

# WHEN IS A COLLECTION PROCESSED?

MEGAN FLOYD DESNOYERS

*Processing.* The activities intended to facilitate the use of personal papers and manuscript collections generally comparable to arrangement, description, and preservation of archival material.<sup>1</sup> (To which the author would add the activity of screening or reviewing the material to insure that there are no legal or donor-imposed bars to opening it.)

When is a collection considered to be processed? When historically valuable material may be made available for research without violating any restrictions as to its use and without endangering its enduring physical state, and when that material is arranged and described so that a researcher may readily find what he/she is looking for in it.

Processing is done to meet the needs and interests of several different groups of people: donors, users, and archivists. Two of these groups—donors and users—often have mutually conflicting needs and interests.

*Donors* who have imposed restrictions on their materials want those restrictions applied before access is granted to any researcher to use any parts of their collections. To meet this need, archivists must review or screen each collection against restriction requirements and criteria as specified in deeds of gift, and must remove, for as long as necessary, those items embargoed by donors.

*Users* may be researchers, donors or their representatives, or archivists answering donors' or researchers' queries. Their common need is the ready retrieval of information, either facts or documents, from the material. Processing must result in adequate arrangement and description of the material to facilitate such retrieval.

The third constituency having needs and interests which processing must meet are the *archivists* or curators themselves. Archivists feel responsible for addressing the needs and interests of both the donor and the user, for enforcing legal restrictions on a collection's use, and for attending to the physical needs of the material itself. The archivists' needs and interests must also be met by adequate arrangement, preservation, description, and screening of each collection.

Archivists have accepted responsibility for applying donor restrictions to collections or parts of collections and for enforcing all other legal restrictions on the use of the material. We apply the provisions of the federal Privacy Act, of appropriate state laws, of legislation controlling the dissemination of national security classified information, and of any other relevant laws and regulations. This is a practical as well as an ethical responsibility. If we do not do the necessary screening, we run the risk of invading someone's privacy, compromising national security, angering a donor by violating his/her trust, and/or making ourselves liable for legal action on many different levels.

Archivists not only strive to meet users' needs for ready retrieval of information, but also have accepted responsibility for opening all collections as soon as possible after receipt and for supplying *all* researchers with as much information about a collection as possible, while giving the material adequate physical protection. Opening collections promptly requires speedy processing. Providing as much information as possible is accomplished through good description of the collection by the person who knows it best, the processor. The physical needs of the material are met by insuring that appropriate preservation and conservation measures are applied to the papers.

To meet these complex and often conflicting requirements, archivists have accepted the responsibility of maintaining a certain level of processing that is professionally suitable, but we have not defined that level very well and, therefore, we strive for an ideal that may not always be practical or appropriate.

There are two problems with establishing a standard level of processing. The first is that it dictates what must be done to a collection whether or not the collection warrants it, and it limits what can be done to a collection that might need more work. We

rarely ask the question: When is *this* collection processed? Instead, we process all collections to an ideal standard level. The second problem is that by processing all collections to the ideal standard level, we cannot keep up with the collections we have on hand or with the new collections coming in. The result tends to be a small number of beautifully processed collections available for use and an extensive backlog of collections that are closed while they wait to be processed.

This backlog is growing at an incredible rate because of two other fairly recent developments: the arrival of voluminous contemporary collections and the fact that more limited archival budgets are being spread over a greater variety of programs. The contemporary collections that institutions are now being swamped with are huge, and they differ from older holdings. They are collections "of great size and historical importance which contain few individual documents of specific research value or autograph interest in their own right."<sup>2</sup> At the same time, overall archival budgets are declining while services and demands are growing. Educational projects, professional meetings, and rising costs of staff, facilities, and materials stretch limited funds even further. There is not much money left for processing, and we are having to justify carefully how we spend the little that is available. We cannot afford to spend as much money to process a single collection as we might have in the past, now that we have more collections, less money, and bigger backlogs.

