
MUSEUM ARCHIVIST

Newsletter of the Museum Archives Section
Society of American Archivists

September 1992

Volume 6 Number 2

FROM THE CHAIR ...

This is my last newsletter column as outgoing chair of the Museum Archives Section. It has been very rewarding and great fun to work with so many talented and dedicated people for the past two years. It truly has been a privilege. Thanks everyone!

Newsletter Pep Talk

It's clear that the newsletter is one of the most important activities that the section sponsors. Perhaps sometimes we take it (and its hard-working editor) for granted? We all need to be more conscientious about submitting news items and articles for inclusion in Museum Archivist. It's a small price to pay for such an informative and useful publication.

New members in particular - won't you submit a report on your archives for the next issue? Contact our newsletter editor for further details.

Meeting of Minds in Montreal

The SAA annual meeting is almost here! This year's meeting in Montreal promises to be a wonderful chance to meet colleagues and to exchange ideas on topics of mutual interest and concern. For more details on the SAA annual meeting and a review of program highlights of interest to newsletter readers, see inside this issue.

I hope many of you will be able to attend the SAA Museum Archives Section annual meeting on Wednesday, September 16 from 8-

10AM. You not only will hear a brief review of the past year's activities, but also will participate in section planning for education, outreach, and publications efforts. We need your ideas and your energy, so please plan to attend.

The next issue of the newsletter will include a summary of the section's actions and meeting discussions in Montreal, as submitted by the section's secretary. In the meantime, please contact me or any section officer with your comments or concerns.

Briefly, the Year in Review

Besides engaging in the "ordinary" activities of the section, e.g. production and distribution of the newsletter, devising and updating the 3-Year Plan, etc., the section undertook the following activities during 1991-92:

*supported sessions at professional meetings, including:

Mid-Atlantic Association of Museums/New England Museum Association (Albany) upcoming in November 1992: "Oral History: A Museum's Hidden Asset" illustrates the ways an oral history program can benefit museums. Society of American Archivists (Mont-real) upcoming in September 1992: "Archives with Museum Facilities" explores ways in which museum methodology and practices can assist with archives goals and overall mission.

MUSEUM ARCHIVIST

is issued twice a year by the
Museum Archives Section of SAA.

News items, letters to the editor, and comments from the
archives community are welcome.

Next deadline: December 15, 1992.

Chair 1991-92..... Kathleen Hartt
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, Box 6826,
Houston, TX 77265
713 526 1361 fax: 639 7595

Chair 1992-93.....Kristine Haglund
Denver Museum of Natural History, 2001 Colorado
Boulevard, Denver, CO 80205
303 370 6361

Membership Secretary.....Alan Bain
Smithsonian Archives, A & I Building, Room 2135,
Washington, DC 20560
202 786 2747 fax: 357 2395

Recording Secretary.....Susan Glenn
Smithsonian Archives, A & I Building, Room 2135,
Washington, DC 20560
202 786 2751 fax: 357 2395

Editor.....Deborah Wythe
The Brooklyn Museum, 200 Eastern Parkway,
Brooklyn, NY 11238
718 638 5000 fax: 638 3731

Outreach.....Theresa Rini Percy
Old Sturbridge Village, 1 Old Sturbridge Village
Road, Sturbridge, MA 01566
508 347 3362 fax: 347 5375

Publications..... Maygene Daniels
National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC 20565
202 842 6175

Assistant Editor.....Meg Klinkow
Frank Lloyd Wright Home & Studio, 951 Chicago
Avenue, Oak Park, IL 60302
708 848 1976

Contributors:

Alan Bain, Kristine Haglund, Kathleen Hartt, Carolyn
Kirdahy, Meg Klinkow, Apphia Loo, Theresa Percy, Mary
Elizabeth Ruwell, Rachel Wild

SECTION BUSINESS

From the Chair, cont.

Texas Association of Museums (San Antonio) in April
1992: "From Artifacts to Archives: Making Information
Accessible" general discussion of archives programs in
museums.

*participated in the new long-range planning initiative of
the Society of American Archivists

*worked with the SAA Education Office to offer its
workshop, "Archives, An Introduction," at the American
Association of Museums annual meeting (Fort Worth) in
May 1993

*began gathering program and curricula information on
Museum Studies programs in the U.S. - exploring the
possibility of including archives career information in
museum studies settings

*submitted Museum Archives information packet for the
International Documentation Centre of the International
Congress on Archives meeting in Montreal

*contacted International Congress on Archives
Committee for Literature and Art Archives concerning its
plans to produce the publication, "An International
Guide to Literature and Art Archives"

This summary report is written for those of you who will
be unable to attend the section's annual meeting. All of
these activities will be reported on in greater detail at
that time. I am looking forward to seeing many of you
there!

Kathleen Hartt
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

Many thanks to all those who responded to my call for
articles and news. I couldn't put together this great
publication without your help! Once again, thanks to
Porcine Software for the use of the laser printer.

At the annual meeting, I will be again be asking for your
help, but don't wait for a personal call--volunteer! A few
ideas:

SECTION BUSINESS

From the Editor's Desk, cont.

Museum Archivist = Cub Reporter

We never have enough news from around the country. Want to get to know people in your region and provide a valuable service to the Section? Become a *Museum Archivist* reporter. Interview people by telephone and write up short articles. Solicit reports on projects and repositories. It's fun and doesn't have to be all that time consuming--give it a try! Call or buttonhole the Editor to volunteer and discuss ideas.

What Keeps Those Archives Volunteers Coming In? (Wouldn't They Rather Be Giving Tours in the Galleries?)

I'd like to run an article in February that draws on the experiences of volunteers in museum archives. Nothing too formal--war stories, favorite projects, what the volunteers like about the work--in the voices of the volunteers, if possible. If you're willing to help out and have some lively folks willing to tell their side of the story, please let me know.

Grant Funding Followup

Make your funders happy and keep your colleagues up to date. If you have had a grant-funded project recently (or not so recently), share the results in *Museum Archivist*. You may even be able to recycle your final grant report, just to keep the work load down. This is a great public relations tool. Include the article in the next grant you submit to illustrate that you are effective, capable, and that you appreciate being funded.

Deborah Wythe
Brooklyn Museum

ARCHIVISTS & LIBRARIANS MEET AT AAM

Earlier this summer, Patricia Williams, Deputy Director of the American Association of Museums, and Laurie Baty of the NHPRC, invited a group of museum archivists and librarians to assist in developing sessions related to our fields for the AAM annual meeting in Fort Worth (May 14-15, 1993). Of the more than twenty

individuals invited, eight were able to attend a brainstorming session at the AAM offices in Washington on August 5, 1992.

According to Pat Williams, interest in establishing a standing Archives and Libraries Professional Committee within AAM has been weak, with most archivists and librarians looking toward groups such as SAA and SLA or RLIS/NA for professional involvement. Setting up a yearly working group will ensure that we are both represented at the AAM annual meeting and provide sessions that reach out to AAM members who may have similar concerns and interests to ours. In the future, the meeting will be planned with a longer lead time, to allow more people to attend.

The meeting began with an introduction by Pat Williams and Meg McCarthy of AAM, describing the process of getting a session on the program. They also provided information on the audience--who attends AAM meetings and what they are looking for. We also discussed the place of archives and libraries in the accreditation process.

In the day-long meeting, many possible sessions were proposed and discussed. Five are being worked out in more detail and will be submitted to the AAM program committee. Mary Elizabeth Ruwell (National Anthropological Archives) will organize a session on "Access, Repatriation and Collection Records," to discuss the challenges of dealing with the documentation of returned or sacred materials, including tribal requests to restrict access. Along with Pat Williams, she will also put together a session on dealing with the demands of film makers. Katherine Martinez (Winterthur) is looking into sessions on regional conservation centers and funding and on access to records of objects, libraries, and archives through computer networks. Rhoda Ratner (National Museum of American History) proposed a session on reformatting and marketing--getting materials preserved and making money in the process by publishing microform and CD-ROM editions.

In addition to sessions, we can put materials into the meeting *Sourcebook*, where they will be available for future reference. Alan Bain will work with Pat Williams to include the 1991 museum archives survey statistics. We also discussed producing a brochure such as the ASC one for inclusion.

