From the Chair

Reflecting on the accomplishments of the Museum Archives Section (MAS) over the years, there is every reason to anticipate that 2015 will be another productive year. Since its formation as a roundtable in 1986, the group has been a goal-oriented one. Much of its success can be attributed to the willingness of its membership to devote time to projects throughout the year, often in task forces or working groups. Through these efforts, a solid foundation has been laid for the activities the section is tackling this year, which—in accordance SAA President Kathleen Roe’s theme of the “Year of Living Dangerously”—are focusing on advocating for museum archival programs at both the individual and organizational levels. Additionally, there is an increased effort to provide members with greater online content.

The survey completed by immediate past co-chairs Heidi Abbey and Jennie Thomas highlighted a need to provide professional development opportunities for members unable to travel to the annual meeting. (For additional information on the survey, please see Heidi Abbey’s article in this issue.) Toward this end, the section is piloting a program to record presentations on topics of interest that can be viewed by members online free of charge. The first of these was presented December 12 by Nancy Enneking, Head of Institutional Records and Digital Stewardship at the Getty, on its electronic records archive. This and subsequent recordings will be available through a Vimeo account that the section is establishing.

Making an Impact: Effective Advocacy within Your Institution

BY ERIN LAWRIMORE
University Archivist, Martha Blakeney Hodges Special Collections and University Archives, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Current SAA President Kathleen Roe kicked off her "Year of Living Dangerously with Archives" initiative at the 2014 Annual Meeting in Washington, DC by strongly encouraging all archivists to take bold actions in promoting the significance (if not essentialness) of archives and archivists to society. She stated that archivists are "most often comfortable and engaged with talking about archival practice—about 'the way we do the things we do' ... Yet all the wonderful techniques, tools and approaches are just the first step. If we are going to get beyond the point where archives and archival records are used in modest amounts, for a modest number of purposes by a modest range of users, then we also have to raise awareness of their value and importance."1

For archivists in an institutional archives (university archivists like me as well as museum archivists and others who directly document their organization’s work), the need to raise awareness of the value and importance of archives and archivists starts at home. An argument of "specialness" and "uniqueness" of the collections as the primary value of archives and archivists often will not prove successful with upper-level administrators who are being forced to make deep cuts and stretch limited budgets. As Lisa Carter wrote in her 2009 post to the blog In the Library with the Lead Pipe, "I’m beginning to think that what’s wrong with special collections and archives today is that they are considered special.” In order to make an impression on and build advocates among administrators and colleagues in your particular organization, you the archivist need to know how to gauge, articulate, and publicize your valuable work in a way that makes it clear how the archives and the archivists’ work impacts bigger, institution-wide goals.2

Of course, the first step in articulating how your work impacts bigger, institution-wide goals is to know what those goals are. What do your organizational leaders see as your institution's primary mission? Ideally, your parent organization has a set of clearly identified goals and objectives that are frequently

(Continued on page 6)
From the Chair (Continued from page 1)

The Standards and Best Practices Working Group, established by past co-chairs Francine Snyder and Susan Anderson, has done an extraordinary job of gathering resources and, most recently, planning a pre-conference symposium on electronic records. This year, the SBPWG is turning its considerable energies toward documenting effective advocacy practices that individual section members may adopt. For specific information, see the SBPWG report in this issue.

To focus on advocacy at an organizational level, the Museum and Archives Advocacy Group (MAAG) has been formed. Following an initial teleconference in October, the MAAG convened at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC on December 16. Kathleen Williams of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and Chris Reich of the Institute of Museum and Library Services met with the group. SAA Council liaison Geof Huth also joined the meeting via telephone. The MAAG is exploring ways to increase the visibility of museum archival programs with affiliated professional organizations and funding agencies. Among MAAG’s immediate activities is the review and revision of the Museum Archives Guidelines.

It is interesting to note that advocacy methods the MAAG are exploring were first entertained in 1986 and revisited intermittently in the years since. Perhaps it is a battle that each generation of museum archivists must wage. It is due to the efforts of Deborah Wythe that these skirmishes—and more—are chronicled online in the MAS early newsletter archive. With the approach of the group’s 30th anniversary in 2016, the project takes on an added importance. For an account of it, see Deborah’s article in this issue.

The annual meeting already promises to be a productive one for the section. SAA has provided a room and equipment for a pre-conference symposium. Efforts will be made to connect with members who will not be in attendance, via live-streaming or Twitter. Until then, keep an eye on the forum and the next newsletter for updates on MAS activities.

With best wishes to all for a happy new year, I am,

Sincerely,
Lorraine A. Stuart
Chair

Meet the Chair-Elect: Barbara Mathé

Barbara Mathé has been Head of Library Special Collections at the American Museum of Natural History since 1998. In 2002, she was also named Museum Archivist, charged with coordinating with the scientific collection managers who oversee the archives held in the Museum’s science departments.

With an MSLS from Columbia University emphasizing archival studies and four years as Assistant Museum Librarian at the Goldwater Library at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1994-1998), Mathé is familiar with the culture of museums and archives. She publishes and lectures on ethno-graphic photography and on metadata issues. She was a member of an international collaborative working group of natural history museums and botanical gardens that developed NCD, Natural Collection Descriptions, a data standard for integrating access to science archives and specimen collections, currently under review by TDWG, the Taxonomic Data Working Group.

