

Winter 2005
Volume 3, No. 2

J

ournal for the Society
of North Carolina
Archivists



Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists
Published Semiannually by
Society of North Carolina Archivists

The *Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists* seeks to support the theoretical, practical, and scholarly aspects of the archival professions by publishing articles and reviews related to curatorial issues (e.g., collection management and development), technical services (e.g., cataloging, processing, digital collections, EAD, preservation, conservation, etc.), and public services (reference, instruction, outreach) for special collections and archives.

The *Journal* accepts a range of articles related to research, study, theory, or practice in the archival professions. All members of the archival community, including students and independent researchers, are welcome to submit articles and reviews. Contributors need not be members of SNCA or live in the state of North Carolina. The *Journal* will not reprint or republish articles submitted to and accepted by other publications.

Submissions should be no longer than thirty pages or 7500 words, including citations. On the cover page, please provide a title for the article as well as the author(s)'s names, position(s), institutional affiliation(s) and business address(es). If the article was presented at a conference, please supply the name and date of the conference on the cover page. On the second page, please provide a title, a brief abstract of the article, and a brief biographical statement for the author(s). Please do not put author(s)'s name(s) on the third and subsequent pages. Please number all pages of the manuscript. All citations should follow the text on a separate page(s) (i.e., endnotes). Digital images, tables, and charts are welcome, but please note that the *Journal* is published in black and white. All accepted manuscripts' citations will conform to Chicago Manual of Style 14th edition. Please consult the Chicago Manual for citations, capitalization, abbreviations, numbers, and other grammatical uses.

Please submit three hard copies of the machine-printed manuscript to the managing editor: Laura Clark Brown, CB# 3926, Wilson Library, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514-8890

Electronic copy will be requested for accepted articles.

Non-membership subscriptions to the *Journal* are \$15.00 per year, and individual issues are \$5.00 plus postage. Please contact the Managing Editor, Laura Clark Brown for subscription information at ljcb@email.unc.edu.

The Society of North Carolina Archivists disclaims any responsibility for opinions or statements made by Contributors.

ation, but, for some chapters, they are not detailed enough to be useful. If *APPM* is your archival description “bible,” do not discard it until you have familiarized yourself with *DACS*'s terminology.

Overall, *Describing Archives* is an excellent and much-needed addition to the continuum of description standards for archival materials. It is inevitable that as archival practices develop and evolve, so will this content standard.

Greta Reisel Browning
Processing and Oral History Archivist
Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies
University of Georgia Libraries

ABOUT THE COVER

Physical Science Class, Fayetteville State University (1940)

Instructor: Israel Everett Glover, Physical Science

Students: Odell Uzzell, Joseph D. Parker, Ornetta Biggers, Thomas Dickens, Hattie Lucas, Joseph Howcutt, and Samuel Chadwick

Building: The Science Building was completed and opened for use in September 1939. It was a modern brick structure with general classrooms, a large lecture room, and laboratory facilities for work in the natural and physical sciences and household arts.

Course: A general survey of the nature of matter and forces of operation in the universe, with special emphasis upon fundamentals of astronomy, chemistry, physical geography, and physics. A foundation for understanding the place of physical science in every day life. Two hours of group discussion and two hours demonstration a week, through the year.

From the *FSTC Catalog, 1939-1940*, Fayetteville State Teachers College, University Archives.

Fayetteville State University Archives

The University Archives serves as the official repository for the archival records of the university. The Archives and Special Collections unit has a dual mission. The primary mission of the Archives is to appraise, collect, organize, describe, make available, and preserve records of historical, legal, fiscal, and/or administrative value to Fayetteville State University. The second mission of the Special Collections area is to make available to our students a collection of books and other materials that will heighten awareness of issues related to African Americans. The University Archives also provides information about Fayetteville State University's programs, activities, faculty, staff, students, and alumni.

The University Archives is located on the fourth floor of Charles W. Chesnutt Library. It contains materials directly related to the history of FSU and of African Americans in Fayetteville, Cumberland County, and the United States. Materials are collected in all formats.

The Archives houses three collections of personal papers for individuals who were instrumental in Fayetteville State University's early growth. These individuals are: Charles Waddell Chesnutt, the second principal (1880-1883) of State Colored Normal School, formerly called the "Howard School"; James Ward Seabrook, the fifth president of Fayetteville State Teachers College (1933-1956); and Rudolph Jones, the sixth president of Fayetteville State College (1956-1969).

Part II, "Describing Creators," consists of three chapters solely related to describing collection creators. Of note is Chapter 10, "Administrative / Biographical History," which discusses in detail the essential parts of the commonly-termed "Biographical/Historical Note" field that was only briefly covered in *APPM* and is one of the core elements in the description of archival materials. Chapter 11, "Authority Records," introduces the concept of an archival authority record based on international standard ISAAR(CPF). *DACS* suggests creating an archival authority record as an alternative to the traditional practice of identifying and describing the creator and constructing the authority name each time it is needed for the finding aid and catalog record. The introduction to Part II provides a lengthy discussion of the advantages of maintaining such records for standardization within and across repositories, the benefits for information sharing, and the need for a more archivally-focused authority record, since name authority records provide comparatively little information about the creator. Chapter 11 follows up this discussion with rules and examples of the most important elements of an archival authority record.

Part III, "Forms of Names," maintains close ties to *APPM* and *AACR2* rules, even with rule numbering (with the exception of the chapter numbers) purposefully aligning with the 2002 edition of *AACR2*. That said, *DACS* has made minor changes, omissions, or additions to tailor the rules even more than *APPM* did to archival description needs. Three chapters constitute this section and include rules for names for persons and families (Chapter 12)—the addition of families as creators reflecting a necessity for archival description not covered in *AACR2*—for forms for geographic names (Chapter 13), and for names of corporate bodies (Chapter 14).

DACS also includes several unique features that support and enhance the rules text. A "Statement of Principles" at the beginning of the book defines eight archival concepts based on theory and practice, and forms the basis for the rules. An "Overview of Archival Description" provides a summary of access tools, both manual and automated, and a detailed overview of the genres of access points and references to authority sources to verify them. The "Appendices" include a wealth of reference information, including a glossary of archival terms defined in context of the rules; "Companion Standards" including those for non-textual materials (since *DACS* does not address these specifically), print and web-based thesauri, and data structure standards; crosswalks between *DACS* and other standards including *APPM*; and several full EAD (2002) and MARC 21 examples for a variety of types of descriptions.

For all of *DACS*'s good points, the omission of an index is conspicuous, as one would be particularly useful in light of the evolving terminology of some familiar concepts and rules. The crosswalks can provide some help in this situ-

and International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (ISAAR(CPF)), last updated in 2004, have added new possibilities for international compatibility and information sharing. *DACS* represents the culmination of a collective effort to compile functional data standards that apply to current practices of describing archives and manuscripts.

