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Abstract

Archival outreach programs serve a key role in the preservation and promotion of public history. Community based educational programs sponsored and implemented by archival repositories allow actual, as well as potential, patrons to learn about their local history and to familiarize themselves with archival materials. It is the purpose of this thesis to explore the postmodern archival perspective and to propose universal program models which can be adapted to facilitate educational outreach in archival repositories of various staff sizes and organizational affiliations. This study will appraise the similarities and differences of a variety of current public outreach programs with a focus on three distinct areas: how an archival organization chooses which target audiences will be best served by public outreach initiatives; how an archives can most efficiently fund and market these outreach projects; and how local communities can utilize archival repositories to build and strengthen their communal identities.
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Introduction

The current economic climate in the United States has forced educational and cultural service agencies, such as those operated by public museums and archival repositories, to adopt a continuing series of budget reductions. As staff members struggle to justify their every expense, it is becoming ever more difficult to maintain a dynamic range of programs and services. While archival repositories have nearly always struggled to secure adequate funding for all of the programs they sought to develop, even the repositories which have been known to remain stable, state agencies for example, are buckling under massive financial cutbacks and considerable downsizing of personnel. It is during sparse economic times such as these when repositories are systematically pressured to re-examine their mission statements and overall objectives in order to prioritize each and every fiscal expenditure. Instead of desperately searching for new ways to stretch limited resources in order to carry on the established routine, perhaps archivists should utilize the present state of affairs to imagine and design a fresh set of archival programs and priorities.

Although many modern archivists are open to innovation, or rather professional renovation, some archivists feel that there are more constructive uses for their time than to contemplate abstract ideologies about why archivists do what they do and what that work actually means to society. This split is evident in the literature that fills the pages of professional journals such as *The American Archivist* and its Canadian equivalent, *Archivaria*. Regardless of personal belief, however, it is undeniable that the ongoing financial burden threatening the traditional archival framework allows the profession the perfect opportunity to reflect on where the profession has been and where it is going to go.
over the course of the next century. One of the prime sectors open for re-evaluation under this potential restructuring of professional priorities is that of educational development in the archival community.

While many American archives already operate basic educational outreach programs, the concept of client-oriented archival education has no standard framework or professional pedagogy in this country.¹ There is still, in fact, a small, yet vocal, portion of the American archival community which actively seeks to discourage further development of such programming, often citing the old-school paradigm of the archivist as passive guardian, as it was so famously outlined in mid twentieth-century archival literature by prominent archivists Sir Hilary Jenkinson in England and Margaret Cross Norton in the United States.² The unfortunate resolution to cling to outdated professional ideologies has significantly thwarted the advancement of educational programming in this country, especially when compared to educational endeavors that have long-since become the norm in most other western nations. While it is true that there will be some difficulties in developing such in-depth programming when staff and resources are already so strained, the eventual result of having such programming in place would not only re-orient the archival mission statement to meet pressing modern demand, it would also potentially

---

¹ As opposed to long-established pedagogical tools and curriculum such as those employed in many European countries, most notably in the French National Archives. For further information on archival pedagogy in France, please refer to the pedagogical section of the agency website at: http://www.archivesdefrance.culture.gouv.fr/action-culturelle/action-pedagogique/

allow archival repositories to dramatically expand their clientele and increase their funding.

Educational programs sponsored and implemented by archival repositories allow actual, as well as potential, users to further their knowledge and comprehension about the way in which repositories and their reference personnel are able to assist researchers in their work. The educational tools archivists are able to provide their clientele serve a variety of purposes, including, but not limited to: promotion of archival materials, marketing for the repository or its parent organization, educating the public about its local history, developing curriculum in conjunction with local schools, as well as facilitating a more profound relationship between an archives’ staff and its user base.

As the archival profession is tentatively poised to explore its own history and question its own identity, archivists who subscribe to a postmodern viewpoint are calling for archival professionals to be aware of the role they play in shaping the history and identity of the public that they serve. Analyzing the concepts of collective memory, differentiating between collective memory and history, and evaluating how these often conflicting concepts coincide to create both individual and social identities, are just a few of the ways that archivists can begin to take a fresh look at their unique social responsibilities and begin to incorporate educational theory and programming into the daily praxis of the archival profession.

The research which was done in preparation for this study utilized a variety of resources and literature from the fields of museology and library sciences, as well as the archival profession. Although these three types of institutions have differing roles to play in the preservation and promotion of cultural heritage, it is the underlying viewpoint of this thesis that the unspoken end
goal for these fields is one and the same: providing access to communal history through the
preservation and display of a community’s documentation, literature, and artifacts.

In order to provide context on how education actually and potentially fits into the
archival mission, the first chapter of this thesis explores the changing role of archives and
archivists in the new millennium, addressing the idea that the archival profession must move
beyond the passivity that was promulgated throughout the professional literature of the twentieth
century. This chapter examines postmodern thoughts on what constitutes history, memory, and
social identity, as well as how those concepts correlate to the new plan of action and social
responsibility in the archives of the twenty-first century.

The second chapter focuses on educational outreach and programming in the archival field,
as well as in the related fields of museology and library science. It includes a brief historical
overview on how museums and libraries have come to focus their mission statements on
educational programming in the United States, and a discussion on why this has yet to happen in
the archival field. In order to understand the current role education holds in the archival
profession, the bulk of this chapter is dedicated to analyzing the results of an original survey which
was sent to a variety of American archival repositories. It investigates how archivists view the
importance of educational programming and whether or not education is currently incorporated in
their institutions’ primary goals, objectives, and budgets.

The final chapter of this thesis examines curriculum planning and other ways that
education can be effectively integrated into the archival mission, including: a brief presentation of
educational theory and pedagogy, a discussion on user studies, and an overview of potential
programming options and specific curriculum ideas.

The conclusion addresses how the archival profession can utilize the programs and
platforms presented in chapter three to overcome the difficulties discussed in chapters one and two.
Chapter One

The Changing Role of Archives and Archivists

Scholars have approached the concept of memory from the vantage point of several different academic disciplines: philosophy, psychology, anthropology, and public history, just to name a few. The approach of each discipline offers the study a unique set of contexts and professional jargons through which to interpret memory, and yet the overall analyses are inherently vague and often conflict with one and another. “Memory,” as Josh Zimmerman states in his 2008 master’s thesis, has come to “encompass everything, but mean nothing at all.”¹

Samuel Hynes has described collective memory as a “vicarious” experience, akin to the concept of mythology, through which members of any given society are able to emotionally connect to an event or person without ever having had first-hand contact with said event or person.² According to Brien Brothman, memory “embodies the philosophical notion of an absolute present” and is “deeply implicated” in the “shaping of consciousness.”³

What these scholars are suggesting is that collective memory serves as a framework for collective identity. Memory not only connects people to past events, it directly shapes the way that human beings understand and interact with the world; in a very literal sense, it

is the concept of memory which forms our individual, as well as communal, identities, in that our own individual memories mean nothing unless they are interpreted through society’s filter of established thought. For example, our sense of right and wrong, the morals and ethics of how to behave, how to interact with others, are all contexts that differ from one society to another. These guidelines of social behavior are not random, but are constructed over time based on events and circumstances that occur within a given community. As a new community member is growing up, these constructs are passed on both explicitly and implicitly through systems of formal education, as well as through interaction with other members of the community.

It is this shared context, this sort of mythology as Hynes puts it, which allows people to interpret their own individual memories, and by extension, their identities. French scholar Paul Ricoeur takes this point to another level, stating that “individual memory and collective memory are placed in a position of rivalry; however, they do not oppose one another.”\(^4\) What he means is that individual memory is based on a set of unique, personal experiences. No two people will have the same set of private memories, nor will any two people interpret their personal memories in the exact same manner, even if they are using the same set of cultural guidelines and communal experiences to do so. There is an innate sense of what Ricoeur refers to as “mineness” in individual memories.\(^5\) Bearing that in mind, however, Ricoeur goes on to explain that we need collective memory not only to interpret individual memory, but to assure us that we are not alone, to

\(^5\) Ricoeur, 97.
authenticate or validate how we see ourselves through how others see us.\textsuperscript{6} This is how people use collective memory, or communal mythology, not only to construct personal identity, but also to relate to other individuals in the same society.

Collective memory differs from history in that history is what allows us to interpret, or contextualize, communal memory. History, in the form of written records, artifacts, monuments, and other physical manifestations of the past, provides us with the evidence to verify and authenticate social memory. Historians seek to gather this evidence and then, whether consciously or not, they interpret the ‘hard’ facts which they have found through the biased lens of their social memory. As Pierre Nora points out, the role of the historian is to “prevent history from being merely history” by relating historic events to the present in meaningful ways.\textsuperscript{7} One poignant demonstration of this filtering mechanism is evident in the evolution of historiography; as a society progresses, the constructs of acceptable social behavior and belief also progress, directly impacting how historic events are understood and valued. American historians at the dawn of the twentieth century, for example, presented the country’s reconstruction after the Civil War as a great success, in direct opposition to how modern historians present the same period of reconstruction as a complete failure. In this process of continual modernization, historians are constantly reinterpreting the past so that it is still meaningful to the present.

