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ENGAGING COMMUNITIES: PUBLIC PROGRAMMING IN STATE UNIVERSITIES’ SPECIAL COLLECTIONS AND ARCHIVES

BY KEVIN S. FLEMING AND MORNA GERRARD

ABSTRACT: Since 1978, when Ann Pederson published “Archival Outreach: SAA’s 1976 Survey,” no systematic attempt has been made to document the extent, challenges, and benefits of the archival profession’s outreach activities. To begin to address this gap, archivists at Georgia State University (GSU) surveyed special collections and archives at state universities nationally about their fund-raising, friend-raising, and educational public programming activities. This article describes some of GSU’s public programming activities and compares them with the results of the survey.

Introduction

In her 1978 article, “Archival Outreach: SAA’s 1976 Survey,” Ann Pederson stated that “we must be responsive to the environments in which we find ourselves in regard both to the holdings which we accession and to the research needs we serve. How can we be the mirror of our times if we shut ourselves off from the larger society and its institutions, and how else can we guarantee the continuing existence and appreciation of our programs if we make little or no effort to educate the society we profess to document?” Pederson and SAA’s Committee on the Wider Use of Archives’ survey was an attempt to document archival outreach activities across the United States. Those activities included exhibits, special events, workshops, publications, audiovisual materials, and on-site visits. As well as presenting the results of the survey, Pederson called for archivists to accept change and a new and growing clientele who would prove themselves not to be “mobs, vandals and thieves assaulting our doors.” Since 1978, when the survey results were published, archivists have accepted and even welcomed their expanding and diversifying clientele, and they have been actively involved in outreach. However, although the profession has increasingly accepted the place of outreach in day-to-day archival practice, no systematic attempt has been made to document the extent, challenges, and benefits of those activities.

Archivists at Georgia State University (GSU) Library’s Special Collections and Archives participate in all aspects of archival practice, as they arrange, describe, and make available the materials housed at the university. Some of the archivists, primarily
those in charge of collections, provide outreach to students at GSU by teaching or coteaching bibliographic instruction and methodologies classes. From time to time, the archivists also provide instruction to students from other institutions. Archivists reach out to the broader community via social media as well as attending community events. Public programming events, which are the focus of this article, are the most time-consuming outreach activities undertaken by the GSU archivists and also the most expensive.

In 2010, Georgia State University Library’s administrators voiced concern over the cost of public programming, in terms of both time and resources. In response, the archivist for the Women and Gender Collections created a list of promised and actual donations of manuscript collections, oral histories, and financial support that had resulted from public programming events since 2005. She also sent a short questionnaire to a limited number of women-focused archival institutions asking for information about their public programming activities. Finally, she searched the professional literature for useful practical advice about hosting public programs. This research showed that special events are indeed a catalyst for increasing collections and support. The survey results and correspondence from the survey recipients demonstrated that other institutions are actively involved in programming and are interested in the results of any future survey.

**Literature Review**

A review of archival literature from the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia produced only one survey pertaining to the subject of outreach, Ann E. Pederson’s “Archival Outreach: SAA’s 1976 Survey.” Generally, literature has focused on the developing theory that outreach activities should be an integral part of archival practice and not simply an add-on. For example, Elsie Freivogel has written extensively on the subject of outreach and educational programming. Her scholarship includes “Wider Use of Historical Records, Education Programs: Outreach as an Administrative Function” and “Making Sure They Want It: Managing Successful Public Programs.” Tim Ericson also calls for fully integrating outreach as an ongoing core archival function in his stirring “Preoccupied with Our Own Gardens: Outreach and Archivists,” which came out of the 1990 Annual Conference of the Association of Canadian Archivists.

Other archivists have written case studies about their programming activities. Subjects discussed in case study articles range from the creation of basic collection overview presentations, childhood and undergraduate instruction, centennial celebrations, hosting a presidential debate, and fund-raising events focused on a particular collecting area and donor set. They include Michael F. Cole’s “It Only Happens Once Every Hundred Years: Making the Most of the Centennial Opportunity,” P. J. Rettig’s “Water Tables: A Case Study of a Successful Archival Fund-Raising Event,” and Anne J. Gilliland-Swateland, Yasmin B. Kafai, and William E. Landis’s “Integrating Primary Sources into the Elementary School Classroom: A Case Study of Teachers’ Perspectives.” Most recently, Larry Hackman’s *Many Happy Returns: Advocacy*
Background

Lacking from the literature is any practical “nuts and bolts” advice about programming activities or information about the breadth and scope of outreach programs in academic institutions across the nation. While the case studies describe the content of successful programs, they tend to focus on the importance of meeting the needs of the audience and do not discuss the management behind those public programs: the how, the who, and the how much. How are decision making, event space planning, equipment logistics, and publicity done? Who is involved in pulling an event together, including administrative, creative, development, and planning personnel? How much does it cost to invite and feed guests, and pay for speakers and equipment? And who pays for it? Furthermore, as noted, no comprehensive surveys have been reported since the one undertaken by Pederson in 1976. In response to this lack of available scholarship, GSU’s Women and Gender Collections archivist worked with the Popular Music and Culture Collection archivist to examine programming activities at GSU through a practical lens.

At the same time, they created a national survey to ask the questions that they most wanted answered: what types of public programming events are undertaken, who is involved in organizing them, how much do they cost, and how they are funded? The survey was designed to create a useful tool for comparing efforts at GSU with like institutions around the country. To that end, the survey was sent to special collections and archives within state-supported academic institutions. For the purpose of the survey, public programming included friend-raising, fund-raising, and educational events. At GSU, friend-raising activities are designed to let existing friends and, hopefully, new friends (including students and faculty) know about the activities and collections within Special Collections. Fund-raising activities are designed to raise monies to support existing endowments or to create new endowments, and the primary constituents are existing donors and their friends, peers, or colleagues. Educational programming includes workshops, symposia, and presentations that are more specialized and broadly promoted than regularly held bibliographic instruction classes, and the audience usually comprises students, faculty, interested researchers from GSU and farther afield, and the general public. This article provides case studies for all of these by highlighting the Women and Gender Collections’ annual friend-raising and fund-raising efforts and the Popular Music and Culture Collection’s one-time educational events.

Case Studies: The Women and Gender Collections

Established in 1995, the Women and Gender Collections at the GSU Library comprises three general collecting areas. The Donna Novak Coles Georgia Women’s Movement Archives documents the second wave of the women’s movement in Georgia, with
particular emphasis on the state’s efforts to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. The Lucy H. Draper Research Collection documents national second wave feminism and efforts to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. The Archives for Research on Women and Gender documents women and LGBTQ-centered activism, as well as women’s activities at Georgia State University.

Friend-Raising: The Georgia Women’s Movement Project Spring Event

In 1998, an annual Spring Event was established, originally named for the founding director of the Women’s Studies Department, who retired that year. The events, which generally take place in April or early May, highlight the Women and Gender Collections, and the themes of the events reflect newly acquired or opened collections or important women-centered anniversaries. A university videographer records each event, and the recording is placed in the Women and Gender Collections.10

The Spring Event and an accompanying exhibit are paid for using the endowment fund. The exhibits remain in place for a full year. Initially, the Women and Gender Collections archivist curated the exhibits, but gradually, other staff members have become involved, and for the first time, in 2012, two graduate assistants were given free rein to create the exhibit.

Attendance at the Spring Event varies widely, from 40 to 120. Based on feedback from invitees, the date, time, and theme of the events appear to affect attendance. Each year, the aim is to continue to attract long-term attendees, while also trying to bring new constituents into the fold. Providing variety in the themes of the events helps to do that.11

Friend-Raising: The Georgia LGBTQ Archives Project Outreach Events

Established in 2011, the Georgia LGBTQ Archives Project brings together archivists, librarians, and activists from around the metro Atlanta area to raise awareness of the importance of saving personal history, to celebrate the role of LGBTQ citizens in Georgia, to link donors to collecting institutions, and to promote the appreciation of LGBTQ history. Participating institutions include the Atlanta History Center, Auburn Avenue Research Library, Emory University, the Fulton County Public Library, Georgia State University, and Kennesaw State University. GSU plays a central role in the project. The project is currently in the process of establishing itself as a 501(c) (3) nonprofit organization. A Facebook page12 serves as the project’s “web page,” members print basic promotional materials, and the local LGBTQ community’s Rush Center donates the space for the project’s monthly meetings. Public programming is irregular and ongoing.

The Georgia LGBTQ Archives Project’s first public programming event took place in late spring of 2012 and was called “Out of Our Closets and Into the Archives.” At this event, archivists from all of the local institutions talked to a packed hall about the importance of saving records, about their own collections, and about the donation process. A current GSU donor also talked about his experience. At the end of the presentations, attendees were given the opportunity to meet with the archivists. Within a week, GSU was in possession of two new collections and one new volunteer. In 2013, archivists from GSU were invited to attend a monthly meeting of SAGE, a local group
that serves older LGBTQ community members. At the meeting, the archivists talked about the importance of estate planning, and the effort resulted in a new collection. In March of 2014, another community organization, Prime Timers, allowed members of the project to present at one of their monthly meetings. At the most heavily attended session in the Prime Timers’ history, archivists talked about donating papers and conducting oral histories, a researcher talked about his work with LGBTQ collections, and a donor recounted his experiences with Emory University. Shortly after the event, GSU’s archivists received e-mails or phone calls from four potential new donors, and within two weeks, the archivists had met with all of them, conducted an oral history with one, and planned oral histories with all the others.

The project, working without a budget, has made great strides in the two-and-a-half years since it was established. Each institution has added to its LGBTQ collections, and the community has embraced the work of the project and is promoting it widely. The community also has embraced its own history and is passionate about saving that history.

Fund-Raising: Shero of the Year Event

At the 2006 Spring Event, the Women and Gender Collections began to honor a “Shero of the Year.” The “Shero” is a person who had impacted the collections in a meaningful way, and she would be asked to encourage attendees to donate to the collections’ endowments.

After the third year of combining a friend-raising program with the honoring of a Shero of the Year, the Spring Event had become long and unwieldy. Since 2009, at the urging of some donor-advisors, two events are held annually: the traditional Spring Event continues to take place in April or May, and a Shero of the Year fund-raiser has been held at locations outside the library in the fall. The fund-raiser is clearly advertised as that, and attendees are asked to make a monetary donation. A small advisory committee comprised of dedicated long-term supporters and the wife of the university president provides planning assistance for the fund-raiser.

Each year, the Shero of the Year is announced via a save-the-date e-mail. The e-mail includes a link to a blog page that serves as the official online announcement. A host committee is then established, and hosts commit to a $250, $500, or $1,000 donation. In 2012, a fourth, $1,500 level was added. A “giving” web page is created so that attendees and hosts can make pledges online, and remittance envelopes are included with the invitations for those donors who prefer to pay by check. All of the Women and Gender Collections’ endowments are listed, so that donors can support the endowments that most appeal to them. To help donors understand why the collections require financial support, a table is set aside at the event to illustrate the cost of managing archival collections. Attached to one cubic foot of manuscript boxes and a CD-R audio interview with a transcript, are mounted signs that show the cost of processing manuscript collections and oral histories. Every year, the amount of money raised by the event has increased: 2009, $12,000; 2012, close to $22,000; 2013, $36,000. The number of attendees has ranged from 70 to 120. Based on invitee feedback, it is clear that date and time affect numbers, as does the identity of the honoree. Since the event
takes place in the fall, political activity can influence numbers: local politicians are most likely to attend if the event is close to an election.

Case Studies: The Popular Music and Culture Collection

The Popular Music and Culture Collection within the GSU Special Collections and Archives houses the papers of songwriter Johnny Mercer, and 2009 marked the hundredth anniversary of his birth. The Johnny Mercer Collections have a significant endowment from the Johnny Mercer Foundation, and a memorandum of understanding outlines various types of activities intended to promote the collection, music, and life of Johnny Mercer.

As part of the centennial celebration, the Popular Music and Culture archivist planned several educational events throughout the year, including a film festival, a four-part tribute radio show, and a two-day academic symposium that included a documentary film screening and concert performance.

Educational: Johnny Mercer Film Festival

A film festival was held with the goal of exposing students to the work of Johnny Mercer and the collections on campus. Four films for which Mercer had written music were selected for screening over a multiday period. The campus movie theater rented several films from the 1930s to the 1970s at no cost. Additionally, three university professors agreed to speak before each of the films. Unfortunately, the screenings were not well attended.

Educational: Johnny Mercer Tribute Radio Programs

The GSU student-operated campus radio station, WRAS, has a free-form program on Sunday afternoons open to any student wishing to present a program or set that is not part of the station’s regular rotation. The Popular Music and Culture archivist approached the station manager about doing several Johnny Mercer tribute programs over a period of four Sundays. While the station is not generally involved with faculty or programs directly related to collections or course work, the staff was open to increased faculty involvement. The archivist created four two-hour programs, selecting music from the collection that highlighted four major aspects of Johnny Mercer’s career—music for theater, music for film, performance as a vocalist, and host of his own radio shows. A student with an interest in Mercer-era music who worked at the station was involved with the program and broadcast.

A few weeks prior to their broadcast, radio advertisements promoted the programs. A scripted voice track was prerecorded, and music selections were added to the programs. While time consuming, the programs were created in this fashion to assure the accuracy of the historical content and the professionalism of the presentations. These prerecorded programs could be reused in the future by making minor edits.

Educational: “Popular Music in the Mercer Era” Symposium

The largest event during this centennial year was a two-day academic symposium titled “Popular Music in the Mercer Era, 1940–1970.” In addition to the symposium, a premiere screening of the Johnny Mercer: The Dream’s On Me documentary film
and a concert featuring the music of Johnny Mercer by Joe Gransden, Liz Wright, and the Georgia State University Jazz Band were held in the evenings. The events were open to the general public and free to symposium registrants, while the concert was ticketed for attendees who did not register for the symposium. The event was held on a Friday and Saturday to accommodate students and faculty, as well as the general public. The budget allowed for the symposium to be catered. The registration for the symposium filled up several days prior to the event and the Friday sessions were well attended, while the Saturday sessions, especially the afternoon sessions, were not as well attended. The sessions were recorded and made available online in the GSU institutional repository after the completion of the symposium. A screening of the \emph{Johnny Mercer: The Dream’s On Me} documentary film was hosted on Friday evening. Unfortunately, a week before the screening, the film had been shown on the television network Turner Classic Movies, which may have affected the screening’s attendance.

Prior to the concert on Saturday evening, a reception was held for symposium attendees and invited donors, guests, and the university Emerita Association. The concert performance was almost completely sold out.

**Public Programming Survey**

The survey, while related to outreach activities in general, consisted of questions pertaining directly to conducting public programming events. The survey results from all of the sections covering the three types of public programming events—friend-raising, fund-raising, and educational—are consolidated in this analysis.

**Methodology**

The goal was to gather information about public programming activities at state-funded universities similar to Georgia State University. To do this, the archivists used Wikipedia’s “List of State Universities in the United States” to identify all of the special collections and archives to be surveyed. The archivists developed a set of 23 questions (see appendix) pertaining to public programming events within special collections and archives. Those questions were repeated in three different sections based on the type of public programming event: fund-raising, friend-raising, or educational. This division also allowed the survey taker to skip a section if it did not apply to his or her institution. Using Zoomerang as the online survey tool, the questionnaire was sent to 446 institutions early in June 2012, followed with a reminder in mid-June of the June 30 deadline. For the following discussion, the authors collated and analyzed the survey data and reported them along with their own public programming events experiences.

**Results**

The survey resulted in a 25 percent response rate. Eighty-four percent of the respondents were from special collections and archives. Eight percent were from special collections only, and 8 percent were from archives only.

The results for friend-raising and fund-raising appear to be skewed, as some institutions view the activities as one and the same. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents
reported that they conduct fund-raising events. Only 22 percent of the respondents conduct any type of friend-raising events. This discrepancy may be attributable to the professional backgrounds and/or philosophies of the staff who are involved with these events. At GSU, for example, while archivists see clear distinctions, the university’s development officers do not distinguish between them. Seventy percent of the respondents conduct educational events.\textsuperscript{15} This is not surprising, considering that the institutions surveyed are academic.

The frequencies of events in each category were similar, ranging between one and four events per year that are a combination of annual and one-time occasions. One institution reported hosting 10 fund-raising events each year, and one reported 15 to 20 events. It may be assumed that larger institutions are able to host more events, whereas smaller institutions with less staff host fewer events. The majority who hosted fund-raising events had both annual and unique one-time events.

At GSU, experience shows that the theme is extremely important because it establishes the foundation for the event. Archivists must ensure that materials in the collection are adequate and appropriate to support the scope of the activities and that the subject matter is attractive to a broad audience. Additionally, for educational programming, they must examine the current field of scholarship to determine if scholars are available to participate in the event. For example, in the initial planning for the “Popular Music in the Mercer Era, 1940–1970” symposium, recent scholarship was surveyed, and it was deemed unrealistic to have a full two-day symposium focused solely on Johnny Mercer, so the scope was expanded to include all popular music during his era. Based on this defined scope, appropriate scholars were solicited to be guest speakers and a call for papers was posted to numerous Listservs.\textsuperscript{16}

The survey showed that themes for all types of events are closely related to the collections and institutions they support. This is certainly true at GSU, as seen with the Spring Events described previously. Among survey respondents, themes or topics for fund-raising events include a focus on a particular collection, preservation how-to workshops, anniversaries, or events related to alumni. Themes or topics for the friend-raising events are all related to established collections or recent acquisitions, and activities include lectures, exhibits, and celebrations of milestones or anniversaries. Themes or topics for the educational events are usually related to a particular collection or exhibit, or are dictated by a university department and its curriculum. The events include research methods and bibliographic instruction,\textsuperscript{17} tours, presentations by donors or patrons, author series events with a focus on a recently published work by a faculty member, how-to events related to genealogy research or preservation techniques, and events at which retirees identify artifacts and photographs.