ROUNDTABLE BUSINESS

AAM Meeting, cont.

As most section members know from reading *Museum Archivist*, archivists have been consistently active in producing sessions from AAM meetings. This year, for example, the SAA workshop "Archives: An Introduction" will be offered at AAM, with Kathleen Hartt and Maygene Daniels as instructors. Last year's archives sessions, "Changing Perspectives on the Documentation of Collections, Parts I and II," were standing room only. AAM's initiative to reach out to archivists and librarians reinforces our efforts and will ensure that sessions are included every year.

If you are interested in being part of the working group that will meet next spring, please let our new section Chair, Kris Hag-lund, know. Here's a great way to get involved!

Deborah Wythe
Brooklyn Museum

MUSEUM ARCHIVISTS MEET IN MONTREAL

As usual, the highlight of the Museum Archives Section's year will be the Society of American Archivists annual meeting, taking place this year in beautiful Montreal. Join us there!

Don't miss the Museum Archives Section meeting on Wednesday, September 16th, 8AM-10AM. It's an active and welcoming group. Sit up front, say hello--don't be shy--get involved!

A good number of museum archivists are participating in this year's program, though Section-sponsored sessions are not numerous. While attending sessions, how about giving some thought to ones you would like to see happen next year. It's never too soon!

Kathleen Hartt, MFA, Houston, will be chairing "Archives with Museum Facilities" on Monday, September 14th at 8AM; at the same time, Sharron Uhler of the Colorado Springs Pioneers Museum will bring the museum archivist's perspective to deaccessioning in "How Do You Throw It Away?" Later that morning, Luke Gilliland-Swetland of the Henry Ford Museum will discuss provenance in the light of Susan Grigg's assessment of historical method.

On Tuesday morning at 10:30, George MacDonald, Canadian Museum of Civilization, will consider the relative merits of entertainment and scholarship in archives. Parallel to that session, Julie Bressor of Shelburne Farms will chair a discussion of selling archival programs. At 3:30PM, Ellen Dunlap of the Rosenbach Museum and Library will speak on loans for exhibits.

Wednesday features John Fleckner, Smithsonian Archives, chairing one of the 2020 Vision sessions, which will look at social and cultural trends, at 10:30AM. Also in that time block, Elizabeth Schaaf of the Peabody Institute chairs a session on preservation, access, and exhibitions, with the enticing title of "Tutus, Frisbees, and Fetishes." That afternoon at 1:15, a session on African American museums as research centers will feature Donald West from the Avery Research Center, Andrea Hinding from the YMCA Archives, and Steven Cameron Newsome of the Anacostia Museum. Also at 1:15, Lynn Davis of the Bishop Museum will participate in a session on the AAT.

On Thursday, John Fleckner again appears on a 2020 Vision panel. A final note: as you dash from lecture to lecture, keep *Museum Archivist* in mind--session reports for the February 1993 issue (due December 15th) will help bring the annual meeting to archivists who couldn't attend. Contact the editor to volunteer!

CALL FOR INFORMATION

Organic Form: Painting, Sculpture and Decorative Arts in America, 1940-1960 (working title) is an exhibition organized by The Brooklyn Museum and scheduled to open in the spring of 1996. The curators are seeking to learn where there are caches of material, private libraries, archives or other information relating to the use of natural and organic form in painting, sculpture and decorative arts from the period. Please contact Brooke Kamin Rapaport, Assistant Curator, Contemporary Art, The Brooklyn Museum, 200 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, NY 11238 (718 638 5000 x260).

LETTERS

MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, BOSTON ARCHIVES UPDATE

The President of the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mrs. Henry R. Guild, Jr., wrote the following letter to Kathleen Hartt, Museum Archives Section Chair, on March 4, 1992. This official statement is printed here with the permission of Nancy Allen, Museum Librarian.

"As President of the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, it is my pleasure to inform you and the members of the Museum Archives Section that as of January 13, 1992, our institution once again has a fully operational Archives Department.

"We are very fortunate that Maureen Melton, the archivist who directed the program so effectively from its creation in 1987, has returned on a full-time basis.

"The interest and concern for the Archives expressed by museum archivists reflects our own belief that systematic collection and organization of records can play an important role in the efficient administration of museums. We are delighted that we have been able to completely reactivate our archives program.

"I know that I speak for all of the Trustees in saying how grateful we are for your continued interest and support."

PUBLICATIONS

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART PUBLISHES ARCHITECTURAL GUIDE

In commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the West Building of the National Gallery of Art in 1991, the Gallery mounted an exhibition on the building itself, "John Russell Pope and the Building of the National Gallery of Art" (March 17-July 17, 1991). A new publication, *The Architecture of the West Building of the National Gallery of Art*, by Christopher A. Thomas, is based largely on the ideas presented in the exhibition. The volume contains many illustrations, including

architectural plans, details, renderings, and photographs, as well as a description of the design and construction process. Needless to say, much of the material for this interesting and attractive publication came from the Gallery Archives. Following on the heels of architectural publications from the Cleveland Museum, Brooklyn Museum, and Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, this is a welcome addition to the group.

NEW AASLH TECHNICAL LEAFLET

The American Association for State and Local History recently published *Archival Materials in the History Museum: A Strategy for Their Management*. The Technical Leaflet, by Paul Eisloeffel and Lisa Gavin, addresses the need to "accommodate archival materials in a standardized, integrated museum management system that does not compromise the spirit of either museum collections management or that of archives." The publication describes archival materials, the nature of archival collections, and proposes a method for dealing with such collections in a history museum, including suggestions for cataloging and processing. A short bibliography is included.

Technical Leaflet #179 was published as part of *History News* (vol. 47/3, May/June 1992); reprints may be ordered from AASLH, 172 Second Avenue North, Suite 202, Nashville, TN 37201 (615 255 2971).

ASC ARCHIVES BROCHURE OFF THE PRESS

The significance of archives in natural history museums is the focus of a program initiated by the Association of Systematics Collections (ASC) in 1990. In the spring of that year, under the auspices of ASC, Karen D. Stevens, Manuscript/Archives Librarian of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, conducted a Natural History Archives survey of ASC members [see: *ASC Newsletter*, June 1990]. Ms. Stevens found that although some institutions had formal archives programs, many others did not. Clearly museums needed to pay more attention to this issue.

The ASC shouldered the responsibility of raising its members' consciousness of the importance of archival materials. To discuss the ways and means of its effort, the Association held a workshop, "Archives in

PUBLICATIONS

ASC Brochure, cont.

Natural History Museums," on August 7-8, 1990, in Richmond, Virginia. Among other things, working groups determined the need for a brochure that "would justify archives programs in natural history institutions, showing how they are often vital to institutions and researchers." After two years in production, the brochure is now scheduled to be ready for distribution at the August 1992 ASC annual meeting.

"Are you throwing away a valuable asset?" is the title of this multi-purpose brochure. It contains explanations of an archives program, and quotations from scientists about the value of archives to the documentation of museum collections. Names, addresses, and phone numbers of resource agencies are also provided. While the SAA manual *Museum Archives: An Introduction* by William A. Deiss is offered for sale from ASC through this brochure, this brochure text also includes a set of archives guidelines. These were drawn, with only minor modifications, from those formulated at the 1979 Belmont Conference on museum archives, sponsored by the Archives of American Art and the Smithsonian Institution Archives.

The Brochure's contents were assembled by Kristine Haglund, Archivist at the Denver Museum of Natural History, with valuable input from Alan L. Bain, Associate Archivist, Smithsonian Institution Archives; K. Elaine Hoagland, Executive Director of the Association of Systematics Collections; James E. King, Director of the Carnegie Museum of Natural History; Karen D. Stevens and others. Kay Herndon of the Denver Museum of Natural History created the brochure's design.

For further information about the brochure or the other services of ASC, contact the Association of Systematics Collections, 730 11th Street NW, 2nd Floor, Washington, DC 20001.