The backlog situation is especially serious because of its impact on the donors, researchers, and archivists. Donors may be annoyed when they discover that collections they deposited years ago remain unprocessed and inaccessible, and they may be even more unhappy when determined researchers approach them directly for access to their collections. Some donors understand and are patient; others become angry and testy. Researchers are frustrated and often angered by processing backlogs that keep collections unavailable. Their needs are certainly not being met. Archivists are equally frustrated because we would like to be opening these collections as soon as possible and to the greatest extent possible. We are apologetic to donors and researchers and genuinely concerned about the seeming impasse.

The author proposes that instead of trying to maintain an ideal

standard level of processing, we look at processing as a *range of choices along a continuum* for each of the four essential processing activities: arrangement, preservation, description, and screening. The continuum runs from the found, or original, state of the material up to the highest possible level of each activity, e.g., a calendared collection where each item is individually filed in an acid neutral folder in an acid neutral box.

The archivist should evaluate each collection and decide how far that particular collection needs to be taken along the arrangement, preservation, description, and screening continua. In making these decisions, he/she would consider the found state of the collection and the requirements and interests of the donor, the users, the applicable legislation, and the material itself. These factors would determine the lowest level of each of the four activities with which the archivist could live comfortably while fulfilling all of those needs.

The archivist must also decide *when* each activity is to be done. This decision will depend on the nature of the papers, the level of each of the four activities to which they will be taken, and the processor's experience. The options range from doing the four activities as concurrently as possible to doing them completely sequentially. Concurrent processing is the most efficient in terms of time and money and sequential processing is the least efficient. An experienced processor might be charged with doing the arrangement, preservation, and screening on each box at one time while also taking all notes necessary for later description. But if any of the activities become complicated or if the processor lacks experience, it may be better to break the tasks apart and do them more sequentially. The four activities are treated separately here to avoid confusion.

*Arrangement.* The process and results of organizing archives, records, and manuscripts in accordance with accepted archival principles, particularly provenance, at as many as necessary of the following levels: repository, record group or comparable control unit, subgroup(s), series, file unit, and document. The process usually includes packing, labeling, and shelving of archives, records, and manuscripts, and is intended to achieve physical or administrative control and basic identification of the holdings.<sup>3</sup>

Proper arrangement of the material in a collection is essential in order to retrieve information from that collection. Anticipating how users will approach the collection and how often they will use it, the archivist must decide on a scheme of arrangement and a work plan that is sufficient for the users' needs yet not too detailed to carry out with available budget and staff. The arrangement activity can be the most labor intensive, and therefore the most expensive, of the four processing activities, since rearrangement may be necessary on the series, folder, and document levels.

The archivist must first survey the entire collection, reviewing all folder, notebook, binder, or other container titles to answer the question: What is the found state of the collection? The found state can range along a spectrum from perfectly ordered, pre-existing series to total disorder. Most collections fall somewhere in the middle. The found state has a direct impact on the processing cost: the better the original order and the less arrangement the archivist has to do, the faster the processing can be accomplished and the lower the processing cost. The original order of a collection should be retained as much as possible, both because that order reveals how the papers were used and because of the practical consideration of cost. But the original order can be maintained only if it is usable and meets researcher needs. Cost factors do not outweigh usability.

The next question to ask is: Are there obvious series or major groupings of materials? These are frequently untitled but are readily apparent in the initial collection survey and are easily assigned a title. A common example is a correspondence file arranged either alphabetically by correspondent or chronologically by date of the letter. The materials may not be called "correspondence file," but a quick survey of the folder titles and a sampling of folder contents will show that that is what it is. Equally common are subject files where folders are titled by subject and arranged alphabetically, or a speech file which has a folder for each speech or for a chronological group of speeches. In each of these cases, a quick survey of the material will reveal the presence of the series.

Are the existing series usable for research? Evaluate them from a user's perspective. Often a minor change in the title of a series or in its arrangement will reconcile existing series with researchers' needs.

