COUNCIL ON FOUNDATIONS

ESTABLISHING FOUNDATION ARCHIVES

ESOURCES FOR GRANTMAKERS

Establishing Foundation Archives: A Reader and Guide to First Steps

Edited by
Kenneth W. Rose
and
Darwin H. Stapleton

Council on Foundations

Council on Foundations
1828 L Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
202/466-6512

Table of Contents

Foreword

On behalf of the board and members of the Council on Foundations, I would like to express appreciation to the Rockefeller Archive Center for hosting the conference that led to the papers included in this volume. This collaboration of the Archive Center and the Council provided a rare opportunity for foundations to learn both why preserving documents is important and how several foundations have approached finding a repository or setting up and managing an archives. Participants in the conference had the added privilege of conferring with experts and seeing an operating archive as they toured the Rockefeller Archive Center.

Why should we be concerned about foundation archives? As institutions that are shaping private initiatives for the public good, documenting this aspect of American society falls uniquely under our stewardship. Foundation documents often provide the only surviving records of the important contributions of nonprofits and foundations to civic life. These records will help to inform future judgments and ensure that the history of the field is not lost.

Preserving our history is becoming a pressing problem as the foundation movement reaches the end of its first century. Space and budget constraints lead many to feel the need to "clean house." Yet, indiscriminate purging of files could lead to irreplaceable losses, especially since the extensive use of telephones and electronic mail has already put much of the daily fabric of grantmaking beyond the reach of history.

We hope that this volume will help to focus attention on the need for a well thought through rationale for document retention and provide practical guidance to foundations seeking assistance. We welcome your comments and suggestions on this first effort and we look forward to working with foundations on maintaining records for future generations.

James A. Joseph
January, 1991

Preface

This volume is a response to the foundation community's growing recognition that foundations have records of immense value which cannot be thrown away without jeopardizing an important segment of recent American and world history. Both the Council on Foundations and the Rockefeller Archive Center (as a leading repository of foundation archives) have had an increasing number of inquiries about establishing foundation archives, and their concern about this issue led them to co-sponsor a conference, "Foundation Archives: Information, Access, and Research." Held at the Center on January 9, 1990, and attended by representatives of several foundations and scholars in the history of philanthropy, the conference heard the papers by James A. Smith, Peter D. Hall, Sara L. Engelhardt and Ann C. Newhall which are included in this volume. Frank J. Wolling, former manager of Records and Library Services at the The Rockefeller Foundation, also participated in the panel discussion. The papers by Richard Kaplan, John J. Grabowski and Kenneth W. Rose, which had originally been prepared for the 1989 meeting of the Society of American Archivists, had been sent to the conference participants for reading prior to the conference.

Both the enthusiastic response of conference participants and the continuing inquiries to the Council and the Center convinced us that a compilation of the conference papers could answer a range of questions raised by those considering the establishment of archives. These essays will be useful to several constituencies within the foundation community, and we invite readers to begin with the essays most relevant to their concerns. The first section consists of essays by two scholars who have used foundation archives in their research. Their discussions of the value of foundation records to both scholars and foundation managers will be of interest to foundation officials considering the issues surrounding the purpose and utility of archival programs.

The second section will be of interest to foundation officials and staff who are charged with the handling and disposition of foundation records. It begins with a survey of current archival practice and policies within the foundation community and proceeds to specific descriptions of how staff at the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation and the MacArthur Foundation have dealt with archival issues. The section concludes with a discussion of how a regional historical society approaches and deals with foundation records.

The third section consists of practical advice on creating an archives from the archivists at the Rockefeller Archive Center. These brief essays discuss issues of access for researchers, good office practices that facilitate preservation and retrieval, the kinds of records foundations should keep, proper organization and storage of records, how to preserve photographs and films, the steps in conducting an oral history interview, and what to expect from an archival consultant. As a practical example of recordkeeping policies, the section concludes with two documents that describe the handling and retention of records at the Rockefeller Foundation.

The final section includes a short bibliography on archives and the names, addresses and telephone numbers of relevant professional organizations and archival supply houses.

A number of people were very helpful in organizing the conference on archives and in preparing this volume. At the Council on Foundations, Elizabeth Boris, Vice President for Research, and Deborah Brody, Director of Private Foundation Services, shared in planning and administering the conference, and also obtained the Council's financial support for the conference and this publication. At the Rockefeller Archive Center, Pecolia Allston-Rieder was the primary staff support for the conference, and word processed the volume's text. Other invaluable assistance was provided by the entire Archive Center staff. Meredith S. Averill, the manager of Records and Library Services at the Rockefeller Foundation, also graciously permitted us to add edited versions of two staff documents to the volume.

