

# SAA Extra

Society of American Archivists, 330 S. Wells St.  
Suite 810, Chicago, Illinois 60606

---

*August 1978*

## EXECUTIVE ORDER ON CLASSIFICATION

National Archives officials have predicted that the new standards for declassification contained in the Executive Order signed by President Carter June 29 will mean that the public will have access to about 600 million pages of documents over the next decade instead of the 350 million that would have been declassified under the previous system.

The order, EO 12065, mandates that classification review must begin after 20 years, instead of the 30 years permitted by EO 11652 issued by President Nixon in 1972.

The National Archives' present declassification effort has been budgeted at \$1,560,000 for FY79. The division is headed by Edwin A. Thompson. Brenda S. Reger is in charge of declassification efforts at the Washington National Records Center in Suitland, Maryland, and Thomas E. Hohman directs the project in the National Archives building. 87 staff members are involved in systematic review of records for declassification, while 16 members of Thompson's staff are assigned to making declassification reviews of records held by presidential libraries. Judith A. Koucky coordinates the presidential libraries program. The Archives will seek a supplemental appropriation to the funds already allocated for FY79 in order to accomplish the accelerated declassification effort mandated by the new Executive Order.

A stronger minimum standard for classification and a reduction in the number of agencies and officials permitted to classify information are high points of the order. Under the terms of the order, federal officials must be able to show that release of information would cause "identifiable harm" to the national security before it can be classified. The previous order required only a less tangible showing that unauthorized disclosure would harm the national interests.(cont. on p. 2)

## PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS LEGISLATION

Legislation which would make presidential records public property, but permit an outgoing chief executive to control access for up to ten years, was reported out of the House Committee on Government Operations in July. The need for legislation to govern the ownership and handling of presidential papers was highlighted by controversies over the papers of former President Nixon. Legislation passed in December, 1974 gave the government control over Nixon's papers, but did not address the subject generally, thus leaving the disposition of papers up to each President. The same legislation created the National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials, which became known as the Public Documents Commission (PDC). In the PDC's final report, recommendations were made that the public be given ownership of presidential papers and those created by Congress and the federal judiciary.

The presidential papers bill was introduced by Representatives Richardson Preyer, D-N.C., John Brademas, D-Ind., and Allen Ertel, D-Pa. As reported out of the Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights, chaired by Preyer, the bill contained a provision which called for the appointment of the Archivist of the United States by the President. This clause was removed during consideration by the full committee.

Some Capitol Hill observers are optimistic about the chances for passage of the legislation in this session. However, several hurdles have to be surmounted in the brief time left before adjournment:

Senate action It is anticipated that Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., a PDC member, may co-sponsor companion legislation in the Senate with Charles Percy, R-Ill.(cont. on p. 3)

---

## CLASSIFICATION (CONT. FROM P. 1)

The new order also reduces the number of officials who may classify information. Eleven agencies were stripped altogether of their authority to classify information, and five others were given reduced authority. Although the total number of persons who can stamp a document "Top Secret" is expected to stay at about 1,400, some reduction is predicted in the 11,900 who can classify a document "Secret" and "Confidential."

In his signing statement, Carter proclaimed: "The public is entitled to know as much as possible about the government's activities. Classification should be used only to protect legitimate national security secrets and never to cover up mistakes or improper activities."

"While some material must be classified," the President continued, "the government classifies too much information, classifies it too highly, and for too long. These practices violate the public's right to know, impose unnecessary costs and weaken protection for truly sensitive information by undermining all respect for classification. The new order will increase openness in government by limiting classification and accelerating declassification. At the same time, it will improve protection for information that needs to be kept secret."

The order lists seven categories of information that can be classified: (1) military plans, weapons or operations; (2) foreign government information; (3) intelligence activities, sources or methods; (4) foreign relations or foreign activities of the United States; (5) scientific, technological or economic matters relating to the national security; (6) U.S. programs for safeguarding nuclear materials or facilities; or (7) other categories of information related to national security and requiring protection against unauthorized disclosure as determined by the President or an official designated by him pursuant to the act.

Although information might technically fall within one of those categories, it must still be shown that release would produce some specific and identifiable harm.

The order also reduces the amount of time that information can be classified. More than half of all documents classified under the old order could retain their classification for up to 30 years. The new order's standard is that most documents will be declassified after six

years, unless there are mitigating circumstances that require continued secrecy. If longer terms are set, the classifying official must explain why the document will continue to need classification with the passage of time.

The order created a new Information Security Oversight Office that will have responsibility for overall supervision of the order. It will have authority to review agencies' procedures and files, and it can overrule their regulations and decisions on the classification of individual documents, subject to appeal to the National Security Council. The office reports to the President on compliance with the order.

Carter called the office a "key element to the new classification system," and said it would have his "strong support."