Paradoxically, the histories presented to the public by professional historians can also serve to shape the way that social memory is understood. This is most apparent in that

\textsuperscript{6} Ricoeur, 120-121.
when historians choose to write about certain histories, while pointedly ignoring others, they shape the ongoing narrative of a community’s historical evolution. In other words, while historians are guiding the public in what they remember, they are simultaneously guiding that same public in what to forget. Forgetting is equally important to the identity of a social group as remembering is. As Elisabeth Kaplan effectively demonstrates in her discussion on the formation of the American Jewish Historical Society (AJHS), by choosing not to collect materials about certain groups of American Jews, or materials which reflected certain aspects of Jewish life in America, the founders of the AJHS were shaping the historical evidence, and therefore the dialogue for social memory of that group.\(^8\)

What Kaplan and others are suggesting is that choosing to focus on, or to represent, one identity necessarily eliminates a whole host of other identities. As one group or community codifies its identity and forms a standardized set of tools for authenticating social memory through history, as often happens with the founding of an archival repository, several branches of that society are concurrently being pruned from the greater community tree.

The issue is much more complex, however, when one takes into account that identity is not a singular, fixed concept that each person wears as a badge. Identity in one group does not preclude identity in any number of other groups; in fact, our notion of self is comprised of a multitude of facets, such as race, gender, nationality, and religious adherence. In his essay on how these various components come together to create

\(^8\) Elisabeth Kaplan, “We Are What We Collect, We Collect What We Are: Archives and the Construction of Identity.” \textit{American Archivist}, Vol. 63, No. 1 (Spring/Summer, 2000): 141.
individual identities, Michael Hamès-Garcia posits that people do not simply identify with one group, but with several groups simultaneously. Hamès-Garcia refers several times to the amalgamation of a variety of group identities which make up the self, emphasizing that these multifaceted associations are not static, but are in fact constantly blurring and blending to take up or to release their dominant positions. It is the totality of these often conflicting roles and their historical contexts which allows individuals to interact and identify with each other in the larger social framework of a community.  

So what does this mean for historians and for archivists as the keepers and promoters of both history and collective memory? Allan Megill makes a persuasive argument supporting the need for historians to be clear about the underlying purpose of their work. As history becomes less concentrated on understanding past events in their own context, and more focused on relating the past to the present, there is a sense of anachronism that manifests itself in historical writing. Megill sees a danger in this historiographical tendency, but he insists that if historians are able to make themselves aware of the philosophical outlook on memory and history, they will be better equipped to provide the academic community with meaningful insight into the events of the past. He further states that each historian must reconcile herself to walking a tightrope while trying to objectively balance the historical contextualization of memory with an engaged sense of purpose.  

Though Megill’s work, like that of most scholars who grapple with the notions of memory and history, is not entirely conclusive, it is both thoughtful and thought

---


provoking, and provides a practical frame of reference in which the contemporary historian can begin to create a relevant context for the meaning of her work.

If scholars such as Allan Megill are correct, and historians should consciously strive to balance the larger implications of history, memory, and identity, then what does that imply for the archivists who preserve the evidence used by historians in order to create their narratives? Verne Harris blatantly dubs archivists as the “active shapers of social memory,” but also insists that these archivists themselves are “shaped by” and act within “the larger forces that contest the terrain of social memory.” Harris reminds us not only that archivists shape the historical record through the selection and appraisal, arrangement and description, and the preservation and promotion the archival profession exercises on materials in its care, but that all of those actions are in and of themselves shaped by each archivist’s individual identity and collective experiences. Harris thus inserts the archival profession into a perpetual loop of how records shape history, memory, and identity, and how in turn history, memory, and identity shape future records. It is this very perspective which pushes archivists like Verne Harris and Terry Cook to suggest that one thing archivists can do to balance out their role in this process is to include in the record as much information as possible about the people who created, selected, sorted, arranged and in any way interacted with the record; the hope behind this suggestion is that given the right analytical tools, historians will be able to peel back the many layers of context shrouding each record as it is placed in the historian’s care to be interpreted for the larger public.12

---

The prevailing school of thought about memory, history, and identity in the archival profession stems from philosophical tendencies rooted in postmodernism. As the profession is inundated with articles about postmodern archival practices, a pattern has emerged wherein the authors of these articles are calling for more transparency of the archival process. Along with buzz words like transparency and awareness, the literature calls for archivists to be more active in their role in shaping the historical record, to tell all sides of the story rather than just the tale of those in power. “Postmodernism,” according to Terry Cook, “seeks to emphasize the diversity of the human spirit by recovering marginalized voices in the face of such hegemony…”

In the postmodern approach to archival practice, gone are the days when archivists passively kept the records in their care. In fact, many postmodernists would argue that this idea of professional passivity was always a misconception because as long as archival records have existed, there have been people responsible for their placement in repositories, their arrangement within those repositories, and their dissemination to the public.

As postmodernists are encouraging action and accountability within archives, whether they subscribe to those same ideals or not, the archival profession as a whole is being forced to re-examine its position on a wide variety of fundamental archival tasks and principles. Part of the responsibility that postmodernists are asking archivists to assume is to be aware of the very concepts of history, collective memory, and identity, and how those


concepts relate not only to the archival record itself, but to the archivists who maintain that record. Brien Brothman makes an interesting distinction in how archivists must approach the sometimes conflicting roles of preserving collective memory and preserving historical evidence:

At the conceptual level, being memory’s archivist and being history’s archivist may each involve radically different attitudes to time and its objects. Memory’s archivist is interested in the past’s residue as material for promoting integrated knowledge, social identity, and the formation of group consciousness; history’s archivist is interested in finding records and, in them, uncovering evidence to develop a linear narrative about a past that is ours, yet different from us.14

Archivists must not only recognize as a profession their active role in shaping the historical narrative and social memory of the communities they serve, but they must be aware that those two roles require different sets of methods and practices. While Brothman is not the only author to point this out, like many of his cohorts, he presents more questions for archivists to ponder than he does solutions for practical implementation.

With all of these questions and ideas to reflect upon, where does that leave the profession as it continues to implement its daily routines? Mark Greene states that “we cannot simplify what is profoundly complex, but we can . . . accept as part of our role that of self-aware, visible, and active actors in the struggle to form both history and social memory.”15 Brien Brothman, Verne Harris, and Terry Cook each promote similar approaches of continual reflection on the larger concepts of history and memory, as well as a conscious sense of self-awareness in each action that we take in our professional duties.

14 Brothman, 62.
In addition to being aware of her own prejudices and personal world view as she implements her daily tasks, the postmodern archivist would document as much information about herself and her background in the metadata of the archival record as she is able. The postmodern archivist would also make different decisions during the appraisal process than the traditional archivist, by seeking to accumulate more records which document the voice of the common citizen or the marginalized than the ruling class.\(^{16}\) The descriptive role of metadata also transforms in the postmodern archives, from being something fixed, to becoming something fluid. In a traditional archives, finding aids and the research which goes into them are done when the records are first processed, and usually that’s that. Postmodern finding aids, however, would be re-examined and rewritten over time with the idea that cultural relevancy and bias will change as the records age.\(^ {17}\)

Perhaps the most immediate impact of a postmodern archives, however, would be the metamorphosis of archivist into activist. Instead of waiting for records to arrive at the repository, postmodern archivists would actively seek them out in targeted batches. The general purpose of such a strategy would be to create a collection which is equally representative of all social groups and economic classes.\(^ {18}\) In short, the postmodern archive is no longer a static repository, but an active environment where historians, archivists, and researchers meet to form and re-form the building blocks of cultural and personal identity.

\(^{16}\) Cook, “Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives,” 30.
\(^{17}\) Cook, “Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives,” 32-34.
Collective memory provides the framework for how we as individuals and as archivists interpret history, interpret ourselves, and interpret our obligations to the historical narrative and those who present it to the public. Awareness of these concepts and how they relate to the archival endeavor is vital, as postmodern archivists have made abundantly clear; but how do we raise that awareness? How do we as a profession create a framework for discussing these fundamental principles? Rather than leaving each archivist to educate herself on these matters, what is needed is the development of an educational curriculum that focuses on these issues and their relevancy to the archival profession.

The Society of American Archivists (SAA) currently offers a variety of courses and seminars through its continuing education platform. However, these workshops are all task-specific, meaning that they instruct practicing archivists on new or improved ways of performing certain everyday jobs, such as preserving or arranging photographs, working with technical programming languages like EAD, and creating online exhibits. While these types of trainings are certainly invaluable to the profession, it is equally as invaluable that archivists are educated about and united in archival theory as well as practice. The basic question of why archivists do what we do is inextricably embedded in all of the decisions that are made on how we do what we do. Many practicing archivists were not formally trained by a graduate archival program. They came into their positions through on the job training or through studies in library, informational, or other social sciences. This patchwork of backgrounds leaves a lot of room for discrepancy in theoretical understanding about our profession.

In order to provide some minimal unity, the SAA officially adopted a set of core values in May 2011. Postmodernists will be pleased to note that this decisive list names History and Memory, as well as Social Responsibility, as core values. While the creation of this list is an important first step in elucidating the “whys” behind archival practice, it is only that, a first step. Citing a value merely gives it nomenclature, not weight. If the SAA is to provide real insight and meaning to these theoretical values, they need to expand upon their course offerings and create a continuing education platform based on archival theory, expounding upon history, memory, identity, and social responsibility in the archives. By doing so, they would be validating the relevancy of these ideas across the entire profession.

Once SAA develops course materials for such a program, similar models could then be adopted in graduate archival training programs, provoking thought and discussion about the “whys” of archival practice in order to optimize the “hows.”