She is supervising a five-year project, funded by the Council of Library and Information Resources (CLIR) and the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), which includes the development of an infrastructure to manage both minimal and full level EAD and EAC-CPF records with the long-term goal of integrating access to scientific and archival collections. The AMNH is presently a host institution for a National Digital Stewardship Resident to survey the digital assets of its science departments as a baseline for developing a digital curation plan to manage and preserve these complex and important collections of research data.

As Chair-Elect, she is working with Chair Lorraine Stuart and members of the Museum Archives Advocacy Group to publicize the value of archives in Museums and will continue this work during her term as Chair.
Results of the MAS Membership Survey 2014  

BY HEIDI N. ABBEY  
Penn State Harrisburg, Former MAS Co-Chair (2013-2014)

If you have never had the opportunity to attend an annual SAA meeting, have not attended an SAA meeting in the past several years, or have never participated in the Business Meeting of the Museum Archives Section (MAS), rest assured that you are not alone! These are just some of the surprising but valuable facts we learned about MAS members as a result of the membership survey conducted during summer 2014. Although survey results were published on the MAS website and shared formally during the 2014 MAS Business Meeting at SAA in Washington, DC, this article is intended to provide as many MAS members as possible with a better understanding of the 2014 survey results and high-light ideas contributed by survey respondents.

Background Information  
First, before discussing the 2014 survey, it is useful to briefly revisit the results of the last MAS survey, which was conducted in spring/summer 2010 when the section included over 900 members. The survey was distributed to all MAS members via the section’s listserv and aimed to gauge members’ priorities. A total of 53 responses were received. Input from MAS members revealed notable ideas and requests to direct the future work of the section, including a desire to have conference sessions that feature more collaboration among archivists, discussions about emerging technology, and a continued focus on museum records management, to name a few. The 2010 survey also revealed an interest in creating an online tool or platform for sharing resources with other members, a goal which MAS has already achieved via the steadfast work of the MAS Standards & Best Practices Working Group. For more information about the results of the 2010 survey, please visit http://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/SAA_MAS_MM_2010.pdf.

Second, before we could move forward with new MAS initiatives for 2013-2014, the MAS Steering Committee decided that it would be critical to resurvey members for their input, particularly considering that, historically, few members are able to attend the annual Business Meeting at SAA. Additionally, those members in attendance at the 2013 MAS Business Meeting at SAA in New Orleans expressed an overwhelming interest in improving communication tools available to members, facilitating opportunities to network with other members, and exploring methods for archival advocacy within our institutions. The 2014 survey aimed to address all of these concerns as well as collect demographic information about MAS members and their respective organizations.

About the 2014 Survey  
During spring 2014, MAS Co-Chairs, Heidi Abbey and Jennie Thomas, and MAS Chair-Elect, Lorraine Stuart, designed a draft survey which was shared with the rest of the MAS Steering Committee for their input. We worked in close concert with staff at SAA and used Survey Monkey to design an online survey that consisted of 21 brief questions. The survey was announced via the MAS listserv in June 2014 and responses were received from MAS members through early July 2014.

Results of the 2014 Survey  
The survey was closed on July 7, 2014 and received a total of 215 responses, which represents a 15.8% response rate considering that MAS membership has increased to 1,357 members. The first seven questions in the survey pertained to members’ demographics and organizational/workplace concerns. This section of the survey was eye-opening and revealed the extreme diversity of museum and non-museum archives represented in MAS. For example, 22.07% of survey respondents indicated that they work in a non-museum setting and 36.62% reported that they work in a specialized museum or cultural institution not listed as one of seven choices in the first survey question. Over 51% of respondents work in a non-profit setting, and nearly 40% described themselves as lone arrangers. Not surprisingly, insufficient funding to meet goals affects almost 30% of members who answered the survey despite working within the context of a supportive administrative structure (44.5%).

Survey questions numbered eight through thirteen focused upon SAA and MAS participation. When asked about attendance at the annual SAA meeting, 73.5% of respondents indicated that insufficient travel funds have prevented them from participating. As for attendance at the annual MAS Business Meeting during SAA, 64% of respondents reported that they have never attended a meeting. These statistics clearly highlight that our members have real barriers to becoming more active in not only SAA but also MAS.

The remainder of the survey questions, numbered fourteen through twenty, related to preferred communication tools currently used by MAS and social media tools and other networking opportunities that MAS might develop to more effectively disseminate information and share best practices among members. When queried about the most valuable resource for learning about MAS, the majority of survey respondents ranked the MAS listserv as their top choice. This is somewhat surprising considering that the MAS listserv has low to moderate activity. The survey also revealed that many MAS members are currently
using social media tools such as Facebook (78.79%), blogs (67.88%), and Twitter (40%). Among survey respondents, there was a strong interest in creating a blog as well as a Facebook group that would be limited to MAS members only. This is one initiative that could be developed in the future to facilitate discussion among section members. Additionally, survey results reflect support for developing bimonthly, online MAS meetings with rotating topics and themes and ongoing interest in continuing the work of the Standards & Best Practices Working Group.

Finally, the last question of the survey enabled MAS members to provide a wide range of ideas and suggestions on how the section could better serve members’ needs in the years ahead.