Describing Archives, it is clear, replaces *APPM*, the standard with which the majority of American archivists are probably most familiar. The second edition of *APPM*, already set for review and revision in the early 1990s, also serves as the basis for *DACS*. With the introduction of EAD in 1996, archivists began to give more attention to archival description for finding aids, and many guidelines and concepts from EAD have been added to the *APPM* foundation. International standards such as ISAD(G), also in concert with EAD, played a large part in the development of *DACS*, and thus, the composite result focuses more on the content of description and not just the context. The organization of the manual is similar to that of *APPM*, but has been expanded from *APPM*'s two parts, "Description" and "Headings and Uniform Titles," to three, "Describing Archival Materials," "Describing Creators," and "Forms of Names."

Drawing heavily from the organization and terminology of ISAD(G), Part I, "Describing Archival Materials" consists of twenty-five essential "elements," or rules, that if used will ensure consistency across all levels of description (single or multilevel). Many of the twenty-five elements correlate to Part I, "Description" in *APPM*, but in *DACS* the rules are grouped conceptually into eight chapters, and several rules have been expanded. Chapter 1, "Levels of Description," presents three levels of description—minimum, optimum, and added value—for use in either single or multilevel descriptions and the minimum to maximum essential elements needed for each of these levels. In this instance and others throughout the book, *DACS* encourages standardization as much as possible, but also acknowledges that local practice and professional judgment may supercede the standard in certain situations.

Descriptions of each element or group of rules in Chapters 2 through 8 contain consistent subheadings such as "Purpose and Scope," "Sources of Information," and "General Rules," as well as helpful commentaries that provide reasoning for rules and typical uses or implications. Examples in both EAD and MARC 21 structures close the description of each rule family, although *DACS* does not advise a specific descriptive product. A highlight of this section includes Chapter 3, "Content and Structure Elements," which contains expanded coverage of scope and content notes, including comments, examples, and discussion of particular features of optimal notes.

Contents

About the Cover	6
The Evolution of Archival Description at the Southern Historical Collection <i>By Laura Capell</i>	7
Reviews	21

Those engaged in the preparation of either real or virtual exhibits will glean a greater appreciation of the significance of that work. Administrators might find the ideas useful for planning renovation, redecoration, or rearranging of their facilities. For serious users of libraries and museums, reading this book will heighten their awareness of their own experiences. Perhaps the best way to take advantage of the ideas presented here, however, would be to use a single essay as preliminary reading for a class discussion, professional workshop, or staff retreat devoted to user education, community outreach, institutional ethics, or long-term planning. *The Promise of Cultural Institutions* makes a substantial contribution to the literature.

Elizabeth Bramm Dunn
Research Services Librarian
Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library
Duke University

Describing Archives: A Content Standard. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004. 291 p., soft cover. ISBN 1-931666-08-3, \$49.00

A new, but not entirely unfamiliar, standard has entered the archival scene. One could say that it is both “new” and “improved” without advertising falsely. No matter what your knowledge of archival description standards heretofore, you have probably followed a standard that has been incorporated into *Describing Archives: A Content Standard*, also known as *DACS*. *DACS* emanated from a joint U.S.-Canadian grant-funded endeavor, CUSTARD (Canadian-U.S. Task Force on Archival Description), that was initiated in 2001. In spring 2003, the group decided that differences between the two countries’ practices were too different to develop a single standard, and the American contingent split from the group and developed *DACS*. The influence of the collaboration, however, has produced a content standard for American archivists that not only builds on previous U.S. standards but also interweaves current international archival descriptive standards.

Describing Archives is the most recent addition to a lineage of national and international standards for archival description. From the days of using the second edition of *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR2)* to describe archival and manuscript materials, through two editions of *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts (APPM)*, the last published in 1989, to updated and recent data structure standards such as the concise format of Machine Readable Cataloging (MARC 21) and Encoded Archival Description (EAD), we thought we had come a long way. International standards such as the General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G)), the latest version in 2000,

Respecting Children in Museums” explore various aspects of this bond of trust. Citing realistic examples of some of the difficult situations museum staff might face (a major donor who wishes to exert control over the institution’s contents and presentations, or the donation of some artifacts that may have been stolen from Jews in Nazi Germany, etc.), Carr examines various facets of ethical principles and then discusses statements of ethics from relevant professional associations. He weighs in squarely as an advocate of openness, inclusiveness, and, above all, responsibility to the public. Regarding an institution’s duty toward children, he states that “Every person, child or adult, brings a complex life grounded on experience, language, and memory to the museum. Every mind there, child or adult, is on the edge of expectation, hope, and insight” (p. 131). Museums should, therefore, not be “thoughtless entertainment, but surprising encounters with new ideas and roles” (p. 134). He goes on to provide numerous suggestions regarding ways to make it so.

The ninth essay, “The Promise of Cultural Institutions,” begins with a quote from Rainer Maria Rilke and a poem called “A Journey” written by Edward Field. Each describes transformative experience as essentially incapable of being captured with words. Carr then revisits the major themes of the previous pieces, describing in very personal terms the many intertwined revelations of his own life-long cultural experiences. Their crucial role in the development of resilient, imaginative people who can tolerate ambiguity and tension and new ideas is even greater in light of an educational system that is often driven by testing rather than by inspiring critical thinking and creativity. In keeping with his advocacy for lifelong learning, Carr provides several helpful appendixes to encourage the reader’s continued exploration: an annotated list of selected readings; “To Observe,” guidelines for noting one’s experience in a cultural institution; and a provocative and inspiring short think piece, “Each Life: Cultural Institutions and Civic Engagement.”

These essays are dense and thought-provoking, not because Carr resorts to jargon, but because he packs them with subtle ideas that require contemplation. They are meant to be savored: read one, or even a few paragraphs, at a time and revisit periodically. They offer no facile solutions to making our cultural institutions more powerful, but rather a framework for the lofty goals to which we may strive and inspiration for those of us who work in libraries and museums. The opposite of the circumscribed, linear presentation of ideas that Carr criticizes in typical schools, the essays direct us to turn our gaze to our visual, physical presence and to the ephemeral qualities of our communications, exhibits, and interactions with our users.

Some readers of this collection might become impatient with the dearth of concrete directives and the lengthy discussion of each facet of an abstract issue.

The Evolution of Archival Description at the Southern Historical Collection

Laura Capell

This essay is excerpted from Laura Capell’s masters paper written for her MLS degree conferred in 2004 by UNC-Chapel Hill’s School of Information and Library Science. The master’s paper won the 2004 Gene J. Williams Award.

Abstract

This study examines the evolution of archival description at the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This study was conducted to analyze changes in the structure and contents of finding aids produced at the Southern Historical Collection from the 1930s through 2003, and to determine the degree to which these changes reflect the development of archival description at a national level.

The Southern Historical Collection has updated its finding aids numerous times from the Works Progress Administration inventories used in the 1930s, to the EAD finding aids produced today. A description and comparison of these various finding aids not only illustrates the evolution of descriptive practices used at the Southern Historical Collection, but it also provides insight into the American archival profession’s shift from adapting national guidelines on archival description to fit individual repository needs to the implementation of national descriptive standards.