What would this coursework look like? Ideally, it would present a discussion on ethics in archives, going into some depth about the various decisions an archivist makes throughout the duties of accessioning, de-accessioning, and processing a collection, as well as providing fair access to processed holdings. Such a course would also delve into the ideas of documentation strategy, outlining the importance of filling out the gaps in the archival record. This might include, for example, a look at the theory of macroappraisal, a top-down approach to archival appraisal designed and implemented by Canadian archivist, Terry Cook. Macroappraisal relies on a complex application of functional analysis in

---

which the roles and activities of records creators are evaluated and prioritized. In addition to ethics and documentation strategy, this theory-based course would focus heavily on the concepts of history and social memory, and how the archival record shapes and is shaped by these concepts. It would explore the role of social memory in forming both communal and individual identity, and it would prepare archivists to ask the questions and perform the tasks necessary to transform repositories into communal gathering places, similar to museums or libraries.

If archival repositories want to thrive in this economy rather than simply survive, then it is time for radical change. Archivists must purge themselves of the erroneous and outdated mindset that passivity excuses them from responsibility. It is time for the members of this profession to understand what their responsibilities truly entail, and make unified decisions on how that impacts their daily activities. As we have seen, archives and archivists directly contribute to the way in which society understands itself and the relationship it has with its past. Imagine what we can do if that contribution is explicit and intentional.

---

Chapter Two

Educational Outreach Programs in Archives and Related Fields

While archives have existed in one form or another since antiquity, the modern repository which allows public access to its records was born during the French Revolution in the late eighteenth century. Similarly, the advent and rise of the modern museum came about during the nineteenth century as a by-product of, or perhaps in tandem with, the rise of the nation-state.¹ While most early museums of the nineteenth century quickly became associated with educational pursuits in the United States, commonly thought of as a powerful and unique pedagogical tool, the same cannot be said for the public perception of archival repositories, which still remain largely enigmatic to the majority of Americans.

Archival repositories prior to the French Revolution consisted largely of the private or personal records of governmental rulers, community leaders, religious organizations, and prominent or wealthy families. The purpose for creating and maintaining these archives was mainly to house records, both administrative and historical, for state, church, or private use.² Even after French archives were opened to the public, and their European counterparts had largely followed suit, scientists and historians didn’t begin to utilize public records for research purposes until the Enlightenment produced a paradigm shift in scientific thought during the nineteenth century.³ And even still, this new perception of the archival endeavor had no direct relationship with public education, other than in the

tangential manner that historians relied upon archival records to produce a historical narrative. It is in this mindset that American archives were begun, and have continued to remain, until the postmodern movement began questioning the archival status quo.

In the United States, early public museums of the nineteenth century developed right alongside public schools; however, the latter came to take on such a significantly larger role in communal education and expenditure that the educative role of museums, although initially tantamount to public education, was never systematized or regulated at the same level of detail as it was in the public school system.\(^4\) The result of this was that educational programs in the museum field were never held to any standard or regulated curriculum, and therefore the quality varied greatly from one organization to the next.

Perhaps as a result of the shift in public priorities from communal education for all ages to a decided focus on youth, museum staff in the United States during the early part of the twentieth century also shifted their priorities. Museum curators began to concentrate more actively on building their collections than they did on organizing outreach or educational programming promoting those collections, a remarkably similar outlook to the one currently espoused by the modern American archival community. However, by the time Lyndon Johnson was setting out to build a Great Society in the mid 1960s, museum staffers had begun to reconnect with their roots in public education. Over the next forty years the museum field was able to substantially revamp its professional mission, placing education at the forefront of its primary goals and objectives.\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) Hein, 4-5.

\(^5\) Hein, 5-6.
The American archival profession would benefit greatly from joining their fellow cultural research institutes in embracing education and education related services as their central mission in serving the public. But for many archival professionals, a paradigm shift such as the one undergone in the museum realm may seem daunting, if not wholly unnecessary. In 1990, notable Canadian archivist and author Terry Cook responded to calls for extended outreach programming as “reveal[ing] the tip of a deep and dangerous theoretical iceberg.” So, why were museum personnel able to reorient their professional outlook while archival personnel appear opposed to doing so?

In order to try and begin answering this complicated question, this author composed a survey on educational outreach and sent it to a random sampling of archival repositories all over the country. The survey was crafted online via the website SurveyMonkey.com and was made available to survey participants between the dates of August 6 – 21, 2009. The recipients of the survey received an email with a direct link to the online survey, a link that was uniquely accessed by the user of the email account to which the survey had been sent. The link could not be forwarded to or accessed by a third party, ensuring that the responses were being generated only by repositories which had specifically been chosen to participate in the research project. A full reproduction of the email inviting the selected recipients to take part in the survey can be found in Appendix A at the end of this thesis, followed by the survey questions in Appendix B, and the graphs documenting the survey responses in Appendix C.

The repositories chosen to receive the survey were selected from the online directory of Repositories of Primary Sources maintained by Terry Abraham at the University of Idaho. While Abraham’s directory lists more than 5000 agencies worldwide, for the purposes of this survey, only those repositories based in the United States were consulted. In the interest of representing a healthy balance of the various types of archival repositories active in the US, the final survey recipient list was engineered to address at least one of each of the following types of organizations in all fifty states of the union: university archives, religious institutions, historical societies, museum and library archives when possible, as well as government branches of a local, state, and federal archival agency. The final recipient list consisted of a total of 258 repositories. Forty-six of those institutions invited to participate in the project actually completed the survey, for an overall response rate of approximately 18%. For a complete list of agencies who responded to the survey, please refer to Appendix D.

The survey began with a question asking respondents to identify the nature of the repository they represented. At least one agency from each possible category was represented in the response group, with the largest response rate held by historical societies as 21.7% (n=10) of the overall survey participants. While those participants who chose the ‘other’ option for this question tied historical societies at 21.7% (n=10) of total respondents, most of them indicated that they represented specific archival programs in a larger library or historical society setting, while one person stated affiliation with a corporate archives. The second largest category of respondents, at 15.2% (n=7) of overall

participants, was university archives, while government branches of both state and federal archives, as well as library archives, all tied for third place at 8.7% (n=4) respectively. Religious archives made up 6.5% (n=3) of respondents, museum archives 4.3% (n=2), and local government and community archives each represented 2.2% (n=1) of total participants apiece.

The next set of survey questions regarded the importance placed on educational outreach in modern archives, with the first question focusing on determining the agency’s position on the matter, and the second relating to the individual viewpoint of the archivist completing the survey. The intent of this pairing of questions was to assess whether or not there is currently a discrepancy between the personal perspective that archivists have about the role and importance of educational outreach and programming versus the stance formally espoused by the repositories for which they work, as outlined primarily by the agency mission statement. The response to these two questions did in fact reflect a significant incongruity between agency and individual belief.

In response to the first of the two questions, which asked the participants to categorize the importance of educational programming as detailed in the agency mission statement, 47.8% (n=22) of respondents said that the repository they represented considered educational outreach and programming to be very important; 28.3% (n=13) stated that their agency considered it to be somewhat important; 13% (n=6) reported that their repository saw it as not very important; and 10.9% (n=5) selected the option of “other” and chose to write in their own responses. The comments from the “other” option ranged from one respondent who explained that “as a private institutional archives,” his
repository only “serve(d) mainly in-house patrons” and therefore chose not to “focus on outreach,” to a state government archivist who explained that while the archives’ mission statement did not specifically address educational issues, the agency did in fact implement outreach programs which could be considered as educational.

In response to the second of the two questions, which asked the survey participants to categorize their own belief about the importance of educational programming, 76.1% (n=35) of respondents stated that they felt educational outreach and programming to be very important; 17.4% (n=8) said they considered it to be somewhat important; only 2.2% (n=1) indicated that they believed it was not very important; and 4.3% (n=2) selected the option of “other.” One participant who chose to write in his own comment under the “other” category said that educational outreach and programming was “very important, but practically impossible.”

The underlying disparity between the emphasis that agencies place on educational outreach and programming, and the belief in the importance of such programming held by individual archivists is quite clear. Some possible reasons for this discrepancy begin to manifest in responses to later questions as participants clarify the types of programs their repositories offer, what audiences they target, and the various constraints they face in creating and maintaining educational outreach programming; therefore, analysis of the implications of this incongruity between agencies and individual archivists on the importance of educational endeavors will follow the results of each remaining survey question.
The next grouping of questions deals with staff resources in the participant repositories, as well as the allocation of those resources. Responses to the first of these three questions illuminate one of many constraints faced by archives all over the country: insufficient staff sizes. 39.1% (n=18) of respondents indicated that their repositories only employed one to three part or full time professional staff members. A somewhat surprising 30.4% (n=14) stated that they had ten or more part or full time professional staff members; however, it is important to remember when considering the implications of this statistic that the highest number of respondents were from historical societies, which often serve as state archives, as well as university, and other government archives. The size of these repositories demands larger staff sizes, but simply because they report higher employment rates does not necessarily mean that they are adequately staffed. 21.7% (n=10) of respondents reported professional staff sizes of four to seven people, and 8.7% (n=4) stated that their institutions employed between eight and ten part or full time professionals.