Some of the ideas generated are summarized below:

- Clarify the vision and purpose of MAS;
- Provide resources for archives graduate students;
- Develop resources with information about conservation;
- Offer webinars or online classes and workshops;
- Continue to develop the Standards & Best Practices Working Group;
- Conduct a follow-up survey to ascertain members’ needs, particularly those of MAS members who are unable to attend SAA or the MAS Business Meeting;
- Use social media tools to deliver information to members throughout the year;
- Consider adding one or two “At-Large” members to the MAS Steering Committee, which would distribute tasks among more people and provide a learning opportunity for new and emerging leaders in MAS.

A more in-depth, unedited list of comments to the final survey question can be found online.

In conclusion, members of the MAS Steering Committee would like to thank everyone who responded to the 2014 survey. The ideas, feedback, concerns, and questions we received will undoubtedly provide assistance with developing new initiatives and broader goals for the Museum Archives Section in 2015 and beyond.
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By Rachel Chatalbash and Susan Hernandez, S&BPWG Co-Chairs

Over the past three years, the Museum Archives Section Standards and Best Practices Working Group has gathered examples of museum archives best practices, such as policies, procedures, and sample forms. We have focused on the full range of activities that museum archivists perform. As a result, our best practices range from sample administrative policies to arrangement and description documentation to interviews with our colleagues about their progress with electronic records. If you haven’t already, please visit our webpage on the Museum Archives Section microsite!

This year, we are transitioning slightly to focus on a different kind of “best practice,” one that doesn’t have to do with electronic records tools or how we encode our finding aids, but rather how we perform outreach and advocacy. For our purposes, we are defining outreach as the activities and programs oriented toward patrons or community members outside of our institution, and advocacy as activities designed to demonstrate the importance and value of museum archives, especially to internal constituents.

For the outreach portion of our project, we are gathering sample documents relating to museum archives outreach activities to be added to our existing online resource guide. Examples of possible documents to gather include but are not limited to: Transcripts or outlines for tours that repositories give Promotional brochures Programs repositories put on for external constituencies such as schools Documentation of archival exhibitions or online archival exhibits Social media projects General descriptions or examples of outreach activities

For the advocacy portion of our project, we are soliciting personal essays that demonstrate the importance of museum archivists and museum archives. These essays are intended to consider questions such as why a museum needs an archivist, or whether a museum archives is different from other types of archival repositories. Please see our call for personal essays below.

If you are interested in sending us sample outreach documents from your institution or would like to contribute a personal essay, please be in touch!

We look forward to updating you on our progress later this year.

Co-Chairs: Rachel Chatalbash, Susan Hernandez

What Does Being a Museum Archivist Mean to You?

The Museum Archives Section’s Standards and Best Practices Working Group is issuing a call to museum archivists for personal narrative essays that demonstrate the importance of museum archivists and museum archives. These essays will help us collectively articulate our roles within our institutions, local communities, and the professional archives field. We hope you will commit to writing an essay.

These essays can address any or all of the following questions:
What is a museum archivist?
What is the significance of museum archives?
Why does a museum need an archives?
If you’re a museum without an archives, what is the argument for why you should have an archives?
Why is it important to have a professional archivist at a museum?
Is a museum archivist/archives different from other types of archivists/archives?
Has the role of a museum archivist changed due to born-digital records?
Where do museum archivists fall in the organizational chart? Where does/should the archives fit in an organizational hierarchy or structure?

Essays should be between 250 and 1,000 words.

The essays will be compiled and published on the Museum Archives Section microsite.

Please email your commitment to writing a personal essay to Rachel Chatalbash, MAS S&BP Working Group Co-Chair, at rachel.chatalbash@yale.edu as soon as possible. Essays are due March 1, 2015. Working Group members will work with you to edit your essays and prepare them for online publication.
reviewed and revised. But, if it doesn’t (or even if it does but you just want to know your administration’s real area of focus), look at which areas of your institution are being funded consistently. When budget cuts come down, what tasks are identified as so critical that no one would consider cutting them? Those are the things that your institution sees as its most important functions, and those functions should guide you toward the view of the institution’s overall priorities.

With these priorities in mind, the next step is to identify specifically the ways in which your archives (the collections as well as the work of the archival staff) impact those important functions. The impact may be direct (teaching an undergraduate class at an academic institution focused on undergraduate education) or indirect (preserving and providing access to annual reports that are necessary for completing accreditation reports that allow the institution to continue operating). The impact may be broad reaching (incorporation of historical images into a broader institutional marketing campaign) or seemingly small and remote in effect (answering an email query from a person who then joins your Friends group).

Ideally, specific examples of impact will be routinely collected so they may be repurposed in outreach and advocacy efforts. This type of information collection can be conducted in a number of ways, from a departmental blog (publicly available or limited, internal availability) that staff can use to record stories of impact, to keeping a personal file for stories on your computer, to designating time for collection of stories during scheduled staff meetings. Stories need not be full case studies, but instead can provide a shell of information that can later be fleshed out as needed. Routine collection of these examples as part of day-to-day activities, as opposed to simply brainstorming your impact at the time you need to demonstrate it, encourages staff to think continually of how their work influences institutional priorities.

The regular collection of impact stories also gives you a wealth of information you can use regardless of the audience you are addressing. A breadth of examples of how your archival work has brought about different types and levels of impact allows you to choose the stories that are particularly of interest to your targeted audience. For example, a discussion with your organization’s chief development officer might focus on your impact on donor relations. A discussion with your organization’s chief finance officer, on the other hand, might focus on ways in which your records management program saves the institution money. Stories of specific instances of impact allow you to personalize your advocacy and increase your potential for success by demonstrating not just alignment to institutional priorities but alignment to a particular resource allocator’s stake in the institutional priorities.