Among other changes the new order makes in the classification procedure:

Documents cannot be classified as a whole. Each portion of a document must be classified separately. This procedure will reportedly solve one of the problems with so-called derivative classification. Previously, whenever a document referred to other classified documents, the whole document received at least the level of classification given to the earlier document because there was no way to determine whether the portion referred to was classified or not.

Classification is not permitted for privately owned documents, unless the government has acquired a proprietary interest in them, nor can basic scientific information not related to the national security be classified. Classification is not permitted to conceal violations of the law; inefficiency or administrative error; to prevent embarrassment to a person, organization or agency; or to restrain competition. Classification may not be used to limit dissemination of information that is not classifiable under the terms of the order, or delay the public release of that information.

In addition, the order requires that agencies balance the public's interest in disclosure against the need to keep information secret. If the interest in disclosure is great, the information must be revealed.

Classification may not be restored to a document once it has been released to the public.

## MEETINGS

The American Society for Legal History will hold a roundtable discussion, "Legal History, Historians and Lawyers' Papers," at its annual meeting in Chicago on October 20, 1978. Participants will include Susan Grigg, Yale University; William H. Harbaugh, University of Virginia; and Robert D. Williams, Werner & Stackpole, a Boston law firm. The session will begin at 4:00 p.m. at the Center for Continuing Education, University of Chicago. Interested archivists are welcome to attend. Anyone who has had instructive experience in obtaining lawyers' papers for a manuscript repository or in arranging for access to such papers, or who desires more information on the discussion should contact Susan Grigg, Dept. of Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, New Haven, CT 06520.

\* \* \*

The School of Library and Information Science, SUNY-Albany, will offer a workshop entitled "Genealogical Information and Materials" on Friday, October 13, 1978. Designed to meet the needs of practicing librarians, the workshop will discuss problems related to helping the public in its hunt for ancestors. Lucile Whalen will be workshop coordinator. For further information, contact Robert S. Burgess, School of Library and Information Science, SUNY-Albany, Albany, NY 12222.

\* \* \*

Enrollment in the October session of the Modern Archives Institute at the National Archives has reached capacity. Consequently, a special session of the Institute will be offered in January. For further information, write Modern Archives Institute, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, DC 20408.

## PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS (CONT. FROM P. 1)

Additional House action The bill must be considered by the House Administration Committee before consideration on the floor.

White House To date, the White House has not supported the bill. Hugh Carter and others from the President's staff have raised objections to the ten year period of presidential control, favoring a fifteen year period instead, and also objected to the 1981 effective date of the legislation. They argue that new legislation should be implemented in 1985, thereby alleviating the possibility of having to handle Carter materials from two terms differently.

## AMERICAN ARCHIVIST BOARD MEETS

New directions were charted for the *American Archivist*, SAA's quarterly journal, in a meeting of the journal's editorial board and the Society's executive committee in Washington on July 17. The meeting was chaired by Virginia C. Purdy, new editor of the *American Archivist*. Board members participating were Lucile Kane, Minnesota Historical Society; Elsie Freivogel, National Archives and Records Service; David B. Gracy II, Texas State Archives; Maynard Brichford, University of Illinois; John Fleckner, State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Trudy Peterson, National Archives and Records Service; and Ruth Helmuth, Case Western Reserve University. The Society's 1977-78 Executive Committee includes President Walter Rundell, Jr.; Vice President Hugh A. Taylor; Treasurer Mary Lynn McCree; Council representative J. Frank Cook; and Executive Director Ann Morgan Campbell. Also participating in the meeting were the publication's section editors, Thomas E. Weir, Jr., Ronald J. Plavchan, Mary Elizabeth Ruwell, Paul Guite, and assistant editor Douglas Stickley, Jr.

Tabulated results of an extensive survey of several hundred *American Archivist* readers served as the basis for much of the discussion. The compilation will be published soon in the journal. The survey indicated that the most widely read section of the journal was "News Notes." Discussion at the meeting touched on the possibility of revising the present "News Notes" policy of publishing extensive listings of archival accessions. A number of members of the executive committee and editorial board argued that the *American Archivist* should publish a much abbreviated accessions section which would cover only major and unusual acquisitions.

Changes will soon be apparent in both the journal's format and content. The Executive Committee has authorized a 50% increase in the journal's operating budget to support a new format which is expected to include more illustrative material.

### SAA STAFF

Ann Morgan Campbell, *Executive Director*

#### Administrative Services

Joyce Gianatasio, *Director*  
Jean DeHorn  
Patricia Garcia

#### Special Programs

Timothy Walch, *Director*  
Karen Hawker  
Deborah Risteen

#### Historical Records Survey Project

Loretta Hefner, *Program Officer*

# SAA Annual Meeting Highlights

SAA's 42nd annual meeting will take place October 3-6, 1978 at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Nashville, Tennessee. Annual meeting program packets were mailed to SAA individual and institutional members on July 19. Major credit for planning SAA'78 goes to the Program Committee, chaired by Edward Papenfuse, Maryland Hall of Records, and to the Local Arrangements Committee, directed by Cleo Hughes, Tennessee State Library and Archives. Descriptions of some of the highlights follow:

*Nashville Bash* - A welcome-to-Nashville party complete with blue-grass music and refreshments. Festivities will begin at 8:00 Tuesday evening.

