U.S., Soviet Scholars Sign Archival Cooperation Agreement

Formal cooperation between Soviet and United States archivists became a reality on 19 February 1987, when Stanley N. Katz, President of the American Council of Learned Societies and Fyodor Mikhailovich Vaganov, General Director of the USSR’s Main Archival Administration, signed a five-year cooperative agreement.

The agreement establishes a joint Commission on Archival Cooperation, and charges this body with achieving cooperation in the following areas:
- exchange of archival experience
- exchange of copies of archival holdings
- exchange of archival literature
- preparation of joint documentary publications
- conducting of joint symposia on archival problems
- access to archival holdings by researchers from the U.S. and USSR visiting each other’s country.

The signing ceremony, held in the Archivists’ Reception Room at the National Archives, consummated the first-ever formal agreement between the American scholarly community and the centralized Soviet archival system. Acting Archivist Frank G. Burke, who heads the U.S. delegation of the joint Commission, joined Vaganov in signing a protocol which provides an agenda for implementing the agreement during its first two years.

Conference Launches Education Initiative

A total of thirty-six archivists, from nineteen states, the District of Columbia, and two Canadian provinces attended the SAA’s Education Conference in Savannah, Georgia, on February 12-14, 1987. During the three-day meeting, participants considered and discussed:
- the results of the recent SAA Survey of Educational Needs, analyzed and presented by Fred Stielow
- regional education priorities and activities as reported by representatives from regional archival associations
- a paper by Mary Jo Pugh entitled “Priorities for Continuing Education”
- Terry Eastwood’s paper entitled “Marshalling Resources for Continuing Education for Archivists”
- concluding remarks by Donn Neal concerning the possibilities and strategies for cooperating as we develop a continuing education program

Attendees also spent part of their time in small-group discussions as they considered questions about priorities for SAA’s continuing education program; the relationship between SAA, regional, and graduate archival education programs; and methods for providing continuing education to archivists.

Conference participants were selected in order to represent different perspectives within the archival community, including regional archival organizations that are, in many cases, the primary means through which archivists receive post-appointment education; graduate education programs that provide basic education for beginning professionals; the education grant advisory committee that...
From the Executive Director’s Desk

I've learned a lot over the past six months about the invaluable work that archivists do in the field of preservation. I've gotten acquainted with the workshops and consultancies that SAA has sponsored, with the generous assistance of NEH, since 1982. (Nearly 1,000 persons from hundreds of institutions have taken part in these activities.)

I've also visited the Northeast Document Conservation Center, one of the finest such facilities in the United States, and familiarized myself with the Preservation Management Institute that NEDCC and SAA are cooperatively offering on June 5-19.

I've also visited half a dozen other outstanding conservation laboratories—in New York, in Utah, in Nebraska, and elsewhere. I've attended several national meetings on preservation needs. I've learned more about pH and phase boxes, about Japanese paper and planetary cameras, than I ever expected to know!

All in all, I have been impressed with the dedication and care for historical materials that conservators and others in the archival profession display. But I have also been impressed with how much more needs to be done if we are to pass along to future generations the priceless records that we hold in trust.

At this writing, SAA's request to NEH for a continuation of our activities in the field of preservation is still pending, but we expect to use the next year or so to look both backward and forward. What can we say about the effectiveness of the workshops and consultancies that we have offered over the past seven years? Have they produced real change in how institutions view preservation needs—and in how they respond? What else can be done to improve the impact of the Society's preservation activities?

Looking ahead, we need to know more about the current and future preservation needs of the archival profession. What are the implications of optical disks and other machine-readable records--and of microforms, for that matter? What new directions should SAA's preservation efforts be taking? Where can we have the most telling impact?

If we are successful in undertaking these important tasks, SAA will be looking for a staff member to lead that effort. He or she will have to have a strong background in some aspect of preservation, broad archival training, a good understanding of how institutions function, and strong skills in the area of evaluation and planning. As the saying goes, "watch this space."

In the meantime, Tim Ericson, Patricia Palmer, and I welcome your thoughts on what SAA has done and might do in the field of preservation. I've become convinced that nothing we do as a profession makes a more meaningful contribution to the society of which we are a part than our work in the area of preservation. Let's redouble our efforts to be as effective as possible, and to persuade others of the crucial and lasting value of preservation work.
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In the meantime, Tim Ericson, Patricia Palmer, and I welcome your thoughts on what SAA has done and might do in the field of preservation. I've become convinced that nothing we do as a profession makes a more meaningful contribution to the society of which we are a part than our work in the area of preservation. Let's redouble our efforts to be as effective as possible, and to persuade others of the crucial and lasting value of preservation work.

SAA Annual Meeting Dates

Dates for the next four SAA annual meetings have been set, and you may want to mark your calendar with these dates so you can be sure to attend:

New York City (Grand Hyatt Hotel) -- 2-6 September 1987

Atlanta (Westin Peachtree Hotel) -- 29 September-2 October 1988

St. Louis (Clarion Hotel) -- 24-28 October 1989

Seattle (Westin Hotel) -- 30 August-3 September 1990

Information about the 1991 meeting should be available early in 1988.

Joyce Testifies Against NEH Funding Cuts

On 10 March 1987, SAA President William L. Joyce testified, on behalf of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, at a House of Representatives hearing to review proposed 1988 budget cuts for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The 1988 budget would cut funding for the NEH Preservation Office by $400,000 and the access program in the Research Division by $250,000. Joyce noted that "[t]hese programs have an impact out of all proportion to their funding levels, and my archival colleagues and I hope that you can maintain the level of appropriation that these programs currently receive."

SAA Staff

Donn C. Neal
Executive Director

Bernice E. Brack
Membership Assistant

Bill Burck
Managing Editor

Sylvia Burck
Director of Financial and Automated Operations

Al Correa
Publications Assistant

Tim Ericson
Education Officer

Patricia Palmer
Acting Program Officer

Toni Pedroza
Office Manager/ Director of Membership Services

Deanna Schmidt
Program Assistant

Troy Sturdivant
Publications Assistant

Lisa Weber
Program Officer

Julia Marks Young
Editor, The American Archivist

The Society of American Archivists
600 S. Federal, Suite 504, Chicago, Illinois 60605
(312) 922-0140
U.S.-Soviet Pact

Continued from page 1

The protocol's agenda includes the following items:
-- during 1987, the U.S. and USSR will exchange lists of archival literature available for exchange;
-- a meeting will occur by 30 June 1987 to plan a joint publication titled The United States and Russia: The Development of Relations, 1816-1865;
-- two U.S. archival specialists to visit the USSR in the fall of 1987;
-- two USSR archival specialists to visit the U.S. in the fall of 1987;
-- an American lecturer to visit the USSR in the fall of 1988;
-- a joint symposium on documentary preservation at the National Archives in the spring of 1988;
-- a Soviet lecturer is expected to visit the U.S. in 1988.

The joint Commission is made up of the following members:
Frank G. Burke - U.S. Chair.
James B. Rhoads - Director, Graduate Program in Archives and Records Management, representing the Society of American Archivists.
Bruce W. Dearstyne - Principal Archivist, New York State Archives, and Executive Director, National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators.
Patricia K. Grimsted - Russian Research Center, Harvard University, representing the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies.
Wesley A. Fisher - U.S. Secretary to the Commission, International Research and Exchanges Board.
F. M. Vaganov - USSR Chair.
E. M. Kozhevnikov - First Deputy General Director of the Main Archival Administration of the USSR Council of Ministers.
E. F. Sopin - General Director of the Main Archival Administration of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.
G. P. Kynin - Deputy Director of the Historical-Diplomatic of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
L. Ye. Selivanova - USSR Secretary to the Commission, Main Archival Administration of the USSR Council of Ministers.

For information about the events that led to this historic agreement, see the article "Mission to Moscow," in the March 1987 SAA Newsletter.

Looking Ahead With CGAP

by Eva Moseley

The Committee on Goals and Priorities met in Atlanta on 15-16 February to continue its work of encouraging and monitoring implementation of Planning for the Archival Profession (the report of the Task Force on Goals and Priorities, published in March of 1986). Operating on an NHPRC grant, CGAP’s members are John Fleckner (chair), Maygene Daniels, Eva Moseley, James O’Toole, Charles Palm, Anne Van Camp, and William Wallach. Daniels, Moseley, and Palm were appointed last fall; Moseley is Council liaison to CGAP. Executive Director Donn Neal regularly attends CGAP meetings.

Besides reports from Fleckner’s meeting with Council in January and from the just-ended education conference, the group heard from Fleckner that several of CGAP’s proposed sessions had been accepted by the ’87 Program Committee: three sessions on a research agenda, two on professional education, and a pre-conference workshop on appraisal.

The GAP Task Force completed its work by selecting 12 priorities from the more than 50 strategies outlined in its report. In the spring of 1986 CGAP members wrote assessments of the state of affairs in each of these program areas. Each assessment considered why this was a priority, what progress had been made in it, what needed to be done, the most likely doers, and factors promoting and hindering success. After its May 1986 meeting, CGAP chose five of the 12 priorities for more concentrated work; at its October meeting, it decided to form planning groups in the five areas; and at the February 1987 meeting it reviewed draft proposals for these five groups.

Formation of these planning groups is a way to draw together individuals—from within SAA, from other archival organizations, and in some cases non-archivists—with common or overlapping interests and expertise who, without CGAP’s initiative, might not join forces, or even sit down together to consider joint projects. The five groups are to meet during 1987 and report to CGAP by 1 November:

1. Automation. Analyze the impact of technology on the ways in which records are created, maintained, and retrieved; and develop and link manual and automated data bases about archival holdings. (Wallach is convenor; see pp. 8, 24, 32, 34 of the GAP report.)

2. Appraisal and documentation strategy. Develop and apply appraisal and documentation strategies to ensure the preservation of historically important records. This is the only group to consider an entire objective rather than a strategy. (Palm; see pp. 10-11.)

3. Institutional evaluation. Develop, implement, and monitor standards for archival programs. To build on work of Institutional Evaluation Task Force. (Fleckner; see pp. 16, 33.)

4. Planning. Train archivists to plan for the development of their programs and resources. (Van Camp and the New Management Roundtable; see pp. 18, 34.)

5. Educational potential of archives. Cooperate with archival colleagues, allied professionals, educators, and others to realize the educational potential of archives. (Moseley; see pp. 24, 34.)

Besides planning, the other major issue for CGAP is communication. Even individuals and groups within SAA are not always aware of other activities similar to their own. Deliberate efforts to inform and to listen are even more necessary for a group that hopes, as CGAP does, to coordinate activities of archivists and allied professionals in organizations and institutions other than SAA: regional archival associations, archival education programs, organizations of librarians, historians, and others.

Among the ideas CGAP discussed were regular reports (such as this one) in the SAA Newsletter; an annual breakfast meeting with chairs of sections, roundtables, and committees; annotating the annual meeting program to indicate to which goal each session pertains; and contacts with regions, both directly and through the Committee on Regional Archival Activity. Committee members hope, too, to hear from individual members. If you have read this far, let us know what you think....
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Education Conference

Continued from page 1

is overseeing the development of a
new series of SAA workshops and
seminars; task force and committee
representatives from Archives &
Society, Education & Professional
Development, Institutional Evaluation,
Automated Records & Techniques,
Archival Information Exchange, and
Goals & Priorities; recent graduates
from archival education programs;
and SAA officers and staff.

During the opening session Fred
Stielow shared his analysis of the
recently completed survey of educa­
tional needs. He noted some confu­
sion on the part of respondents who
had difficulty with the distinction
between "basic" and "advanced" edu­
cation, and outlined an "essential
dilemma" that archivists need to
confront: "A problem exists because
of the need to provide remedial entry­
level training to people thrust into
archives without proper credentials.
But, if this opening is provided, do
we not work against graduate archival
education and professionalization
itself?" Stielow reported that
archivists see the need for additional
education in many subject areas,
especially appraisal, conservation,
description and reference. He also
noted a strong interest in special
media—including still photographs,
machine-readable records, cartogra­
phic and architectural records, and
sound recordings—and in archival
management.

A session on "Regional Perspec­
tives on Archival Education" followed
Stielow's presentation. It was devoted
to the presentations by represen­
tatives from seven regional archival
organizations and of the Archivists of
Religious Institutions, who compared
the educational needs of their consti­
tuencies to the results of the SAA
survey. The regional spokespersons
also discussed their groups' own
priorities and recent educational
initiatives. The reports shared infor­
mation about a number of imaginative
projects, including educational needs
assessments, grant-supported work­
shops and institutes, and such innova­
tions as scholarships to take part in
regional educational opportunities.

Mary Jo Pugh focused her remarks
not only upon priorities for specific
workshops or seminars, but also upon
creating "a framework by which we
can foster integration of pre-profes­sional
education, practice and continuing
education." She outlined eight factors
that affect continuing education for
archivists, including the nature of the archival profession
itself; influences on the practice of
our profession; the nature of existing
archival education; archival environ­
ments and clientele; social, economic
and political pressures; the increased
recognition of the need for manage­
ment skills; and the structures avail­
able for providing archival education.

Pugh contended that continuing
education must be related to basic
educational requirements for entry to
the profession but that archivists have
not yet agreed on what these require­
ments are. She noted: "Even the best
trained new archivists...have only a
handful of courses cobbled onto a
library science or history curriculum,
typically taught by an adjunct member
of the host department, with little to
say in the shaping of the overall host
curriculum."

She proposed that specific prioritys
for continuing education exist in the
areas of appraisal, new technolo­
gical and communications systems,
preservation of archival materials and
managing archival programs. But
equally important, she concluded, SAA
should "take important initiatives in
defining basic education, assuring its
quality, setting standards of practice,
and guiding archivists...to better
accomplish the goals of identifying,
preserving and making available our
documentary heritage."

In his paper, Terry Eastwood
agreed that the lack of commonly
accepted pre-appointment education
for archivists was an important factor
to remember, and that "we must not
use continuing education to make up
deficiencies in basic education
along the way." He also character­
lized the archival profession as one
"severely impoverished in its own
body of knowledge."

"Archivists," he maintained, "are to
a large degree technicians. We have
long shrunk from such a realization
because of our humanistic roots."
Because of this, "very little contin­
uing education for archivists can be
effectively conducted within the four
walls of a classroom." Therefore, a
successful program must include active
involvement on the part of archival
institutions to serve as laboratories
"in which archivists apply their tech­
nical knowledge."

Eastwood also suggested that, "be­
cause we are a resource-poor field, we
must rely on the talents and strengths
we have." Workshops and seminars
should be developed by respected mem­
bers of the archival profession, not
only because they are one of our most
important resources, but because archi­
vists probably would not accept or
benefit from education given by anyone
else.

Cooperation between institutions and
professional associations—to design
and coordinate coursework, to provide
facilities, and to support archivists
interested in learning more—was also
seen as an integral part of the frame­
work for continuing education.

On Saturday morning, conference
participants divided into six working
groups, considering such questions as:

-- How best can SAA cooperate
with regional archival organizations
and graduate programs in providing
educational opportunities?

-- Should SAA educational offerings
be scheduled in conjunction with re­
gional meetings?

-- How should SAA-developed offer­
ings be marketed?

-- What are the best ways to develop
and maintain cooperation between SAA
[and] regional archival organizations?

Each group presented a list of specific
recommendations based upon the
questions they had considered.

Donn Neal focused his closing re­
marks on inter-institutional coopera­
tion, how this relates to archival
education generally, and to SAA's role
in particular. He noted that coopera­
tion is not something that simply
"happens" but that it has to be
planned, with clearly and explicitly
stated goals, and with incentives for
institutions to participate. He also
suggested that cooperation involves
some risks on the part of those who
commit themselves, and that it often
"succeeds best in incremental steps."
A cooperative relationship should
develop in four stages: knowledge of
potential partners, respect for individ­
ual or program differences, trust of
one's cooperative partners, and
cooperation in achieving common
Where do we begin? What can we accomplish together? Participants to consider three important goals. Neal concluded by asking participants to consider three important questions. Where do we go from here? What can we accomplish together? Where do we begin?

Acting upon the ideas, concerns and recommendations generated at the Savannah conference the SAA education office has begun developing a framework for its continuing education program. Planning calls for maintaining a close liaison with regional associations, graduate education programs and SAA task forces and committees in developing and scheduling its educational offerings.