Description at the Southern Historical Collection

The Southern Historical Collection, located at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, houses one of the most prominent collections relating to Southern history and strives “to preserve the priceless sources of Southern history, and to organize, list, and describe the materials so that they are readily available for research.” Formally established by the University in 1930, the Southern Historical Collection was originally comprised of the collections of the North Carolina

Laura Capell is the Japanese American Veterans Collection Project Archivist at the University of Hawaii Library. She graduated with an MLS from UNC in 2004 and has an MA in public history from NCSU.

Historical Society and the acquisitions of University of North Carolina Professor J.G. de Rouhac Hamilton. The founding director of the Southern Historical Collection, Hamilton began actively acquiring manuscript collections in 1927, and until his retirement in 1948, he traveled throughout the South soliciting donations of private manuscript collections. Hamilton was so successful in bringing manuscripts to North Carolina from other Southern states that he earned the nickname “Ransack,” and the Southern Historical Collection grew quickly, numbering over 800 collections by June 1939.¹

At first, the Southern Historical Collection emphasized acquiring materials over processing them, because, as Hamilton explained to University President Frank Porter Graham in 1937, “The problem of saving was – and is – so much more important than arranging, that chief attention was paid to that.” Simply collecting manuscript materials was not enough, though, because unless these collections were arranged and described, they remained inaccessible to researchers. Hamilton explained to Graham in 1929 that the library had over 100,000 manuscripts, but they were “stored and unarranged and, for the most part, were inaccessible to investigators.”²

During the Depression, the Southern Historical Collection was able to obtain funding from a variety of relief agencies to begin processing collections. In 1932, the library hired an assistant to begin arranging and describing some of the collections, and in 1933, they received additional assistance to process materials through the Civil Works Administration. According to a 1934 report, relief workers were making progress arranging and filing manuscript collections. They had also begun work on a bibliography of materials relating to the South, a project endorsed by Hamilton.³

In 1935, the Federal Emergency Relief Act established the Works Progress Administration (WPA), which provided the Southern Historical Collection funding to arrange, repair, copy, and file manuscript collections. The WPA also sponsored the Historical Records Survey, with the aim to promote “the discovery, preservation, and listing of basic materials for research in the history of the United States.” Under the direction of the Historical Records Survey, repositories across the nation could contribute to a national guide to manuscript collections. The Southern Historical Collection began work on the Historical Records Survey in 1936, and in addition to contributing to the national guide, processors worked to complete a guide to the collections at the Southern Historical Collection.⁴

To promote uniformity in the national guide, the WPA provided survey forms and detailed instructions to use in the description of manuscript collections. The instructions explained how to complete each item in the survey worksheets

committed, dedicated by mission and service, to the construction of thinking lives, and to the illumination of thoughtful possibilities for those lives. These places are destined to be active and responsive forums, communicative institutions, not passive or reticent. A great cultural institution is a place of friction, heat, light, warmth, and the occasional flame” (pp.57-58).

Each of the essays collected in *The Promise of Cultural Institutions* explores a different aspect of the role of a museum or other gathering place. Most of the pieces are rather abstract in content. In several, Carr analyzes the interior and unique experience of the user connecting with the institution in a profound way. In “A Museum is an Open Work,” he explores the cultural institution as “an embodiment of intentional connections and cultural possibilities,” (p.1) and describes its transformative potential through its ability to stimulate cognitive acts. Echoing postmodern literary theory, he describes the user as “completing the museum as a cognitive environment” (p.4). This theme is expanded in “Museums, Educative: An Encyclopedia Entry.” Cleverly writing for an encyclopedia that does not exist, the author describes an educative museum: it “creates situations that invite, support, and expand independent inquiry without imposing the procedures, curricula, evaluations, or instructions of classrooms...” (p.18). The most successful sort of educative museum is evoked in the third essay, “In the Contexts of the Possible: Libraries and Museums as Incendiary Cultural Institutions.” The meeting of minds in just the right environment can kindle a metaphorical fire of enlightenment and transformation. A prerequisite for this combustion is establishing a feeling of connection with others, a quality explored further in “A Community Mind.” A successful cultural institution must evoke a sense of connection with the humans who created the artifacts displayed and with other, living individuals who share their knowledge and experience as they relate to those artifacts. In the fifth essay, “The Situation that Educates,” Carr examines the conditions that promote an educational experience. Key to this goal is intellectual risk-taking, moving beyond the known and comfortable. The responsive cultural institution expands the horizons of its users by constructing a situation for critical thinking, a place that offers no satisfying exit except through thought.” (p. 71-72), Factors that promote critical thinking include the arrangement of the materials, the space itself, and the presence of others with whom to share the experience. Continuing this theme of education, “A Poetics of Questions” asserts that the question is the central vehicle of change. The answer is less important than the question, which can drive an intellectual quest over time. “The good question helps to organize the difference we want to make in our knowledge; it is at once a tool, a plan, and an aspiration” (p.99).

Cultural institutions, Carr argues, have a tremendous and complex obligation to uphold the public trust. “Museums and Public Trust” and “Crafted Truths:

studies to examples drawn from finding aids and other descriptive tools. In addition to being thoughtful and engaging, they help to keep the book grounded in a museum context.

The arrival of this book marks the culmination of a period of remarkable growth for the field of museum archives. With such a complete and instructive guide available, I hope this trend will continue in the future. This book offers sound advice for anyone responsible for archival holdings in a museum setting.

Julie Ludwig
Assistant Archivist
The Frick Collection and Frick Art Reference Library
New York, NY

The Promise of Cultural Institutions, by David Carr. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press, 2003. 213 p. ISBN 0-7591-0292-9, \$24.95

David Carr devotes his considerable energy as a thinker, educator, writer, and consultant to examining the role of cultural institutions. A member of the faculty of the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carr guides his students and, in this case, his readers in contemplating the philosophical underpinnings of libraries, museums, and other cultural institutions. Drawing from the literature of cognitive psychology, museum studies, library science, art, anthropology, and philosophy, as well as poetry and other forms of literature, he strives to inspire us to be more imaginative in envisioning the possibilities of our organizations and more purposeful about achieving those possibilities. He teases apart a process that is powerful, but invisible: the individual revelatory experience that a “user” can experience in an environment that combines provocative objects (sculpture, books, images, scientific specimens) and conditions promoting contemplation, questioning, and the forging of intellectual connections. Archival repositories are something of a hybrid between a museum and a library: preservers of artifacts possessing intrinsic interest as well as purveyors of information. As archivists, our ultimate goal is to provide access to the materials we preserve and the requisite environment to facilitate such responses. The qualities necessary to this ideal—promoting education and community and adhering to ethical principles—are at the heart of this anthology. Carr asserts that “unless an individual life has multiple opportunities to be rescued from banality and to be thoughtfully transformed by a library or a museum or a botanical garden or a planetarium—that is, by a collection of knowledge and experience, passionately gathered and thoughtfully constructed—an important failure of attention has occurred. Our libraries and museums should be intentionally

and provided examples. Dan Lacy, the executive assistant to the Historical Records Survey in North Carolina, stressed the importance of collection descriptions documenting the types of material, the topics covered, and significant persons in the collection, with the belief that a uniform procedure for description would result in outstanding cataloging.⁵