*Committee Meetings* - Many committee chairpersons have scheduled committee meetings for all or part of Tuesday. Several committees are planning special activities. The Aural and Graphic Records Committee will tour Vanderbilt TV News Archives from 10:00 a.m. to noon, have a luncheon business meeting, and then tour the Country Music Foundation Library and Media Center from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. The Education and Professional Development Committee will review the second draft of the proposed "Program Standards for Archival Education: The Practicum." Also on their agenda is a discussion of the formal study report on program options for continuing education. The Religious Archives Committee will be hosted by the Southern Baptist Historical Commission for their all-day meeting. The Labor Archives Committee will discuss several projects of importance to those who have the responsibility of preserving labor records. They will discuss the possibility of compiling a directory of institutions holding labor-related records in both the U.S. and foreign countries. The College and University Archives Committee plans a full day meeting. Topics to be discussed include the C & U Book of Readings, standards for college and university archives, federal legislation dealing with college and university archives, and a possible task force on uniform statistical reporting. All committee meetings are open to any interested annual meeting participant.

*Nashville Seminars* - The 1978 Program Committee has scheduled limited enrollment seminars on a variety of archival topics. The purpose of the seminars is to elaborate on and reinforce subjects presented in regular sessions, but to do so in smaller groups where extended discussion is possible.

*Drop-In Rooms* - An innovation at this year's annual meeting, drop-in rooms are meeting areas where interested individuals can seek answers to specific questions and discuss common problems with experts in various aspects of archives. Drop-in room staff members and the topics they

will discuss include: Preservation, Edmund Berkeley, Michael Plunkett; Arrangement and Description, David B. Gracy II; Automation, H. Thomas Hickerson; Reference and Access, Sue E. Holbert; Legal Issues, Alex Ladenson; Security, Philip P. Mason; Surveys, John A. Fleckner; Access Regulations, Richard Jacobs; Reprography, Carolyn Sung; Administration, Robert M. Warner; Exhibits, Gail Casterline; Public Programs, Ann Pederson; Cartographic Records and Architectural Drawings, Ralph Ehrenburg.

*Demonstrations* - Basic paper conservation techniques and advanced finding aids will be featured in demonstrations throughout the course of the meeting.

*Womens' Caucus* - SAA's active women's caucus will meet at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday.

*Newcomer's Briefing* - New Society members are invited to attend a briefing Wednesday morning with members of SAA's staff and the Society's officers. Coffee and rolls will be provided.

*Placement* - The Society's placement service will operate Tuesday through Thursday in an effort to assist employers in meeting qualified candidates to fill professional vacancies. Employers should bring vacancy announcements, and candidates should bring resumes to the SAA booth in the exhibit area.

*Exhibits* - Representatives of a number of companies with products and publications of interest to archivists, manuscript curators, and records managers will exhibit and discuss the items with annual meeting participants. Exhibits will be open Tuesday through Thursday.

*Open Forums* - Annual meeting participants will have several opportunities to participate in open discussions of major issues confronting the Society.

Nominating Committee Open Forum: SAA members are invited to share their suggestions for candidates for the 1979 elections. Wednesday, noon - 1:00 p.m.

Open Forum with SAA Officers and Council:  
Members are offered the opportunity for informal discussion with SAA officials.  
Wednesday, 1:00 - 2:00 p.m.

A Code of Ethics: An Open Forum: A draft code of ethics will be presented to the membership prior to the forum; participants will be encouraged to discuss the proposed code and to suggest revisions. Wednesday, 2:00 - 4:30 p.m.

Open Forum on Procedures for the Approval of Graduate Archival Education Programs: The Committee on Education and Professional Development and the audience will discuss the proposed procedures for the approval of graduate archival education programs by an SAA Board for Archival Certification.  
Thursday, 9:30 a.m. - noon.

*Business Meeting* - The proposed associate dues policy for foreign members will be considered at the annual business meeting which will also feature the annual reports of the treasurer and the executive director.

*Presidential Banquet* - Walter Rundell, Jr. will deliver his presidential address, "Photographs as Historical Evidence: Early Texas Oil," awards will be presented, and new Fellows will be recognized at the annual Presidential Banquet scheduled for Thursday evening. The Banquet will be preceded by the Presidential Reception which will begin at 5:30.

*Closing Brunch* - A buffet brunch and a look forward to 1979's meeting in Chicago will mark the closing of SAA '78. The brunch, which will begin at 11:15 a.m., will include remarks from SAA's incoming president, Hugh A. Taylor.