The next SAA Newsletter will feature expanded Savannah conference proceedings, with summaries of recommendations, a detailed presentation of Fred Stielow's survey analysis, a listing of workshops and seminars that SAA is interested in developing immediately, and a request for proposals from SAA members who would like to create these course offerings. Anyone with questions or suggestions should contact Tim Ericson at 312/922-0140.

**Continuing Education Workshops Announced**

The SAA Continuing Education program is pleased to announce the first two in its series of new workshops being developed with the help of a matching grant by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and the Mellon Foundation.

"Archival Fundamentals: Appraisal" is a one-day workshop being developed by Maygene F. Daniels of the National Gallery of Art. This workshop will be taught first on 1 September, at the SAA annual meeting in New York City, and again as part of the Midwest Archives Conference, 15-17 October, in Columbia, Missouri.

"Starting an Electronic Records Program," a one-day workshop developed and taught by Margaret Hedstrom of the New York State Archives, will be first offered on 22 July, at the NAGARA annual meeting in Atlanta, Georgia. The workshop will be offered again in conjunction with the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, 15-17 October, in Charleston, West Virginia.

**Plans for SAA/NEDCC Preservation Management Institute Near Completion**

Plans for the Northeast Document Conservation Center’s Preservation Management Institute, to be held at the Simmons College Graduate School of Library and Information Science in Boston on 5-19 June, are nearing completion. This is a pilot program designed to train experienced administrators to plan, implement, promote, and support comprehensive preservation programs in archival and historical record repositories. Participants will acquire a basic knowledge of archival preservation, management skills and strategies, and information about funding and other resources with which to build effective preservation programs. The two-week program is being cosponsored by the Society of American Archivists with funding from the Office of Preservation, National Endowment for the Humanities.

Fifteen institutions were recently selected to participate in the Institute, including the Georgia Department of Archives and History, Kraft Corporation (Morton Grove, IL), Harvard University, California State Archives, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Kentucky Department for Library and Archives, South Carolina Historical Society, Virginia State Archives, New Jersey Historical Society, Edison National Historical Site (West Orange, NJ), Illinois State Archives, the Public Archives of Canada, Missouri-Springfield Research Center at Howard University, Amherst College, and the Minnesota Historical Society. All of these participating programs have demonstrated a strong commitment to preservation program development, including the establishment of a part- or full-time position for a preservation administrator.

Instructors for the Institute include Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, formerly the director of SAA’s Basic Archival Conservation Program and now a conservator at the National Archives; Judith Fortson-Jones, Conservation Officer at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University; Jan Merrill-Oldham, head of the Preservation Department at the University of Connecticut Library; and Duane Webster, Director of ARL’s Office of Management Studies. Andrew Raymond, formerly an assistant director at the Northeast Document Conservation Center and Program Officer for SAA, is the Project Director.

The Institute curriculum will address both preservation and management issues, with particular emphasis on their application to circumstances and problems shared by the participating programs. Examples of preservation topics to be covered include the nature of archival materials, interior climate control, basic architectural principles, housekeeping policies and procedures, storage systems and containers, preservation needs assessment, reprography and conservation treatments. The role of the archivist as manager planning concepts and techniques, problem-solving and decision-making, introducing and managing change, and funding for preservation are among the management subjects that will be covered during the program.

The curriculum is specifically aimed at preservation programs which have already been established, but are not yet fully developed because of a lack of trained personnel and other resources. If successful, such training will help them to better integrate preservation principles into ongoing archival operations, improve the use of remedial and preventive measures, generate more resources, make preservation a higher institutional priority, and expand the number of preservation advocates at the regional and national level.

By now, the 1987 annual meeting program is at the printer and will soon be on its way to you in the mail.

If you have any questions about the conference, please call Toni Pedroza at the SAA office.
SAA in New York, New York!

Baseball has the World Series. Hockey has the Stanley Cup. Archives—the SAA Annual Meeting!

In order to help members plan for this memorable week in the late summer while waiting for the meeting packets to arrive, here is a sample of what can be expected in New York, September 2-6.

American Airlines will serve as the official carrier for SAA's meeting. To take advantage of this low fare, members must purchase tickets up to 7 days prior to departure. If a better discount is available, participants will earn an additional 5% off that promotional fare when all requirements of the tariff are met (most fares require an advance purchase of 30 days). To find the best fare call 1-800-433-1790 and ask for STAR FILE #S-12899.

The Grand Hyatt Hotel (212-883-1234) will serve as the headquarters hotel. Special SAA room rates are $78 for single rooms and $88 for doubles plus 13.25% tax plus $2. Reservation cards will be included in the annual meeting packet.

Child care services will be available to meeting registrants. Those wishing to use this service should contact SAA at 312-922-0140 for information. The deadline for child care registration is July 24.

The 1987 Program Committee selected 98 presentations from almost 200 proposals. Session topics cover a wide spectrum—business archives, conservation, religious archives, management, automation—something for everyone. This year's Committee chose to experiment with tracks or a series of sessions linked by subject. Three tracks of three sessions each were selected and include planning ideas of the Committee on Goals and Priorities, the Automated Records and Techniques educational program, and the role of institutional archives.

Six pre-conference workshops will be offered in conjunction with the meeting. They are: Archival Fundamentals (9/1); Archives: An Introduction (8/31-9/2); Basic Archival Conservation (8/31-9/2); Documentation Strategy Seminar (8/31); Oral History in the Archives (9/1-2); and Understanding the MARC Format for Archival and Manuscript Control (8/31-9/1).

For registration information please contact SAA. The Host Committee has planned a full slate of New York area activities. Meeting participants will be able to choose from a variety of tours, including an all-day religious archives tour which will visit four repositories; New York Public Library Preservation tours; New York City Municipal Archives tours; 42nd Street walking tours; and more! Tours are scheduled for Wednesday, September 2. Also scheduled is an overnight post-meeting tour along the Hudson River.

Sections and Roundtables will meet on Thursday, September 3. SAA President William Joyce will deliver his address on Thursday, followed by a reception at the New York Public Library's Astor Hall. Sessions are scheduled for all day Friday, Saturday, and Sunday morning. The meeting is scheduled to end on Sunday afternoon with a luncheon and closing remarks from incoming SAA President Sue Holbert.

New Report Available From SAA

SAA is now distributing copies of the Congressional Papers Project Report. The Project considered what broad actions and specific activities would be necessary to improve the preservation of Congress's record, then proposed the following: setting minimum standards for collections and repositories; improving records management practices in Congress; improving relations between congressional offices and repositories; developing archival training and publications that focus on congressional collections; and better defining the congressional collections marketplace.

The Report—sponsored by the Dirksen Congressional Center and the NHPRC—may be ordered from SAA at a cost of $3.00.

American Archivist Seeks Review Editor

SAA invites applications from members interested in serving as review editor for The American Archivist. Duties of this position include soliciting and receiving books from publishers, securing competent individuals to review books, collecting and editing completed reviews on a quarterly basis, proofreading galleys, writing short reviews for the "Brief Notes" section, and preparing lists of selected recent publications that are neither reviewed or noted.

The review editor works closely with the editor and managing editor of the journal. Ability to work within a fairly rigid time schedule is necessary, as is institutional support for postage and telephone. The new editor will be responsible for the department as of the Winter 1988 issue and should begin work soon after the selection is made in June 1987. The appointment, initially for one year, can be extended by the journal's editor for up to three more years.

Applications in the form of a letter and resume, as well as any inquiries for further information, should be sent by May 20 to Julia Marks Young, Editor, The American Archivist, School of Library Service, S.S. Box 5146, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS 39401-5146.

Authors Needed to Update Basic Glossary

SAA wishes to update and expand its "Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscripts Curators, and Records Managers." This helpful resource book, first published in 1974, contains terms and definitions widely accepted within the profession. SAA members interested in undertaking this revision should contact Edmund Berkeley, Chair of the SAA Editorial Board, before June 15, 1987.

If your institution did not receive a copy of SAA's Automation Information Center Survey, which queries archivists about their in-house automation activities, please contact Lisa Weber or Deanna Schmidt at the SAA office.
Hamer Award Changes Approved

At its meeting in January, the SAA Council approved changes in the Philip M. Hamer and Elizabeth Hamer Kegan Award.

The award, first given in 1973, will now be given to an archivist or editor, or group thereof, who has increased public awareness of a specific body of documentation through the compilation, transcription, or public presentation of archival or manuscript materials for educational, instructional, or other public purpose.

Archival materials can include manuscripts, photographs, motion picture films, or other materials normally found in archival or manuscript repositories; and publication can be in any form, including hard copy, microfilm, video disc or other appropriate formats.

Awards will be presented at the 1987 annual meeting in New York City, September 2-6. The awards will recognize accomplishments for the 1986 calendar year.

Nominations for all awards should be sent to Virginia C. Purdy, 509 S. Irving St., Arlington, VA 22204 by June 1, 1987.

Author Proposals Sought for New SAA/ALA Manual

SAA is exploring the feasibility of publishing a new title in its publication series. One of two topics will be chosen: "managing local history materials within a library," or "managing an archives within a library." Negotiations are underway to publish this book cooperatively with the American Library Association.

SAA members are invited to submit proposals to be considered as authors, or joint authors, of this publication. The proposals should include information about the professional background of the proposer(s) and a brief prospectus for the projected publication.

These proposals should be submitted before June 15, 1987 to Edmund Berkeley, Chair of the SAA Editorial Board. Please send a copy to the SAA office.

Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor:

Your announcement in the March 1987 issue of the newsletter that you are planning a "works-in-progress" section is of considerable interest to me. I believe that many in the archival profession would like to have a central source where they could keep up with what other archival institutions are doing. I suggest that it be organized alphabetically by the name of institution, with a brief summary of the project's activities and goals, and the name, address, and telephone number of a person to contact for further information.

Malvina B. Bechor
Georgia Department of Archives and History

From the Editor: Is there any more interest and/or feedback on this proposed "works-in-progress" section?

Dear Editor:

In his short article on "The Care and Feeding of Genealogists," March 1987, p. 12-13, Kermit B. Karns quite rightly points out that beginning family researchers tend to be unsophisticated. Classes in research methods would obviously help, but I still think archivists will find 95% of their beginning genealogical patrons have not taken such classes. And of course, as Karns suggests, the archivist or librarian should take time to explain the archive to new patrons. However, as professionals who care about our patrons, I think we must go even further.

Do not just be a talker, but also a listener. Take time to ask the patron exactly what he is after. This is a basic part of the "reference interview," as taught in library schools. So many times I have seen a genealogist dutifully study the card catalog or records inventory, make the request for material and then find that this wasn't what he wanted at all. This wastes two people's time and could be avoided with a proper reference interview.

An archivist who does not know in general what genealogists are looking for would do well to read a basic guide to genealogical research or better yet to spend time researching his own ancestry. The enthusiasm and excited air of genealogists, particularly when they have made a "find," often mark them as oddballs in the eyes of archivists and librarians who do not understand the underlying psychological motivations.

William Copeley
Associate Librarian

A Call for Letters

Wouldn't it be useful to know where individuals listed in Who's Who in America and similar publications will be depositing their personal papers? Eva Moseley suggests that we write Marquis Who's Who to urge that they include a question on this topic when they collect biographical data from candidates to be listed. Eva notes that asking for this information might help to educate these individuals so that they think about how they intend to dispose of their papers.

The address for Marquis Who's Who is 200 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611. Send the SAA office a copy of your letter, if you will.
The SAA Certification Program: A Report to the Profession

by William L. Joyce

With its vote at its winter meeting to initiate a program of certification for the archival profession, the SAA Council brought to culmination a careful and deliberate decision-making process, as it also inaugurated a bold new initiative to further define what it means to be an archivist. In reaching its decision, Council committed itself to appoint at its June meeting an Interim Board to implement plans for certification by petition and by examination, as well as to design and then to implement a plan for recertification. As a first step, the Interim Board will submit a detailed plan and budget by 1 December 1987 for Council approval.

Council reached its landmark decision after careful deliberation and full debate within the profession. In August 1984 SAA president Andrea Hinding appointed a group to draft a plan for certification of archivists; the group, chaired by Susan Grigg, produced a plan that was published in the July 1985 SAA Newsletter. The plan was also reviewed by the Committee on Education and Professional Development, and was featured at sessions at the annual meetings in Austin and Chicago. There was also careful consideration of proposals at various regional archival organization meetings. On the basis of all these discussions, Council revised the original plan, and that was published in the August 1986 SAA Newsletter.

In preparation for the Council decision at the January meeting, I appointed a subcommittee of Fran Blouin, Trudy Peterson, Anne Diffendal, and Donn Neal to develop more detailed information concerning the steps necessary to implement the plan if Council voted to adopt certification. The subcommittee was asked to consider the costs of implementing the plan, sources of anticipated revenue for the plan, the administrative arrangements necessary to manage the plan, and, finally, the amount of volunteer energy necessary to carry out the plan. In its report to Council, the subcommittee noted that it had made a number of assumptions:

-- that recertification was necessary to the plan as the only mechanism to insure advancement of the profession, and as an important source of revenue to the program, and must be implemented at the same time as certification;

-- that the issue of liability to the Society could be significantly reduced through creation of sound procedures, which entailed, among other things, engaging a professional testing company;

-- that the membership would be deeply involved in certification from the beginning and that therefore the program could not be phased in, but must be fully planned from the outset.

The subcommittee further assumed an 18-month start-up period from the creation of the Interim Board in late spring 1987, and concluded that certification by petition would be available for one year only (not two years), and that a five-member Interim Board composed of a chair and four members would oversee the process. (The Council subcommittee had decided that the initial seven-member board was too large.) Member one would be in charge of development of criteria for evaluation of certification by petition and later be charged with developing procedures for recertification; member two would oversee development of the examination; member three would supervise administrative and appeals procedures; and member four would be a public member (most certification programs feature a "consumer" or user on the policy-making board.) A consultant to the subcommittee had suggested that including such a member would broaden the perspective of the board and further reduce exposure to liability. The executive director would also serve on the Board ex officio. Members one, two, and three would chair subcommittees for their responsibilities, each subcommittee consisting of two additional Society members. The Council subcommittee estimated that it would cost slightly in excess of $48,000 over an 18-month period to implement the program. The costs include funds for Interim Board and Board subcommittee meetings (c. $13,000), legal counsel to review procedures (c. $500), expenses of an expanded Board subcommittee to develop with a professional testing company a suitable process for certification by examination (c. $10,000), and a contract (c. $8,000) with that testing company for administering the test. Moreover, the Council subcommittee also determined that the Society would need to employ on a half-time basis clerical support staff to meet adequately the needs of the certification program. It was estimated that this would cost approximately $12,000. (Executive director Donn Neal estimates that he will need to devote approximately 20% of his time to assist in implementing the program.) The consultant suggested that the examination would consist of short-answer questions as a way to enhance its objectivity, which would further reduce exposure to liability. The consultant also recommended that the testing company would be engaged to develop the test according to the "knowledge-skills-abilities" method.

The Council subcommittee further estimated that thirteen people would have to give generously of their time and experience if certification is to be implemented as planned. Four members would serve on the Interim Board; six additional members would serve on the Board subcommittees (two Council members would also be appointed to serve as liaisons on the Board); three additional members would serve on the test construction panel. In order to maintain the certification program by examination for a five-year period would cost the Society $12,000 per year (beyond the $48,000 start-up costs for the program) for meetings, test construction, paying the testing company, and support by the SAA office. Because the profession is an evolving one, the en...
The tire examination procedure would need to be reviewed thoroughly (i.e., to undertake a systematic analysis of archival position descriptions, to consider the core content of archival work, to draft questions, and to conduct trial exams) at the outset and again every five or six years at an additional cost of $10,000.

The Council subcommittee posed alternative methods for paying for certification--estimating that the Society would need 400 participants the first year if the fee were $100, 250 if the fee were $200, and 200 if the fee were $250--in order to meet program expenses. For example, if we assume an annual fee of $200, we would need to attract 250 archivists to pay $200 the first year for certification by petition, and we would also need to attract another 120 to pay $200 to take the examination each subsequent year. The subcommittee also estimated that recertification would cost archivists either $50 or $100 every six years.