The target audience is closely tied to the theme that has been selected. Respondents reported that students and faculty are present at all types of programs to some extent, and donors and the general public are much more likely to attend fund-raising or friend-raising events than educational programs. The target audiences for fund-raising events are primarily donors and the general public, but in over half of the instances, faculty and students are also included. At GSU, the audience for the Shero of the Year Event includes all of the individuals on the Women and Gender Collections general mailing list, but it expands each year to include the contacts of the Sheroes and/or their
friends. As a result, the pool of potential attendees increases each year, as the mailing list expands. Respondents’ target audiences for friend-raising events are similar to fund-raising events, but with an increased emphasis on students and faculty. The target audiences for educational events are primarily faculty, students, and the general public, with less of a focus on donors.

Respondents reported that, while the methods for advertising are similar for all types of programs, the degree to which on-campus publicity is disseminated is greater for friend-raising and greatest for educational events. To publicize the fund-raising events, institutions incorporate a variety of traditional methods, including departmental newsletters, mailings, formal invitations, as well as promoting through campus media outlets and local newspapers and radio stations, and utilizing more modern methods such as websites, Listservs, and social media. They utilize the same publicity methods and outlets for fund-raising as they do for friend-raising events, although friend-raising events appear to elicit more communication across campuses. Methods and outlets for publicizing educational events include traditional print and electronic media such as student newspapers, publications, newsletters, and flyers (campus media outlets); websites, e-mail, Listservs; and social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, and blogs.

Respondents reported that the number of attendees varies greatly, with 15 being the lowest and 300 to 400 the highest. The average is between 20 and 50. Through experience, the archivists at GSU know that the theme greatly affects the number of attendees: the more relevant the theme is to the lives of the invitees, the more likely they are to make the effort to attend. For example, the Popular Music and Culture archivist recently hosted an event celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the Georgia Old-Time Fiddlers Conventions which was well attended because the regional emphasis and subject matter reflected an important part of the cultural heritage of the audience members. They could relate directly to the subject matter either because their ancestors participated in the original fiddlers conventions or because they play fiddle themselves. Likewise, the 2013 Women and Gender Collections’ Spring Event focused on Doe v. Bolton, the often-forgotten Georgia sister case to Roe v. Wade. The audience, many of whom have long bemoaned the neglect of their state’s landmark case, was the largest in the history of the event.

Of course, other factors can contribute to attendance. For example, the Johnny Mercer film festival was poorly attended across the board. Despite banners on the GSU Library’s homepage, announcements on History and Communication Department Listservs, promotional flyers placed throughout campus, and the GSU movie theater’s own marketing methods and outlets, some screenings had no attendees. In hindsight, two important factors played a role in the poor attendance: the content did not appeal to students and the time and location were not conducive to student attendance.

While the theme of an event heavily influences the interest of attendees, the location has practical implications for planning and attendance. If a venue is difficult to find, get to, or access, numbers will be seriously affected. GSU, for example, is scattered around downtown Atlanta, its library buildings are not accessible from the street level, and once in the library, visitors have to deal with strict security. Solutions to these problems can be as simple as providing attendees with detailed directions to campus and clear signage once on campus. Alternatively, archivists can seek out nontraditional
locations for events. For the “Popular Music in the Mercer Era, 1940–1970” symposium, a major obstacle was locating a proper on-campus venue. Since the screening of the documentary film and the concert were to be held at the Rialto Center for the Arts on the GSU campus, it seemed reasonable to have the symposium in the same venue. The main drawback was that the eight-hundred-seat auditorium was more than appropriate for the screening and concert, but too large for the symposium. Without a traditional meeting space in the venue, the lobby of the Rialto Center for the Arts was utilized for this purpose. While not ideal, this arrangement allowed the entire event to be held in one location, alleviating the need to transport attendees between the daytime presentations and the evening film screening and concert.

The survey shows that while the location of fund-raising events varies, three-quarters of friend-raising and educational events take place within the library, with the remaining quarter outside the library, either on or off campus. The locations of fund-raising events are evenly spread out among the library, special collections and archives, other facilities on campus, or off campus entirely. Seventy-three percent of the respondents indicated that they hold friend-raising events in the library. The remaining events are held elsewhere on campus or off campus. The vast majority of the educational events are held in special collections and archives or the library, while 27 percent indicated that they hold events at another facility on campus, and 18 percent are off campus entirely.

The overwhelming majority of respondents reported that events of all types last approximately two hours, although a few educational programs last a full day. The timing of events varies widely, though the trend is for weekdays or evenings during the spring and fall semesters. For fund-raising events, the season, day of the week, and hour vary. The majority of respondents reported hosting events in the spring and fall. While some events are held on weekends—both Saturday and Sunday—weekdays are more common. Some reported afternoon events, but evenings are most popular, in particular midweek evenings. The majority of friend-raising events are held during the spring or fall semesters on midweek afternoons or evenings. Some are also held on Friday afternoons or evenings, or Saturday evenings. Not surprisingly, scheduling of educational events varies greatly. However, the vast majority are held during the semester sessions on weekdays—particularly midweek. Some events are held on Saturdays. While some respondents reported day-long events, most reported that their events are limited to two hours. The Georgia LGBTQ Archives Project has successfully timed its events to coincide with prearranged and monthly meetings. An audience and the size of that audience are guaranteed, and the location and time are already ascertained.

Respondents reported that the majority of fund-raising events are catered and that alcohol is provided. Almost half (43 percent) of the friend-raising events are catered and half (47 percent) include alcohol. Catering for educational events varies widely. Forty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that none of the educational events are catered; 42 percent indicated that some are; and only 6 percent indicated that all the events are catered. Not surprisingly, 76 percent of the respondents do not serve alcohol at the events, but conversely 24 percent actually do.

Administrators are always concerned with the cost of events, and without their willingness to loosen purse strings to allow archivists to play host, events cannot
happen. Among the ways respondents mentioned to keep costs down are seeking out cosponsorships across campus or in the local heritage or business community or asking for discounts from caterers who support a collection. At GSU, one of the Women and Gender Collections’ donors arranged for discounted alcohol for fund-raising events, and at LGBTQ Archives Project events, food is provided potluck style by the members of the host organizations. According to the survey, the cost of fund-raising events is significantly higher than the costs of friend-raising and educational events. Catering is the greatest cost for fund-raising events. This is also the case with friend-raising events, but the expenses are considerably less. While a few institutions reported that they spend more than $2,000 on events, the average is between $500 and $1,000 per event. In GSU’s experience, the cost of the event does not always reflect the success of the event: the LGBTQ Archives Project events have no direct costs, but have resulted in increased collections, greater support, and new visibility for the archival institutions around the state. The majority of educational events do not have any direct costs associated with them. When costs are associated with an event, they are related to catering and/or publicity and range from $50 to $300.

Though many respondents indicated that donor endowments or development funds pay expenses for fund-raising events, some reported that library funds or sponsorships from corporations and businesses pay directly for events. Attendance fees and grants were also listed as sources of funding. Expenses for both friend-raising and educational events are paid for from donor endowments or directly from library funds. Using state funds to pay for alcohol is often prohibited.

With a few exceptions among respondents, for fund-raising activities, the university, donors, or memorandums of understanding do not dictate events. While friend-raising events are not either, GSU’s Spring Event bucks this trend. Only in a few instances do donors or memorandums of understanding dictate the content of educational events.

Approximately half of the respondents indicated that neither fund-raising nor friend-raising events are cosponsored. Conversely, educational events are more likely to be cosponsored with another department or institution. Forty-two percent of the respondents indicated that none of their fund-raising events are cosponsored, while 54 percent indicated that only a portion of their fund-raising events is cosponsored. Respondents also indicated that if an event is cosponsored, it is in conjunction with another university department, local historical society, or humanities council, and only in some instances with the development office/foundation. Other cosponsors include local and regional libraries, and policy centers. Sixty percent of respondents indicated that their friend-raising events are not cosponsored, while 40 percent indicated that some of the events are cosponsored by other departments within the university or local historical societies and libraries. Other sources of funding include grants and library friends groups. Thirty-two percent of respondents indicated that their educational events are not cosponsored, while 62 percent indicated that other departments within the university, alumni, university administration, or local historical societies and libraries cosponsor some of their events. Collaboration in other ways can also be successful. For the reception prior to the Johnny Mercer Centennial Concert, the university’s School of Hospitality Administration allowed a group of students working on a class project to assist with planning and implementation, including the catering
budget, food and drink selection, and decorations. This was a mutually beneficial way to work with an outside department.

Less than half of the institutions have department-wide outreach plans. In the fund-raising category, 42 percent reported having a department-wide outreach plan. In the friend-raising category, 43 percent of the institutions have a department-wide outreach plan. In the educational category, only 33 percent of the institutions have a department-wide outreach plan.

Among the respondents, the director of development or the head of the special collections usually undertakes the planning of fund-raising events. For friend-raising and educational events, the planning is the responsibility of the archivist. In most cases, the director of development or the head of special collections and archives is responsible for planning and coordinating fund-raising events. To a lesser degree, respondents indicated that the duties fall to a sole curator or archivist. Some institutions have an outreach/marketing coordinator or a committee dedicated to these types of events. Unlike fund-raising events, the planning and coordinating responsibilities for friend-raising events overwhelmingly fall to the curator or archivist. Some institutions have an outreach/marketing coordinator or a committee dedicated to these types of events. The planning and coordination of educational events falls to the archivist or head of special collections. At GSU, the majority of the activities related to the Johnny Mercer Centennial events were implemented solely by the Popular Music and Culture archivist. In hindsight, the events would have benefited from a formal planning and outreach committee. Because events such as these benefit not only special collections and archives, but the university as a whole in terms of positive attention and general awareness, an outreach committee that includes archivists, members of the library administration, and personnel from other related departments on campus (public relations, facilities, etc.) helps to create a more cohesive event.

Overall, institutions provide assistance for fund-raising events, but little assistance is provided for friend-raising and educational events beyond the regular staff of the special collections and archives departments. Almost all institutions have staff to assist with the planning and implementation of fund-raising events. This additional staffing usually comes from the university development office or library administration. Only two of the respondents indicated that they are provided with staff to assist with the planning and implementing of friend-raising events. Twenty-one respondents reported that they do not receive institutional assistance for educational events and that only special collections and archives staff participate in their planning and implementation. Twenty-seven respondents reported that they do receive assistance. However, in many instances, that assistance actually comes from within the department (department secretary/archives assistant/student assistants). Some listed other library staff, and a few listed development staff and alumni.19

Reflecting past experiences at GSU, survey results show that the scale, nature, and complexity of events dictate the time required to plan. The results ranged from a few weeks for small educational events to a year for large events like a symposium. Depending on the size and scope of the fund-raising event, the planning period ranges from one to six months with the majority being the latter. On average, the planning period for friend-raising events is two to three months, considerably less than for fund-raising
events. On average, the planning period for educational events ranges from a few weeks up to six months, while some take up to a year to plan.

Respondents measure the success of events by attendance, income generated, and donation of or increased use of collections. Not surprisingly, respondents judged nearly all of the fund-raising events as successful or effective based on their attendance and income generated. Some institutions measure success by the amount of press coverage the event receives. Additionally, a fair portion of the respondents seek out external and internal feedback after the completion of events, either via surveys or debrief meetings. Friend-raising events are deemed successful or effective based on attendance; donation of materials, either by attendees or donor referrals; and increased use of collections. Educational events are deemed successful or effective based on attendance and information gathered from attendee feedback through surveys or evaluations. That being said, some forms of outreach are very difficult to evaluate. For instance, the success of the Johnny Mercer radio tribute programs that aired on the campus radio station WRAS was nearly impossible to evaluate. However, several inquisitive call-ins were made during the show, and the programs received positive feedback from the station manager. The standard programming on WRAS is predominantly indie rock music, so the demographic of the listening audience is not typical for the music of Johnny Mercer. The archivist was well aware of this fact beforehand, but one of the goals of the program was to bring awareness of Johnny Mercer and the archival collections to an audience that might otherwise not know about the songwriter, his music, and the collection housed at GSU. Although the program mentioned several times that the content was being presented by the Popular Music and Culture Collection, neither inquiries nor visitors to Special Collections and Archives noticeably increased shortly after these broadcasts.

Archivists at GSU recognize that assessment of events has not been done well or thoroughly for many years. The archivists measure success simply by number of attendees and/or postevent feedback. The creation of an outreach plan with specific instructions, tools for assessment, and the requirement of mandatory debrief meetings would go a long way to enable archivists to honestly measure success and find ways to modify the procedures and planning for future events. It is a goal of the department to create such a tool.

Among the respondents, all three types of events face similar challenges, including scheduling, lack of time and staff, and budget constraints. The reported challenges related to planning and implementing fund-raising events include scheduling and coordination with other departments and offices, lack of time and staff, as well as budget constraints and lack of effective publicity to generate an appropriate audience. Friend-raising events face similar challenges. Educational events are especially challenged by the lack of staff time and funding. At GSU, selecting a date and time for the Women and Gender Collections events has been a consistent challenge. To streamline the planning procedure, the archivist focuses on the most important participants for each event: the library or host(s), presenters, and anyone being honored. Religious holidays and other local women’s events are also considered. Of course, at times the only date available is problematic. For example, in the Women’s Collections’ fifteenth anniversary year, 2010, two Sheroes were honored. The only date and time
that worked for the honorees coincided with the Atlanta Gay Pride Parade. Since the
Shero event took place in Midtown and the parade route ran through Midtown, traffic
was a significant consideration.

Despite the challenges involved in hosting fund-raising events, many respondents
reported benefits too, including increased awareness of the department/collections,
increased funding and support, donation of new collections, and the creation and
strengthening of partnerships with other departments or organizations. The reported
benefits of friend-raising events include increased awareness and advocacy for the
department or collections, improved donor relations, and the development of new or the
expansion of existing collections. The benefits of educational events reported include
increased awareness and advocacy for the department, collection acquisitions, and
the creation of new connections and collaborations. These benefits certainly reflect
the experiences of archivists at GSU. An additional benefit, not widely reported in
the survey and perhaps not of immediate use to institutions, is that communities are
strengthened through a shared understanding of their history, a new awareness of its
importance, and a greater appreciation of the efforts of those community members
who belong to different generations. This is certainly apparent at GSU’s Spring Events,
where second, third, and fourth wave feminists come together to learn about the past
and how that past influences their lives today.

A question about successful and creative programs rounded out the survey, and the
responses were quite varied. The majority of responses were in relation to educational
events, and respondents reported that anniversaries and events with a regional emphasis
were better attended. Successful and creative fund-raising and friend-raising events fall
into three categories: performances, including folk singing, a dinner theater produc-
tion, and a performance at the local opera that coincided with the presentation of music
databases; exhibitions, including cut-outs of entertainers, highlighting courtship and
marriage with a dinner hosted by the university president and his wife, and a photo-
graphic exhibit projected in 3-D; and community events such as donor recognition and
show-and-tell presentations by archivists. More successful and creative educational
events were reported than fund-raising and friend-raising events combined. However,
when broken down, many of the events listed could be more accurately described as
a combination of educational and friend-raising. Among the successes listed were
events directed toward students and faculty, which include campus author events,
student/parent events, and a creative arts festival. Other events listed were designed
for broader communities and include an archives film series, exhibits, anniversary
events, genealogy events, how-to workshops, and events at which community members
help archivists identify images within their collections. Among the more interesting
responses was a “Zine Night” at which attendees learned about ‘zines and created their
own. It was so well received—especially among undergraduates—that the institution
is planning a similar event about pop-up books. Other successes include a symposium
on aviation’s response to the 9/11 attacks that attracted almost five hundred people and
was covered by C-Span, and a display about Argentina’s public education system that
received so much interest that a continuing education course now travels to Argentina
to explore the history of education and international education. Finally, one institution
reported that it participates in many local festivals and is in fact a member of two local chambers of commerce.

**Conclusion**

Pederson’s survey was sent to four hundred archival institutions nationwide. This 2012 survey was sent to more than four hundred state-supported academic institutions that represent only part of a much-expanded archival presence in the United States. The number of institutions surveyed and the response rate in the GSU survey are similar to Pederson’s survey. Also similar is the fact that respondents are “spotty” in documenting budgets and vary in the way they define their programs. However, things have changed. Archives is no longer a profession that provides outreach services only to scholars and other archivists. Today, public programming is designed for students and the community too. As public universities include community interaction in their missions, it is not surprising to see that their archival units are providing such interactions. Pederson described outreach in the mid-1970s as being comprised primarily of “informal, one-time campaigns.” This has changed over time. It is clear from the 2012 survey that not only has the frequency of events increased, but also that a growing number of institutions create outreach plans and provide some support for such endeavors.

Research on this article began with questions about the methods and reasons special collections and archives host events. The results show that the experiences of the authors are rather normal, if not necessarily ideal. They believe that, as archivists in an academic institution, educational programming should take priority. However, friend-raising and fund-raising are also necessary for the survival and growth of special collections and archives. They hope that this article will initiate important conversations; encourage department heads to create responsible and realistic outreach plans that take into account staff, space, and time constraints; and serve as proof to skeptical administrators that outreach in general, and public programming in particular, are indeed normal activities that should be supported. Ideally, archival education will include classes on outreach and donor relations. Conversations with colleagues reveal that many archivists come to the profession with little knowledge of or desire to attempt outreach. Educating budding professionals about this work can only benefit archivists and the archives they serve. The authors also hope that archivists outside of state academic institutions will conduct surveys similar to this one so that, over time, it will be possible to fully understand the evolution of outreach in American institutions.
Appendix

This survey consisted of three identical sections, each pertaining to a different category of events: Fund-raising, Friend-raising, and Educational. For illustration purposes, only the Fund-raising section is included here.

Special Collections and Archives Outreach Survey

The following survey is intended to gather data for a research study designed to document outreach activities in state academic institutions across the United States. After the results have been collated and interpreted, they will be published and shared with survey participants. The completion of the survey is voluntary. This survey includes three categories of events that a special collections and/or archives might participate in: Fund-raising, Friend-raising, and Educational. Answer questions in each section, and you may skip a category if it does not apply. Institutional information will not be shared, but the results of the survey will be made available.