In addition to regularly collecting specific examples of impact, reviewing your assessment methods and ensuring that they focus on demonstrating your impact on the institution can prove valuable. How does each measurement you are taking demonstrate that you are contributing to the mission of your organization? In your assessment reporting (annual reports, newsletters to a Friends group, or the like), are you framing your assessment statements clearly in terms of direct impact on your institution’s priorities? Yes, archives, libraries, and other cultural heritage institutions will always have the challenge in an often assessment-driven world of having numerous indirect and collective benefits that may not always be easy to directly measure or quantify. But reporting the metrics you do collect in a way that directly demonstrates your impact gives a framework to position these collective benefits within your organization’s broader priorities.

It is also important to note that both the collection of impact stories and the interpretation of assessment data should focus not simply on the collections, but on the work of the archivist. This is an important distinction that can make the difference between the survival of an archives (the collections making an Impact (Continued from page 1)
themselves) and the survival of an archives staffed by a professional archivist. In communicating with administrators, we must make clear the ways that the work of the professional archivist—not the collections alone—influence institutional priorities. For example, use of archival records as part of a development campaign aimed at marketing an institution's history can have great impact on the overall mission of the organization. But, in discussing this effect, the archivist needs to be acutely aware to not make herself "invisible." The archival records played a prominent role in a successful development campaign, but it was the work of the archivist in collecting, processing, and conducting research that made the use of the records—and the corresponding success of the campaign—possible.

In his September 2007 inaugural SAA presidential address, Mark A. Greene outlined what he called the “five frustrating foibles" of the archival profession, traits he saw “as diminishing our professional identity and our future.” One focused on the profession's resistance to shift from “placing primary emphasis on service to our users rather than our collections” due to “a deeply ingrained 'cult of the record' that insists that archivists are guardians and servants of the material, not facilitators and servants of our researchers.” In conversations with organizational leaders and reporting of assessment activities, we must make clear that the archives' impact on the institution's priorities is due primarily to the work of the archivist.1

Greene also stressed in his 2007 address the importance of active and consistent work in order to gain respect for the archives. He argued, "If our bosses don't understand what we do, that is surely not their fault but ours. If we haven't explained and demonstrated to resource allocators why what we do is so important, there is no one to blame but ourselves.” In launching her "Year of Living Dangerously with Archives" initiative, current SAA president Roe likewise urges archivists to step outside of their comfort zone and take bold action to advocate for and raise awareness of archives and archival work.

Archives and archivists bring unique historical collections, in-depth knowledge of organization and description, experience working with various types of donors or researchers, and more to an organization. But, only when the archivist can clearly articulate how his or her work specifically advances the institution’s mission can archival advocacy move beyond a sense of self-evident importance to one of clear demonstration of impact and organizational essentialness. Then, the archives can gain champions and support to help it thrive and ensure that the archivist can be a good steward for the collections, now and into the future.

Notes:
As so often happens, archivists can be a bit slow at making their own archives accessible. At last year’s SAA meeting, our new chair, Lorraine Stuart, suggested that we check with the SAA Archives and see if they had OUR newsletter archives.¹ No need. As the Museum Archivist editor from 1989 to 1995, I had socked away my Word files on the Brooklyn Museum network, and even taken care of converting them from one Word version to the next. An early attempt to convert them to PDF was a pretty miserable failure, with all formatting lost, so at that point I made RTFs and set them aside. I told Lorraine that I would bite the bullet and get digital versions to Supriya Wronkiewicz, our Section Webmaster.

And a very tasty bullet it turned out to be! As a prelude to the RTF to PDF conversion (Word now, happily, does a good job of creating PDFs), I had to page through each issue to tweak the formatting to make the newsletters look as good as they had in print. As is so often the case, a dreary job turned out to be fascinating, as I walked through eleven formative years of the museum archives movement.

The twenty years between William Deiss’s first edition of *Museum Archives: An Introduction* (SAA 1984), which asks, “Why should a museum have an archives program?” and “How should they go about it?” and the second edition of the book, planned and written by a talented group of Section members and published in 2004, witness the continual growth of professionalism in museum archives and museum archivists. At a time when little else was written and published about our niche, *Museum Archivist* served as our brain trust and documents the invention of “museum archives” as a distinctive professional focus.

For those who weren’t there—and a walk down memory lane for those who were—I thought I would recount some of the highlights here. Perhaps this can be a prelude to a thirtieth anniversary celebration in 2016!

That first issue of Museum Archivist (December 1986) is a fascinating read, recounting the Section’s genesis as a Roundtable and including a report of the SAA Museum Archives Task Force (MATF) and the results of a survey on museum archives sent to more than 500 museums (only 7% had an archivist on staff at the time). The seminal work of the MATF caused an outpouring of support from museums for archival programs, with new programs popping up in issue after issue of the newsletter.

Two parallels to current events are also evident in that issue: “NHPRC Raises Questions on Status of Archives Program at Corcoran” and “AAM Accreditation Commission Introduces Questions on Museum Archive in Self-Study.” Given the closing of the Corcoran and the release of the newest AAM self-study, which no longer includes questions on archives, this is a call to constant vigilance for the strength of our programs.

