pp.).

Photographs: Archival Care and Management is a must-have book for all photograph archivists, whether new to the archival profession or seasoned veterans. This is a manual that must be in every archives. As the authors state, their book “is a how-to manual about the preservation and use of photographs in archives, libraries, museums, and other cultural heritage organizations.”

This work is a worthy replacement of the ever-popular *Administration of Photographic Collections*, published by the Society of American Archivists in 1984. *Photographs: Archival Care and Management* continues to focus on the traditional aspects of photograph preservation and processing, but it also deals with developing issues focusing on technologies that surround digital photographs and proper storage. The book also takes a fresh look at reading and researching photographs, reference services, and photograph duplication.

The book's thirteen chapters are divided into different aspects of photographic collections. The first two, “Photographs in Archival Collections” and “History of Photographic Processes,” deal with the basics, the meat and potatoes of photographs. For example, the history chapter includes many pages on identification of images and the basic photographic processes, such as daguerreotype, collodion emulsions, gelatin emulsions, and color processes. Other chapters address acquisition and appraisal, reference services, and outreach.

Also, anyone dealing with copyright and ownership issues will certainly want to read the chapter on “Legal and Ethical Issues of Ownership, Access, and Usage.” Here the reader will find information on donor restrictions, loan agreements, copyrighted and uncopyrighted materials, and public domain. The reader can also get a brief but valuable introduction to learning more on legal issues when dealing with photograph reproductions and exhibits.

Photographs: Archival Care and Management also focuses on preservation of both paper and born-digital photographs. In these chapters, the authors discuss proper housing and

storage procedures while also spending time on digital conversion and management of digital images.

A great feature of the book is the highlighted boxes. The authors offer helpful “tips,” terminologies, and resources for the reader. These areas can be very useful for archivists new to the profession. For instance, there are numerous “tip” boxes that focus on photograph identification, preservation priorities, and donor restrictions. Tables will help archivists trying to find aid identification elements from DACS and EAD.

The appendices are particularly valuable. The authors review the proper “Supplies and Equipment for the Care and Storage of Photographic Materials” and “Funding Sources.” Again, these sections are very useful for any new archivist and will guide them through the tedious process of ordering supplies and working with vendors.

The illustrations and images in *Photographs: Archival Care and Management* make this book stand out from other books and manuals that deal with photographs. Mary Lynn Ritzenhaler, Diane Vogt-O’Connor, Helena Zinkham, Brett Carnell, and Kit A. Peterson have produced a manual essential to any archivist who deals with photographs.

Jody Lloyd Thompson
Georgia Institute of Technology

Planning New and Remodeled Archival Facilities. By Thomas P. Wilsted (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2007. 204 pp.).

If one reads Thomas P. Wilsted’s *Planning New and Remodeled Archival Facilities* while working in an older facility not yet slated for remodeling, it is likely to make her either weep or salivate. If the reader’s institution is preparing to remodel or create a new facility, then the book will prove a useful guide that will walk her through the basics of either of these scenarios.

Archival Facilities opens with a discussion of the importance of archival facilities as symbolic structures. Wilsted states, “archive buildings are the material manifestation of the concept which human societies have of their collective identify.”

On a day-to-day basis, this meaning is probably overlooked by most archivists so that eventually an archival facility becomes relegated to simply a place of work or even a source of stress. Wilsted highlights in his book that archival buildings provide legitimacy for a cultural heritage, just as the unique materials held within their walls do.

Archival Facilities is a practical guide for the uninitiated into the specifications of what a new or remodeled archival facility should contain. In addition, it also provides advice on how to work with all the people who will be involved in such an institution-changing and financially challenging process. Though state, federal, and academic archival facilities are most heavily represented in photographs and project examples, the information provided is relevant to a broader audience including museums, historical societies, and organizational and corporate archives.

The audience for the title is varied, and Wilsted advocates for the active participation of the archivist in planning committees regardless of institutional size and structure. As archivists tend to work in an insular community, it is easy to forget that those outside the profession do not speak the same archives-focused language. Wilsted provides advice on how to prepare archivists to communicate effectively with architects, engineers, specialists, and contractors. He stresses the obligation of archivists to educate all stakeholders in the needs of collection preservation and security and the requirements for daily management of storage areas, reading rooms, and staff spaces.