**Question 1—Choice—One Answer**
Are you a Special Collections or Archives or Both?
- Special Collections
- Archives
- Both

**Question 2—Choice—One Answer [Mandatory]**
Does your department do Fund-raising Events?
- Yes [Skip to 3]
- No [Skip to 4]

**Question 3—Open Ended—Comments Box**
Approximately how many events do you have each year?

**Question 4—Choice—One Answer**
Are they annual or one-time events?
- Annual
- One-Time
- Both

**Question 5—Open Ended—Comments Box**
Is there a topic or theme for your events? Please explain.

**Question 6—Choice—Multiple Answers**
Who is your target audience? (select all that apply)
- Faculty
- Students
Donors
General Public
Other, please specify

**Question 7—Open Ended—Comments Box**
What outlets are used for publicity?

**Question 8—Open Ended—Comments Box**
What is the average attendance per event?

**Question 9—Choice—Multiple Answers**
Where are the events held? (select all that apply)
- Library
- Special Collections
- Archives
- Other facility on campus
- Off campus

**Question 10—Open Ended—Comments Box**
What time of the year, day of the week, and time of day are they usually held?

**Question 11—Choice—Multiple Answers**
How long are the events? (select all that apply)
- Couple of hours
- One-day
- Multi-day

**Question 12—Choice—One Answer**
Are they catered?
- Yes, all are catered.
- Yes, some are catered.
- No

**Question 13—Choice—One Answer**
Do you serve alcohol?
- Yes, at all events
- Yes, at some events
- No

**Question 14—Open Ended—Comments Box**
What are the costs associated with the events?

**Question 15—Open Ended—Comments Box**
How are the events paid for?
Question 16—Open Ended—Comments Box
Are the events dictated by the university, donors or memorandums of understanding?

Question 17—Choice—One Answer
Are the events co-sponsored?
- Yes, all are co-sponsored.
- Yes, some are co-sponsored.
- No

Question 18—Open Ended—Comments Box
For the co-sponsored events, who are your co-sponsors?

Question 19—Choice—One Answer
Does your institution have a department-wide outreach plan?
- Yes
- No

Question 20—Open Ended—Comments Box
Who is in charge of the planning and coordination?

Question 21—Open Ended—Comments Box
Does your institution provide staff support to plan and carry-out the events? Please explain.

Question 22—Open Ended—Comments Box
How long is your typical planning period?

Question 23—Open Ended—Comments Box
How do you measure the effectiveness of the events?

Question 24—Open Ended—Comments Box
Describe some of your challenges with planning and carrying-out events.

Question 25—Open Ended—Comments Box
Please describe the benefits of hosting your events?

Question 26—Open Ended—Comments Box
Please describe any events that were successful or unusually creative.
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NOTES
2. Ibid.
3. The Women and Gender Collections archivist regularly provides instruction to students from Agnes Scott College and from further afield. In 2012, a group of feminists from Duke University visited the Women and Gender Collections as part of their “Archives Dive.”
4. Publications examined include American Archivist, the journal of the Society of American Archivists; Provenance, the journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists; Archival Issues, the journal of the Midwest Archives Conference; Archivaria, the journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists; Journal of the Society of Archivists (UK); and Archives and Manuscripts, the journal of the Australian Society of Archivists.


11. In 2010, for the 15th anniversary of the Georgia Women’s Movement Project, the event focused on bringing together long-term donors. The library hosted a Sunday afternoon high tea and celebrated the efforts of the Women’s Collections’ founding mothers. One donor paid for three commemorative hanging panels, and the library paid for a large plexiglass plaque that listed everyone who had made a donation since 1995. The event was very successful: not only did more people want to attend than could be accommodated, but it was the first time since the 1980s (and possibly the last time) that such a large group of Georgia’s second wave feminist stalwarts and friends gathered in a room together. The year 2011 was the 40th anniversary of Georgia State University’s Southern Labor Archives. To highlight this, archivists for the Women’s Collections and the Southern Labor Archives collaborated to curate the exhibit We Can Do It: Empowering Women at Work, which included materials from both collections. They also hosted an event that drew attendees from both the feminist and labor communities. Leading up to 2012, a number of collections documenting domestic violence in Georgia were processed, and an exhibit and event, both named Taking Back Our Lives, highlighted those collections. Speakers discussed their experiences establishing Georgia’s earliest battered women’s shelters, and the audience included a large number of domestic violence activists and representatives of organizations. The year 2013 marked the 40th anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision Roe v. Wade. An exhibit, Governing Choices: The Legal History of Reproductive Rights, was curated, and the Spring Event brought together two individuals involved in Roe’s sister case, Doe v. Bolton. This event, the most heavily attended to date, attracted a large number of GSU students.


13. From 2009 to 2011, the event was held in the centrally located home of State Legislator Kathy Ashe. The 2012 event honored Ashe, so the location of the event was moved to a centrally located local golf club with abundant parking. The 2013 event will be held in a newly renovated building that houses the GSU president’s office.


15. There appears to be some overlap of educational and friend-raising events.

16. Listervs included the Music Library Association, the Association of Recorded Sound Collections, the American Musicological Society, the Society for Ethnomusicology, the Society for American Music, H-South, H-Southern Music, Popular/American Culture, the International Association for the Study of Popular Music, and Ex Libris.

17. While archivists at GSU do consider hosting bibliographic instruction and research methods classes an important part of their ongoing outreach activities, they do not normally categorize them as public programming. Clearly, this illustrates that perceptions of what constitutes educational programming vary. If the survey were to be sent again, Gerrard and Fleming would provide a fuller definition of the categories being surveyed.

18. The results in this section may be flawed, as many respondents did not appear to understand the question. Some reported what they spent money on rather than giving a dollar amount.

19. It is clear from the responses to this question and to the question about successful and creative events that there was some confusion: some respondents appear to consider educational events to be what the authors would call friend-raising or even fund-raising events. Furthermore, responses indicate that there was confusion about what form the “institutional” assistance could take. If this survey were to be resubmitted, the authors would define what kinds of activities each kind of outreach event would entail, as well as defining institutional assistance.

FILLING IN THE GAPS: USING OUTREACH EFFORTS TO ACQUIRE DOCUMENTATION ON THE BLACK CAMPUS MOVEMENT, 1965–1972

BY LAE’L HUGHES-WATKINS

**ABSTRACT:** From 1965 to 1972, the United States was in the grip of a new wave of black student activism through protests and demonstrations at college and university campuses from coast to coast. Academic institutions were deluged with demands for increasing black faculty hires, developing black studies programs/departments, and increasing the number of black student admissions. Kent State University was one of the thousands of colleges and universities challenged to address the demands of a demographic who felt their civil rights were under siege within the walls of academic establishments. This article describes the attempts by the Department of Special Collections and Archives to acquire and strengthen materials documenting the black campus movement at Kent State University. The author includes a brief historical background, an assessment of current holdings, an overview of the documentation plan, a review of the outreach strategy, and the acquisition of a collection highlighting the black campus movement and black student life. Ultimately, the article aims to provide an understanding of the value of archiving the full spectrum of history.

One of our challenges as we build and extend democracy is the need to ensure that our youth know where we come from, what we have done to break the shackle of oppression, and how we have pursued the journey to freedom for all. . . . This is what archives are about.¹

—Nelson Mandela, 2009

**Introduction**

Themes of race, class, and gender commonly infiltrate academic discourse, especially in an institution that specifically collects and provides a re-presentation of history. Consequently, archivists from underdocumented communities may find it nearly instinctual to wonder about the contextualization of the experiences of their communities within the walls of their institutions, though it would likely be the same for any individual striving to provide a rich and complete illustration of history. In 2013, Kent State University hired its first African American female archivist and began to focus
more sharply on the critical question: what is the documented history of diversity at the university?

One of the most important developments of the black student experience at US colleges and universities was the evolution of the black campus movement (BCM) of the 1960s. The BCM is an important segment of history’s narrative because it shows that black students and their various supporters insisted on an education that provided a “relevant learning experience.” The BCM demanded a validation of the black experience through educational development, the creation of cultural centers, diverse student programming, and an increase in black students, faculty, and staff. It is imperative that all universities and colleges identify and preserve documentation of how the BCM formed within their institutions. At Kent State University, such documentation will highlight how the historical development of the Pan African Studies Department, the Cultural Center, the Institute for African American Affairs, integrated housing, the various offices and initiatives devoted to cultural awareness, and the present diversity in faculty and staff evolved, in part as a result of civil unrest promulgated by student activists. Black students and their supporters protested against the policies they saw as impeding the progress of the black student experience. The BCM initiated an undeniable transformation within academic institutions and changed the trajectory of higher education in the United States.

The archival community has historically underdocumented the experiences of African Americans and other marginalized groups, so this is not a new predicament for academic institutions or repositories. A preliminary assessment of Kent State University’s repository, an annual review of the collection development policy, and research inquiries regarding the BCM revealed gaps in the historical record of various underdocumented communities that were integral to the evolution of the university’s history. More specifically, significant gaps existed in the documentation of the BCM at Kent State University, making it imperative to devise a strategy to address a critical period in the history of the university and its growth, and in a larger context, American history. Fortunately, this lapse in the department’s collection development was partially recognized, and all stakeholders welcomed strategic outreach efforts to acquire documentation of the BCM at Kent. As a result, one of the objectives of the university archivist was to establish the Black Campus Movement Project, with the mission to acquire and document the social activism of black students from 1965 to 1971.

**Historical Background**

The Society of American Archivists approved a list of core values in 2011, encouraging members of the archival community to adopt them as part of their professional practices. One of the values underscored is diversity—seeking “to document and preserve the record of the broadest possible range of individuals, socio-economic groups, governance, and corporate entities . . . to build connections to under-documented communities to support: acquisition and preservation of sources relating to these communities’ activities . . . ” The act of archiving historically underrepresented communities has been a challenge for decades, as generations of immigrants transformed
once homogenous neighborhoods to multicultural epicenters burgeoning with various languages, traditions, and new social mores. Ethnic studies of the mid-1960s focused on predominately white ethnic groups, but, by the end of the decade, a shift began to emerge. The civil rights movement (CRM) brought forth demands for humane treatment and the establishment of organizations such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). The Chicano or Mexican American movement also highlighted areas of inequality within the arena of education and labor. These cultural revolutions caused academia to slowly shift focus from white ethnic groups onto ethnics of color. During the same period, the women’s liberation movement pushed for women to gain more influential roles in government, diverse positions in the labor force, and better wages. As these previously historically underrepresented communities pushed for progress, questions relating to their historical evolution within the context of American history began to arise. Brian Keough wrote in “Documenting Diversity: Developing Special Collections of Under Documented Groups” that the onslaught of these particular communities wanting access to records regarding their development within society highlighted the inability of the archival community to handle requests from ethnic and racial minorities, women, and the working class. In 1971, historians Howard Zinn and Sam Bass Warner elaborated on the need for a shift in the practices surrounding the representation and archiving of history during a Society of American Archivists meeting. Zinn noted that the “existence, preservation, and the availability of the archives, documents, records, in our society are very much determined by the distribution of wealth and power.” Warner went on to argue in his presentation that historians and archivists “made themselves comfortable with the classic concerns of famous politicians, leading families, reformers, and the patronage of high culture. . . .” Racial and ethnic minorities and other underdocumented groups were not considered to represent these ideals, and therefore their accounts were rarely incorporated into histories or archives. As more progressive attitudes toward history began to challenge the appraisal practices of archives, a new charge for archivists was established that demanded a reassessment of previous policies. Capturing the black campus movement is one way Kent State University is balancing the documentary record.

**Black Campus Movement**

The era of the civil rights movement reached its apex and began its decline in 1963. The CRM initially was established with the objective of influencing the moral compass of white America using the platform of nonviolence, desegregation, and unification with white liberals. As the CRM continued to suffer heinous acts of violence and fatalities involving its leaders, such as the bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama, and the murder of the National Association of Colored People’s (NAACP) field secretary, Medgar Evers, some of the youth within the CRM began to identify with black power, a philosophical approach that veered sharply from what the stalwarts of the CRM espoused. This philosophy centered on principles of black unity, power, and solidarity. During the mid-1960s, as the leadership of SNCC
introduced the term “black power” into the national consciousness, its core principles soon garnered supporters on campuses across America in the form of the black campus movement.\textsuperscript{12} In the 1961–1962 school year, students at Central State University in Ohio established the reform action movement, which took on a “black nationalist, student rights” slant.\textsuperscript{13} During the same period, study groups transformed themselves into pockets of political activism, such as UHURU in Detroit.\textsuperscript{14} However, the BCM did not begin to coalesce until after a few seminal events like “Bloody Sunday” in 1965.\textsuperscript{15} On March 7, 1965, six hundred protesters in Selma, Alabama, attempted to march across the Pettus Bridge in response to Dallas County’s persistent attempts to block voting rights of black residents. An army of state troopers and the Selma police met the protesters with tear gas, clubs, and whips.\textsuperscript{16} The televised events of “Bloody Sunday” inspired many students to respond with great urgency the following day. At Howard University, students delivered a petition to US president Lyndon Johnson demanding an end to the brutality against blacks in Selma.\textsuperscript{17} As tensions continued to mount, student activists at the University of Arkansas “demonstrated inside and outside the president’s office, demanding abolishment of segregation in Greek organizations and housing.”\textsuperscript{18} By the late 1960s, it was commonplace to hear soaring oratory from African American speakers whose goal was to further radicalize/politicize black students. Martin Luther King Jr. spoke at Occidental College in Los Angeles in April of 1967 about the “illegal and unjust war in Vietnam,” and, in the same year, activist H. Rap Brown of SNCC campaigned for black studies at New York’s City College.\textsuperscript{19} Muhammad Ali also became a political figure, visiting many campuses during the same period, including Kent State University in 1969, where he discussed black power and the struggles of African American men.\textsuperscript{20} Many of these speakers addressed campuses during weeks dedicated to the exploration of black culture and issues which were usually organized by Black Student Unions (BSUs) or Black United Students (BUS). These organizations were the nation’s first chain of politically and culturally progressive Black Student Unions, who served as pressure groups to pursue a wide range of alterations meant to transform higher education.\textsuperscript{21} The scheduled events by the BSU and BUS groups included films, panel discussions, and social events. The black power movement (BPM) created a new wave of black student activists ready to challenge the oppressive system that they believed existed in academia across America. Black students were ready to become agents of change through the black campus movement, the academic arm of the BPM.\textsuperscript{22}

On February 13, 1969, nine hundred National Guardsmen swarmed the campus of the University of Wisconsin–Madison to confront thousands of protesters with fists raised, voices shouting, and posters emphasizing nonnegotiable demands, racism, black power, black pride, and revolution—higher education was under siege.\textsuperscript{23} The march of ten thousand students from the university to the capitol became known as the BCM’s largest march.\textsuperscript{24} University of Illinois students joined the fray by challenging the administration to establish a Black Cultural Center and a Black Studies Department, to employ more black residence hall counselors, and to hire hundreds of black professors.\textsuperscript{25} The groundswell of activism continued until approximately a thousand colleges and universities faced demands meant to destabilize the institutionalized racism that had infiltrated
their policies and was seen as unjust and destructive to the academic experience of black students. The BCM asked for curricular changes including the development of black studies, strategies for increasing black student enrollment, campus activities that encouraged cultural sensitivity and understanding, increased financial assistance for disadvantaged students, more black faculty and staff, cultural centers, and a variety of other requirements. Kent State University confronted similar demands from black student activists on campus and the many other groups that agreed structural changes were needed.

**Kent State’s Black Campus Movement**

Henry Austen said, “America is a vampire, a buzzard . . . a hypocritical, imperialistic country.” The public relations officer for Deacons of Defense continued on by encouraging the black students at Kent State University to unite and “deal with the barriers threatening the survival of black people and frustrating their liberation.” By May of 1968, the Kent State Student Senate voted to recognize Black United Students, an organization that was the impetus for the most pivotal cultural changes that occurred on the Kent campus in the late sixties and early seventies. African American students at Kent State University, in conjunction with other members of the BCM across the country, wanted the very nature of scholarship redefined to include black ideologies. The black student body made demands for full integration and wanted access to every level at its institution of higher education. Several revolutionary changes emerged on Kent’s campus out of the BCM. Some of the more significant developments included the establishment of a Cultural Center and the Institute of African American Affairs, the forerunner to the current Department of Pan African Studies; a review of off-campus housing discrimination practices; the establishment of educational programs meant to assist first-generation college students; and a litany of other accomplishments. Regrettably, the holdings in the Department of Special Collections and Archives at Kent State University do not adequately document the groups and individuals of the black campus movement of the 1960s and early 1970s.

**Kent State Shootings**

During the first week of May in 1970, Kent State University (KSU) became embroiled in a series of events that soon gained national and international attention. After four days of demonstrations and protests surrounding the invasion of Cambodia, the Ohio National Guard killed four KSU students and wounded nine other students on May 4. The shootings and the aftermath are among the most widely known historical narratives surrounding the university.

Kent State University quickly established the May 4 Collection in 1970 and initiated a massive effort to collect materials from administration, faculty members, academic units, and eventually from outside the Kent community. As a result, the collection is over three hundred cubic feet and is used by a cross-section of scholars for research projects and by filmmakers, artists, and other members of the media. Establishing the May 4 Collection was a huge and complex undertaking, and, as with any significant
event in history, several subtexts are interwoven into its narrative, although not all the subtexts are as clearly defined and as easily identified as some of the more well-known themes. The subtexts of a historical period may also seem invisible due to the lens through which the overall framework is interpreted. Thus, gaps in the historical record are often prevalent and frequently require an examination into the subthemes of race, ethnicity, gender, class, or sexuality to provide a fuller representation of history. Though the BCM was established before the Kent State shootings, an analysis of the chronology and developments surrounding the event reveal that the BCM played a role in the minute number of black students present at the Kent State shootings.