*Tours* - Two post-meeting tour options will be offered. A tour on Friday will visit two of Nashville's historic homes: Traveller's Rest, the home of Andrew Jackson's law partner, Judge John Overton, and Jackson's own home, The Hermitage. A box supper will be served prior to departure for Friday night's performance of the Grand Ole Opry. A two-day Middle Tennessee tour will depart Nashville early Friday afternoon and will include a visit to the Jack Daniel Distillery, the oldest licensed distillery in the U.S.; a stop at Lynchburg to see the town square and the Jack Daniel Museum; and a trip to Cumberland Springs where the Distillery is hosting a bar and barbecue with square dancing, horse shoes, and Blue Grass Music.

## The Lighter Side



CLONING IS THE ANSWER

SAA's approach to the recruitment, training, and certification of archivists is wrong. Cloning is the answer.

I suggest SAA appoint an *ad hoc* committee to determine the qualities that characterize the perfect archivist, locate the person who most nearly embodies those characteristics, and then clone him.

The advantages are many and obvious. It would even, at the annual meetings, simplify the identification by the hotel staff, the exhibitors, fellow members, cab drivers, and the cops of the visiting SAA members.

The *ad hoc* committee would determine the characteristics most desirable in an archivist. As starters, I suggest he be tall and long-armed enough to reach high shelves, have a wide enough handspan to grip a dozen file folders of documents, be left-handed, have an IQ in the 82-92 range (considered ideal for the profession), and be endowed with the typical archival stare developed by and so well suited to long periods alone in the stacks.

This committee, or perhaps another one, might look into the desirability of cloning archival administrators, whose necessary qualities differ from those of archivists. Since administrators are less lovable and cuddly, there may be difficulties in recruiting administrative clone-bearers. But administrative clones could at birth be put into and raised in special institutions. Such an institutional upbringing would have advantages.

I, as a member of the Federal Women's Program Committee, am bothered by the question of what, under cloning, will be the future of women in the profession. But there seems to be no way around the cloning limitations that biology imposes on the female. The selected male archivist can be cloned annually in all 50 states; a female is limited to a lifetime of at most a dozen or so clones. Perhaps the SAA could establish for those females who volunteer to bear clones the title of Mothers of the Society, the equivalent of the present Fellows.

If we begin now, we can have the first crop available by or about the year 2000. PROJECT 2000 is a natural name for this effort.

Leonard Rapport

# REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION

In August 1977, SAA President Robert M. Warner appointed the *ad hoc* Committee on Institutional Evaluation to consider whether standards might be formulated for the purpose of evaluating archival and manuscript repositories. (Hereafter, use of the term "archival" will be understood to include "manuscript.") This committee consists of William L. Joyce, American Antiquarian Society, chairman, and Judith Austin, Idaho State Historical Society, William N. Davis, Jr., California State Archives, Mary Jo Pugh, Michigan Historical Collections at the University of Michigan, and Charles R. Schultz, Texas A & M University Archives. The committee met first on October 4, 1977 at the SAA annual meeting in Salt Lake City and later on February 27-28, 1978 in Chicago.

The committee decided that its first responsibility was to review the literature on formulating institutional standards and accreditation procedures in order to understand current issues and to determine if existing practices could be adapted to the needs and purposes of the SAA. Having reviewed a substantial portion of the pertinent literature, the committee has concluded that the Society of American Archivists should move to adopt a program of institutional evaluation. The report reflects the committee's reasoning in arriving at this conclusion and advances some preliminary procedural guidelines and basic evaluation criteria so that the SAA membership can be apprised of what such a program might entail.

Several factors have influenced the committee in its deliberations:

- a. This is a time of definition within the archival profession. The Committee on Education and Professional Development, for example, is endeavoring to identify those elements constituting sufficient preparation of archivists. (The term "archivists" is used broadly here and includes manuscript curators and others responsible for collections of unpublished records.) Moreover, the willingness of the Society to consider difficult issues, such as archival ethics, similarly reflects a profession seeking to define and regulate itself.
- b. Professions identify themselves and their services through three principal means: (1) certification or licensing of individuals, such as in the medical and legal professions; (2) accreditation or approval of training programs, such as in library science and in a host of other professions represented by the Council of Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA); and, (3) accreditation or approval of institutions, such as the program of the American Association of Museums (AAM). An advantage of institutional evaluation is that the profession is judged by the quality of the services it actually renders rather than on the credentials of those individuals whom it employs.
- c. Archives rely upon their parent institutions for support and, like other educational and cultural institutions, they are increasingly dependent upon financial support through outside funding provided by contracts, project grants and contributions. These sources seek guidance in making judgments about institutions and their ability to make the best possible use of funds allocated to them. It would be far better for SAA to take the lead in creating a procedure for the evaluation of institutions than to have such responsibility fall to those whose primary concern may or may not be the improvement of the quality of archival services. There is, furthermore, increased scrutiny of public services by citizens; the public wants to know that its money is well spent.
- d. In recent years the federal government has relied increasingly on institutional accreditation as a requirement for funding. Evidently, the AAM is attempting to utilize this approach in persuading the Institute for Museum Services to regard museum accreditation as an important criterion in determining eligibility for funding.
- e. Last year the *Report of the National Commission on the Records and Documents of Federal Officials* proposed that the public papers (as opposed to federal records) of federal officials be housed in repositories chosen by those officials. The *Report* suggested legislation to this effect with Congressional appropriation of funds to assist repositories in the processing of such papers. A program of institutional evaluation would doubtless assist Congress, as well as other federal agencies, in determining eligibility for such appropriations.

