Mission Critical: Effective Internal Advocacy for Your Archives
by Erin Lawrimore

Abstract

In order to be a good steward for the archives, an archivist must be able to show that the work of the archives is important--even critical--to the overall mission of its parent institution. How does the archives fit into the larger organizational mission, and what can the archivist do to ensure that the work of the archives is seen as an integral piece of the institutional whole? The author discusses the need for institutional alignment when assessing and discussing archival work, and provides examples from her work in a university archives of ways in which archivists can move beyond notions of self-evident importance and specialness in order to gain broad institutional support.

In his September 2007 inaugural presidential address to the Society of American Archivists, Mark A. Greene outlined what he called the "five frustrating foibles" of the archival procession, traits he saw "as diminishing our professional identity and our future." First, Greene identified the profession's resistance to change, arguing that "we can be--are, certainly, at times--bold and innovative. But we

2

must make boldness and innovation hallmarks of our profession." He continued by noting the profession's resistance to shift from "placing primary emphasis on service to our users rather than our collections" due to "a deeply ingrained 'cult of the record' that insists that archivists are guardians and servants of the material, not facilitators and servants of our researchers." Greene bluntly stated "frankly, my friends, we whine too much," and expressed the need "for advocacy for our institutions, our associations, and our profession." Finally, he concluded his list of foibles by noting "we pay too much attention to the trees and too little to the forest," both in terms of daily practices like item-level appraisal and in terms of the profession which "[focuses] too intently on the particulars of daily work and not intently enough on the purposes underlying our actions."[1]

Years later, each of these foibles continues to plague the archival profession to some degree. Much of the day-to-day work of the archives has been impacted by the recommendations made in Greene and Dennis Meissner's article "More Product, Less Process" along with subsequent articles and presentations written about minimal processing. But basic issues of archival advocacy and promoting the work and impact of our profession continue to affect our current situations. Many archivists maintain their focus on daily work in the archives without truly examining how that work impacts the larger parent organization--the institution which houses and typically funds the work of the archives. In an academic institution, for example, this parent organization includes both the university library in which the archives is often situated, as well as the greater campus community and leadership.[2]

In order to be a successful steward for archives, the archivist must be a staunch and effective advocate, clearly articulating the archives' value within the larger parent organization in order to gain broad institutional support for the archival repository and its work. As Sarah M. Pritchard, Dean of the Libraries at Northwestern University, noted in her plenary discussion at the 2011 Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Preconference, archivists do valuable work and, within our own professional community, we discuss the specific ways in which we make contributions to our organization, "but we don't link it enough directly to the university's goals. We have a great opportunity to show why they should be spending all that money on us--because it's helping advance their goals."[3]

Much professional discussion has focused on the uniqueness of special collections and the role of special collections as "distinctive signifiers of excellence" across research libraries. Promoting the archives as "treasures" to be cherished can be an effective tool for gaining support from certain donors, but it is often ineffective--at least on its own--as a means of garnering support from colleagues or administrators. How does the work of the archives bring value to the work of the organization in a way that no other departments or units do?[4]

The 2013 ITHAKA S+R issue brief *Can't Buy Us Love: The Declining Importance of Library Books and the Rising Importance of Special Collections* further emphasized the importance of the unique materials held in special collections, "suggesting that research libraries devote a greater percentage of budget and staff time than we hitherto have to the management and dissemination of those rare and unique documents that each of us owns, that no one but the

holder can make available to the world, that have the potential greatly to enrich the world of scholarship, and that can be made available outside of the commercial marketplace without damage to any participant in the scholarly communication system." Yet, Anderson, in advocating for additional support and funding for special collections, clearly states that he does not conflate "uniqueness" with "value." He emphasizes that he is "urging that each of us make this shift in consultation with our local stakeholders and in harmony with the missions of our host institutions." While special collections may be "distinctive signifiers," they cannot exist in a vacuum.[5]

This recognition that the archives, while unique, must contribute to their parent organization's mission is the key to successful internal advocacy. An argument of "specialness" or a reliance on an intrinsic appreciation for the value of archives *alone* simply will not prove effective in advocating for growth or development within your parent organization. By aligning the work of the archives--along with the assessment and discussion of that work--with the institution's mission, the archivist can help overcome possible notions of exceptionalism and preciousness that might impede the archives' work. Doing so, she can build an army of advocates who can champion and successfully argue for the archives' vital importance to the core mission of the parent organization. In this way, the archives can be seen as a critical component of the overall institution--a component that the institution simply cannot be without.

Beyond "Special"

Before entering the archives profession, I worked for a number of years in college athletic media relations. In

5

this role, I served as the statistician, media relations contact, and chief public relations officer for a number of teams in major college athletic departments. In Spring 2000, I worked in the athletic department at the University of Texas, and one of my chief goals was to promote and gain media attention for Texas's nationally ranked and respected men's swimming and diving team. Historically, the men's swimming and diving team was a national force, and the 2000 season was no exception. The team claimed the Big 12 Conference championship and, on a cold March day in Minnesota, won the NCAA national title. Coupled with the fact that this was an Olympic year and the Longhorn team included numerous athletes and a head coach who would go on to claim a number of medals at the Summer Olympics, advocating for this team might be seen as an easy task. But, not so in Texas, where football is the sport of choice. Even months after the conclusion of a somewhat mediocre 9-5 season, the local sports media wanted to focus on the football team, leaving little room for swimming news--even for national champions.

This experience of managing public relations for a very successful team that likewise received very little media attention has a strong parallel to many experiences in archives and with archival professionals. Archivists do impressive work with wonderful collections of resources that simply cannot be found anywhere else. But, to return to Greene's list of foibles, "frankly, my friends, we whine too much." Too often archivists may feel they lack understanding of their work from colleagues, administrators, or external parties. Yet, as reflected in the literature as well as in many less public settings, much of the conversation surrounding archives is focused heavily on the uniqueness of

6

the archival holdings and archival work--the ways in which we are different. Often this comes at the expense of exploring how our differences allow us to make unique contributions to the larger organization.

Lisa Carter argued in a 2009 post to the blog *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*, "I'm beginning to think that what's wrong with special collections and archives today is that they are considered special." Successful advocacy cannot begin--or end--with an intrinsic assumption of "specialness." While the materials held in the archives are certainly unique and valuable (both for research purposes and, in many cases, monetarily), segregating archives and archival work and presenting them as a unique "other" only serves to silo the important work being done in the archives. If the archives works in an insular environment and the archivist relies upon an argument of "specialness" in her work with colleagues, administrators, and others in the parent organization, internal advocacy success will be limited. The key to gaining institutional support lies not in statements of difference, but in how the archives is doing work that makes a valuable contribution to the overall mission of the parent organization. The archivist needs to know how to gauge, articulate, and publicize this contribution in a way that makes it clear how the archives and archival work directly supports colleagues, the organization, and bigger, institution-wide goals.[6]

Institutional Alignment

The first step in aligning the work of the archives with the parent organization's goals, of course, is identifying what those goals are. Ideally, organizations have clearly defined goals and objectives that the archivist can consult in

considering how archival work affects this larger mission. If the goals are not clearly defined, an examination of the areas that have seen growth in terms of support or that receive much of the public attention paid to the organization can often lead to a discovery of implicit goals. Verbalized or implicit, these goals typically relate directly to the areas or work that the parent organization sees as its core functions, and often stand as tasks viewed as so critical that, even in dire financial times, they are sheltered from severe budget cuts. Should the archivist find that the repository's work does not align with the institution's mission, a critical reassessment of services and emphases is necessary.

Knowing what the parent organization sees as its primary goals, the archivist's next step is to critically examine how the archives' work contributes to these tasks and question how the archives' contributions might be documented in a clear manner. When speaking with an administrator or resource allocator--particularly one who has no past experience using or working in archives, as is often the case--lofty ideals and notions of identity-building or remembrances of past events often will not suffice when they are questioning why the archives should receive a sliver of the overall (often shrinking) money pot. As Pritchard noted in her published RBMS remarks, "expecting an appreciation of the goodness of special collections won't carry the day even in well-off, prestigious institutions, because--well, because at the top level 'it's all about them.'" The archivist must be able to present concrete evidence of the impact that the repository has on the institution's operations in order to ensure that administrators understand how the work of the archives impacts the whole organization. Assessment of those aspects of archival work that directly impact the

8

institution's overarching goals must be consistent, clear, and in line with the parent organization's larger means of assessment.[7]

For example, a university archives housed within an academic library can track the number of people who come into the archives or the number of boxes or collections circulated. But, in terms of the overall mission of my library, is that really what matters? Is the library's primary mission to get bodies in and materials out? Typically, these basic metrics will not be found in the library's stated goals and objectives (and even if they were, the numbers for the archives will always look paltry next to general library statistics). In looking at the academic library's goals--and thinking about what aspects often get the most institutional support--terms like "information literacy," "instructional technologies," "community engagement," and "diversity" are often highlighted. And often, these goals feed into the larger academic institution's mission and goals. So, in examining assessment done in the university archives, how might the archivist rethink assessment in order to align with institutional goals and objectives?

The metrics that are being tracked must be questioned, and the presentation of that information within the library--and to administrators and colleagues outside of the library--must be critically reassessed in order to truly document how the work of the university archives is assisting the library (and the academic institution) in reaching its primary objectives. For example, if a stated goal of the library is to provide quality information literacy instruction, how does the university archives--and the work of the archivist--impact this goal? How is this impact to be measured? Simply counting the number of students who

9

attend required archival instruction sessions does not adequately assess the archivist's contribution to this goal. Working with faculty on competency-based or even satisfaction-based assessments to gauge the impact of instruction on student learning and understanding, on the other hand, provides valuable information that can be used by the archivist in demonstrating how the work of the archives aligns with the work of the larger library. Combining archives-specific assessment toolkits, such as those available through Archival Metrics (http://www.archivalmetrics.org/), with the knowledge of the assessment techniques and reporting styles employed by instruction librarians can help the archivist understand how to measure and present information relevant to evincing value. In this way, the archivist can articulate his impact within a framework that places great emphasis on information literacy.[8]

Being Part of the Bigger Picture

Knowing your institution's mission and designing assessment that measures your contribution to that mission is important, of course, but the way in which you present this information to your organization's leaders is absolutely critical in order to build internal support. Value statements must be presented in a way that demonstrates the archives' unique contribution to an overarching institutional goal. Contributions to a greater scholarly community that stretches beyond your institution's boundaries are an important piece of archival work, and should be noted. But in talking with administrators and colleagues, discussions should focus on similarities, not on "specialness." How does the work of the archives fit within the framework of the larger organization?

The initial step in developing these conversations is simply to leave the archival work space and talk with colleagues in your parent organization--even those who you think do not impact or are not impacted by the work done in the archives. Attend formal and informal events held throughout the institution, and listen when others are talking about the work they are doing. Additionally, avoid framing conversations with colleagues and administrators around the "specialness" of the archives and archival work. Language focused on uniqueness can enhance existing stereotypes about the archivist or preconceived notions of the archives as "other." This can quickly lead to alienation, in turn resulting in archives being left out of procedures, processes, and discussions where the archivist might make a real impact and receive real benefit.

Returning to the example of the university archives in an academic library, we recall that impacting information literacy is a stated institutional goal that the archivist wants to assess and articulate in order to make evident the archives' contribution towards this organizational mission. While the institution's general instruction librarians might not be well versed in archival practices, these colleagues can provide valuable advice on how to conduct instructional sessions, regardless of subject matter or focus. The techniques that prove useful in teaching basic search skills to English 101 students can be translated to teaching advanced history classes how to search finding aids or digital collections. These librarians might not understand the details of archival work and practices, but their strong understanding of information literacy in a general sense as well as their strong understanding of how the parent organization's leaders prefer for information literacy to be conducted or measured

can be invaluable in organizing and assessing archival instruction session.