The concern of targeted violence toward members of the black student population led leadership within the BUS organization to urge African American students to stay away from the scheduled events that occurred on May 4, 1970. Echoing BUS’s sentiment was Milton Wilson, the director of Human Relations, who wrote in the aftermath of the Kent State shootings:

While Black students have the same concerns as other Americans—and this includes the concerns of Vietnam and Cambodia and the large proportion of our national energies devoted to militarism—Black students are more concerned about the manifestations of racism. Indeed, I believe that our Black students were more concerned about the tragedies that followed in Augusta and Savannah, Georgia, and at Jackson State than at Kent State. . . .

The BCM at Kent State clearly influenced several areas at the university, from the development of a black studies program to the participation of black students in the events of May 4, 1970. Kent’s BCM merits further study due to its roles within the national sphere and as a catalyst for systemic, campuswide changes that reflected the transformation of the national landscape.

**Preliminary Assessment**

Ibram Rogers’s *The Black Campus Movement: Black Students and the Racial Reconstitution of Higher Education, 1965–1972* has become the authoritative text on how the movement transpired around the country. His exploration provides critical information for those seeking to understand the movement’s progression, goals, objectives, and key players. Rogers’s exhaustive inquiry yields key themes and subject matter that allow an archivist to understand this period and to begin identifying and selecting materials. The text can guide any special collections and archives department in the process of assessing the key people and events integral to presenting the most accurate account of the BCM.

The initial assessment of Kent State’s archives included a search for documentation relating to several areas. A few of the major areas encompassed black student organizations (Black United Students, the Black Student Association, Black Student Union, Students Organized for Black Unity), the hiring of black faculty during the late sixties for departments or offices that had previously included only white faculty members or for staff posts, the emergence of departments and programs geared toward the education
of students on the black diaspora. The evaluation also targeted any materials relating to the initiatives meant to encourage cultural sensitivity through campus programming, to improve the academic success of black students, and to increase black student enrollment from 1965 to 1971.

Available Documentation

In 2013, the Department of Special Collections and Archives held an open house announcing the digitization of the 1960s *Daily Kent Stater* (*DKS*), the student newspaper. The digitization of this decade has made the search for key dates, times, individuals, and groups of the BCM far easier. The digital archives of the *DKS* from the 1960s quickly became an invaluable resource for highlighting significant protests, demonstrations, individuals, and organizations that aided the frontlines of the BCM at Kent State. The *DKS* provides some dates and names for the establishment of the Institute for African American Affairs (IAA). Slated as an experimental endeavor for undergraduate students, the program focused on black studies. The *DKS* also reported on the creation of the Office of Minority Affairs, a liaison between black students and the administration, which assisted in reporting on- and off-campus discrimination, engaged in educational development, and pushed for “better race relations.” Furthermore, the *DKS* provides information on major protests, such as the walkout of more than two hundred black students in November of 1968, which started as a protest against the recruitment of students by the Oakland California Police Department. The student newspaper also reported on a silent demonstration in April of 1970 to reiterate demands for an increase in black student enrollment, a new cultural center, and all-black faculty members in the Institute for African American Affairs. While Rogers’s text offers a general outline of key areas to begin researching and assessing BCM materials held by any university’s archives program, the *DKS* was instrumental in providing pivotal information on how the BCM evolved explicitly at Kent State University. After utilizing the student newspaper, a more targeted assessment of Kent State Special Collections and Archives holdings revealed the documentation currently available to provide some of the more essential information. A few of the initial results were as follows:

- Presidential papers, which provided an administrative record of specific developments of various offices, departments, or programming targeted at disadvantaged students or historically underrepresented groups;
- Faculty papers, including flyers, newsletters, correspondence, and newspaper clippings on the campus disruptions pertaining to the organization Black United Students;
- Administrative papers, documents from other administrative offices on campus;
- University Police records highlighting organizations of interest on campus; and

Robert White served as the president of Kent State (1963–1971) during this time of civil unrest at the university; his presidential papers contain some of the more significant administrative documentation illuminating the BCM there. The papers reveal administrative decisions, some documentation of the development of different
departments and offices, and the hiring of some of the black faculty on campus during the 1960s and early 1970s. The published report, *Involvement Two Years Later: A Report on Programming in the Area of Black Student Concerns at Kent State University, 1968–1970* by Milton E. Wilson Jr., a former dean for Human Relations, provided critical insights from the viewpoint of an administrative office. Wilson’s office was charged with being an ally to disadvantaged students and served as the umbrella under which the Office of Minority Affairs resided. The Wilson report synthesized some of the more culturally significant advancements on campus and specifically addressed the involvement (or lack thereof) of black students during the events of May 4, 1970, which further demonstrates the BCM as a subtext of the May 4 narrative.

After identifying some of the groups and individuals that initiated the cultural revolutions at Kent State, it became evident that the student organization known as Black United Students played a quintessential role in shifting the cultural paradigm of the campus during the late 1960s and early 1970s. More specifically, it was the BUS leadership that urged black students on campus not to attend the May 4 rally protesting the invasion of Cambodia that led to the killings of four white KSU students by Ohio National Guardsmen and left nine with significant injuries. While some black students attended some of the activities during the events leading up to May 4, initial research shows a significant portion did not attend the activities on May 4, and some black students were even quoted as saying, “it was not their thing,” in the Wilson report. However, the university’s archives does not have a significant amount of documentation concerning this aspect of the events of May 4, which in turn highlights the gap in the historical record regarding the overall evolution of the BCM.

While the assessment process uncovered a cross-section of records from faculty and some administrative offices referencing some institutional decisions, correspondence reflecting the administration’s concerns about black student uprisings, the advancement of campus initiatives, programming, and the emergence of academic programs, gaps remain in the historical record where documentation of Kent BCM is inadequate, making it essential to institute a documentation plan stressing key areas of acquisition for the archives.

**Documentation Plan**

The following list identifies weaknesses found during the initial assessment of the department’s holdings. These topics were highlighted as key areas in which to acquire documentation as the department moves forward on its BCM project:

- Black United Students, with a specific focus on student and faculty leadership within the organization; activities, events, and details surrounding the historical development of the organization, such as founding members; and the acquisition of additional publications created under BUS, including a complete collection of *Black Watch* and related materials;
- Institute of African American Affairs, its historical development, faculty, staff, and programming, 1969–1971;
- Office of Minority Affairs, a chronology of development including staff and administration, documentation including reports of discrimination, educational development, notes on presentations to classes and other campus units;
• Department of Human Relations, its historical development, its relationship with BUS and other minority organizations, programming, and publications, 1960s–1970s;
• Cultural Center (Kuumba House), its development, goals and objectives, student and faculty affiliates, and activities, 1968–1971;
• Kent State University cultural student programming, a clear chronology of activities, events, and initiatives developed, 1965–1971;
• NAACP Student Chapter, including founding members, the organization’s chronology; activities, with a particular interest in the explanation of its disbandment shortly after the creation of BUS; and publications, 1960s; and
• SNCC (student chapter), its historical development, campus engagement, faculty, staff, student affiliates, and publications, 1960s.

These initially identified areas, among others, will serve as the guideline for the types of archival records and content to be targeted during the outreach process. A summary of the list will be included in the documents used to solicit potential participants.

A documentation plan should be viewed as a “fluid document.” As the outreach process begins, new areas of interest may emerge, which were either overlooked during the initial assessment or which may develop after engaging with those solicited for the project. The documentation plan should be reviewed for possible revisions every six months during the course of the outreach project.

Changes in Collection Development Policy
After acknowledging and identifying the lapses in the historical record and establishing a documentation strategy for the black campus movement, it was important to make sure KSU’s collection development policy “officially” reflects the department’s efforts to cultivate donors and collections pertaining to underdocumented groups and communities. Before engaging in outreach efforts, it was critical to strengthen the policy’s language regarding efforts to acquire archival materials of historically underrepresented people and communities. Creating a clear policy sets a tone and provides official documentation of an archives’ philosophy. Working with the head of Special Collections and Archives, the policy was revised to state specifically:

In order to more fully reflect the diversity of the people and communities that make up Kent State University history, University Archives seeks to acquire collections that document historically underrepresented groups. We are specifically interested in developing collections that document African American, Asian, Latino, LGBTQ, Middle Eastern, Native American and other historically underrepresented people and communities within the KSU family. The papers and records of student organizations, faculty and staff members, and alumni will be considered for inclusion in University Archives.38

Project Development
In 2010, Kent State University’s Department of Special Collections and Archives decided to establish a collection documenting the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender organizations, literature, and people within Northeast Ohio. By partnering with the
Kent State University’s LGBT Neighborhood Project, the department has been able to engage in outreach efforts aimed at acquiring correspondence, diaries, photos, newsletters, oral histories, and a variety of personal and organizational materials documenting this community. The development of the LGBT project served as a guideline for the types of materials and documentation to be targeted for the Black Campus Movement Project. Like the LGBT model, the Black Campus Movement Project included a clear mission statement and emphasized specific goals:

Kent State University’s Department of Special Collections and Archives has decided to launch the Black Campus Movement Project. From 1965–1970, university and college campuses across the country experienced the Black Campus Movement, which was in part aimed at establishing a department of Black Studies, Cultural Centers, an increase in black faculty, financial aid for economically disadvantaged students, specialized assistance to meet the academic demands of courses, culturally sensitive programming, and an overall effort by academic institutions to respect the cultural perspective and history of the African American community. Therefore, in an effort to create robust collections highlighting historically under-documented communities at Kent State University, the Department of Special Collections and Archives has launched an initiative that seeks to acquire and record the evolution of Kent State University’s Black Campus Movement. The project will collect correspondence, diaries, photographs, newsletters, oral histories and a variety of personal and organizational materials documenting the Black Campus Movement from 1965–1970.

This statement was sent to all potential participants with a summary of specific areas of interest underscored in the documentation plan and consent and waiver forms.

Generating a List of Potential Donors and Participants

Outreach projects of this nature face a host of challenges, including generating a list of potential connections. Where does one start if a list of names is not immediately available? The digitized Daily Kent Stater and the Involvement Two Years Later report assisted with identifying 5 potential candidates for solicitation, but the goal was to create a list of 20 names for initial solicitation.

In 1990, Special Collections and Archives established the Kent State Shootings Oral History Project, which includes eyewitness narratives from police, National Guard personnel, administrators, faculty, students, alumni, and hospital personnel. The oral history of Edmund T. Moore generated a significant list of names. Moore was a student at the time of the Kent State shootings, and he retired as an associate professor in the Department of Pan African Studies at Kent State University in 2010. During an introductory conversation, Moore provided a list of names of individuals who were active on campus as students, faculty, and staff members from 1968 to 1970.

Between the Daily Kent Stater, the Involvement Two Years Later report, and Moore, an initial list of 20 names was generated and a list of 16 names was sent to the Alumni Office and the coordinator of the black alumni organization at Kent. Between both entities, contact information was created for 11 names. A total of 15 names was included
in the initial solicitation process. However, before moving forward with the outreach project, it was vital to comply with university regulations.

**University Compliance: The Institutional Review Board**

Many universities require that an institutional review board (IRB) monitor research involving human or animal subjects. The IRB process is meant to protect participants. Research projects are reviewed to make sure they follow federal regulations. The IRB process requires the principal investigator(s) (PI) to receive a Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) certification. After the PI(s) passes the online certification test, the university requires that the investigator(s) also completes an application. Due to this project’s focus on “human subjects,” it required an application pertaining to human subjects. The application comprises a 15-page series of questions. The application also requires the PI(s) to attach consent forms, waiver forms, a list of questions that will be given to potential participants, and samples of correspondence that will be sent to potential participants.

It took approximately four weeks for the university’s IRB to approve the project. However, if any changes are made to the project, another form must be submitted to the IRB, highlighting any additions/changes. The PI(s) should have a clear vision and strategy for the project before submitting the application to prevent any additional delays.

**Solicitation**

After the Black Campus Movement Project received a stamp of approval from the IRB, correspondence was sent out to potential participants in a variety of ways depending on what information was available. Some participants were called directly if addresses and e-mail information were not available. For those who did have an address or e-mail, the following was sent:

- A description of the project (goals and objectives)
- Summary of areas of interest
- A list of the approved interview questions
- Consent forms/waiver (oral histories/interviews have the potential of being published)

Participants have the option of becoming donors by submitting collections that fit within the project’s criteria or participating in an oral history/interview. The oral history serves as an eyewitness account of the participant’s role within Kent State’s BCM or his or her observations of the BCM from 1965 to 1970. Questions were sent ahead of time to ensure that participants were at ease with the tone and focus of the project. If participants were not comfortable with the questions, then it was best to know ahead of time. A total of 15 individuals were initially contacted from November to December of 2013.

**Challenges**

While the project remains in its early stages, some of the initial challenges included outdated contact information; unanswered responses despite contact via e-mails, phone
calls, and letters; gaining trust of participants; and scheduling. Although initially 20 individuals were identified, some contacts were not up to date. The generous assistance of the Office of Alumni and the black alumni organization did not guarantee they had the most up-to-date information. After learning that five individuals’ phone numbers and addresses were no longer valid or were unavailable, other resources were used to seek contact information, though in some cases it was to no avail. Networking with individuals who do respond is a complementary approach.

Similarly, social media platforms are a viable form of contact or a resource. Social media accounts such as LinkedIn can give critical information, including the most recent or latest professional organizational affiliation for a potential contact. LinkedIn accounts may reveal that a potential participant previously worked at a university/college—and some universities and colleges are permitted to give contact information for former administrators, faculty, and staff. Facebook can also yield contact information, or a general locale for some individuals. At the very least, a general Google search may uncover a news article, an e-mail address, or a phone number, especially if the subject does not have a social media account. A potential participant’s information may appear in a basic/advanced Google search, which was the case with two participants in this project.

Another challenge in an outreach project of this nature is a potential participant’s lack of response or an unwillingness to revisit this period of his or her academic or professional history. Three contacts whose information was up to date decided not to respond to any form of communication. Their names were permanently removed from the list.

Other challenges that remain include scheduling, especially when potential participants have varying work or extracurricular activity hours. A former member of BUS at Kent State University, now located in New Jersey, was instrumental during some of the formative years of Black United Students and would be a valuable addition to the oral history component of the project, but it has been difficult to schedule a phone conference or in-person interview with him. He is responsible for a radio podcast on political issues and is a practicing lawyer. The project will continue to correspond with the hope of finalizing a date and time for an interview with him.

Finally, gaining the trust of potential donors or oral history narrators has been one of the most challenging aspects of the outreach project. Erwind Blount, one of the former presidents of BUS, is considered to have been one of the most polarizing figures in BUS during the late 1960s. He is a self-proclaimed recluse and did not want to participate upon initial contact. Not until after a 90-minute conversation, during which the university archivist shared previous experiences as an undergraduate in student organizations geared toward the betterment of disadvantaged communities, did a rapport slowly build. Fortunately, Blount has done several phone interviews and has responded to two rounds of typed questions pertaining to his contentious relationship with the Robert I. White administration, his role as a BUS president, the Kent State shootings, and his history with the City of Kent police.
Early Outcomes

The Black Campus Outreach Project is in its early stages, though some successes have been achieved in less than a year. In November of 2013, Lafayette Tolliver (a Kent State University alum) responded to solicitation by the project. Tolliver agreed to an in-person interview in Toledo, Ohio, where he discussed his time at Kent State University from 1967 to 1971. Tolliver was an active photographer for the student yearbook, the Chestnut Burr, and a member of the student newspaper for which he penned a column, in addition to serving in the capacity of an “unofficial” photographer for many black student activities and organizations on campus. Tolliver was also a member of the BUS organization. At the conclusion of the interview, Tolliver gave a tour of his cache of negatives pertaining to black student life and images of protests relating to the Vietnam War and events surrounding the Kent State shootings, much of which has never been published. Shortly after, Tolliver agreed to donate his collection containing thousands of negatives and prints, newspaper clippings, and correspondence. Images from the Tolliver Collection will be used in the May 4, 2015, exhibit commemorating the 45th anniversary of the Kent State shootings. Tolliver’s photographs were highlighted in a photo exhibition in October 2014 during the campus homecoming festivities.

The project has also garnered a few oral histories from university faculty members, including the first chair of the university’s Institute for African American Affairs and former chair of the Department of Pan African Studies, Dr. Edward Crosby. The project has also acquired an interview from the former coordinator of minority affairs and one of the founding members of BUS, Donald Thigpen. Erwind Blount has submitted over 10 pages of text recalling his role in the black campus movement at Kent State University, which has provided enlightening insights into what transpired on campus during the 1960s.

In working with Dr. Crosby, his wife, and son, connections were made with Beatrice Mitchell. A resident of Ravenna, Ohio, Mitchell kept significant records on the development of McElrath, a predominately economically disadvantaged community in Ravenna, and the McElrath Improvement Center. During the 1960s, McElrath had strong ties to Kent State University faculty and to members of Black United Students, who were active in this community with afterschool programs, food donations, and a variety of other activities as they fought to gain water and sewage services, which did not arrive until the 1970s. Mitchell will be donating her records on McElrath to Kent State University’s Special Collections and Archives in 2014 and 2015.

This important nexus of voices continues to expand, and the department remains energized about the potential of future acquisitions.

Future Goals

Future objectives for the project include a more targeted approach for the inclusion of female voices involved in leadership or supportive roles within organizations instrumental to the black campus movement at Kent State University. The male perspective has dominated thus far in the project; the next round of solicitations will focus on
gathering female contributors. The role of women in the BCM will provide another stimulating layer within the discourse of this movement; it is another subtext that has yet to receive a critical analysis and demands further investigation. Also, follow-up correspondence will be sent to those individuals who expressed interest but have yet to fully engage in the project.

Kent State University’s Special Collections and Archives plans to digitize the Tolliver negatives and integrate them into the Centennial Collection, a digital collection highlighting the university’s history. The project also aims to generate a considerable number of oral histories/interviews that may eventually serve as a catalyst to create a new digital collection focusing on the perspectives of black student life at Kent State University.