Kristine Haglund
Denver Museum of Natural History

NEWS, NOTES & ANNOUNCEMENTS

MUSEUM ARCHIVES INSTITUTE

The fifth annual New England Museum Association and Old Sturbridge Village Museum Archives Institute, which was held on April 10-11, 1992, was another success. Eighty participants from ten states attended the two-day program focused on archival principals and practices. The special topic session dealt with space management. Evaluations were extremely favorable with comments such as "It was money well spent," "knowledgeable faculty" and "hope to return next year."

The 1993 Institute is scheduled for April 16th and 17th at Old Sturbridge Village. Legal issues and ethics will be the special topics, in addition to the usual introductory program. The introductory program is designed for the beginner who works in a museum or historical society and operates on a two year cycle. The special topic session provides Institute alumni and more experienced archivists with the opportunity to keep abreast of current archival issues and themes. Participants in either program qualify for C.E.U. credits. For information contact: Theresa Rini Percy, Research Library, Old Sturbridge Village, 1 OSV Rd., Sturbridge, MA 01566 (508) 347-3362.

NELSON-ATKINS MUSEUM APPOINTS ARCHIVIST

The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, Missouri, recently appointed Chuck Hill archivist under its NHPRC grant. Prior to joining the Nelson-Atkins, Hill taught history and multi-cultural studies at Valley City State University in North Dakota and worked on three other NHPRC projects: the Lakota Archives and Historical Resource Center at Sinte Gleska College in Rosebud, South Dakota; Project HOPE (Help Opportunities for People Everywhere) in Millwood, Virginia; and, briefly, the Polk County Archives in Des Moines, Iowa.

The Nelson-Atkins Museum Archives consists of more than one thousand cubic feet of material. The records, dating from the 1920s, include files relating to the estate of William Rockhill Nelson, the trust that founded the museum, the construction of the museum building, creation of the collec-

NEWS, NOTES & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nelson-Atkins Museum, cont.

lections, and operation of the museum. About half of the archival collection was stored in a limestone cave and has now been retrieved by Mr. Hill. The Archivist reports to the Administrator for Special Exhibitions and Collections Management.

PROJECT ARCHIVIST ON THE JOB AT THE CLOISTERS

Lauren Jackson-Beck, Librarian at the Cloisters Museum in Fort Tryon Park, New York, reports that Elaine McCluskey has been hired as Associate Archivist, to process the papers of Medievalist Sumner Mc-Knight Crosby. Crosby's work focussed on the Abbey of St. Denis. The project is funded by a grant from the International Center of Medieval Art. Ms. McCluskey previously worked at the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia.

Smithsonian Videohistory Collection opens

An original collection of videotape in the history of science and technology, produced by Smithsonian scholars, is now open for use. The collection was produced between 1986 and 1991 with funding from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and guidance from the Smithsonian Videohistory Program. Eighteen Institution historians produced 22 projects--for over 200 hours of tape--that cover a wide range of topics in American science and technology, primarily since the beginning of World War II. Topics include aeronautics and space exploration, computer development, medical technology, robotics, the Manhattan Project, small arms design and manufacture, slate quarrying, clockmaking, automotive manufacturing and management techniques, paleontology, and the conservation of endangered species.

Tapes, transcripts and finding aids are available for researchers, and copies are available for a fee. For more information, contact the Smithsonian Institution Archives, 2135 Arts and Industries Building, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560 (202 357 1420).

ARCHIVISTS AND ANTHROPOLOGISTS URGE PRESERVATION OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL RECORDS

Anthropologists Sydel Silverman (Wenner-Gren Foundation) and Nancy Parezo (University of Arizona) organized a conference on the preservation of anthropological records, held February 28 - March 4, 1992. Among the twenty participants were Joan Warnow-Blewett (founding archivist of the Center for the History of Physics) who spoke on the role of a discipline history center, Mary Elizabeth Ruwell (archivist and director of the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian) who commented on the role of archives within anthropology, and Thomas Wilson (anthropologist and administrator at the Center for African Art) who examined the role of museums in preserving anthropological records.

Participants agreed that the primary data of anthropological field work cannot be replicated and that preservation of the records is essential for future research and education. They resolved that 1) anthropologists should take steps to care for the unpublished materials in their possession and to make arrangements for the appropriate archival disposition of these materials; 2) professional organizations and institutions should adopt policies to insure that their own unpublished materials be systematically preserved and take the lead in implementing strategies for the documentation and preservation of the anthropological record.

The resolution is being endorsed by various professional organizations, in particular the American Anthropological Association and the Society for American Archaeology. The conclusions and recommendations of the symposium will be presented in a published volume.

Mary Elizabeth Ruwell
National Anthropological Archives

REPORTS

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART ARCHIVES PROGRAM: THE FIRST THREE YEARS

The Museum Archives program at The Museum of Modern Art in New York City, a part of the Office of the Secretary and General Counsel, was established in January 1989 to evaluate, preserve, process, arrange, and describe the Museum's historical records and make them available. A three year start-up period was initiated in February 1989; the first two years were funded with grants from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Reed Foundation, David Rockefeller, and anonymous donors; additional funds have been received from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and from the estate of the late Mrs. Richard Deutsch.

The museum archivist and project director, Rona Roob, set the following goals for the first two years: to establish procedures for the orderly transfer of institutional records to the archives; to hire and train an archives technician; to prepare retention and disposition schedules; to process records and make them widely accessible through finding aids and descriptions entered into RLIN; to provide research and reference services; to store appropriate records at the Rockefeller Archive Center; to produce a Guide to the Museum's archival holdings; to continue to locate and acquire by gift additional papers relevant to the history of the Museum; and to develop a local database for museum records.

The NHPRC grant provided for a second staff member and I began as archives technician in April 1989. Through reports and published materials I familiarized myself with the history of the Museum and standard archival methodology; in January 1990 the Museum enabled me to attend the Modern Archives Institute in Washington, DC. The archivist worked closely with me to teach me the practical aspects of processing papers and producing comprehensive finding aids. Gradually my training extended to other aspects of archival work, including records appraisal, records management, reference work, MARC/AMC and RLIN, and most recently, grant writing. In June 1991, Apphia Loo, a former intern in the Archives and a recent college

graduate, joined the staff for a twenty-month period as archives assistant under a provision in a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

One of the first priorities was to arrange a permanent workspace for the Archives. An area in the Library's administrative section was reconfigured to accommodate the Archives staff. An area above the Library stacks was designated as archival space. During the past year this area has been converted into an additional work space and we expect to install 240 linear feet of shelving in the weeks ahead.

Before these work areas were completed we began to concentrate on one of our major goals, the evaluation of Museum records management needs. I have learned that this is an essential component for the orderly transfer of historical records to the Archives. We met with non-curatorial departments to determine the types of records generated, their disposition, and potential historical value. Working closely with staff members, records schedules were compiled for those departments that generated the greatest volume of records, including Finance, Personnel, Development, and Mail Order. We have also met with curatorial and program-related departments to advise them on how to manage their records. One important benefit has been a greater awareness by staff members of the potential historical value of their records.

In addition to the evaluation of on-site records, we also inventoried approximately 600 boxes kept in an off-site facility. Preliminary assessments of this off-site material made in preparation for designing an archives program for the Museum and for the preparation of the NHPRC grant facilitated this task. Museum-wide procedures have now been established for records storage whereby departments must contact the Archives to receive a box number and all storage box inventories must be reviewed by the Archives. In this manner, we have the opportunity to continually review the different types of records generated and identify records for the Archives. In addition to records transferred to the Archives from various departments and those discovered in storage areas, records are acquired by gifts. Some gifts are solicited by the archivist, who regularly suggests that former staff members and trustees give their papers to the Archives.

REPORTS

MoMA Archives, cont.

Processing papers and making them accessible continues to be a major objective. During the past three years we have processed 19 record groups comprising 342 linear feet. Finding aids are produced in a standard format and an accompanying description of the record group is entered into RLIN. A preliminary Guide to the Archives' holdings is being compiled.

Reference requests have substantially increased since the first year of operations. Approximately 300 requests were received in 1989 and this has gradually increased so that approximately 600 requests were received during the past fiscal year. Perhaps one reason for this is that the archivist is actively engaged in outreach. She regularly lectures or informally speaks on different aspects of Museum history to Museum members, interns, staff, trustees, and affiliate groups as well as to outside organizations. The archivist writes a "From the Archives" section that appears in the Museum's *Members Quarterly*. The Archives has also participated in the annual New York Archives Week sponsored by the Archivists Roundtable of Metropolitan New York.