f. Institutional evaluation offers a means for archival agencies to interpret more effectively their role to those fiscal sources and governing bodies which would ordinarily be considerably removed from the daily administration of those archival agencies.

g. Prospective donors of archival materials, especially those attempting to choose among several repositories, may profit from such an evaluation program. Institutional accreditation might encourage donors to consider program quality and ability to deliver services in selecting those archival repositories to which they give their records.

h. The profession has recently witnessed an increase in the number of archival agencies. The Society of American Archivists is rightly concerned about the quality of these archives, particularly among those institutions which might not realize the commitment necessary for a good program. Archival programs must be adequately funded, staffed, and equipped to offer a reasonable standard of care for the records they collect and sufficient service for their constituency. Our responsibility to the records and to the public demands that we establish some means of assessing institutional quality and of providing some assistance to those institutions which are considering the establishment of archival programs.

A program of institutional evaluation featuring both self-study and peer review offers SAA and its membership a number of benefits by promoting institutional integrity and program quality. The self-study entails a comprehensive statement of institutional objectives and evaluation of how resources are directed toward meeting the objectives as stated:

a. Despite the remarkably diverse characteristics of individual archival institutions, all share a common aim in seeking to present themselves to the public in a professional manner and in contributing to public knowledge according to their abilities.

b. A combination of self-study and peer review incorporates staff participation and awareness with a corroborating judgment by qualified professionals that resources are being utilized effectively in disseminating services.

c. The evaluation of institutional services through application of standards inspires public confidence by verifying that archival objectives are met. Clearly, the needs of the public as well as those of archival repositories are best realized in developing, promoting, and applying standards of archival service.

d. Institutional evaluation increases awareness of services and fosters institutional cooperation and coordination, especially since the evaluation process includes peer review which really involves an advisory consultation.

e. Professional recognition by peers not only augments staff morale but by its very nature also promotes long-range planning. Evaluation can also serve as an educational device for administrators of parent agencies.

A program of institutional evaluation must promote diversity while simultaneously applying fundamental, commonly shared guidelines in appraising archival services:

a. SAA institutional evaluation would be voluntary and would apply to archives alone and not to the entire institution of which the archives are a part. The evaluation would be undertaken only within the context of how well a repository has directed its resources toward fulfilling the goals and objectives it has set for itself.

b. Only archives which can be recognized as distinctly separate from other institutional programs and services would be eligible for evaluation.

c. Any institutional review program must respect the confidentiality of all information compiled for the purpose of evaluation. No information would be available to anyone not directly involved in the evaluation process without the permission of the institution undergoing the evaluation.

However, SAA will maintain and disseminate a roster of approved institutions.

d. A program of institutional evaluation must entail an initial application, a self-evaluation, and a peer review.

e. In developing procedures to implement such a program, the SAA Council and officers shall endeavor to keep costs as low as possible consistent with program quality.

f. There shall be no attempt to create different grades or classes of repositories for the purpose of evaluation.

A program of institutional evaluation also requires a core of irreducible criteria which can serve as a basis for developing the questionnaire for archival self-evaluation as well as a checklist for the on-site review. The following principles are suggested to identify areas which may be covered in such a program of evaluation:

a. The archives, through its governing body, will develop and review periodically a statement of its goals and objectives in accordance with those of the agency of which it is a part.

b. The archives will appraise, accession, arrange and describe, conserve and provide access to records in its custody.

c. The archives will be located administratively wherever it can best serve the interests of the institution of which it is a part and where it will be most capable of meeting the needs of its clientele.

d. The archives will be adequately funded to enable it to accomplish its mandate.

e. The archives will be operated by a staff sufficiently trained and experienced to carry out its work effectively. The conditions of employment, duties, and responsibilities of all staff members will be specified in writing. The archives will maintain written policy statements and procedural manuals.

f. The archives will solicit, purchase, or accept records only when they fall within the stated acquisitions policy. After accession, records will be made available to researchers as soon as legally possible and physically practicable. Records will be arranged, described, stored, and conserved in accordance with archival principles and practices as noted in the professional literature. All collections will be processed to promote the most efficient and expeditious access consistent with responsible utilization of resources.

g. The archives will provide equal access to all readers on a regular basis. Hours will be consistent with the reasonable demand of patrons.