K.W.R.
D.H.S.
January, 1991

Introduction

By Kenneth W. Rose and Darwin H. Stapleton

Why Archives?

Every foundation has records, but most do not have archives. Creating archives is a self-concious act that recognizes the importance of preserving the past documentation and organizing it so that needed information may be readily located. By establishing its archives, a foundation seeks to reveal its past to its current trustees and staff, and—with some limits—to serious scholars. In so doing, a foundation takes responsibility for its past, welcomes the praise and the criticism which ensue, and can therefore more fully acknowledge its achievements and accept changes in its traditions.

Institutional needs are paramount in the decision to establish archives. The most practical reason for archiving records is so that they can be used to preserve fiscal and programmatic continuity. Every foundation has to account for its past expenditures, prepare a budget and an annual statement, and maintain some coherence in its granting policy. Trustees' minutes, treasurer's balance sheets and annual reports may be the absolute minimum needed to provide some perspective on these activities. Of course, some recordkeeping is also required by the laws governing the operation and tax liabilities of foundations. But the simple accumulation of these records alone does not constitute the creation of archives.

Serving the Institution

By retaining such records as grant files, officers' correspondence and committee reports, foundations provide a complete record that allows them to make a more rigorous assessment of past activities and future directions. There are two fundamental phenomena which rest on this richer record: memory and morale. Without the strong institutional memory provided by archives, foundations may find themselves embroiled in unverifiable debates about how the actions of the past can inform the future. It is perhaps not always true that "those who do not learn from the past are condemned to repeat it," but learning from the past can be extremely difficult if it is not recorded and preserved.

Staff morale is enhanced by a lively institutional memory. Such attitudes as identification with the ideals of the founders, a strong sense of tradition or a faith in the values of program goals can be important means of maintaining a sense of mutual purpose, institutional integrity and an appreciation of the significance of the foundation's work. Archives probably reinforce these attitudes most consistently simply by day-to-day use, but also contribute by providing historical photographs for reports and brochures, documents and other materials for exhibits and a safe repository for critical records which trustees and staff have committed precious time and effort to produce. There are few things more discouraging than discovering that valuable ideas and data have been lost.

Serving the Public

Beyond these internal reasons for maintaining archives stands the broader issue of social responsibility. With the privilege of nonprofit incorporation comes certain expectations, among them a deeper level of accountability to the public than profit-making enterprises. An archives that routinely provides some public access to a foundation's historical record (for example, to grant files which are more than 20 years old) demonstrates a positive regard for the public's legitimate interest in its activities.

Scholarly Research

In all likelihood, the segment of the public most interested in foundation records is the scholarly community. The majority of researchers who visit the Rockefeller Archive Center to use foundation records are scholarly users—university and college professors conducting research for articles and books, and doctoral candidates at work on dissertations. In 1989, 129 of these academic researchers visited the Archive Center, comprising 64 percent of the 199 researchers through the Archive Center's doors that year. By comparison, 35 (17 percent) of the Center's 1989 researchers were nonacademic researchers (independent, unaffiliated researchers, journalists, film producers, etc.), another 15 (7 percent) were undergraduate or high school students and 20 others (10 percent) were representatives of institutions whose records are housed at the Center.

In several papers in this volume, academic users of foundation archives echo Jim Smith's argument in the *1989 Rockefeller Archive Center Newsletter*, that foundation archives are valuable resources because they often contain the only detailed record documenting the work of some of "the most fragile and ephemeral organizations that comprise [the] nonprofit sector." For scholarly researchers, a foundation's archives is as potentially rich in resources as the number and variety of institutions, individuals and program areas it has funded. Scholars are rarely interested in the history of philanthropy or specific foundations *per se*; of the more than 1,500 researchers who have visited the Rockefeller Archive Center in the 15 years it has been open, fewer than 50 have been interested in the history of philanthropy or foundations as such. What usually interests them most is a foundation's role in the history of some other institution or set of institutions (a school, college, university, hospital, museum, research institute, etc.) or subject area (agricultural development, the arts, black education, child welfare, Latin American fiction, medical education, molecular biology, the natural sciences, public health, race relations, the social sciences, etc.), or support for a particular individual artist, author, composer, educator, historian, medical researcher or scientist. In other words, it is what a foundation does outside its offices that is of most significance to academic researchers, and that record is usually best preserved in the correspondence, letters of recommendation, evaluations, reports and memoranda located in the grant files. Annual reports rarely are sufficient for their purposes; the value of the archives for these users rests with the details contained within well-preserved grant files. The project files of the various philanthropies housed at the Rockefeller Archive Center have served as source material for at least 118 books and dissertations and 175 scholarly articles since the Center opened in 1975. (We estimate that the Center has learned of only about two-thirds of the publications that cite its collections.)