As part of the Museum Archives program, the archivist administers an oral history project, which was initiated in October 1990 with funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities. This thirty-month project will produce the oral histories of forty individuals whose activities helped shape the Museum's course. Interviewees include Leo Castelli, Philip Johnson, John Rewald, and Edward Warburg. The interviews are being conducted by a professional oral historian, Sharon Zane, who consults with the archivist to discuss undocumented areas of Museum history that interviewees may be able to clarify. To date, sixteen interviews have been completed. This project continues to be an exciting opportunity to discover new information about Museum history. Indeed, the archivist believes that an important aspect of oral history is "filling in the gaps," an expression she first heard used by James Fogerty of the Minnesota Historical Society whose session she attended at an SAA oral history work-shop in 1987.

We have also begun a preservation project. The archivist targeted the Public Information Scrapbooks for

preservation microfilming. Compiled by the former Publicity Department, these 212 large format scrapbooks contain thousands of newspaper and magazine clippings that document Museum events from 1929 through the late 1960s. Since the scrapbooks were made accessible with a cross-referenced index in August 1990, more than 90 outside users have examined over 85 percent of the albums in the course of their research. However, even the most careful handling of the scrapbooks results in some damage due to the unwieldy size of the albums coupled with the fragile condition of the newsclippings. A grant for this project is currently pending; we hope to begin microfilming in January 1993.

The goals for the first two years of the Archives were accomplished for the most part. The Archives processing activities were greatly accelerated during the third year by the addition to the staff of an archives assistant.

During the three-year start-up period, while providing access to outside researchers, the Museum Archives has also become an important resource within the Museum. The Archives has been enthusiastically received and supported by staff and administration as well as by The Museum of Modern Art trustees, who in 1987 made a resolution of their commitment to the formation of an archives program "as a regularly established ongoing program of the Museum." Now that the Archives is in place, the archivist will focus on the formulation of a five year plan and assist in plans to permanently endow the program.

Rachel Wild
The Museum of Modern Art

THE NHPRC AND TRIBAL ARCHIVES

The National Historical Records and Publications Commission (NHPRC) recently completed a long range plan and will soon be writing guidelines for its implementation within the next year. Currently, grants for tribal archives work are classified under the "Native American Initiative" and, though this designation and the application deadline will change, it is anticipated by staff that there will be funds for this work in the future. This reassurance must be seen in the light of the Commission's current total budget, cut from \$5.4 million

REPORTS

NHPRC Tribal Archives Grants, cont.

in 1992 to a mere \$4 million for 1993. NHPRC's budget was last \$4 million in 1979.

Ironically, 1979 was also the first year that NHPRC funded tribal archives projects. Since then some 20 tribes, represented by 6 institutions, have received funds for archives, records management, and/or oral history projects. The archival and records management work is complicated by a prohibition against NHPRC funding for processing federal records. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), a federal agency, claims the records of work it has funded; the tribes may also claim ownership of such information. Problems may arise over disputed territory, a good example being school records. The law is clear that the BIA, not the tribe or NHPRC, decides ultimate ownership.

Dan Stokes, NHPRC staff member responsible for administering the program, says the most successful is a finite and clearly defined project, such as microfilming of litigation files and the creation of a finding aid. Successful projects administered by qualified archivist have been funded at Little Big Horn College in Montana and Oglala Lakota College in Kyle, South Dakota. An anthropological oral history project by the regional office of Native American affairs in the west coast of Alaska, working with the Yup'ik tribe to translate, transcribe and index Yup'ik language tapes was recently funded. These materials will be available at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks.

No official tracking of completed projects is possible because of staffing limitations at NHPRC. However, most tribes with successful programs return to the NHPRC well for more funding. There is a strong informal network and the news is encouraging. Often the funding from NHPRC for archival and oral history projects will act as seed money that attracts other grant money for building a facility to house the resulting collections.

Meg Klinkow
Frank Lloyd Wright Home & Studio

TIME GOES QUICKLY: THE MILLE LACS CHIPPEWA ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Brenda Boyd has been Director of Tribal Operations for the Mille Lacs band of Chip-pewa Indians on the Mille Lacs Reservation in Onamia, Minnesota, for the past eight years. She received her archival training in 1988 at the Western Archives Institute at UCLA and now splits her time among several projects, including grant writing, oral history work, and tribal enrollment work. Grant writing is fundamental to accomplishment of her tribe's archival work, though the reservation has provided a tribal building with space for the oral history project records and the archives. Ms. Boyd has had remarkable success in securing funds, resulting in the juggling of a complicated schedule of intersecting NHPRC, National Park Service, and foundation funded projects. She persuaded the Bush Foundation of St. Paul to fund an oral history project for the first time. This was not only a first for the foundation, but also the first oral history project on a reservation in Minnesota. Red Lake Reservation has since also initiated one.

A year-long NHPRC grant, completed this past June, funded oral history work with tribal elders, as well as some government appointees and elected officials. Questions dealt with biographical information and sometimes resulted in the donation of personal papers of archival value to the band or clan. The interviews were translated from the Mille Lacs language, then transcribed and a computerized index created. There have already been three researchers requesting to see the project files, though they are not yet officially ready for open access.

The question asked of elders that is perhaps of most immediate significance to the tribe is "What advice would you like to pass along to those who follow?" Ms. Boyd was proud to have interviewed her father among the tribal elders. The experiences of these important individuals, their thoughts for the future, and their expressive language are fugitive resources that will be lost if not recorded. As Ms. Boyd reminds us, "Time goes quickly."

Meg Klinkow
Frank Lloyd Wright Home & Studio

REPORTS

THE WILLIAM S. LIEBERMAN PAPERS AT THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART ARCHIVES

The Papers of William S. Lieberman have recently been added to the collection of processed papers in The Museum of Modern Art Archives. The Papers (1939-79), which contain 31.3 linear feet of correspondence, photographs, and ephemera, document Lieberman's extensive career at the Museum. He began working as a volunteer in 1943 and returned to the Museum in 1945 after taking the museum course taught by Paul J. Sachs and receiving his master's degree from Harvard University. After working as assistant to Alfred H. Barr, Jr., the Founding Director of the Museum, he held a succession of curatorial and directorship positions in the Departments of Drawings, Prints, and Painting and Sculpture. Since November 1979, he has been the Chairman of the Twentieth Century Art Department at The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

The Papers contain correspondence between Lieberman and art dealers, galleries, museums, and such artists as Leonard Baskin, Masuo Ikeda, Marc and Valentina Chagall, Chryssa, Lee Krasner, Robert Motherwell, and Emilio Sanchez. A large portion of the Papers is devoted to documentation on "Max Ernst," "Joan Miró," Museum exhibitions directed by Lieberman, and "The New Japanese Painting and Sculpture," a Museum-sponsored international circulating exhibition that he co-directed with Dorothy C. Miller.

An indexed finding aid has been compiled. The finding aid and the Papers will be housed at the Rockefeller Archive Center in Pocantico Hills, Tarrytown, New York, with which the Museum has an arrangement to store important archival material. An additional copy of the finding aid will be kept in The Museum of Modern Art Archives, where researchers may call for an appointment to use the material.

Apphia Loo
Museum of Modern Art

STUDIES

FUNCTIONS OF MUSEUMS AND THE MUSEUM OF SCIENCE, BOSTON

Editor's note: Carolyn Kirdahy originally presented the following as a paper at a meeting of the New England Archivists.

The thesis I wrote as a requirement for a Master's degree in History/Archival methods from the University of Massachusetts, Boston, was a functional analysis in an institutional setting in which I used the Museum of Science, Boston as a case study. I wrote a history of the Museum, surveyed literature on collection analyses and functions of museums, and outlined the functions of the Museum of Science. _My motivation for this project came from an article by Judith Endelman that appeared in the Summer 1987 issue of *American Archivist* in which she described collection analyses at three historical repositories. _Subject lists were devised and holdings were compared to these lists to determine collection strengths and weaknesses. Endelman concluded with a plea for a universal subject list to which all collections could be compared. While I agree that many institutional archives and manuscript repositories have enough in common to share a universal subject list, I was also concerned that the uniqueness of an institutional archives might be lost if it adhered to a standardized, universal subject list. I thought that, instead of a subject or organizational chart approach to archives, a functional approach (as used by other archivists recently) might be a better test in an institutional setting.