As a contributor to archival literature on the topic of building and remodeling archival facilities, Wilsted does not ignore those authors who came before him. He provides references to their work in his text and each chapter is followed with a paragraph of suggested reading. These references guide the reader to a wealth of information, including national and international print and Internet sources on everything from fire codes to storage standards. Thoughtfully, Wilsted provides a six-page glossary of building and construction terms and acronyms that will serve the archivist well.

When planning new or remodeled archival buildings, or just going about the daily duties in a preexisting one, the balance between practical and theoretical information in Wilsted's text can help guide archivists in advocating for the resources needed

to fulfill the professional obligation of preserving the evidence of society.

Nora Lewis
Georgia Historical Society

BOOK NOTES

With the increasing awareness of internationalism in archives, it is fitting that the vice president of the Federal Archives of Germany, Angelika Menne-Haritz, wrote the introduction to a new edition of *Archives and the Public Interest: Selected Essays* by Ernst Posner (edited by Ken Munden; Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006). Indeed, Menne-Haritz's comments remind us of the bridge that Posner's work provided between the American and European worlds of archives. When written, Posner's essays illustrated the contrasts between the two archival cultures and evinced his patrician attitude toward American archives; today they provide context in tracing the history of archival development in the United States and point to the shrinking differences in archival theory and practice among various nations. If you have never read this collection or are unfamiliar with Ernst Posner, the book offers a new opportunity to get to know the German-American archivist and his views. If it has been awhile since you have read the 1967 edition, try the new release. You may find that a second look gives you new perspective on the twenty-first-century archival world.

Kenneth D. Crews's second edition of *Copyright Law for Librarians and Educators: Creative Strategies and Practical Solutions* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2006) provides an easy guide to many of the copyright issues that organizations large and small face. Crews is the Samuel R. Rosen II Professor at the Indiana University School of Law and a professor in the Indiana University School of Library and Information Science. His book covers copyright; rights of ownership; working with fair use; education and libraries; and issues with digital, music, and unpublished materials. Its organization and language make it usable for professionals and non-professionals outside the library (and legal) world in institutions such as archives and museums where copyright questions often arise with no one on

staff to readily answer them.

A somewhat dry and technical addition to the books we have received is Willow Roberts Powers's *Transcription Techniques for the Spoken Word* (Lanham, Md.: AltaMira Press, 2005). In a matter-of-fact way, the book runs through the science of interview transcriptions. Useful appendices provide sample interview forms, typographic notations, and sample transcripts. Unfortunately, it does not take into account oral histories or the archival context of oral history.

Understanding Archives & Manuscripts by James M. O'Toole and Richard J. Cox (Archival Fundamentals Series II, Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2006) proves true to its series' reputation for providing fresh studies in archival basics. In this case, O'Toole and Cox make sense of the twenty-first-century realm of archives and manuscripts in a way that will be valuable to beginning archival students and part-time practitioners who need to understand the profession but don't have the time for exhaustive study. While the book is not daunting, it is thorough in its treatment of the subject; at the same time, the bibliographic essay and notes will not disappoint those who seek exhaustive study.

RSG

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

David B. Gracy II Award

A \$200 prize will be presented annually to the author of the best article in *Provenance*. Named after David B. Gracy II, founder and first editor of *Georgia Archive* (the precursor of *Provenance*), the award began in 1990 with volume VIII. It is judged by members of *Provenance*'s editorial board.

The *Provenance* editorial board selected co-winners of the 2006 Gracy Award. They are Laura Botts and Lauren Kata for their article, "Are the Digital Natives Restless? Reaching out to the Ne(x)t Generation," and Catherine Stollar Peters for her article, "When Not All Papers Are Paper: A Case Study in Digital Archivy."

Editorial Policy

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

Manuscripts and related correspondence should be addressed to Editor Reagan L. Grimsley, Department of History, Auburn University, 313 Thach Hall, Auburn, AL 36849; e-mail: rlg0007@auburn.edu.

Review materials and related correspondence should be sent to Reviews Editor Randall S. Gooden, Clayton State University/ Georgia Archives, c/o Georgia Archives, 5800 Jonesboro Road, Morrow, GA 30260; e-mail: RandallGooden@clayton.edu.

An editorial board appraises submitted manuscripts in terms of appropriateness, scholarly worth, and clarity of writing.