Conclusion

If, then, archives can serve foundations' most important needs and goals, as well as public and scholarly interests, foundation officials need to be better acquainted with archival matters. It is the purpose of this book to provide a general overview of archives and their operations for the trustees, officers and staff of foundations who will make the decisions to establish archives, transfer their historical records to them and work with them daily. We believe foundation officials will profit by reading these essays and that they will come away with answers to their basic questions.

I
The Historical and Managerial Value of Foundation Records

Why Foundation Archives Matter

By James Allen Smith

Historians are by nature scavengers. We can be likened to catfish feeding listlessly on the refuse at the bottom of a pond or even to crows swooping down from a lofty perch to pick at road-side remains. Whatever the analogy, the historical imagination is inevitably nourished by—and sometimes feasts upon—the submerged waste stuff of earlier epochs and the accidental remains of defunct institutions.

It should thus come as no surprise that historians are perpetually hungry and voracious sorts when it comes to questions about preserving the written records of institutions or creating archival collections. Historians can never be certain what scrap of paper will nurture their insights into the past. And they inevitably must ask themselves how their understanding of a society has been skewed by the accidents that cause the survival or disappearance of particular bodies of records. It is indeed accident and happenstance, more often than not, that determine what raw historical matter will remain in our possession in the long run. A personal anecdote is illustrative.

I sat in my office at the Twentieth Century Fund in 1981 when my secretary, who had been the keeper of the institution's files for thirty years, brought several well-worn file folders to my desk. The fund, a venerable New York-based policy research foundation where I served as a program officer, had just approved a new project to examine the history and long-range financial prospects of the nation's social security system. As every foundation must, we were making room in our cramped files for the administrative records of a new project. My secretary dropped some old folders on my desk containing material on fund projects from the 1930s and 1950s on social security. They were important projects in their day. Indeed, they concerned perennial questions about the financing of the social security system. But what we had saved for years were administrative correspondence and research contracts—documents with legal and bureaucratic significance to the foundation. What we had discarded, sometime in the mid or late 1960s presumably when moving from one mid-town office to another, were the substantive deliberations of a distinguished, foundation-financed Committee on Social Security that had met throughout the mid-1930s at the very moment when the administrative and fiscal apparatus of the system was being set up.

The fund's project director writing a book in the 1980s would no doubt have found these earlier expert deliberations on social security invaluable as part of the administrative and political history of the nation's evolving programs for the elderly and disabled. In fact, the Twentieth Century Fund's committee in the 1930s (and a successor group in the 1950s) were close equivalents to the so-called Greenspan Commission on Social Security summoned by President Ronald Reagan, which was then hard at work dealing with yet another crisis in social security financing. As best we can surmise, the records of the early committees documented important moments in the nation's continuing public policy debates about social security (although, in truth, we can never be completely certain of the significance of what we had lost). But the story tells us something about the nature of the papers housed in a foundation's file cabinets and desk drawers, and why we ought to think carefully about their preservation and disposal.

The anecdote is illustrative, first, of the chance and accidental circumstances—a need to expand storage space, a move to new offices, a fire or flood—that so often determine which historical records survive and which do not. It is, second, a cautionary tale intended to remind us that the documents that may or may not seem important to a foundation can be very important to future historians, policy analysts or other researchers whose fields have been touched by American philanthropy. Indeed, foundations often house material that is exceedingly important for understanding the nation's social history, intellectual developments in various academic fields, as well as the genesis of many important public policy initiatives.

Foundations are at times the only repository of material for some of the most fragile and ephemeral organizations that comprise this nation's nonprofit sector. In foundation correspondence and memoranda are accounts of the beginnings of organizations or social movements as well as hints of the networks that operate on the peripheries of our formal political processes. Indeed, some organizations may once have flourished and then faded from view while leaving few permanent traces on the institutional landscape apart from their dealings with foundation officials. Moreover, the flow of paper that passes between foundation staff and nonprofit organizations (or between staff and board) reveals much about contemporary perceptions of social, political and economic dynamics, and the changing agenda of public problems and the various strategies—successful or failed—for responding to them.

Those foundations which have supported research and professional training also hold documents that are significant for the intellectual history of particular research fields or professions. The modern philanthropic foundation emerged at a historical moment of great confidence in the benefits to be derived from large-scale investments in research and professional specialization. Whether the field is economics, medicine, law or psychology, American foundations have continued to play a part in shaping research priorities and directing intellectual resources toward particular fields. The record of these changes is often preserved in foundation files, and the vantage point from which foundation officers view these changes is sometimes far better than the perspective derived from the papers of individual researchers or single research institutions.