After processors had begun work on the collection guide, Hamilton noted in 1937 that “while the sorting, pressing, arrangement and filing was slow at first, it is now carried on rapidly and efficiently... Most of these [collections] have been surveyed, calendared, and provided with index cards.” By 1938, more than seventy percent of the collection had been accessioned and described. In addition to the survey worksheets, the collections were listed on 3 x 5 cards that included content descriptions, the number of items, dates, prominent subjects and names, and the source of the collection. When the WPA discontinued the Historical Records Survey in 1939, work on the guide continued with state funding, and the *Guide to the Manuscripts in the Southern Historical Collection* was published in 1940. It listed alphabetically the 809 collections that were processed through June 1939. Each entry contains the collection name and number, dates, the number of items, provenance information, and a brief contents description.⁶

In the mid-1940s, the staff at the Southern Historical Collection established more effective methods for accessioning and processing materials than those used during the 1930s. The new procedures resemble the methods suggested by T. R. Schellenberg in his writings of the 1950s and 1960s. Each collection received a permanent call number, and instead of filling out WPA survey forms for each collection, processors completed accession sheets for collections not listed in the 1940 *Guide*. The accession sheets became the primary means of maintaining intellectual control over the collections, and they contained provenance information, the date and terms of acquisition, a brief biographical or historical sketch of its creators, and a preliminary contents description that included the main topics of the collection, the dates and geographical areas covered, and the size. For smaller collections, the accession sheets often provided adequate documentation, but for larger collections, the accession sheets were often accompanied by more detailed surveys. These surveys were not fill-in-the-blank forms like the WPA surveys, but rather they were unstructured descriptions tailored to best fit the needs of individual collections.⁷

James Patton, the second director of the Southern Historical Collection, outlined the descriptive practices used in 1949: “We make a general description of the collection—the nature of the papers, and of the business involved, and the

history of the chief persons or institutions involved. We make a very limited index of the proper names most dominant—persons, places, institutions, religious sects, also professions and businesses, wars, etc.” In order to stay abreast of new developments, staff members studied the procedures used at other repositories and attended a training session for the care of manuscripts offered at American University in 1945. According to processor Brooke Allan in 1957, the processing procedures then in place had progressed over the years and differed markedly from the procedures used during the WPA years.⁸

By 1955, the Southern Historical Collection held over 2,500,000 items arranged in over 3,000 collections that included letters, legal documents, diaries, plantation journals, account books, church records, genealogical records, maps, and other miscellaneous materials. A 1955 manual outlined the processing practices of the Southern Historical Collection. When new acquisitions arrived, processors recorded them into an accession book and assigned permanent names and numbers to new collections. Next, they created a card for the source file, which was arranged alphabetically by donor, and then they filled out an accession sheet for each acquisition. The accession sheet used in the 1950s was the same as the one designed in the mid-1940s, and it was the primary method of description. The collections were arranged in chronological order and placed in acid-free folders and boxes. The collections were shelved on closed stacks according to the accession number.⁹

The Southern Historical Collection relied on three primary in-house reference tools in the 1950s. The first was the 1940 *Guide to the Manuscripts in the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina*, but it only listed collections processed prior to June 1939, so many of the collection’s holdings were not included. Another reference tool was the card catalog, which allowed users to search the collection in several ways. A master file listed each collection by name and included basic descriptive data about the collection, but researchers could also access the collection through a geographical catalog divided by states, a chronological catalog divided into six time periods, and a proper name index listing people and places recorded on the accession sheets and surveys.¹⁰

Access to the collection was also available through a series of loose-leaf binders that contained a survey or accession sheet for each collection. For collections listed in the 1940 *Guide*, the binders contained the WPA surveys from which the guide was made, but these older surveys were sometimes accompanied by accession sheets or other updates for recent additions. The 1955 manual explains that for most smaller collections added after 1939, the accession sheet provides enough description, but if “the accession sheet is incomplete, it is replaced as soon as possible by a survey, which describes the group in great

and disaster planning. A more logical place for this essay might have been directly after the chapter on records surveys, which would have created three related but unarticulated subsections: one on records surveys, records management, and accessioning; one on preservation, security, and disaster planning; and the remainder devoted to special formats grouped by chapter. This is a minor point, of course, but it might have helped to improve the flow and cohesiveness when so many topics are being treated under the heading of archival management.

The final portion of the book is entitled “Museum Archives Issues,” and treats emergent historical developments such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and the restitution of Nazi-looted art. This is by far the shortest of the four sections in the book, and the one that will have the most limited application, depending on the museum collection at hand. Nevertheless, these discussions are thoughtful and informative, and this is an entirely appropriate forum for them. Even for archivists whose collections are not concerned with Native American artifacts or repatriated art, these essays will make interesting reading.

Rounding out the book is an outstanding resource guide that includes an extensive bibliography of print resources divided topically to reflect the arrangement of the chapters in the book, along with sample policies, procedures and forms, a list of Internet resources, and selected providers of archival products. The web resources listed here are major, longstanding sites (e.g. Conservation Online (CoOL) and the Online Archive of California), and while they are probably not new to many archivists, they are likely to remain current resources for many years to come.

Although the museum environment is clearly the reference point for all of the essays in this book, much of the content is so essential to any archival enterprise that it would be applicable in a wide variety of repositories, not just museums. This generality may stem from the fact that the book is intended for use in a range of museum archives, from those in art and natural history museums to those of science and technology centers. While all museums share the basic functions of collecting, preserving, and exhibiting (among other things), the materials generated in the course of carrying out these functions can differ widely from one institution to the next, hence the need here for a basic and practical approach, and in this attempt the book succeeds admirably. In fact, one of the unique features that distinguishes this book from a more general manual are the outstanding “real museum” examples found in both the main body of the text and in the many sidebars highlighted in gray throughout the book. These sidebars range from insightful quotations and case

Museum Archives: An Introduction (2nd ed.) edited by Deborah Wythe. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004. 256 pages. ISBN: 1931666067, \$62.

The second edition of *Museum Archives: An Introduction* is a welcome addition to the literature in the field, not only because it expands on the first edition by more than 200 pages, but also because it is very nearly a comprehensive guide for establishing and maintaining a successful museum archives program. Unlike the first edition of this manual, which was developed not for archivists, but for museum professionals with little or no archival training, the second edition treats every area of archival functionality in significantly greater detail and draws extensively on examples from established museum archives programs.

The book is divided into four main sections. The introduction describes the efforts to establish museum archives guidelines and programs over the years, as well as the context and function of archival holdings in a museum environment, and the various needs that should be addressed in setting up a program, including physical space, funding, and administrative support. As a museum archivist myself, it was remarkable to note the relative newness of these programs, even in some major museums. Reading the opening essay on the history of museum archives, I was struck by the characterization of these efforts as a “movement” in the 1970s that evolved dramatically within the span of a few decades. During that period of time, federal funding programs, initiatives at various institutions, and concern on the part of archival professionals helped these programs to go from relative non-existence to a state of increasing prominence in the public eye.