From at least the turn of the century, museum literature defined museums in terms of functions or purposes. But I found that just as subject lists may not describe all archival collections, definitions of museums may not describe all museums. These museum definitions were usually very general, and attempted to be applicable to all museums. Because they were based upon a traditional collecting museum model, like an art or natural history museum, they did not address the unique functions of a science museum, whose exhibits consist more of hand-crafted, interactive displays than displays of objects.

STUDIES

Museum of Science, Boston, cont.

In the late 1800s, George Brown Goode, assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, wrote that museums should have the dual purposes of educating working class people and increasing knowledge through research. He defined a museum as "an institution for the preservation of those objects which best illustrate the phenomena of nature and the works of man." Goode's democratic definition of museums included the functions of education, research, and preservation.

In 1907, at the first meeting of the newly formed American Association of Museums, a paper entitled "The Aim of a Public Museum" was read by Dr. George A. Dorsey of the Field Museum of Natural History. This paper challenged Goode's views of the functions of museums. Dorsey's ideal museum was strictly research oriented, and did not have room to compromise this function for the education of the public. Directly disputing Goode's emphasis on the educational aspects of museums, Dorsey stated, "It seems to me that the conscious striving to make the public museum educational defeats the object of the museum," which he viewed as being research.

In 1939, Albert Eide Parr of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, described the functions of a natural history museum as being somewhere on a continuum, which had at one end research as its main objective and entertainment at the other end. In between these two extremes, a natural history museum must provide education by researching its specimens and exhibiting them to the public in a way that is understandable and entertaining. In this respect, he was supporting Goode's dual purpose view of museums as research and educational institutions, but was also acknowledging that museums employ entertainment to attract the public and keep them interested.

In 1970, Joseph Veach Noble, then Vice-Director for Administration at The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and who later served as president of the American Association of Museums, outlined five functions that he believed were common to all museums. His purpose in declaring this "Museum

Manifesto" was to urge museum professionals, who had become segmented by specialization in the 1960s, to reexamine museums in terms of their functions and by doing so realize common purposes that were shared by all museums. These five functions were: acquisition, conservation, study, interpretation, and exhibition.

Although Noble stressed that these functions were common to all museums, it is evident from the first two functions-- acquisition and conservation of the objects collected--that they were written with an eye toward a museum like The Metropolitan Museum of Art. This is supported by the fact that he stated that the collection is the cornerstone of a museum. Unlike the traditional art museum, the Museum of Science is not a collecting museum, and whereas art collections tend to increase in value over the years and require intensive preservation and conservation measures, constructed hands-on exhibits, as found in the Museum of Science, depreciate with each visitor use, and are considered ultimately expendable.

For twenty years, Noble's five functions remained a standard that was used as a tool for performance evaluation of museums, a framework for some museum's organizational charts, and curricula for museum studies programs. They were also used as a basis for defining museums.

In 1970, for the purpose of accreditation of museums, the American Association of Museums (AAM) defined a museum as "an organized and permanent non-profit institution, essentially educational or aesthetic in purpose, with professional staff, which owns and utilizes tangible objects, cares for them and exhibits them to the public on some regular schedule."

This definition, like Noble's functions, was based upon a collecting museum. By 1975, however, the AAM realized that not all museums own and utilize objects of intrinsic value, and modified the basic definitions for planetariums, art centers, and science and technology centers. The definition for a science and technology center, such as the Museum of Science, became "an organized and permanent non-profit institution, essentially educational and scientific in purpose, with professional staff, open to the public on a regular schedule, which maintains and utilizes exhibits and/or objects for the presentation and interpretation of scientific and technical knowledge." This definition transferred emphasis from collection to education.

Museum of Science, Boston, cont.

Stephen E. Weil, deputy director of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, in an article in the April/May 1990 issue of *Museum News*, readdressed the functions identified by Noble two decades earlier. Weil cited Dutch museologist Peter van Mensch's analysis of museums, which reduced Noble's functions to three: to preserve, study, and communicate.

Van Mensch linked more closely Noble's first two functions of acquisition and conservation by identifying preservation as the first function of museums. Preservation was emphasized over acquisition, because of a recent trend in the museum profession that emphasizes the ethical commitment that museums have to acquire objects only if they have the proper facilities to care for them. The second function, to study, remained unchanged from Noble's original list. Communication, as Weil viewed it, encompassed Noble's functions of interpretation and exhibition. An exhibition, he argued, not only presents the message intended by its planners and designers, but is also a commentary on the institution and society.

Weil wasn't totally satisfied with the term communication, and ended his article with an appeal to better articulate the communication function. The responses to this plea were varied. One museum director suggested that the term "participation" should be substituted for "communication" because it is a more active word that implies interaction between museum and visitor. Several readers argued that Noble's traditional five functions could not and should not be altered, and one professional argued that the entire discussion was "analogous to the once animated theological controversy regarding the number of angels that could dance on the head of a pin."

By examining past and current opinions about museum functions, one thing becomes clear. There is little consensus among professionals when they strictly apply these functional models to their own institutions. Where one professional sees museums as servants to the public, another views them as bastions of knowledge that should be insulated from public

influence. Where one museum professional emphasizes collection aspects of museums, another tries to illuminate public outreach. Each institution has its individual characteristics and mission, and although they may share some functions, they _may not share all of them. When the AAM expanded its definition for science and technology centers, it was admitting that generalized definitions cannot include, and may sometimes even exclude, all institutions that it is trying to cover.

It becomes important, therefore, for each institution to examine itself and search for the unique characteristics that are not included in generalized definitions. Models can be referred to, but should not be taken at face value. Rather, they should be sources of inspiration from which certain elements can be borrowed.

*Functions of the
Museum of Science, Boston*

Although some of the traditional museum functions can be found in the activities of the Boston Society of Natural History, the predecessor of the Museum of Science, main-taining a museum was only one of the society's many endeavors. The BSNH was founded in 1830 for the study and promotion of natural history. The functions of the so-ciety were to research, to provide oppor-tunities for men interested in natural his-tory to interact, to promote public in-terest in natural history, and to provide a means for members to legitimize their work. Research was the main function of the soci-ety. To facilitate research, the society collected specimens and established a_ lib-rary. Research results were published on a regular basis, and the members exchanged their studies through monthly meetings and correspondence.

When the society opened the doors to its new museum in the Back Bay toward the end of the Civil War, it began to cater more to the public and extend the function of pro-moting public interest in natural history to include education. In 1895, the museum's exhibits were redesigned to include more educational information and appear less like organized displays of the specimens. By 1914, the educational function was stea-dily overshadowing the research function of the society, so that by 1937, all tradi-tional research and membership activities ceased. The museum's name became the New England Museum of Natural History, and a department of education was established. *The Proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural History*, which reported scientific

Museum of Science, Boston, cont.

findings, were discontinued. In 1946, the museum's name was changed to the Museum of Science, and its scope was extended to include all the sciences. The new building at Science Park on the Charles River Dam featured entertaining, interactive exhibits that visitors could touch and manipulate. The museum made its exhibits more enter-taining to the public in order to attract more paying visitors. To facilitate the de-velopment and maintenance of the new muse-um, the administration became more active in the daily operation of the museum, and a professional staff replaced volunteer curators.

Today the Museum of Science performs three basic functions: education, administration, and entertainment. The mission of the museum is "to stimulate interest in and further public understanding of science and technology primarily through the operation of an informal educational institution serving effectively the broadest audience possible." This mission statement illustrates the functions of the MOS. Phrases such as "stimulate interest" and "further public understanding" imply that education is a major goal of the institution. The word "informal" gives the context in which this goal is to be fulfilled. The educational process is not conducted in structured classroom study, but rather is achieved in an environment that promotes discovery and is entertaining. "Operation" is also a key word in the statement because without proper man-agement and administration of the museum, it would not exist.