Are the existing series too general or too specific? Sometimes a great deal of material will be filed into one huge series when it really should be divided into several smaller, more specific series. At other times there are many small series which could conveniently be yoked together into a larger, more cohesive series. For example, there might be a modest sized subject file and several small files—such as civil rights, disarmament—which are also subjects. It makes sense to move the small units into the larger subject file.

Do the existing series need reordering among themselves? Are they filed consistently, either alphabetically, chronologically, or from general to specific or vice versa? Arranging the series in a logical order may be just a matter of renumbering boxes.

Unfortunately, the survey of the collection's arrangement may reveal that there are no series, either obvious or obscure. This will mean a lengthy, expensive sorting project, during which the processor will have to look carefully at all the materials, consider various arrangement schemes, settle on a final one, and put the material in that order. Maintaining original order is not important in this case, because the order reveals little of the way the materials were used and because the materials are unusable in the state they are in. Instead, we must settle on an arrangement that is determined by potential researcher use and by the ease of accomplishing the rearrangement. A sentence in the finding aid can explain what the original order was.

Once the series are determined, titled, and rearranged among themselves as necessary, the archivist must consider the internal arrangement of the units (folders, notebooks, binders, etc.) within the series. Each series should be reviewed and the following questions asked:

1. Are the units adequately titled?
2. Are they arranged in correct order?
3. Are they too large?
4. Are they too small?

An adequate title would include the series title and a unit description consisting of at least a name or word title for alphabetically arranged series or a date title for chronologically arranged series. Folders with word titles may also be given dates when the

dates are significant or when there is so much material on a subject that it needs to be divided into thinner folders by date. Folder titles do not need to be absolutely consistent as long as their contents are clear and like materials are easily identifiable in a once-through of the finding aid. The author has recently finished processing a small collection of research materials where the donor's titles were accepted absolutely and this fact was explained in the finding aid. There are inconsistencies and repetitions and not every title is perfect, but all of the information is retrievable.

Correct order means that each folder is filed in the order set for that series, whether chronological or alphabetical. This is a minimum requirement in order for users to be able to locate folders.

Folders are too large when their bulk poses a preservation or retrieval problem. When there are more items in a folder than it will comfortably hold, for preservation reasons the materials should be divided into thinner folders. If the folder is thick and the titling is so general that researchers will waste time searching for a small unit of information, the folder should be broken into thinner, more specifically described folders.

Folders may be too thin or too specifically titled. The decision to correct this involves cost factors. If we are replacing existing folders with acid neutral folders and are listing each folder in the finding aid, we should consider consolidating items into folders with more general titles. Folders are rarely too specifically titled for researchers' needs, however. If the material is valuable and is finely foldered, it might also be wise to keep it that way for preservation considerations.

The final and most expensive level of arrangement is the document level. Whether it is necessary to arrange at the document level depends on the importance of the material, its retrievability, the frequency of its projected use, and its quantity.

Certain forms of arrangement and types of material necessitate arrangement at the item level. Chronological or alphabetical correspondence files must be correctly ordered to permit effective retrieval. If each item of the collection or series is extremely important or if researchers will be looking for specific items, then we must make sure those items are perfectly arranged; literary manuscript collections fall into this category. Subject files do not

## ARRANGEMENT CONTINUUM

## Found State

**SERIES  
LEVEL**

*Consider the existing order; review all folder, notebook, binder, or container titles. Ask if there are any obvious groupings or series; if they are titled; if they are usable for research; if they are too general or too specific; if they are in correct order.*

Review reveals no rearrangement or retitling needed at the series level.

Review reveals at least some rearrangement or retitling needed at the series level.

Describe the rearrangement and retitling needed at the series level.

**FOLDER  
LEVEL**

*Review the units in the series (folders, notebooks, binders, etc.). Ask if they are adequately titled; if they are correctly arranged; if they are too thick or too thin.*

Review reveals no rearrangement or retitling needed at the folder level.

Review reveals at least some rearrangement or retitling needed at the folder level.

Describe the rearrangement and retitling needed at the folder level.