The middle two sections of this book work in tandem with one another and are the most instructive in terms of the day-to-day activities of museum archives. The first of these sections deals with archival fundamentals such as appraisal, arrangement and description, and research. Oral history programs fall in this section as well, and although this topic has certainly been treated in greater detail elsewhere, this essay emphasizes the value and uses of these histories in a museum environment much more than a general treatment of oral histories would.

The second of the middle sections deals with various aspects of archival management from accessioning to security. Several chapters here are also devoted to the collection, processing, and care of non-paper materials, including photographs, audiovisual materials, architectural and electronic records, and objects. The arrangement of this section, however, is slightly curious. For instance, the essay on records management falls between two very short chapters on security

er detail, usually with a chronological analysis. The purpose of the survey is to indicate the research value of the group, showing the more important individuals, places, and activities on which the manuscripts give information.”¹¹

A new survey worksheet was introduced in the late 1950s or early 1960s, but no documentation can be located describing its implementation. Although the presentation differs from the previous accession sheet, the new form contained many of the same data elements. It allowed for a provenance paragraph, however, and it had a space for a physical description of the collection. Also, instead of having a place for a preliminary description and a subsequent history, the new form asked for the history and description of contents. Like the older forms, this new form did not specifically indicate the need for a detailed folder or box listing. Detailed inventories were still individualized for each collection and completed on separate sheets.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the Southern Historical Collection continued to use the same in-house reference tools that had been in use in the 1950s. The collection did periodically contribute to the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections*, which originated in 1959, but not all of the collections met the size and format qualifications for inclusion. However, in 1970, the Southern Historical Collection produced *The Southern Historical Collection: A Guide to Manuscripts* to replace the outdated 1940 *Guide*. The new guide was similar in format to the old guide; each entry contained the collection name and number, dates of the materials, the extent, the states covered, and a brief paragraph describing the contents of the collection that indicates the types of materials and important people, places, dates, and subjects. The collections were not listed alphabetically, though, but rather they are arranged in collection number order, with an index to provide name access to the collections. The guide’s instructions explained that it could “indicate general holdings on a given topic, but it can not substitute for a personal visit to the Southern Historical Collection to examine the more detailed descriptions and indexes and, of course, the manuscripts themselves.”¹²

Administrative manuals from 1974 and 1975 briefly outlined processing procedures at the Southern Historical Collection, and although they resemble the practices of the 1950s in many ways, descriptive practices evolved over time as archival practices became more refined at a national level. New acquisitions received a permanent name and collection number, or were designated as additions to existing collections. Collections that arrived in an organized state were left, for the most part, in original order, but disorganized collections were chronologically arranged into series. Instead of the accession sheets used in the 1950s, the 1974 manual indicates that processors typed a brief descriptive find-

ing aid (also called a survey) after arranging a collection, and the creation of more detailed description was based on the nature of the collection and staff time. The surveys were not at the item level, but they did indicate items that were shelved separately from the rest of the collection. From these finding aids, processors prepared catalog cards for the departmental catalog, because the collections were still not included in the general library catalog. Entries for collections that met the requirements for inclusion in the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* were periodically sent to the Library of Congress.¹³

By 1980, several years after the publication of David Gracy's *Archives and Manuscripts: Arrangement and Description*, the Southern Historical Collection recognized the need to modify its processing procedures. The department expressed the need for change, indicating that "the survey format used by the Southern Historical Collection for the past fifty years must now change. We can no longer do a complete chronological analysis for each group." While these sentiments were not new, the Southern Historical Collection began to take action to update its arrangement and descriptive practices, most likely spurred on by Gracy's guidelines. During accessioning, the department established basic intellectual and physical control over collections by recording pertinent information such as collection name and number and provenance. However, the bulk of the description was done during processing, not accessioning, like it was in the 1950s when the accession sheet had been the principal finding aid for collections. This separation of processes reflects the practices advocated by the Society of American Archivists.¹⁴

By 1981, the department's finding aids had been revised "to provide greater uniformity and clarity and to conform to national standards insofar as they have been established." The modified surveys contained a biographical sketch, a scope and content note, series descriptions, and a container list, and extent was given in cubic feet rather than number of items. In 1982, the department further refined its finding aids by including information on access restrictions and copyright, shelf lists, and container listings in the series descriptions. The new finding aids made it easier for researchers to access the collections, and a memo from 1989 remarks that the inventories were "more consistent and usable," and that "many researchers praise the inventories."¹⁵

Arrangement practices were also updated during the 1980s, making them more consistent with the processing procedures endorsed in the Society of American Archivist publications. Instead of the old practice of filing collections in one large chronological run, collections were to be divided into logical series based on the type of material, such as correspondence and financial materials. Moreover, photographs and oversize materials were separated from the

informed, and well-led staff can compensate for a host of other organizational deficiencies and achieve truly outstanding results" (p. 141).

Archivists and archival managers should find Kurtz's discussion of fundraising and marketing appealing. With an uncertain economy and budget cuts, learning fundraising strategies and public relations skills will be a necessity for the survival of many archival programs. Kurtz offers several pages of tips to increase and expand funds. He lists agencies that offer grant support and gives the reader an example of a grant application. The final chapter is loaded with good advice for archival managers on how to polish public relations skills to market archives. Kurtz outlines recommendations for successful marketing to aid archivists and archival managers in meeting their overall objectives.

The publication of *Managing Archival & Manuscript Repositories* by Michael J. Kurtz is a clear indication that the archival profession will encompass more and more business lingo and style. The manner in which the book is presented is also a call to archivists and archival managers to become savvier in the archival profession. Kurtz's sound advice and examples for new ways to manage archives is an indispensable piece of literature for those looking for ways to improve their archives. Although the book targets archivists and archival managers that have a staff to perform designated archival functions, it is also useful for archivists and librarians who do not have a staff but must perform all archival activities. Novice archivists and archival managers alike will find Kurtz's examples, simple language, and limited use of archival jargon helpful. His book is much more approachable than the volumes of the *Society of American Archivists Archival Fundamentals Series* I had to endure as a beginner. Beginner archivists will find *Managing Archival & Manuscript Repositories* a good companion to books like *Starting An Archives* by Elizabeth Yakel.

Nooma Monika Rhue
Archivist
Johnson C. Smith University
Charlotte, North Carolina

sion is usually not related to records” (p.7).

After the overview of management theories, Kurtz leads the reader into a dialog about managerial styles and practices. He emphasizes the relationship between good managerial skills and leadership skills: “Leadership and management skills go hand-in-hand for the successful archival administrator” (p. 15).

Kurtz reiterates the necessity for archival managers to know their cultural environment and to determine if their managerial skills parallel the institutions in which they are employed. He also suggests ways in which archival managers can maneuver through the administrative chain of command, and gives examples of how to determine which administrative office to approach in order to gain the optimum support for an archival program.