These three functions do not exist in-dependently. There is a tension between the entertainment and educational values of the exhibitions and programs. This is sometimes referred to as administration versus education, or mission versus marketing. Entertainment, however, can also be viewed as a link between the educational and administrative functions of the Museum. Entertainment can be a means to achieve the individual and collective goals of education and administration. It is a vehicle for educators to get the attention of and inspire their audience. Entertainment values also provide administration with a competitive product to market. If more visitors are attracted to the museum, then more people will be exposed to the

educational programs, and more revenue will be available to support these programs. Perhaps Albert Eide Parr's continuum should be redesigned to have education at one end and administration at the other, with entertainment as a fulcrum that moves back and forth trying to balance the two ends.

Carolyn Kirdahy
Museum of Science, Boston

DOCUMENTING MUSEUMS AS INSTITUTIONS AND AS PURVEYORS OF CULTURE: RECORDS, PAPERS, AND SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

Editor's note: Alan Bain read the following paper at the 1991 SAA annual meeting. Included here are the text and the results of museum archives surveys completed in 1983-4 and 1991 and the 1989 AAM survey.

Appraisal, acquisition, and ownership are each major topics for discussion, let alone trying to tie them together within an institutional framework. If I had selected to discuss these issues within the context of the Smithsonian Archives program, and how they are treated and resolved working in a major networking museum complex, this discussion would have been more concise, with some specific conclusions. Instead, I have attempted to provide some understanding about what is unique about museum records and special collections; how they are maintained, and the state of archival programs within museums.

In 1983, the Society of American Archivists Task Force on Museum Archives, in order to ascertain the status of archives in museums, developed a questionnaire. Lack of monetary and staff resources necessitated using a small but defined representative group to provide answers for the museum world at large. Available was the mailing list of accredited museums belonging to the American Association of Museums. And, so, 550 museums were questioned about their archival resources.

The survey included questions about institutional funding, policy on storage of non-current records, various types of records stored and their storage location, interest in information about museum archives programs, and assistance from the Task Force. Statistical data generated from the 300 responses were never published, although some of the results concerning archival

Documenting Museums, cont.

needs and requirements by the respondees were summarized in several publications.

When I was asked to give a talk on museum documentation and how museum archival programs respond to the various records, special collections, and personal papers generated by museums, it provided me with an opportunity to run some comparisons, where possible, on the status of archival programs within museums, in general.

Museum archival programs are still in a state of infancy. Unlike other cultural institutions, museums, with a strong history in the collecting of artifacts and objects to document mankind, have shown a dreadful lack of concern in maintaining or developing programs to store documentation about themselves. To a large extent, then, the development of museum archival programs is more the story of museums' lack of sense of their own history than about the attempts by museum archives to meet this need.

MUSEUMS AND MUSEUM RECORDS

It has been estimated that there are over 8,000 museums in this country, with more than 6,800 cited, profiled, and documented in the 1991 directory of the AAM. Museums play multiple roles in their communities. Some museums have no permanent collections, others may have no exhibitions. Museums serve as cultural centers, art schools, historic houses, botanical gardens, living farms, and homes for technological wonders; and provide a haven for children and grownups alike. There are various differences in their orientation which have an impact on record keeping practices. Yet, to better understand the rich variety of sources museum archives may house, it is best to define museums in their most common form.

In their broadest context museums collect object, artifact, and specimen collections. Through the research use of these collections by museum curators, their colleagues and other scholars, and museum staff use of the collections through interpretation to the public by way of exhibition, education, and other outreach programs, society is provided with a glimpse of its

heritage, its cultural legacy, a view of its past environment, and at times, a look at its perceived future.

Several major types of informational resources support the various functions and activities of the museum and its staff: official records; personal papers of staff, associates, and trustees; and manuscripts and special collections brought into the museum, usually by curators to support the artifact collections, or to document a particular individual, theme, or region.

Most official records are similar, in many respects, to those created by any parent institution. There are policy decision records, usually created by the museum trustees or board of regents, director, and department heads, and support group records, created by the personnel office, treasurer, buildings manager, and security office.

Records unique to museums include extensive case files, accession records, a primary source documenting the museum's association with its collections. Maintenance of these vital records depends on the structure of the individual museum, and at times, several offices in one museum may share parts of what would be a single file at another museum. For the most part, these files exist with the museum's registrar, and/or curatorial department.

These files document the museum's legal right to its permanent collection, as well as the status of its loan artifacts. The files trace the movement of these collections, from transfer to the museum, preservation, storage, exhibition, and perhaps as a loan for an off-site exhibition. Included in these files may be correspondence and memoranda between museum staff and the donor; an official deed of transfer; photographs of the item or items; monetary appraisal statements; title listings; shipping and receiving reports; insurance arrangements; condition reports, and preservation and conservation reports.

Other information may also reside in these files. Natural history museum accession files may contain documentation on the exploring expedition which led to the collecting of certain specimens, while art museum accession files may contain information about the artist that goes beyond the documentation of the object. The informational content, therefore, may extend beyond supporting the museum's legal concerns, and may include culling original source documentation from other files in

Documenting Museums, cont.

order to develop an inclusive file about the collection. The level and detail of information depends on funding available to support offices for records creation and gathering, and the amount of time curators have for documenting the collection itself.

Since, for the most part, museum collections remain permanent, and their activity is documented in the accession record, the record remains an open file. Rarely, then, are these files transferred to the archives. Nonetheless, because of the uniqueness of the information, as well as it being a vital record, archivists are very much interested, both in the informational content, and in preserving the original.

Another series of records providing both documentation about museum activity and historical information about individuals and events, are the museum exhibition records. Files pertaining to exhibitions may be found in one or more offices, depending on the size of the museum. They include director's correspondence concerning the development of an exhibition; development office grant and endowment information; curatorial records documenting the establishment of the exhibition, registrar records containing loan records if part, or all of the exhibition comes from outside the parent institution; case design and floor layout records; exhibition scripts; publication labels and catalogs, and public affairs publicity information. Exhibition records may also consist of audio-visual and written interviews with the subjects represented in the exhibition, correspondence with other organizations about the theme of the exhibition, correspondence with participants and creators of the works on display, historical notes, and bibliographic sources. Unlike accession records, however, most exhibition records are usually transferred to the archives, except, perhaps, where the exhibit contained mostly objects from the permanent collection. Then, the material may be filed in a curatorial information file about the collection.

Additional collection related records are retained in museums. In art museums, special curatorial files contain information gathered by staff, or prepared as

reports by museum fellows, on the artist or sculptor whose works are in the permanent collection. Files such as these may also include manuscript collections and personal papers of the artist.

Natural science museums collect and maintain field diaries and notebooks documenting the collection activities of staff and associates who have forwarded specimens to the museum. This documentation may re-side indefinitely with the curatorial department, and is a prime candidate for pre-servation, if that is possible.

Museum curators may also spend time soliciting and collecting special collections and personal papers, ranging from individual items to major papers and records of other organizations and individuals, to supplement the object and artifact collection, and the information they need to document the collections in the storerooms under their control. These items may also be collected or later used for display as part of an exhibition. This information may stay with the curatorial department without any policy for transfer to the archives, perhaps be transferred to the archives at a later date, or go directly into the museum archives, depending on the museum's collection policy and arrangements made between the curatorial department and the archives.

It is a truly fortunate archives where arrangements are made before these collections are transferred to the museum to have the archivist appraise the documents along with the curator.

In addition to official records and those records and collections I have discussed, museum archivists may also pursue materials outside the parent organization that complement documentation about the museum and the museum's collection mandate.

THE KEY PLAYERS INVOLVED WITH MUSEUM RECORDS

In looking at the question of creation, acquisition and control of museum archival materials there are three key players. There is the individual museum. Its role within the community, along with its mission and activities, establishes a basis from which the other players derive pleasure or angst. Historical societies, natural science museums, and art collections which exist within the context of a larger institution, perhaps a state archives or a public library, may be bound by state and

Documenting Museums, cont.

local laws regarding the records created and maintained by the museum staff.

In certain instances, a museum, by law, must forward all archival records to another agency, usually the parent archives. In the case of natural history and biological museums, certain records may be kept indefinitely by the museum to document the permanent collection and ongoing research, even when the museum is part of a larger organization which mandates that official records be transferred to the parent organization. In this latter case, curators are looking for archival assistance in handling scientific data that will remain on-site.