As Council gathered for its meeting, the results of the poll of the membership had just been compiled. The results of the poll might best be described as "inconclusive," with 51.8% of the membership who responded (some 941 members) in favor or strongly in favor of the concept of certification, and 37.3% opposed; the August 1986 revised plan was favored by 43.9%, with 42.1% opposed; approximately the same result prevailed regarding certification by examination. Certification by petition was favored by 57.7%, and opposed by only 31.6%, though recertification was opposed by 42.7%, and supported by only 38.7%; recertification by exam was opposed by 56% and supported by only 20%. 70% of the membership indicated they were eligible certification by petition, and 42.7% indicated they would apply for certification. 17.9% of the membership said they were willing to pay $200-300, while 60.4% indicated they were not. Of those with responsibility to hire archivists, 29.8% said that certification would be a factor in their hiring decisions, while 65% indicated that it would not.

In its discussion of certification, which took place over two days, Council considered the subcommittee's report and voted to amend the 1986 plan accordingly. The duration of the period for certification by petition is reduced from two years to one; the competency test to be developed would be short answer; recertification would be considered an integral part of the plan; and the Interim Board is reduced from seven to five members. Council members noted that recertification and the Society's ongoing educational initiative would be closely related, and that should strengthen both efforts. The discussion also focused on how long the Interim Board would be in operation before it gave way to the Academy of Certified Archivists (when there are 100 certified archivists, the academy would be separated from, if related to, SAA). Further discussion focused on whether it could be financially self-sustaining at any stage.

In consideration of the certification plan, Council members also discussed the level of support in the membership; the likelihood that volunteers could be found to serve on the Interim Board and in other posts; the place of certification among the Society's priorities; the financial implications of adopting certification and whether the program could ever be self-sustaining; whether or not the proposed plan would achieve the purpose and goals of certification; the impact of certification on the work of the SAA office; and, in the event that certification had not been adopted, what alternative means existed for developing further the profession. Several Council members did stress that certification should be seen as part of an overall effort to strengthen the profession, with other elements including continuing education, publications, institutional evaluation, and the graduate education guidelines.

Finally, it was noted that by measuring competencies and establishing certain uniform standards for these competencies, certification will help define what an archivist is and does. The resolution appointing the Interim Board for the purpose of establishing a program for the certification of archivists passed by a vote of eight in favor and two opposed. It is now up to us to make the program work, and to pledge to use certification as a tool for improving our profession.
Proposed Guidelines for Graduate Archival Education Programs

The SAA Committee on Education and Professional Development (CEPD) decided in August 1985 to revise the existing guidelines for graduate archival education, which had been adopted in 1977 (see The American Archivist, 41: 255-56). A subcommittee consisting of Richard Cox (chair), Frederick Stielow, Susan Davis, and Andrew Raymond prepared the revised guidelines, submitting them to the full committee in August 1986, where they were discussed and approved for submission to Council.

The Committee met in February 1987 in the wake of the Council’s decision to proceed with a plan to certify individual archivists. It was agreed that certification represents an opportunity to strengthen graduate archival education programs as the preferred form of pre-appointment professional education. The Committee recognizes that once certification is implemented, new guidelines will be needed that specify the necessary components of pre-professional education with greater precision, consistent with the knowledge base prescribed for certification. The Committee believes that the current draft can serve to guide current archival education programs during the transition, and to be taken into consideration by the Interim Board of the Academy of Certified Archivists. If approved, the guidelines will provide the basis for discussions with educational administrators and other interested parties.

A summary version of the proposed guidelines is printed here to provide the basis for your comments. You are invited to respond to both the substance and form of the guidelines, evaluating them in terms of their effectiveness in strengthening archival education programs. Please direct your comments to David Klaassen, CEPD Chair, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota Libraries, Minneapolis, MN 55455. If received by early June, they will inform Council’s discussion and action on the guidelines.

I. Introduction

Education is essential to the well-being and continued development of any profession. The better prepared a profession’s practitioners are, the stronger that profession will be. Archivists have long been concerned about this issue, predating even the formation of the Society of American Archivists.

A decade ago CEPD prepared guidelines for graduate archival education. Although these guidelines have served the profession well, there is clearly a need for an updated and improved version. This need reflects the profession’s continuing growth, the increasing complexity of its mission in the information age, and recognition of the challenges faced in gaining adequate resources and developing a stronger theoretical basis for professional work.

The following document replaces the 1977 guidelines for graduate archival education programs. Certain assumptions guided the preparation of these new guidelines, including the following:

1. The work of an archivist represents that of a profession not a craft or applied vocation. Theory is not only just as important as practice, but guides and determines that practice.

2. The definition of archival work encompasses a broad range of administrative and cultural responsibilities for the selection, care, and use of records of enduring value.

3. The archival profession requires more than education only through workshops, short-term institutes, and single courses with practica. The guidelines that follow are designed to support multi-course programs at masters and doctoral levels in related fields or fully independent graduate programs in archival administration.

4. Archivists have their own core of knowledge complemented by other fields. As a result, the adequate educational preparation of an archivist will continue to draw upon many related fields and disciplines while emphasizing the archivists’ own theoretical and practical knowledge.

5. Individuals training to work as archivists in specialized areas (such as science and technology, medicine, law, etc.) will also need to seek necessary additional education in those fields.

6. And, finally, the following guidelines recognize the dynamic nature of the field. They are designed with the intent that they be periodically reviewed and updated.

The guidelines that follow reflect, to a degree, current practices and expectations regarding education in the archival profession. And strengthening of these current guidelines beyond those adopted a decade ago is the result of the post-1977 emergence of multi-course graduate archival education programs that grant certificates or masters degrees with concentrations in archival administration. In order to provide students full archival education opportunities according to these guidelines, graduate-level programs will have to consist of, at the least, the configuration of three courses originally outlined in the 1977 guidelines.

I. Basic Knowledge and Theory

This section describes the elementary information that any graduate of a graduate archival education program should be cognizant of and able to apply in practice. Students should also become familiar with the theoretical foundation of archival work.

A. Nature of Information and Records

Archivists need to possess both knowledge of the history of record-keeping techniques and the ability to understand the dynamics of modern information systems in order to facilitate the management of such systems and to be able to select and maintain those records that have enduring value. Knowledge about the following areas should be acquired:

1. Origins and history of humanity’s efforts at written and other forms of communications and data manipulation.
2. The development of record-keeping systems and their place in the administration and documentation of societies.

3. The social and cultural utility of archives.

B. Archives in Modern Society

The current archival profession is a product of the modern world. Students need to gain a firm understanding of the history and present nature of the archival profession, recognizing that the profession is dynamic and changing in response to the challenges of documenting society. Knowledge about the following areas should be acquired:

1. Origins and development of archival principles, methods, and institutions in the modern world.
2. The types and varieties of archival repositories and holdings.
3. Development and continuing influence of related disciplines and fields on the archival profession.
4. The present nature and issues of the archival profession.

C. Basic Archival Functions

The basic functions that follow—especially appraisal and arrangement and description—delineate the daily work of the archivist in the modern information age. Supporting each of these functions are standards and accepted practices, which archival educators must introduce to their students.

1. Appraisal and acquisition
2. Arrangement and description
3. Preservation management
4. Reference and access
5. Advocacy and outreach
6. Law and ethics
7. Professional development and cooperation
8. New technologies and tool skills

D. Managerial Functions

Many archivists assume administrative responsibilities to varying degrees. Since basic managerial techniques are useful even to the general work of the archivist, all students should be introduced to a range of management principles. Such an introduction will also be valuable to the large proportion of archivists who function either as one-person archival operations or as members of small programs within larger organizations. In addition, such knowledge will further the work of those archivists in charge of the records management or broader information systems of their institutions. It is recognized that students seeking training in these areas take courses in other departments or participate in workshops and institutes sponsored by other professional associations. Students should be encouraged to take advantage of such opportunities.

1. Organizational theory and practice
2. Program planning
3. Human resources management
4. Resource development and information resource management
5. Buildings and facilities maintenance

III. Program Elements

Described below are elements for a graduate archival education program which would best enable students to gain both required basic knowledge and some understanding of selected fields and disciplines. These elements are designed to ensure a mixture of theory, research, and practical experience. These elements cannot be offered in a one-course program. The minimum structure for formal archival education is now represented by the three-course sequence. That has arisen to meet the 1977 guidelines.

A. Course Format

Students preparing for archival courses should be given a broad introduction to archival administration including regular courses on archival core elements, advanced seminars and electives, opportunity for independent study, and opportunity for practical work on an archival repository. Students who are seeking only an introduction to the basics of archival work may need only introductory courses, workshops, or institutions that are either part of or available outside of the graduate archival education programs.

1. Regular Graduate Courses. Students should have graduate courses that cover the nature of information and records in modern society, and basic archival functions. Students should also be encouraged to take courses on managerial functions and courses in related fields like public or applied history, information and library science, history and historical methods, records management, historical editing, oral history, and public administration.

2. Practica. Students should be required to participate in practica of 140 hours or more that provide experience for students in any of the areas outlined above. The decision about the nature of such practica should be dependent upon the student's career goals and interests and the availability of suitable archival repositories. These practica should be teaching and learning experiences that introduce the student to a wide range of archival responsibilities including appraisal and acquisitions, arrangement and description, reference and access, and various managerial functions.

3. Independent Study. Students preparing for archival careers should be encouraged to pursue independent study that allows them to specialize in areas too narrow to justify a formal course and that supports the writing of a thesis or dissertation. Students writing a thesis or dissertation should be encouraged to research archival topics, especially on theoretical areas relating to the nature of information and records, archives in modern society, and basic archival functions.

B. Faculty

A full, multi-course archival education program should have a director, other general faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturers, and internship advisors and supervisors.

1. Director. The director of a graduate archival education program should be a regular faculty member with a graduate degree in a related field and five years of significant experience in archives. A typical background should consist of practical experience, administrative responsibility, professional involvement, and a proven record of publication on archival theory and administration.

2. General Faculty. General faculty should consist of other regular, full-time faculty who can cover areas of basic knowledge and introduce students to related fields and disciplines.
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3. Adjunct Faculty and Lecturers. Adjunct faculty and lecturers may be used in order to employ the expertise of local archivists and to provide exposure for students to related fields and disciplines. The use of these individuals should be designed to provide sources of expertise not covered by other faculty and to demonstrate the nature of practical experience in certain areas.

4. Practica Advisors and Supervisors. Practica advisors and supervisors also are necessary for the administration of practical field experiences. These advisors and supervisors should be archivists with graduate degrees and professional experience in the area of the practicum.

C. In-House Facilities

In order to support an adequate educational program for prospective archivists, a university or college should have in-house "laboratory" facilities, a library of the relevant literature, adequate placement service, and facilities for data processing and conservation. These are requirements for full education programs. Schools that offer only introductions to the archives profession will not require such a full array of in-house facilities, although an archives and library of archival literature are still essential.

Transitions...Transitions...

Beverly D. Bishop is now Reference Archivist in Special Collections at Emory University. Patricia L. Adams has left her position as Archivist of the St. Louis Art Museum to become the Associate Director of the Western Historical Manuscript Collection of St. Louis, and Associate Archivist of the University of Missouri at St. Louis. Mary K. Witkowski is now Assistant Head of Historical Collections at the Bridgeport Public Library. Nancy M. Merz is now Director of Archives and Records Management Services at History Associates Incorporated. Elizabeth C. Stewart Weber has left her position as Institute Archivist and Head, Special Collections at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and is consulting in Terre Haute, Indiana. Marilyn Ryall is the new Director of NICLOG at AASLH. Nancy Kraft has been promoted to Chief of the Iowa Bureau of Library and Archives, where Linda Brown-Link recently became Cataloguer. At NARA, T. Matthew De Waelsche is now Supervisory Archivist at the National Civilian Personnel Records Center—St. Louis. John Fawcett has been named Acting Archivist for Presidential Libraries. Thomas F. Soapes is now heading the Life Cycle Coordination Staff. Waverly Lowell has been named Director of the National Archives’ San Francisco Branch; and George Chalou is Inter-Agency Liaison of the Office of the National Archives. Lannae Graham is joining the staff of the Billy Graham Archives as Reference Archivist. Luciana Duranti will join the faculty of the University of British Columbia on July 1 as Assistant Professor in the School of Library, Archival and Information Studies.
Archival Automation: The MARC AMC Format

by Lisa B. Weber

In 1983, when SAA’s National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF) finished its five years of work, no one knew what its impact would be. The revised and expanded MARC AMC (Machine-Readable Cataloging for Archival and Manuscripts Control) format, a joint product of the Library of Congress and the task force, had been approved and was awaiting publication. But whether the format would find wide acceptance throughout the archival community or would be ignored (as had been the old MARC Manuscripts format) remained to be seen.

Four years later the answer is clear. The archival profession has enthusiastically embraced MARC AMC.

MARC AMC enables archivists to become part of the larger information community. With it, we can integrate information about archival materials with other kinds of library holdings. But, to integrate and exchange data in a meaningful way, archivists must follow standard descriptive practices. The AMC format provides a technical structure—a container—for exchanging data, and a framework for organizing it. But, the content of the data elements is defined by standards outside the format, many of which come from the library community.

The MARC AMC format can be implemented in a variety of ways, one of which is through national or regional networks. The Research Libraries Group (RLG) lists 45 institutions nationwide that have contributed a total of nearly 86,000 AMC records to the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN) data base. RLG has taken a longstanding and consistent interest in MARC AMC, first helping to develop the format and then aggressively building its file of archival and manuscript materials. Currently, RLG is involved in an National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC)-funded project in which seven state archives are entering government records into the data base to test, among other things, cooperative appraisal strategies and a functions vocabulary list.

OCLC’s Online Union Catalog contains about 58,300 AMC records. Because of its current system design, OCLC isn’t certain how many repositories are using the AMC format to describe their collections, but estimates that some 20 to 25 repositories are currently using it, and more plan to in the future. The U.S. Office of Education recently awarded the Western Library Network a grant to implement the AMC format in its system, and the format is available to Canadians through their national bibliographic utility, UTLAS.

MARC AMC is also supported by several local library systems. This fact enables archival repositories that are part of larger research institutions to integrate information about their holdings with other kinds of research and library materials—creating one integrated online public catalog. This is a very attractive incentive. Local library systems that have implemented AMC include LS/2000, NOTIS, VTLS, Geac, and LIAS.

Microcomputer software that can create MARC AMC records exists in the form of Michigan State University’s MicroMARC:amc—an NHPRC-funded project. Cactus Software is working towards release of its MARC-compatible archives and records management software in late summer of this year. MARCON, originally a software package designed specifically for archivists and records managers, is now a generic retrieval and information management package with thesaurus support. Currently, MARCON imports but cannot export MARC records.

Archivists tend to think about automating for two distinct but related purposes. One purpose is to gain better administrative or management control. The other purpose is often referred to as intellectual or descriptive control—using automated techniques to gain better access to the content of archival materials.

Archivists often use separate automated techniques for these two purposes. NISTF recognized this bifurcation and saw the need to develop a standard format which would encompass both requirements.

The revised MARC AMC format contains data elements for descriptive requirements, but also accommodates the concept of control over archival processes or actions which are performed upon the records themselves. NISTF believed it was important to include both kinds of data in one format because actions affect the actual content of the materials in intellectually significant ways. The C for “control” in the AMC format really means something.

But the format and descriptive standards are only half of the equation. Of equal importance is having software which allows you to perform the necessary functions. Being able to input action information into a MARC record doesn’t mean you can “do” anything with it. Functionality depends upon the system implementation. What many archivists are looking forward to is a MARC-compatible integrated system—one with the capacity to control archival and manuscript materials throughout their life cycle.

PRESNET, software being developed for the Office of the Presidential Libraries of the National Archives, approaches this ideal (see the March 1987 Newsletter). The Smithsonian Institution’s Bibliographic Information System is planning, though has not yet developed, a collection development module. RLG’s implementation of AMC does provide some administrative functionality. But RLG is particularly interested in developing a local workstation application that would expand its “archival control segment” to increase administrative control and maintain information locally. MicroMARC:amc also provides a level of administrative control. But to truly exploit the potential of the MARC AMC format, more software development needs to take place.