So many archives programs sprang up in those early years and the many grants, surveys, acquisitions, and facilities improvements reported in the newsletter attest to the energy of this new facet of the profession. We hear from the MFA, Boston, the Milwaukee Museum, MoMA, and the Brooklyn Museum—and many others—about their new programs; about the National Gallery Archives’ new facility; a records survey at the Phillips Collection and a photo survey at the Smithsonian; and oral history projects at Mystic Seaport. Collections are acquired and processed, from the Eakins Collection (Pennsylvania Academy)
to the Soby Papers (MoMA) to Frank Lloyd Wright materials at his home and studio.

We dipped our toes into automation—brand new at the time—and sometimes jumped in headlong: laser disks, MARC cataloging, the Web, databases. Exhibition reports documented our outreach efforts. Native American and tribal archives issues were discussed in detail. We published reports, finding aids, and guides. Researchers had a voice in Museum Archivist, presenting reports on topics as diverse as a study of dealer/collector J.B. Neumann and the Golden Age of natural history museums. We went to meetings of allied organizations: MCN, AASLH, AAM, and archival regionals. Bad news was reported, too: budget disasters, floods, archives in trouble, program proposals rejected.

Grants, especially from the NHPRC, which was a driving financial force behind the museum archives movement, form a continual thread through the years. And they had “legs” beyond just the institutional support: an archives gets a startup grant and then starts supporting the rest of the community with reports and case studies. Job postings show the growth of a cohort of museum archives professionals.

A timeline of the Section’s history in the newsletter shows the progress from the 28 people who attended the August 1986 meeting of the Museum Archives Roundtable; to our successful proposal to become a Section in January 1990; to the many session proposals for the annual meeting; to the innovation of the annual section working group meetings and the resulting reports (some of which were fodder for chapters in the manual); to extended discussions (starting in 1993) about producing a second edition of Museum Archives: An Introduction; all culminating (and continuing) in the hundreds of Section members and exciting projects of today’s group. The Chair wrote a column in each issue, presenting thoughts on both the Section’s work and museum archives in general.

It’s worth noting that it wasn’t until September 1993 that email addresses started appearing on the masthead of Museum Archivist, and by no means all of the officers had them, even as recently as the 1997 issue. Museum Archivist was—in the days of occasional face-to-face meetings and frequent telephone talks—a valuable means of communicating, sharing, publicizing, and trumpeting our work. And, while we now have a myriad of new and useful communication possibilities, that exercise of putting our thoughts into writing and sharing them with colleagues still has great value.

Go read a little history—our own history!

Notes:
1. The Section records are another question altogether — there used to be a couple of records cartons that were packed up and shipped from one new Chair to the next. We might want to look into where they eventually landed.
2. See also the chapter on the Museum Archives Movement in Museum Archives: An Introduction, 2nd edition.

Stay Connected

The Museum Archives Section has an official SAA email list as well as a Museum Archives listserv. The listserv relays news items related to the profession and serves as a forum for members to assist one another with issues encountered in archives.

Official SAA Museum Archives Email List
All new and renewing section members are automatically subscribed—albeit in NOMAIL mode—to an official SAA Museum Archives Email List. Information on official email lists can be found on the SAA website. The archives of this list are available for members.

Museum Archives Listserv (SAAMUS-L)
While emails do circulate on SAA Museum Archives email list, section discussion also takes place on the SAAMUS-L listserv. To join the Museum Archives listserv send an email to LISTSERV@SI-LISTSERV.SI.EDU with the following commands in the body of the email: subscribe SAAMUS-L firstname lastname. Replace “firstname lastname” with your own name; for example: subscribe SAAMUS-L John Smith.
To post to the list, send email to SAAMUS-L@SI-LISTSERV.SI.EDU.

The Museum Archives listserv, SAAMUS-L, is hosted by the Smithsonian Institution. If you have any questions about the Museum Archives listserv, please contact Marisa Bourgoin.
News from the Indianapolis Museum of Art Archives

Internship Profile: Rebecca Pattillo

As a graduate student at Indiana University, Indianapolis (IUPUI), I am currently pursuing my MA in Public History and my MLS. One of the greatest strengths of IUPUI’s Public History department is its internship program. Through a cost-share arrangement with host institutions, graduate students have the opportunity to work directly with public history professionals in one local organization, 20 hours per week, for the duration of the school year. Faculty make the placements with the academic and professional interests of each student in mind. Imagine my anxiety not knowing where I would be placed or on what projects I would be working! When I received my placement for the 2014-2015 academic year, I was ecstatic to find that I would be the first IUPUI Public History intern to work at the Indianapolis Museum of Art (IMA) Archives as the inaugural Ursula Kolmstetter Scholar (a position named in honor of the late IMA head librarian).

My primary project with the IMA Archives has been to process the papers of Percival Gallagher, a principal landscape architect for the Olmsted Brothers firm. After learning about archival theory and best practices from IMA Archivist Samantha Norling, I was ready to tackle Gallagher’s papers. Archival processing was an entirely new experience for me, one that was overwhelming at first. How on earth was I going to make sense of all of these items? How did I plan to organize the collection into series that would stay faithful to the original order? How then should I describe the series so that the collection made sense to a researcher? And, most important, are these nitrate negatives dangerous?! Thankfully with Sami’s guidance at each step, my apprehensions eased and I began to question less and discover more.

I am happy to announce that my first processing project was a great success, and the Percival Gallagher Papers are now open for research at the IMA Archives. Now that the collection has been processed and the finding aid written, my next project is to digitize the Gallagher photographs…especially the nitrate negatives!