In this matter, we have some common concerns with archivists of colleges and universities that have museums as part of the campus facilities. From what I have seen, most university museums tend to keep their own records in order to maintain a history of the collections and support staff research, and rarely does the material go into the central university archives. On the other hand, these museums may not have the resources to hire a full-time archivist, and collection documentation such as field notebooks tends to get lost over the years.

Other museums have collection policies which establish parameters as to what the museum will collect in the way of objects and artifacts. In most cases, this collection policy does little to assist the museum archivist to define a records policy. It may, however, help in establishing a collection policy concerning manuscripts and papers from outside the institution.

The second player is the museum staff. From past experience, which is probably not the best method for presenting one's case, administrators and managers of programs consider the documents they create and work with the property of the museum. Other staff members, however, including curators and research staff, create what they consider personal papers, with a right to dispose of this material and even papers of deceased colleagues, as they see fit. Part of the problem of having individuals consider the work they do as private, is that they do not always manage to separate official records from personal papers, and the documentation

about a given activity is filed together. On this matter there are no clear-cut guidelines. Rarely is there legislation concerning this issue. Archivists rely on the institutional goodwill of the curators, and where necessary solicit personal papers so that the combination of papers and records provide a complete history of important activities.

The museum archivist forms the third player in this scenario. And here, the problems are no less difficult. The role of the archivist and how the museum perceives the program is a major factor as to how successful the program will be. Museum archivists may not be professional archivists, but rather staff persons assigned to care for the archives as an additional task. In some museums, curators, directors, librarians, collection managers, and others have multiple roles, the archives being only a minor function of their daily workload. Another problem is that a so-called museum archivist may not operate a centralized program. The archivist may be in charge of only the trustee and director's records, or only the anthropological records. As such, this person is a departmental archivist, with no records control existing outside of a narrowly defined specified area.

THE 1991 MUSEUM ARCHIVES SURVEY

In late spring of 1991, I prepared a survey designed to gather information on records keeping policy and special collections in museums. Individuals were selected from the Museum Archives Section newsletter database, which at the time contained over 380 names. Not all persons listed in the database were necessarily members of SAA or of the Museum Archives Section. Two hundred twenty-nine individuals were selected. Selection was based on affiliation with a museum, or an object, artifact, or specimen collection within a university department or library, for example. Decisions were based on title, office, and institution. Individuals (including SAA members and other archivists) who fell outside this category were not sent the questionnaire.

If you look at figure 1, you will see the breakdown by title of those who received the questionnaire. Major recipients included archivists, or archivists of special collections, or with dual positions. Archivists, archivists responsible for photograph and slide collections, and archivist/ historians accounted for 31% of the total selected. Librarians, which included library technicians and catalogers, as well as

Documenting Museums, cont.

those responsible for manuscript collections, made up 19% of the total. Curators, associate and assistant curators also made up 19% of the total. Archivists and librarians who, by title, specifically noted dual roles, i.e., archivist/librarian, librarian/archivist, made up 7% of the total as did directors. Registrars made up about 5% of the total. Other museum staff accounted for the remaining numbers.

The questionnaire asked for type of organization; institutional funding; archives budget; date when the archives was organized; level of education of the respondent; current position; years spent at the position and years affiliated with the archival profession; yes/no responses to whether there is an official archives, a mission statement, and a collection policy for official and non-official records; whether federal, state, or local laws apply to official records; if there is an institution policy requiring official records be turned over to the archives before staff leave or retire; if there is a contractual agreement on the transfer of personal papers, and a question concerning reference use of the archives, by staff, for which purposes, and use by outside scholars. *[Editor's note: the questionnaire, handed out at the SAA session, is not included here. Its contents should be clear from the following figures.]* There were 145 responses, about 63% of those polled.

Before we go into the responses, I need to warn you in advance that the total count for many answers goes beyond the 145 responses received. This is because 16 of the respondents replied to some questions with more than one answer. Every time an additional answer was given, a new record was created for the respondent to hold the answer. These additional records have not yet been culled from the database, and selected to be discussed separately. The multiple responses are still factored in the total number of answers received.

Two questions posed some problems in trying to provide meaningful data. If you look at figure 2 you will see the wide variety of answers given to both question one (type of organization) and question six (current

position). When discussing these questions I have had to combine some of the answers so that they would be more usable.

The remaining figures contain data, when possible, for both the 1983 survey and the 1991 survey. This is so we may draw comparisons as to the development of museum archival programs for the past eight years.

Figure 3 provides a summary of the various types of institutions represented in both the 1983 and 1991 surveys. I have included information from the American Association of Museums survey taken in 1989, to see how representative we are compared to museums nation-wide. We are under-represented for historic sites and history museums, and over-represented for art museums and natural history museums. This may be because the last two, for one reason or another, are taking the biggest strides towards developing archival programs, or an interest in handling their collection related documents. History museums and historic sites may have had their needs met by information provided by the American Association for State and Local History, and see no reason for tying in with the Society of American Archivists.

Figure 4 provides the best testimony as to the growth of museum archival programs over the last 8 years or so. The first set of tabulations provides the numbers of those who responded to the 1983 questionnaire compared to those who responded in 1991. In 1983, 21 respondents listed their title as archivist, whereas in 1991, if you combine archivists with those with dual positions, 88 archivists responded. Some qualifications must be noted. First, over 44% of the respondents in 1983 never stated what their titles were. And second, all of the questionnaires were sent to the directors of museums, and may not have been forwarded to the archivist for response.

In 1983, 66% of the museums responding said someone was responsible for their archives. Where they identified the person by title, 48 stated they had an archivist, which accounted for 16% of the total response. The remainder of responsibility was just about equally shared by librarians, registrars, curators, and directors.

One major factor missing from the 1991 questionnaire is a question on archival education: how many archivists, or non-archivists responsible for archival programs have had professional training, or received

Documenting Museums, cont.

on-the-job training at another archives before going to their current employment.

I leave the funding question for you to peruse when you have the time. I should note, however, that under archives funding, in figure 5, the large numbers with a small funding base leads me to believe that only funds for supplies were considered in the response. More than likely, the archives was a part of a library or department, and salaries were not broken out. The remaining figures contain tabulations for the rest of the questionnaire.

For the remaining time, we need to get to the questions that lie at the heart of the matter. What are the total numbers of archival programs? How many museums have mission statements for records and collection policy statements for manuscript collections and personal papers? Are there other agreements and laws that would affect museum archival programs?

What we have are not cross-tabulations, so we cannot check for any trends. For example, it would be possible to check and see if museums that have federal or local laws which are applicable to its records have additional archival programs, anyway, which may mean there are records they are not forwarding to a parent institution.

Figure 6 provides responses to questions 4, 5, and 7. A majority of archival programs were started after 1970, and almost 67% of the respondees had their master's degree. Surprisingly, in figure 7, 51% stated that they had been associated with the archival profession for over five years. For a better reading, I need to compare those who have archival programs, and those who have the title of archivist against non-archivists who are in charge of an archival program.

Forty-eight percent stated they have an official archives program. Again, these are raw tabulations, because we need to run that figure against question 11, to see how many archival programs have mission statements. Right now, we only know that 37% of all respondents have one.

In figure 8, 10% of the respondents said they have various laws that apply to their records. We can run that against organization to get a sense of museum type. Question 13 should be matched against those who had an archives mission statement.

Compared to archives programs and mission statements concerning official records, a larger group, 50%, stated they had a collection policy. Here, we should try to find out if there are ties to a library program, where manuscripts and personal papers were most likely to be stored before an archives program was developed.

Looking at figure 9, question 17, we can see that a very small number have any official agreement concerning personal papers, something museums most likely have in common with other institutions. Since what I have here cannot be compared with other types of institutions at this time, the information is isolated and we do not know how museum archival programs stand up to programs elsewhere. What is heartening for me is the growth of archival programs, regardless of the support they may receive, over these last eight years.