Accepted manuscripts will be edited in the above terms and to conform to *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th edition.

Contributors submit manuscripts with the understanding that they have not been submitted simultaneously for publication to any other journal. Only manuscripts which have not been previously published will be accepted, and authors must agree not to publish elsewhere, without explicit written permission, a paper submitted to and accepted by *Provenance*.

Two complimentary copies of *Provenance* will be provided to the author; reviewers will receive one complimentary copy.

Letters to the editor which include pertinent and constructive comments or criticisms of articles or reviews recently published by *Provenance* are welcome. Ordinarily such letters should not exceed 300 words.

Manuscript Requirements

Manuscripts should be submitted as Word documents or as unformatted ASCII-preferred documents. Notes should be unembedded endnotes, not footnotes.

Text, references, and endnotes should conform to copyright regulations and to accepted scholarly standards. This is the author's responsibility. *Provenance* uses *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th edition, and *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*, 3d edition (G. & C. Merriam Co.) as its standards for style, spelling, and punctuation.

Use of terms which have special meaning for archivists, manuscripts curators, and records managers should conform to the definitions in Richard Pearce-Moses, *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* (Chicago: SAA, 2005). Copies of this glossary may be purchased from the Society of American Archivists, 17 North State Street, Suite 1425, Chicago, IL 60602-3315. It is also available online at <<http://www.archivists.org/glossary/index.asp>>.

AUTHOR/TITLE INDEX

- Architectural Records: Managing Design and Construction Records*, Waverly B. Lowell and Tawny Ryan Nelb, review, 59-61
- Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective*, Verne Harris, review, 61-63
- Bishop, Carol, reviewer, 59-61
- Carnell, Brett, See Ritzenthaler, Mary L.
- “Designing a Preservation Survey: The Digital Library of Georgia,” Sheila McAlister, 15-24
- Film Preservation: Competing Definitions of Value, Use, and Practice*, Karen F. Gracy, review, 63-64
- “Georgia’s Circuit Rider Archivist Program: A Trip Through Learning and Service,” Randall S. Gooden, 35-58
- Gooden, Randall S. “Georgia’s Circuit Rider Archivist Program: A Trip Through Learning and Service,” 35-58
- Gracy, Karen F., *Film Preservation: Competing Definitions of Value, Use, and Practice*, review, 63-64
- Hackbart-Dean, Pam. “If One Wants a Good Result, One Needs a Good Consult,” 3-14
- Harris, Verne, *Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective*, review, 61-63
- “If One Wants a Good Result, One Needs a Good Consult,” Pam Hackbart-Dean, 3-14
- Lewis, Nora, reviewer, 66-68
- Light, Michelle, reviewer, 61-63
- Lowell, Waverly B., and Tawny Ryan Nelb, *Architectural Records: Managing Design and Construction Records*, review, 59-61
- McAlister, Sheila. “Designing a Preservation Survey: The Digital Library of Georgia,” 15-24
- McClurken, Karen M., reviewer, 63-64
- Nelb, Tawny Ryan. See Lowell, Waverly B.
- Peterson, Kit A. See Ritzenthaler, Mary L.
- Photographs: Archival Care and Management*, Mary L. Ritzenthaler, Diana Vogt-

- O'Connor, Helena Zinkham, Brett Carnell, and Kit A. Peterson, review, 65-66
- Planning New and Remodeled Archival Facilities*, Thomas P. Wilsted, review, 66-68
- Ritzenthaler, Mary L., Diana Vogt-O'Connor, Helena Zinkham, Brett Carnell, and Kit A. Peterson, *Photographs: Archival Care and Management*, review, 65-66
- Thompson, Jody L., reviewer, 65-66
- Vogt-O'Connor, Diana, See Ritzenthaler, Mary L.
- Wilsted, Thomas P., *Planning New and Remodeled Archival Facilities*, review, 66-68
- Zinkham, Helena. See Ritzenthaler, Mary L.