Special Collections and Archives will reevaluate the entire project at the end of 2014 and address the need for new strategic approaches, remedy weaknesses in the documentation plan, assess current successes and failures, and renew IRB credentials for the project.

As efforts to acquire documents emphasizing Kent’s black campus movement continue, the project plans to engage in outreach efforts within the classroom by encouraging the usage of the acquired collections. The University Archives plans to develop presentations for key departments on campus that will find the latest acquisitions focusing on diversity at Kent State University applicable to their departmental curricula and will hopefully encourage students to engage in archival research on diverse issues.

**Conclusion**

Encompassing the entirety of a system of statements, the archive, rather than representing a static space of cultural or documentary accumulation, is the site of enunciation of a multiplicity of historical, cultural, and political statements that function to defy the configuration of a singular vision of history.

—Mario Ramirez, 2009

Defying a singular vision of history takes a concerted effort on the part of the archivist and stakeholders who are invested in cultivating the history of a university and its surrounding community. Gathering documentation on the black campus movement to create a robust historical record is a worthy venture for any university or college. Broadening the language that represents an academic institution’s narrative will foster a sense of goodwill within the diverse populations that exist on a campus and within the surrounding community. Strengthening these bonds will in turn create important relationships for generations and will serve as the foundation for what is one of the most important goals of the archives community—democracy!
ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Lae’l Hughes-Watkins is the university archivist at Kent State University. Her current research interests are African American history and the use of social media platforms as discovery tools for archival materials. She is a member of the Society of American Archivists and serves on the Nominating Task Force Committee and the Diversity Committee, where she is assisting with case studies pertaining to diversity in the archival record.

NOTES

5. Ibid., 85.
9. Rogers, The Black Campus Movement, 73.
10. Ibid., 69.
11. Ibid., 67.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., 68.
15. Ibid., 74.
17. Rogers, The Black Campus Movement, 75.
18. Ibid., 91.
19. Ibid., 80.
22. Ibid., 67.
23. Ibid., 1.
25. Ibid., 1.
29. Kent State University, Department of Special Collections and Archives, “Chronology, May 1–4, 1970,” accessed October 1, 2013, speccoll.library.kent.edu/4may70/exhibit/chronology/index.html.
32. Ibid., 100.
36. President I. White Papers, Box 33, 41, 48, 67, Department of Special Collections and Archives, Kent State University.
38. Collection Development Policy, Kent State University Department of Special Collections and Archives, revised 2013.
39. The LGBT Collection in Special Collections and Archives, Special Collections and Archives Collection Development Policy, Kent State University, 2010.
40. The Black Campus Movement Project, Special Collections and Archives, Kent State University, 2013.
42. Kent State University, Office of Research and Compliance, accessed September 2013, www2.kent.edu.
USE OF ARCHIVES BY CATHOLIC HISTORIANS, 2010–2012: A CITATION STUDY

BY JILLIAN M. SLATER AND COLLEEN MAHONEY HOELSCHER

ABSTRACT: This article reports on a citation study examining the use of archives by researchers in the field of Catholic history. The authors collected citation data from three Catholic history journals published from 2010 through 2012. They analyzed two citation attributes: the type of materials cited and, for archival materials, the type of repository. This article presents results and observations from the study and discusses them in the context of archival practice. The authors discuss how findings from this study can inform collection development and archival description as well as ideas for further research.

Introduction

This citation study examines Catholic historians’ use of archival sources and the types of repositories where they access these materials. The authors analyzed 5,995 citations in three peer-reviewed journals that publish research in the field of American Catholic history. The study focused on recent scholarship and used articles published from 2010 through 2012. The authors selected the “reference study” method in which each source (for example, each book, journal, or archival collection) is counted only the first time it is cited. For the purpose of this article, the authors use the term “Catholic historians” to refer to historians who conduct research in the field of Catholic history. This study aims to document patterns in the use of archives and focuses on the types of repositories where historians access materials. The authors use findings from this study to address collection development and descriptive practices, considering Catholic repositories as well as broader archival practice.
**Literature Review**

Many previous studies have examined historians’ use of information sources, and a few have specifically considered archives. For example, Margaret Stieg Dalton and Laurie Charnigo used surveys and citation analysis to investigate the types and extent of sources that historians use.¹ They stated that “Sources used most frequently for primary information by . . . historians were, in descending order, archives, manuscripts and special collections, books, newspapers, government documents.”² Other studies have examined historians’ use of archives within the context of archival practice. For example, Frederic Miller’s 1986 study evaluated citation patterns in social history research.³ His in-depth evaluation included analysis of the number of citations to archival materials, subject of the article, date range of the archival collection, and number of repositories each historian visited. Miller concluded that although usage patterns vary, social historians remain reliant upon archival research; such statistics could therefore motivate acquisition and appraisal decisions.⁴ Wendy Duff and Catherine Johnson have conducted studies on information-seeking behavior in archives.⁵ In their 2002 study, interviews with historians revealed that familiarity with a collection or repository and the existence of finding aids are major factors that influence use.⁶ Clark Elliott reviewed citation patterns in the history of science and discussed the potential impact of citation studies on archival appraisal.⁷ He advocated for quantitative research as a solid foundation for informing archival practice. Diane Beattie used surveys and citation analysis to study the use of archives by researchers in the emerging field of women’s history.⁸ She suggested that studying citation data would allow archivists to respond more effectively to the needs of a particular user group. Chris Burns employed citation analysis to document historians’ use of archives over a four-year period.⁹ He discussed the importance of gathering data that may help guide acquisition policies, arrangement and description priorities, and instruction practices.

In studying Catholic historical materials, it is important to consider the unique context in which these records are kept. Three distinguishing characteristics come to mind: the types of repositories that house Catholic materials, the history of archival practice in the Catholic Church, and the complex nature of religious archives. Types of repositories, for example, include those operated by the church, such as diocesan archives or the archives of religious orders, as well as Catholic colleges and organizations. Catholic repositories are also distinctive within the history of general archival practice. Several articles published between 1950 and 1975 discuss their employees’ lack of formal training, inadequate facilities, and need for modernization in Catholic archives.¹⁰ Later, David Bearman’s 1983 survey on the state of the archival profession documented the significant expansion and formalization of religious archival programs in the early 1980s.¹¹ James O’Toole, who has written extensively on Catholic archives, addressed the complex question, “What is different about religious archives?”¹² He provided four significant considerations: “the influence on the archives of external, non-archival beliefs; the inherent difficulties of the mandate to document the intangible; the impact of the decline of organized religion; and the difficulties created by an apparent incompatibility of archives work and religious belief.”¹³ Because of the
considerations mentioned above, collecting Catholic papers poses challenges not found in other arenas of archival practice.

Although many previous studies have examined historians’ use of archives and implications for archival practice, none have done this through the unique lens of Catholic history scholarship. Additionally, while accounts of the backgrounds of Catholic repositories exist, no studies have addressed how often historians are using materials from these repositories in their research. Knowing this, the authors identified a need to gather data on information sources used by Catholic historians and, specifically, the types of repositories where they access archival materials.

**Methodology**

Citation analysis typically involves recording the details of citations from a number of publications to determine what materials are being consulted and then analyzing materials by type, frequency, or other factors. For this study, the authors selected the “reference study” method. This method counts each source (for example, book, journal, or archival collection) only the first time it is cited. For each reference, the authors evaluated two attributes: the type of materials cited, and for citations to archival materials, the type of repository where the materials are located. They recorded the data in spreadsheets, which were then used to calculate totals and percentages.

**Journal Selection**

Three refereed journals with a focus on Catholic history in the United States were selected for the study: *American Catholic Studies*, *Catholic Historical Review*, and *US Catholic Historian*. The journals were selected based on publisher reputation, recommendations from librarians and scholars, and the authors’ personal experience. *American Catholic Studies* has been published since 1887 and is the official journal of the American Catholic Historical Society. The journal has won several awards from the Catholic Press Association and is currently published by Villanova University. *Catholic Historical Review* is the official journal of the American Catholic Historical Association and has been published by the Catholic University of America Press since 1915. *US Catholic Historian* is published by Catholic University of America Press and is a “scholarly journal devoted to the history of the Catholic Church in the United States.” The authors felt that these journals represent current scholarly communication in the field and therefore provide a reliable sampling frame.

**Citation Counting Criteria**

The authors analyzed citations in feature articles (excluding book reviews and opinion pieces) and gathered two sets of data. The first data set focused on the types of source materials and included the following categories: books, journal articles, archival materials, primary sources, and other materials. For purposes of this study and to ensure consistency, the authors used the definitions listed in Table 1.
Table 1. Definitions: Source Material Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Material</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Monographs, monographic series, edited or themed volumes including biographies, novels, and similar publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>Articles published in academic journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival materials</td>
<td>Personal papers, organizational records, and artificial collections; also documents, artifacts, visual resource material, and/or moving images of enduring historical value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary sources</td>
<td>Items or documents that contain a firsthand account of events including newspaper articles, oral histories, maps, and land records, also gray literature, conference presentations, and theses or dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other materials</td>
<td>Materials not fitting into the above categories, for example, a conversation or personal correspondence between the author and an individual or group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second data set captured information about citations to archival materials. These were classified based on the types of repositories. The authors established categories taking into account the scope of this study, personal experience, and an examination of similar studies and literature on Catholic archives. For example, Burns used the following repository types in his study on historians’ use of archives: private collections, public offices, national archives, institutional archives, state and local archives, academic research collections, public libraries, historical societies, historical libraries and museums, and foreign repositories. While Burns’s categories are useful to document citations in broader historical research, the authors also wanted to document repositories that specifically collect Catholic materials. *The Directory of Archive and Manuscript Repositories in the United States* distinguishes three types of Catholic repositories: diocesan, religious orders, and Catholic colleges and universities. James O’Toole later confirmed these as “the three major kinds of Catholic archives.”

Based on the considerations above, the authors identified eight categories of repositories for this study: diocesan archives, archives of religious orders, Catholic colleges or universities, non-Catholic colleges or universities, Catholic organizations, government archives, local sources, and other sources. They used the definitions in Table 2.
Table 2. Definitions: Repository Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repository</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan archives</td>
<td>Archdiocesan, diocesan, and parish archives or any repository in a district or see under the supervision of a bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives of religious orders</td>
<td>National, provincial, or local branches of Catholic vowed religious orders, such as orders of priests, brothers, and sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic colleges or universities</td>
<td>Pontifical universities or private institutions of higher education operated by or with relationship to the Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic colleges or universities</td>
<td>Secular institutions of higher education or those operated by religious organizations other than Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic organizations</td>
<td>Nonprofit organizations owned and operated by or affiliated with the Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government archives</td>
<td>National, state, and county archives, or any repository otherwise owned and operated by a government body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local sources</td>
<td>Public library, historical society, or museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other materials</td>
<td>Private collections of individuals, repositories of non-Catholic religious groups, or any repository not covered by the above categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodological Considerations

Many previous studies note the challenges inherent in the process of counting and analyzing citations. The extent and variety of information sources available and the subjectivity of certain sources make it difficult to classify some citations. Primary sources are particularly challenging to classify. Pearce-Moses notes that primary sources are inherently subjective and defining them often depends on how the materials are being used.22

Results

The authors analyzed 5,995 references from 130 feature articles for this study. The initial survey found that just over 50 percent of the references were to books; 22 percent to primary sources; 15 percent to journal articles; 7 percent to archival materials; and 3 percent of the references were to other sources (see Table 3).
Table 3. Total References by Types of Materials, 2010–2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Materials</th>
<th>Number of References</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>51.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>15.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival materials</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary sources</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>22.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. This chart shows the breakdown of the types of materials referenced by Catholic historians.

The second set of data counted and analyzed the types of repositories where archival materials were accessed. It revealed that researchers cited diocesan archives, archives of religious orders, and archival collections at Catholic colleges and universities most frequently. Each of these categories was cited over 20 percent of the time. Government archives were cited 12 percent of the time. Local repositories were cited 7 percent of the time. Non-Catholic colleges and universities were also cited about 7 percent of the time. Catholic organizations were cited approximately 4 percent of the time, and 5 percent of citations were to other repositories that did not fit in any of these categories (see Table 4).
Table 4. Total References to Archival Materials by Repository Type, 2010–2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Repositories</th>
<th>Number of References</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>21.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order/Provincial</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic college or university</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic college or university</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic organization</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. This chart shows a breakdown of the types of repositories used by Catholic historians.
**Discussion**

The results and observations of this study are considered in the context of Catholic repositories as well as broader archival practice. The findings are discussed in regard to practical issues including archival description, collection development, and related activities.

**Collection Development**

An important responsibility for archives is obtaining relevant materials, usually under the guidance of a collection development policy. Frank Boles wrote that “a well-focused collecting policy will result in a body of complementary, interrelated collections that may become a cultural treasure.” The authors discuss collection development practices based on results and observations from the survey. While some issues are specific to repositories collecting Catholic history materials, many may be considered in a broad range of collecting contexts.

Nearly half of the repositories cited were those of dioceses or religious orders. This reveals that a majority of collections are being housed in repositories that routinely collect a well-defined range of historical documents. Official church records—including baptismal records, financial documents, administrative correspondence, and the personal papers of officials—are routinely collected at diocesan and archdiocesan archives. Archives of religious orders collect administrative records related to the orders’ operations (such as schools, hospitals, or other businesses), personal papers of members, and artifacts associated with their groups’ histories. For religious orders and diocesan archives, collection development practices may include updating records retention schedules or increasing outreach efforts to ensure that they continue to be the primary repositories.

Where does this leave other repositories? Archives other than those of dioceses and religious orders may face a challenge when collecting materials related to Catholic history. In this study, Catholic colleges and universities were cited approximately 20% of the time—about 5% less than dioceses or religious orders. The remaining 35% of citations were split between government, Catholic organizations, local repositories, and other sources.

Developing an awareness of the collecting scope of similar repositories will help archivists to approach collection development strategically. In the context of Catholic archives, many acquisitions are based on established relationships or routine records retention. This is also true for repositories in other specialized areas, such as those affiliated with particular religious, social, or political groups. Repositories without fixed arrangements (such as routine acquisition of permanent records) must be proactive to continue developing relevant and robust holdings.

For Catholic colleges and universities that house special collections, this may mean identifying previously untapped opportunities and updating their policies accordingly. Catholic colleges might direct outreach efforts toward collecting areas that official church archives do not already cover. For example, they may wish to focus on developing relationships with potential donors including notable lay individuals and families or church groups. For a broad range of special collections, becoming a “designated
repository” may be a mutually beneficial relationship. If resources allow, an archives could identify an organization that produces relevant materials and work with that organization to deposit its permanent records and/or develop a transfer schedule. James Geary provided an example of such a relationship in his case study on the arrangement between Kent State University and the Diocese of Youngstown, Ohio.⁶ He discusses the advantages experienced by both organizations. Depositing its collections at Kent State has been an inexpensive way for the diocese to preserve its archives under professional care and provide increased access to the materials.²⁷ For the university, such a collection brings prestige to the repository, serves as additional incentive for other individuals or organizations to donate their records, and supports academic research.²⁸

Nonprofit organizations or church groups may not always have the resources to care for and provide access to records of enduring historical value. Becoming a designated repository not only enhances a university’s special collections, but ensures that the materials are properly preserved and accessible. For example, the Marian Library at the University of Dayton and the Mariological Society of America, a Catholic theological association dedicated to the study of Mary, the mother of Jesus, established a designated repository relationship in 2012.²⁹ The Mariological Society is a small organization (under three hundred members) with few resources to preserve its permanent records and historical materials. While the society benefits by having its records properly cared for, the Marian Library benefits through the acquisition of a unique collection within the niche field of Mariology. The library included a “designated repository” statement in its collection development policy and may build upon this model in the future.

To keep collections relevant, repositories cannot always wait for donors to seek them out with unsolicited donations. A strategically crafted collection development policy helps archivists acquire materials that enrich their collections. The most heavily cited repositories in this study operate with some degree of routine records retention or strong donor affiliation. Developing an awareness of the collecting scope of similar repositories can be a good foundation for archivists in a variety of historical contexts. Exploring the potential for “designated repository” relationships can be a worthwhile approach for some special collections. A clearly articulated policy will help archivists to define and document priorities and direct collecting and outreach activities accordingly.

Description

A variety of factors influence a historian’s choice to consult a particular body of records. For archival materials, studies have shown that the extent of description and indexing are factors that impact use.³⁰ In the present study, Catholic colleges and universities are among the most popular repositories where historians consult archival materials. In 2013, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops identified 246 degree-granting institutions of Catholic higher education in the United States, but references to Catholic colleges or universities in this study point toward a relative few of them.³¹ Most citations are to the University of Notre Dame, Georgetown University, and Catholic University of America. Other heavily cited Catholic universities include Villanova University, Loyola University Chicago, and Boston College. All six of these universities provide access to online finding aids, making their archival holdings easily discoverable.
One discrepancy in this trend is the discoverability of diocesan and religious orders’ archives. These repositories are heavily cited, yet based on samples from this category, dioceses and religious orders are much less likely than academic repositories to provide access to online finding aids. Familiarity and predictability may explain the persistent use of these collections. Duff and Johnson suggested that name recognition is a factor that influences use.\textsuperscript{32} Additionally, the routine nature of organizational records makes holdings in these repositories more predictable to the experienced researcher. Catholic historians tend to be familiar with the kinds of standard materials held at these repositories—diocesan and parish business records, religious orders’ membership records, correspondence from the leadership of these organizations—and will be able to locate and use them even when online finding aids or inventories are not available.

The authors observed that some historians tend to cite heavily from a single collection, rather than citing materials from a variety of archival collections in an article. The authors speculate that, in some cases, additional related collections exist, but were not accessed. One way that archivists may facilitate further discovery of related materials is through descriptive elements. In \textit{Describing Archives: A Content Standard, Second Edition (DACS)}, section 6.3 provides guidelines for documenting “Related Archival Materials.” This element allows for description of “the existence and location of archival materials that are closely related to the materials being described by provenance, sphere of activity, or subject matter, either in the same repository, in other repositories, or elsewhere.”\textsuperscript{33} This field is not required for a DACS-compliant finding aid, but its use could greatly assist researchers in finding additional materials.