The committee is aware that various objections might be raised against the implementation of an effective evaluation program for archival institutions. These objections are worthy of serious consideration. Objections considered by the committee are italicized in the statements below; the committee response follows immediately.

a. *A major problem facing any accreditation program is the challenge of validating criteria for program quality.* To put it another way, do conditions generally thought necessary for quality programs in fact produce those programs? A focus on services actually delivered rather than on individual training should help to minimize this objection.

b. *Once a program of institutional evaluation is adopted, and once the majority of institutions is evaluated, there may be no reason for the program to continue. Once an institution is accredited, it may not feel compelled to sustain or improve its program.* No institution would be given permanent accreditation; accreditation would be given only for a specified number of years. The committee envisions an on-going program of assessment. The SAA may wish to adopt more rigorous standards in the future or to adopt new standards to reflect new developments in technology or techniques. Through evaluation of institutions in light of their professed objectives



and their utilization of resources to realize those objectives, institutions may be directed to increasingly effective levels of service. "Evaluators" thus function in this context as consultants in helping institutions adapt their practices to the changing needs and expectations of their constituencies.

c. *Governmental guidelines for funding could threaten to subvert or to influence unduly the evaluation criteria.* By its very existence, a program of institutional evaluation offers more protection than the lack of one in the face of proliferating governmental guidelines. SAA sponsorship and the integrity of the program itself should lead government to rely increasingly on the SAA program rather than upon guidelines which might be formulated by those outside the profession.

d. *Standards might not be equitably applied in the evaluation of institutions.* Training potential "evaluators" to be knowledgeable about the background of the formulation of the standards and the intentions of the Society should alleviate such problems. The assessment will be made by one committee which will consider both the institutional self-evaluation and the peer evaluation before arriving at its determination.

e. *Diversity among archival repositories will be compromised; innovation will be stifled and special needs overlooked. Archivists will be forced to adopt policies they deem unnecessary or undesirable.* Every archival agency is by definition unique and has its own goals, needs, and priorities. Any evaluation program would first entail institutional self-appraisal based upon how well it has directed its resources in fulfilling those goals and objectives which it has set for itself. Second, peer evaluation would occur within the context of those goals and objectives. A major advantage of institutional evaluation lies in the fact that each program is assessed on its own terms; no attempt is made to compare one institution directly with another. The committee believes that certain basic principles underlie a responsible level of care; it is this which the committee is trying to establish for all institutions, not an inflexible sequence of identical or quantitative procedures.

f. *The autonomy of archivists could be threatened by documentation of problems beyond their control.* First, the program is voluntary and it would seek to meliorate problems rather than to aggravate them. The program would be confidential. The Society would be offering a service to members, not acting as an adversary. Second, institutional evaluation could positively assist the archivist in educating the administration of his parent agency to the needs and priorities of the archives. Needs which have been documented by a national professional organization could serve the archivist as a valuable tool; the evaluation process would serve as an outside consultation. Even now the parent institution does, in fact, set standards, often low and inadequate, by which its funding decisions are made.

g. *A program of institutional evaluation would constitute an excessive investment of time and money.* The sense of purpose imparted to the profession as well as the steady improvement of archival services should provide a most gratifying return on the investment of time and treasure. Of course, administrators of the program would make every effort to keep costs and fees as low as possible. The Society might apply for project funding to establish the program.

A bibliography of the materials which the committee found useful in preparing its report is available to interested members from the office of the Executive Director.

## **MEMBERSHIP FORUM TO DISCUSS MAJOR PROPOSALS BEFORE SOCIETY**

Three major proposals now being considered by the Society of American Archivists will be discussed at a membership forum at the Nashville annual meeting. President-elect Hugh A. Taylor will preside at the function which is scheduled for 1:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 4. The proposals to be discussed are certification of individual archivists, accreditation of archival education, and the proposal for evaluation of archival institutions outlined above.

## PROFESSIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

ARCHIVIST, Arizona Historical Society, responsible for arranging and cataloging manuscript collections; caring for rare book holdings; and maintaining the Society's oral history collection. *Qualifications:* Master's degree in one of the social sciences, preferably American history, from an accredited college or university, and one year of responsible experience in records management, historical research, or technical archival work. *Salary:* \$12,336-16,243. Candidates should contact SAA headquarters for a copy of the announcement.