Having a standard format gives archivists the opportunity to exchange information. Of equal importance, however, is that the MARC AMC format gives the archival profession a common vocabulary and framework within which to discuss our work—from descriptive practices to administrative procedures. To my mind, that is perhaps the most exciting result of MARC AMC thus far.

(For further reading, see vol. 49, no. 1 of The American Archivist.)
Institutional Evaluation and Program Assessment: A Task Force Report

by Paul H. McCarthy

To paraphrase M. Scott Peck, author of The Road Less Travelled, an unrelenting commitment to reality is necessary for continued growth and for a life of increasing maturity. Although Peck's comments were directed to individuals focused on personal growth, they can also be applied to the development of archival programs.

Institutional self evaluation and program assessment can be the touchstone of "reality" that spurs focused institutional development, or keeps a well-established program on track. The time taken to appraise strengths, acknowledge weaknesses—and concentrate energies to build on the former and compensate for the latter—is critical for logical institutional development.

For more than a decade, SAA has helped develop and promote institutional self evaluation—one of the three priorities (along with certification and education program accreditation) that emerged in the profession during the late seventies. Through the leadership of Mary Jo Pugh and William L. Joyce, as well as the considerable efforts of Task Force for Institutional Evaluation members, in 1982 the Society published Evaluation of Archival Institutions: Services, Principles, and Guide to Self-Study. The study was widely distributed and apparently used informally by a number of archivists to critique their own programs. A more formal self-study program, involving consultants and site visits, was initiated with grant support from the Council on Library Resources.

Although the benefits of comprehensive self study and accompanying site visitor reports have been perceived as substantial, in the past few years only a small number of institutions have engaged in this formal process. The extensive staff time required for a lengthy narrative-based study is a definite barrier to wider use. Also, the lack of external incentives or recognition gives pause to already hard-pressed archivists. For the last 18 months, the Task Force has been exploring a checklist-based format that would retain the scope of the appraisal yet speed the process considerably.

After publication of the self-study booklet, the Task Force designed, tested, distributed and compiled the first SAA Census of Archival Institutions. Its purpose was to collect information that would describe the universe of archival institutions, provide a distinction between different types and ranges of institutions, and compile data that would lead the profession to establish benchmarks or standards where appropriate.

The recent $7,900 NHPRC grant will permit the Task Force to test, analyze, and publish data relating directly to the major types of archival institutions. Using it, state archives, university archives, and other major types will be able to compare and contrast their programs with those of institutions with similar missions.

The GAP report identified the evaluation of archival institutions as a priority area for professional action. In March of 1987, with the encouragement and support of CGAP, four members of the Task Force, a representative from CGAP, and executive director Donn Neal met in Chicago. After intense discussion of the Census and the analysis and use of its data with a simplified self-study document, the group developed an outline for this revised self-study. It will be based on the checklist originally designed for the "Site Visitor" and will include a number of additional materials. The group envisions a document with a paraphrase of the archival principles appropriate to that area, a checklist of statistical and evaluative questions, a section to note program areas requiring improvement along with action steps to accomplish those goals.

Also included may be a planning summary sheet, a user evaluation form, data tables for all major institutional types, and a copy of the SAA Principles of Institutional Evaluation. The data tables will be an extremely important and useful addition. A discussion of how SAA might assist institutions completing the survey and acknowledge their efforts raised some interesting possibilities.

Current plans call for concurrent work with the census data and revision of the self-study document. Paul Conway heads the development, analysis, and arrangement of the census data, and will put a major effort into this during the summer. Terry Abraham heads development of the data element forms, and Bob Byrd is to suggest revisions of the questions for each program section. The Task Force plans to have a preliminary draft of the document available for discussion at the New York meeting. Other members of the Task Force are Anne Cagier of UCLA, Carolyn Majewski of the Texas State Archives, Thomas Mills of the New York State Archives, And William Moss of the Smithsonian.

The Steering Committee of the Management Round Table agreed to assist the Task Force in testing the preliminary draft of the document prior to final review. The Task Force projects completion of the revision by fall 1988. If you have particular concerns or thoughts about the arrangements or subject matter of this project, please contact one of the Task Force members directly.

Paul H. McCarthy chairs the Task Force for Institutional Evaluation.
Report of the Task Force on Archives and Society

by James E. Fogerty

The Society of American Archivists' Task Force on Archives and Society was launched in 1983 by then-SAA president David B. Gracy II. Gracy conceived of the archives and society agenda as the cornerstone of his terms as vice-president and president, and appointed the Task Force to coordinate its development, advise its progress, and carry forward its work. Succeeding presidents of SAA have given strong support to the archives and society initiative, as the Task Force addresses such complex issues as the place of archives in society.

During its four years of operation, the Task Force has taken on a number of major projects and been involved in the preparation of several important products, including a major report entitled "The Image of Archivists: Resource Allocators' Perceptions," known widely as "The Levy Report." After its principal author. Another major project was production of "Who is the 'I' in Archives," a general-purpose brochure which became available in January 1986.

Both the Levy Report and the brochure point clearly to the profession's need for a systematic program of public relations, both to support efforts already underway and to coordinate planning for future work. Recognizing that few archivists have developed skills in public relations and outreach, the Task Force undertook an investigation of the possibilities and ramifications of a public relations program for the profession.

The first element of that investigation was completed during the 1985 SAA annual meeting in Austin, Texas, when Task Force members met with Peggy Barber, Associate Executive Director for Communications of the American Library Association. Barber discussed ALA's successful public relations campaign and its ten-year outreach plan, and the plan of work developed to reach those goals. It was a valuable opportunity to work with the architect of ALA's marketing program, who offered many useful suggestions. Following those meetings the Task Force studied the archives and society initiatives already undertaken by regional organizations, assisted by SAA's Committee on Regional Archival Activity. Virtually all those efforts involved public relations in an attempt to reach various segments of the public with information about archivists and their work. The efforts lacked a unifying force, however, and the Task Force heard an increasing number of requests for such coordination from SAA. In each case the individual archivists and regional organizations involved looked to the national organization for leadership.

Between January and May 1986, several Task Force members met with principals of two leading firms to discuss the archives and society initiative and the goal of providing a unified program of public relations for archivists through SAA. The meetings were preceded and followed by extensive contact with both firms. A key document used in preparing for the meetings was the report of the SAA Committee on Goals and Priorities: Planning for the Archival Profession. In both instances the public relations professionals praised the report for its scope and depth, and noted its frequent reference for the need for better public relations for the profession.

The meetings were intensive and helped inform the public relations professionals of the Task Force's work and concerns, while informing the Task Force on procedure and the experiences of similar organizations. It is encouraging to note that the identity problems faced by archivists are shared by many other professions, all of them concerned with establishing more realistic public perceptions of their work and its value to society and specific audiences.

Both series of meetings produced reports and proposals from each firm which defined the issues involved and proposed strategies for addressing those issues. The Task Force reviewed and commented on each report, and discussed them at length during a meeting at the 1986 SAA annual meeting in Chicago.

In summary, the Task Force report recommends that SAA launch a carefully phased public relations program. Both the Levy Report and the CGAP study have noted that archivists cannot expect to acquire adequate resources or recognition of their work and its value without improved public relations efforts on several levels. The first and most important of these is SAA itself. Without a coordinated approach at the national level, regional organizations and individuals cannot hope to address public relations in any meaningful, long-term sense.

Most archivists do not believe that they, acting alone, can dent the public ignorance about their work. They understand that improved status within their individual institutions can only be obtained by improving the status of the entire profession. In this, SAA's leadership is essential. It is the single unifying force for the archival profession in the United States.

That such an approach is needed, and the issue of public relations of importance to most archivists, is evident. A wide variety of activities of regional organizations support that perception. Such recent events as New England Archives Week, the Midwest Archives Conference President's Award, and the Society of Georgia Archivists' two-day workshop on archives and society issues indicate a definite interest in the quest for public understanding of the archival profession. The Task Force on Archives and Society believes the approach outlined in this report offers a clear start toward that goal.

The Task Force report has been presented to SAA Council, and will be discussed at its June meeting. For further information contact James E. Fogerty, chair, SAA Task Force on Archives and Society, Minnesota Historical Society, 690 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55101.
The Strange and Convoluted History of the Nixon Materials: A Retrospective, Part II

Part I of this article appeared in the January 1987 newsletter. A brief synopsis of that installment follows:

As President Nixon resigned in August 1974, the National Archives took control of his administration’s White House records, files, and tapes (the Nixon Materials). When the GSA Administrator signed an agreement with Nixon that allowed him to decide which records and files the Government could keep, Congress stepped in and enacted the Presidential Recordings and Materials Preservation Act of 1974. PRMPA made the Nixon Materials United States property and called for GSA to create regulations providing for the public’s access to them. In the next several years Nixon lost a series of court challenges to PRMPA. Meanwhile, four sets of public access regulations were rejected either by Congress (through a one-house legislative veto provision in PRMPA) or by settlement between Nixon and GSA. Processing and review of the Nixon Materials began in 1979, giving priority to those materials that reveal the abuse of governmental power. In 1980 the fifth set of access regulations went into effect. Nixon challenged them in court and lost his lawsuit two years later.

March 23, 1983

Senators Thomas Eagleton (D-MO) and Charles Mathias (R-MD) introduce S. 905, which would establish the independence of the National Archives from the General Services Administration. If passed and signed into law, the bill will give the National Archives authority over its own budget, program priorities, and personnel management; and will protect it from the politicization of archival activities. As a result, the National Archives will have sole responsibility for regulating the Nixon Materials.

The Senate Committee Report accompanying the legislation states:

Professionalism is absolutely essential to proper performance of archival and records management functions; it is the sine qua non of the archivist’s work. Our ability to preserve and make available a full and rich documentary historical record depends on archivists determining what records are of lasting value and which are not, as well as determining which records are timely for opening to the public and which are not. If these decisions are made arbitrarily, or motivated by political rather than professional considerations, the historical record could be impoverished, even distorted.

August 12, 1983

Notice is published in the Federal Register that the National Archives has identified, inventoried, and prepared for public access the Nixon White House Special Files. The approximately 1.5 million pages of the Special Files include virtually every written communication between the President and his staff, his Cabinet, and other advisers. Processing them has taken more than 100,000 staff-hours.

The notice requests that anyone wishing to file a legally or constitutionally based claim that would bar public access to all or a portion of the Special Files do so by September 12, 1983.

As required by the notification provision of the regulations, copies of this notice are sent to President Reagan; former President Nixon’s attorneys; anyone responsible for creating or maintaining a file segment of the Special Files; anyone named in material that is essential to an understanding of the abuse of governmental power; and to anyone listed on the Nixon Materials Registry.

September 1983

During September, items in the Special Files that have been appraised as private, personal, not related to abuses of governmental power, or not otherwise of general historical significance are returned to their rightful owners.

September 8, 1983

By request, the National Archives extends the deadline for filing claims to bar release of the Special Files.

The new deadline is November 10, 1983.

Mid-September 1983

Reps. Glenn English (D-OK) and Jack Brooks (D-TX) introduce the House of Representatives’ version of National Archives independence legislation (H.R. 3987).

October 20, 1983

A group of 29 former Nixon Administration officials file suit (Allen v. Carmen) in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, requesting a preliminary injunction to block release of the Special Files. They argue that the one-house legislative veto provision of the PRMPA is unconstitutional, and claim that its presence invalidates the section granting GSA the authority to promulgate public access regulations. This argument is identical to one which Nixon dropped and agreed not to pursue when he signed the Nixon-GSA Settlement in 1979.

The same law firm that has represented Nixon throughout his disputes over the Nixon Materials is representing the plaintiffs in this lawsuit.

November 9, 1983

By request, the National Archives again extends the deadline for filing claims to bar release of the Special Files. The new deadline is January 3, 1984.

December 30, 1983

The U.S. District Court rules in Allen v. Carmen that the legislative veto provision of PRMPA is unconstitutional. This ruling invalidates the fifth set of access regulations. But the court holds that the unconstitutional veto provision is severable from the remainder of PRMPA, thereby leaving intact the GSA Administrator’s authority to draft a new set of public access regulations.

February 6, 1984

GSA Legal Counsel recommend not appealing Allen v. Carmen. Archivist Warner requests a National Archives
study of the access regulations implementing PRMPA.

February 10, 1984

The Nixon Materials Regulations Review Group begins examining the recently invalidated access regulations provision by provision to assure that they meet the intent of PRMPA, adhere to professional archival standards and practice, and are consistent with the practices of presidential libraries.

February 17, 1984

The Department of Justice/Office of Legal Counsel (DOJ/OLC) recommends not appealing Allen v. Carmen. Its memorandum makes a curious offer: "If the Administrator is willing to consider improvements in the regulations and their implementation, this Office will, of course, be willing to work with him to develop procedures that enable the incumbent President to exercise his constitutional and statutory privileges and duties."

March 1984

The Nixon Materials Regulations Review Group issues a 23-page report that concludes:

As archivists, the members of the review group regret the need for such elaborate regulations which dictate laborious procedures. Archivists would have much preferred to administer the Nixon materials under a deed of gift similar to those of other Presidents. Other Presidents have delegated broad authorities to archivists, trusting their judgment in preserving privacy, confidentiality, and national security. They have not required notification procedures by which archival decisions might be challenged, nor have they withheld from archival processing all material unrelated to official duties. The regulations are an attempt to treat the Nixon materials equitably in relation to the materials of other Presidents within the context of a uniquely adversarial relationship.

We have concluded that the fifth set of regulations adequately delineated the responsibilities of archivists while protecting the rights of individuals. The peculiar provisions of the fifth set, such as notification of intention to open and return of a nebulous category of political materials, are the regrettable legacy of 10 years of legal disputes. We believe that processing of the Nixon materials should continue unaltered and that the Nixon historical record be made available to the public without further delay. If the Special Files and other Nixon documents are made available for research soon, the National Archives will have come as close as possible to the desired parity of treatment of all presidential materials in custody.

The Review Group recommends that the National Archives and Records Service...repromulgate the identical regulations that were promulgated on March 7, 1980.

April to October 1984

Warner accepts the Review Group Report and passes it on for legal review by GSA, DOJ, and White House Counsel. The National Archives drafts the proposed sixth set of access regulations and an explanatory preamble.

June 8, 1984

In a letter to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), DOJ again expresses concern with the access regulations: "There are a number of legal deficiencies in this latest set of regulations and their contemplated implementation by the Archivist which are unrelated to the legislative veto issue."

June 21, 1984

The Senate passes its National Archives independence legislation after weeks of active resistance by several executive branch agencies.

August 2, 1984

The House of Representatives passes its National Archives independence legislation into law, to take effect April 1, 1985.

October 19, 1984

President Reagan signs National Archives independence legislation into law, to take effect April 1, 1985.

October 23, 1984

Archivist Warner accepts the proposed sixth set of access regulations and submits them to GSA for clearance procedures.

December 4, 1984

GSA delivers the proposed regulations to OMB’s Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) for clearance under Executive Order No. 12291. This order, signed by Reagan in 1981, requires that departments and agencies submit any proposed regulations to OMB, so OIRA can determine whether they are consistent with the President's regulatory principles. OIRA is supposed to focus primarily on the economic impact of new regulations.

March 19, 1985

OMB completes its review of the proposed regulations and recommends no changes.

March 29, 1985

The sixth set of access regulations is published in the Federal Register for a 60-day notification and comment period.

April 1, 1985

The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) becomes an independent agency. Full responsibility for the Nixon Materials now resides with the National Archives.

April 1985

Archivist Warner resigns and Frank G. Burke becomes Acting Archivist. It is now up to President Reagan to nominate a new Archivist, who must then be approved by the Senate.

June 1985

The National Archives sends the proposed regulations to the Civil Division of DOJ for legal review.

July 9, 1985

An internal Civil Division memorandum discusses the proposed regulations and states, "The Office of Legal Counsel has also reviewed the regulations and has indicated that it has no changes to recommend. We agree with OLC that the regulations proposed by the Archives are legally defensible in their present form, and we have no substantive changes to recommend."

July 11, 1985

After receiving verbal approval from the Civil Division, the National Archives sends the regulations to OMB for clearance under Executive Order No. 12291. Enclosed with the
regulations is a finding that they are "nonmajor" (will have relatively minor economic impact).  