Percival Gallagher Papers Now Open for Research at the IMA Archives

The Percival Gallagher Papers (M006) document the personal and professional life of prominent landscape architect and partner of the Olmsted Brothers firm, Percival Gallagher (1874-1934). During his career, Gallagher worked on a variety of projects for private residences, state parks, and cemeteries. Some of his projects include the Essex and Union Counties park system in New Jersey, Bryn Mawr, Vassar, and Duke University grounds, and Oldfields in Indianapolis. This newly processed collection at the IMA Archives contains Gallagher’s research files, correspondence, scrapbooks, plans and maps from his landscape projects, and photographic prints and negatives that document his European travels, work projects, and family visits.

To view the finding aid for the Percival Gallagher Papers and learn more about the IMA Archives visit: http://www.imamuseum.org/research/archives.
The Metropolitan Museum of Art Opens Four Archival Collections for Research

The Metropolitan Museum of Art recently opened for research four substantial collections of archival material. The first three described below were processed with funds provided by the Leon Levy Foundation.

**James J. Rorimer records**: James J. Rorimer (1905-1966) joined The Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1927 as Assistant in the Department of Decorative Arts, then rose through the curatorial ranks leading to his 1938 appointment as Curator of Medieval Art and The Cloisters. Rorimer left the Museum in 1943 to join the US Army, and served in Europe as Lieutenant, Captain, and later as Chief of the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Section of the Seventh Army. After the war, Rorimer returned to the Metropolitan as Director of The Cloisters and Curator of Medieval Art (1949-1955), and Director of the Museum (1955-1966). The records document mainly his time as Museum Director, and include correspondence with institutions, organizations, donors, and trustees, clippings and documentation of special exhibitions and notable acquisitions, and information on the Museum's Fifth Avenue and Cloisters buildings. Finding aid: [http://libmma.org/digital_files/archives/James_J_Rorimer_records_b18437540](http://libmma.org/digital_files/archives/James_J_Rorimer_records_b18437540)

**Theodore Rousseau records**: Theodore Rousseau (1912-1973) served in the US Navy during World War II and in the Art Looting Investigation Unit of the Office of Strategic Services before being appointed Associate Curator of Paintings at The Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1947. He was named Curator in 1948 and Chairman of the Department of European Paintings in 1967, and was elected Vice Director of the Museum and appointed as its Curator-in-Chief in 1968. The records include correspondence related to curatorial matters, acquisitions, and deaccessioning, as well as clippings, articles, and photographs of works of art. They also include documents from his long professional involvement with the International Council of Museums and drafts and final versions of his professional writings and lecture presentations. Finding aid: [http://libmma.org/digital_files/archives/Theodore_Rousseau_records_b18461839.pdf](http://libmma.org/digital_files/archives/Theodore_Rousseau_records_b18461839.pdf)


The fourth collection newly available is the Robert Lehman Papers, processed by Museum Archives staff with funds provided by the Robert Lehman Foundation. The papers document the collecting of art by financier Robert Lehman (1891-1969) and his father, Philip (1861-1947). Over the course of sixty years, first Philip and then Robert acquired thousands of artworks with scholarly knowledge, astute connoisseurship, and skillful negotiation of the art market. Spanning seven hundred years of western European art, from the fourteenth to the twentieth centuries, the works include paintings, drawings, manuscript illumination, sculpture, glass, textiles, antique frames, maiolica, enamels, and precious jeweled objects. Upon Robert Lehman’s death in 1969, he bequeathed 2,600 works to the Metropolitan Museum with the stipulation that they be exhibited as a private collection, reflecting his belief that “important works of art, privately owned, should be beyond one’s own private enjoyment and [that] the public at large should be afforded some means of seeing them.” The Robert Lehman Wing, erected to display the collection, opened to the public in 1975.

The Robert Lehman Papers document the acquisition and cultivation of this magnificent art collection by Philip and Robert Lehman and include correspondence with galleries, dealers, advisers and museums, invoices, insurance records, object descriptions, and inventories. Prominent individuals represented in the papers include art dealers and consultants such as F. Kleinberger, Harry S. Sperling, and Charles Durand-Ruel, as well as art historians Bernard Berenson, R. Langton Douglas, and Max Friedländer. The papers also include photographs and memorabilia regarding the Lehman family, Robert’s military service, and travel. This material offers a wealth of historical information that will advance research on one of the finest private collections ever assembled in North America and that will support scholarship in other arts and humanities disciplines. A comprehensive finding aid to the papers is available here: [http://libmma.org/digital_files/archives/Robert_Lehman_papers_b1848688.pdf](http://libmma.org/digital_files/archives/Robert_Lehman_papers_b1848688.pdf).

For information about access to this collection, please email [lehmanpapers@metmuseum.org](mailto:lehmanpapers@metmuseum.org). For information regarding the Robert Lehman Collection and the Robert Lehman Wing, visit [http://www.metmuseum.org/about-the-museum/museum-departments/curatorial-departments/the-robert-lehman-collection](http://www.metmuseum.org/about-the-museum/museum-departments/curatorial-departments/the-robert-lehman-collection).
The Archives Department of The Frick Collection and Frick Art Reference Library is pleased to announce that Associate Archivists Susan Chore, Julie Ludwig, and Shannon Morelli passed the SAA Digital Archives Specialist certificate examination this year.