Kurtz discusses numerous archival topics and methods that will be of great interest to novice archivists and a refresher for more experienced archivists and managers. Kurtz expounds on familiar archival subjects such as archival planning and management of archival facilities. He highlights performance tracking as a powerful management tool for archivists and archival managers who often have to justify their program by demonstrating its value and success. His examples on performance tracking are very easy to read and implement.

The section on project management contributes greatly to the archival profession because so many archivists and archival managers are developing digitization projects to broaden accessibility to collections. Several pages are dedicated to explaining the life cycle of a project. Kurtz defines five elements of successful project implementation: “mandate, support/resources, team leadership/facilitation, communication and clear goals” (p. 99). This information is a useful resource for anyone who is just getting started in developing and managing projects.

Attentive archivists and archival managers will appreciate Kurtz’s viewpoint on empowering staff and the importance of teamwork. Kurtz writes, “How management treats people can define the whole character of an organization. Remembering that the staff is the central resource of the unit will keep the manager firmly focused on properly managing the most valuable asset, the people in the organization” (p. 116). Kurtz’s emphasis on staff as partners and the need to include them in the planning process and the setting-up of strategies and goals are good commentaries for employee retention. Kurtz introduces steps for recruitment, a format for job description and advertisement, interview questions, and a system for performance effectiveness. His discussion continues with general rules and tips for archival managers. Kurtz concludes this discussion about staff and staffing with a successful punch line: “A motivated,

rest of the collection in order to best facilitate their special housing needs. The department hoped that the new arrangement practices, along with the detailed container lists and revised collection descriptions would make the collections more accessible to users.¹⁶

In 1982, the Manuscripts Department implemented “levels of processing,” a concept advocated by Gracy. Before processing commenced, collections were accessioned to determine how thoroughly they should be arranged and described. By 1990, the levels had been refined to minimal and full processing. Minimal processing required collections to be screened, arranged, housed, and described “only to the point of basic usability,” and they were cataloged enough to provide “essential access points” Full processing of collections entailed arranging to the folder level, weeding duplicates and ephemeral materials, rehousing all materials in archival containers, and providing conservation treatment when necessary. Fully processed collection received a detailed inventory and thorough cataloging. The processing levels allowed the staff to allocate their time more effectively, instead of dedicating large amounts of time to collections with a low research value.¹⁷

The Southern Historical Collection also began to address the question of automation, realizing the benefits of automating time-consuming processes, such as accessioning and description. The unique nature of archival and manuscript materials slowed the process of automation and the standardization that accompanied it for American repositories, but by 1982, the Manuscripts Department lamented the fact that it lagged behind other library departments and some of the “more progressive manuscripts repositories” in the area of automation. The department was particularly interested in the possibility of using word processing software to make the creation of finding aids more efficient. After persistent effort to obtain the necessary equipment and training, the Manuscripts Department began producing its first finding aids on a word processor in 1984. As computer technology evolved, the department updated its software from a version of MultiMate, to Word Perfect, and finally, Microsoft Word.¹⁸

Automation not only assisted in the preparation of finding aids, but it also revolutionized the cataloging of manuscript materials. The 1983 development MARC-AMC, a standardized format for cataloging archival and manuscript collections, not only prompted the department to automate its cataloging, but also allowed the department to contribute cataloging records to the national electronic database, OCLC. By 1985, the department was planning to implement MARC-AMC, realizing that even though it would not immediately benefit the collection, over time use of MARC-AMC could improve access to manuscript materials, making them available through a national online database. In

1986, the Manuscripts Department had its first OCLC profile approved and input twenty records in the MARC-AMC format. Over the next few years, work continued to refine the process of creating MARC-AMC records, but until the department received a grant for cataloging the collections in the early 1990s, few new records were added to OCLC. Although MARC was an important development that increased the accessibility of collections, it was not considered as a substitute for finding aids, which contained much more thorough and detailed information about the contents of collections.¹⁹

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the department drafted and revised several processing manuals to incorporate new arrangement and descriptive practices as they developed. Intent on maintaining its reputation as a prominent and progressive manuscript repository, the Southern Historical Collection made a committed effort to stay abreast of new developments in the field. These manuals reflected the principles advocated by Gracy in the 1980s and by Fredric M. Miller in his 1990 SAA publication, *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts*. Although the department tailored the SAA guidelines to best fit its needs, Gracy and Miller both had a large impact in shaping the descriptive practices at the Southern Historical Collection.²⁰

Even though the Southern Historical Collection had revised the finding aids it created for newly processed collections to comply with the Society of American Archivist guidelines, many finding aids for older collections remained outdated. The diversity of these finding aids and the inconsistent quality of the description was problematic and hindered access to those collections. In 1987, the Southern Historical Collection had more than 1,500 feet of materials that were “described so poorly that use is discouraged and if attempted, unacceptably difficult.” As the department maintained in 1986, these collections, which had been “arranged and described by untrained WPA workers, packaged in acidic containers, and heavily used for more than forty years,” needed to be reprocessed “according to current archival standards.” The department wanted to rearrange the collections into series, rehouse the materials in new acid-free containers, and update the bibliographic descriptions of the collections to make them more accessible to researchers, but it lacked the resources to undertake such a large retrospective processing venture.²¹

A series of grants and projects completed by the department in the 1990s facilitated the reprocessing of many older collections. In 1991, the department began work on an eighteen-month U.S. Department of Education Title II-C Cataloging grant to create 2,700 MARC records in OCLC. Not only did the grant assist the Southern Historical Collection in cataloging a sizable amount of its collections, but it also helped the department to update older finding aids

purchased from the respective websites. The shipping fee for the *Guide* is \$8 dollars; the *Quick Reference* costs \$25 dollars.

¹Kevin Tripp, *American Archivist* 67 (2004): 293.

Karen Glynn
Visual Materials Archivist
Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library
Duke University

Managing Archival & Manuscript Repositories by Michael J. Kurtz. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004. 255 p. ISBN #1-931666-09-1, \$90.

Archivists' roles have transformed into multiplicities of duties and responsibilities. Archivists no longer just process and arrange collections for preservation. The buzzword of the twenty-first century is “ACCESSIBILITY.” Job descriptions for archivists now encompass metadata specialists, encoded archival description gurus, and digitization projectionists. Many archivists are in charge of managing archives and acting as project managers to complete temporary assignments. As archivists we somehow just welcome these revolutionary changes because we understand the importance of preserving history and making it available for public use.

Managing Archival & Manuscript Repositories by Michael J. Kurtz is a timely read for archivists who manage archives. Kurtz's book can be used as a practical guide to assist archivists and archival managers in planning and delegating multitudes of duties in the archival profession. It also will prompt interest among archivists and archival managers to re-vamp their roles as managers. Kurtz's use of concrete examples and suggested readings is a plus for grounding the reader with the fundamentals on how to incorporate effective planning, measure job performances, and develop good strategies for teamwork and collaboration.