The archivist, in turn, can use this knowledge to gain significant insight into what is considered "success" in information literacy in the organization. Assessment practices can be aligned to those of other instruction activities in the library and around campus. Additionally, in conversations about the archives' contributions towards the library's information literacy goals, the archivist can focus on similarities and the archives' contributions to the overall mission. It positions the archives and archival work as an essential part of the whole--the pie filling as opposed to the (superfluous) cherry on top.

Information literacy and classroom engagement, however, are not the only areas of importance in which a university archives impacts its larger organization. Much like corporate or other institutional archives, university archives also play a critical function in the business operations of the organization. For example, in examining impact on the institution as a whole, the archivist must also develop means to assess value to business operations in terms of time savings when retrieving information necessary for program reviews or value to campus development efforts in connecting potential and current donors with archival materials. Business integration and operational value should not be lost in the discussions of archival assessment. The archivist must approach the assessment and statements of value from all relevant angles.[9]

Building an Army of Archival Advocates

Meeting and learning from colleagues across the parent organization can help overcome stereotypes or

misconceptions that might exist about archives or archival practice. Similarly, it aids the archivist in understanding how the archives is viewed by others in the institution. But perhaps even more importantly, these opportunities lay the groundwork for collaborations and conversations about the archives' role in the organization and what the archives and archivist can contribute to larger goals. In discussing what the archivist can and what the archives currently does do, an emphasis on mutual benefit is likely to assist in building a team of advocates for the archives--a cadre of folks who will speak on the archives' behalf.

In today's world of hierarchical bureaucracy, the archivist simply cannot be at the table for every discussion across the organization that might impact or potentially be impacted by the work being done in the archives. Proactive outreach and education coupled with a successful history of building mutually-beneficial partnerships means that the archivist can build a team of colleagues across the institution, colleagues who understand the archives' role in the organization and can speak to current and potential contributions the archivist's work makes on institutional goals. The archives is no longer seen as a special "other," but as a vital component of the institution and its efforts.

Once again revisiting the university archives and information literacy example, the archivist can find invaluable colleagues in instruction librarians. Often these librarians are called upon to serve on campus curriculum committees or participate in university-wide discussions related to instructional challenges or assessment. The number of students they reach each year in instructional sessions offered in conjunction with general education or freshman-level courses is substantial. Having these librarians

13

understand how archival instruction works to enhance information literacy can greatly impact how the archives is perceived and involved in current instructional efforts and any future instructional planning in the library and around campus. If the archives are viewed as an essential part of the library's resources, then these librarians will present them as such when conducting general library instructional sessions or when speaking with teaching faculty across the university. From the archives' perspective, this relationship is beneficial in that there is now an advocate for the archives present in general library instructional sessions, at curriculum planning meetings, and at campus-wide instructional discussions.

Similarly, the archivist can find individuals across campus who can serve as advocates for the archives and its work outside of the library. For instance, an archivist's focus on outreach to campus athletics to educate administrators on the value of archival records in building a sense of history around athletic teams or in incorporating historical images or other materials in outreach to former athletes or athletics supporters might lead to increased collaboration, public awareness, and, ideally, funding for the archives' work. Developing documentary collecting initiatives around major campus projects can also highlight the value of the archives in the eyes of key administrators. By successfully building a team of advocates--including instruction librarians and colleagues from other areas of the university--the archivist can ensure that many (or at least some) of those who are involved in these conversations are aware of the archives and its work. As a result, the archives will benefit with greater exposure and more opportunities to become intertwined with the mission-critical work of the parent organization.

Conclusion

On a broad level, the exact ways in which an archivist might go about promoting the work of and advocating for the archives will depend on the institution as well as the ultimate goal that the archivist is trying to reach or build support for. In some cases (for instance, in some donor relations), a strict focus on the "specialness" of the archives and archival work might prove the most effective approach. There certainly *is* a time and place for emphasizing the archives' uniqueness and the ways in which it differs from other, sometimes related, fields.

In discussions with colleagues and administrators within the parent organization, however, there are two keys that can lead to an environment in which archival advocacy efforts can be more fruitful and serve to clearly show how the work of the archives is a critical component of the organization. First, align the work of the archives with the institutional mission and goals. Archives do have valuable, unique resources that can reach a broad community of users, yet this aspect of archival work is not the most effective focus for conversations with those who are more concentrated on internal organizational issues such as tuition affordability, community engagement, or changing enrollment demographics. By clearly proving how the archives and the work of the archivist fits into the larger whole of the organization, the archivist can gain the second key to successful internal advocacy--an army of advocates who can speak about the important work of the archives even when the archivist cannot.

In his 2007 address, Greene stressed the importance of active and consistent work in order to gain respect for the archives. He argued, "if our bosses don't understand what we

do, that is surely not their fault but ours. If we haven't explained and demonstrated to resource allocators why what we do is so important, there is no one to blame but ourselves." Archives and archivists bring unique historical collections, in-depth knowledge of organization and description, experience working with various types of donors or researchers, and more to an organization. And there are many aspects of archival work that are unique. But, successful internal advocacy requires a conversation that moves beyond arguments of "specialness" to clear statements demonstrating how the archives aids the organization in its critical functions.[10]

The archivist must realize that "uniqueness" is not the key to the archives' importance to the parent organization. Only when the archivist can clearly show how the work of the archives can and does advance the institution's mission and her colleagues' work can archival advocacy move beyond a sense of self-evident importance. Then, the archives can gain champions and support to help it thrive and ensure that the archivist can be a good steward for the collections now and into the future.

Erin Lawrimore has served as the University Archivist in the Martha Blakeney Hodges Special Collections and University Archives at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro since June 2011. She holds a B.A. in English from Duke University and a Masters of Information Studies from The University of Texas at Austin School of Information. Prior to her arrival at UNCG, she worked at North Carolina State University's Special Collections Research Center and the University of Tennessee's Special Collections Library. She is an active member of the Society of American Archivists, and

was selected as a member of the 2013 cohort of the Archives Leadership Institute. Additionally, she serves as a lecturer for San Jose State University's School of Library and Information Science.

NOTES

1. Mark A. Greene, "Strengthening Our Identity, Fighting Our Foibles" (speech presented at the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, Chicago, IL, September 1, 2007), accessed November 22, 2013, http://www.archivists.org/governance/presidential/ma-green2007.pdf, 2; Greene, "Strengthening Our Identity," 4; Greene, "Strengthening Our Identity," 4-5; Greene, "Strengthening Our Identity," 6; Greene, "Strengthening Our Identity," 8; Greene, "Strengthening Our Identity," 9-10.
2. Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing," *American Archivist* 68 (Fall/Winter 2005), 208-263.
3. Sarah M. Pritchard, "How Special is Your Library?: Special Collections and the Value of Academic Libraries" (speech presented at the annual preconference of the Rare Book and Manuscript Section of the Association for College and Research Libraries, Baton Rouge, LA, June 23, 2011), accessed November 22, 2013, http://www.rbms.info/conferences/preconfdocs/2011/Talks/Plenary3.mp3.
4. Nicholas Barker, "Introduction," in *Celebrating Research: Rare and Special Collections from the Membership of the Association of Research Libraries*, eds. Philip N. Cronenwett, Kevin Osborn, and Samuel A. Streit (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2007), accessed November 22, 2013, http://www.celebratingresearch.org/intro/intro.shtml.
5. Rick Anderson, "Can't Buy Us Love: The Declining Value of Library Books and the Rising Importance of

Special Collections," *ITHAKA S+R Issue Briefs*, August 1, 2013, accessed November 22, 2013, http://www.sr.ithaka.org/blog-individual/cant-buy-us-love-rick-anderson-kicks-new-ithaka-sr-issue-briefs-series, 7.

6. Lisa Carter, "It's the Collections that are Special," *In the Library with the Lead Pipe* (blog), February 11, 2009, accessed November 22, 2013, http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2009/its-the-collections-that-are-special/.

7. Sarah M. Pritchard, "Afterword: Special Collections and Assessing the Value of Academic Libraries, *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 13, no. 2 (2012), 191.

8. For addition information on assessment of information literacy and archival instruction, see Anne Bahde and Heather Smedberg, "Measuring the Magic: Assessment in the Special Collections and Archives Classroom," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 13 no. 2 (2012), 152-174; Amy Roberson, "Assessing the Archives Instruction Session" (speech presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Southwest Archivists, Austin, TX, May 2013), accessed November 22, 2013, http://southwestarchivists.org/Resources/Documents/SSA2013Presentations/robersonpresentation.pdf; and Wendy M. Duff and John M. Cherry, "Archival Orientation for Undergraduate Students: An Exploratory Study of Impact," *The American Archivist* 71, no. 1 (2008), 499–529.

9. The Archival Metrics project does include a toolkit for assessing economic impact, although the focus is primarily on government archives.

10. Greene, "Strengthening Our Identity," 7.

A Hidden Obligation: Stewarding Privacy Concerns in Archival Collections Using a Privacy Audit

by Anne T. Gilliland and Judith A. Wiener

Abstract

The archival practices of minimal processing and mass-scale digitization have developed as a way for archivists to deal with the realities of making large backlogs of archival materials available quickly and efficiently while saving staff time and meeting budgetary restrictions. However, these practices have also meant that archivists may not have examined collections closely, and they may not be aware of privacy concerns that may exist "hidden" within the materials. In order to ensure that archivists meet their legal and ethical obligations as good stewards of privacy while providing access, the authors will review these legal and ethical stewardship obligations as well as introduce the readers to the concept of incorporating a privacy sensitivity audit into the initial appraisal workflow process.

Introduction

Every archivist is familiar with balancing the demands of donor agreements, the imperative to provide access and preserve history, and the necessity of complying with privacy and confidentiality laws and norms. These demands become more urgent and harder to balance when the archivist is dealing with minimal processing and mass-scale digitization techniques.

In an effort to meet the challenge of making massive amounts of archival material more accessible as

quickly as possible, many archival institutions have subscribed to practices such as minimal processing or automated scanning for physical and digital projects.[1] However, these processes have meant that archivists may be less aware of the materials within their collections or what they are making widely accessible to the general public in their reading rooms or online. This material can include sensitive and private information that archivists may want to protect as a means of good donor relations stewardship or may need to protect for ethical or legal reasons.

Assessing the legal risk inherent in archival records can be a daunting task for archivists untrained in such matters. Although some issues may be clear cut and obvious, such as the laws against disseminating Social Security numbers, other issues may be contextual and subject to vagaries in state, or even national, laws. The practice of guarding the privacy of those whose lives are documented in archives, while at the same time providing access and protecting the historical record, is a delicate balancing act that archivists must uphold. Being aware of the privacy challenges that can be present in modern archives as well as the ability to recognize them quickly and make appropriate processing, accessibility, and digitization decisions is paramount to maintaining this balance.[2] Archivists can utilize the same skills they use to conduct a pre-processing survey to identify privacy and stewardship issues. The purpose of this paper is to provide a method for a common-sense sensitivity audit during the early processing and digitization process that promotes good stewardship of records. Real-world examples will demonstrate situations that archivists may find themselves in when making these difficult decisions.

Privacy Concern Review

Traditionally, the archival profession has recognized and upheld the value of protecting the privacy of those reflected within records, and this value has been understood widely by archival professionals to be central to the mission of maintaining good stewardship.[3] Laws have further codified this responsibility on the local, state, and federal level. This means that the stewardship of personal privacy with records is bound not only by professional duty but also bound by law. Therefore, it is imperative that the general ethical and legal framework of privacy concerns inherent within archival materials be understood and addressed by the stewards of such records.