The authors also observed that, despite archival description standards such as DACS, historians cite archival materials relatively inconsistently. The unique nature of archival materials and various levels of description used at different archives (collection, box, file, or item level) make this a challenge for both archivists and historians. The authors observed in this study that many historians cite materials at the item level and a few include box and folder numbers. Some historians cite a repository but no collection title. Most historians use abbreviations when citing multiple materials from a single repository, but these vary from article to article. For example, the University Archives at the University of Notre Dame is abbreviated as AUND, UND, ND, and NDA in various articles. These inconsistencies may pose challenges for future researchers attempting to locate the same documents based on citations. Preferred citations for archival materials can be noted in DACS-compliant finding aids (\textit{DACS 7.1.5}).\textsuperscript{34} Another way archivists can encourage uniformity is to emphasize preferred citations in additional locations. For example, archivists could include the preferred citation on the repository’s website, in an access and use policy, and in other guidelines that researchers use when consulting a collection. Increased visibility of the preferred citation may help improve consistency in published citations and discoverability for future researchers.
Further Research

The data collected in this study provide a foundation for looking at patterns of use, in this case, the types of repositories where Catholic historians access archival materials. Surveys or interviews with historians could complement this study and provide a rich source of qualitative information on the use of archives. For instance, why are diocesan and religious orders’ archives (which were found to provide little or no access to online finding aids) the most heavily cited in the current study? To help answer this, historians could be asked about factors that influenced their choice to consult a specific body of records. Previous studies on information-seeking behavior in archives such as Duff and Johnson’s analysis of e-mail reference questions or Dalton and Charnigo’s 2004 hybrid (qualitative and quantitative) study may provide a foundation for developing a qualitative component to this study.  

As mentioned above, many historians tend to rely heavily on a single collection or repository. Since the “reference study” method was used (each citation was counted only the first time), the data do not reflect the extent to which some historians rely on archival sources. For example, Christopher Staysniak’s article, ‘‘We are definitely the pioneers of this movement’: The Regis Lay Apostolate and the Origins of Postgraduate Volunteerism, 1949–1972” in American Catholic Studies, contains 35 citations to materials from Regis College Archives and Special Collections.  

The reference study counted this as one (only the first time the repository was cited). An additional example is Seth Smith’s article, “Implementing Vatican II in Two Rural, Southern Parishes” in US Catholic Historian, which contains a total of 84 citations to archival materials from four repositories. In this study, only four references were analyzed (the first time each collection was cited). A more in-depth citation study could analyze every unique citation in each article. In Smith’s article, for example, 84 citations would be analyzed. This would be a labor-intensive undertaking, but it would provide detailed documentation and further insight into historians’ use of archival sources.  

Catholic repositories, like other collections dealing with a particular field or topic, have unique sets of considerations based on the context in which they exist. Although the study was conducted within the framework of Catholic history, similar methodology could be applied to a variety of fields. For example, archivists at a repository specializing in women’s materials could analyze the citations in Journal of Women’s History and Gender and History, while a repository that collects items of local interest could examine citations in history journals specific to their region, such as Southwestern Historical Quarterly or New England Quarterly. Repositories in every niche face unique issues when acquiring new materials and making them known to researchers. Analyzing citation data is one way that archivists can identify patterns of use to help guide decision making in many areas of archival practice.

Conclusions

This exploratory study provides an overview of Catholic historians’ use of archival sources and repositories in recent years. It also offers insights into archival practices
that could be improved or adopted to ensure continued use of archives. First, it shows the importance of developing an awareness of the collecting practices of other repositories. Diocesan and religious orders’ archives not only have an established role as the homes for materials created by their managing bodies, but they also have a known reputation among Catholic historians; other repositories may wish to direct their efforts toward content that is not already part of these organizations’ collecting purview. For some archives, developing a collection may include forming a “designated repository” relationship with a nonprofit organization or other bodies creating relevant materials. Documenting priorities in a collection development policy will allow archivists to be efficacious when considering potential donors and prioritizing outreach activities.

Observations from this study are twofold regarding archival description. On one hand, heavily cited Catholic college and university archives all provide access to online finding aids. This supports the widely recognized importance of discoverable archival description. In contrast, the archives of dioceses and religious orders, which are cited somewhat more frequently, do not provide access to online finding aids. This suggests that other factors such as name recognition and predictability of holdings may influence a researcher’s decision to consult records at these repositories. Further research, such as surveys with historians, would be useful for providing additional insight into factors that influence their choice to consult a certain body of records.

Potential also exists for adding or highlighting descriptive elements to facilitate discovery. For example, archivists might explore publicizing related archival materials in their finding aids, both for collections within their repository and, if resources allow, related collections at other repositories. Additionally, this study found that some archival citations in the history literature are inconsistent. One way that archivists might address this is by emphasizing a preferred citation in finding aids as well as other documentation such as access and use policies. This would encourage uniformity among published citations and improve discoverability of these materials in the future.

Finally, this study provides a foundation and incentive for further research on the use of archives by Catholic historians. It also reiterates the potential for citation analysis to inform practices in a variety of archival settings. The results and observations of this study confirm what many previous researchers have suggested: quantitative and/or qualitative studies on the use of archives can provide invaluable insights for archivists that will allow them to better meet the needs of users and ensure continued relevancy of archival collections.
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In Archivists, Collectors, Dealers, and Replevin: Case Studies on Private Ownership of Public Documents, respected archival practitioner and library and information science educator Elizabeth H. Dow studies the conflicts that arise from “a legal action brought for the purpose of recovering specified items” (p. vii). She asserts that, despite her professional ties to the Manuscript Society (MS), she is capable of bringing to the neglected archival topic of replevin a dispassionate and independent voice when presenting the viewpoints of the community of collectors and dealers as well as those of the Council of State Archivists (CoSA). Dow concludes that each side has much “to gain by understanding the other’s perspective” (p. xiii).

The book contains clear prose and straightforward organization. Dow writes informative introductory chapters on the development of archival practice and the archival profession in the United States; on the recurrent problems of “theft and neglect” of documents that often occur owing to weak management practices for maintaining public records; on the circumstances that surround the collecting of original documents, whether by public institutions holding a mandate under state law to collect, or by dealers and collector-hobbyists tied to collecting for profit and gain; and on relevant state and federal statutes on public documents in private hands that serve as legal instruments by which public archives can reestablish ownership of property improperly or illegally removed from an archival agency by no fault of its own. In grouping the chapters thematically, Dow attempts to build a bridge between the parties; she encourages government archivists and collectors to understand the mindset of each other as both want to preserve the documentary past.

Dow has a good understanding of the public archives and manuscript traditions. She paints, however, a dark picture of conflict among competing parties arising from the presence of public documents in private hands. Key elements in the storyline are the absence of specific legislation that defines what records belong to the public and who authorizes their disposition. She also argues that public officials discarding documents in good faith years ago adds to the ambiguity over the ownership of alienated documents and makes recovery action(s) by government archivists even more vexing for all participants. As for this claim, this reviewer must conclude that Dow’s portrait of replevin of public records and the level of tension that exists between parties is a bit overdrawn in light of the infrequent use of the practice by all levels of government. She is on the right track, however, emphasizing how archivists and manuscript curators initially had to gain physical and intellectual control over the records in their custody to understand what gaps existed in the documentary corpus, to determine where the missing records were, and to establish whether they could be rightfully retrieved by the public through legal means if they had become in some way alienated. Cases do exist where a current holder held some semilegitimate claim to the title of the property.

Dow correctly appreciates that the enduring conflict or the clash between state archivists and the collecting community comes down to “perspective and what theory one applies to the circumstances” (p. 65). The differing perspectives, the several legal
theories that accommodate either side of the ownership question, and the ways each party makes its respective case represent the content in chapter 6. In comparing the perspectives of the two sides, Dow here again blames the confused state of affairs on decades of “inadequate management” in governmental archives (p. 69). Though this is a fair observation and offers some of the freshest material, it is overly harsh if one understands the emergence of state records programs and records management in the United States. The formation of state archives began in Alabama in 1901. Those archival programs that followed, like Pennsylvania, developed slowly in terms of practice. The National Archives—“America’s Ministry of Documents”—was not established until 1934. Before 1940, few agency records management programs existed to handle the huge volume of unscheduled federal and state records. During the Works Progress Administration (WPA) era of the 1930s and the subsequent two decades, staff historians in many states often blocked the functioning and development of state archival programs to protect their own interests.

In chapters 7 (“Case Studies”) and 8 (“Avoiding Conflict”), Dow advances pathways to reduce the present conflict that frustrates both sides. There are times in the book when she acknowledges that to recover public property (even for routine documents or abandoned property) can be messy and troublesome for state archivists to execute in a complicated “real world.” Here, the author falls short in giving comment and voice to the negotiations and agreements that state archivists and private parties execute outside of the court to settle public record ownership questions, even when case law precedent and state law are absent. In lieu of actual case studies, she offers (over 20 pages) a series of purported, mostly imagined, case studies that will disappoint many readers. Not to have examined or even sampled the professional papers of Solon J. Buck, Margaret Cross Norton, Ernst Posner, H. G. Jones, Thornton Mitchell, and those of dealers such as Kenneth Rendell are also missed opportunities. For example, following the important recovery claim precedent established in the 1976 case North Carolina v. West,1 did state archivists initiate more recovery applications and crusade against private collectors, historical societies, and libraries? I think not; however, Dow does not account for or even investigate whether the B. C. West case contributed to more replevin requests by state archival agencies over the next 15 years.

In the final chapter, titled “Avoiding Conflict,” Dow argues, “Avoiding a problem always costs less than remedying it” (p. 103). She provides a useful “precautionary measures” statement for archival managers, buyers, and sellers, along with a list of steps for buyers and sellers to consider to avoid replevin and a list of questions for archivists to consider before filing a replevin action. Such “procedural advice,” as well as guidelines, may well result in fostering improved public records legislation by states and in improving future opportunities for the partisans to settle disputes outside of the court system. Heads of most archival agencies cannot count on the legal staff of an attorney general to undertake a lawsuit on its behalf in what is a low priority for that governmental office. On the whole, state archivists tolerate the usual patterns of intermingling that leads to ambiguity on titles of public documents and acquiring records of different origins or unclear provenance. Doubt surely matters in ownership questions. Reasonable men and women should be able to resolve them in a professional manner.

Contextually, the archival community at large is responsible for the lack of attention
given to the powerful tool of replevin and its complications and obstacles. Classical archivists G. Philip Bauer, Philip Brooks, and T. R. Schellenberg barely mention the circumstances of pursuing discovery. Ernst Posner in his survey of American State Archives (1964)\textsuperscript{2} did, but offered only three passing references to the recovery of specified items by legal action. Subsequently, H. G. Jones in his Local Government Records: An Introduction to Their Management, Preservation and Use (1980) reminded all of us that “public records are public property.”\textsuperscript{3} The former state archivist of North Carolina sidestepped any direct or full discussion of replevin or when a government holds a right of ownership. The word “replevin” is not in his index. Even so, Jones did argue “public records may be no more altered, defaced, mutilated, or removed from custody than public funds may be embezzled or misappropriated.”\textsuperscript{4} The unity of purpose for public records specialists and for collectors and dealers ought to be to support the advancement of the broad public records mission in the United States. Archivists are duty bound to protect the public interest.

Dow’s critical and singular achievement in Archivists, Collectors, Dealers, and Replevin is the way she fills a void in the archival literature on ethics and law. She sets the stage to further the conversation on the replevin problem and to close the divide between government archivists and collectors. She builds on the scholarship of Gary M. and Trudy Huskamp Peterson (1985)\textsuperscript{5} and Menzi L. Behrnd-Klodt (2008).\textsuperscript{6} However, it is unfortunate that Dow advances a limited and narrow examination and investigation of replevin applications at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). Of some concern is why she missed covering two important legal cases, those of William Clark and Kenneth D. Sender, in which the court ruled for private collectors, but affirmed the right of the National Archives to use replevin to reclaim public record property.

Finally, Dow’s view of the two competing perspectives more often than not favors the world of the Manuscript Society whose membership includes large numbers of dealers and collectors. Laying aside these quibbles, manuscript and special collections librarians as well as public records specialists should own and read this small but expensive book, albeit with a critical eye.

Roland M. Baumann
Emeritus Archivist
Oberlin College
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The Society of American Archivists (SAA) celebrated its 75th anniversary at its 2011 annual meeting in Chicago, Illinois. ARCHIVES 360° and SAA@75: “Then, Now . . . Wow!” was a time to reflect on the foundations, development, and future of the American archival profession. The semiannual American Archivist published four articles in the second issue of the 2011 (74th) volume that engaged the anniversary theme. But this issue insufficiently examined the breadth of the archival profession as covered at that momentous occasion. The American Archivist Online Supplement to Volume 74, guest edited by William E. Landis, compiled nine sessions from the 2011 annual meeting selected and reviewed by the Program Committee. In his introduction, Landis states that the purpose of the supplement is to capture annual meeting content in a more permanent and freely accessible means than purchasable session recordings. Panelists adapted their presentations into articles that explore the evolution of archival practice, examine professional diversity, and debate questions and opportunities for the twenty-first century. This successful supplement is the first of its kind for The American Archivist.

In “Which Hat Are You Wearing: ‘You Need What? When?’,” Russell L. Gasero, Chana Revell Kotzin, Lisa M. Sjoberg, and Alison Stankrauff discuss the unique challenges of lone arrangers. Time management and collaboration are consistent themes in their presentations. Stankrauff details her extensive service record in archival organizations and various local activities, including a collaborative grant-funded project with Indiana University South Bend’s Civil Rights Heritage Center. Although the intent is to offer advice on balancing service obligations with daily job demands, her presentation heavily turns on her service record. Her time management advice is limited to a few concluding paragraphs, and her suggestions boil down to meticulous recordkeeping and daily reminders. Sjoberg discusses outreach strategies at Concordia College that engage college and high school students and faculty with primary sources. She concludes with tips for managing both time and outreach activities, including nurturing relationships, repurposing efforts, and rigid scheduling. Kotzin’s presentation on the collaborative Jewish Buffalo Archives Project offers the most developed suggestions for managing tasks in complex projects. The authors do not describe how to manage daily tasks such as supervising students, processing, or reference duties in addition to the described activities. However, they all demonstrate that relationship building through service or collaborative projects is indispensable to becoming a successful lone arranger.

In the twentieth century, American archival education, traditionally rooted in history education, matured and evolved into several graduate programs in library and information science schools. Many workshops and other institutes are also available now. In “The View from Here: Perspectives on Educating about Archives,” Donna McCrea, Paul Conway, Brenda Banks, Nancy Zimmelman Lenoil, and Michael F. Suarez, S.J., focus on various aspects of archival education. Conway’s analysis of research articles in three North American archival journals published from 2001 to 2011 is rooted in
the context of contention over the role of research in advancing professional theory versus facilitating practice. Conway discovered that research is conducted largely by archival faculty and students rather than by practitioners and that it constituted only 35 percent of the articles studied. Although he argues for better understanding how research bridges the gap between education and practice, Conway found that archivists are not proactively melding research findings into daily work.

Both Banks and Lenoil affirm the role of the Georgia Archives Institute, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Archives Institute, and the Western Archives Institute in educating archivists and minorities with little formal training. The institutes remain relevant in the twenty-first century: digital education is either under development or already included in their curricula. Suarez describes his concern over the lack of cohesion between archivists and special collections librarians and discusses the role of Rare Book School as an educational meeting ground where these two groups can mutually benefit.

Connell B. Gallagher, Mark A. Greene, Leigh McWhite, Naomi L. Nelson, and Linda A. Whitaker pay homage to the Congressional Papers Roundtable’s (CPR) impact on their careers in “Roundtables as Incubators for Leadership: The Legacy of the Congressional Papers Roundtable.” The article illuminates the importance of roundtables as a gateway for involvement and relationship building in a large organization like SAA. The authors note the ways in which participation in the CPR helped develop their leadership skills and led to greater professional opportunities. Of encouragement to all archivists, the authors speak gratefully about the support from likeminded archivists in a close-knit roundtable community. Several audience member testimonies from the original session reflecting similar themes are included.

The 75th anniversary would have been incomplete without an examination of early American archivists who modernized the profession in the early-to-mid-twentieth century. “Founding Brothers: Leland, Buck, and Cappon and the Formation of the Archives Profession” features insight from authors who researched extensively in the personal papers of these founders. In his review of Lester J. Cappon’s diaries, Richard J. Cox observes that writings on archival history draw more from published literature than archival sources, and this conclusion creates the context for the article. From the diaries, we learn about Cappon the person: his struggles, ambitions, and points of view from competing yet complimentary archival, historical, and documentary editing backgrounds. Cox demonstrates the value of studying archival materials to learn more about the profession than can be discovered through publications. Charles J. Dollar gives a conventional and straightforward account of Solon J. Buck’s impact on the formation of SAA, early archival education, and the Federal Records Act of 1950. Peter J. Wosh highlights four legacies of Waldo G. Leland—globalism, Progressivism, institutionalization, and professionalization—and their impact on early archival developments. Like Cox, he advocates exploring the social components of archival history. The careers of these founders reflect the growing pains of archival science as it became a profession distinct from history.

