

*The American Archivist Online Supplement to Volume 74.* Edited by William E. Landis. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011. [www2.archivists.org/american-archivist/supplement/aaos74](http://www2.archivists.org/american-archivist/supplement/aaos74). Free.

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

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

In the twentieth century, American archival education, traditionally rooted in history education, matured and evolved into several graduate programs in library and information science schools. Many workshops and other institutes are also available now. In “The View from Here: Perspectives on Educating about Archives,” Donna McCrea, Paul Conway, Brenda Banks, Nancy Zimmelman Lenoil, and Michael F. Suarez, S.J., focus on various aspects of archival education. Conway’s analysis of research articles in three North American archival journals published from 2001 to 2011 is rooted in

the context of contention over the role of research in advancing professional theory versus facilitating practice. Conway discovered that research is conducted largely by archival faculty and students rather than by practitioners and that it constituted only 35 percent of the articles studied. Although he argues for better understanding how research bridges the gap between education and practice, Conway found that archivists are not proactively melding research findings into daily work.

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

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

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

From "gatekeepers" to "facilitators," from "records oriented" to "user oriented," perhaps no aspect of archival work witnessed as drastic a change in the twentieth century as access and reference. These ideas are explored by George W. Bain, John A. Fleckner, Kathy

Marquis, and Mary Jo Pugh in “Reference, Access, and Outreach: An Evolved Landscape, 1936–2011.” Pugh presents a broad overview of reference by focusing on several environmental factors influencing its practice within an institution. Sidestepping a pressing question, she limits discussion of reference’s place in today’s Internet-dominated world to just one paragraph, mentioning online tutorials, guides, and the evaluation of information resources. Pugh ends by arguing for better understanding of information-seeking processes and continued outreach efforts so that archives are better positioned to be users’ information entry points when appropriate. Fleckner’s survey of the evolving notions of access builds upon Pugh’s conclusion by arguing that increasing archival literacy is the next frontier to facilitate access. (Some archivists and institutions are already exploring this avenue; for example, I recently participated in a Purdue University study aiming to develop archival competencies for undergraduate history majors.) Bain completes the article by tracing the notions of outreach from an afterthought when SAA and the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) were founded to the central archival function it is today. He credits the expansion to the maturation of the profession in the 1970s and the establishment of SAA’s Reference, Access, and Outreach Section in 1983. He continues with the “archives and society” discussions of the 1980s, the creation of Archives Month, National History Day, and the “I Found It in the Archives” contest.

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

In “Exploring the Evolution of Access: Classified, Privacy, and Proprietary Restrictions,” William C. Carpenter, Charlene Nichols, Sarah A. Polirer, and Judith A. Wiener remind us that archival access operates in the context of proprietary and legal restrictions that are at times necessary for the greater good. Carpenter discusses the evolution of federal classification for national security and chronicles several presidential executive orders that have advanced and refined the declassification of government information. She mentions the implications of technology and controversial organizations such as WikiLeaks only in passing. Polirer explains the corporate archivist’s role in serving business needs by restricting proprietary information and supporting risk management, and provides a framework for making business records accessible. Disappointingly, she offers no perspective on the oft-cited role of archives in keeping corporations accountable to society, or the ethical complexities of corporate archives. Wiener discusses the evolution of privacy issues in medical records to illustrate the challenges in balancing access and protecting privacy. She points to Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act-related resources to aid archivists in health science repositories, noting the necessity of institutional legal advice when formulating access policies.

Since Peter Gottlieb argued for establishing a federation of existing archival organizations in his 2010 SAA presidential address, archivists have reexamined the relationship between SAA and the regional organizations. Numerous authors representing several organizations offer their perspectives in "*E Pluribus Unum? SAA and the Regionals.*" The year 1972 saw the establishment of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, New England Archivists, Midwest Archives Conference, Northwest Archivists, and the Society of Southwest Archivists. The authors note that these groups had similar agendas: creating networks where less-experienced or resource-challenged archivists could focus on local needs and exchange ideas in ways not offered by SAA. They identify areas of existing collaboration and suggest new ideas such as working toward a common agenda like SAA's strategic priorities, or including regional representatives in SAA's governing structure. Although Gottlieb's vision remains unfulfilled, this discussion provides initial ideas to move us toward a new relationship.

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

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

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