And in a nation where the boundaries of the public and private sector are murky, the work of foundation-initiated commissions, task forces and other deliberative bodies can give us the first glimpse of new public policy initiatives and of policy options debated and discarded. Foundation records do not simply document the nation's patterns of private beneficence, but rather are a way of understanding the interaction between the public and private sectors in our democracy.

While these arguments for the importance of foundation records are persuasive to historians, they may not prove as compelling to those who work in foundations—the people who must occasionally clear out a file drawer or make space on their office shelves or who perfunctorily decide to toss out their notes on a staff meeting, memoranda on abandoned program areas, or the preliminary correspondence leading up to a proposal. Unconscious managerial behavior as well as conscious organizational decisions come forcefully into play in determining what is kept and what is discarded, as Peter Dobkin Hall's essay elaborates and as the Rockefeller Archive Center's Foundation Survey shows.

What is most striking (and more than a little perplexing), in the very telling evidence from Kenneth W. Rose's account of the foundation archival survey, is how often foundation executives respond to queries about their records by saying that they have no noteworthy documents, that their files are inconsequential, that their work is not historically significant, or that there is nothing historians would likely find of interest. The individual answers might be variously attributed to modesty, evasiveness, poor recordkeeping or ignorance of the significant body of scholarly work drawing on foundation files that has already been published. Collectively, however, the answers suggest a somewhat more troubling attitude among many of the survey respondents. If the records of some of the largest American foundations are not noteworthy or consequential, is it possible that the philanthropic work itself might not be noteworthy or consequential?

It is worrisome enough to historians when records are lost by accident, but it is profoundly more troubling when they are lost because foundation executives so readily deem them insignificant. The answers foundation executives have given to the Archive Center's survey seem to call for a much more explicit rationale for preserving foundation records and for making the documents accessible to future scholars. If such a rationale is to prove persuasive to foundation staff and trustees, it must be rooted, not in the historian's acquisitiveness and hunger for evidence, but in a foundation's understanding of its distinctive mission and purpose as well as in a wider understanding of the role of American philanthropy. The preservation of foundation records and access to them is a matter not merely of administrative or regulatory necessity; rather it must be linked to some of the broader justifications that have been articulated for the role foundations play in American society.

The assumptions that foundations bring to their work have varied over the years and continue to differ from one foundation to the next. The various rationales that have been offered for foundation activities do not need elaboration in this essay. They are familiar to anyone who has explained a foundation program to a potential grantee, argued on behalf of a proposal at a staff or trustee meeting or evaluated a grant application. The broad rationales for philanthropic work include:

1) Advancing knowledge and professional expertise;
2) Building institutions and networks that bridge the gaps and span the interstices of a large, often fragmented nation;
3) Serving as a countervailing force both to the value system that dominates the economic marketplace and the majoritarian values of our governmental institutions;
4) Giving voice and organizational structure to divergent and often unrepresented points of view within a pluralistic society;
5) Providing a special kind of venture capital or social risk capital in which successful returns need not be measured with the fiscal rigor of the capitalist market;
6) Preserving a philanthropy of original intent in which values and ideals expressed by founders and donors can be honored by future generations.

Each of these approaches to philanthropic work has implications for the preservation of records. Each rationale offers clues about the kinds of records that will serve to document philanthropic activities. An initial letter of inquiry in which a scholar attempts an early formulation of an idea and tries to justify financial support for a project by situating it in the context of a given discipline, is not merely extraneous background material preparing the way to a proposal but a document that ultimately can help the foundation and future historians judge philanthropy's role in advancing knowledge. A program officer's file on a new nonprofit organization may be the only place where the pre-history and the early aims of fragile nonprofit entities can survive over the long term. The minutes and correspondence of foundation task forces and commissions can document the interaction of the governmental and private sectors and perhaps tell us about the beginnings of public policy initiatives. Foundation appraisals of their program or surveys of work in particular academic or professional fields provide important insights into the uses of professional expertise and the practical applications of knowledge. At times, foundations have also become the repositories of material on founders and their families, inadvertently holding evidence which can be of value in understanding not only individual charitable motivations but also the broader complex of philanthropic intentions in our society.

As institutions operating on the boundaries between knowledge and action and between public and private sectors, foundations offer a vantage point from which to view changes in our intellectual life and political culture. Like any group on or near a boundary, however, they are vulnerable. Their role is easily misunderstood. The continued well-being of foundations depends on how well understood their activities are by policymakers and the public. Perhaps the most persuasive argument for the importance of foundation archives is that the documents they contain are the means of evaluating and judging what American philanthropy has accomplished.