The next question asked participants to put some context around these numbers by delineating how many of those staff members mentioned spent their time primarily on education related programs or services, and how many of them only occasionally worked on education related programs or services. A count of thirty-six people were reported to work primarily on educational services, and a count of forty-three people were reported to occasionally work on educational services. What do these numbers tell us? In order to gain some deeper understanding of these statistics, it is necessary to go back to the previous question and get an approximation of how many total employees the respondents reported were working for their institutions. By averaging the total possible number of
employees indicated within the choice of responses, one can infer that there are approximately 309 overall employees in all of the forty-six archives which responded to this survey. Based on this approximation, only 12% of these employees are primarily focused on educational services, and only 14% are occasionally working on educational services.

Staffing is not the only key component to educational programming, however. Funding for program development, material resources, and outreach related to educational services is just as important to a successful program as having the staff to conduct the services offered. The final question in this group asked survey participants to approximate the percentage of their repository’s annual budget which is devoted to educational programming. Nearly half of the participants, 43.5% (n=20), responded by saying that none of their budget is earmarked for educational services. 19.6% (n=9) said that between 1% and 5% of their budget was set aside for educational programming. 17.4% (n=8) stated that between 6% and 10% of their budget went to education. 4.3% (n=2) reported that between 11% and 15% was devoted to education, and another 4.3% (n=2) said that it was between 16% and 20%. And finally, 10.9% (n=5) of respondents said that more than 20% of their budget was allocated to educational programming and services. While nearly 11% (n=9) of respondents do state that more than 20% of their annual budget goes to education, the majority of respondents, 80.5% (n=37), state that less than 10% of their budget is earmarked for educational programming.

The percentages demonstrated in the responses to these three questions clearly indicate that educational programming in American archives is currently a very low
priority. Why is this? No matter how large an archival organization, there is almost always a shortage of hands to deal with the amount of work the repository is responsible for overseeing. Between balancing the backlog of materials to process, the maintenance and preservation of those materials which have already been processed, and the intake and upkeep of acquiring new materials to add to the collection, repository staff members have enough full time work to keep them busy around the clock. And yet that minimal listing of duties doesn’t even include the reference services and research assistance offered by most institutions, let alone the time-consuming responsibility of outreach and education, or any of the other important roles many archivists play during a given day. As Sir Hilary Jenkinson was so fond of saying, the modern archivist must become a “Jack of all trades.”

In all of that other essential work, educational programming is often one of the easiest components to de-prioritize, to set aside for some imagined later date when all of the other multitude of tasks will be under control. It is a difficult cycle to break when that convenient day of control never arrives and when resources are never earmarked for, or specifically allocated to, educational services. Archives are always acquiring more materials, and in turn, backlogs are usually growing rather than shrinking. Until educational programming is seen to be as vital an element to archival practice as collection development and maintenance, it will be a cycle which continues as it has for the past one hundred years.

So why should a repository redirect precious staff time and resources away from processing and research in order to educate, potentially expanding their clientele when they
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won’t be expanding their staff? The next grouping of questions aims to understand just that.

The first question in this grouping seeks to demonstrate what types of clientele are being targeted to receive programming. Respondents were asked to check all categories which applied to their institutional offerings. 17.4% (n=8) of the repositories surveyed said that this question did not apply to them as they do not offer educational programs. However, of the repositories which do offer educational services, the largest targeted group is university students, who receive programming at 67.4% (n=31) of the respondent repositories, while university professors are only targeted by 32.6% (n=15) of the repositories. K-12 educators receive offerings at 50% (n=23) of the repositories, followed closely by K-12 students at 47.8% (n=22). Novice researchers are targeted by 52.2% (n=24) of the repositories, while genealogists receive offerings at 47.8% (n=22) of the respondent archives, and other professional researchers or scholars are targeted by 43.5% (n=20). 28.3% (n=13) of respondents chose to fill out the “other” category, leaving replies such as media, parish personnel, general public, collectors, library/museum staff or other archival professionals, record officers, agency heads, and one respondent even stated that they offer services to “anyone who asks and can be accommodated by our schedules.”

What is perhaps most striking about the statistics reported here, is that educational services are most targeted to students and teachers. Many of the university archives that responded to this survey stated that education was an important part of their mission statement, given the very nature of their materials and funding. These institutions budget and staff for educational programming more consistently than any other type of institution
which participated in this project. But it was the government institutions and historical societies more than any other participants who sought to reach out to the most diverse ranges of target groups. From K-12 students and educators to researchers of all proficiency levels, from state employees and record officers to media personnel and the general public, these agencies appear to offer services to as many people as they are able.

Is this because they have more responsibility to the public? Is it because they are trying to broaden their clientele? Or is it because they want to generate more revenue, which can then go to fund more programs? Question eight in the survey asks participants whether the programs offered in their repositories seek to serve current clientele or potential clientele, or whether they aim to provide programming for both of these groups. 20% (n=9) of respondents said the question did not apply to them since they did not currently offer programming, a slightly higher response to the same claim made in the previous question. Not one single participant reported that their institution served only current patrons, while one institution did state that they only offer programming to potential patrons. Most repositories, 77.8% (n=35), said that they offer educational programming to both current and potential clients.

So just what types of programming are these repositories offering? Participants were given a list of possible answers and told to check all that apply to their institution. 73.9% (n=34) of repositories replied that they were offering in-house or on-site lectures or presentations, and 52.2% (n=24) offer in-house seminars and workshops. 56.5% (n=26) of respondents reported that they were offering these services off-site by traveling to other locations to deliver lectures or presentations, and 43.5% (n=20) host off-site seminars and
workshops. Only 4.3% (n=2) of respondents stated that they offer seminars or workshops online. This breakdown makes sense in that most archives have research rooms or other conference areas available to host educational programs, and having archival materials at hand while leading such programs can be monumentally helpful in allowing educational participants to make a strong connection with what they’re learning. However, not all patrons who might be interested in such program offerings have the luxury of living or working near a repository. In rural Montana, for example, genealogists or even town or county records officers might be hundreds of miles away from the closest archival center. By offering traveling workshops, seminars, lectures, or other presentations, an archival institution is able to open its client base to a much more diverse group of patrons. The same is true of offering web programming; online programs can range from something as simple as a brief video on how to access or request collection holdings, to something as complex as an interactive course on state historical records or genealogical documentation.

Regardless of where these programs are offered, this same survey question asks participants about the nature of the programs they offer. Most of these responses were specified by a respondent selecting the “other” category and giving details not directly addressed in the survey question. Fourteen repositories stated that they offer services related to curriculum design for K-12 classrooms, and another seven stated that they offer services related to curriculum design for university students. Two repositories counted their agency newsletters as educational outreach. One repository stated that they do distance learning, and another said that they offer research guides. One institution even
responded saying that it considered its volunteer and internship programs to be a part of its educational services.

What can be understood from this grouping of questions is that while institutions are targeting both current and potential patrons, by offering specific programs to targeted groups, the range of those programs is rather limited. As discussed in the previous chapter, museums and libraries offer a much wider range of programming, to a much wider range of people. This adaptation to the needs of their respective clienteles has given libraries and museums a much deeper connection to the communities which they serve. So why haven’t archives followed suit? Is it just because of limited staffing and limited funding for such programs as some of the earlier survey questions implied?

Question number ten asks respondents just that. Addressing the respondents who stated that these last three questions did not apply to them because they did not offer educational programming, question ten allows respondents to clarify the specific reasons why their repositories don’t offer educational services. Participants were given a list of possible reasons and asked to check all that applied to their institutions; they were also given a chance to offer their own reasoning by selecting “other” and leaving an additional statement.

Not surprisingly, the top two reasons stated were in fact limited staffing and limited funding, tying for first place with 21.7% (n=10) respondents apiece. In a tie for second place, 8.7% (n=4) of respondents stated that there was a lack of demand for such programming, while an additional 8.7% (n=4) stated that there was a lack of proper staff training to lead such programs. And in a tie for the third most common reason why these
repositories do not offer educational services, 6.5% (n=3) of respondents said there was not enough room in their repositories to host programs, and another 6.5% (n=3) simply stated that educational programming was not a part of their mission statement. Only one respondent checked the box that listed educational programming was not relevant to overall archival work. Of the 15.2% (n=7) of respondents who chose to fill out the “other” category, an additional four respondents cited lack of staffing and funding.

As a follow-up to this question, as well as to all questions in this survey, the final question asked respondents if there was anything else they wanted to add. Most participants chose to leave this question blank, and some of those respondents who did choose to answer were merely reiterating statements they had previously made, or giving further context to the scope of their repository; however, one participant in particular left us with this thought: “Educating users is always a challenge--in terms of time, opportunity, and willingness on the part of users to be educated. Normally, though, once they have been through the experience, they are grateful for it.” This was especially striking because it was one of the only comments which discussed the patron, who for all intents and purposes, is the very reason an archives exists.

The repeated citation of insufficient staff and funding is an enormous hindrance in the promotion and implementation of educational programming in American archives. In an economy which is not quick to support cultural institutions, this hindrance can be very hard to negotiate. Despite these difficulties, however, it is vital that archives resist the urge to remain stagnant in outdated programming. In order to broaden their range of users, as well as to justify their bids for public funding, archives must continue to adapt their
mission statements and goals to meet the evolving needs of the communities they serve. Reorienting the archival profession toward the mission of cultural education is an efficient way of doing this while also allowing archivists to appropriate the mantle of social responsibility which has become such a hot topic in the archival profession over the past few years.  