From “gatekeepers” to “facilitators,” from “records oriented” to “user oriented,” perhaps no aspect of archival work witnessed as drastic a change in the twentieth century as access and reference. These ideas are explored by George W. Bain, John A. Fleckner, Kathy
Marquis, and Mary Jo Pugh in “Reference, Access, and Outreach: An Evolved Landscape, 1936–2011.” Pugh presents a broad overview of reference by focusing on several environmental factors influencing its practice within an institution. Sidestepping a pressing question, she limits discussion of reference’s place in today’s Internet-dominated world to just one paragraph, mentioning online tutorials, guides, and the evaluation of information resources. Pugh ends by arguing for better understanding of information-seeking processes and continued outreach efforts so that archives are better positioned to be users’ information entry points when appropriate. Fleckner’s survey of the evolving notions of access builds upon Pugh’s conclusion by arguing that increasing archival literacy is the next frontier to facilitate access. (Some archivists and institutions are already exploring this avenue; for example, I recently participated in a Purdue University study aiming to develop archival competencies for undergraduate history majors.) Bain completes the article by tracing the notions of outreach from an afterthought when SAA and the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) were founded to the central archival function it is today. He credits the expansion to the maturation of the profession in the 1970s and the establishment of SAA’s Reference, Access, and Outreach Section in 1983. He continues with the “archives and society” discussions of the 1980s, the creation of Archives Month, National History Day, and the “I Found It in the Archives” contest.

In “Seventy-Five Years of International Women’s Collecting: Legacies, Successes, Obstacles, and New Directions,” Rachel Miller, Danelle Moon, and Anke Voss discuss early twentieth-century and contemporary efforts to document women’s history. Miller and Voss explore the contentious relationships between European suffragists Roskia Schwimmer, Rosa Manus, and Aletta Jacobs out of which came the Aletta Institute for Women’s History in Amsterdam, as well as the Sophia Smith Collection at Smith College, the Schlesigner Library at Harvard University, and the Schwimmer-Lloyd Collection at the New York Public Library. Interestingly, European women had a lasting impact on women’s collections in the United States. Moon focuses on how the virtual International Museum of Women came to be, an institution that reflects the legacy that Schwimmer, Manus, and others have had on the growth of women’s collections today.

In “Exploring the Evolution of Access: Classified, Privacy, and Proprietary Restrictions,” William C. Carpenter, Charlene Nichols, Sarah A. Polirer, and Judith A. Wiener remind us that archival access operates in the context of proprietary and legal restrictions that are at times necessary for the greater good. Carpenter discusses the evolution of federal classification for national security and chronicles several presidential executive orders that have advanced and refined the declassification of government information. She mentions the implications of technology and controversial organizations such as WikiLeaks only in passing. Polirer explains the corporate archivist’s role in serving business needs by restricting proprietary information and supporting risk management, and provides a framework for making business records accessible. Disappointingly, she offers no perspective on the oft-cited role of archives in keeping corporations accountable to society, or the ethical complexities of corporate archives. Wiener discusses the evolution of privacy issues in medical records to illustrate the challenges in balancing access and protecting privacy. She points to Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act–related resources to aid archivists in health science repositories, noting the necessity of institutional legal advice when formulating access policies.
Since Peter Gottlieb argued for establishing a federation of existing archival organizations in his 2010 SAA presidential address, archivists have reexamined the relationship between SAA and the regional organizations. Numerous authors representing several organizations offer their perspectives in “E Pluribus Unum? SAA and the Regionals.” The year 1972 saw the establishment of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, New England Archivists, Midwest Archives Conference, Northwest Archivists, and the Society of Southwest Archivists. The authors note that these groups had similar agendas: creating networks where less-experienced or resource-challenged archivists could focus on local needs and exchange ideas in ways not offered by SAA. They identify areas of existing collaboration and suggest new ideas such as working toward a common agenda like SAA’s strategic priorities, or including regional representatives in SAA’s governing structure. Although Gottlieb’s vision remains unfulfilled, this discussion provides initial ideas to move us toward a new relationship.

The final chapter, “Thirty Years On: SAA and Descriptive Standards,” looks at the development of archival descriptive standards and SAA’s past and potential involvement. Victoria Irons Walch presents on behalf of Kathleen D. Roe and focuses primarily on the National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF); MARC AMC; Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts; and the Working Group on Standards for Archival Description. William E. Landis discusses the General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G)) and the American response, Describing Archives: A Content Standard, and argues that American descriptive standards should be influenced more by ISAD(G) rather than by their historic bibliographic roots. Michael Rush examines Encoded Archival Description (EAD) and Encoded Archival Context: Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF) and promotes several principles to guide future standards. William Stockting describes standards development in the United Kingdom. Unlike those in the United States, British standards were rooted in ISAD(G) and witnessed greater leadership from national bodies like the Public Records Office, now the National Archives. Walch, Landis, and Rush offer a fascinating analysis of SAA’s and NARA’s tepid involvement in standards development. Session chair Steve Henson makes clear that American standards would not have been possible without the grassroots enthusiasm of a core group of archivists. They do, however, note SAA’s support in the form of endorsing, publishing, and offering workshops on descriptive standards.

The Online Supplement exposes readers to history and perspectives on various aspects of the archival profession. It uniquely captures reflections on important topics as archivists commemorate 75 years of SAA and progress into the twenty-first century. Archivists of all experience levels will undoubtedly learn something new about how our profession has evolved during the first 75 years of SAA. The freely available volume makes annual meeting content more accessible than ever before. Landis states that future online supplements will be posted at the discretion of The American Archivist. I hope this option is pursued.

Matt Gorzalski
University Archivist
Morris Library-Special Collections Research Center
Southern Illinois University

Perspectives on Women’s Archives satisfies on two counts. This collection of essays provides a useful summary of the development of the field of women’s history since the emergence of the discipline in the 1970s and of the growth of women’s archives from the earliest days of the republic. As such, it might well be incorporated into reading lists for both history and archival studies programs. But the book also offers stimulating prescriptions for the future direction of archives and raises urgent questions about the quality and equality of access in our overwhelmingly digital environment. In this way, it advances the ongoing discussion of why archivists do what we do and how we can do it better—all without the grating neologism “herstory” making more than a token appearance in the text.

The editors originally intended to collect in one volume all the available archival literature on women’s archives. Not only did they discover that the amount of archival material supporting work in women’s history is daunting, they also decided that one book is inadequate to address all the major issues in the field that demand attention. This in itself points to the fact that both women’s history and women’s archives have come a long way since their inception and are now a vital part of our cultural universe.

The book begins with prominent historian Gerda Lerner’s overview of the appearance of women’s history as a field of serious academic study in the activist 1970s, a time of striving for social equality and inclusion. She traces the trajectory of approaches used, from compensatory and contributory history, or the activities of women considered notable in a man’s world and on a man’s terms, through a transitional history focusing on women’s culture, to today’s emphasis on a holistic history of all humankind. The simultaneous search for sources in which to ground this discipline revealed that the emergence of women’s archives had preceded the formal development of women’s history per se, with historian Mary Ritter Beard proposing a revolutionary World Center for Women’s Archives in 1935. Although Beard’s dream failed to give rise to a lasting independent entity, Anke Voss argues that her long collaboration with Smith College archivist Margaret Grierson established a model for future collecting endeavors aimed at illuminating women’s experience. Yet, as Janice E. Ruth points out, the Library of Congress had been accessioning women’s materials such as poems by Phillis Wheatley since shortly after its founding in 1800, and, by the turn of the twentieth century, was actively soliciting the papers of prominent women such as abolitionists, suffragettes, and pioneers in fields traditionally dominated by men. Taronda Spencer shows that historic black colleges and universities were also in the forefront of the women’s archives movement, collecting materials produced by their female graduates even prior to 1935.

But as Deborah Gray White and Audrey T. McCluskey assert, black women’s own voices remained scarce in mainstream archives, even those with a commitment to collecting in women’s studies. This was due partly to the black community’s heavy reliance on oral tradition and partly to the majority society’s tendency to interpret black women as victims rather than agents. Inevitably, literate, white, upper-class women generated the most material in traditional formats as well as the most interest among collecting
institutions. Eva S. Moseley emphasizes that, absent documents telling the stories of nonelite women, apparently trivial domestic records can assume hitherto unimagined importance. She cites historians’ use of household accounts to add new dimensions to studies of American economic history and recommends expanding descriptive norms to capture the existence of such materials in archives (a suggestion that rather reduces the allure of “More Product, Less Process”). Indeed, unusual sources increasingly recognized as important carriers of women’s culture—artifacts like textiles and family albums, self-published photocopied journals or ‘zines, web-based records—pose challenges of description and preservation that severely strain the limited resources of many institutions.

Mary A. Caldera notes that access to records documenting the lesbian experience is influenced not only by the definitions arising from identity politics and bias in the lesbian as well as archival communities, but also by privacy concerns surrounding sensitive materials. Given the private sphere to which women were long relegated, it is not surprising that privacy and censorship considerations loom large in women’s archives. The records of human reproduction (including abortion) treated by Tanya Zanish-Belcher and those of medical facilities and social welfare agencies held by many congregations of women religious, mentioned by Fernanda Perrone, are cases in point.

The editors highlight three major issues for women’s archives, all of which are of equal significance to the archival community as a whole. One revolves around the current buzzwords “hidden collections”: access problems associated with intellectual control and spatial location may be greater for women’s archives with their host of anomalous formats containing some seemingly innocuous subject matter and housed in a myriad of often unexpected places, but the paucity of institutional resources that enters into the equation resonates with almost every archivist. Resources, as Zanish-Belcher and Voss insist, have an enormous impact on what is saved, what is publicized to potential users, and how this information is disseminated. While marginalized groups have traditionally been defined in terms of race, ethnicity, occupation or class, and sexual orientation, the current divide between technological haves and have-nots, whether these be individuals or institutions, is potentially almost as deep and as damaging to the historical record and to our collective memory.

It is increasingly easy to regard digital technology as both the blessing and the bane of modern archives, a vicious cycle in which more records are created and broader access is possible, but where such access may prove illusory if, for example, migration issues limit its permanence and if those without technological resources or skills are barred from sharing in the bounty. This dilemma is echoed in the conclusions of two essays cowritten by Kären M. Mason and Tanya Zanish-Belcher. In their 1999 collaboration, the duo recognized that while computer technology promises greater archival access, care must be taken not to exclude the nonwired public from the conversation. In 2007, however, they delivered a paean to the democratizing effect of digital technology on archives with no attendant caveats. One wonders whether the increased use of the Internet over the prior 10 years lulled them, and perhaps other archivists, into a false sense of security that thankfully has proved temporary. The editors’ cautious stance today represents a necessary corrective to the constant digital hype that appears to hold us captive.
A related concern of the editors is what they perceive to be the erosion of the archivist’s historical sense. The current focus on information management, whether analog or digital, and the widespread adoption of the library degree as the standard in the archival profession may be destroying the traditional humanistic orientation of archivists. Past collaborations between archivists and historians, as in the case of Mary Ritter Beard and Margaret Grierson, were instrumental in the creation of collections of women’s materials necessary to support scholarship in the burgeoning field of women’s history as well as women’s own expanding feelings of self-worth. If, as Eva S. Moseley claims, archivists have the ability to promote new trends in history, and if, as so many of the authors of these essays assert, improving the documentation of underrepresented groups requires the intervention of activist archivists, then archivists must fundamentally be scholars, even if they do not themselves function as such professionally. It also is not difficult to foresee a decline in intellectual access to collections if archivists lose their grounding in the humanities and become IT specialists.

The final major issue for women’s archives posited by the editors is the role of the professional archivist vis-à-vis citizen archivists, whose grassroots community archives enrich the documentary record of neglected segments of the population, including the “man in the street.” Here the activist archivist once more strides to the fore. This vision of the archivist as, in Elizabeth A. Myers’s words, “gateway, rather than gatekeeper” (p. 434) encourages the professional to collaborate with the citizen archivist and even to create records in an attempt to integrate underrepresented groups into the archival landscape. This is one instance in which the usual reservations about artificial collections fall by the wayside.

While the essays can grow repetitive, a failing common to compilations structured around a very specific topic, this reviewer welcomes this overview of the present state of women’s archives, as well as the exhortation to archivists to craft a higher, more proactive professional and community profile. Ambitious, perhaps, especially in this era of blighted budgets, but this ambition is worthy of those who have gone before, who faced even greater odds in their quest to create a new historiography. Holistic history demands holistic archives.

Christine Froechtenigt Harper  
Supervising Archivist  
Records Retention Section, Office of the Comptroller, City of St. Louis

This long-awaited translation of Arlette Farge’s 1989 classic, Le Goût de l’archive, is a welcome addition to a small but growing body of literature exploring encounters with archives. The book details a noted French historian’s memories and ruminations about the archival research she performed using Ancien Régime records in preparation for her doctoral dissertation in 1974. Anecdotal reminiscences recall the practices of repositories in Paris in the early 1970s, recounting the author’s engagement with primary sources, including frustrations, philosophical reflections, self-doubts, and identification with the subjects of her research. Included are astute observations about how historical knowledge is produced through the complex process of converting research in original documents into historical narrative and argumentation. Lively and often profound, the text is nicely complemented by Natalie Zemon Davis’s perceptive introduction.

Farge’s account centers on eighteenth-century police and judicial records at the Archives nationales, the Bibliothèque nationale, and, more particularly, the Archives de la Bastille at the Arsenal Library in Paris. We watch as she negotiates her way through the foot-dragging and confusion of obtaining a reader’s card at the Arsenal Library, locates appropriate offices in a welter of poorly identified rooms, studies oversized volumes in search of registers and call numbers, vies with other researchers for the best reading room seats, is distracted by the coughing and quirkiness of fellow readers, and wins the attention (or fails to) of archival staff. The archivists seem distant and impatient. The reading room is cold in summer as well as winter. Some of the documents, unpunctuated and oddly spelled, can hardly be read. “Your eyes alone are not up to the task,” Farge indicates. “[T]he only way to decipher . . . is to pronounce it out loud, to whisper the disjointed writing” (p. 59). Her descriptions linger over the distinctive smells of old bundles, the delicious sensation of touching bindings and paper, the excitement of discovery, and the fascination of eavesdropping on forgotten voices from a bygone era.

The book warns against surrendering to digressions, unguarded identification with the lives glimpsed in “talkative” (p. 73) records, and other seductive traps of archival research. The police and judicial files detail tavern brawls, libel, blasphemy, domestic violence, theft, dog bites, murder, networks of police informers, and subversion, recording verbatim statements that sketch vivid pictures of downtrodden lives as well as the machinery of suppression. One arrested man under interrogation believes he is being punished by God for loving a married woman. A washerwoman, accused of sedition, seems more concerned about correcting her name for the record—she admits that she is sometimes called “Pockmarked Fatty,” but she does not respond because it is not her real name and she does not like it (p. 83). Historians, Farge advises, should be close to, yet distanced from, the words, events, and personalities contained in primary sources: “History is never the simple repetition of archival content, but a pulling away from it, in which we never stop asking how and why these words came to wash ashore on the manuscript page. One must put the archive aside for a while, in order to better think
on one’s own terms . . . alternating tasks of exclusion and reintegration of documents and writing, as you add your own style to the thoughts that emerge” (p. 75).

Many of the observations and insights are applicable to archives and archival research in general. Archives are a vast ocean, Farge suggests, where unwary researchers can sink or find themselves hopelessly adrift. Archivists, she maintains, keep their bearings in this overwhelming expanse of material by reducing their collections to indices and call numbers, to cubic and linear meters, to determinations of how much shelf space may be required for a particular purpose, “a clever way of coming to grips with the archives, of taming them, while . . . recognizing the impossibility of ever taking full possession of them” (pp. 4–5). The French word *fonds*, as a note reminds us, refers not only to archival collections, but also to the ocean floor (p. 131).

The stories contained in “raw traces” in the archives take shape, according to Farge, “only when you ask a specific type of question of them. . . . ” (p. 12). *Dépouiller*, the standard French term for unpacking bundles of documents and sifting through them, derives from roots meaning unveiling, removing clothes, or skinning an animal to get the meat inside (p. 131). Somewhat surprisingly, the book’s translation by Thomas Scott-Railton renders *le goût* in the title as “allure” instead of “taste,” even though the latter more accurately invokes the sensual pleasure described by Farge as she immerses herself in the figurative consumption of archival documents.

Farge decries the ability of reproductions to provide researchers with direct, personal connections to the past. “An archival manuscript is a living document; microfilm reproduction, while sometimes unavoidable, can drain the life out of it” (p. 15). Her opinion, if she revised it for the twenty-first century, would probably likewise disparage the relative lifelessness of digitized collections. *The Allure of the Archives* is an intriguing case study of a thoughtful historian’s encounters with archival practices and archival research some 40 years ago. One hopes that American (and French) archivists today are more inviting, less punctilious, more eager to engage in meaningful dialogue, and more helpful in suggesting appropriate research opportunities and directions.

Jeffrey Mifflin
Archivist and Curator
Massachusetts General Hospital

The 2013 work *Archives and Archivists 2* is proof that a successful project breeds success. *Archives and Archivists*, published in 2006, marked the 30th anniversary of University College of Dublin’s archival and records management programs. This equally important sequel sets out to highlight research by the program’s postgraduates and, according to the editors Ailsa C. Holland and Elizabeth Mullins, “Its purpose is to provide an opportunity for new practitioners in archives and records management to continue engaging with the research they began during their studies and to provide a platform on which they can publish” (p. 7). Functionally, the book is broken into three sections: postmodernism, perceptions and memory, and advocacy and user perspectives. It features 13 authors whose postgraduate experiences are fairly diverse, but all of whom have capitalized on their education to find employment in cultural humanities or cultural history fields, predominantly in Ireland. Indeed, it will come as no surprise to the reader that the case studies and subject focus of the latter two sections of the book—perceptions and memory, advocacy—center almost entirely on the Irish experience from the perspective of archivists and archives users as well as the laws and cultural institutions that govern archival practice in Ireland.

*Archives and Archivists 2* begins with a critical section dedicated to archival theory. Collectively, the essays provide timely reflections on theoretical issues in the field ranging from Antoinette Doran’s thoughtful primer concerning the impact of postmodernism, postcolonialism, and feminism on archives, to Julie Brook’s equally analytical review of the effect of modernism and postmodernism on appraisal. The essays of Harriet Wheelock and David Ryan, concerning the intersection of Web 2.0 and postmodernism and personal *fonds*, respectively, seek to analyze the unique space where archival theory and practice meet. Wheelock’s critique of transparency, or lack thereof, of online archival descriptions is particularly relevant as archivists continue to wrestle with the Internet as a way to “harness collective intelligence” while at the same time revealing the limits of archival authority (p. 49).