Consulting with one's legal counsel on an overall policy can be extremely helpful, because any audit should be customized to take into account the institution's approach to privacy issues and applicable state laws. However, many privacy professionals, who, depending on the institution's practice, may be attorneys or others with special training and certification in privacy issues, have not considered the possibilities of such issues with archives and special collections. So, consulting with one's legal counsel or with others responsible for institutional privacy concerns on an overall policy development may also lay the groundwork for working together on specific cases that may arise in the future.

Ethical concerns

The archival professional has an ethical obligation to uphold and protect the privacy of those whose lives are detailed within archival records. This responsibility of record

stewardship is so deeply ingrained within the profession that it is codified almost universally into the profession's ethical framework and is the subject of many articles within the profession's body of literature.[4] This altruism of the profession is especially pronounced when records pass from their once-intended purpose into the realm of historical significance. In other words, archivists have an ethical duty to protect such information, even if no legal obligation exists.

It is true that archival records have always contained private or sensitive information and they are very likely to continue doing so in the future. Examples include information that could be potentially damaging or embarrassing, such as revelations made in personal diaries or evidence of criminal wrong doings, or personally-identifiable information, such as that found in medical and student records, which may be regulated by law. What has changed is the ability of technology to widely expose such private information and the lack of knowledge on the part of the archivist that such information even is present. This is due to modern processing methods that greatly limit the knowledge of what might be contained in such materials because of limited contact with the materials before their release for wide usage in the reading room or online.

In order to provide good stewardship of records, an archivist should take into consideration several key points to ensure privacy concerns are addressed. These include an analysis of how the creator or those who have private information contained within the records intended this information to be seen. Was it considered to be a private audience (such as between a patient and researcher or within personal correspondence) or for a larger audience (such as

publication drafts)? In terms of donor relations stewardship, did the donor of the collection intend that it would be seen by a small number of researchers and specialists in a reading room, or was the intent that the materials should be digitized and distributed to a wider audience? In addition, the steward of a collection must also consider whether the donor had the right to make decisions to restrict or enable access to the private information of others contained in the materials. Is the privacy or confidentiality of the donor at stake, or that of other people?

Legal concerns

Although it may be difficult to assess the amount of such information in a large collection, making decisions about digitizing or making certain types of information available is relatively easy. Federal laws and a preponderance of state laws prohibit making public Social Security numbers, financial information, and other information that may aid in identity theft; student information covered by FERPA; and personal health information subject to HIPAA. Similarly, a custodian may make decisions to limit access to a minor's information relatively easily, whether the issue is explicitly addressed in an applicable law or not. State laws may impose further restrictions, although the scope of those restrictions can be problematic, especially when digitizing material and making it available online across state and national borders.

Other legal requirements are sometimes harder to assess. The traditional common law privacy torts contain criteria that may appear opaque to the layperson, such as "highly offensive to the reasonable person," or the "reasonable expectation of privacy." When they have been codified into

statutes, these laws are not likely to be written with archival collections in mind, and privacy law court cases based on facts that include archives and special collections are few and far between. Even more confusingly, different states recognize different torts and have different standards for liability. For example, along with specific privacy and confidentiality statutes, privacy torts recognized in North Carolina include appropriation of the plaintiff's name or likeness for the defendant's advantage and intrusion of seclusion. Intrusion of seclusion must be "highly offensive to a reasonable person."[5] Intentional infliction of emotional distress or negligent infliction of emotional distress might also be relevant in some situations. Intentional infliction of emotional distress must involve "extreme and outrageous conduct," which is intended to cause and does cause severe emotional distress. The most likely of these to be applicable in an archival scenario would be negligent infliction of emotional distress, which in North Carolina must involve "willful and wanton" conduct that was reasonably foreseeable to cause severe emotion distress and which did cause severe emotional distress.[6] North Carolina also recognizes a right of privacy stemming from the state constitution, although courts have not been more specific about its sources.[7] In addition, statutes of limitation on state laws may limit the right of a plaintiff to recover for a privacy or confidentiality breach, but many institutions would find the publicity and resultant ill-will undesirable nevertheless. Other states recognize different privacy torts with different standards and statutes of limitation.

In addition, there may be quasi-legal or pragmatic privacy and confidentiality concerns to address in a

sensitivity audit. For example, material may contain older human subjects research that today would be subject to an Institutional Review Board or anthropological material where there might be some concern regarding access due to cultural or religious reasons.

Archival professionals should also analyze their responsibilities on many levels. This could include what their responsibility is to the donor versus what their responsibility is to making the records widely available. This responsibility may vary due to the nature of the archival institution – whether it is a governmental or private organization. One should also consider one's institutional philosophy or policies on restricting access or making material widely available to all and at what level. For example, an archive may have in its collection personal letters expressing sentiments that are now discredited or seen as racist. Is there a difference between making the letters openly available with names and addresses to walk-in visitors and making them available on the Internet? How old do letters need to be before these concerns fade, ethically if not legally? Does the age and position of the writer matter? Do answers to these questions change if the recipient was a public figure? The differences that these variations make illustrate the contextual nature and nuances of our notions of privacy and the unsettled, evolving nature of our conceptions of privacy law and ethics.

Once ethical and legal considerations are understood, analyzed, and contextualized, the next step is to set up an audit process based upon these considerations, in order to better identify and address any privacy issues that may exist within archival collections.

The Audit Process

As discussed, it is difficult to determine if sensitive information is contained within collections when there is a backlog of unprocessed records, and the trend toward minimal processing and mass digitization of collections makes that determination more difficult, but not insurmountable. One solution is to conduct a sensitivity audit at the time of collection appraisal (e.g. accessioning). Conducting the audit at this point can save time, as archivists are often assessing the collection during the appraisal process for other preservation and access issues. It also alerts the archivist to privacy issues that are inherent in the collection at one of the earliest processing stages and when critical collection decisions start to be made. Making such decisions at the onset of the process can save time and liability later in the process if these concerns are left unknown. A sensitivity audit can help determine the need for access restrictions or redaction and the collection's suitability for mass digitization and open access on the Internet.[8] Making such decisions is in -line with the flexible nature of minimal processing techniques, which recognize that many different processing decisions may be appropriate for collections.[9] The following section will walk the reader through the steps needed to conduct a privacy audit at the initial appraisal stage of a collection.

Initial Assessment and Location of Privacy Information

The first step in this process is to complete a quick assessment of the collection's contents in order to determine if any sensitive information is likely to be contained within the collection. As mentioned previously in this article, there is general sensitive information that is likely to be contained

within archival collections. Hints that such material is contained within a collection include the existence of personal financial information (such as bills, credit card or bank statements); personal or private correspondence that could be of a protected nature (such as lawyer-client correspondence); health information or records; student records; organizational records or trade secrets; and classified governmental documents.

This initial assessment should be done in a fairly quick manner, in a similar way archivists scan collections for signs of other inherent issues, such as mold, insect infestation, and preservation concerns while conducting a preliminary accession or appraisal inventory.[10] Container listings or donor inventories can also be of significant help, if available, to gain an understanding of what privacy concerns might be present within records. If the donor is available, asking about sensitive materials that may be present may also be helpful in flagging potentially sensitive information. Collections within these subject areas may need closer screening than others at this preliminary stage to better assess risk for privacy breaches and may be more subject to laws and regulations than other types of collections.[11]

If privacy-sensitive material is located, notes should be made to indicate the location of such material. This will help in the later appraisal and processing decisions that should be made, such as the prevalence and importance of this information to the rest of the collection, the amount of such information contained, and further processing and digitization procedures that should be undertaken.

Analysis of the Privacy-Sensitive Information
Once privacy-sensitive information is located, the next step is to analyze the information found against the overall contents of the collection. This process includes an analysis of how to best serve as a steward of the collection. This stewardship can include determination of how to best meet the needs of access, privacy protection, and organizational risk management, while upholding legal and ethical standards and requirements.

Beyond the legal considerations present, privacy-sensitive information should also be analyzed in the context of the professional ethical standard of protecting privacy to serve as a good steward both for donors and for those whose lives are reflected in the records. Questions that may surface include: whether or not the donor knew that such materials existed within the collection; if the donor had the right to donate the personal information of others; what was the original intended purpose of the record's creation; and what was the intention of the donor once the materials were donated?

Other considerations beyond legal and ethical concerns include donor expectations, institutional expectations and policies regarding access and privacy, and organizational risk aversion levels. Donors may require restricted access on all or portions of collections for privacy considerations. Organizations often have varying levels of risk aversion and may lean towards openness or closed records, depending on their own policies and mission. For example, academic institutions may be much more concerned about open access for collections than business archives.[12] Therefore, also weighing the information found

28

within a collection against these local standards and expectations is key.

Making the appropriate processing decision

After an analysis is made about the sensitive material found, the next step is to weigh the type and quantity of this information against the entire contents of the collection. Any processing decisions for the entire collection should be based on the amount and integration of sensitive material. Determining whether or not information is even pertinent to the collection may be an easy first step in this process and can depend on an institution's collection scope and the nature of the collection. For example, personal financial records and personal health records often add little value to collections. However, these records might hold quite a different significance if the personal finance records were those of an infamous white collar criminal or the personal health records were contained within the papers of an eminent medical researcher. Likewise, a medically focused archive may choose to keep patient records of a prominent researcher but a small historical society may feel confident removing patient records found in the collection of a local family physician. The context of the information within a larger scope can provide the archivist with direction about the decision to deaccession documentation or to hold the materials with measures, such as access restrictions, to protect privacy while maintaining the integrity of the historical record. If the information can be simply removed or destroyed, decisions about processing the rest of the collection can be made independently of the sensitive information.

29

It is also important to analyze how private information is integrated into a collection. For example, if the sensitive information is contained within only a few limited records series, it might be possible to isolate and restrict access to a few series, by methods such as setting up a research or financial record series or subseries. When that is the case, the collection can be processed using several methods. An archivist may employ more traditional and detailed processing method for the sensitive record series and make another less-invasive processing decision for the rest of the collection. This mixed approach to processing that takes into account the overall nature of the collection is in-line with the principles of the overall minimal processing philosophy.[13]

Sometimes, however, private information may be so thoroughly interwoven into the collection that nothing less than item-level analysis and redaction may be necessary. This is obviously a far more intensive task than simply creating and restricting a series or two within a collection. The best approach in this case may be intensive processing where the curator lends a high level of intellectual control to the collection and creates a detailed finding aid. This process may include the careful redaction of information contained within documents. As this takes more time, money, and staffing than minimal processing, it may mean that a collection is restricted in its unprocessed form or not be appropriate for an institution to keep within its holdings. Organizations may then decide to seek or apply additional resources to a collection or even deaccession such a collection to another repository better equipped to handle such materials.

Digitization

Digitization of records has meant that access to materials is now further-reaching than in the past. This access and stewardship is clouded even further in the case of older collections that are targeted for digitization. A donor who was familiar and comfortable with an archives providing access on a limited basis within the confines of a reading room may have felt differently about access if he or she knew that worldwide access would be allowed through a digital repository one day.[14] Archival repositories now regularly include copyrights transfer and digitization clauses in their donor agreements, but this was certainly not the case in the past.

The purpose and scope of digitization projects should be analyzed. For example, projects that are undertaken for preservation or space reasons without the expectation of increasing access may be able to proceed in a more expedient fashion than collections that are being scanned to provide broader access. For these wider-access projects, an audit process similar to the one described above for paper-based collections can be completed to better understand materials that are to be digitized. Collections without security concerns could likely be scanned and made fully available, while a limited or tiered access approach may be appropriate for collections containing sensitive information. This is similar to the processing decisions described above for paper-based collections, where some series may be restricted or determined not suitable for scanning while other portions could receive open access. Redaction of materials prior to or after scanning may also be necessary to provide digital access.