As for collecting records, manuscripts, and personal papers, it is my belief that mission statements and collection policies, in themselves, do not make for an inclusive program, one that fully documents the activities and history of the institution. Archivists who rely on statements to drive the transfer of records to their door will never do justice to the museum and outside scholars interested in documenting some facet of museum life, or research data generated by former museum staff. Only constant communication with staff members of the museum, education on preservation and public responsibility, and active participatory contacts with potential donors will result in a fully-developed program, where the acquisition results will match the records mandate and collection policy designs of the archival program.

Alan Bain
Smithsonian Archives

Documenting Museums, Figures

Figure 1. 1991 SURVEY DISSEMINATION

229 Surveys sent out to:	
Administrative Officer	3
Archivist	72
[incl photo/slide/hist]	
Archivist/Librarian	16
Collection Manager	8
Curator [incl MSS, photo]	43
Director [incl exec/assoc/asst]	15
Historian	2
Librarian	44
Museum Asst/Tech/Spec	3
No Title	6
Registrar	11
Various Programs	6

Figure 2. 1991 SURVEY:
KEY TO RESPONSES, QUESTIONS 1 & 6

Question 1. Type of Organization

1. Aquarium; 2. Arboretum/botanical garden; 3. Art museum/center; 4. Children's /youth museum; 5. General museum; 6. Historic house/site; 7. History museum; 8. Natural history or anthropology museum/ site; 9. Nature center; 10. Planetarium; 11. Science/technology center/museum; 12. Zoo; 13. Specialized (specify) ; 14. Organizations with Art Collections 15. Technology/Transportation; 16. Historic House; 17. Labor; 18. Business; 19. Memorial to an Individual; 20. Police; 21. Religious; 22. State Historical Society; Historical Society; 23. Medical; 24. Decorative Arts; 25. Institutional Slide Collection, College; 26. Photography; 27. Ethnic; 28. Special Collections, A-V; 29. Black History Collections; 30. Library; 31. Crafts/Folk Art; 32. Vertebrate Zoology; 33. Historic Vessel & Museum; 34. Art Archives; 35. Archaeology/A Anthropology; 36. Tribal; 00. No Response; 99. Memo

Question 6. Current Position

1. Archivist in charge; 2. Deputy Archivist; 3. Archivist; 4. Technician; 5. Volunteer; 6. Other (specify); 7. Archivist/ Librarian; 8. Department Chairman; 9. Curator, Assoc/Asst Curator; 10. Librarian; 11. Head Librarian; 12. Registrar/Asst Registrar; 13. Collections Manager/Archivist; 14. Project Archivist; 15. Collections Manager; 16. Visual Arts Supervisor; 17. Special Collections Cataloger; 18. Museum Director/Asst Director; 19. Library Coordinator; 20. Library Director/Asst Director; 21. Administrator, Assoc/Asst Admin; 22. Public Relations Administrator; 23. Education Program Specialist; 24. Business Manager; 25. Education Director; 26. Illustrator, Photo Collection; 27. Assistant Director, Administration; 28. Director of Collections; 29. Research Center Director

Figure 3. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE
COMPARISON OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL TYPES

	1983-4	1991	AAM 1989
Art Museums (3,24,31,34)	37.3%	24.0%	14.8%
Arboretums	N/A	04.3%	00.9%
Historic Sites (6,16,19,33)	N/A	11.0%	25.5%
History Museums	25.3%	18.6%	29.3%
Nat History Museums (8,32,35)	05.7%	22.7%	03.1%
General Museums	08.0%	04.3%	08.6%

Figure 4. TITLE OF INDIVIDUAL
RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

	1983-4	1991
Unknown	234 [44.7%]	
Director/Asst Dir	53 [17.7%]	6 [3.7%]
Deputy Director	9 [3.0%]	
Librarian	26 [8.7%]	29 [20.0%]
Curator	22 [7.3%]	12 [7.5%]
Archivist	21 [7.0%]	73 [50.3%]
Registrar	14 [4.7%]	4 [2.5%]
Admin/Admn Asst	14 [4.0%]	3 [2.0%]
Archivist/Librarian	N/A	11 [6.8%]
Coll Mgr/Archivist	N/A	4 [2.5%]

1983-4: IS SOMEONE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE
ARCHIVES?

yes (specified)	149 [49.7%]
yes (unspecified)	53 [17.7%]
no one	70 [23.3%]
no response	28 [09.3%]

1983-4: IF YES, WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR
ARCHIVES?

Archivist	48 [16.0%]
Librarian	32 [10.7%]
Registrar	24 [08.0%]
Curator	28 [09.3%]
Director	23 [07.7%]
Deputy Director	4 [01.3%]
Administrator; Admin Asst	13 [04.3%]

Figure 5. INSTITUTIONAL FUNDING

	1983-4	1991
\$ 99,999 or less	41 [13.6%]	13 [08.1%]
100,000-499,999	107 [35.7%]	28 [17.4%]
500,000-999,999	51 [17.0%]	12 [07.5%]
1,000,000-5,000,000	84 [28.0%]	56 [34.8%]
5 million +	N/A	40 [24.8%]

Documenting Museums, Figures

1991: ARCHIVES FUNDING

\$ 10,000 or less	93 [57.8%]
10,001-49,999	30 [18.6%]
50,000-99,999	13 [08.1%]
100,000-299,999	7 [04.3%]
500,000-999,999	5 [03.1%]
1 million +	-- ----

Figure 6. 1991 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

4. Date Archives Began	
Before 1940	31 [19.3%]
1941 - 1949	3 [01.9%]
1950 - 1959	9 [05.6%]
1960 - 1969	11 [06.8%]
after 1970	87 [54.0%]
don't know	5 [03.1%]
no archival program	13 [08.1%]
no response	2 [01.2%]
5. Highest level of education completed	
some college or less	4 [02.5%]
Bachelor's degree	25 [15.5%]
Master's degree	107 [66.5%]
Ph.D.	13 [08.1%]
second Masters	6 [03.7%]
dipl/cert Archival Mgmt	2 [01.2%]
Certified Archivist	1 [00.6%]
no response	3 [01.9%]
7. Length in your current position	
2 years or less	36 [22.4%]
2 to 5 years	55 [34.2%]
over 5 years	67 [42.6%]
no response	3 [01.9%]

Figure 7. 1991 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

8. Associated with Archival Profession?	
2 years or less	25 [15.5%]
2 to 5 years	36 [22.4%]
5 to 10 years	46 [28.6%]
Over 10 years	37 [23.0%]
0 years; not/never assoc	2 [01.2%]
no response	15 [09.3%]
10. Does your organization have an official archives program, whereby official [business] records of the parent institution are periodically transferred from active/inactive status into a separate unit designated as the institution's archives and/or manuscript repository?	
yes	77 [47.8%]
no	81 [50.3%]
no response	3 [01.9%]

11. Does the archives/manuscript repository have a written mission statement/mandate from the organization giving responsibility for the organization's inactive records?	
yes	60 [37.3%]
no	95 [59.0%]
no response	6 [03.7%]

Figure 8. 1991 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

12. Are there laws that require institution staff to release official records to the repository before leaving?	
yes	15 [09.3%]
no	121 [75.2%]
do not know	2 [01.2%]
no response	23 [14.3%]
13. Is there an institution regulation requiring staff release their official records to the repository before leaving?	
yes	44 [27.3%]
no	109 [67.7%]
do not know	2 [01.2%]
no response	6 [03.7%]
14. If the institution archives/manuscript repository collects personal papers and special collections in addition to official records, is there a written collection policy defining goals and parameters?	
yes	81 [50.3%]
no	51 [31.7%]
do not collect	21 [13.0%]
no response	8 [05.0%]

Figure 9. 1991 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

15. If the archives/manuscript repository has an oral history project, are there guidelines, and/or is the project tied into the collection policy of the archives/manuscript repository?	
yes	41 [25.5%]
no	33 [20.5%]
no project	79 [49.1%]
inactive	-- -----
other	1 [0.6%]
no response	7 [04.3%]
17. Is there a contractual agreement between the institution and staff members to ensure that personal papers of staff members are deposited with the archives/ manuscript repository before they leave?	
yes	8 [05.0%]
no	144 [89.4%]
contracts with field workers and others, not with full-time staff	1 [00.6%]
no response/not applic	8 [05.0%]