July 19, 1985 

The National Archives receives a letter from the Civil Division formally stating that the access regulations are legally defensible as written.  

July 23, 1985 

The National Archives receives a letter from OIRA acknowledging that the regulations are nonmajor, but adds without explanation that "[I]t has been necessary for us to extend our review period on this rule."  

August 13, 1985 

An internal OMB memorandum, titled "Nixon Papers Regulations," discusses "several serious substantive problems (some of constitutional proportions) with these rules." It suggests an exploratory meeting between representatives from the National Archives, the departments of Justice and State, and White House Counsel.  

August 29, 1985 

Another internal OMB memorandum seconds the need for a meeting to discuss problems in the access regulations -- but a meeting that would not include Archives personnel. It advises that a decision be made at this meeting as to whether the Archivist should be brought into discussions. 

The Archivist never is brought into discussions.  

On or about October 1, 1985 

Steven Galebach, Special Assistant to Attorney General Edwin Meese, takes the following notes at a meeting between representatives of White House Counsel, OMB, and DOJ: 

Ralph thinks we should go to WH staff & see what amt. of political heat we should be willing to take 

Archivist has declassified many documents 

Issue: Do we put WH or DOJ people on the job to review documents 

AG's opinion: concurred that we should hesitate to force the issue -- get Archivist confirmed first.... 

Major question is whether Archivist makes judgment on Exec. Priv. 

Options 
1 - do nothing 
2 - examine documents & 
3 - fight out issue of who judges Exec. Priv. 
4 - let regs go 

Early Fall 1985 

OMB asks OLC to undertake a legal review of the draft final regulations.  

On or about November 1, 1985 

Galebach takes the following handwritten notes at a meeting with two of Nixon's attorneys: 

White House Records to be released by Archives about May-June-July of 1986 

Pub. Int. grp to file lawsuit against OMB in next week to 10 days 

Story planted few weeks ago -- prob. by Archives 

Proposed WH Central Files -- release some now, but wait for sensitive items until 1989 or 90 

Tapes - Watergate-related -- some out 1990, w/other tapes to come out 2000 unless RMN consents 

Proposed Universal notification -- to anyone whose name shows up 

Archives says this is extraordinary burden 

DOJ -- even under Carter -- said lack of universal notice was a serious flaw in the regs 

Archives proposed a "registry" -- only 50 people are in the registry -- plus name of person whose file it was 

Suggests a better process than registry for notification 

Can Archives negotiate w/Nixon attys for a mutually acceptable notification provision? Archives has no incentive to negotiate as of now 

Suggestion: More notification for tapes than for written materials -- because no one knew they were being taped 

...Discovery shows: 

Archivist doesn't know what Exec. Priv. is about -- regs do not apply this standard 

They don't know how to apply Exec. Priv. -- they routinely release deliberative documents 

They look at "clearly unwarranted intrusion into personal privacy"  

December 18, 1985 

Public Citizen, Ralph Nader's public interest law firm, sues Acting Archivist Burke to force promulgation of the access regulations.  

January 16, 1986 

Galebach takes the following handwritten notes at a DOJ meeting: 

Two areas of concern in Archives regs: 

1. Change § 1275.44, or interpret it so as to allow DOJ opinion to govern decision of Exec. Priv. claims 

2. Can a former Pres. assert Exec. Priv. that is binding on incumbent Pres? In other words, should we write in a provision 

Late January 1986 

Public Citizen offers to drop its lawsuit if the Acting Archivist commits himself to a deadline for promulgating the access regulations. Burke cannot do so, however, until he knows that OMB is going to clear them.  

February 3, 1985 

Jeffery S. Paulsen, a DOJ attorney defending Acting Archivist Burke in the Public Citizen lawsuit, writes the following notes about a conversation with Bob Cynkar, Deputy Assistant Attorney General: 

We shld. tell Archives OMB not D ' ng any language. Get Archives to commit to a date for publication. Then tell them about OMB interp.... 

[Told this to Dave Anderson. He still disapproved. Asked Cynkar whether I could tell Archives OLC is working on a report. He said no.]  

February 4, 1986 

Paulsen writes the following notes about a conversation with the Acting Director of Legal Services at the National Archives, Gary Brooks: 

- Told him OMB not have any changes 
- He wondered why they don't release now but sd cl'd publish w/in 30 days -- i.e. by 2/28 
- Also, plan is to publish at same
February 5, 1986
Paulsen writes the following notes about a conversation with OMB official Bob Damus:

1) Stip. shld. say Archives will send to Fed. Reg. by 2/28, not publish by then.
2) OMB will not release to Archives 10 days in advance. Will release 2 hrs. in advance.
3) Don't want any leaks to Wash. Post

[It asked, what's to leak if OMB not making any changes?]

Damus -- You never know what can happen.

February 6, 1986
OMB writes a letter to OLC, formally requesting that it determine whether the sixth set of access regulations adequately "protect any party's opportunity to assert any legally or constitutionally based right or privilege which would prevent or otherwise limit access to such recordings and materials," as required by section 104(a)(5) of [PRMPA]."

There is no mention in the letter that OMB has contacted OLC previously about this matter, or that OLC is in fact already preparing such a report.

February 7, 1986
Paulsen sends the following handwritten note to Brooks:

OMB will be ready to clear the regs by 2/18/86. They will not actually clear, however, until Archives selects its date for submission to the Federal Register & Congress (no later than 2/28/86), and then will clear in time to meet that date. OMB will not be changing any language in the regulations.

Paulsen also sends the following handwritten note to Cynkar:

Yesterday, Bob Damus at OMB told me OMB will not release regs. to Archives until the 28th. I had previously told Archives it would be the 18th based on our conversation. I don't know whether Archives will sign on to the stipulation if they can't get an advance look at OMB's release.

February 18, 1986
The Office of Legal Counsel returns the regulations to OMB along with a legal memorandum which states, "You have asked that this Office review the proposed regulations to determine whether they meet the statutory mandate of PRMPA.... As we discuss below, we believe the proposed regulations are adequate to meet that standard, so long as they are interpreted and administered as set forth in this opinion."

The memorandum then makes the following legal argument: 1) the Archivist is bound to accept the executive privilege claims of an incumbent President; 2) an incumbent President "should respect a former President's claim of executive privilege without judging the validity of the claim"; 3) as a result, the Archivist must accept without challenge any claim of executive privilege that former President Nixon may assert.

Although this argument seems to contradict the regulations, which authorize the Archivist to make administrative decisions concerning executive privilege claims, the memorandum holds that "the duty of the Archivist to execute the President's decisions... must be regarded as implicit in the Archivist's responsibility under the regulations."

February 21, 1986
The National Archives receives a letter from OMB which states, "The purpose of this letter is to inform you that we have concluded our review and believe that the rule as submitted for our review, and as interpreted in the enclosed memorandum from the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice, is consistent with Executive Order No. 12291."

February 24, 1986
Paulsen sends the following handwritten note to Cynkar:

Archives balked at the OLC opinion, so stipulation still hasn't been filed. It sounds like they'll sign on by the end of the week, though.

Late February 1986
A Stipulation of Dismissal is filed in Public Citizen's lawsuit in which the Acting Archivist agrees to publish the access regulations in the Federal Register and submit them to Congress no later than February 28, 1986.

February 26, 1986
The National Archives sends the regulations, along with a copy of the OLC opinion, to Congress for the required 60-day report and wait period.

February 28, 1986
The sixth set of access regulations is published in the Federal Register. On the same day, a National Archives internal memorandum states that "the Acting Archivist believes he must adopt OLC/OMB's interpretation as NARA policy." This belief is based upon two factors: 1) OMB's approval of the regulations was conditioned upon the OLC opinion; and 2) the opinion represents the legal views of DOJ, which is, in effect, the National Archives' attorney.

Mid-March 1986
Rep. Glenn English schedules a hearing of the Government Information, Justice, and Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations to review the Nixon Materials access regulations in light of the OLC opinion. The hearing is set for April 29.

March 19, 1986
In response to an article in the New York Times about the upcoming hearing, OMB Deputy General Counsel John Cooney writes a memorandum to the OIRA files, stating that the OLC opinion "confuses, in my view deliberately, the question [sic] whether a former President, once he has left office, may independently assert the privilege, or whether his claim of privilege simply is a recommendation which the incumbent must confirm before the Archivist is compelled to withhold the material."

April 29, 1986
The access regulations hearing produces the following excerpts from testimony:

Mr. English: Can an Archivist make a final administrative decision on a claim of privilege by a former President?

Mr. Cooper: I think our opinion does go into--

Mr. English: I am asking you flat
out. Can he or can he not?

Mr. Cooper: The analysis that we have indicated is that only under some circumstances, some very limited circumstances.

Mr. English: What circumstances?

Mr. Cooper: As the opinion discusses, in the end the Archivist's decision is the incumbent President's decision on that.

Mr. English: Let me see if I have this right. The question of whether or not we are going to have access to the Nixon papers, tapes, and everything else is going to depend on whether Ronald Reagan wants us to or not? Is that right?

Mr. Cooper: No, sir.

Mr. English: That is just what you got through saying.

Mr. Cooper: I think that probably in the end on virtually every document that is contested in any way by anybody, it will be the courts who decide whether or not--

Mr. English: Then why didn't you leave it up to the courts in the first place?

Mr. Cooper: That is exactly what the opinion does.

Mr. English: That is what you designed the opinion to do, is to stimulate all this activity in the court?

* * *

Mr. English: According to the Washington Post, you don't believe that there should be any concern over differences between the Office of Legal Counsel opinion and the regulations published by the Archives because the whole matter is going to be litigated anyway. Evidently that's what you just got through saying again -- the whole business is going to be litigated. And that's, quite frankly, very strange legal advice to give. It's like telling your client, "Don't worry about it, I've done a bad job and made matters more complicated but we're going to get sued anyway.

And no one in the private sector would put up with that kind of attitude and I think that the Government is certainly entitled to better work from its employees.

* * *

Steven Ross, General Counsel to the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives: Let me turn now to the question of the substance of Mr. Cooper's opinion, which I think can be accurately described...as somewhat of a double play combination, sort of a modern version of Tinkers to Evars to Chance.

The way Mr. Cooper would have it is the Archivist must kowtow to the President, to the incumbent president because he supposedly works for the incumbent President, who in turn, must kowtow to the former President because that is the only way to preserve executive privilege.

My response to both propositions is: Hogwash. That is simply not the law. That is not what the Court has said and that is not the way our government works. The Constitution clearly allows the Congress to make a choice, which is to allow an officer of the Government to exercise his discretion in making certain determinations.

...It is clear that when an executive official is vested by a statute with the discretion to make a decision, it is the intent of the Congress and the requirement of the statute that he is the one that makes that decision. The OLC memorandum would substitute the position of the former President for the discretionary decisionmaking of the present-day Archivist, and again, that is simply contrary to both the intent of the statute, the language of the statute, the intent and language of the regulations, and the teaching of every applicable Supreme Court case in the history of the Nation.

* * *

Eric Glitzenstein (representing the Public Citizen Litigation Group): Now, there has been a lot of focus upon judicial review. Mr. Cooper kept repeating that the memorandum is really no big deal, because access to documents can be sought in the courts and, if there is an erroneous or an overbroad claim of executive privilege, it could be checked by judicial review. That is total fiction.

...[T]he assumption that there are people out there who are going to repeatedly file lawsuits seeking access to particular documents or to a particular file, simply isn't warranted. I'm not aware of who those people are who are going to continually file these lawsuits, and I notice Mr. Cooper did not refer to them either.

...Last, even if one were to succeed in a court of law to reverse one Presidential claim of executive privilege, the way I read the Justice Department memorandum the Archives would have to ignore the applicability of that judicial determination as to similar or functionally identical documents. In other words, even if a court says: This type of privilege claim is frivolous...the Archivist would still have to abide by precisely that kind of privilege claim the next time around and would not be able to say: The court has ruled on that issue; therefore I'm no longer going to go along with that kind of privilege claim.

June 10, 1986

The Acting Comptroller General of the United States delivers a legal analysis of the OLC opinion to the U.S. Senate. In its cover letter it faults the opinion's conclusion that the Archivist must accept Nixon's assertions of executive privilege as "inconsistent with the Archivist's regulations and contrary to his statutory responsibilities under [PRMPA] and...also at odds with past practice under the Act."

June 26, 1986

The sixth set of public access regulations go into effect.

June 27, 1986

Public Citizen, Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, and David Bollier file suit (Public Citizen v. Frank Burke) in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to restrain the National Archives from complying with the OLC opinion when deciding matters of public access to the Nixon Materials.

August 15, 1986

The Senate passes a resolution stating the sense of the Senate that the OLC opinion "contradicts the plain language of [the National Archives] regulations and the congressional intent in...PRMPA" and that the "regulations should take effect and be implemented by the Archivist without regard to the interpretive memorandum by the Department of Justice...dealing with the executive privilege claims of former President Nixon."

November 1986

The National Archives opens to the public 4,464 audiotapes and 4,082
videotapes produced by the White House Communications Agency from December 1968 to August 9, 1974. The tapes include comprehensive coverage of appearances and speeches by Nixon administration officials, news reports, White House press briefings, and extensive coverage of the Watergate hearings.

No executive privilege claims are filed against the release of this material.

Early December 1986

The National Archives opens to the public approximately 1.5 million pages of Nixon Materials dealing with such domestic-policy issues as education, housing, and science policy. No executive privilege claims are filed against the release of this material.

January 30, 1987

Notice is published in the Federal Register announcing the proposed opening of the Special Files on May 4, 1987. The notice requests that anyone wishing to assert a legally or constitutionally based claim against public access to this material should do so before May 1.

February 3, 1987

Oral arguments are heard in Public Citizen v. Frank Burke. The federal defendants argue that the lawsuit is premature and the issues not ripe for review, because no claims of executive privilege have been filed and the Archivist has therefore not had to apply the advice in the OLC opinion. Following this argument, Nixon’s attorney represents to the court that Nixon intends to assert claims of executive privilege to block release of the Special Files on May 4.

March 6, 1987

Judge George H. Revercomb files his decision in Public Citizen v. Frank Burke. Ruling first on the prematurity of the lawsuit, he “finds it irrelevant that there will be a time delay before the DOJ/OLC memorandum is applied in the processing of assertions of executive privilege claims. The injury to plaintiffs is certainly impending and they need not wait...before review is appropriate.” Revercomb then turns his attention to the merits of the case and states: This Court concludes that as [PRMPA]...and the regulatory scheme...have withstood scrutiny as to their constitutionality and survived, the DOJ/OLC memorandum is not compelled by the Constitution. Furthermore the court concludes that the memorandum thwarted the legislative intent of [PRMPA] and the regulations promulgated pursuant to [PRMPA].” Accordingly, it is DECLARED that the February 18, 1986 memorandum from the Department of Justice...is contrary to law and cannot be relied on by the National Archives in implementing [PRMPA], and it is further ORDERED that the National Archives shall not comply with the DOJ/OLC’s memorandum in implementing [PRMPA] and shall instead assess the validity of any claims of executive privilege asserted by former presidents in accordance with its own regulations....

March 11-30, 1987

Officials from the CIA, the FBI, the Secret Service, and the departments of Defense, Treasury, State, and Commerce visit the National Archives to review the Special Files finding aids and make sure nothing is being released that will violate national security.

April 1987

The White House meets with the various agencies to decide upon a course of action.

The National Archives readies itself to open the Special Files on May 4th, albeit with the full expectation that it will be stopped by claims of executive privilege. This will entail pulling items, reviewing them, making determinations on whether to grant the claims, and then segregating files. This process could take up to six months, after which Nixon has the right to contest the Archivist’s decisions in court. In short, our long wait to review many of the Nixon Materials does not yet appear to be at an end.

Review of the White House Tapes nears completion. Processing and review of the White House Central Files continues.

Postscript

From beginning to end, the history of the Nixon Materials is unprecedented. No presidential materials before or since have been so legally bound to be opened, nor so legally prevented from being opened.

The requirement that materials deemed personal be systematically identified and returned is unique to the review of the Nixon Materials. The other restriction categories in the public access regulations -- many of which have been resisted tooth and nail by Mr. Nixon in the courts -- are essentially the same as those in use throughout the presidential library system.