Indeed, since the opening of the Rockefeller Archive Center and the individual archives of several other large foundations, the scholarly understanding of American philanthropy has grown considerably. New means for judging the accomplishments of foundations—and improving their long-term performance—are at hand when scholars have access to and can compare the records of a number of the nation's foundations.

Only ten years from the approach of a new millenium, the theme of judgment—without stirring millenial tremors of fear or trumpeting crackpot apocalyptic warning—is appropriate. The question, if there is a Judgment Day, is this: How will the role of philanthropy in American society be perceived 100, 500 or 1000 years from now? What will shape the ultimate evaluation (a term more suited to our contemporary professional sensibilities) of the role of foundations and nonprofit institutions in American life?

To answer these questions we might want to look back 500 or 1000 years and ask how medieval and early modern charity have been perceived by historians and to examine the kinds of records that have shaped their interpretations. In doing so, it is useful to keep in mind that charity as a religious concept and animating ideal of medieval life was far more central to the culture of Western Europe than philanthropy and voluntarism are today. The great foundations of the past—the great endowed institutions—the monasteries of the early Middle Ages, the hospitals and urban religious establishments of the later Middle Ages—have each left behind bodies of written materials. The very simplicity of words etched into parchment surfaces by sharp quills dipped into enduring inks assures that documents are legible centuries later. But by what kinds of documents are charitable activities and institutional practices known?

Institutional records consist primarily of account books, especially accounts receivable, copies of wills in which gifts have been left to an institution, deeds of property, and rules and regulations, usually redactions of monastic rules. The documents preserved are of enduring legal and financial significance; patterns emerge from studying them, but they often reduce charity to legal formulae and fiscal routine. It is the rare document in an institutional archive that gives a clue about decisionmaking or daily life. Those insights often emerge from documents that have been preserved by state, usually municipal authorities. Records of trials regarding disputed property rights, unruly hospital inhabitants or lepers wanting to be freed from leprosaria are exciting compared to the stacks of wills and deeds. Indeed, the richest documents to survive are often a part of the public legal record, providing views of charitable institutions struggling with extreme circumstances.

By what evidence will the work of twentieth century philanthropy be judged? How will the place of the nonprofit sector in American society be assessed? If past survivals of records are a clue, we can be sure that the fiscal and legal documents filed with government agencies will endure as will the accounts of the most controversial and exceptional moments in an institution's life. But the more telling record of deeds attempted and done will only be available to future generations if those who now labor in foundations understand the importance of history's evaluation, are convinced that their work matters enough to be worthy of a future generation's judgment, and act to preserve the documents that tell their story.

Institutional records consist primarily of account books, especially accounts receivable, copies of wills in which gifts have been left to an institution, deeds of property, and rules and regulations, usually collections of monastic rules. The documents preserved are of enduring legal and financial significance; patterns emerge from studying them, but they often reduce charity to legal formulae and fiscal routine. It is the rare document in an institutional archive that gives a clue about decision-making or daily life. Those insights often emerge from documents that have been preserved by state, usually municipal authorities. Records of trials regarding disputed property rights, unruly hospital inhabitants or lepers waiting to be freed from leprosaria are exciting compared to the stacks of wills and deeds. Indeed, the richest documents to survive are often a part of the public legal record, providing views of charitable institutions struggling with extreme circumstances.

By what evidence will the work of twentieth century philanthropy be judged? How will the place of the nonprofit sector in American society be assessed? If past survivals of records are a guide, we can be sure that the fiscal and legal documents filed with government agencies will endure as will the accounts of the most controversial and exceptional moments in an institution's life. But the more telling record of deeds attempted and done will only be available to future generations if those who now labor in foundations understand the importance of history's evaluation, are convinced that their work matters enough to be worthy of a future generation's judgment, and act to preserve the documents that tell their story.

Paper Ephemera: Managers, Policymakers, Scholars and the Future of Philanthropy

By Peter Dobkin Hall

Towards a Rationale for Foundation Records Management

Records management in foundations is generally treated as a support issue. It is seldom viewed as having any relationship to foundations' substantive grantmaking activities, nor is it thought to have much bearing on either internal managerial and governance issues or external concerns of regulation and legitimacy. This paper will suggest that what records are kept and who has access to them has important bearing on what foundations do, how they do it and by whom it is done—as well as on how those actions are viewed and interpreted by those outside the organization.

Ideally, it ought to be possible to address decisions about records management in terms of a relatively simple set of questions: What records are needed to serve a foundation's own reference needs? What records are foundations legally required to retain? Who should have access to foundation records? What formats will best serve these needs? What will it cost?

The problem is that the answers to even these simple questions contain judgments about a foundation's purpose, its mission and goals, its allocation of power between both board and staff, and within staff, and its accountability to external constituencies. How these questions are answered may not only reflect the character of the foundation as an organization, but may also, if made in an uninformed way, profoundly impact its purposes and processes in the future.