SUBJECT INDEX

- Archives,
 - and collections overview, 25-27
 - and consulting, 3-14, 35-58
 - and environmental conditions, 27-29
 - and preservation, 15-34
 - and storage, 26-28
 - and physical plant, 27
- Circuit Rider Archivist Program, 35-58
- Consulting, archival, 3-14, 35-58
- Digital Library of Georgia, 15-34
- Digital preservation, 15-34
- Disaster planning and security, digital, 29
- Environmental conditions, 27-29
- Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board (GHRAB), 38-40
- Georgia State University, 7-8
- Metadata, 23-24
- Physical Plant, archives, 27
- Preservation Needs Assessment Survey*, by Patkus, 18
- Preservation strategies, 21-23
- Preservation survey, 15-34
- Rome [Ga.] Area History Museum, 47-51
- Stewart County [Ga.] Superior Court, 51-54
- Storage, digital, 26-28

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

David B. Gracy II Award

A two-hundred dollar prize will be presented annually to the author of the best article in *Provenance*. Named after David B. Gracy II, founder and first editor of *Georgia Archive* (the precursor of *Provenance*), the award began in 1990 with volume VIII. It is judged by members of *Provenance's* editorial board.

The *Provenance* editorial board selected co-winners of the 2006 Gracy Award. They are Laura Botts and Lauren Kata for their article, "Are the Digital Natives Restless? Reaching out to the Ne(x)t Generation" and Catherine Stollar Peters for her article, "When Not All Papers Are Paper: A Case Study in Digital Archivy."

Editorial Policy

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

Manuscripts and related correspondence should be addressed to Editor Reagan L. Grimsley, Department of History, Auburn University, 313 Thach Hall, Auburn, AL 36849. . E-mail: grimsley_reagan@yahoo.com.

Review materials and related correspondence should be sent to Reviews Editor Randall S. Gooden, Clayton State University/ Georgia Archives, c/o Georgia Archives, 5800 Jonesboro Road, Morrow, GA 30260. E-Mail: RandallGooden@clayton.edu.

An editorial board appraises submitted manuscripts in terms of appropriateness, scholarly worth, and clarity of writing.

Accepted manuscripts will be edited in the above terms and to conform to *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th edition.

Contributors submit manuscripts with the understanding that they have not been submitted simultaneously for publication to any other journal. Only manuscripts which have not been previously published will be accepted, and authors must agree not to publish elsewhere, without explicit written permission, a paper submitted to and accepted by *Provenance*.

Two complimentary copies of *Provenance* will be provided to the author; reviewers receive two tear-sheets.

Letters to the editor which include pertinent and constructive comments or criticisms of articles or reviews recently published by *Provenance* are welcome. Ordinarily such letters should not exceed 300 words.

Manuscript Requirements

Manuscripts should be submitted as a Word document or as an unformatted ASCII-preferred document. Notes should be unembedded endnotes, not footnotes.

Text, references, and endnotes should conform to copyright regulations and to accepted scholarly standards. This is the author's responsibility. *Provenance* uses *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th edition, and *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*, 3d edition (G. & C. Merriam, Co.) as its standards for style, spelling, and punctuation.

Use of terms which have special meaning for archivists, manuscripts curators, and records managers should conform to the definitions in Lewis J. Bellardo and Lynn Lady Bellardo, compilers, *A Glossary for Archivists, Manuscripts Curators, and Records Managers* (Chicago: SAA, 1992). Copies of this glossary may be purchased from the Society of American Archivists, 527 S. Wells Street, 5th Floor, Chicago, IL 60607.

2007 Officers
Society of Georgia Archivists

President

Jill Severn
University of Georgia

Vice-President/President-Elect

Morna Gerrard
Georgia State University

Secretary

Marie Force
Delta Air Line Archives

Archivist

Muriel McDowell Jackson
Middle Georgia Archives
Washington Memorial Library

Treasurer

Elizabeth Barr
Georgia Archives

Director (2006–2007)

Tamara Livingston
Kennesaw State University

Past President

Valerie Frey
Georgia Archives

Director (2007–2008)

Elizabeth Russey
Emory University

Newsletter Editor

Renna Tuten
University of Georgia

Web Editor

Abigail Griner
University of Georgia

Administrative Assistant

Frances Overcash

Inside

If One Wants a Good Result, One Needs a Good Consult

Pam Hackbart-Dean

Designing a Preservation Survey: The Digital Library of Georgia

Sheila McAlister

Georgia's Circuit Rider Archivist Program: A Trip through Learning and Service

Randall S. Gooden

Reviews

Information for Contributors

Index