Kurtz begins with annotations of management theories, using quotes and concepts from well-known management thinkers such as Frederick W. Taylor and Peter Drucker to substantiate key elements in management. Kurtz connects these management theories to the archival environment by acknowledging how archives are similar to and different from other organizations: “Management is basically about people, what they do, and the organizations in which they work. From that perspective, an archives is like any other organization... The archival manager, however, faces certain challenges particular to the archival environment. Most archival operations are small (sometimes only one “lone arranger”) and are located within larger parent institutions whose primary mis-

ture film caretakers and what they were commissioned to produce. And some of the archivists, museum professionals, and curators had committed to further assistance on the project to ensure its fidelity to their expressed needs.

Attendance at the needs assessment workshops was by invitation. Lists of cultural repositories from across the country were reviewed to create an even mix of public, private, national, regional, and local organizations that held historically significant moving image collections. Participants submitted a descriptive survey of their film holdings and preservation practices and sent a reel of film to the George Eastman House in Rochester, New York for a free laboratory evaluation prior to the workshop. Data from the surveys informed the design of the workshop sessions. Information from the laboratory evaluations was used in the workshop sessions to describe the film preservation process.

I did not participate in the creation of the *IPI Media Storage Quick Reference* after the Duke workshop, so the remainder of this account refers only to the step-by-step evolution of *The Film Preservation Guide: The Basics for Archives, Libraries, and Museums*. The draft chapters were first reviewed, discussed, and amended by classes of film preservation students at the L. Jeffrey Selznick School of Film Preservation at the George Eastman House. The students and staff also provided great illustrations to clarify the film handling techniques and preservation practices described in the *Guide*.

Next, the NFPF faxed the draft text, chapter by chapter, to the eight-member editorial committee for critique and revision on conference calls. After revisions were made, the manuscript was forwarded to private and commercial laboratories across the country for technical review. The last and final lap of the review circuit was performed by volunteers from the needs assessment workshops—the desired end users of the product.

Annette Melville, the Director of the NFPF, designed this extraordinary schedule to maintain the fidelity of the project and shepherded it to completion within one year of the first needs assessment workshop. In doing so, she forged working bonds between professionals in academia, cultural heritage institutions, commercial film laboratories, state film laboratories, and non-profit institutions. By reaching out to such a varied constituency, Melville complicated the process of production and provided an opportunity to novices and professionals in academia and business to collaborate on creating something of value.

Finally, the two reference tools produced by the NFPF are affordable. A critical point for the hardworking staff of the small, underfunded institutions the books were designed to serve. Both can be downloaded as a free PDF file or

and improve its card catalog. Catalogers had to write abstracts for each collection for the MARC records, and when included in finding aids, these abstracts greatly improved collection-level description. After cataloging collections in MARC, the department was also able to submit records to the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* for collections that had never before been included. The Southern Historical Collection also completed a microfilming project for the University Publications of America (UPA) series, “Records of Ante-bellum Southern Plantations” and “Southern Women and their Families in the 19th Century,” in which numerous collections were reprocessed and given updated finding aids and MARC records. Because of a departmental policy of filming only complete series or subseries, many collections had to be rearranged into series and redescribed in order to select materials for microfilming.²²

In the early 1990s, the Manuscripts Department received an NEH Preservation Grant to rehouse and microfilm collections and to create MARC-AMC records. Similar to the UPA microfilming project, many of the collections involved in the NEH grant had to be reprocessed. Electronic summaries of these collections were also produced as part of the grant project. The summaries were derived from the MARC records, and they contained the main entry, title, collection number, extent, abstract, and an abbreviated container list. Often the summary for a collection was printed and placed alongside the inventory for that collection in the binders of finding aids available for public use. While the summaries were useful resources, they were not substitutes for the actual finding aids. In 1993, the department received another NEH grant for “Accessing the American South,” a two-year project to arrange, describe, and catalog twenty-four important collections from its backlog. Although some of the collections were recent acquisitions, many were older collections that needed to be reprocessed. Processors arranged collections into series and created detailed finding aids in Microsoft Word, applying Miller’s guidelines. Many of the collections analyzed in this study were reprocessed as a part of this grant project.²³

These projects helped the Southern Historical Collection further refine its “internal descriptive standards” and make them compatible with the national guidelines. Since MARC records for new collections were derived in large part from finding aids, the finding aids were updated to contain the data elements necessary to create MARC records. In 1993, the department’s annual report remarked on the progress made on updating its collections: “Over the past six years, we have rehoused and improved finding aids to our pre-1980 accessions and . . . entered records of all our significant processed holdings into local and national online databases.”²⁴

In addition to using automation to streamline description processes, the Man-

uscripts Department desired to provide electronic access to its collections, and by 1995, the majority of the Southern Historical Collection's holdings were represented in the UNC library's online catalog. The department stopped adding new records to the card catalog in 1995, but it was not removed from the search room until 2001. In addition to the online catalog, the department was also interested in making the finding aids available online in order to increase accessibility. The Manuscripts Department established an Internet presence in the mid-1990s, and in 1993, it placed its first finding aids online in ASCII text. In 1994-1995, Southern Historical Collection finding aids in ASCII text were migrated from the library's gopher site to the World Wide Web. Work continued to mount all finding aids that were in machine-readable format on the web, and the department began to explore the possibility of converting older finding aids into electronic documents. In 1995-1996, a total of 338 finding aids were loaded onto the Manuscripts Department web site, bringing the total to 1,200. Most of the online finding aids were in ASCII text, but by 1996, several had been encoded in HTML.²⁵

The development of EAD in 1996 had a significant impact on the creation of finding aids for Southern Historical Collection materials, the full extent of which is yet to be realized. In keeping with its position as a leading manuscripts repository, the Manuscripts Department began looking into implementing EAD soon after it was developed, and the first EAD-encoded finding aids were posted to the departmental website in 1998. Although the contents of the finding aids did not dramatically change in the conversion to EAD, the content elements became standardized, and EAD provided a standardized structure for finding aids that provided a navigable, searchable, and user-friendly finding aid. Because not all browsers had the capability to view SGML pages, the EAD finding aids were made available in both SGML and HTML, and in the first years of its use, the SGML could be viewed through a Panorama Viewer.²⁶

At first, processors created finding aids in Microsoft Word, as they had been doing before EAD, and then they converted them to EAD with templates and Word macros. Version 1.0 of EAD, which worked as both an SGML and an XML DTD and incorporated the "enhancements requested during experimentation with the 'beta' test version of the EAD DTD," became available in 1998, and the Southern Historical Collection made preparations for that transition later that year. By 2001, processors encoded finding aids directly into EAD using Notetab software, and the department was working to migrate existing EAD finding aids from SGML to XML. The department also was preparing for the conversion from EAD Version 1.0 to EAD Version 2002.²⁷

In addition to the implementation of EAD in 1998, other advances were made in providing access to the collections. Collection records in the library online

REVIEWS

The Film Preservation Guide: The Basics for Archives, Libraries, and Museums by the National Film Preservation Foundation. San Francisco, Calif.: 2004. 121 p. Illustrations. Bibliography. Glossary. Index. Soft cover edition. ISBN 0-9747099-0-5. (Free PDF download www.filmpreservation.org)

IPI Media Storage Quick Reference by Peter Z. Adelstein. Image Permanence Institute. Rochester, NY, 2004. (purchase or free PDF download www.imagepermanenceinstitute.org)

Being closely involved in the conception, evolution, and production of the *Guide*, I cannot write an unbiased review, but I would like to describe its creation process in more detail than Annette Melville does in the *Guide's* preface, because I think it is a model of professional collaboration worth emulating. Please read Kevin Tripp's article in *The American Archivist*¹, to understand the value of the *Guide* to a working professional in a regional film archive.