There is always a choice of yardsticks to use in measuring performance. Each one involves a different configuration of power within the organization, as well as different postures in regard to external constituencies. The value of each, moreover, may depend on the age of an organization: performance measures suitable to a start-up organization, where expectations are relatively unformed and consensus relatively strong, may not be appropriate at later points. Their value also obviously depends on the kinds of needs being served, which may change over time, either due to the success of the foundation's activities or for other reasons.

The capacity to make intelligent choices about yardsticks—about a foundation's mission and objectives—depends in large measure on whether it has the capacity, in terms of a coherent and accessible record of its own activities, to reflect on itself. Ultimately, effective management depends not only on the managers' judgment, character and technical competence, but also on the body of information available to help them understand their organization and their role in it, as well as the organization's position in the external environment.

Thus, to say that records management policies must be weighted in terms of their "costs and benefits" begs the question—what is in the "best interest" of a foundation? Merely raising the issue suggests a range of uncertainties about who should determine such policies, what the foundation's purposes are and the relative importance of various internal and external stakeholders in its activities.

Resolving these uncertainties is likely to be especially difficult for independent grantmaking foundations, where costs and benefits cannot be weighed in terms of profits, attracting capital or customer satisfaction. For grantmakers, the calculus of costs and benefits is framed by their charters, by the regulatory environment, by public opinion, and, ultimately, by assessing whether their projects and programs are making an impact on the problems to which they are addressed.

Changing Foundations, Changing Information Needs

The extensive literature on foundations produced over the past thirty years tells us a great deal about what they are and what they do, but curiously little about how they actually operate. Despite all the rhetoric about philanthropic professionalization, as well as some promising proto-professional activities, including the formation of regional associations of grantmakers, there really is no foundation management literature comparable to the case studies, empirically-based analyses and theoretical reflections on organizational processes of public agency management. This literature, which has focued increasingly on organizations as information systems and on the role of executives as information managers, has important bearing on records management and its place in the managerial process.

While foundation staffers increasingly consider themselves professionals, they seldom think of themselves as managers. Generally recruited from the worlds of academia and social service, few have received formal managerial training, nor have foundation trade publications (in contrast to trade publications in other nonprofits fields) partaken in any obvious way of the mainstream public and private management literature. As a result, grantmakers have tended to remain relatively unsophisticated in their thinking about the role of information, current or retained, in the managerial process.

Though philanthropy itself boasts an ancient lineage, the vast majority of American foundations—some 77 percent, in fact—were created since 1950.[1] The newness of foundations has important managerial implications, particularly with regard to the continuity of their missions and purposes.[2] This, in turn, has significant bearing on their capacity to formulate goals and objectives. Almost every foundation starts out being governed by individuals—donors, trustees and staffs—who share a common sense of purpose. But when those who shared in the founding vision die and are replaced by individuals with different viewpoints and values, confusion and conflict over a foundation's mission and goals is bound to occur.

The changing nature of foundation management has accelerated this process. As professionalization has led to the development of a career-orientation among foundation managers, staff turnover has increased dramatically. According to the *1988 Foundation Management Report*, half the CEOs of responding foundations had held their positions for less than five years—and 19 percent had held their positions for less than two. Though the report notes that 27 percent of these individuals had been promoted from within, the fact that nearly three-quarters of them were outsiders to their organizations offers compelling evidence of future problems in maintaining continuity. Unfortunately the report offers no information on board turnover. Nonetheless, it seems inevitable that this too will increase with the passage of time.[3]

Information and Uncertainty

Demographic changes among foundation staffs and governing boards—whether involving temporal distance from the donor, increasing board and staff turnover or growing staff professionalism—inevitably produce uncertainty and conflict over a foundation's mission and goals. External changes, including changing public needs and expectations, as well as more exacting regulatory oversight, introduce further uncertainties. One response to this has been increasing foundation interest in planning, evaluation and self-assessment.[4]

Evaluation, assessment and planning procedures which originated in business have been adapted to operating nonprofits—both of which are dependent on external resources (capital/grants and contracts/donations, sales/user fees, customers/clients) for their survival.[5] Though originally envisioned as methods for enabling organizations to adapt to changing external environments, critical examination of how these procedures actually operate has led us to understand them as strategies affecting the flow and interpretation of information.[6] Rather then offering "objective" and "rational" criteria for assessing past performance or for projecting future activities, evaluation, assessment and planning procedures are now understood to have an essentially political function, constituting "an interpretive framework that allows the organization to be understood by its internal and external stakeholders."[7] This, in turn, forms a consensual or coalitional basis for the allocation of responsibility, resources and accountability.