An integral part of the postmodern perspective, social responsibility calls for archivists to be active and aggressive in ensuring that the archival record is abundant, diverse, and as unbiased as possible. Additionally, social responsibility requires archivists to be engaged and self-aware. As Rand Jimerson states in his 2005 Presidential Address to the Society of American Archivists, “Archives are not neutral or objective.” Archives tell a story, and archivists shape that story. As discussed in the previous chapter, postmodernists believe that archivists need to be hyper-aware of preserving every possible angle of the archival story, including seeking out the so-called gaps by soliciting records from marginalized groups.

Taking the postmodern perspective on archives and social justice one step further then, this author purports that it is not enough to collect the records which tell the whole story. In order for that tapestry of social commentary to have any meaning, it must be promoted, interpreted, and utilized by as many community members as possible. What better way to do this than by educating communities about the richness of material that is housed in their local archives? Inviting people into public repositories, teaching them how
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9 The many books and articles written by prolific South African archivist and author Verne Harris, as well as work penned by such as authors as Rand Jimerson and Mark Greene are a good starting point for those interested in more information on archives and social responsibility.

to make use of the records contained therein, and promoting the value and importance of our cultural heritage is a critical, yet highly overlooked, aspect of the core values of the postmodern archives. Maintaining a connection to the community which feeds an archives, and educating that community, is the only way to sustain true relevance in the postmodern world.

George Hein, noted author on museum education, has pointed out that in the early field of museology there was a considerable amount of debate around the “educational goals” of American museums, contrasting the importance of public education to “a more elitist, exclusive tradition.” This is astoundingly similar to the ongoing polemic within the American archival community on whether staff should utilize the limited resources available to them in order to cater their services to an academic elite, or whether those resources would be better directed towards a larger general public, an audience which could potentially bring less prestige or recompense to a repository than its scholarly counterpart might proffer. Hein outlines the shift in the “educational function of museums” over the latter part of the twentieth century, stating: “The modern world has changed the social and cultural structure in which this function [museum-based education] is taking place.”

If American archives want to assure their place in our culture, if they want to assure that the records they work so hard to maintain will actually endure to serve posterity, then quite frankly, more people need to know that archives exist in the first place. Outreach programs to educate the public, to explain and expand current archival services, and to
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promulgate the very existence of our field, is critical to ensuring that this field is sustainable. But how can we do that when archivists themselves feel helpless to do more?

Although some respondents did purport to find little value in educational programming, most of this survey’s participants touted educational services as an under-developed, yet critical, component of the overall archival endeavor in this country. In fact, most repositories reported that they offer what they can with the resources they have. So how can these repositories do even more with their current resources? How can the archival field change its collective mindset to emulate the shift seen mid-century in the fields of museums and libraries? What types of programming should these repositories offer? Chapter three will examine the current varieties of educational programs being offered and discuss ways to implement these programs on a limited budget.
Whereas teachers and administrators began incorporating museum field trips into their curriculum well over a century ago, at the dawn of the new millennium most educators still have little or no idea as to how they can integrate archival holdings into their lesson plans, nor the means or desire to coordinate field trips to a local repository so that students are allowed hands-on experience in an archival setting. As demonstrated in chapter two, there are several reasons why archival repositories don’t actively reach out to educators and provide them with the tools and understanding they need to create a meaningful curriculum around archival materials. By outlining basic educational theory and demonstrating how it can be applied in an archival setting, this chapter seeks to offer archivists specific curriculum and programming ideas that can be put into practice under varying budgets, in repositories of all sizes and orientations.

When designing educational programming, it is important to remember that educational experiences must be challenging if they are to leave a lasting impression. They must engage the audience and require them to bring something of themselves into the learning process. It is in this way that even the most infrequent trips to museums or archives become substantial and meaningful components of public education. Author George Hein identifies the “fundamental challenge of museum exhibitions and programs” as being: “… how to transform the obvious enthusiasm of visitors into connected,
engaging, integrated activities that lead to growth.”¹ This same challenge is perhaps even more daunting in an archives than it often is in a museum, due to the additional challenges inherent in the very nature of archival repositories. Whereas the materials held by a museum are generally geared toward public display and interaction, archival holdings are, out of undisputed necessity, usually kept out of sight from visitors until specific materials are requested by researchers. Add to this set of obstacles the general lack of public knowledge or understanding as to what a repository is and what purpose it serves, and the difficulty of constructing a meaningful archival educational program can seem overwhelming for even the most enthusiastic of archivists. If the archival profession and the material it preserves are to remain relevant, however, and if archives are to rise to the challenge of the postmodern perspective, it is essential that this outdated mindset is overcome.

The first step in planning any educational programming is to understand who currently uses an archives. Once this has been deciphered, the repository can decide what programming will suit its current clientele, and what programs it can offer to attract new clientele. There is still an unfortunately common misconception among archivists that educational outreach is something aimed at one all-encompassing public. On the contrary, archival repositories, no matter how finely focused their mission statement or collecting policies, serve a variety of clients who rely on archival professionals to help them with an even larger variety of needs.

Because the materials and patrons of every archive differ, each repository must tailor its outreach strategies to meet the specific sets of needs exhibited by its own particular clientele. Some of these groups may include: genealogists, university scholars, students from the K-12 age group, lawyers, community groups, public servants, journalists, and one-time clients with very specific needs, among an extensive list of many others.

Before a repository can effectively target the groups that it wants to reach through public programming, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the groups who frequent the archives, as well as groups who could potentially become archival users if they were made aware of how an archives could benefit them.

In order to assess an archival repository’s actual and potential clientele, an archives’ staff should develop and execute a variety of user studies of its patrons. Mary Jo Pugh highlights the necessity of such research not only before implementing any form of constructive outreach programs, but for the overall success of an archives’ reference services in general. Pugh states that:

… measuring the use of repository holdings is necessary to organize and manage reference services in the repository and to evaluate their effectiveness. Quantitative information about use and users is needed to allocate resources, plan staffing patterns, order equipment and supplies, plan programs to meet identified needs, and reward staff. Such information helps staff to determine whether the level of service is adequate, assess assumptions about reference services, and modify services to meet changing circumstances.
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While one immediate goal of user studies is to inform an archives about the various publics that it serves, as Pugh points out, the larger purpose of such studies is to give a repository the information it needs to evaluate its own usefulness and to reorient resources if there are areas in which that efficacy is found to be lacking.

There is a wide range of available formats for collecting information on patrons and the ways in which they use the services offered by an archival repository; however, before launching into a research initiative, it is important for an archives to reflect upon which strategy is most appropriate for its own overall needs so that it may put into action a research methodology that will provide the types of information which will facilitate those specific needs. In other words, the reference staff must come to a consensus on what sorts of data and data gathering practices will provide them with fruitful knowledge about their clientele and will in turn help them to create effective educational programs for that clientele. Certain methods for studying users rely upon ongoing research efforts woven into the daily routine of an archives, such as keeping track of the number or rate of recurrence for certain types of service requests, collecting intake questionnaires, or tracking the number of hits on a repository’s website. Other methods offer more in-depth response from a repository’s clientele, but require action to be taken outside of the daily routine, such as sending out follow-up surveys to first time or repeat patrons, or incorporating an optional survey on the website for remote users.

One very important point to keep in mind, however, is that if a repository is going to commit the time and resources to research its users, then it must also be willing to dedicate the time and resources to evaluate the data that is gathered from such a project and
to use that data in a productive way. In a survey carried out by a team of Canadian archivists in 2008, designed to evaluate how archivists utilize the information garnered through user studies, the survey’s organizers found that the majority of archives relied upon their user studies almost purely to provide their resource allocators with statistical documentation about the repository’s number of patrons in order to justify or to augment their funds.\(^4\) While assuring funding is obviously vital to the operation of an archives, it should ideally be only one of many actions taken based upon the outcome of such research initiatives.

When evaluating the results of user studies, it is important to understand that although quantitative results may seem like a boon of information, this notion can be misleading. The information that is gathered by statistically measuring users and their specific patterns of uses is beneficial for identifying significant groups of users and the services that they rely upon, but it does not give the archives any insight into the usefulness of the repository or the services which it provides. In other words, while statistics show that a certain number of people have visited the archives, they do not demonstrate how many people were satisfied by their visit or how many people felt that their needs could have better been met in some way. It is for this very reason that archivists who are trying to assess their clientele in order to create effective educational outreach programs should rely upon a combination of user studies that will collect statistical data about users, as well as surveys that will furnish more in-depth analyses of both user satisfaction and frustration.

Once a repository has decided upon an appropriate means of assessing its clientele and their needs, implemented that assessment, and gathered results based on that data, then archives personnel can begin designing educational outreach programs that will both support current archives users, as well as bring in new users to fill in any gaps that were brought to light during the evaluation.

Educational outreach can represent a wide range of program options for any number of user groups and their various needs. Reference personnel are usually trained to meet the needs of these clients on a case by case basis, which is often a slow process that is repeated each time a similar situation arises. One form of outreach which can meet the needs of the reference staff, as well as the needs of multiple users, is a coordinated educational seminar.\(^5\)

One benefit of seminars is their cost-effectiveness; once created, they can be offered as frequently as desired to meet the on-going needs of reference staff and clients alike. The platform for a seminar can be as basic or as complex as reference personnel see fit. When appropriate, if there is enough interest in a certain topic to warrant it, a seminar can be offered at varying levels of expertise to cater to a range of clients in any given group of patrons. For example, if an archives is going to offer a seminar for genealogists, depending on the number of genealogists who habitually utilize the archives, it might be worth the staff’s time to offer an introductory course aimed to instruct novice genealogists about the types of documents and materials that will help them in their research, as well as

a more advanced course for seasoned genealogists who want to know more specific information about the repository’s particular holdings.