One can’t help but recall the cynicism of Justice Rehnquist, whose 1977 dissent in Nixon v. Administrator...termed it "extremely naive" to believe that archivists processing Nixon Materials would not leak items to the press. Since then, not one unauthorized disclosure has occurred while National Archives staff have conducted their work of processing and review -- this despite a backdrop of continuing and threatened litigation regarding the Nixon Materials, and of constant scrutiny of the National Archives' work by Nixon's lawyers, the press, and other interested parties.

For three years during the course of National Archives work on the Nixon Materials, at least one Nixon agent, and frequently two or three, conducted their own review of every page of the White House Special Files. Such a second review by agents of a former President is unique in the history of presidential papers in the presidential library era. Apparently the review was conducted with the intention of identifying those documents that Nixon believes should not be released even though the National Archives has concluded that they should be.

The Nixon Materials that have recently been opened for the public and those that are scheduled for opening in May are similar in content and form to those that have been routinely opened in other presidential libraries soon after the end of a President’s administration. The only significant difference is Mr. Nixon’s refusal to accept the same timely access as his predecessors and successors.
Bicentennial Opportunity: Documents on Display in New York

by Christine W. Ward and Bruce W. Dearstyne

The New York State Archives cooperated with the State Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution in an exhibit that coincided with initiation of New York's commemoration of the Constitution. The one-day exhibit in February contained twenty important documents including minutes of New York's first colonial legislature, the first State Constitution, and records of the state convention that ratified the U.S. Constitution. We had several goals for the exhibit: cooperating with the State Bicentennial Commission to take advantage of public interest in the federal Constitution; broadening that interest beyond the Constitution to other foundation documents of government; testing press and public interest in exhibits; mounting an exhibit in a high-traffic area of the Empire State Plaza governmental complex near the State Capitol; and drawing the attention of the Legislature and other governmental leaders to the Archives' holdings and programs. The exhibit succeeded on all of these scores.

The Archives has no exhibition staff, so exhibit preparation work fell to reference and preservation personnel. Basic conservation treatment had to be performed on several records, including humidifying and flattening buckled or distorted pages and mending tears and weak areas. Preservation staff also prepared the exhibit cases, provided prospective enclosures to safely transport the documents, and mounted and dismounted the exhibit.

We devoted much time and effort to publicity. The Archives and Bicentennial Commission each issued press releases. The Archives' announcement invited press representatives to come to the Archives beforehand to photograph the documents and discuss them with staff, and announced that the archives would hold a press conference at the exhibit. Press kits with information on each document and on the State Archives were available at the exhibit.

Several thousand people, including numerous legislators, viewed the exhibit. Many people remarked that it was exciting to see the original documents, most never before on public display. A large crowd gathered to hear Governor Mario Cuomo and New York's Chief Judge Sol Wachtler, chair of the state Bicentennial Commission, at the ceremony that officially launched the state's Bicentennial celebration. Wachtler called the documents in the exhibit "an awesome sight," and thanked the Archives for its efforts.

All three Albany television stations devoted a few moments to the exhibit on their evening news. Publicity in Albany-area newspapers helped boost attendance. The New York Times carried a feature story and photo of the exhibit. This story, two television interviews with State Archivist Larry Hackman, and a few of the local press stories mentioned the need for New Yorkers to give greater attention to their documentary heritage and that New York's relatively new archival program needs additional resources to catch up in preservation and other work.

What did we learn from this day of archives in the limelight? First—not really a surprise—even a modest exhibit requires much planning and coordination! The exhibit, important though it was, interrupted other essential on-going reference and preservation lab work. Second, we were reminded that these documents, and many other that we hold, still require a great deal of preservation treatment. Conservation lab staff spent many hours preparing both documents and cases to ensure safe and secure transport and exhibit. Some of the documents actually needed treatment to undo and reverse treatments carried out years ago that have since been discredited by conservators.

Third, it takes persistent effort to attract press attention to historical records, to convey the significance of the documents, and to explain the importance of the archival programs that preserve and administer them. Fourth, the Bicentennial is an opportune time to direct public attention to historical records in general and to the need for strong historical records programs. Overall, this exhibit was worthwhile in terms of getting documents—and important accompanying messages—before the public.

Ward is a Staff Archivist, and Dearstyne is Principal Archivist, at the New York State Archives.
The Instructional Archivist
by George W. Bain

We all know how important it is to have a good reference archivist to assist researchers in finding information. But for a reference archivist in this day and age, the skills needed and tools available are constantly changing. In order to adjust successfully to these changes it may behoove archivists to look to their colleagues in the library profession. For instance, I hope that many of you are familiar with the academic librarians who do "library instruction" or "bibliographic instruction."

Over the past quarter century instructional librarians have added a new dimension to traditional reference work. In the past, the reference department dealt primarily with the query, "What is the answer to my question?" The new thrust has given more attention to the other side of the reference query, "How do I find the answer to my question?"

To this end, instructional librarians are responsible for activities that include giving orientation tours, preparing library information sheets or handbooks, developing exercise sheets or workbooks, preparing bibliographies, and even evaluating or grading written library assignments. Some of these activities are more passive while others are more active; but both are needed for a full program of instruction.

Archivists, of course, also have reference staffs. But to what extent can we apply the basic concepts and practices the instructional librarians employ to our own situations? Is there a place for an instructional archivist in college and university repositories? In state or provincial archival centers religious archives or other settings? We can point to intriguing precedents such as the mini-classes at the Minnesota Historical Society reported by Dallas Lindgren (Chrislock) in 1979, and the exercises in Tim Ericson's limited printing "Academic Outreach" booklet (1984). (I do hope this becomes a full-fledged publication.) But where do we go from here?

Are there also reasons why we should expand traditional reference repositories and make reference archivists full and equal partners in developing subject headings for our inventories and other finding aids? Many feel that this would be a good idea, given reference archivist's familiarity with the way patrons approach materials, but evidence suggests that the nation has not caught on widely. What are we doing about, or what is the impact on reference work of recently available tools such as Chadwyck-Healey's National Inventory of Documentary Sources (NIDS) and the archives and manuscripts control (AMC) format on the RLIN and OCLC bibliographic utility databases? These make it so much easier than using Hamer's guide for US materials. And artificial intelligence is on its way!

Beyond this, however, how can we educate the public about more effective ways to retrieve information by including provenance in addition to the usual author, title, and subject entries? Do archivists and government documents librarians have anything to offer each other here? Will it profit us to look to cognitive psychology as instructional librarians have for insights into how our users approach finding information? For example, cognitive psychologists' studies have indicated that neophyte and veteran researchers solve problems differently. This suggests that we should remain patient with those who have problems using our finding aids. It also behooves us to think in terms of teaching researchers strategies for finding information sources in archival records and manuscript collections.

We need to begin trying imaginative new efforts and reporting the results of these in archival literature. For instance, the profession would benefit from a report that expands upon Mary Jo Pugh's recent comment how she used to comb the University of Michigan course catalog to identify classes in which archival materials should be employed. Likewise, I hope that some archival shop will soon allocate a position of "instructional archivist". If any has already, please let me know. I will happily present to the first US or Canadian respondent who can verify this, a special award at the Reference Access Outreach Section's business meeting in September--a big apple and TWO Snickers bars!

George W. Bain chairs the Reference-Access-Outreach Section.

An earlier version of this article appeared in that Section's newsletter.

1987 Annual Meeting Myth #1 -- New York is expensive.

Yes, it can be. But there are plenty of free things to do. You can visit Rockefeller Center. You can explore and hike in Central Park. You can pretend you're rich and window shop in Tiffany's, in Bendel's, or in Sak's Fifth Avenue. After all, over 200 archivists live in the New York area, and they're not all rich!
Featured Regional: The Society of Colorado Archivists

by Barbara Neilon

In 1987 the Society of Colorado Archivists reached a milestone--our membership passed the 100 mark! Since 1980, when our initial membership of 18 was concentrated in the Denver area, SCA has seen significant membership increases every year. The group now represents at least 35 institutions from Grand Junction to Greeley, and Ft. Collins to Pueblo.

Founded in 1979, SCA adopted its constitution and bylaws and elected its first five-member council on 29 March 1980. Jerry Minkoff served as the Society's first president. Interestingly, one of the council's first actions was to propose a resolution supporting the independence of the National Archives.

Soon the Society began sponsoring day-long meetings twice a year, beginning with a joint meeting with the Conference of Intermountain Archivists during the spring of 1981. The meetings rotate among institutions, and their programs most often have been centered on a theme. Topics have included Establishing an Archives, Archives and the Law, Computers in Archives and Records Centers, Archives and Historic Preservation, Micrographics for Archives, The Small Historical Society, Volunteers in Archives, Records Management and Archives, and Photographic Collections in Archives. The spring meeting for 1987 focused on Funding for Archives and was attended by SAA executive director, Donn Neal.

All of the biannual meeting programs have been given by local persons, with conscious efforts made to include on the programs persons in related fields (librarians, museum curators, records managers, etc.) as well as experts from such professions as law and architecture. Although all of the meetings have been centered on the front range of the Rocky Mountains, we look forward to the day when we can plan a meeting on the western slope.

As with most professional groups in Colorado and other western states, geography plays an important role in SCA. Meeting planners must take into consideration small population centers, long distances between them, mountain barriers, and the hazards of winter travel.

To date SCA, now governed by a seven-member council, has largely concerned itself with establishing a workable organizational structure, presenting worthwhile programs to attract new members, and disseminating information. In the spring of 1984 the first issue of The Colorado Archivist was published under the editorship of Bonnie Hardwick, who was also serving as SCA president. The quarterly publication has highlighted annual meetings, carried profiles of archival institutions within the state, and provided the usual news of Society concerns.

Currently SCA faces a new challenge. With the closing of the School of Librarianship and Information Science at the University of Denver and the accompanying demise of the Archives Institute there, many of us are concerned not only about opportunities for continuing education, but also about the training of new archivists. It is our hope that through concentrated effort and cooperation with regional and national professional groups we can help fill the need for archival education within the state of Colorado.

Barbara Neilon is president of the Society of Colorado Archivists.

Archives and Public History: Issues, Problems, and Prospects

BRUCE W. DEARSTYNE, Guest Editor

"This is a time of change and excitement in archives," writes guest editor Bruce Dearstyne, and the special issue of The Public Historian he has assembled captures this growing sense of energy, deliberation, and self-understanding in the archival profession. Articles by Larry J. Hackman, Page Putnam Miller, Richard J. Cox, Edie Hedlin, and Terry Eastwood--as well as reviews of 18 books relevant to archival work--provide provocative reading for anyone concerned with archival issues, problems, and future prospects.

$5 for members; $7.50 for nonmembers.

To order, write:
Society of American Archivists
600 S. Federal St, Suite 504
Chicago, Illinois 60605

24 May 1987 SAA Newsletter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8 May</td>
<td>Southeastern Archives and Records Conference; Orlando, Florida.</td>
<td>Contact: Bureau of Archives and Records Management at (904) 487-2180 or (904) 487-2073.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 May</td>
<td>Midwest Archives Conference Spring Meeting; Chicago, Illinois.</td>
<td>Contact: Maureen O'Brien Will, Chicago Historical Society, Clark Street at North Avenue, Chicago, IL 60614, (312) 642-4600.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 May</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference; Baltimore, Maryland.</td>
<td>Contact: Jane Odom, Archives Center, National Museum of American History, Washington, DC 20560, (202) 357-3270; or Elizabeth Schaaf, Archives of the Peabody Institute, 1 E. Mt. Vernon Pl., Baltimore, MD 21202, (301) 659-8157.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13 May</td>
<td>CD-I/The Future; Online International Conference; San Francisco, California.</td>
<td>Contact: Carol Peters at Online Internaional Conference; San Francisco, California. Contact: Valerie J. Nurcombe, 8 One Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, NY 14623, (716) 475-7275.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May</td>
<td>Michigan Archival Association Spring Meeting; Ann Arbor, Michigan.</td>
<td>Contact: Thomas Featherstone Walther P. Reuther Library, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16 May</td>
<td>Lake Ontario Archives Conference; Syracuse, New York.</td>
<td>Contact: Ms. Amy Doberth, University Archivist, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16 May</td>
<td>New England Archivists' Spring Meeting; Portland, Maine.</td>
<td>Contact: Louise M. Kenneally, Archives, Stonehill College, Easton, MA 02377, (617) 238-1081, ext. 396.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20 May</td>
<td>American Society for Information Science Mid-Year Meeting, Cincinnati, Ohio.</td>
<td>Contact: George L. Abbott, 1987 Mid-Year Meeting, Program Co-Chairman, 311 Stonecrest Drive, Syracuse, NY 13214.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 May</td>
<td>Society of Southwest Archivists' Annual Meeting; New Orleans, Louisiana.</td>
<td>Contact: Robert S. Martin, Special Collections, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803-3300.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22 May</td>
<td>&quot;Legal Requirements for Records and Information Management Programs&quot;; a seminar sponsored by Nashville ARMA, Music City Chapter, Nashville, Tennessee. Contact: ARMA Seminar, c/o Jean B. Waggener, State Library and Archives, 403 7th Avenue North, Nashville, TN 37219, (615) 741-3308.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19 June</td>
<td>&quot;Preservation Management Workshop&quot;; Simmons College, Boston, Massachusetts. Contact: NEDCC, 24 School St., Andover, MA 01810, (617) 470-1010.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 June</td>
<td>Special Library Association's Annual Conference; Anaheim, California.</td>
<td>Contact: Bill Johnson, Membership Development and Marketing, SLA, 1700 18th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009, (202) 234-4700.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 June</td>
<td>Society of California Archivists Spring Meeting; Monterey, California.</td>
<td>Contact: Helene Whiton, 1824 Arch St., Berkeley, CA 94709.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June-7 August</td>
<td>&quot;Understanding the MARC Format for Archival and Manuscripts Control&quot;; Cincinnati, Ohio.</td>
<td>Contact: see 22-23 April entry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 July</td>
<td>&quot;Basic Training Workshop for Slide Curators in Art and Architecture&quot;; Austin, Texas. Contact: Mr. Jack Brannon, Fine Arts Continuing Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Fine Arts Building 2.4. Austin, TX 78712, (512) 471-8862.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 July</td>
<td>&quot;Microcomputer Applications in Visual Resource Collections Workshop&quot;; Austin, Texas. Contact: (same as July 13-18 entry).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25 July</td>
<td>NAGARA Annual Meeting; Atlanta, Georgia. Contact: Bruce W. Dearatyne, New York State Archives, 10A75 Cultural Education Center, Albany, NY 12230.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16-21 August | First International Symposium on Newspaper Preservation and Access; London, United Kingdom. Contact: Valerie J. Nurrcombe, 8 Kingfisher Drive, Over, Winsford, Cheshire CW7 1PF, UK. |


4-8 October | ASIS Annual Meeting; Boston, Massachusetts. Contact: Stephen Morrison, ASIS, 1424 16th Street, NW, Suite 404, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 462-1000. |
| 12-15 October | International Information Management Congress; Vienna, Austria. |

19-22 October | ARMA Annual Conference; Anaheim, California. Contact: International Records Management Council, 22243 Mission Drive, Woodland Hills, CA 91364. |
| 25-29 October | "The Care & Preservation of Two-Dimensional Collections," a Workshop; Boston, Massachusetts. Contact: (see 19-23 July entry). |

4-6 November | Concordia Historical Institute's Conference on Archives and History; St. Louis, Missouri. Contact: Concordia Historical Institute, 801 De Mau, St. Louis, MO 63105. |
| 19-20 November | Society of Georgia Archivists' Fall Meeting; Atlanta, Georgia. |
New SAA Members

Casey Edward Greene
Rosenberg Library
2310 Sealy Ave.
Galveston, TX 77550
(409) 763-8854

Nola Skousen
1505 Moulin
Madison, WI, MI 48071
(313) 223-8040

Joanne B. Moore
P.O. Box 86190
7227 Reynolds St.
Pittsburgh, PA 15237
(412) 371-0600

Linda Blazer
(New Mexico St Univ)
P.O. Box 3286
Las Cruces, NM 88003
(505) 646-4746