**ITEM  
LEVEL**

*Spot review the items in a few folders in each series. Ask if the folder titles accurately reflect the contents of the folders; if the items need to be in correct order; if they are already in correct order.*

Review reveals no retitling of folders or rearrangement of items in folders needed.

Review reveals at least some retitling of folders or rearrangement of items in folders needed.

Describe the retitling and rearrangement needed.

Weigh the costs in time, staff and material expenses. Decide on the level and course of action.

Apply the course of action.



necessarily need such specific arrangement because there is no required and expected internal order and because the user will probably be reading the contents of an entire folder rather than searching for a specific item.

If the item can be pinpointed to a specific folder by an adequate finding aid, and if the item is not extremely important and/or will not be searched for often, we do not have to worry about the arrangement within the folder. We can expect the user to go through the entire folder to find the item, and the finding aid will tell him/her to expect to have to do that.

If the collection is massive, then regardless of the importance of the item or the frequency of its use, we probably cannot justify arranging the items within the folder.

In considering whether or not to arrange at the item level, spot review the folder contents within each series. The decision will vary from series to series. Important and/or valuable series may have the items arranged within the folder, while less important series in the same collection will not be given item level arrangement. When sampling the contents of scattered folders in each series, we should ask if the folder titles accurately reflect the contents, if the items need to be in a particular order, and if they are already in that order.

*Preservation.* (1) The basic responsibility to provide adequate facilities for the protection, care, and maintenance of archives, records, and manuscripts. (2) Specific measures, individual and collective, undertaken for the repair, maintenance, restoration, or protection of documents.<sup>4</sup>

All collections should be evaluated to determine their need for protection from their containers, from self harm or destruction (such as from deteriorating chemicals or metal in, on, or near the documents), and from damage, destruction, or theft by users.

Preservation steps may either be taken at the time of processing, or scheduled for a later date if the materials will not be damaged by the delay. The major question to ask in determining how far to take the preservation activity and when to do so is: Is the danger, either from the environment or the users, immediate? If the answer is yes, the preservation steps must be taken immediately. Security preservation must be done prior to opening a collection. Steps to stop existing deterioration must also be taken immediately. Steps

to prevent future deterioration may be scheduled for the future.

Preservation from containers is done at the box and folder levels. Looking at each box, we ask:

1. Is the box contributing to the deterioration of the material because of its:
  - acidity,
  - size (too large, too small),
  - condition (torn, wet), or
  - lack of strength?
2. Will it contribute to the deterioration of the material in the future?
3. What is the size of the items in the box? Do they fit comfortably in the box without folding or bending?
4. What will be the amount of future use of the items in the box? Will the box size and structure permit this degree of use without excessive wear on the contents?

At the folder level, we examine a sample of several folders from each series and ask the same questions. We also consider whether the folder is too thickly or thinly filled to protect its contents during storage or use.

Traditionally, archivists have routinely refoldered most personal papers or manuscript collections regardless of the found state of the folders. Custodians of massive holdings, such as the National Archives, have not done this and have instead retained the incoming folders wherever they existed. We need to begin questioning the need for refolding instead of making it a standard requirement for finished processing.

Preservation from self harm or destruction takes place on the item level. The items in a few folders from each series are examined to identify existing or potential instances of rusted metal fasteners, acid transfer, and deteriorating copies. Recommendations are then made for preservation steps for each series and a timetable is given for each step. Series within a collection will have different recommendations depending on their natures: e.g., a clippings series comprised of acidic newsprint will eventually deteriorate unless deacidified or photocopied, while a general correspondence series might not need anything done to it. The archivist must then

## PRESERVATION CONTINUUM I

### Preservation from Containers

#### Found State

#### BOX LEVEL

*Consider the boxing; look at and open each box.* Ask if the box contributes to the deterioration of the material because of its acidity, size, condition, or strength; if it will contribute to the material's deterioration in the future; if it is the correct size for its contents; if it is appropriate for the future use of its contents.

Review reveals no reboxing needed.

Review reveals at least some reboxing needed.

Describe the reboxing needed.