Seminars and workshops also offer the advantage of their portability. Once the staff has done the work to create a program, the staff can either offer that program on site in their reading room or take the program off site to meet with professional or avocational groups in any location that the group sees fit. If a local group of genealogists meets once a month in a fixed location, the archives staff can bring the seminar directly to that group, which might allow for more group members to participate because it is a meeting that they have already been planning to work into their schedules. An archivist’s preparation for such an outing would be minimal since the majority of advance work would have been completed in the creation of the lecture, and in the likelihood that such off site presentations would be recurring often, a set of example materials could easily be arranged and set aside for just that purpose.6

In addition to regularly offered seminars to target groups who already frequent the archives, the reference staff can prepare a brief presentation to offer groups who are not familiar with the repository and its holdings. Ann ten Cate discusses the benefits of this strategy and its impact on her small repository in Canada as it approached groups such as, “Lions Clubs, Chambers of Commerce, senior citizen’s groups, newcomer’s clubs, sororities, groups of librarians, historical societies, ratepayers groups, and Women’s Institutes, with audiences of up to one hundred people.”7 As the small staff at this archives went out into the public and approached groups who might be interested in learning more
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about the repository, they experienced a mushroom effect as even more groups began to contact the archives to arrange for the presentation to come to them. The presentation that they offered was simple, consisting of a general outline of what an archives is and the types of materials it holds, with some sample materials chosen from the repository for their visual appeal. This type of educational outreach is straightforward, cost-effective, and an excellent way to promote archives to audiences who may not know about them.

One specific group who may or may not already be familiar with archival materials, but who could almost certainly benefit from any number of different educational outreach programs, are teachers. Much research has been done recently outlining ways in which archival repositories can reach out to educators to bring primary sources into local classrooms. Marcus Robyns and Julia Hendry have both suggested several different methods for creating efficient programs to bolster archival support in both K-12 and university level curriculum focusing on critical thinking and sophisticated analytical skills. Hendry suggests that “inquiry based learning” can incorporate primary source materials found in archives into history, geography, and social studies lessons in much the same way that science teachers incorporate physical experiments into their coursework. Instead of relying solely on textbooks to instruct students, Hendry suggests that teachers utilize “letters, political cartoons, governmental reports, photographs,” and “historical maps” in tandem with secondary sources so that students can “come to their own conclusions” about

---

past events instead of merely digesting the pre-packaged timeline of events served to them by conventional teaching aids.⁹

As Hendry points out, most K-12 students are educated about history through a singular reliance on secondary sources. As archivists know, the historians who gather the information to put into textbooks have spent long hours in archival repositories searching through the documentary evidence in order to create a sanitary and streamlined interpretation of historical events. If students are allowed to handle or read some of that documentary evidence themselves, perhaps they will not only be able to make an emotional connection to history, but will also learn to analyze conflicting evidence in the process.

There are many ways that an archives can support teachers in the K-12 education system, both inside and outside of the repository. Providing training seminars for educators on how to use the archives and how to utilize primary sources in the classroom is one proven method of effective outreach. To do this, archivists must educate themselves on local curriculum requirements for various grade levels and evaluate the types of materials in the repository’s holdings that could support those curriculum requirements. Once the proper materials have been identified, logistical questions on how to make best use in disseminating them should be addressed by the reference staff. Would it be more beneficial to create sample packets to distribute to teachers based on what grade level they are responsible for teaching? Or would it be more in the interest of the archives to present a generic sample packet to educators of all grade levels and then allow the teachers to
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approach the archives’ staff for assistance in arranging specific materials based on that teacher’s individual lesson plans? These are questions that each repository will have to consider, taking into account the time and resources they will be able to invest in initiating such an outreach endeavor.

Moving beyond the seminar, if an archives has the staff and resources to create their own lesson plans, they could invite classes to come into the repository itself and learn about archives first-hand. Tours of the stacks and a hands-on set of activities in the reading room serve two purposes: they allow students to learn about their local history outside the classroom, and perhaps more importantly, they familiarize children with the setting and function of an archives so that they will be able to utilize archival institutions throughout their educational careers. Having large groups of children enter a quiet reading room can be disturbing to other research patrons, so it is important to carefully plan school tours and alert other clients about the impending presence of the children well in advance.10

If an archives is interested in launching a program in which school groups come into the repository, the archives staff might consider conversing with their counterparts at local museums or libraries which already have similar programs in order to gain some insight about how those establishments have organized their programs and to find out who their liaison is with the local school board. As Ann ten Cate and others make abundantly clear, the museum and library professions have been working with schools for a long time

10 ten Cate, 34.
and have a great deal of literature out on the subject\textsuperscript{11}; it would certainly be beneficial for any reference staff interested in working with school groups to familiarize themselves with that literature and to adapt the suggested methodologies to an archival context.

Other methods for catering to K-12 educators include: creating packets of primary sources, including grade level appropriate exercises to accompany the materials, which can be bought or borrowed from the archives\textsuperscript{12}; relying on required curriculum to create digital presentations with computer software like Microsoft PowerPoint that teachers can incorporate into their classrooms, which can be sold through the archives either at the production cost or for profit; or simply creating digital exhibits to be made available on a repository’s website so that teachers and students can analyze reproductions of archival materials which support the lessons they go over in the classroom.\textsuperscript{13} All of these projects require a certain amount of preparatory work from the archives’ staff; however, these are all projects which allow a repository to create outreach tools while providing the flexibility to invest only the time and resources that is convenient for them. In other words, these are all projects that have the potential to be as basic or as elaborate as an archives sees fit. What’s more is that once these types of tools are created, they can be utilized indefinitely, assuring that the time and resources necessary to their initial preparation will be a small contribution compared to the long term return of the investment.

One particularly innovative educational outreach tool has been made public in the state of Montana by the Montana Historical Society (MHS). Over the course of two years,
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from 2007-2008, the MHS archives staff worked with a group of teachers and librarians to publish a “Companion Website and Online Teacher’s Guide” to the Montana state history textbook, *Montana: Stories of the Land.* The website contains a fully digitized version of the textbook itself with integrated lesson plans, worksheets, tests and answer sheets, PDF files containing maps and other related documentation, as well as interactive links to related primary sources that are available both digitally and in hard copy through the MHS archives. To clarify, here is a sample of the layout of the main page for each chapter:

**Chapter 6 - Montana's Gold and Silver Boom, 1862 – 1893**

**Online textbook:** Chapter 6 - (.pdf)

**Worksheet 1:** Placer versus Quartz Mining - (.pdf)
**Worksheet 2:** Creating and Interpreting a Graph - (.pdf)

**Learning from Historical Documents:**
Letter from Emily Meredith to "Father," from Bannack, 1863
Letter from Cornelius Hedges to "Parents," from Helena, 1865
Letter from E.W. Knight to U.S. Attorney General, 1882, about Segregated Schools

**Interesting Links**
Take a virtual tour of Bannack, Montana's first territorial capital. Can you identify these artifacts?
Explore Marysville.
View pictures from several other Montana ghost towns, including Elkhorn, Garnet, Granite, Hecla, and Virginia City.
Use this interactive map to discover ghost towns near you.

Not only do teachers have the content of the textbook available to them in an online environment, facilitating the overhead projection of text and images in the classroom.

---

setting, they also have a wide variety of tools at their disposal to personalize lesson plans with primary sources and other related materials that have the potential to spark interest in students and make history come to life. Although the coordination of such a large project was time consuming, the cost and effort were shared by the various groups involved in the implementation of the project, which also fostered a stronger relationship between the Historical Society and prominent members of the state’s Department of Education. It is this form of collaboration which can make projects of any scope achievable by repositories of any size.

By sharing the cost, responsibility, and resources of developing educational programs, even the smallest archives can make big change in their communities. Depending on the particular project, a repository could invite local teachers or school board officials to help design curriculum, local libraries or museums to contribute material or staff resources, or any number of other local, state, or national groups or agencies to participate in project implementation. This collaborative effort not only widens the scope and funding of a program, it also widens the scope of the audience and potential program participants.

One excellent example of such a collaborative effort took place in Bellingham, Washington over the course of three years, between 2007-2010, on a project called “The Historic Resource Survey & Inventory of the Lettered Streets, York, and South Hill Neighborhoods.” The city received $150,000 in funding from the Preserve America Grant Project in order to petition for three local neighborhoods to become listed on the National
Register of Historic Places.\textsuperscript{16} The planning and undertaking of fieldwork was coordinated between the mayor’s office, the city museum and library, the county assessor, the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, the Washington State Northwest Regional Archives, Western Washington University, the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, the Historic Preservation Northwest Consultant Team, and a significant number of volunteers from the community.\textsuperscript{17}

The project allowed community members to learn about the holdings found in the local archival repositories, museum, and library, as well as how those holdings could be utilized to research the history of their neighborhoods and homes. The volunteers were taught to evaluate the architectural elements of the structures in their neighborhoods, and to write reports which were then submitted to the Historic Preservation Northwest Consultant Team for inclusion in the petition packet. The training of the volunteers, as well as the collection and organization of their work, was shared by the staff members of the archives, museum, library, and other city officials. This allowed the workload to be distributed among trained professionals, while at the same time allowing volunteers and other community members maximum exposure to their local heritage institutions. It is through collaborative efforts such as this one that community awareness is the most greatly impacted.