With digitization also comes increased consideration to ensure that information is not compromised. For example, institutional practice may mandate that certain information be handled on secure, segregated workstations by staff who have had training in handling sensitive material. It is also interesting to note that born-digital collections may also be subject to similar privacy concerns. Minimal processing techniques are also being implemented for such collections and thus hidden privacy challenges may also exist within these collections. Professionals within the area have called for the same flexibility of processing decisions that are needed when dealing with paper-based collections. In addition to auditing the digital materials for privacy-sensitive information, automated software solutions are being developed that would help the archivist identify such materials to facilitate this process.[15]

Conclusion

The protection of privacy is a value that is at the core of archival stewardship. It is codified by law and written into the professional ethical standards archivists uphold. Although clearly documented in the profession's theoretical literature, upholding this value can be quite a challenge to manage in an age of limited resources, increased backlogs of collections, and digital options that make information more accessible than ever before. However, understanding the basic legal and ethical considerations surrounding these issues combined with an easy-to-implement audit process completed at the accession stage can aid an archivist in making appropriate processing, access, and digitization decisions. This understanding and implementation can help

mitigate privacy concerns and result in meeting the challenge of providing good stewardship of sensitive materials.

Anne T. Gilliland is an attorney and librarian who is the scholarly communications officer for the university libraries at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She holds a secondary appointment at the university's law library. She has over 30 years of experience working in a variety of positions in academic libraries.

Judith A. Wiener is an associate professor and the Assistant Director for Collections and Outreach at The Ohio State University Health Sciences Library. She has 15 years of experience in the field of special collections. Both authors have published previously on the topic of the ethical and legal obligations archivists face while protecting privacy in various archival settings.

NOTES

1. Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing," *The American Archivist*, 68 (2005): 209-213.
2. Judith A. Wiener and Anne T. Gilliland, "Balancing Between Two Goods: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and Ethical Compliancy Considerations for Privacy-Sensitive Materials in Health Sciences Archival and Historical Special Collections," *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 99.1 (2011): 15-16.
3. Heather MacNeil, "Information Privacy, Liberty, and Democracy," in *Privacy and Confidentiality Perspectives*, ed. Menzi L. Behrnd-Klodt and Peter Wosh (Chicago, IL: Society of American Archivists,

2005), 67-81.
4. Society of American Archivists. 2011. "SAA Core Values Statement and Code of Ethics," Society of American Archivists. Accessed November 22, 2013. http://www2.archivists.org/statements/saa-core-values-statement-and-code-of-ethics; Association of Canadian Archivists. 1996. "Code of Ethics. "The Association of Canadian Archivists. Accessed November 22, 2013. http://www.archivists.ca/content/code-ethics; and International Council on Archives." ICA Code of Ethics." International Council on Archives. Accessed November 22, 2013. http://www.ica.org/5555/reference-documents/,37328.
5. *Broughton v. McClatchy Newspapers, Inc.*, 161 N.C. App. 20, 28-29, 588 S.E.2d 20, 27 (2003).
6. *Smith v. Jack Eckerd Corp.*, 101 N.C.App. 566, 400 S.E.2d 99 (1991) and *Dickens v. Puryear*, 302 N.C. 437, 452, 276 S.E.2d 325, 335 (1981).
7. *Acosta v. Bynum*, 180 N.C. App. 562, 567 638 S.E.2d 246, 250 (2006) and *Treants Enters., Inc. v. Onslow County*, 83 N.C.App. 345, 350 S.E.2d 365 (1986), *aff'd*, 320 N.C. 776, 360 S.E.2d 783 (1987)
8. Judith A. Wiener and Anne T. Gilliland. "Bridging the Divide: Integrating Privacy Sensitivity Audits into the Archival Appraisal Process." Accessed November 22, 2013. http://ohsweb.ohiohistory.org/soa/images/c/c4/WienerGilleland_SOA_2012.pdf.
9. OCLC. "More Product, Less Process: Why it Matters to Archivists, Librarians, and Researchers." OCLC. Accessed November 22, 2013. http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/events/2010/10-12h.pdf.
10. F. Gerald Ham, *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago, IL: The Society of American Archivists, 1993): 67-74.
11. Anne T. Gilliland and Judith A. Wiener, "Digitizing and Providing Access to Privacy-Sensitive Historical Medical Resources: A Legal and Ethical Overview," *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 8.4 (2011): 383-384.
12. William C. Carpenter, Charlene Nichols, Sarah A.

Polirer, and Judith A. Wiener. "Exploring the Evolution of Access: Classified, Privacy, and Proprietary Restrictions." The American Archivist, 74 (2011): 1-25, Accessed January 29, 2014. http://www2.archivists.org/ sites/all/files/AAOSv074-Session602.pdf.

13. Mark A. Greene. "MPLP: It's Not Just for Processing Anymore." The American Archivist, 73 (2010): 175-180, Accessed January 29, 2014. http:// www.columbia.edu/cu/libraries/inside/units/bibcontrol/ osmc/mplp.pdf

14. Gilliland and Wiener, "Digitizing and Providing Access to Privacy-Sensitive Historical Medical Resources," 391 -393.

15. Trevor Owens. "More Product, Less Process for Born-Digital Collections: Reflections on CurateCamp Processing. *The Signal Digital Preservation Blog.* The Library of Congress. Accessed November 23, 2013, http://blogs.loc.gov/digitalpreservation/2012/08/more-product-less-process-for-born-digital-collections-reflections-on-curatecamp-processing/.

Litigation Planning: Hoping for the Best While Preparing for the Courts
by Christine Anne George

Abstract

Like natural disasters, litigation is something that most archival institutions hope to avoid. In light of recent litigation involving promises of access restrictions to donors, archivists may want to create litigation plans for their institutions. Litigation planning, inspired by disaster planning, will help mitigate risk to currently held collections as well as any future collections that may come to the institution. By making policy decisions and considering options before problems arise, archivists will be good stewards to their collections.

There is an adage that offers a rather interesting dichotomy--"If you can't be a good example, you'll just have to be a horrible warning."[1] For those who fall somewhere in between the good example and the horrible warning, having a specific instance of a horrible warning is an excellent motivator to align with the good example. Consider natural disasters. Seeing the devastation that has befallen other cultural institutions due to the elements is enough to make one consider disaster planning. While a disaster plan is not an absolute protection, having one in place "enables people to overcome the confusion and turmoil created by a disaster, and provides a preplanned and rehearsed course of action."[2] The principles of disaster planning can be adapted to other forms of disaster. After all, Mother Nature is not the only

one who can wreak havoc on an archives--Lady Justice can be just as problematic.

While there are any number of reasons why an archives may find it necessary to "lawyer up," one legal battle in recent memory provides a chilling reminder that when restricting collections, promises of absolute confidentiality will not hold up in a court of law. The Belfast Project is an oral history collection hosted by Boston College that was meant to capture the memories of paramilitaries involved in the period of sectarian violence in Northern Ireland known as the Troubles.[3] The individuals who were interviewed for the Project were promised that the interviews would remained sealed until either their death or if they gave express permission.[4] The promise of absolute confidentiality was vital for obtaining the interviews.[5] However, when the Police Service of Northern Ireland used the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States to subpoena the interviews, it became apparent that such a promise would be impossible to keep. The litigation surrounding the Belfast Project involved three separate parties and a number of appeals that went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.[6] When one considers the interpretation of an international treaty and the still raw political situation in Northern Ireland, it could be easy to classify the Belfast Project as an anomaly. However, at the heart of this conflict is the question of how far an archives can limit access to a collection based on the donor's request. From that vantage point, the trouble Boston College faced with the Belfast Project is no longer unique. The same problem could arise at any number of institutions across the country. Now that the warning has been issued archivists need to create litigation plans for their institutions.

The Responsible Custody portion of the Society of American Archivists' Core Values Statement reads, "Archivists ensure proper custody for the documents and records entrusted to them. As responsible stewards, archivists are committed to making reasonable and defensible choices for the holdings of their institutions."[7] Litigation planning, then, should begin with the institution's Deed of Gift. A Deed of Gift, sometimes referred to as a donor agreement, "is a formal, legal, agreement that transfers ownership of, and legal rights in, the materials to be donated."[8] The Society of American Archivists recommends the Deed of Gift include the following elements: the names of the donor and the recipient; the title and description of the materials donated; transfer of ownership; access to the collection; transfer of copyright; separations, or return of items the institution no longer wants; other elements the institution wants addressed; and the donor's signature.[9] From this list, there are a number of legal issues that could lead to litigation, either from the donor or a third party, particularly with ownership, copyright, access, and separation. In light of the fallout from the Belfast Project litigation, this article will focus on the access provision of the Deed of Gift, in particular how the access provision can be problematic in terms of a subpoena.[10]

Responsible stewardship necessitates that archivists and their institutions consider any restrictive access policies before finalizing a Deed of Gift. Moments after a subpoena is served is not the time to begin to consider whether or not the institution is willing to challenge the subpoena or whether or not the donor was left with the impression that the institution would be willing to do so.

Adding to the weight of stewardship over archival collections is the legal concept *ignorantia juris non excusat*, meaning ignorance of the law is no excuse. Though there are exceptions, a person cannot escape liability by claiming to not know about a law. If there is a law affecting an archives' collections or the archivist does not comply with orders from the court, the institution and archivist can face swift and serious consequences. This is not meant to be alarmist. Litigation, like natural disasters, is unlikely. Nevertheless, no one wants to serve as the horrible warning of the cost of unpreparedness. The way to avoid that is to plan to protect and mitigate with a litigation plan.

Much like the way disaster plans should be adapted for each institution, litigation planning also should take into account the special needs of each institution. To create a comprehensive litigation plan, archivists must address two areas: existing collections and future collecting. Archivists must evaluate current collections, determine what may be at risk for litigation, and mitigate that risk. This assessment of potential litigation should inform decisions about risk-taking for future collecting. Evaluation of current collections and future collecting should include the following five considerations:

- *Learn the Law:* Archivists need to know what laws affect their collections and what actions can be taken should the institution face a lawsuit. There are a variety of privacy laws at both the federal and state level.[11] Do your collections fall under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) or Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)? Or

perhaps a state privacy law? The language used in the Deed of Gift should reflect the current law. The Belfast Project case serves as a reminder to avoid making promises for terms of access that may be difficult, if not impossible, to keep because under American law, the materials were discoverable. It is important to know how much protection can be given to a collection, articulate those limitations to the donor, and make sure that the language in the Deed of Gift reflects those limitations. For instance, it could be adding the phrase "to the extent of U.S. law" to any promises of access restrictions. The second part of learning the law is understanding the archivists' rights as well as those of the institution. Just because a subpoena appears does not mean that the archivist must automatically hand over the requested material. There are other options available that would allow the institution to challenge the subpoena.[12] It is better to learn about options for legal action ahead of time rather than scramble to find information after a subpoena arrives.

- *Survey the Collections*: Consider the collections that are currently held by the institution. Do they have Deeds of Gift? If not, are there any agreements or correspondence in place outlining promises made to the donors? What is covered by the Deed of Gift? Are there promises for absolute confidentiality that the institution may not be able to uphold? If the Deed of Gift promises access restrictions that might be difficult to uphold--and the collection is not currently involved in any litigation--the archivist may want to consider ways to limit potential

exposure.[13] Steps may include not making the finding aid available online or only on site, or downplaying certain collection content in the finding aid.