Dan Barringer
State Farm Insurance, Co.
One State Farm Plaza
Bloomington, IL 61701
(309) 766-5207

Sandra Florand Young
(UICC)
2806 N. Cambridge, #5
Chicago, IL 60657
(312) 995-2742

Jerome J. Probst
111 W. Cherry, #E
Alexandria, VA 22303
(703) 960-3431

John Straw
(Indiana Univ)
4989 Beech Hollow Ct, #B
Indianapolis, IN 46254
(317) 274-0464

Ronald C. Stone, Jr.
301 W. 39th, #206
Chicago, IL 60616
(312) 482-1015

Barbara K. Brandt
1921 Grant Ave.
Altoona, PA 16602

Travis Dudley
(Dallas Public Library)
4124 McNell St.
Dallas, TX 75227
(214) 749-1447

Patricia L. Joy
(Chic-Nova)
17 Hallack St.
Waterbury, CT 06706
(203) 482-1015

Karen Peltier
(Yale University)
97 Wakefield St.
Hamden, CT 06517
(203) 432-4794

Mary Colin Santos
Knight-Capron Library
Lynchburg College
Lynchburg, VA 24501
(804) 522-8441

Michael A. Southwood
(U.S. Naval Reserve)
8025 Tyson Oaks Circle
Gainesville, VA 22607
(703) 847-0940

Joan B. Surrey
(Rockford College)
319 Seminole Ave.
Rockford, IL 61102
(815) 226-4036

Michael Thompson
279 W McClellan Ave.
Springfield, OH 45504

Christopher M. Agnew
Episcopal Diocese of Delaware
605 Delaware St.
New Castle, DE 19720
(302) 322-1692

Monique Bourque
P.O. Box 4704
Newark, DE 19715
(302) 451-2371

Karen D. Stevens
Univ of Pennsylvania
7701 Cresheim Rd.
Philadelphia, PA 19118
(215) 898-7024

Bro. Thomas Warner
La Salle University
20th St & Olney Ave.
Philadelphia, PA 19141
(215) 891-1294

Susan J. von Salis
Blomserth St.
Maiden, MA 02148

Ann C. Van Deursen
Burgundy Farm Country Day School
3700 Spruce Rd.
Alexandria, VA 22303
(703) 960-3431

ACTES

DE LA VINGT-DEUXIÈME
CONFÉRENCE INTERNATIONALE
DE LA TABLE RONDE DES ARCHIVES

BRATISLAVA 1983
L'ARCHIVISTE ET L'INFLATION
DES ARCHIVES CONTEMPORAINES

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE TWENTY-SECOND
INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVAL
ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

BRATISLAVA 1983
THE ARCHIVIST AND THE INFLATION
OF CONTEMPORARY RECORDS

189 pp., softbound: $14.00 members; $18.00 others

600 S. Federal, Suite 504, Chicago, Illinois 60605 (312) 922-0140
APPRAISALS OF ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS

The 1985 Internal Revenue Service regulations concerning appraisals of manuscript and archival collections have caused a number of persons who had been appraising small to medium size collections to withdraw from the field. Consequently, many institutions are contacting us about collections which they previously believed were too small, or insufficiently significant for us to consider for appraisal.

We are well known for undertaking virtually every major appraisal during the past two decades, from Random House to Paramount Pictures, Igor Stravinsky to George Gershwin, Samuel Clemens to Hamilton Jordan, Fred Allen to Norman Vincent Peale, and numerous others in the fields of literature, music, the arts, sciences, business, and legal, military and political history, including the ten million items in the North Pacific archive.

Our appraisals which have been little publicized are those of hundreds of small archives of no great commercial value, but which require proper valuation for their donors. These are collections which must be accurately evaluated at minimum cost—collections whose fair market values do not warrant detailed examinations, inventories and reports, but which require the preparation of the most accurate descriptions and reports possible, commensurate with their values. Our success at determining the appropriate balance between these factors is based on our efficient appraisal practices, extensive experience and qualified research staff.

Our normal procedure is to quote a firm appraisal fee and give a general range of the fair market value based on an examination of the institution’s initial inventory. There is no obligation to proceed with the appraisal and there is no charge for this information, nor is there any fee charged if we believe the collection or archive could not find a commercial market, a prime requirement for the establishment of fair market value.

Please contact Rosalie Fawcett with any questions you may have. A brochure describing our experiences and the institutions we have undertaken appraisals for is available. Also available is a reprint of an article by Kenneth W. Rendell, published by the Society of American Archivists, “Tax Appraisals of Manuscript Collections”.

KENNETH W. RENDELL INC
154-aa Wells Ave. Tel: 617-969-7766
Newton, Mass. 02159 Cable: Autographs Boston
ARCHIVAL EDUCATION SPECIALIST
New England Archivists, University of Connecticut; Storrs, Conn.
NEA-sponsored grant funded by NHPRC; 18-month appointment. Reports to Director of Historical Manuscripts & Archives (Project Director), in conjunction with NEA Education Project Committee and an Advisory Board representing diverse historical records organizations in six states. RESPONSIBILITIES: Plan, publicize and conduct a series of basic archival education workshops in the six-state region; to exchange information with other professional organizations; to provide information/advice on archival/historical records programs; to coordinate project activities and prepare project reports. QUALIFICATIONS: Master's degree in Archival Management, History, Library Science, or related field; 2-3 years archival experience; demonstrated teaching ability/experience, preferably including archival workshops; driver's license for reimbursed travel. SALARY: up to $25,000, depending on qualifications and experience; Blue Cross/CMS, with major medical; 22 days vacation; 12 paid State holidays per year. Send resume and cover letter by June 15, 1987 to Randall Jimerson, Director of Historical Manuscripts & Archives, Box U-205, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268.

PROJECT ARCHIVIST
AFS International/Intercultural Programs; New York City
For 2-year NHPRC-funded project to develop an archival program in coordination with projected records management system. The organization anticipates establishing the position on a permanent basis after the termination of the grant. RESPONSIBILITIES: Working with Project Director and administrative officers to develop policies, procedures and schedules, and implement the necessary functions; surveying, appraising, accessioning, processing, and preserving; preparing finding aids and staff manual. QUALIFICATIONS: Graduate degree in history or related field, experience with automated access systems and microfilm/microfiche, knowledge of records management, minimum 3-5 years’ experience in archival practice and administration. Consultants in preservation/conservation and records management will be available to the archivist over the 2-year period. SALARY: $26,000 per annum, plus generous benefits. Send letter of application and resume with references to: W.P. Orrick, Archival Project Director, AFS International/Intercultural Programs, 313 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10017.

ARCHIVIST
Ford Foundation; New York City
RESPONSIBILITIES: Administers the archives and records storage programs of the Foundation; storage, security, and retrieval of the Foundation’s historical records, including both long- and short-term storage, microfilming, retention schedules, and information retrieval. Oversees archival research effort for providing data to Foundation staff and outside researchers concerning wide range of Foundation interests since its inception. QUALIFICATIONS: Graduate degree in Library Science or related field; 4 years experience in either archives or special collections, including supervisory experience and good communication skills. SALARY: $33,600-$40,400. Send resume to Joan Carroll, Employment Manager, The Ford Foundation, 320 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10017.

HEAD OF ARCHIVES AND SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) University Library
RESPONSIBILITIES: Report to the Director of the University Libraries and serve as a member of the Unit Heads, the libraries’ development and policy-making body. Management and continuing development of the Archives program which includes collection development, appraisal, organization, preservation, publicity, and security. QUALIFICATIONS: Master’s or higher ALA-accredited degree with 3-5 years of archival experience in an academic or research organization; demonstrated ability to communicate effectively both orally and in writing and to interact successfully with colleagues, administrators, staff, users, and donors; supervisory experience; ability to meet the responsibilities of a tenure-track appointment. BA or MA in History, experience with archival computer applications preferred. SALARY: Dependent on qualifications; minimum for Associate Librarian $24,000; Librarian $29,030. Benefits include 22 working days vacation, liberal sick leave, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, major medical, group life insurance, dental plan, TIAA/CREF retirement/annuity plan; Librarians are eligible for sabbatical leaves and other research support. To apply, send letter of application, resume, and 4 references to: Barbara B. Fischler, Director, University Libraries, IUPUI, 815 W. Michigan Street, Indianapolis, IN 46202.

It is assumed that all employers comply with Equal-Opportunity/Affirmative-Action regulations.
DIRECTOR
Institute for Great Lakes Research; Bowling Green, Ohio
The Institute currently houses, among other resources, the nation's largest archive relating to Great Lakes industrial, transportation, and commercial public. New three-year plan calls for emphasis on American maritime and regional economic history on a broad scale. Tenure-track appointment. Reports to Dean of Libraries and Learning Resources.

RESPONSIBILITIES: Developing and coordinating activities of the Institute collection through gifts and purchases; provision of access, public service and scholarly assistance in the use of materials; continuation of grant and endowed initiatives; teaching American economic history; development of conferences and publications which make use of Institute materials and resources; and enhancement of public outreach programs and early use of the Institute's holdings. Expected to pursue own research and publications. QUALIFICATIONS: Ph.D. in American economic or maritime history; administrative experience appropriate to the management of a large archival or special collection. SALARY: Commensurate with qualifications and experience. Applications received by April 15, 1987 will be assured first consideration. Send letter of application, resume and reference to reference to Dary Hess, Chair, Search Committee, Dean's Office, Jerome Library, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403.

ASSISTANT ARCHIVIST
Anheuser-Busch Companies; St. Louis, Missouri
RESPONSIBILITIES: Assist the corporate archivist access, interpret and care for our corporate collection. Assisting with an ongoing interpretative display program, including thematic development, constructing and maintaining exhibits, and organizing and maintaining the corporate photographic collection. QUALIFICATIONS: BS in History, art history, or museum science and at least 3-5 years experience in curatorial activity and interpretative display work, including exhibit construction and maintenance. Master's degree, experience with automated retrieval systems and a background in history or business history will be considered a plus. The people who maintain and extend our reputation for excellence can expect to be rewarded with salaries and benefits that rank amongst the top in the industry. Send resume and salary history to: Anheuser-Busch Companies. Corporate Employment, Department A-DK-EB, One Busch Place, St. Louis, MO 63118.

ARCHIVIST
Clemson University; Clemson, South Carolina
RESPONSIBILITIES: Arrangement and description of the Senator Strom Thurmond Collection and other modern collections. Includes reference service, preparation of exhibits, and other duties as required. Reports to the Head of Special Collections. QUALIFICATIONS: ALA-accredited MLS and specialized training or experience in archival management. Advanced degree in history or political science, skill in written and oral communication, ability to work as a member of a team, effort in preparing finding aids and in the use of the AMC format preferred. SALARY: $10,000 plus benefits. Tenure-track, faculty-status, entry-level position available July 1, 1987. Applications received by April 20, 1987 will be given first consideration. Send letter of reference to: Deana Axtle, Chair, Archivist Search Committee, R.M. Cooper Library, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-3001.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Conservation Center for Art and Historic Artifacts; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
CCAAHA is a non-profit regional conservation laboratory specializing in the conservation of works on paper including paintings, architectural materials, photographs, and other paper-related materials for over 160 member institutions and other private and institutional clients. Additional responsibilities include the development of research and educational programs. RESPONSIBILITIES: Under the authority of the Board of Directors, the Executive Director is responsible for overall administration and operations, including management of a $500,000 annual budget and a fifteen-member staff, marketing of services, fundraising, and long-range planning. REQUIREMENTS: Strong administrative skills and proven ability to represent institution publicly. Training in conservation need not be a requirement. Significant relevant experience in management required. Send application, resume, and 3 references by June 30, 1987 to Search Committee, Conservation Center for Art and Historic Artifacts, 264 South 23rd Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

RECORDS MANAGER
University of South Carolina: Columbia
RESPONSIBILITIES: organize and implement a comprehensive university records management program; design record forms; prepare and submit retention/disposition schedules; develop microfilming activities; supervise assistants; and instruct appropriate university personnel as to proper records-keeping techniques. QUALIFICATIONS: Bachelors degree with relevant graduate work preferred and at least 2 years experience working in a records management program; extensive knowledge of records management principles and techniques; skill in document research and preservation; experience with microfilming and automated records keeping systems and equipment preferred; supervisory experience; ability to effectively communicate orally and in writing. SALARY: $20,439 plus excellent state employee benefit package. Position available July 1, 1987. Send letter of application addressing all of the above qualifications, resume, and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of 3 references to: John Heiting, Associate Director, McKissick Museum, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208.

ARCHIVIST/REFERENCE LIBRARIAN
University of Wisconsin-River Falls
One of 13 area research centers affiliated with the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, located 30 miles east of St. Paul, Minnesota. Position available June 1. RESPONSIBILITIES: As Archivist (50%), oversees university archives program and regional research program. Administers and maintains archival collections. Serves as liaison with campus offices regarding university records and with the State Historical Society regarding the regional archival collections. As Reference Librarian (50%), works 10 hours per week at the reference desk. Provides bibliographic instruction in art on paper, library and archival collections. QUALIFICATIONS: ALA-accredited MLS, training or experience in archival administration; 2 years archival work, some reference experience. Second Masters in History or regional history field preferred. SALARY: $21,768-$27,210, depending on qualifications. This is a fixed-term academic staff, 12-month appointment with full benefits. Application deadline June 1, 1987. For application, write to Herman Storm, Chalmers Davie Library, University of Wisconsin-River Falls, 120 Cascade Ave., River Falls, WI 54022. (715) 425-3742.

MANUSCRIPTS LIBRARIAN
University of Arizona; Tucson, Arizona
The Special Collections department contains the Arizona and Southwestern collections of books, photographs, and manuscripts, rare book and other research collections, modern and archival materials, and archives as well as the University Archives. Staff is comprised of 5 professional librarians, 2.5 career staff, and student assistants. Position available July 1, 1987. RESPONSIBILITIES: Manage and process manuscript, archival and photographic collections, process ephemeral materials to be located in various University archival files; supervise other processing and provide reference assistance in the Special Collections Reading Room. QUALIFICATIONS: ALA-accredited MLS or other relevant Master's degree. Preference will be given to a person with specialized training or experience in manuscript and/or archival processing in an academic or research library. Background in Western American history or culture preferred. SALARY: $18,500 minimum, depending on qualifications. Academic professional status, voting member of the faculty, 24 days professional leave per year plus 22 days paid vacation, 12 days sick leave and 10 holidays. Standard benefits package. Applications received prior to April 17, 1987 will receive first consideration. Send letter of application, resume and names of 3 references to: W. David Laird, University Librarian, University of Arizona Library, Tucson, AZ 85721.

ARCHIVIST
Berry College; Rome, Georgia
Reports to Director of College Library. Permanent full-time position. Berry College is a private liberal arts college in northwest Georgia with a co-ed student population of 1,500. RESPONSIBILITIES: To organize, administer, and service Martha Berry Papers and historical records of the College. Some reference duties. QUALIFICATIONS: ALA-accredited MLS, basic background in history, and archival experience highly desirable. Application deadline July 1, 1987. Send letter of application, resume, and names and addresses of 3 references to: Ondina S. Gonzales, Director, Memorial Library, Berry College, Mount Berry Station, Rome, GA 30149.

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS DIVISION
LIBRARIAN/CURATOR
University of Texas at Arlington
RESPONSIBILITIES: Curatorial development activities of the Special Collections Division, including the preparation of collection development policies and the acquisition of all book and serial materials acquired through purchase; provides public service to researchers; plans, prepares, and mounts all exhibits and displays in the Division; coordinates the basic preservation program of the Division. QUALIFICATIONS: ALA-accredited MLS; 2 years acquisitions/collection development experience in an academic or research library setting, preferably in a special collections division; experience in preparation of exhibits; and training or experience in basic preservation techniques. Preferred: Archival training and a demonstrated interest in history, particularly the history of the Southwest; reading knowledge of a romance language, preferably Spanish; experience or training in design and layout of publications; knowledge of the antiquarian book trade. SALARY: $20,000 minimum, dependent on qualifications and experience for position package. Send letter of application, resume, and the names of 3 professional references by May 15, 1987 to: Dr. Gerald D. Saxon, Assistant Director for Special Collections, The University of Texas at Arlington, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019.
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LIBRARIAN II: CURATOR, SOUTHWESTERN WRITERS COLLECTION
Southwest Texas State University Library; San Marcos, Texas
RESPONSIBILITIES: Directs all activities relating to Southwestern Writers Collection and related materials. Develops policies and procedures for development and use of the collection including fundraising, public relations, reference services, exhibit preparation, and publishing programs.
QUALIFICATIONS: Demonstrated knowledge of the writers and literature of the Southwestern United States plus a minimum of 3 years professional experience in special collection archival management, and/or as subject bibliographer. ALA-accredited MLS; superior writing and speaking skills; ability to establish cardinal relationships with researchers of various backgrounds and interests, as well as with colleagues and potential contributors. SALARY: $21,024 minimum. To apply, send letter of application, resume, and names of 3 references by May 15, 1987 to: Personnel Office, SWTSU, San Marcos, TX 78666-4615.