Collaboration with teachers and school board members in particular can be especially helpful when planning programs geared toward students. Not every archivist

\textsuperscript{16} For more information on the National Register of Historic Places, please visit the National Park Services website at: http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/, and for more information on the Preserve America Grant Project, please visit the National Park Services website at: http://www.nps.gov/hps/HPG/preserveamerica/index.htm. \textsuperscript{17} http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/community-development/historic/preserve-america/preserve-america-grant-award.pdf, Accessed 07/09/11.
preparing an educational outreach initiative needs to be trained in curriculum planning. In fact, most of them won’t be. However, by reaching out to those professionals who are trained in such matters, a repository will be increasing the effectiveness and relevancy of the materials or programs they offer, while at the same time establishing an important link to the very community they intend to serve.

It is also important to adapt programs and materials to serve as many different groups as possible. For example, several of the tools and strategies previously discussed which are appropriate to K-12 education can easily be adapted to the university level. When students enroll in higher education they are often expected to use critical thinking skills in ways that they have never had to do before. Most, if not all, university disciplines could benefit from student awareness and understanding of archival materials and how to access them, especially in, but not limited to, universities which have archival repositories on campus.

Marcus Robyns discusses this in great depth in an article he wrote detailing his experiences and experiments in various classrooms at Northern Michigan University. As university archivist, Robyns was able to put together packets of primary source material based on lesson plans being taught in a diverse range of courses on the university campus. He carefully prepared the launching of this program by inviting faculty to give feedback and suggestions about how they could use such a program in their classes. Because critical thinking is a required course objective across all disciplines in the university,

---

19 Robyns, 375.
Robyns received input and interest from a wide range of fields, including both social and hard sciences.

Marcus prepared a simple PowerPoint presentation which could be adapted to the unique course load of any professor interested in participating in the program. The presentation began by explaining what a primary source is and how it can be used, then moved onto discussing the basic nature of historical research, and critical thinking.\textsuperscript{20} Once the presentation had been given, there was a group exercise which was tailored to the particular needs of each class, allowing students the chance to utilize the knowledge they had just gained.

In this article, Robyns continuously refers to the archives as a lab, insisting that students of the social sciences should utilize archives much in the same way that students of the hard sciences use their own specialized laboratories. Robyns outlines the curriculum he has created using archival materials to encourage students to analyze and critique conflicting arguments, while at the same time strengthening their critical thinking skills and promoting awareness of primary sources. By using letters, newspaper and journal articles, photographs, and other university archival holdings which presented varying viewpoints of the same historical events, Robyns was able to provide his students a platform for hands-on research, allowing them to practice verification of facts and to learn how to contextualize evidence and information.\textsuperscript{21}

By familiarizing students with primary source materials and training them on how to analyze and fact check that information, Robyns is truly transforming the classroom into

\textsuperscript{20} Robyns, 376-380.
\textsuperscript{21} Robyns, 376-379.
a research laboratory. Robyns’ approach allows students to take something more than just historical knowledge away from his class. He is teaching students to analyze data, to break down arguments, and to draw their own conclusions about conflicting evidence. Instead of simply presenting data and dates, and having students memorize that material and present it back to him in the form of tests or essays, Robyns is also offering his students the chance to have a meaningful interaction with history. As we saw at the beginning of this chapter, it is only through meaningful interaction that lasting memories are formed. With some research and effort, any archival repository could follow Robyns’ lead and create a series of activities to take into classrooms or to distribute to teachers or professors for use in their own lessons, which would help nurture students’ critical thinking skills.

Critical thinking is a skill which transcends the classroom, a skill which sets a student up for success in every aspect of life. For this very reason, most universities and community colleges place an emphasis on critical thinking as a required part of their curriculum. But helping students develop important cognitive skills such as critical thinking can be a real challenge for educators. As Marcus Robyns has demonstrated, the nature of archival research offers a meaningful and unique solution to this challenge.

Archivists who are interested in further examples of specific programming ideas would greatly benefit from browsing the website of the New York State Archives. The New York State Archives is unique in that it is the only official state archival program which is part of the State Department of Education. Because the basic funding and program direction are guided by education, the State Archives have developed a wide

variety of programs, workshops, webinars, and interactive web materials for students, educators, archivists, and records managers.

One last thing to keep in mind while preparing to embark on an outreach program, whether it is an educational endeavor, or any other type of public programming, is that part of the purpose of publicity and outreach is to bring clientele into the archives. Many authors who write about outreach in archives warn their colleagues against promoting programs without ensuring the resources to meet the array of challenges that increased patronage can sometimes bring with it.\textsuperscript{23} While many educational programs are intended to inform generalized groups of users how to enhance their experience within the repository, it should be understood that educational outreach geared towards non-users and students often results in an influx of novice researchers who may need extra attention from the reference staff upon their initial visit to the repository. If reference personnel will be ill-equipped to handle the repercussions of such programs, it might be best for a repository to focus solely on supporting client groups which already utilize the archives rather than trying to bring in new users.

That having been said, it is important to understand that whether an archives is initially oriented to serve one particular public or to serve many diverse publics, outreach programs can always help to widen the scope of a repository’s clientele. In order to effectively implement relevant outreach programs, an archives must first familiarize itself with its patrons and the types of projects which they carry out in the repository through coordinated user studies. Once a repository has a clear idea of which publics it currently

\textsuperscript{23} ten Cate, 34.
serves and which publics it has the potential to serve, outreach strategies that are tailored to those groups can be researched and actualized by the repository’s staff. As has been discussed throughout this chapter, educational outreach opportunities can be time consuming and draining on both staff and funds, so it is vital that ample research is undertaken to assure that a repository is launching the types of public programming that are consistent with both the resources and the end results that the archives is equipped to handle.

Whether it is education to benefit current patrons or to bring in a new range of clientele, whether it is education geared for students in K-12 or university classrooms, or whether or not the effort is ongoing or limited to a singular event, the possibilities for using public programs to promote awareness of archives and to educate the public are numerous and varied, only limited by the time, resources, and creativity of the archivists responsible for educational outreach.

If archivists are to overcome the obstacles they currently face in securing the necessary resources to operate, educational outreach is the most efficient and beneficial way to bring in more users, to broaden the scope of the communities they serve, and to open themselves up to a more diverse range of funding options. Additionally, by acquiring young patrons through educational outreach in the K-12 and university systems, archives are assuring that future generations of community members will be aware of and utilize the archival community.

By following the simple steps of surveying the users they currently serve, evaluating the quantitative and qualitative data of those surveys to see where the gaps are
and where there is room to grow, and then designing tailored educational programming to meet the needs and capture the interest of both current and potential patrons, archives will be ensuring that they play a unique and crucial role in society. It is by solidifying this role that the cycle of use and relevance can be established, investing in patrons so that patrons will invest in the archives. With tenacity and ingenuity, archivists can promote their repositories, expand their clientele, and serve a wide variety of users, all through the scope of educational outreach and programming.
Conclusion

Archival outreach programs serve a key role in the preservation and promotion of public history. Community based educational programs sponsored and implemented by archival repositories allow actual, as well as potential, patrons to learn about their local history and to familiarize themselves with archival materials. By following the lead of related informational and cultural fields like museology and library science, archives can expand their reach by making their collections relevant and accessible to the American public.

In the first chapter we saw how the postmodern archives strives to become more transparent, more self-aware, and more active in shaping the archival record through targeted collecting policies and a dedication to social justice. By giving a voice to the marginalized, and by narrowing the gaps in the historical record, postmodern archivists are committed to sustaining and promoting social memory through the preservation of the documents and artifacts which allow the members of a community to identify with each other.

Building on that framework, chapter two provided an overview of how twentieth-century American museums adapted to changing social norms and fiscal priorities by reorienting their focus on educational programming. With the idea that American archives would benefit from following the path laid out by their counterparts in the field of museology, this author presented the findings of a survey sent to American archivists in order to understand what role education currently holds in United States archives. That
survey demonstrated both the interest of many archivists to begin implementing educational programming, and the hurdles which those archivists perceive to be hindering such a transformation of the status quo. Money, training, and other necessary resources were shown to be seen as stretched too thin to accommodate the switch in program goals.

However, as seen in chapter three, by evaluating the needs of current patrons and identifying the gaps in services offered, archives can begin implementation of educational programming on a small scale at little additional cost. By expanding patronage and solidifying their place in the communities they serve, archives can reach a wider audience and potentially solicit a wider variety of grants and funding. Furthermore, by investing in educational programs which would make archival institutions relevant to the K-12 and university communities, an archives is ensuring that future generations of prospective patrons are familiar with and comfortable utilizing their services.