- *Evaluate Institutional Policies:* There may not be much that can be done about current collection holdings, but by evaluating institutional policies, archivists can try to contain any future risk. The institution should consider how far it would be willing to go to protect its collections as litigation can be prohibitively expensive. If a subpoena is issued, would the institution be willing to fight it, appeal after appeal? Make a good faith effort to challenge it? Or simply comply with the subpoena? Once that decision is made, future donors should be informed of the policy, and the policy should be reflected in the Deed of Gift. The institution will want to consider potential for litigation as a factor when deciding whether or not to take a donation. These policies should be evaluated regularly as circumstances can change, such as enactment of new laws or reinterpretation of existing laws. The language in the Deed of Gift must reflect the institution's current policy.

- *Practice Articulating Policies:* Simply having language in a Deed of Gift is not enough. Archivists who are working with donors or potential donors need to be able to articulate and explain the institution's policies that appear in the Deed of Gift. Archivists should practice verbalizing the policies, and, perhaps, create a document that explains the policies in greater detail that can be copied and pasted into emails to potential donors.

- *Find a Lawyer*: Sometimes the worst happens, and an institution is served with a subpoena or faces litigation. In anticipation of that, archivists should have contact information for an attorney ready. When creating a litigation plan, archivists should determine if there is a lawyer or firm that is affiliated with or employed by the institution. If that is not the case, archivists should attempt to find a lawyer with the knowledge and experience required for the situation. This is not to say that an institution or archivist needs to have an attorney on retainer right away, but choosing an attorney early will help an institution be prepared.[14] Archivists may want to start by consulting an attorney regarding Deed of Gift templates, policies, or, at the very least, have an idea of what the attorney's fees will be or if he or she would be willing to take the case *pro bono*.[15] Archivists may want to check in yearly with the attorney since retirement or relocation would mean that other representation must be found.

The thought of an archives facing litigation can be overwhelming, much like facing a natural disaster. Most institutions most likely will not face litigation. However, with more and more finding aids becoming searchable online and digitization efforts increasing, previously obscure collections are at an increased risk of being drawn into litigation. As stewards of the historical record, archivists need to be concerned with living up to the promises made to donors and following the letter of the law. In order to be true to what is promised in Deeds of Gift, archivists need to understand the law and how far access restrictions can be

honored. Perhaps this means having an attorney review the institution's standard Deed of Gift or the archivists practicing articulating their institution's policies to donors. Knowledge cannot be assumed and ignorance will not be forgiven. Just as institutions prepare for the worst with disaster plans, so too must institutions consider litigation. Potential risks can be mitigated if caught early enough. While there is no way to guarantee that an archives will never face litigation, planning ahead can help. In many cases, this preparation may be for naught, but it is far better to be prepared for the worst than to be bewildered in court and become the horrible warning for the profession.

Christine Anne George received her B.A. from Bard College, her J.D. from St. John's University School of Law, and her M.S.I.S. from the University of Texas at Austin School of Information. She works at the Charles B. Sears Law Library at SUNY Buffalo where she serves as Archivist & Faculty Services Librarian.

NOTES

1. This quote appears in the fictional book *Faking It*, although there appear to be other variations attributed to different authors. Jennifer Crusie, *Faking It* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002).
2. Johanna Wellheiser, Jude Scott, and John Barton. *An Ounce of Prevention: Integrated Disaster Planning for Archives, Libraries, and Record Centres* Second Edition. (New York: Scarecrow Press, 2002), 15.
3. For more information concerning the Belfast Project and the litigation involving it, please refer to Christine Anne George, "Archives Beyond the Pale: Negotiating

Legal and Ethical Entanglements After the Belfast
Project," *American Archivist* 76, no. 1 (2013): 47–67.

4. Jim Dwyer, "Secret Archive of Ulster Troubles Faces
   Subpoena," *New York Times*, May 13, 2011, http://
   www.nytimes.com/2011/05/13/world/
   europe/13ireland.html?_r=2.

5. There is a code of silence that is strictly observed by the
   paramilitary groups in Northern Ireland. The code of
   silence is strictly enforced and breaking it could lead to
   death.

6. The parties involved were initially the United States
   government and Boston College. However two men who
   were involved in the Project joined in a separate action.
   The case originated in Massachusetts' district court, was
   appealed to the First Circuit, and then appealed to the
   Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ultimately refused
   to hear the case.

7. "SAA Core Values Statement and Code for Archivists,"
   Society of American Archivists, accessed November 27,
   2013, http://www2.archivists.org/statements/saa-core-
   values-statement-and-code-of-ethics.

8. "A Guide to Deeds of Gift," Society of American
   Archivists, accessed November 16, 2013, http://
   www.archivists.org/publications/deed_of_gift.asp.

9. "A Guide to Deeds of Gift."

10. In this instance, a subpoena refers to a *subpoena duces
    tecum*, or a subpoena for production of evidence. A
    subpoena is a writ from a court requesting either
    testimony or information. Although the subpoena can be
    challenged, it cannot be ignored. Ignoring a subpoena
    can lead to a person or institution being held in contempt
    of court which carries a penalty of a fine or jail time.

11. In the United States, citizens are governed by both
    federal and state law. Federal laws are the supreme law
    of the land and can preempt state law, but do not cover
    all areas. There are certain areas where states provide the
    legislation. In those particular areas, the law can vary
    greatly from state to state. This variation makes it all the
    more important for each institution to look into the laws
    of its particular state.

12. Challenging a subpoena can be done in one of two ways: a party can move to quash a subpoena, which means requests that the court not enforce it, or the party can move to limit the subpoena, which means that the scope of information requested is cut down.
13. Once a subpoena is issued for materials from the collection, an attorney should be consulted before changing any aspect of the collection. Archivists should not risk being held in contempt of court for tampering with requested material.
14. Many times, when someone is hiring an attorney he or she will do so on a retainer, which means that the person prepays a retainer fee. The retainer fee is a prepayment for services that have not yet been rendered.
15. Pro bono is a free service that is given for the public good. The American Bar Association's Model Rules for Professional Conduct encourages lawyers to "aspire" to fifty hours of pro bono service a year. "Pro Bono." American Bar Association. Accessed November 17, 2013, at http://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/pro_bono.html.

The Missing Link: Observations on the Evolution of a Web Archive
by Craig Fansler, Kevin Gilbertson, and Rebecca Petersen

Abstract
The web is vast and unorganized, making it difficult to collect and to curate for archival and research purposes. In this article, we discuss web archiving in the scope of a university archive, the challenges associated with such web archiving, and archival strategies for building and maintaining a web archive. This article chronicles our experience developing appropriate standards of practice for this medium, providing adequate metadata for the digital objects, constructing precise capturing protocols, and sharing access to these online collections. While some difficulties lie in transforming our archival modalities from print to digital, an equal share of obstacles relate to the speed, scale, and distribution technologies of the web itself.

Introduction
The Special Collections and Archives department at Wake Forest University's Z. Smith Reynolds Library has been utilizing Archive-It (archive-it.org), a web archiving subscription service, to capture the web presence of Wake Forest University since June 2008, with a total archive of 1.1 TB. As a team of three, each with particular job responsibilities that relate to aspects of web archiving, we have been working to expand and refine our crawls and to develop a more agile and comprehensive methodology for capturing

the record of academic, administrative, and student life at our university.

Web archiving provides both preservation of and access to information on the web for future use. Much of what we produce exists only on the web in electronic form. By creating a web archive, we fulfill, in many ways, the traditional stewardship role that librarians and archivists have performed for books and print materials. In this case, however, it is electronic web content that we collect, arrange, describe, and preserve.

In this article, we discuss web archiving in the scope of a university archive, the associated challenges, and relevant archival strategies. When archiving the web (or even a selected portion of it as we do), a number of technological constraints exist that frustrate any goal of completeness. Our work is to develop appropriate standards of practice for this medium, to provide adequate metadata and access mechanisms to these online collections, and to align the ongoing realization of a web archive with the evolution of the web itself.

While our goal is to archive a small domain of the web, it can be helpful to situate our activities within the larger frame. The recent establishment of the Web Archiving Round Table by the Society of American Archivists reinforces the current and future trend of web archiving (Society of American Archivists 2013). Further, it can be difficult to imagine an archive of the web, it being a vast, unorganized, and growing repository of human knowledge and activity. In October 2012, the Internet Archive--the non-profit digital library that supports the Archive-It service and runs the Wayback Machine--topped 10 petabytes of archived data (The Internet Archive 2012).

Technical Challenges

Web archiving is a complicated activity. The medium to be archived--the World Wide Web--is colossal, disparate, refractory, and mutable. Sometimes, the technology used on the web limits what can be archived. Archival practice, in seeking to capture--to catalogue and preserve--this medium, must address these limits, which sometimes require unique customizations. The technical challenges of archiving the web are perhaps little different from our familiar print practices: we seek to archive artifacts we do not control. Instrumental differences lie in the blend of technical scale, speed, and constraints that hinder both effective practices and effective captures. These and other technical issues further magnify organizational dynamics and continue to push us to rethink and refine our approach.

Robots Exclusion Standard

The robots exclusion standard is a set of instructions for web robots identifying the parts of an otherwise publicly viewable website that should not be visited by the robots (Wikipedia 2013). These exclusions can be (and often are) detrimental to capturing the complete artifact, page, or document. In many cases, a robots.txt file blocks access to a site's supporting materials, including layout and style specifications (CSS files), interactive functionality (JavaScript files), and images. A captured site missing such elements can be unrecognizable and, as a result, may seem corrupted when accessed via the web archive.

Contacting the webmaster or site owner may be necessary to get permission to crawl a site, which is to say, to ignore any robots.txt exclusions. Permission to crawl a site is not always granted and further technological barriers often

prevent web archiving. According to the 2012 NDSA Web Archiving Survey, some institutions do not respect robots.txt files when archiving sites in their interest area (NDSA Content Working Group 2012). This practice seems to be the rule more than the exception according to the NDSA survey, as 75% of web archivists either sometimes or never asked site owners for permission to crawl their site. To keep their archive consistent and comprehensive, many organizations believe that they need to crawl sites and to make them publicly available at all costs.

In a web archiving roundtable discussion at the 2013 Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting in New Orleans, one archivist made the point that his library followed the *ACRL Standard for Fair Use* for their web archive. The *ACRL Standard for Fair Use* states that the fair use rule may be used in several contexts, including "collecting material on the web and making it available" (Association of Research Libraries 2012).

Other institutions archive sites on the web by following the advice of their legal counsel. These institutions believe they should ask permission for anyone who is not officially part of their institution or university. Some attorneys advised that web archiving without permission may violate terms of service for social media sites. To get around these restrictions, some institutions take screenshots or create PDF versions of sites as a reference.

Thus, when building a web archive, it is important to consider the role of robots.txt files in terms of ownership and access and to establish a process that protects the integrity of the site and the archive. Most crawlers provide a configuration setting to ignore any encountered robots.txt files. The argument can be made that, if content is publicly

available on the web, there is no reason for an archival crawler to respect the listed exclusions. While this route is easy, it also circumvents archival and legal practices regarding permission. The alternative route, to contact a site owner or webmaster to ask for permission, has the advantage of conforming to extant practices and has the potential benefit of enhancing any outreach efforts. Best practices are still being formed around this issue.

Scope Constraints and Crawl Reviews

An automated web crawler depends on hyperlinks, just as we humans do, to navigate the web. To build a web archive, a crawler works from a set of designated sites, essentially a list of links it is allowed to follow. Often, because websites extend beyond the designated site into assemblages of subdomains and subdirectories, followed links and embedded media can be determined to be out of scope by the crawler and the content will not be archived. Such scope constraints complicate any attempt at completeness.