In addition to the *Guide*, the Mellon grant secured by the National Film Preservation Foundation (NFPF) financed the *IPI Media Storage Quick Reference*. These tools provide the basic information required to care for, make accessible, and store the moving image materials found in many libraries, museums, historical societies, and archives. Publication of the *Quick Reference* finally acknowledges the reality that most paper based-institutions store non-print media with print media because they cannot afford separate storage facilities. The slim, easy-to-use *Quick Reference* offers clear guidelines about the temperature and humidity requirements of still and moving image materials, allowing caretakers to make informed decisions about the best climate control for facilities housing mixed media.

The NFPF did not follow the traditional model of hiring an expert to write a technical guide. Experts were hired but rather than sitting at their desks to disgorge knowledge encrypted in specialized jargon, they attended two needs assessment workshops where they were sequestered with the future users of the guides. The first workshop was at Duke University and the second was held at the Minnesota History Center of the Minnesota Historical Society. The future users expressed their specific needs throughout the eight-session, daylong workshops describing the parameters in which they worked including: knowledge of non-print media, staff size, budget, and physical infrastructure. By the end of the daylong needs assessment workshops, the film specialists had a much better understanding of the specific concerns and needs of the fu-

²⁵ Moltke-Hansen to West, 19 April 1989; "Report of the Manuscripts Department and Southern Historical Collection, 1982-1983"; "Technical Services Section Annual Report, FY 1994-95," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "Technical Services Section Annual Report, FY1995-96," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

²⁶ "Technical Services Section Annual Report, FY1995-96"; "Annual Report, 1997-1998," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "EAD Information for Public Service," 6 July 1998 in EAD files in the Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

²⁷ "Version 1.0 of EAD SGML DTD Now Available," 3 September 1998 in EAD files in the Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "Annual Report, FY2002/2003," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

²⁸ University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Libraries Manuscripts Department, www.lib.unc.edu/mss/inv.html, viewed on 1 April 2004; "Annual Report, 1997-1998"; "Annual Report, 1999-2000," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

catalog were linked to the finding aids on the department website. Also brief summaries were created in HTML for collections that did not have electronic finding aids. These summaries are derived from the MARC records and contain the collection name, number, dates, extent, type of accession and date, a brief abstract, online catalog terms, and a copyright disclaimer. These summaries refer users to the complete finding aids located in the search room at the Manuscripts Department. As of yet, not all of the Southern Historical Collection's finding aids are available electronically, but when collections without electronic finding aids are reprocessed, new finding aids are created in EAD. By September 2003, finding aids for 4,146 of the 4,604 collections comprising the Southern Historical Collection and the General and Literary Manuscripts were accessible on the Manuscripts Department's website. Detailed inventories were available for 1,565 of those collections, while summaries were available for 2,581 collections. During the Southern Historical Collection's 70th anniversary in 2000, the department celebrated the progress made in its descriptive practices, advancing from the WPA inventories to EAD finding aids.²⁸

REFERENCES AND NOTES

¹ *The Southern Historical Collection of Manuscripts at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina*, reprint of *Bookmark* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Library, 1955), 3; *Guide to the Manuscripts in the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina*, James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), v-vi; Blosser and Wilson, *The Southern Historical Collection*, preface.

² J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton to Frank Porter Graham, 14 December 1937, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

³ Hamilton to Graham, 14 December 1937; Gay Garrigan Moore, "The Southern Historical Collection in the Louis Round Wilson Library of the University of North Carolina, From the Beginning of the Collection through 1948" (M.L.S. thesis, University of North Carolina, 1958), 30-32; "Report on the Activities of the University of North Carolina Library, 1933-1934," 20 September 1934, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

⁴ Moore, "The Southern Historical Collection," 30-32; "The Historical Records Survey," 1940, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Caroli-

na at Chapel Hill.

⁵ Dan Lacy to Mrs. Lyman Cotton, 7 August 1936, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Works Progress Administration, "Supplement 6 to the Manual of the Historical Records Survey: The Preparation of Guides to Manuscripts," 10 September 1937, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

⁶ Hamilton to Graham, 14 December 1937; "Report" 14 December 1938, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Moore, "The Southern Historical Collection," 32-36; J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton, *The Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1945), 5; *Guide to the Manuscripts in the Southern Historical Collection*, 1.

⁷ Moore, "The Southern Historical Collection," 47; "Organization Memorandum No. 42," 15 December 1955, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

⁸ James W. Patton to the American Historical Association Committee to Consider the Use of Manuscripts, 19 December 1949, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Moore, "The Southern Historical Collection," 48, 59-63.

⁹ "Organization Memorandum No. 42."

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² "Questionnaire: Rare Book and Special Collections in University Libraries," 9 June 1970, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Blosser and Wilson, *The Southern Historical Collection*, 1-2, 5.

¹³ "Manuscripts Department Administrative Manual," October 1974, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "Manuscripts Department Administrative Manual," September 1975, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

¹⁴ Faye P. Gamel to Carolyn Wallace, 27 June 1980, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "Annual Report, Technical Services Section, 1990-91," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

ty of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

¹⁵ "Report of the Manuscripts Department and Southern Historical Collection, 1980-1981," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Gamel to Wallace, 27 June 1980; "Report of the Manuscripts Department and Southern Historical Collection, 1982-1983," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; David Moltke-Hansen to Tim West, 19 April 1989, in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

¹⁶ Gamel to Wallace, 27 June 1980.

¹⁷ "Annual Report, Technical Services Section, 1990-91."

¹⁸ "Report of the Manuscripts Department and Southern Historical Collection, 1982-1983"; "Technical Services Annual Report, 1984-85;" Lynn Holdzkom to Peter J. Roberts, 8 October 1998, in the EAD files of the Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

¹⁹ "Technical Services Annual Report, 1984-85;" "Technical Services Annual Report, 1989-90," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "Technical Services Annual Report, 1986-87."

²⁰ Moltke-Hansen to West, 19 April 1989.

²¹ "Technical Services Annual Report, 1984-85," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "Technical Services Annual Report, 1987-88," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "Manuscripts Department: Preliminary Annual Report, 1985-86," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

²² "Annual Report, Technical Services Section, 1990-91."

²³ "Annual Report, Technical Services Section, 1991-92," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Alphonso Calhoun Avery finding aid summary, 01 April 1991 in the Control Files, Manuscripts Department, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; "Manuscripts Department, 1992-1993 Annual Report," in the Records of the Academic Affairs Library Manuscripts Department, University Archives, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

²⁴ "Manuscripts Department, 1992-1993 Annual Report."