By educating the people who could potentially support them, and by creating a more widespread awareness of what archives are and what they contain, American repositories and the archivists who run them would be taking the first important step toward realizing the postmodern objective of promulgating social responsibility. Postmodernists would progress greatly in mainstreaming their ideas about the directions in which the archival profession should move if they could demonstrate to their critics some immediate and tangible benefits of adopting the postmodern perspective. This author purports that the most efficient way to do that would be to incorporate educational programming into the very core of the postmodern archival program model.
When educational programming becomes central to a profession’s mission statement, as it has in the museum field, that profession has the opportunity to inspire a much more meaningful and long-term impact on the community it serves. Children who are taught to think critically, to engage in a lesson by participating directly with the information in primary sources, hold a greater level of esteem and place a greater value on both the lesson learned and the person or institution who taught them that lesson. Those children then grow up to expect their own children to have the same or similar experiences, and they reach out to the educators who will be able to reproduce those experiences which they so fondly remember. American museums have made themselves a place of refuge and intrigue for young learners and their parents. It is vital that American archives come together to do the same.

Institutes of cultural heritage have the opportunity, and according to postmodernists, the responsibility, to preserve and promote awareness of social history and its impact on shaping cultural identity. This is not something to be taken lightly. The archives as a gathering place, a laboratory of knowledge, is something over which archivists can have direct control. But that control must be regulated and consistent, outlined and adopted by the professional community as a whole. Otherwise, the change will not be sustainable or induce a true paradigm shift. But it would only take a few daring pioneers and a handful of success stories to demonstrate the possible impact that this transformation of priorities can have on a repository and the public it serves.

American archives, like American museums and libraries before them, are at a critical time in their own evolutionary history. In an age when funding is being cut, and
hard choices are being made on how to use available resources, it is more essential than ever before that the archival profession band together to reassess its core values. As we saw in the first chapter, the Society of American Archivists is trying to do just that by formalizing a list of what those core values are. However, it is necessary to do more than simply state those values. In order to truly validate them, there must be curriculum set in place to give meaning and insight into how those values affect our daily tasks.

Utilizing archival materials to create instructional and evocative lesson plans is crucial to integrating society into the archives. Curriculum planning invites everyone to come into repositories, to participate in furthering their own education, and to grow as individuals as well as community members. Students, educators, business professionals, amateur researchers and genealogists, records managers, historians, all are equally apt to benefit from educational outreach. The problem is that most of them don’t know it yet. In fact, most of them might not even know what an archives is. Through curriculum planning and advocacy, that can and will change.

By validating the importance of educational outreach through adopting program models which rely upon such outreach endeavors, archives can assert themselves as a vital part of their communities. By increasing awareness of a repository through educational outreach, more patrons will become invested in the repository, and in turn, there will be more avenues to secure future funding. What’s more, the requests for additional funding will be quantitatively justifiable through the increased number of program participants and researchers who utilize archival services.
Promoting communal identity through archival education benefits everyone in the community, not just the repository which stands to gain users or resources from the effort. As we saw in the previous chapter, museums have paved the way for archives to open their doors to a larger public through educational programming. Now, it is up to archivists to take on the mantle of social responsibility and engage the communities they serve by providing a gathering place, an interactive laboratory of primary source information, and by training community members how to use the tools and materials therein to appropriate and expand upon the story of who they are and how far they have come. For when that is achieved, communities will be able to stand together and move forward as a united group, forming societies which value their cultural heritage and take the time and effort to invest in its preservation.
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Appendix A

Email Invitation to Participate in the Online Survey

Dear Fellow Archivist,

I am a second year graduate student in Rand Jimerson’s archives and records management program at Western Washington University, currently working on completing a master’s thesis on educational programming in American archival repositories. I am writing to ask for your assistance in the completion of this project.

In order to evaluate the current state of educational outreach in this country, I have prepared a very brief survey concerning the educational programs offered by your repository. If you would please take a few moments of your time to complete the survey, your participation will contribute to a more accurate and complete assessment of the current role of educational outreach in the archival community. Please complete the survey at your earliest convenience and no later than Friday, August 21, 2009.

Please keep in mind that within the context of this survey, the term “education related programs and services” refers to any classes, workshops, seminars, web tools, curriculum planning, lectures, presentations, or any other educational endeavor offered by an archival repository and designed with the purpose of either training researchers about how to use archives, or which generally utilizes archival materials to educate students or clients.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please don’t hesitate to contact me at the email address below. Thank you very much for your time and your input. I appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Serra Hagedorn
hagedos@students.wwu.edu

Here is a link to the survey:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails regarding this survey, please click on the link below, and you will be automatically removed from the mailing list.
http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
Appendix B

Survey

1. How would you rate the level of importance placed on educational outreach and programming as outlined in your repository’s mission statement?
   a) Very important
   b) Somewhat important
   c) Not very important

2. How do you, as an archivist, personally rate the level of importance of educational outreach and programming within the archival profession?
   a) Very important
   b) Somewhat important
   c) Not very important

3. How many full or part time professional staff members are currently employed by your repository?
   a) 1-3
   b) 4-7
   c) 8-10
   d) More than 10

4. Of those full or part time professionals, approximately how many of them work:
   a) Primarily on education related programs and services ____
   b) Occasionally on education related programs and services ____

5. Approximately what percentage of your annual budget is earmarked for education related programs or services?
   a) 0%
   b) 1% - 5%
   c) 6% - 10%
   d) 11% - 15%
   e) 16% - 20%
   f) More than 20%

6. If your repository does offer education related programs and services, what types of clientele do you target? Please check all that apply:
   ___ Professional researchers or scholars
   ___ Novice researchers
   ___ University students
   ___ K-12 students
   ___ University professors
   ___ K-12 teachers
___ Genealogists
___ None of the above
___ Other, please explain:

7. If your repository does offer education related programs and services, are you primarily interested in serving:
   a) Current patrons
   b) Potential patrons
   c) Both
   d) Not applicable

8. What types of education related programs and services do you currently offer? Please check all that apply:
   ___ In-house seminars or workshops
   ___ Online seminars or workshops
   ___ Traveling or off-site seminars or workshops
   ___ In-house presentations or lectures
   ___ Traveling or off-site presentations or lectures
   ___ Curriculum design for K-12 classrooms
   ___ Curriculum design for university classrooms
   ___ None of the above
   ___ Other, please explain:

9. If your repository does not currently offer education related programs and services, please explain why that is by checking all of the answers which apply:
   ___ Not enough funding
   ___ Not able to spare the necessary staff members
   ___ Lack of client demand for such programming
   ___ Insufficient staff training to create such programming
   ___ Insufficient space in the repository to offer such programming
   ___ Does not fit into the goals outlined by the agency mission statement
   ___ Programming not seen as relevant to archives
   ___ Not applicable
   ___ Other, please explain:

10. Is there anything else that you would like to add in relation to educational programming and public outreach in archives?
Appendix C

Survey Results\(^1\)

Which one of the following categories most accurately describes your organization?

- Federal Government Archives
- State Government Archives
- Local Government Archives
- Historical Society Archives
- Library Archives
- Museum Archives
- Religious Archives
- University Archives
- Community Archives
- Other (please specify)

How would you rate the level of importance placed on educational outreach and programming as outlined in your repository’s mission statement?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Other (please specify)

\(^1\) Numbers on X axis in graphs represent actual number of responses, not percentages.
How do you, as an archivist, personally rate the level of importance of educational outreach and programming within the archival profession?

Approximately what percentage of your annual budget is earmarked for education related programs and services?
If your repository does offer education related programs and services, what types of clientele do you target? Please check all that apply:

- Professional researchers or scholars
- Novice researchers
- University students
- K-12 students
- University professors
- K-12 educators
- Genealogists
- Not applicable (we do not currently offer education related programs)
- Other (please specify)

If your repository does offer education related programs and services, are you primarily interested in serving:

- Current patrons
- Potential patrons
- Both
- Not applicable (we do not currently offer education related programs)
Appendix D

Institutions Which Responded to the Educational Outreach Survey

Alaska
Alaska State Archives

California
NARA Pacific Region, San Bruno
San Diego Historical Society

Colorado
Colorado Historical Society

Connecticut
Connecticut Historical Society
University of Connecticut, University Archives
Yale University Archives

Delaware
University of Delaware, University Archives

District of Columbia
Smithsonian Institute Archives

Florida
University of Florida at Miami, University Archives

Georgia
Georgia Historical Society

Hawaii
Hawaii State Archives

Idaho
University of Idaho University Archives and Special Collections

Indiana
Indiana Historical Society

Iowa
University of Iowa Women’s Archives
Kansas
Kansas State Historical Society Kansas State Historical Society

Maryland
National Public Broadcasting Archives
University of Maryland College Park, University Archives

Massachusetts
Thoreau Institute Archives

Michigan
Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit

Minnesota
Clay County Historical Society

Montana
Montana Historical Society and State Archives

New Hampshire
Dartmouth University Archives
New Hampshire State Historical Society

New Jersey
Jewish Historical Society of Central Jersey

New York
Columbia University Archives
LGBT Community Center Archives
NARA Northeast Region, New York City
New York University Medical Library Archives
Vassar University Special Collections

North Carolina
American Dance Festival Archives
North Carolina State Archives

Ohio
Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives

Oregon
Oregon State University, University Archives
**Pennsylvania**
Chemical Heritage Foundation Archives  
Philadelphia Archdiocesan Historical Research Center

**Rhode Island**
Rhode Island Historical Society

**Texas**
NARA Southwest Region at Ft. Worth

**Vermont**
Vermont State Archives

**Virginia**
Virginia Historical Society

**Washington**
Catholic Archdiocese of Seattle  
NARA Pacific Alaska Region, Seattle  
Seattle Municipal Archives

**Wisconsin**
University of Wisconsin, Manuscripts Library  
University of Wisconsin, University Archives  
Wisconsin Historical Society