It is often necessary to perform both test crawls (where designated sites are captured without being added to the web archive) to check for possible problematic captures with new sites and to conduct periodic crawl reviews to ensure that the data and documents captured during a crawl meet established quality control measures. Such test crawls and crawl reviews gain increased importance when social media sites are to be archived. The content and delivery mechanisms of social media sites can change rapidly, often creating gaps and unusable fragments in the web archive.

Constant State of Development

The technical issues of scale--so many sites, so many links--are compounded by the often ephemeral and increasingly modular nature of web content, making it difficult to collect and to curate for research. Social media--this wealth of primary source material--intensifies these factors and challenges our ability (and the crawler's ability) to respond effectively to changes and updates. Because many web sites, especially social media sites, are in a constant state of development, adding new features and gaining new users, web crawlers are often confounded by the continual and interactive changes and the quality of captured web content can suffer. In response, developers of a web crawler reevaluate and update their methods to accommodate such web content. While this process is cyclical and can be imperfect, it is worth the effort and is no reason to omit a site from attempted capture.

Archival Practice

Born-Physical vs. Born-Digital

There are certain assumptions we--as archivists and librarians--can make about appraisal, acquisitions, arrangement, description, and access of born-physical materials. Over time, archival practices have been honed, standardized, and taught. It is the established best practices of archival processing that both inform and hinder the new frontier of web archiving. Depending on the collection scope and collection development policy, selection and appraisal of web sites can be similar to born-physical materials. However, in this digital realm, challenges continue to increase during acquisition, arrangement, description, and access.

51

Traditional physical archives present challenges of their own. In our case, the structure of the University Archives record groups is closely related to the structure of the university. We have mirrored the hierarchical structure of administrative offices, student groups, and publications when arranging the records of those offices. Of course, this system is not without flaw or overlap. Restructuring of university departments, renaming of offices, publications, and student groups is a constant concern for archivists and affects users and access more than one might think. Electronic records, such as floppy discs, hard drives, and other born-digital media, have added another layer to the contents in a university archive. Archivists and records managers are constantly discussing and reevaluating the struggle of ingesting, reformatting, and migrating born-digital records. Hierarchical structure, arrangement overlap, and media reformatting are challenges that translate to a web archive as well.

Beyond Our Domain

In our web archive, we focus on the web presence of the university, specifically university-hosted websites and the profusion of websites about the university, vendor websites, and social media. Student groups, academic departments, and even the university president have a web presence that is not hosted by the university. Although not the official output of the university domain, secondary sites are increasingly central to sharing and managing news about university life. Ease of use and free hosting have eliminated the ostensible gatekeeper known as the webmaster and unleashed thousands of individual content creators across every university campus.

Social Media and User-Generated Virtual Communities

Across the university, faculty, staff, and students are blogging, tumbling , tweeting, and more. Social media is a legitimate form of recording events and personal experiences (e.g., Occupy movements, the Arab Spring, the ousting of the University of Virginia president). In *I, Digital*, Lee mentions opportunities for archivists to complement traditional collecting techniques with social media and other user-generated content from the web (Lee 2011, 206). Sometimes, these social media sites are the only place a user can see information. Often, there are no policies and procedures that require consent from the parent institution, nor does the parent institution necessarily know what sites are being created. In the case of a university, many instances of information exchange and social record are taking place beyond the university domain.

Unfortunately, for the purposes of a web archive, a well-developed collection development policy can have limited reach. Missing the opportunity to include these accessory sites in an institutional record would be a shame but the absence of an omniscient register and the corollary difficulty in creating a comprehensive list require an improvisational practice that favors serendipitous discovery. Some institutions invite website creators to submit their URLs to be included in the web archive. While this outreach effort encourages participation, pitfalls remain when considering completeness.

It is important to be realistic about web archiving. It is easy to get off topic or to get derailed by one site and one issue. As with any good archive, having an up-to-date collection development policy is invaluable but it is easy to get frustrated with completeness as well as with precision.

As with born-physical materials, technical, logistical, and logical exclusions will happen.

Arrangement, Description, and Access

Assuming an institution has successfully found and captured the websites it wants, content managers must then focus their attention on arrangement and description. It is necessary to consider a web archive to be an unprocessed collection until there is some intellectual control over the contents of the collection. Arrangement and description are the backbone of archival practice and that should not be forgotten after a website has been captured. It is with arrangement and description that institutions can provide access to users.

Institutions provide access in a variety of ways. Drexel University Archives has a search box on their website for their web archive (archives.library.drexel.edu). Columbia University Library creates MARC records for all of the URLs they capture in Archive-It (library.columbia.edu). NYU's Tamiment Library uses finding aids to integrate their web archive into their holdings (www.nyu.edu/library/bobst/research/tam). These institutions, along with many others, have arranged and described the content of their web archive in hopes of not only preserving the contents, but also to encourage use and discovery.

Preservation and Future Use

Libraries and archives have always preserved content for future use. Until recently, this activity involved primarily print content. Web archiving is essentially the same task with one obvious, pivotal difference: instead of

print and the associated material challenges, web archiving manages digital content and the associated technical challenges. Preserving this transient information for the future is not simply an automated collection activity: it requires regular, responsive, and systematic diligence.

Some institutions regard web archiving as web site preservation while others see web archiving as a collection access issue. Ideally, web archiving serves both preservation and access roles. Often, demand for access can drive the need for preservation; as such, while the preservation of web content is needed, access to archived web content is critical. The preservation component is done primarily so access will be possible in the future. Because web content captures a moment in time, highlighting particular social trends and current events, it can be used to enrich understanding and offer perspective during the research process. A web archive of such content will be invaluable to researchers, both present and future. Such use can happen only through careful preservation and access protocols. Web archiving thus has dual responsibilities: preserving access to the data and preserving the integrity of the data itself.

As we move into the future, it will be the responsibility of web archive providers to migrate to new software. Using emulation and migration techniques to provide continued access, it is possible to recreate obsolete technologies on current equipment. One example is the Universal Virtual Computer (UVC) created by Raymond A. Lorie of IBM. This computer is used as an independent platform for hosting older and newer versions of software for emulation strategies. To provide preservation of the data itself, migration converts the digital objects to a form that is accessible on current technology. Migration is an ongoing

55

responsibility for web archives. In addition to emulation and migration, a trusted digital repository--one that has established policies and standards as well as reliable hardware and software--should be used (Masanés 2006). These are new and evolving standards and techniques. As we continue to preserve our printed material, we must seek every opportunity to ensure our digital preservation efforts.

Conclusion

In web archiving, similar in many ways to building a library print collection, we seek information that matches our collection areas and research interests. Web technologies and web organizations change often. To be aware of the contingency of things on the web does not mean that everything on the web should be archived or that everything on the web has the same importance. Web archiving demands clear objectives, whereby organizational goals help in selecting what information should be preserved. With the growing repository of information on the web, it can be difficult to identify what web sources will provide the best information in the future.

In this article, we have demonstrated the complexity of good stewardship of a web archive. For a web archive, planning, creating, capturing, and preserving are complicated and iterative processes. Whether the objective of a web archive is to capture one domain or a thousand domains, it is critical to have a deliberate and intentional system. Technical challenges may be a concern during quality control and the ever-growing web may be an obstacle when finalizing a collection development policy, but these issues are not reasons not to build and maintain a web archive. It is imperative to expand each archive into the online world.

56

With the recent establishment of the Web Archiving Round Table by the Society of American Archivists, we see an increased awareness and engagement with web archiving. As the profession and its targets change, we will continue to encounter new challenges. In the case of web archiving, for a library gathering only university web content and for institutions pursuing large online research agendas, the opportunities for examining our practices and expanding our perspectives are virtually endless.

Rebecca Peterson is a MLIS graduate of UNC Greensboro and received her undergraduate degree from The George Washington University. She works as an access archivist on the Special Collections and Archives team at Z. Smith Reynolds Library, with a focus on University Archives, the N.C. Baptist Historical Collection, and personal papers and manuscripts.

Kevin Gilbertson is a MLIS graduate of the University of South Carolina in Columbia. He has worked at the Z. Smith Reynolds Library since 2005. As web services librarian his work includes web application development, user interface design, and open source software initiatives.

Craig Fansler is a MLIS graduate of UNC Greensboro. He is the preservation librarian on the Special Collections and Archives team at the Z. Smith Reynolds Library. His work includes the preservation of library materials, print design, exhibits, and disaster preparedness.

WORKS CONSULTED

1. Association of Research Libraries, "Code of Best Practices in Fair Use." Last modified January 2012. Accessed September 12, 2013. http://www.arl.org/ storage/documents/publications/code-of-best-practices-fair-use.pdf.
2. Brown, Adrian. *Archiving Websites: a practical guide for information management professionals*. Baton Rouge: Facet Publications, 2006.
3. Fansler, Craig, Kevin Gilbertson, and Rebecca Petersen. "The Missing Link: Connecting Past, Present & Future Through Web Archiving." Poster session. Z. Smith Reynolds Library, Wake Forest University, 2013.
4. International Internet Preservation Consortium, Accessed September 12, 2013. www.netpeserve.org.
5. Lee, Christopher A. *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
6. Masanés, Julien. *Web Archiving*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2006.
7. NDSA Content Working Group, "National Digital Stewardship Alliance." (2012). Last modified June 19, 2012. Accessed September 12, 2013. http:// www.digitalpreservation.gov/ndsa/working_groups/ documents/ ndsa_web_archiving_survey_report_2012.pdf.
8. "SAA Web Archiving Roundtable." Conference session at Archives 2013, the Joint Annual Meeting of the Council of State Archives and the Society of American Archivists, New Orleans, LA, August 11-17, 2013.
9. Shallcross, Michael. "On the Development of the University of Michigan Web Archives: Archival Principles and Strategies." *On the Development of the University of Michigan Web Archives: Archival Principles and Strategies*. (2010). http:// files.archivists.org/pubs/CampusCaseStudies/ Case13Final.pdf (accessed September 12, 2013).
10. Society of American Archivists, "Web Archiving

Roundtable." Accessed November 18, 2013. http://
saa.archivists.org/4DCGI/committees/SAATBL-
WEBRT.html?
Action=Show_Comm_Detail&CommCode=SAA**TBL
-WEBRT&.

11. The Internet Archive, "10,000,000,000,000,000 bytes
archived!" (2012). Accessed September 13, 2013. http://
blog.archive.org/2012/10/26/10000000000000000-bytes
-archived/.

12. Wikipedia, "Robots Exclusion Standard." Accessed
September 13, 2013. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
Robots_exclusion_standard

REVIEWS

Laura A. Millar. *Archives: Principles and Practices.* **New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 2010. 303p. Bibliography, figures, glossary, index, and tables. $85 (non-member); $75 (member).**

Archives: Principles and Practices earned the 2011 SAA Waldo Gifford Leland Award for writing of superior excellence. This textbook is, as the author states, a 'why-to' book rather than a 'how-to' book (xvi). The target audience includes lone arrangers working in small repositories without a robust budget or program. Students in archival programs, "especially those just embarking on a career in archives and still unclear about what the profession exists to do (xvii)," are also cited as the targeted audience. This book is currently used in many archival education programs. *Archives: Principles and Practices* strives to comprehensively explain the theory and implementation of contemporary archival management practices.

The book's chapters break down the archivist's job, going from a broad introduction of "What are archives," followed by a discussion of the expectations of an archivist (ethics, skills, etc.) through the tasks of appraising, description, and outreach, and concludes with an explication of the challenges of archiving digital materials. The end matter contains a list of resources. These include a glossary, a list of relevant journals, a small list of professional associations, and a bibliography organized by each chapter. There is some overlap of authors, but Millar's list provides a wealth of opinion and experience useful for anyone

interested in deepening their knowledge of archival research and relatively recent issues and best practices.