We are also glad to announce that two manuscript collections related to artists have been acquired since we last reported to MAS. One collection consists of correspondence and other documentation concerning the painter Antoine Vollon, his son Alexis Vollon, and their contemporaries. The gift, consisting of approximately 400 items, came from Carol Tabler, who also gave The Frick Collection a Vollon watercolor View of Dieppe, 1873. The collection is processed and the finding aid available (Vollon Correspondence Collection, 1846-1937). A second acquisition, the diaries of Matilda Gay, wife of the painter Walter Gay, as well as other Walter Gay documents and memorabilia, has also been processed and the finding aid will be posted shortly.

Archives staff participated in a 60 Minutes film shoot for a segment on Wikipedia to be aired in Winter 2015. Along with other members of the library staff, Julie Ludwig and Shannon Morelli were filmed creating Wikipedia articles for two clocks in The Frick Collection that were bequeathed by Winthrop Kellogg Edey or purchased using funds from his bequest. We were asked to participate because of our ongoing institutional involvement with Wikipedia through our GLAM-WikiProject and our relationship with Dorothy Howard, the Wikipedian-in-Residence and Open Data Fellow at the Metropolitan New York Library Council.

Finally, in celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the Frick family’s taking up residence in their new home at 1 East 70th Street on November 17th, 1914, the Archives Department created an exhibition using Google Open Gallery. Entitled “A Comfortable Well Arranged Home: 100 Years of Henry Clay Frick’s New York Residence,” the exhibition consists of photographs and documents that illustrate the history of the planning, construction, and furnishing of the Frick family’s permanent home in New York City, now The Frick Collection.
Leon Levy Funds AMNH Field Book Project

The Leon Levy Foundation has funded a project at the American Museum of Natural History Research Library to create in-depth catalog records for the Museum’s scientific field books. While some of these books are held in the archives in the Library, many are maintained in the individual scientific departments because of their intrinsic connection and importance to the specimens and objects in the scientific collections. Many of the books have been gathered and sometimes bound together but others are included within individual manuscript collections. Anticipating in-depth cataloging, the notation “includes field notes” was made to relevant minimal catalog records in the science department archives, created during an IMLS-supported risk assessment, as well as to similar minimal records for archival collections in the Library, funded by a CLIR Hidden Collections grant. These notes will readily identify the books to be described in greater detail.

This project will result in centralized access to the records for the field books through the Library catalog regardless of their physical location and will facilitate their future scanning so they may be added to the collection of field books within the Biodiversity Heritage Library providing integrated access across collections within many institutions.

Finally, expanding on the Museum’s second CLIR Hidden Collections grant, this project will also include the ongoing work of creating EAC-CPF records for the names of the expeditions and the people associated with them to help relate the records for the books to the records for the specimens across the Museum’s scientific departments and, in time, across other natural science collecting institutions.

Guggenheim Museum Archives Completes NHPRC Electronic Records Start-Up Grant

In 2013, the Guggenheim Archives received funding for an electronic records start-up project from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). The 18-month project resulted in the creation of a comprehensive plan to establish and manage a much-needed electronic records repository for the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation.

The project entailed comprehensively inventorying the foundation’s electronic records, establishing a digital archives infrastructure, developing capacities for processing removable media as well as procedures for incorporating obsolete and obscure file formats, creating web archives, and preserving significant email correspondence. In addition, the Archives developed detailed workflows for incorporating born-digital records into the repository, including complex file formats such as video, three-dimensional models, CAD drawings, and more.

The project generated several reports, which are available on the project webpage.

Final Report
Three-Tiered Plan for Managing Electronic Records

Project Reports
Digital records processing and obsolete media ingestion workstation
Preservation and Access Formats
Preserving Significant Email Correspondence
Procedures for Preserving SRGF Websites and Microsites
Setup, Test, and Evaluate an OAIS-compliant Trusted Digital Repository
Tool Summary

Thanks to the project, the Archives now has the ability to fulfill its mission with the addition and use of an electronic records repository that collects, preserves, and makes available electronic records that document the activities and history of the Guggenheim Foundation.
Over the course of 2014, we have completed several projects in the Wildlife Conservation Society Archives.

In February 2014, the Archives completed a website displaying digitized copies of scrapbooks created in the early twentieth century by William T. Hornaday. The scrapbooks are part of a series of albums Hornaday compiled to chronicle the several wildlife protection campaigns he spearheaded. For nearly three decades, during much of which he also served as first Director of the Bronx Zoo, Hornaday led fundraising and lobbying efforts to protect North American wildlife. Made possible through funding from the Leon Levy Foundation, the project was the Archives' largest digitization effort to date.

Later in the year, with funding from the Metropolitan Library Council of New York (METRO), the Archives digitized the Society’s run of historical annual reports. These are available through the Internet Archive. In addition to being beautifully illustrated with wildlife photography, the annual reports provide valuable documentation of the Society’s rich and diverse activities year by year.

Additionally, we've made available several new collections for research. Among them are:

**Collection 3054: New York Aquarium senior staff records, 1955-1979 (bulk 1964-1979):**
The collection holds correspondence, administrative and operational records, subject files, and other materials from directors, curators, and other senior staff at the New York Aquarium. The materials in the collection come from the files of NYA Directors Christopher W. Coates, Paul L. Montreuil, Ross F. Nigrelli, James A. Oliver, and George D. Ruggieri, as well as from several other Aquarium senior staff members, including Jewell Bungay, William S. Flynn, H. Doug Kemper, Pedro Ponciano, and Stephen Spotte. The records document the day-to-day operations of the Aquarium, in particular its animal exhibits and its finances, as well as its collecting expeditions and the construction and renovation of exhibits.