Conventional evaluation, assessment and planning procedures were designed to serve the needs of resource-dependent organizations that are revenue maximizers, defining their relation to their environments by adjusting income to expenditures through efficient and effective use of resources. Foundations, on the other hand, are *legitimacy* maximizers. The forces to which they are most subject do not involve sufficiency of financial resources. They involve internal agreement on mission, objectives, goals and programs and seeking congruence between those internal agreements and the expectations of external constituencies—government agencies, legislators, the courts, the press, professional and trade associations, scholars, donees. When resource-dependent organizations do not operate efficiently or effectively, they are likely to either fail or reorganize. When foundations do not effectively or efficiently manage legitimacy, they are likely first to undergo internal conflict and, ultimately, to come to the attention of courts and regulatory agencies.

Managing Legitimately

In such a setting, evaluation, assessment and planning procedures obviously have to be implemented in a very different way. They may have in common the goal of generating shared understanding among internal and external stakeholders, but the information out of which such understandings are constructed may be significantly different. Particularly important for a foundation is the nature of its charter instrument. Business corporations and operating nonprofits enjoy almost unrestricted freedom to alter their charters, but this is not the case for all foundations. For foundations formed as trusts, the charter is more than a contract between living members of a corporation. It is a trust instrument which imposes enforceable obligations to fulfill the intentions of their founders. If these intentions can not be fulfilled, trustees are not free to alter them at will. They are required to ask the courts for guidance in reinterpreting their purposes. Even in foundations whose purposes are open-ended injunctions to act "for the benefit of mankind," administrators and trustees have generally been attentive to the kind of benefactions favored by donors during their lifetimes.

With the passage of time, as donors and their associates die, as public needs change and as management becomes increasingly professionalized, the interpretation of charter purposes is bound to become more problematic, involving greater uncertainty and greater potential for conflict among trustees, between board and staff, and between the foundation and external stakeholders. As this happens, foundations are likely to turn increasingly to formal evaluation, assessment and planning procedures. But as they do so, they are bound to encounter the inability of these procedures to factor in divergent interpretations of charter purpose. This is no small matter because of the legal force of foundation charters and because of the standing of a variety of constituencies, internal and external, to compel judicial review of the actions of trustees and managers in carrying out their obligations under these instruments. As proceedings like those involving the Buck Trust suggest, the court may devote considerable attention to issues that seem essentially historical in nature.[8]

Businesses and operating nonprofits can depend primarily on opinion research to define and prioritize stakeholder interests. But the interpretive framework within which internal and external stakeholders of a foundation shape their understanding of its mission and objectives is uniquely constrained by the past. As charitable trustees, they are legally bound by the documentary records of their organization's activities, within which are embedded the motives and intentions of a foundation's donor and his successors and agents.

Conflict, Uncertainty and the Politics of Information

As foundations mature organizationally, it seems inevitable that their trustees and managers will encounter greater uncertainty about their missions, goals and objectives. The greater the uncertainty about these central concerns, the greater the likelihood of conflict between stakeholders and the greater the likelihood that they will look to objectively verifiable evidence to settle these disputes. In such conflicted settings, especially where their awareness of their organization's past is weak and where records are inaccessible or unavailable, control of retained information—the power to define the significant events in the organization's past and, in effect, to define its purposes—may assume considerable tactical importance.[9] Acknowledging the control of such records as instruments of power in organizations, two leading management scholars only half-humorously suggested that:

> minutes should be written long enough after the event as to legitimize the reality of forgetfulness. They should be written in such a way as to lay the basis for subsequent independent action. In general, participants in the organization should be assisted in their desire to have unambiguous actions taken today derived from the ambiguous decisions of yesterday with a minimum of pain to their images of organizational rationality and a minimum of claims on their time. The model of consistency is maintained by a creative resolution of uncertainty about the past.[10]

Quite clearly, each foundation constituency has its own stake in retained information, as well as its own capacity to enforce its claims to access organizational records.[11] The information needs of internal constituencies vary according to their function in the organization. Normally, staff may only be concerned with convenience, in particular the extent to which records enable them to do their jobs more effectively and efficiently. But in a situation of conflict, they may also view records as means of documenting their contributions to the organization, which in turn may serve to legitimize their claims as stakeholders in its programs and policies. In addition, as staff become more professionalized and career-minded, they develop an interest in the completeness and accessibility of records to the extent that they play a role in documenting their professional achievements and facilitating either promotion within the organization or movement into better positions elsewhere.