MANUSCRIPT SPECIALIST/ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN
Museum of American Textile History; North Andover, Massachusetts
RESPONSIBILITIES: Aspects of all library collection (books, prints, photographs, and manuscripts) including a combination of reference work, collections organizing, indexing, exhibition planning, etc.; process, preserve, and provide reference service for the manuscript collections and Museum archives. QUALIFICATIONS: Combination of library and archival skills. Will consider candidates with a degree from an accredited program in archival administration and with library experience or MLS with archival/manuscript collections background. Prefer BA in History/humanities, computer experience, and 2-3 years' experience with historical collections. Send resume, reference, and writing sample to Clare Sheridan, 800 Massachusetts Ave., North Andover, MA 01845.

RECORDS SUPERVISOR
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; Washington, D.C.
Seeks mature, well-organized person to supervise communications and mail office (known as Archives/ Mailroom operation for public organization. QUALIFICATIONS: good English and spelling, typing, telex, etc., experience. SALARY: $20,000. Good vacation, medical coverage. Apply to Dennis Brydges, Executive Officer, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Liaison Office for North America, 1001 22nd Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20437.

ASSISTANT RECORDS MANAGER
J. Walter Thompson Company; New York City
Full-time, permanent position in the archives of the world's largest U.S.-based advertising agency. RESPONSIBILITIES: Daily records management operations as counterpart in New York, servicing 1200 employees; storage, retrieval and destruction of non-current records that do not have archival value; revision of retention schedules; development of filing standards; education of employees about records management; and the identification of potential archival materials; advisory service to other offices. QUALIFICATIONS: Records management training and business experience; excellent communication and negotiating skills. Prefer archival or library training. Available June 15. Send letter, resume, and names and phone numbers of references to: Cynthia Swank, J. Walter Thompson Co., 466 Lexington Ave., New York, NY 10017.

ARCHIVIST
Georgia State University; Atlanta, Georgia
Tenure track position with faculty rank and status. Available July. RESPONSIBILITIES: Acquire, arrange, describe, and provide reference service to materials relating to the history of Georgia State University; care for and develop the rare book collection; serve as departmental and library preservation officer including responsibility for operation of conservation laboratory; provide records management services to library and university; acquire, arrange, describe, and provide reference service to materials relating to 20th century Southern historians; plan and execute appropriate outreach activities; direct the work of part-time archival assistants. QUALIFICATIONS: Master's degree (preferred areas: history or ALA-accredited MLS); 2 years full-time archival experience (or an equivalent amount in part-time experience) in an archival institution or library; knowledge of modern archival methods, techniques of historical research and preservation of materials; commitment to public service; good communication skills, and the ability to work well with colleagues and patrons. Participation in professional and research activities important. Prefer experience with university archives, rare books, and preservation of materials. SALARY: $20,000 minimum for 12 months. Applications received by May 8, 1987 will receive first consideration. Send letter, resume, and names, addresses and phone numbers of 3 references to: Mrs. Dianne M. Smith, Assistant to the Librarian, Pullen Library, Georgia State University, 100 Decatur Street, S.E., Atlanta, GA 30303-3081.

ARCHIVIST
Supreme Judicial Court; Boston, Massachusetts
Plans, organizes and participates in the conduct of an archival conservation/preservation program which includes all aspects of archival activity. Works with the Director, other archivists and conservators of the division of Archives and Records Preservation to design and execute archival, conservation and preservation programs applicable to all Massachusetts court records and to the establishment of a judicial archives of historically valuable collections. RESPONSIBILITIES: Participates in planning and makes recommendations for surveys of records of all court departments, for records maintenance and micro-reproduction policies, and for schedules. Recommends priorities, develops and coordinates archival projects, and devises and directs archival processing of specific collections. Prepares reports on programs and maintains files and inventories. Plans for and supervises preparation of materials to be included in the judicial archives. Prepares budget and schedules for specific projects as assigned. Assists researchers. Recruits, trains and supervises archival aids and interns. Participates in educational, outreach and field service programs involving travel throughout the Commonwealth as requires. Other duties as assigned. QUALIFICATIONS: Graduate degree in history, archives or library science, or equivalent experience. Knowledge of archival theory and methods applicable to large document collections. Ability to work independently as well as in collaboration on team projects. Proficiency in written and oral communication. 2-3 years of archival experience with some supervisory experience. Familiarity with records materials, with micrographics, with legal records and court organization preferred. SALARY: (Grade 13) $20,060-$25,531. Send resume and 3 references to: Mary Eleanor Murphy, Acting Director of Archives and Records Preservation, Supreme Judicial Court, 1300 New Court House, Boston, MA 02108.
ARCHIVIST
City of Portland; Oregon
RESPONSIBILITIES: Examination and appraisal of public records for inclusion in the City of Portland's archival collection. Provides guidelines for initial document sorting, develops and maintains archival finding aids, research for City agencies and members of the public. Prioritize processing activities based on perceived research potential, need of accessibility and uniqueness of the record. Successful candidate will have verifiable training and experience in archival systems, especially in the public sector. SALARY: $1,953 monthly starting. Generous benefits package. Application deadline is July 17, 1987. For application materials, write Portland Civil Service, City Hall, Room 170, 1220 SW Fifth Avenue, Portland, OR 97204.

REGISTRAR-ARCHIVIST
Old Westbury Gardens; Old Westbury, New York
RESPONSIBILITIES: To manage collection records and supervise use of photographs, blueprints, letters, and drawings in the archives of a 100-acre Long Island historic house/gardens complex. QUALIFICATIONS: Education background in history or Library Science with specialized training through workshops or apprenticeship; minimum 2 years experience in art or historical museum; experience in cataloging and handling historically sensitive documents; must be methodical and organized as well as computer literate. A familiarity with conservation techniques is desirable but not mandatory. SALARY: $18,000-$20,000 plus attractive benefits package. Position available immediately. Send letter of interest, resume, and references to: Jethro M. Hurt, Executive Director, Old Westbury Gardens, P.O. Box 430, Old Westbury, NY 11568.

ARCHIVIST
University of Michigan; Flint, Michigan
This position is a challenge for a self-motivated individual to develop the collections and general operations of this important unit of the Library, responsible for the Archives and the Center for the Study of Local History. QUALIFICATIONS: MLS with course work in archival administration; experience in public manuscript and archival collections; familiarity with Michigan history; the ability to answer reference questions and assist library patrons; ability to communicate well with patrons, peers, superiors, and subordinates, and the public. SALARY: $18,000. Send resume with names of 3 references by May 30, 1987 to: David Palmer, Library Director, The University of Michigan-Flint, Flint, MI 48502-2186.

CURATOR OF MANUSCRIPTS AND BOOKS
Pilgrim Hall Museum; Plymouth, Massachusetts
RESPONSIBILITIES: Providing access and related research/reference assistance; acquisition, organization, and arrangement of manuscripts collection; creating finding aids and bibliographic tools; conservation planning; development of community outreach program; supervision of volunteers or interns. QUALIFICATIONS: MLS with archival concentration or graduate degree in archival management. Demonstrated knowledge of historical research methods and Massachusetts history. Experience with photographic collections a plus. Familiarity with automated systems preferred. Job is presently 5/8 time with flexible hours; possibility of full-time in future. Contact: Laurence R. Pitzer, Director, Pilgrim Society, 75 Court Street, Plymouth, MA 02360.

PAPER CONSERVATORS
(Two positions, GS-9 and GS-11)
National Archives; Washington, D.C.
The National Archives is seeking two creative paper conservators interested in working with archival materials to enjoy challenging conservation problems and have excellent people skills. Both jobs will be initially based in Washington, D.C., the San Francisco area will be the ultimate location for one of the positions. Salary will start at $22,458 for the GS-9 position; $27,172 for the GS-11, depending on experience. For additional information and application procedures, contact: Personnel Office, National Archives and Records Administration (NNPD), Washington, D.C. 20408; (202) 535-5360.

PROGRAM OFFICER
The Ford Foundation; New York City
Working with the Cairo-based representative and other program staff, the program officer will develop the regional child survival program. The program assists local professionals working on problems of child health, focusing on the socio-economic determinants of health and illness, and helping local medical and other institutions to develop public health or related social science capacity. Together with other staff, the incumbent will be responsible for the program in women's rights and related more generally to contribute to the formation of Foundation strategies in the Middle East and North Africa. If based in Khartoum, the program officer might also serve as assistant representative for coordinating all Foundation activities in Sudan. Position location: Cairo, Egypt, or Khartoum, Sudan. QUALIFICATIONS: Advanced training (preferably Master's) level in public health, medical anthropology or sociology, epidemiology, medical demography, or related fields; previous residence in developing country; field research or project experience in public health; and strong analytical, conceptual, and writing skills. Previous experience in the Middle East or Africa and competence in spoken Arabic preferred. SALARY: $44,000-$50,000. To apply, send resume to: The Ford Foundation, 320 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10171.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR ARCHIVES AND SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
East Tennessee State University; Johnson City
Twelve-month, tenure-track appointment. Faculty rank and status. QUALIFICATIONS: Reports to and assists the Director, University Libraries. Management of the division including selective acquisition and processing of collections consisting of Southern Appalachian manuscript materials, university archives and other restricted-use library resources. Solicits gifts; prepare grant proposals; interpret the division collection and program to the university, scholarly users and the public; participate in interdisciplinary Centers of Excellence program in Appalachian Studies and Service. Supervise 2 FTE faculty, 2 support staff and student assistants. QUALIFICATIONS: ALA-accredited MLS, additional graduate training in Eastern U.S. social sciences, archival training and minimum of 3 years archival experience. Preferred: Ph.D., good interpersonal relations and communication skills; background in Appalachian and Southern Appalachian documents/materials, rare book management, media presentations, preservation and emergency programs, OCLC-AMC format and microcomputer applications. Deadline: May 18, 1987 and continues until position is filled. Send application letter, resume, names, addresses and phone contacts of 3 references to: Personnel Office, East Tennessee State University, P.O. Box 24,070A, Johnson City, TN 37614-0002.

LIBRARIAN II/SPECIALIST II (Archivist)
Special Collections/Rare Books & Manuscripts Division; New York Public Library
RESPONSIBILITIES: Accessioning archival collections; related reference services; acceptance of archival collections; rejection of manuscript collections; development of cooperative technical services in response to personal, written, and telephone requests as assigned; related duties. Some supervision of technical staff. Reports to the Senior Project Archivist of NEH accessioning grant. QUALIFICATIONS: Bachelor's degree. Masters degree in library science, liberal arts or humanities; archival training plus 2 years relevant professional experience including some supervisory experience in archives or manuscript collection; demonstrated knowledge of the Division's subject areas; ability to write clearly and concisely; reading knowledge of at least one modern foreign language, preferably French, German or Spanish. SALARY: $23,631. For consideration, send resume to: Francine Feuerman, The New York Public Library, Human Resources Department, 8 West 40th Street, 2nd Floor, New York, NY 10018.

PROJECT ARCHIVIST
Archivists in Religious Institutions; New York City
Archival "Wonderwoman" or "Superman" needed for an innovative two-year NEH Grant program. If you have mastered all aspects of the archival profession in a single bound and have a more outgoing personality than Clark Kent, we want you! QUALIFICATIONS: RESPONSIBILITIES: Directives Technical Assistance Project which will consist of planning workshops, on-site archival consultations and cooperative programs such as joint purchase of supplies, development of in-service training programs and the development of technical services. QUALIFICATIONS: Master's degree in the humanities or library science and an archival certificate from a recognized archival training program. Three years professional experience including arrangement and description, archival management, conservation, and planning. Strong writing and interpersonal skills required. Consulting experience preferred. SALARY: $28,000 plus standard benefits. Starting date: August 1, 1987. Send letter of application and resume with the names of 3 references by June 1, 1987 to: Thomas Wiltse, Project Co-Director, The Salvation Army Archives and Research Center, 145 West 15th Street, New York, NY 10011.

SECRETARY/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Kansas State Historical Society; Topeka, Kansas
The Kansas State Historical Society is a private non-profit corporation and agency of the state of Kansas, which serves as trustee for the state in a comprehensive history program. Annual operating budget exceeds $5 million; there are 144 state, 10 corporate and a number of contract employees. RESPONSIBILITIES: Overall administration, and supervision under direction of the board of directors and state statutes; financial management; preservation, care, and interpretation of collections of public relations and liaison with media, and the society board; program development; fund raising; managing resources, etc. QUALIFICATIONS: Graduate degree in one or more of the following: American history, library science, anthropology, historic architecture, historic preservation, archives management, or museum sciences plus experience in administration. SALARY: $20,000 plus attractive benefits and experience plus generous state employee benefits. Application period opens April 1 and closes August 1, 1987. Send for application instructions: Search Committee, Kansas State Historical Society, 120 West 10th Street, Topeka, KS 66612.
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ARCHIVES INTERNSHIPS
The Edison National Historic Site; West Orange, New Jersey

Two positions available, each twelve weeks full time or equivalent. Opportunity for intensive experience in arrangement and description. The Edison Archives contain an estimated 3.5 million items documenting the life and works of Thomas Alva Edison. A unit of the National Park Service, the Edison National Historic Site is located in West Orange, NJ, 15 miles from New York City. Internships will be centered around the arrangement of previously unprocessed series, creation of finding aids and of MARC/AMC compatible cataloging data. QUALIFICATIONS: Candidates must be currently enrolled in, or just graduated from, graduate programs in librarianship, history or related disciplines and must have completed at minimum a full semester introductory course in archives. Previous processing experience desirable. Internships are sponsored by the Friends of the Edison National Historic Site. Stipend: $4000 for twelve weeks. Available beginning June 1987. Send letter of application with resume and letter from archive course instructor to: Mary B. Bowling, Archivist, Edison National Historic Site, Main Street and Lakeside Ave., West Orange, NJ 07052.

ARCHIVIST
Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts; Boston

Reports to the Bishop. RESPONSIBILITIES: Administer active records management program; acquire and interpret noncurrent administrative and historical records of central diocesan offices and committees; administer all aspects of collection management; direct research, reference, and outreach services for the Diocesan Library and Archives; manage special library of rare books and reference materials; prepare exhibits and publications; serve as staff liaison with parish historians and other diocesan committees. QUALIFICATIONS: Advanced degree in history and archival administration; at least 3 years experience in archives and records management; strong public speaking and writing skills; ability to work with both professional and clerical staff, committee members, donors and church officials. Knowledge of American church history and of word processing and data base software for archival applications preferred but not essential. SALARY: dependent on qualifications and experience. Health insurance and other benefits. Send letter of application, resume, and 3 references by June 1, 1987 to: Mrs. Patricia C. Nason, Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts, One Joy Street, Boston, MA 02108.

LIBRARIAN I: SPECIAL COLLECTIONS CATALOGER
Southwest Texas State University Library; San Marcos, Texas

RESPONSIBILITIES: Cataloging of all materials in all formats for special collections/archives including Southwestern Writers Collection (50%) and other cataloging duties as assigned (50%). QUALIFICATIONS: ALA-accredited MLS with coursework in special collections librarianship/archival management. Minimum one year professional cataloging experience using LC and OCLC. Comparable para-professional experience will be considered. SALARY: $17,196 minimum. To apply, send letter of application, resume, and names of 3 references by May 15, 1987 to Personnel Office, SWTSU, San Marcos, TX 78666-4615.