BUSINESS ARCHIVIST, J. Walter Thompson Company, New York City. New, full time position with responsibility for reorganizing, centralizing, preserving, and processing books, documents, proofs, and many other forms of advertising materials representing over 100 years of company history. *Qualifications:* Previous experience in organizing business archives, with professional background in business history, communications, advertising, or related fields. Expertise in preservation, audio-visual, and micrographic techniques desirable. *Salary:* Based on qualifications and experience. Send resume to N. Terry Munger, Manager of Information Services, J. Walter Thompson Company, 420 Lexington Ave., New York, New York 10017.

CURATOR OF MANUSCRIPTS AND BOOKS, Pilgrim Society, Plymouth, Massachusetts, to administer a well developed collection of manuscripts and a research library related to the history of the Pilgrims and Plymouth. *Qualifications:* archival training and experience, knowledge of colonial history, master's degree. *Salary:* \$5,850, plus contribution to medical insurance, 20 hours per week. Available October 1, or earlier. Send resume to Laurence R. Pizer, Director, Pilgrim Society, 75 Court Street, Plymouth, MA 02360.

ARCHIVIST, University of Arkansas at Little Rock Library; responsibilities include developing archival collections; processing of materials; preparing bibliographies; assisting researchers; consulting with faculty; public relations; and participating in administration. *Qualifications:* archival experience, appropriate subject background, ALA/MLS, knowledge of law applicable to archives, ability to relate to community and foster donor activity. Send resumes and three recent letters of recommendation to Kathy Essary, UALR Library, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, 23rd and University, Little Rock, AR 72204.

CURATORIAL ASSOCIATE, University Archives, Harvard University Library. Responsibilities include solicitation and processing of archival collections, partial supervision of support and student staff; assistance to curators in planning new archival systems and procedures, answering reference questions; preparing exhibitions; service at reading room reception reference desk; accessioning and acknowledging and related duties. *Qualifications:* MA in American history and familiarity with problems and procedures in several of the following areas: preservation, records management, microforms, computer applications, and audio-visual records. Highly desirable are MLS, archival training including practicum and/or related experience, and knowledge of one or more western European languages. *Salary:* \$11,900 +, plus other major benefits. Available immediately. Send resumes to Philip E. Leinbach, Assistant University Librarian for Personnel, Harvard University Library, Cambridge, MA 02138.

*Two positions, the Johns Hopkins Medical Institution.*

ARCHIVIST, to assist with a twelve month NHPRC funded project to process and arrange the archives. Specific duties include processing documents, implementing records arrangement plans, and collaborating on the preparation of a finding aid. *Qualifications:* MA in history or a humanities related field with archival processing. 1 year position, to begin September 1, 1978. *Salary:* \$14,000 plus benefits.

ARCHIVAL TECHNICIAN, to assist with a twelve month NHPRC funded project to process and arrange the archives. Specific duties include the sorting of documents and arrangement of records according to designated plans. *Qualifications:* BA preferred but not required, with a preference for someone who has majored in history or library science. Prior archival experience desired. 1 year position to begin September 1, 1978. *Salary:* \$8500 plus benefits.

For above positions, send resume to Thomas B. Turner, Archivist, The Alan Mason Chesney Medical Archives, The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, 36 Turner Auditorium, 720 Rutland Ave., Baltimore, MD 21205.

ARCHIVAL ASSISTANT, Georgia Historical Society, to assist in the cataloging of manuscript collections at the Georgia Historical Society.

# PROFESSIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

1 year appointment, funded by an NEH grant. Responsibilities include processing manuscript collections, preparing inventories and finding aids, and other duties as required. *Qualifications:* MS, preferably in library science, successful completion of an archival training course, archival experience, and a background in Georgia history. *Salary:* \$10,500. 15 days vacation and other benefits. Position available October 1, 1978. Send resumes and references to Anthony R. Dees, Director, Georgia Historical Society, 501 Whitaker Street, Savannah, Georgia 31401.

ASSISTANT ARCHIVIST, Clark University, responsible for day-to-day operations of small but active university archives. Duties primarily processing and reference, but include management of office and supervision of work-study students. *Minimum qualifications:* BA, archival training, and at least one year processing experience. *Salary:* \$10,000 + plus benefits, depending on qualifications and experience. Position available immediately. Send application, resume and supporting letters to William A. Koelsch, University Archivist, Clark University, Worcester, MA 01610.

*Two positions, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.*

ARCHIVIST, to process the papers of individual women and of families. Responsibilities include sorting, arranging, and preparing finding aids, preparing materials for microfilming, and supervising a staff assistant. *Qualifications:* MA, preferably in American history and/or women's history; archival training, and 1-3 years archival processing experience. *Salary:* dependent upon experience, minimum \$11,900. One year grant-funded position. Starting date between Sept. 1 and Oct. 1, 1978.

ARCHIVIST, to process the records of contemporary women's organizations and to establish procedures to interfile future additions. Responsibilities include sorting, arranging, and preparing finding aids, with some supervision of student assistant. *Qualifications:* MA in American history, women's history, or a related field; archival training and/or experience; records management experience. *Salary:* \$11,900. One year grant-funded position beginning October 1, 1978.