#### FOLDER LEVEL

*Consider the foldering (or binding); make a sample exploration of several folders in each series.* Ask if the folder contributes to the deterioration of the material because of its acidity, size, condition, or strength; if it has metal fasteners; if it will contribute to the material's deterioration in the future; if it is the correct size for its contents; if it is appropriate for the future use of its contents.

Review reveals no refoldering needed.

Review reveals at least some refoldering needed.

Describe the refoldering needed.

Weigh the costs in time, staff and material expenses against deterioration or damage potential. Decide on level and course of action for each series.

Apply the course of action to each series.

## PRESERVATION CONTINUUM 2

### Preservation from Self

#### Found State

#### ITEM LEVEL

*Consider the need for preservation from self; make a sample exploration of several folders in each series and examine their contents. Ask if there is already deterioration from rusted metal, acid transfer, fading images, deteriorating copies; if there is potential deterioration and when it can be expected to happen.*

Examination reveals no preservation needed.

Examination reveals at least some preservation needed either now or in the future.

Describe the level of preservation needed within each series.

Weigh the costs in time, staff and material expense against deterioration potential. Decide on level of action and schedule for each series.

Carry out the course of action decided on.

## PRESERVATION CONTINUUM 3

### Preservation from Use

#### Found State

*Consider the potential for unintentional user harm; look at the contents of a few folders in each series.* Ask what the level of use will be for each series.

Review reveals low use probable.

Review reveals medium to very high use probable.

Consider the impact of use on the items; decide what preservation measures to take such as not stapling items, numbering items, placing fewer items in a folder, photocopying entire series, or micro-filming the collection.

Apply the measures decided on.

*Consider the potential for intentional user harm; look at the contents of a few folders in each series.* Ask if there are valuable materials in the series that might be stolen or defaced.

Review reveals no series have valuable materials.

Review reveals at least some series have valuable materials.

Review each document and decide how to protect it (photocopy, ownership stamp).

Apply the measures decided on.

determine what he/she can afford to do.

Preservation at the item level is, of course, the most expensive, but there are choices as to how much we do and when. For example, for metal deterioration, we can choose to:

- |       |  |
|-------|--|
| Least | Note deteriorating metal for future removal.<br>Remove deteriorating metal.                                      |
| Most  | Note potentially deteriorating metal for future removal.<br>Remove all metal and replace with non-rusting metal. |

Security preservation steps to prevent intentional and unintentional harm from users are also taken at the item level. The contents of a few folders in each series are evaluated. To protect materials from honest user damage, we consider what level of use there might be. If the anticipated usage level will be extremely high, we might want to consider filling folders more thinly; numbering the pages of items that will frequently be photocopied instead of stapling them; or even closing the originals and making a microfilm or photocopy set available for use. To prevent dishonest damage or theft, we determine whether there are valuable items in the series. If there are, we can decide either to do nothing, to stamp each item on the back with the institution's name, or to replace the item with a photocopy.

There are, then, three continua for preservation:

- Preservation from containers (continuum 1),
- Preservation from self (continuum 2), and
- Preservation from use (continuum 3).

*Description.* The process of establishing intellectual control over holdings through the preparation of finding aids.<sup>5</sup>

Description is necessary so that users will know where within a collection they can find information they want, and so that the processor can pass on to every researcher what he/she has learned about the collection.

The form of description for each collection is determined by the nature of the collection, its anticipated research use, and the rules and requirements of the institution. The nature of the collection and its research use are often closely interrelated. Important collections or series will probably be used heavily and thoroughly; their descriptions will have to be detailed to help serve their many

users. Less important materials will probably be used less frequently, and the few users will be able to approach the collection with less detailed descriptions. Institutional requirements may influence the form and degree of description. For instance, the institution may have a card catalog of subject and title entries, requiring the processor to prepare entries for each collection processed.