**Collection 1006: Gloria Hollister Anable papers, 1914-2005 (bulk 1926-1947):**
Anable, nee Gloria Hollister, was a naturalist and ichthyologist who, from 1928-1941, was employed as a Research Associate under William Beebe in the New York Zoological Society’s Department of Tropical Research. As a Research Assistant, Hollister recorded the observations of Beebe and his collaborator Otis Barton during their record-setting dives in the Bathysphere; she also prepared specimens found through dredging. Hollister’s collection includes black and white photographs and negatives; glass lantern slides; correspondence; journals; lecture, research, and motion picture notes; and specimen lists relating to her expeditions, particularly the 1926 and 1936 expeditions to Arima Gorge, Trinidad and Kaieteur Falls and Plateau, British Guiana (now Guyana). In addition, this collection includes material on an unrealized expedition to Iceland, articles relating to Beebe and Hollister’s work with the Bathysphere, correspondence, biographical material, and newspaper clippings concerning her professional affiliations, conservation work, and personal interests.

The collection holds the records of the international programs of the New York Zoological Society (NYZS), with records relating to NYZS sponsorship of field research and wildlife conservation projects carried out from the 1970s to the early 1990s. NYZS grants funded ecological studies of animals and regions, as well as projects promoting wildlife conservation awareness, conservation legislation, and the creation of protected areas. The bulk of the collection consists of correspondence between NYZS officials and project grantees, administrative records relating to grant approval and funding processes, and the resulting field reports and publications.

For more collections newly available, please visit our website or email us at library@wcs.org.
Internship Report:
Outstanding Women in Ornithology: Florence Merriam Bailey

BY KELSEY DIEMAND, Digital Services Division Spring 2014 Intern, Smithsonian Institution Archives

A version of this post originally appeared on the SIA’s blog, The Bigger Picture

As an intern with the Digital Services Division, I worked with the Florence Merriam Bailey Papers during Spring 2014 and learned a great deal about Florence’s life and work and its influence on the nineteenth century scientific community. Before embarking on this project, I had little knowledge about the field of ornithology and had never heard of Florence's work. After looking at her various diaries, journals, publications, and photographs, Florence’s passion for studying birds became very apparent to me.

Florence was the daughter of Clinton Levi Merriam and the sister of Clinton (C.) Hart Merriam, a famous zoologist who worked for and eventually became director of the US Biological Survey and was first president of the American Society of Mammalogy. C. Hart Merriam introduced Florence to her future husband, Vernon Orlando Bailey, another prominent figure in the field of natural history. Vernon and Florence spent their life together as a perfect team, conducting research together and taking the scientific world by storm.

Florence was born on August 8, 1863 in Locust Grove, NY during the Civil War. At the age of eleven, she wrote a diary detailing her daily thoughts and activities in Washington, DC, where she was living at the time. In her early entries, she speaks of taking walks, attending Sunday school, and learning Latin. She was highly literate and well written by the age of eleven and cared about her studies. "I have finished all of my Sunday School lesson, but of course I will have to look it over every day." She even displayed a hint of adolescent humor in her entries, as on January 6, when she stated, "I have not done anything today that is worth writing down so I guess I won't say anything." I found this first diary interesting not only because I was able to read about young Florence’s life but also because it was really interesting to study the physical differences in the diaries themselves from those of today. Florence also kept other diaries of her life in Washington and journals from trips to places such as South Carolina, Maine, and California. In her California journal in particular, I found that her curly, cursive writing was sometimes hard to decipher and I had to look up the places she was describing. However after working with her collection for several weeks, I started to become familiar with her handwriting.

This collection also includes a vast collection of field notes and photographs from her expeditions. One trip in particular caught my eye. Florence’s 1898 trip to Mount Hood in Oregon was interesting to work with because it included both field notes as well as photographs. This made it easy to visualize the places and species she wrote about. She also took photos of the mountain itself as well as of the bird habitats in the area, including trees and bushes.

One of my favorite groups of photographs and documents are those from "Homewood." Homewood was Florence’s name for the family property in Locust Grove, NY. She documents the house and land via photographs. I particularly enjoyed the pictures of "Brownie," a squirrel that was often present in Homewood. Florence seemed to enjoy taking pictures of him, as there are several within her collection of him in a variety of amusing poses.

I enjoyed this collection for its variety of field documents and photographs, both in the field as well as personal ones. Through interacting with Florence’s diaries, field books, and photographs I was able to connect at a personal level with this inspiring woman of the scientific community. Florence was not only a researcher of birds, but a promoter of their preservation too. She became involved with the Committee on Bird Protection of the American Ornithologists’ Union, and as a result of her efforts and others, the Lacey Act of 1900 was instituted. This act prohibited interstate trade in wildlife that had been illegally taken, transported or sold. Florence Merriam Bailey was a prominent historical figure in the field of ornithology and an inspiring woman.

Florence Merriam Bailey, Record Unit 7417 - Florence Merriam Bailey Papers, 1865-1942, Smithsonian Institution

Florence Merriam Bailey Diary, 1874. Entries March 1-2 with drawings. Record Unit 7417 - Florence Merriam Bailey Papers, 1865-1942, Smithsonian Institution Archives.