For above positions, send resumes, including two references, to Archivist Search Committee, Schlesinger Library, 3 James Street, Cambridge, MA 02138. Deadline is August 10, 1978.

ARCHIVES STATE PROGRAM DIRECTOR serves as Director, Wyoming State Archives Historical Research and Museums Department. *Qualifications:* MA in history, political science, or public administration and five years experience in program development and administration or archives administration. *Salary:* \$1784/month-\$2390/month. Send official application to Wyoming State Personnel Division, Emerson Building, 2001 Capital Avenue, Cheyenne, WY 82002.

ARCHIVIST, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California. Half time position, responsibilities include developing a program of selecting, collecting, and organizing LBL records, publications, and equipment with relevance to the history of U.S. 20th century sciences. *Qualifications:* Master's degree in one of the sciences, or in the history of science, with experience in interviewing and archival duties. *Salary:* \$950-1,340 per month, pro-rated. Send resumes to Dharma Kaur Khalsa, Personnel Representative, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.

CURATOR, Poetry and Rare Books Collection, State University of New York at Buffalo. Responsible for administration of contemporary American and English poetry, manuscripts, and rare books collection. Duties include development, organization, preservation, and service of the collections. *Qualifications:* Graduate degree in English/American literature, and MLS from an ALA accredited school, or an equivalent combination of education and experience. Extensive knowledge of modern literature, familiarity with specialized book dealers, small presses, and management of special collections; at least 5 years relevant experience with collection and care of rare books and manuscripts. *Salary:* \$22,000 +, depending on qualifications. Faculty status at rank of Associate Librarian/Librarian. Send resume to M.E. State, University Libraries Personnel Officer, SUNY at Buffalo, 434 Capen Hall, Buffalo, NY 14260.

*Please note additional job listing on back page.*

*It is assumed that all employers listing vacancies with the Society of American Archivists are in compliance with Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Regulations.*

As the August Newsletter is an extra issue, there will be no August "Employment Bulletin."

# SAA Extra

Ann Morgan Campbell, Executive Director (312) 922-0140  
Society of American Archivists, 330 S. Wells St.  
Suite 810, Chicago, Illinois 60606

NON-PROFIT ORG.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
CHICAGO, IL.  
PERMIT NO. 885

INSIDE. . .

<i>American Archivist</i> Board Meets . . . . .	3
Annual Meeting Highlights. . . . .	4
Committee on Institutional Evaluation. . .	6-9
Placement. . . . .	10-11

. . .AND MORE!!

TIME VALUE MAIL

## BUSINESS ARCHIVES WORKSHOP SCHEDULED

The Society of American Archivists will sponsor a workshop, "Business Archives: Procedures and Policies," December 4-8, at the Pick-Congress Hotel in Chicago. The workshop will be composed of two consecutive learning modules. The first three days of the workshop will cover the basic elements of archival work slanted to the interests and concerns of individuals with little or no knowledge of archives. The curriculum of this module will be a condensed version of that being used in the SAA Basic Archival Workshops. The last two days will cover specialized topics of interest to professional business archivists. The two modules will run consecutively, and participants will be given the option of registering for either or both modules. For more information on the workshop, contact SAA's headquarters office, 330 S. Wells Street, Suite 810, Chicago, IL 60606.

## ASSOCIATE DUES PLAN FOR FOREIGN MEMBERS PROPOSED

In response to requests from Canadian members, SAA Council will recommend a resolution regarding a special membership rate for foreign members to the membership at the annual business meeting in Nashville. The resolution would make archivists residing outside the United States whose primary allegiance is to their own national archival association eligible for a special SAA membership rate of \$30.00 per year.

## DRAFT CODE OF ETHICS AVAILABLE

As reported in the July issue of the *SAA Newsletter*, the Ethics Committee has prepared a draft for discussion at a formal session in Nashville. Copies of the draft are available from the chairperson, and will also be available in Nashville. Anyone who wants to speak formally on one or more points of the code should contact the chairperson no later than September 20. Write or call David E. Horn, DePauw University Archives, Greencastle, IN 46135. (317) 653-9721, ext. 358.

## OPPORTUNITIES (CONT. FROM P. 11)

ASSISTANT ARCHIVIST, Salvation Army Archives and Research Center. Responsibilities include the supervision of processing and reference room; preparing finding aids. *Qualifications:* Advanced degree with archival training and at least one years experience; MLS desirable. *Salary:* \$12,000 plus benefits. Available immediately, send resume to Thomas Wilsted, Archivist Administrator, Salvation Army Archives and Research Center, 145 W. 15th St., New York, NY 10011.

SAA'S NEW PHONE NUMBER IS:

(312) 922-0140