There is definite honesty in advertising in the title, as it clearly states the goal and achievement of this publication: to provide an overview of the basics in archival principals and practices. The author provides fundamentals and information to lay the groundwork for understanding how archival organizations, and their internal processes, work. The lack of a strong editor is apparent in the number of typographical errors (misspelling Steven Hensen's name in reference to *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts* is an especially egregious example).

Dr. Millar, currently an archival consultant, earned her Master of Archival Studies at the University of British Columbia and her Ph.D. in Archival Studies at the University of London. Working with small and large repositories, with staff from varied backgrounds, Dr. Millar has witnessed the need for resources addressing the information needs of new archivists.

An area of strength for the book is her sustained emphasis on *respect des fonds*. She introduces the concept on page 101 and refers multiple times throughout the rest of *Archives* to original order and keeping archival collections separate and distinct from each other while avoiding the creation of artificial collections, no matter how tempting.

Covering an entire profession in one book is a daunting task. I was impressed with the author's ability to identify aspects within each chapter which highlight some of the most important, most contentious or the most basic parts of that area of interest. For example, in the chapter "Protecting Archives," Dr. Millar discusses the difference between conservation and preservation; notes a range of

preservation issues (light, pollution, etc.); presents a sample preservation policy; and covers optimal storage environments for various media. She includes nitrate film, artifacts, audio-visual material and even microform. In a short amount of space, she touches on issues and differences, along with addressing contemporary best practices.

I often found myself looking for more specific information while reading about a certain area. In her introduction to description a few chapters prior to the Arranging and Describing Archives chapter, I kept looking for a reference to *Describing Archives: A Content Standard.* She noted that there would be more information in the ensuing chapter, but the lack of in-depth information on this topic kept me looking for greater substance. In fairness, Millar does provide the basics, as promised.

Dr. Millar's own work is focused on English-speaking countries outside of the United States. The examples and sample forms cited in this publication are primarily derived (either in fact or hypothetically) from Canada or other British Commonwealth nations. The author references activities and laws found in these countries. Since this is a 'why-to' book rather than a 'how-to' book, international references help show the developing archivist the range of options across the world. However, in reviewing this for an American audience, I found the lack of U.S. examples less than helpful. This was especially true in the areas of copyright and governmental regulations. Going back to the chapter "Protecting Archives," the information on storage temperatures is written in Celsius. This is not a tragic error; rather, it is an example of how the international nature of the book can cause some challenges when shifting from

the why to the how needed when moving to the implementation of theory.

There are other publications on the market which attempt to cover the basics of the profession. *Understanding Archives and Manuscripts* (James M. O'Toole and Richard J. Cox, Society of American Archivists, 2006) is similar in some respects, though not as broad in scope. That book runs about 100 pages shorter than *Archives: Principles and Practices*.

Archives professionals with a few years of experience will sate their desire for more targeted and more robust information in publications crafted towards the specific area of interest or concern, such as copyright, reference, and preservation, to simply name a few. Although this book may not be the go-to book for those farther along in their career, *Archives: Principles and Practices* will be most helpful for those just starting out and those interested in a broad view of the profession.

Lynn Eaton
James Madison University

***Content, Context, and Capacity: A Collaborative Large-Scale Digitization Project on the Long Civil Rights Movement in North Carolina*, http://www2.trln.org/ccc/index.htm. Triangle Research Libraries Network. Reviewed June 6, 2013.**

Content, Context, and Capacity: A Collaborative Large-Scale Digitization Project on the Long Civil Rights Movement in North Carolina (CCC) is an invaluable resource for scholars, students, educators, and public

the why to the how needed when moving to the implementation of theory.

There are other publications on the market which attempt to cover the basics of the profession. *Understanding Archives and Manuscripts* (James M. O'Toole and Richard J. Cox, Society of American Archivists, 2006) is similar in some respects, though not as broad in scope. That book runs about 100 pages shorter than *Archives: Principles and Practices*.

Archives professionals with a few years of experience will sate their desire for more targeted and more robust information in publications crafted towards the specific area of interest or concern, such as copyright, reference, and preservation, to simply name a few. Although this book may not be the go-to book for those farther along in their career, *Archives: Principles and Practices* will be most helpful for those just starting out and those interested in a broad view of the profession.

Lynn Eaton
James Madison University

Content, Context, and Capacity: A Collaborative Large-Scale Digitization Project on the Long Civil Rights Movement in North Carolina, http://www2.trln.org/ccc/index.htm. Triangle Research Libraries Network. Reviewed June 6, 2013.

Content, Context, and Capacity: A Collaborative Large-Scale Digitization Project on the Long Civil Rights Movement in North Carolina (CCC) is an invaluable resource for scholars, students, educators, and public

historians. A project of the Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN), consisting of Duke University, North Carolina Central University, North Carolina State University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, this collaborative effort began in the summer of 2011 and will include thirty-eight manuscript collections and 400,000 digital objects by the time it concludes in 2014. With a thematic focus on the Long Civil Rights Movement (LCRM), it encompasses materials related to "the struggles against economic, social, and environmental injustices that continue even to this day," according to the site. "In the LCRM, the cast of well-known heroes and villains swells and no longer excludes the grassroots players, such as the labor unions and community organizers, or the LCRM's opponents in the emerging New Right."

The LCRM challenges the dominant civil rights movement narrative, which begins with the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, focuses on the 1960s public protests, and culminates with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In contrast, the LCRM (1930s to 1980s) paints a more dynamic, complex picture, interweaving gender, class, and race as well as yoking civil rights to workers' rights, and race to class.[1] The players hail from rural as well as urban areas; tobacco and textile unions; African American churches, businesses, civic groups, and schools; interracial community organizations; universities; community service organizations; and cooperative extension services. The manuscript collections comprising CCC all have strong links to the LCRM theme.

For the scholar or graduate student, the unusual methodology of this large-scale digitization project is ideal. Entire collections are digitized, and each item appears online

64

in the same order as it does in its physical arrangement. The digital collections mirror the physical reading room experience--but through CCC are accessible from anywhere. The methodology also makes the digitization of large volumes of material possible. Instead of selecting items for an exhibit-like online display--a time-consuming process-- mass digitization is integrated into each institution's workflow. No descriptive metadata is added, and the researcher uses either the TRLN search function, the holding institution's online catalogue, or the collection finding aid for the individual collection to locate an item.

CCC also provides a rich lode of primary source material for teachers. The breadth of the collections; the volume of items; and the lack of metadata for topics, date, or reading levels, however, all create challenges for the pressed-for-time primary or secondary teacher. This does not, and should not, preclude the use of these important curricular resources in the classroom. For instance, as one educator pointed out to me, state educational leaders can select one or two themes to explore, then develop an online course for in-service teachers, exposing them to the topic-related content and asking them to investigate the archives and create classroom approaches and curricula.

The availability of the digital content also opens endless possibilities for the development of other projects. As a CCC study, "North Carolina Secondary Educators' Use of Primary Sources," concludes: "One way to think about large-scale digitization is that it is both an end-goal and a building block: for most primary sources, large-scale digitization and delivery may be as far as it ever goes. But once materials are digital and freely available on the open

65

web, content can and should be reused and repurposed by other projects and partners."

CCC also offers opportunities for the independent scholar or public historian whose research centers on a local or state civil rights struggle, as mine does. I am an independent scholar (a journalist by training) who has conducted oral histories, researched, and examined the 1963 civil rights protests in Danville, Va., a city that shares many traits with the piedmont region of North Carolina, including a once-thriving economy based on textiles and tobacco. The materials in the CCC collection broaden and provide regional context for my research, offering points for comparison and contrast on the topics of segregation, women activists, labor union leaders, and racial and economic factors, and remind me to consider extending the scope of my project back to the 1930s and at least through the 1980s.

As a researcher unfamiliar with many of the North Carolina collections, however, I found the wealth of material initially daunting. One discovery that proved helpful was a link I found on the CCC site, under Related Resources, to the *Publishing the Long Civil Rights Movement* blog (https://lcrm.lib.unc.edu/blog/). The blog, based at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, is regularly updated during the project, and among this year's posts were short essays and images highlighting portions of the CCC collections and providing fascinating insights into their importance. When the project is complete in 2014, a CCC investment in a similar blog, solely devoted to the CCC project, would be wise, to broaden the audience and entice newcomers to explore the digital collections.

The CCC project deserves a broad audience: it is a groundbreaking undertaking, "the first attempt by a library

consortium to conduct a collaborative manuscripts digitization project on this scale," according to the site. The goals of the project, made possible by a $150,000 grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, go beyond promoting access to these remarkable collections. The aims include testing and evaluating this approach to collaborative large-scale digitization and developing standards, practices, and processes for the four libraries which can serve as a model for future digital projects and for other institutions. Among the daunting tasks undertaken was the development of an intellectual property strategy to address the complex copyright issues inherent in the digitization of modern documents. This project, if successful, serves as a first step in digitizing many more collections and as a model for other libraries.

This ambitious undertaking is a tribute to the collaborative framework and spirit of the Triangle Research Libraries Network, founded in 1977 to facilitate and promote access to scholarly materials for Duke University, North Carolina Central University, North Carolina State University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. *Content, Context, and Capacity* is also a reflection of the remarkable richness of the twentieth-century collections at these four North Carolina institutions and the wisdom of the scholars, librarians, collectors, and citizens who saw fit to assemble and preserve them. These digitized documents will help expand the understanding of the civil rights movement and make clear its breadth, depth, and multifaceted nature. The long term success of the CCC project will be measured over the years in the scholarship that is produced, in the educational history programs that are developed, and in how well its model endures. The outlook seems bright.

NOTES

1. Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, the Julia Cherry Spruill Professor of History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, coined the term *the Long Civil Rights Movement* in an influential 2005 article, "The Long Civil Rights Movement and the Political Uses of the Past"; *The Journal of American History* 91, no. 4 (2005): 1233–63, doi: 10.2307/3660172.

Emma C. Edmunds
University of Virginia

Christopher J. Prom and Thomas J. Frusciano, eds. ***Archival Arrangement and Description.*** **Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2013. 215p. Appendixes, bibliographies, and illustrations. $35 (nonmember); $25 (member).**

Archival Arrangement and Description, edited by Christopher J. Prom and Thomas J. Frusciano, marks one of the first publications available in the *Trends in Archives Practice* publishing initiative started by the Society of American Archivists (SAA). This publication is broken down into three modules, each addressing current trends and issues involving arrangement and description. The three modules are intended to be used in conjunction with Kathleen Roe's *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005) in order to gain a better understanding of "foundational principles, theoretical bases, and current best practices" regarding archival arrangement and description

NOTES

1. Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, the Julia Cherry Spruill Professor of History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, coined the term *the Long Civil Rights Movement* in an influential 2005 article, "The Long Civil Rights Movement and the Political Uses of the Past"; *The Journal of American History* 91, no. 4 (2005): 1233–63, doi: 10.2307/3660172.