Description may range from the least to the most detailed, but the minimum requirements for each collection are:

1. A citable title, so that researchers may ask for or cite that specific collection. Example: The Personal Papers of Jane Thomas.
2. The date span of the collection, to place it in time. Example: 1938-1945.
3. The quantity of the collection, to indicate the amount of material to be looked at. Examples: 5 linear feet, or 96,000 pages.
4. A summary of the collection's contents, describing the major record types, subjects, and correspondents or types of correspondents. Example: Diaries, draft manuscripts of Ms. Thomas's works, and original incoming correspondence and copies of outgoing correspondence with family members and academic associates in American social history. Subjects treated include American social history, 1850-1945, . . .

and perhaps:

5. When the material was received by the institution.

The lowest level of description is a container list of the material as received. Such a list sometimes comes with a collection, or it may be made by a staff member at the time of accessioning. If the archivist decides the material is useful in its receipt order and makes no changes in the arrangement, that list could serve as the basis for the final finding aid. The archivist would, at the least, add an introductory narrative including the minimum requirements listed above.

More often, the material needs some rearrangement, after which the archivist prepares a new list of the series and their folders as

## DESCRIPTION CONTINUUM

## Found State

**CONTAINER OR FOLDER LEVEL** *Consider the existing description. Was any description provided by the donor? Is it accurate?*

Review reveals accurate container list exists.

Review reveals no list or an inaccurate container list exists.

Prepare an adequate list of the materials as received.

**COLLECTION LEVEL** *Determine the final form of description. Consider the nature of the material and its potential use.*

**COLLECTION LEVEL** Process the collection taking necessary notes.

**FOLDER LEVEL** Write a folder title list of materials as processed.

**SERIES LEVEL** Write descriptions of each series.

Elements  
of an  
Inventory/  
Register

**COLLECTION LEVEL** Write scope and content note for the collection.

**COLLECTION LEVEL** Write biographical note for creator or agency history.

**COLLECTION LEVEL** Write an introduction and provenance note.

**COLLECTION LEVEL** Relate the collection to other holdings in the institution.

**COLLECTION LEVEL** Relate the collection to other collections in other institutions.

**COLLECTION LEVEL** Prepare catalog entries for the institution's catalog or guide to holdings.

**COLLECTION LEVEL** Prepare catalog entries for outside sources.

**ITEM LEVEL** List each item in the collection, if warranted.



rearranged. This is the first element in an inventory or register, which consists of:

1. A list of the series and their folder titles,
2. Descriptions of each series,
3. A scope and content note for the collection,
4. A biographical note on the creator or an agency history, and
5. An introduction and provenance note.<sup>6</sup>

After an inventory/register is completed, the archivist may prepare catalog entries for the institution's catalog or guide to holdings and for outside sources (such as the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections). Notices of the collection's having been opened may also be sent to professional journals.

The most detailed forms of description are item listing and calendaring. A calendar is an item list, arranged chronologically, which includes a brief description of each item. These are very expensive and time consuming processes. They can only be justified when each item in the series or collection is extremely important or valuable, will be heavily used, and will be sought as an individual item. The manuscripts and correspondence of a famous writer might justifiably be described in this way.

*Screen.* To examine records or archives to determine the presence of restricted documents or information and to remove such documents from the files.<sup>7</sup>

The screening activity is probably the least flexible and most sensitive and immediate of the four activities. If a collection is going to be screened in part or in its entirety, it must be screened prior to opening, for there is no point in screening it once the material has been used by researchers. Screening has the greatest impact on the labor intensiveness of processing the collection, the length of time needed, and the resulting expense. Screening requirements drive us immediately down from the collection or series level to the document level.