The second section of the book, perhaps its most successful and informative for a non-Irish reader, concentrates primarily on the complex relationship between Irish archival practitioners and Irish archival users. Kevin Lohan’s research focuses on a qualitative analysis of two Irish newspapers and their portrayal of archives. Luckily for all archivists, his research points to an emerging halo effect—associating archives with societal accountability that renders archives institutionally trustworthy and thus relevant outside of a narrowly defined cultural milieu of historical research (pp. 95–96). Indeed, as further substantiated by the work of Pauline Swords, archives serve important cultural and social functions within Irish society in the form of community archives. As she concludes, community archives can protect or even restore a unique shared identity especially during times of generational shift or other major changes/challenges to a community such as during “the Troubles” (pp. 105–7). Swords touches on an enduring subtheme of the powerful role archives play in a community that wants to remember, while at the same time struggling with its profoundly difficult past.

The sometimes-fraught relationship between the individual and the state, particularly
around the issue of “right to know” surfaces again, and most explicitly, in the deftly written essay by Kristen Mulrennan. In a fascinating review of recordkeeping practices in Irish asylums, primarily focusing on Grangegorman Psychiatric Hospital, Mulrennan reveals the complex intersection of records creators, legal restrictions, and user expectations. Similarly, Leah Benson’s comprehensive assessment of Irish privacy laws with regard to archival access issues exposes the real tension between the benefits of research using personal information and the importance of individual consent. Emma Saunders takes a similar tack but with a refreshing focus on the Stasi records of the former German Democratic Republic. Saunders’s detailed description of the establishment and function of the BStU (Office of the Federal Commission for the Records of the Ministry for State Security of the Former German Democratic Republic) makes for an important case study on how the state, and archivists working for the state, can negotiate the extremely challenging terrain of historical state records generated illegally about its own citizens. Given recent dramatic shifts in global politics and the underlying dialogue concerning the exercise of governmental authority through surveillance, the lessons of the BStU experience are particularly germane.

The final section of the book ruminates upon the very core ideology of Irish archival practice, albeit from different perspectives. Niamh Collin’s essay on the relationship between archivists and family historians from the archivist’s perspective is a solid foil to Catherine Wright’s essay, which presents the perspective of family historians. Both authors recognize the increasingly important role of family historians as a user group in local authority archives. Therein are important lessons for any archives seeing a spike in use by nontraditional or nonscholarly researchers. According to Collin, family historians (genealogists) are enthusiastic users who consume a disproportionate amount of staff time compared to traditional academic scholars. Moreover, these nonprofessional users typically work and publish with a disregard for historical context. At the same time, family historians, by their proliferating numbers, have compelled archives to revisit their service and access structures. In contrast, Wright suggests that while family historians may begin without knowledge of or regard for historical context, they often develop complex research narratives around their original research question. Indeed, in an area of shared deduction, Wright found that family historians want greater access to the records and more instruction from archivists. The last two essays of Archives and Archivists 2 focus on other archives users—teachers. Brian Kirby’s sophisticated analysis of the complicated tensions between teachers, instructional requirements, and archivists ultimately posits that even when excluded from structural planning—in this case curriculum development—archivists must nevertheless assert their value. Fundamentally, he concludes that archivists have an opportunity, if not an obligation, to teach the teachers. Louise Kennedy carries a similar thesis through to the role of archives and archivists in higher education pedagogy. As is also typical of North American student experiences, too few University College Dublin undergraduate students find their way to the archives, while graduate students often do. For both groups, student experiences vary from heavily mediated to self-directed. Ultimately, Kennedy rightly argues that faculty-archivist collaboration is key in deepening student experiences in the archives, but that archivists need a more defined role in that collaboration.
As a whole, *Archives and Archivists 2* is a crisp read of contemporary archival issues in Ireland composed by newly minted archival practitioners. In the editors’ stated purpose—to provide a platform for new professionals to reach a broad audience—it is a resounding success. Ultimately, many of the essays suffer from the limits of their own construction, which was a result of masters or doctoral coursework. Many, if not most, of the authors qualify their work as being limited in scope. For example, the authors’ use of small interview pools and their employment of qualitative rather than quantitative analysis makes drawing large-scale conclusions difficult. Further, many of the essays reflect the standard graduate school writing template of literature review, methodology, and analysis. While this does not impair the research itself, it nevertheless creates reader fatigue. These criticisms are minor, however, and should not detract from an otherwise cohesive group of essays, attentively arranged, thoughtfully presented, and well argued.

Elizabeth A. Myers
Director of Special Collections
Smith College
“Digital preservation”—two words that can invoke anxiety in even the most veteran archivist, from the lone arranger looking for a cost-effective way to transfer digital files off of obsolete media to curators at large research institutions who struggle to manage increasingly vast and diverse bodies of digital data. As the book’s subtitle suggests, and as Adrian Brown states explicitly in the introduction, *Practical Digital Preservation: A How-To-Guide for Organizations of Any Size* was written primarily for current and prospective practitioners in smaller archives, libraries, galleries, museums, and other institutions with an obligation to collect, preserve, and provide access to information resources in digital formats. Brown’s central thesis is that “digital preservation is a practical proposition for all,” and throughout the book he emphasizes that “it is not only possible but eminently realistic for organizations of all sizes to put digital preservation into practice, even with limited resources and existing knowledge” (pp. 2–3).

The scope of *Practical Digital Preservation* is not limited to “preservation” in the narrowest sense of the word, but rather encompasses all aspects of implementing a comprehensive digital preservation program from pre-preservation strategic planning to final dissemination of curated digital content to end users. However, the book is not intended to be comprehensive, but rather a “starting point” or “initial guide” that points readers to further information, tools, and resources. Due to its formulaic structure, the book is easy to navigate and lends itself to consultation as a ready-reference resource. Case studies are also included at the end of some chapters to provide specific examples of how practical digital preservation has been successfully implemented by smaller institutions.

Chapter 1 serves as the introduction and describes the book’s target audience, outlines the goals of digital preservation, and debunks common digital preservation myths. Here Brown also demonstrates a concern for precise and consistent use of digital preservation terminology by thoroughly defining fundamental concepts like *digital object* and *digital repository* and explaining the criteria for including terms in the glossary.

Chapters 2 through 4 introduce requirements and best practices for pre-preservation planning. As archivists and curators of digital content, we can easily become so fixated on the technical requirements for preserving digital records that we neglect some of the more fundamental prerequisites like the need for a clearly articulated digital preservation policy and sustainable funding model. For this reason, Brown’s decision to devote one-third of the book to pre-preservation planning is a fortunate one for readers and makes this section arguably the most important and useful in the entire book. Chapter 2, “Making the Case for Digital Preservation,” outlines strategies for securing resources for a digital preservation program by quantifying the value of digital preservation in a manner that will appeal to decision makers and funders. Brown recommends developing a “digital asset register” that documents all of an institution’s digital assets and includes a risk assessment outlining each asset’s vulnerability and the potential impact on the institution if the asset were to be lost. A template and detailed instructions for creating a digital asset register are provided in appendix 1. Chapter 3, “Understanding Your Requirements,” outlines procedures for defining digital preservation requirements
such as identifying stakeholders and their roles, modeling requirements based on your institution’s business requirements, and developing a “requirements catalog” that describes those requirements in detail. Chapter 4, “Models for Implementing a Digital Preservation Service,” focuses on steps for selecting an appropriate model for implementing the digital preservation requirements outlined in the requirements catalog. Potential models include developing a custom, in-house solution; using open source software tools; purchasing a commercial solution; and outsourcing to a hosted third-party service provider. Examples of common digital preservation software, tools, and services are provided in appendix 3.

Chapters 5 through 9 outline the principal functions of a digital repository. Chapter 5 covers the steps for selecting and physically acquiring digital objects, while chapter 6 focuses on ingest and accessioning procedures for bringing digital objects under intellectual control. Brown’s understanding of the acquisition, ingest, and accessioning of digital objects is heavily informed by the tools and techniques for smaller institutions outlined in the Paradigm Project’s Paradigm Workbook on Digital Private Papers (2007) and the AIMS Work Group report, AIMS Born-Digital Collections: An Inter-Institutional Model for Stewardship (2012), and he does an excellent job of explaining not only what should be done to implement a successful digital preservation program, but also why each step is important. Chapter 7, “Describing Digital Objects,” provides guidance on choosing, acquiring, and storing descriptive, technical, and structural metadata to support a digital repository.

Chapter 8, “Preserving Digital Objects,” is the heart of the book and introduces “the strategies and techniques required to ensure that digital information remains accessible and usable over the long term” (p. 193). Here Brown addresses many of the concerns that one would expect to see in any serious overview of digital preservation including potential threats to the reliability, authenticity, and accessibility of digital information such as bit rot and technological obsolescence; preservation strategies including migration and emulation; and security controls and routine integrity monitoring of files. This chapter is rich with information and provides a very detailed yet concise overview of many of the concepts that often reappear in the broader digital preservation literature.

Chapter 9, “Providing Access to Users,” focuses on the decisions that institutions must make when providing access to digital objects. Brown believes, and many readers would likely agree, that “access provides the very raison d’être for digital preservation,” in that the preservation actions we take should be informed by the anticipated needs of our users (p. 243). User needs, however, must ultimately be balanced with any legal considerations and the technical capabilities of the repository.

In chapter 10, “Future Trends,” Brown concludes by considering the future of digital preservation tools, techniques, and ideas. He is well aware of the potential pitfalls inherent in what he refers to as “futurology,” but explains that in a rapidly changing field like digital preservation, “There is some value in considering the areas of progress that are most apparent, and how they may manifest” (p. 273). From his perspective, the future of digital preservation will likely include an expanded market for commercial solutions as the private sector looks to “off-the-shelf” solutions for preserving their commercially viable digital assets, as well as the emergence of hosted digital repositories, or
“Preservation-as-a-Service” (PrasS), as a common digital preservation solution that is particularly attractive for smaller institutions.

A central argument reiterated throughout the book is that “digital preservation is an outcome, which can be achieved by many different means, and at varying levels of complexity, to suit the needs and resources of the organization in question” (p. 4). To demonstrate this inherent flexibility, Brown has developed a “digital preservation maturity model” as a way for organizations to assess their capabilities in relation to a minimum standard for each of the requirements for planning and implementing a digital preservation program. The maturity levels for each requirement range from 0 to 5, with 3 being the minimum recommended standard. As Brown explains, “The value of such maturity models lies primarily in providing a framework for thinking about digital preservation as a broad spectrum of acceptable capabilities, rather than a single, and almost certainly unobtainable, ideal of curatorial perfection” (p. 90). This maturity model should not only prove to be exceedingly useful for preservation planning purposes, but it also aligns with the Levels of Digital Preservation released by the National Digital Stewardship Alliance (NDSA) in 2013. Brown’s maturity model is in fact much broader in scope given that it also encompasses policies, staffing, and organizational support—three digital preservation planning requirements that the NDSA explicitly chose to exclude from its recommendations.

Many readers may be disappointed by the lack of attention given to archival arrangement and description in the book. The concept of arrangement is not addressed at all, and the term “arrangement” only appears once or twice in reference to content management systems like Archivists’ Toolkit that facilitate archival arrangement. Archival description is only mentioned briefly in reference to ISAD(G) and EAD, two of many descriptive metadata standards introduced in chapter 7. This omission is likely due to the diversity of Brown’s intended audience, which includes a variety of different cultural memory institutions beyond archives. The first book in SAA’s new Trends in Archives Practice series, Archival Arrangement and Description (especially Module 2: “Processing Digital Records and Manuscripts”), would be a more appropriate resource for readers interested in strategies for processing digital archival records.

One could argue, in reference to the book’s cost, that the majority of the information presented in Practical Digital Preservation is derived from resources that are already freely available online; however, Adrian Brown has combed through the often overwhelming deluge of information that comprises the current output of the digital preservation community and has extracted, synthesized, and presented the most relevant bits in a highly readable and readily comprehensive format that digital preservation practitioners and researchers will likely consult and cite frequently, well into the foreseeable future. If readers wish to take advantage of Brown’s diligent research and thoughtful insights gained through years of practical experience as an innovator in the field, it is going to cost a little more upfront, but doing so will ultimately save them a tremendous amount of time and make the task of practical digital preservation seem much less intimidating.

Brandon T. Pieczko
Digital Archivist for Manuscript Collections
Ball State University

In 2008, to provide continuity across the profession and acknowledge skills needed for effective stewardship of special collections materials, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) approved Competencies for Special Collections Professionals. This document explicitly contends that those responsible for special collections materials must be “committed to promoting the appreciation and use of special collections materials to a variety of audiences. . . . ” and “skilled in planning and implementing programs and publications that promote and interpret collections, such as exhibits. . . . ” Indeed, at one time or another, most archivists and special collections librarians face curating a display or exhibit. Despite this, modern resources on exhibit preparation geared to special collections are lacking, leaving staff to glean guidance from general library exhibit publications or to turn to colleagues in the museum field for the most current materials on exhibits. Jessica Lacher-Feldman’s book, Exhibits in Archives and Special Collections Libraries, attempts to fill this void in the literature.

With over a decade of experience in rare books, outreach services, and exhibit production, as well as a successful series of workshops for the Society of American Archivists on creating exhibits, the author is uniquely qualified to write on this topic. Using her background to her advantage, her enthusiasm shows in the tone of her writing, and she encourages readers to “proceed and be bold” in approaching exhibit work (p. 6). Some relish curating exhibits, and others see it as a burdensome task. She acknowledges that for most, creating exhibits is done in addition to other duties; it is seldom one’s only responsibility, and it is rare to dedicate staff solely to producing exhibit content. But this shouldn’t stop or discourage archivists, librarians, and curators. She asserts that we have many of the required skills, even if they are not immediately recognizable in the application to exhibit work. For example, exhibits require historical research, writing, editing, collaboration, and teaching skills, all things special collections professionals do every day. For archivists or librarians with lingering doubts or reticence to tackle exhibits, Lacher-Feldman’s book focuses on allaying those fears.

Creating an exhibit need not be complicated, but considerations are numerous. One of the author’s stated goals is to offer “practical and structured guidance” (p. 5). With 16 chapters, 6 appendices, case studies, templates, and exercises, the book is methodically organized, beginning with the theoretical “why exhibit?” (pp. 7–16) and exhibit process overview and proceeding to a breakdown of the steps involved. These steps—as further exemplified in both the mini- and expansive chapter-length case studies—are the most compelling. In just two hundred pages, Lacher-Feldman touches on everything related to exhibits: identifying topics, supplies, documentation, policies, design, online components, publicity, outreach, and assessment.

In particular, the author makes effective use of the recurring theme of drawing on skills common to archivists and librarians. Archivists document not just the records of others, but our own processes, procedures, and best practices. Exhibits are no different, and the author includes a sample exhibit policy outlining mission, scope, identification of responsibilities, loans, and security. She extols and shows through case studies the
benefits of collaboration, from using coworkers, students, or others from outside the repository as cocurators, to integrating exhibit development into the daily work of the repository, as exhibit inspiration can and should be identified during collection acquisition, processing, and reference. In a nod to “More Product, Less Process,” the author gives the reader unequivocal permission to use just what’s needed for each exhibit. For example, not every exhibition needs a companion publication, catalog, or brochure. Likewise, considering quick turnaround times between displays and juggling other work duties, it is entirely appropriate to be a “temporary expert” on an exhibit subject.

The lengthiest chapter concerns design and layout. Some may be tentative when it comes to creativity, but Lacher-Feldman successfully argues it is an opportunity for empowerment. She urges special collections staff to take a fresh look at their collections to mine hidden exhibit themes such as using the format of an item (diaries, bindings, advertisements, or letterhead) as the basis for an exhibit. Similarly, she offers an exercise to rethink current exhibit space, not to plan for an expensive remodel, but to look for opportunities to rearrange cases, adjust lighting, or use wall space in an inventive manner. Exhibit design and layout is not limited to just the arrangement of materials inside a case, but also involves the display of the exhibit area itself.

Lacher-Feldman’s approach is practical and hands-on, and she includes numerous sample forms, templates, exercises, supplier lists, and case studies to bolster and expand upon exhibit theory. It is apparent that these materials come from her experience in special collections exhibit development and in teaching workshops on the topic, and it serves the reader well. Rooted in realism and experience, she acknowledges that not all responses to the interpretation of collection materials for a public audience will necessarily be positive. Extensive case studies address both public and in-house issues regarding controversial or sensitive exhibit content.

It would be remiss not to draw attention to Fernanda Perrone and Flora Boros’s excellent literature review in appendix A. The review is inclusive, arranged topically, and covers the limited resources pertaining to special collections exhibits. Not surprisingly, the most relevant and up-to-date resources originate in the field of museum studies. These sources, combined with Lacher-Feldman’s practical, step-by-step guidance, form a significant resource for exhibit development by special collections professionals.

Exhibits in Archives and Special Collections Libraries is comprehensive in scope, but it does have a few limitations and omissions. In particular, the author recognizes that some charged with exhibit work are lone arrangers, but leaves it up to them to glean what they can from the book as every repository will have differing circumstances. While this is true, a case study with content geared toward overcoming the unique obstacles a lone arranger may face would have been welcome. Additionally, the work lacks details regarding the creation of a digital exhibit. Last, with the exception of the front and back covers, the images in the book, though exemplary, are in black and white. Visual cues offer powerful inspiration, and presenting color choice is inherent in showing examples of good exhibit design. While important to note, these issues do not diminish this work’s impact. This book shouldn’t be the only resource used when tackling exhibits, but it should be required reading. For those with experience, it serves as a tune-up to get back into good habits and perhaps revisit or establish best
practices. For students and those new to exhibit work, it is a core text that makes exhibit development achievable, enjoyable, and less daunting.

Amy Vilz
University Archivist
University at Buffalo
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