Emma C. Edmunds
University of Virginia

Christopher J. Prom and Thomas J. Frusciano, eds. *Archival Arrangement and Description.* **Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2013. 215p. Appendixes, bibliographies, and illustrations. $35 (nonmember); $25 (member).**

Archival Arrangement and Description, edited by Christopher J. Prom and Thomas J. Frusciano, marks one of the first publications available in the *Trends in Archives Practice* publishing initiative started by the Society of American Archivists (SAA). This publication is broken down into three modules, each addressing current trends and issues involving arrangement and description. The three modules are intended to be used in conjunction with Kathleen Roe's *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005) in order to gain a better understanding of "foundational principles, theoretical bases, and current best practices" regarding archival arrangement and description

(iv). Module one is titled "Standards For Archival Description," module two is "Processing Digital Records and Manuscripts," and module three is "Designing Descriptive and Access Systems." The modular approach is intended to be a user-centered initiative where readers have the option to mix and match various modules in order to best meet their needs and curiosities. The *Trends in Archives Practice* publications (which are available in both print and electronic formats) will build upon existing foundational SAA publications, offering new voices from innovative leaders in the archival profession and helping professionals keep pace with the rapidly changing world of archives, records management, and digital curation.

The first module is written by Sibyl Schaefer and Janet M. Bunde and offers an overview of standards that are currently used in archival description. Not all standards are included in this module, but the authors highlight those that are most widely used and have been adopted by many institutions and organizations that partake in archival description. More recently adopted and developed standards in the archival community are also included. This module is divided into four sections. The first covers the importance of standards with a particular focus on the importance of standard archival description. Schaefer and Bunde state, "It is important to adhere to standards when describing archival materials because their use allows archives to record consistent, findable metadata about collections and records held within repositories" (16). Additionally, this section discusses how descriptive standards can be classified into three types that include data structure, data content, and data value. Section two focuses on fourteen national and international archival descriptive standards. Each standard

mentioned is covered in depth and descriptions and examples are provided when appropriate. The third section discusses the future of archival descriptive standards. Moreover, this section highlights groups that are continuing to work on archival descriptive standards such as EAD consortia (e.g., Online Archive of California), and the Social Networks and Archival Context Project (SNAC). A description of archival management software is included, as well as plans to revise current standards. The final section in this module emphasizes the importance of each archival repository choosing a descriptive standard that fits its institutional culture based on staffing levels, budget, knowledge, and other local needs. Appendices follow this section and feature case studies, additional readings, and definitions of acronyms used throughout the module.

The second module, written by J. Gordon Daines III, focuses on workflows, procedures, and tools to assist archivists and curators who acquire and manage digital records and manuscripts. Daines argues that it is crucial for archivists and curators to develop the necessary skills to handle digital records so information that was once in paper format will be preserved in the digital world. Moreover, the author states, "By carefully examining existing processing strategies and by adapting new tools and services in light of the demands that digital materials impose, archivists can exercise appropriate stewardship over electronic records and collections" (90). Module two is divided into four sections. Section one focuses on some of the challenges and opportunities that archivists are faced with when securing and managing digital records. The second section highlights issues surrounding processing workflows, specifically how and why existing workflows can and should be adjusted to

cater to digital records and manuscripts. Additionally, this section focuses on how each step in processing workflows will be affected by acquiring born-digital materials. Section three provides an overview as well as guidance on the best ways archivists and curators can manage and maintain born-digital records in their collections. This section also includes sample workflows and a description of specific tools that can help archivists and curators be good stewards of digital records and manuscripts. The fourth section includes recommendations on how to develop and maintain skill sets for dealing with born-digital materials. The second module concludes with a number of appendices that include case studies, recent and current activities and projects that are focusing on how to handle digital records and manuscripts (such as the Born-Digital Special Collections project at OCLC), a chart outlining selected tools and software that can assist with processing born-digital records, a chart showing standards that are applicable for the description of digital records, and a list of further readings.

Module three, by Daniel A. Santamaria, is the last module covered in the book and is entitled "Designing Descriptive and Access Systems." The author presents the case that in the twenty-first century, archivists and curators are faced with challenges and opportunities to make archival collections available online in order to keep up with the demand for digital content that "promises the ability to provide twenty-four-hour universal access to archival material" (148). This module outlines some of the tools and strategies that can be used to assist in making archival collections available online via MARC, MARC AMC, or EAD-encoded finding aids. Santamaria argues that despite the staff size and budget challenges, most archival

71

repositories can find a tool that will fit their needs and help them make more content available online. The tools that Santamaria focuses on represent the primary components of archival description and access. Additionally, the tools are best used with "pre-accessioning, accessioning, description, the delivery of descriptive records and content, and the evaluation of services" (149). In addition to providing information about tools, the author also discusses what archivists and curators must know in order to plan and effectively implement access systems. In this module, Santamaria hits home the importance of adhering to archival standards such as DACS when describing collections and archival content in order to increase access by improving the discoverability of digital content. Moreover, appendices present a summary of recommendations, case studies, a chart listing selected tools that support description and access, further readings, and sample workflows for small repositories.

The structure of the book around the three modules is effective at covering a wide breadth of new information while at the same time providing synthesized content for a professional audience. The authors offer reliable information and proficient insights for all levels of experience, varied institution sizes, and multiple technology skill-levels. Archivists and curators will learn something new and find a plethora of resources within each module, including useful graphs and figures that accompany the text. One shortcoming of the work is the lack of an index. This is especially troublesome as the book covers many terms, concepts, and standards. Nevertheless, *Archival Arrangement and Description* is recommended for all archival professionals

and chiefly those who arrange and describe archival collections.

Katie Nash
Elon University

Jessica Lacher-Feldman. *Exhibits in Archives and Special Collections Libraries.* **Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2013. viii, 200p. Appendixes, illustrations, index, notes, and photographs. Softcover. $69.95 (nonmember); $49.95 (member).**

Jessica Lacher-Feldman has crafted a handy reference specifically for archivists, librarians, and special collections curators to use in developing exhibits from their holdings. The book grew out of a popular one-day workshop, "Archival Exhibitions" created by Lacher-Feldman for the Society of American Archivists' (SAA) continuing education program. She draws on her thirteen years of experience at the University of Alabama, where she served as Public and Outreach Services Coordinator and later as Curator of Rare Books and Special Collections at the W. S. Hoole Special Collections Library. Currently she is Head of Special Collections at Louisiana State University's Hill Memorial Library.

Her goal from the start is to demystify the task of creating exhibits and to succinctly present guidelines for successful, robust results. She aims to inspire as well as to educate, and urges readers to "Proceed and Be Bold," a motto coined by the architect Samuel Mockbee, co-founder of Auburn University's famed Rural Studio in Hale County, Alabama.[1] She shares her enthusiasm and passion for her

73

and chiefly those who arrange and describe archival collections.

Katie Nash
Elon University

Jessica Lacher-Feldman. *Exhibits in Archives and Special Collections Libraries.* **Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2013. viii, 200p. Appendixes, illustrations, index, notes, and photographs. Softcover. $69.95 (nonmember); $49.95 (member).**

Jessica Lacher-Feldman has crafted a handy reference specifically for archivists, librarians, and special collections curators to use in developing exhibits from their holdings. The book grew out of a popular one-day workshop, "Archival Exhibitions" created by Lacher-Feldman for the Society of American Archivists' (SAA) continuing education program. She draws on her thirteen years of experience at the University of Alabama, where she served as Public and Outreach Services Coordinator and later as Curator of Rare Books and Special Collections at the W. S. Hoole Special Collections Library. Currently she is Head of Special Collections at Louisiana State University's Hill Memorial Library.

Her goal from the start is to demystify the task of creating exhibits and to succinctly present guidelines for successful, robust results. She aims to inspire as well as to educate, and urges readers to "Proceed and Be Bold," a motto coined by the architect Samuel Mockbee, co-founder of Auburn University's famed Rural Studio in Hale County, Alabama.[1] She shares her enthusiasm and passion for her

73

work as well as her expertise, learned--and earned--over years of practice, research, and simple trial and error.

A survey of the table of contents reveals a methodical unpacking of the frequently overlapping steps and conventions that comprise exhibit development, execution, promotion, and documentation. The sixteen chapters, each opening with a brief abstract of the topics addressed, are bookended by two important prompts: first, to consider why exhibits are relevant and important to *one's own* institution, and finally to reflect on lessons learned from a completed exhibit and apply them to future planning in the exhibition cycle.

Woven throughout are brief and chapter-length case studies contributed by colleagues from other repositories that demonstrate the book's "how-to" principles in practice. These real-world examples and perspectives from a variety of curators are a valuable addition. Graphics and sidebars within the chapters offer detailed outlines on topics such as the exhibit development cycle, policies, and basic tools and supplies. Though it is weighted toward physical exhibits, there is a chapter about simple online exhibits and the potential of the Internet to reach a larger audience through blogs and social media.

Six appendices cover a review of literature organized by subject that echo the book's chapters, compiled by two of Lacher-Feldman's colleagues from Rutgers University, as well as sample documents and forms and illustrated instructions for making simple book supports and labels.

The content is scalable to different circumstances, but it will be especially useful to those institutions that are starting or seeking to expand an existing exhibits program

with a small staff and limited budget. This distinction is important, because unlike art museums, galleries, and even some notable libraries such as the Beinecke or the New York Public Library, most archives and special collections repositories operate within unique constraints. It can be summed up with the word *resources*.

Time and money. To be sure, in the economic climate of recent memory, doing more with less is a challenge across professions and disciplines--particularly in higher education, academic libraries, and archives. It's easy to see how public outreach such as exhibits could take a back seat to collection building and description, as well as other forms of access and discovery that facilitate research. But Lacher-Feldman effectively argues that not only are exhibits an integral part of a mission to educate and expose collections to a broad audience, they are also an effective way to advocate for and develop collections, and enhance our knowledge as subject specialists. On this point she notes:

> It is worth considering how the work we do in exhibit development might fall into the realm of research...and affords us new opportunities as experts--not just in the materiality of our physical holdings, but also in considering their symbolic, historical, intellectual, social, and cultural significance. Exhibition curatorship *is* scholarship. (10)

Space. There are more physical configurations and assets such as cases, cabinets (locked, unlocked), wall space (permanent, movable), and lighting (natural, artificial) than

can be listed here. Each curator must find ways to shape exhibit possibilities to his or her particular situation. By presenting a holistic approach to exhibit planning and development readers can tailor Lacher-Feldman's recommendations to their specific needs and resources.

The core resource: the collection. Unlike the object- or art-based collections of museums, the majority of material in archives and libraries present some display challenges. Often the materials are too fragile, or the lighting and climate conditions in the available exhibit space insufficient to place originals on display for any length of time. The rich content of a manuscript or document may be difficult to discern without the aid of magnification or an enlarged facsimile.

Expertise. Professionals in archives and special collections wear many hats. Mounting exhibits is typically not the primary task in a curator's portfolio and few librarians or archivists have training in the craft of exhibit design. Though Lacher-Feldman identifies graphic design as "the most complicated component of exhibit development" (23), readers would benefit from more critical amplification on the subject. (Full disclosure: though my title is Exhibits Librarian, I am a graphic designer by profession.)

On the one hand, a good case is made for archivists to bring their training in description, interpretation, and knowledge of history to bear on exhibit development and writing--urging the curator to become a "temporary expert" (20–21). This assumes that, though the territory may be unfamiliar, the curator brings significant knowledge, experience, and expertise to the task. The subject of

translating that work into a physical exhibit is sometimes treated too simplistically--inviting us to "Channel Your Inner Graphic Designer." (23)

The back cover copy states that "exhibit development doesn't have to be complicated or overwhelming." I would suggest a small but significant edit: "exhibit development and execution *is* complicated, but it *need not be* overwhelming." Jessica Lacher-Feldman's thoughtful handbook goes a long way to guide users through the process. It's a welcome addition to my reference shelf.

Molly Renda
North Carolina State University

NOTES

1. This groundbreaking program, founded in 1993, takes architecture undergraduates out of the classroom and into the field to learn their craft through design-build projects for the surrounding community. www.ruralstudio.org