Screening is done to meet the requirements of the donor and any applicable legislation. The first step is to review the donor's deed of gift to determine what restrictions the donor has imposed on the

## SCREENING CONTINUUM

## Found State

<b>COLLECTION LEVEL</b>	<i>Identify any restrictions on the use of the collection. Ask if there are any donor-imposed restrictions, Privacy Act restrictions, national security restrictions, or any applicable state laws.</i>
	<div>Review reveals no restrictions on the use of the collection.</div> <div>Review reveals some restrictions on the use of the collection.</div>
<b>SERIES LEVEL</b>	<i>Examine the series titles. Ask if any of the series are likely to contain sensitive materials that would be closed under the restrictions identified above.</i>
	<div>Review reveals no series which are likely to contain restricted materials.</div> <div>Review reveals some series which are likely to contain restricted materials.</div>
<b>FOLDER LEVEL</b>	<i>Examine the folder titles in the series identified as likely to contain restricted materials. Ask if any of the folders are likely to contain restricted materials.</i>
	<div>Review reveals no folders which are likely to contain restricted materials.</div> <div>Review reveals some folders which are likely to contain restricted materials.</div>
<b>ITEM LEVEL</b>	<i>Review the contents of the folders identified as likely to contain restricted materials. Ask if the items should be closed under the restrictions identified above.</i>
	<div>Review reveals no items which need to be closed under the restrictions identified above.</div> <div>Review reveals some items which need to be closed under the restrictions identified above.</div> <div>Close those items; open the remainder.</div>

use of the collection. Next, the archivist needs to determine what other legislation applies to the collection. Once the pertinent restrictions are identified, the series titles are examined to determine which series might need to be screened. Within the identified series, the archivist then reviews the folder titles for folders whose contents have to be examined. Finally, he/she reviews each item in the identified folders.

Following this review, the archivist closes the items, folders, or series that the restrictions require be closed. The remainder of the collection is opened for research use.

*When is a collection processed?* When the archivist has selected from the processing continua and applied the appropriate degree of arrangement, preservation, description, and screening activities that will make that collection usable for the researcher while protecting the physical well-being of the material and honoring donor and legal restrictions on the collection. If this process is judiciously applied, many collections will be appropriately processed more quickly and at more reasonable expense than in the past, and processing backlogs will begin to disappear.

## FOOTNOTES

1. Frank B. Evans, Donald F. Harrison, Edwin A. Thompson, and William L. Rofes, "A Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers," *The American Archivist* 37 (July 1974): 427.
2. Eleanor McKay, "Random Sampling Techniques," *The American Archivist* 41 (July 1978): 283.
3. Evans et al., "A Basic Glossary," p. 418.
4. Ibid., p. 427.
5. Ibid., p. 421.
6. The Society of American Archivists' publication, *Inventories and Registers: A Handbook of Techniques and Examples* gives an excellent description and several examples of each element in an inventory/register.
7. Evans et al., "A Basic Glossary," p. 430.

# And now there are nine.

The Society of American Archivists' popular Basic Manual Series has two new additions: *Archives & Manuscripts: Maps and Architectural Drawings*, by Ralph E. Ehrenberg, and *Archives & Manuscripts: Public Programs*, by Ann E. Pederson and Gail Farr Casterline.

## Public Programs

This lavishly illustrated manual discusses a wide range of activities that an archives can use to encourage greater communication between archivists and the various institutional, social, and professional communities to which they belong. Photographic documentation programs, oral history, exhibits, lectures, publications, instructional programs, and slide presentations are among the activities discussed. All archivists and manuscript curators interested in creating public interest in their collections should have a copy of this manual in their libraries. 96 pages, including a bibliography and 10 sample forms useful in various types of public programs. \$5 SAA members, \$7 others.

## Maps and Architectural Drawings

This manual is designed as a general reference work for the archivist who lacks specialized training but who requires some knowledge of maps and architectural drawings. Chapters are devoted to accession and appraisal, arrangement, description, conservation, storage, and reference and access as they apply to these special types of records. The manual includes many illustrations, plus a glossary, a list of selected conservation and storage supplies and suppliers, and a bibliography. 64 pages, \$5 SAA members, \$7 others.

Other manuals in SAA's *Archives & Manuscripts* series include *Appraisal and Accessioning*, *Arrangement and Description*, *Reference and Access*, *Security*, *Surveys*, *Exhibits*, and *Introduction to Automated Access*. All can be ordered from SAA, 330 S. Wells St., Suite 810, Chicago, IL 60606.