Another aspect of the status of retained records in regard to managerial professionalization involves the autonomy of management. Normally speaking, the central task of managers is to control and interpret the flow of information between the organization and its external environment and among internal constituencies, including the board. This not only provides managers with the capacity to evaluate the performance of other employees and to assess programs, projects, overall organizational performance, but also, in doing so, to set the policy options presented to the foundation's trustees. In a conflicted setting, what information is retained and who has access to it may have considerable bearing on the outcome of conflicts between managers and their boards.

The information needs of trustees are both comprehensive and limited. As the group bearing ultimate legal responsibility for a foundation's activities, trustees should have access to all information, retained or current. On the other hand, from a practical standpoint, exercising such a prerogative would fatally impair managerial effectiveness. Trustees also generate information—particularly materials having to do with personnel decisions and deliberations about recruiting fellow boardmembers—which cannot, for practical reasons, be included among a foundation's official records, but which nonetheless may have crucial bearing on interpreting its mission and goals. Normally, neither managers or trustees have any compelling reason to transgress these domains of information—but in situations of conflict, they may seek to do so.

Certain external constituencies—regulatory agencies, legislatures and the courts—have legal authority to enforce their information needs on foundations. Others, such as professional and trade associations, may have only moral authority to do so. The general public, the press, scholars and grantees have neither legal nor moral authority to view foundation records. Nonetheless, because of the peculiar legal status of foundations as tax-exempt charitable trusts and corporations, they cannot be excluded as parties interested in the retention and accessibility of foundation records.

Normally, the claims of external constituencies on retained foundation records are of little significance, consisting of little more than expecting routine public listing of grants. In situations of conflict however, external constituencies' claims may be far-reaching. For example, when the Cox Committee investigated foundations in 1952, it required those with assets exceeding $10 million to respond to a 90-item questionnaire which, among other things, asked the respondents to list those institutions, operating agencies, publications, specific projects and individuals that had received grants from foundations, and the amounts and years and nature of such grants since 1935. "For the larger foundations," as Emerson Andrews noted, "replies grew to book size (Henry Allen Moe's response for the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation ran to 329 pages)."[12]

These questions were relatively simple and, indeed, if asked today could be answered with little difficulty, since the kinds of issues that concerned the Cox Committee ended up being embodied to a large extent in the regular annual reporting requirements imposed by the 1969 Tax Act. But one can imagine more difficult kinds of questions being asked—questions unanswerable by the minimal records retention requirements of current regulations. What if congressional committees became interested in decisionmaking processes within foundations, issues that could only be engaged through administrative memoranda, phone-logs, appointment books, correspondence and successive drafts of policy documents? That Congress might be interested in materials of this kind might seem incredible—but, from the standpoint of foundation watchers before 1952, so did the idea that the government might demand a full accounting of their grantmaking activity.

Conclusion

Quite clearly, information is powerful stuff. Control of information and access to information plays a crucial role in shaping the configuration of power within organizations, as well as profoundly influencing the outcome of internal conflicts. Because of the peculiar character of foundation charter instruments and because of the peculiarities of foundations as legitimacy maximizers, retained records may be even more important, not only in resolving internal conflicts, but also in influencing the outcome of regulatory, investigative and judicial interventions in foundation practices and policies.

If both internal and external constituencies have vital stakes in preserving and accessing foundation records and if, as I have tried to suggest, control of such information constitutes a critical dimension of power in and over organizations, it follows that records management policies need to be framed in the broadest term—with a view not only to their immediate dollar costs, but in terms of managerial effectiveness, trustee responsibility and organizational survival.

Implicit in this formulation is the likelihood that records management policies will tend to be determined by the interests of whomever happens to be in control of the organization at any given time. As Elizabeth McCormack has noted with regard to foundation self-evaluation efforts, "self-evaluation is difficult; self-deception is easy."[13] Thus for some grantmakers, it may be difficult to resist the urge to adopt selective and restrictive records management policies, saving only the files that the law and executive convenience require and severely limiting access to them (this is the practice followed by the vast majority of American foundations).[14] But, as suggested by Richard Nixon's missing 18 minutes of tape, Ollie North's deleted files and the "lost" Atomic Energy Commission's records of radiation-caused disabilities, there may be limitations to this approach.[15] Pragmatically, it is nearly impossible to destroy information once it has been created and begins to move through an organization, because for each person who has a stake in destroying or suppressing information, there are always others who have a stake in its preservation. Destroying or unreasonably restricting access to information can be powerfully delegitimating for any organization. For foundations, which are legitimacy-maximizers, the consequences could be devastating.

Records retention should be as inclusive as possible not only to enhance the overall legitimacy of foundations in the public policy arena, but, more importantly and immediately, to enhance their effectiveness and to resolve the conflicts of mission and goals that seem likely to become more frequent and intense as donors die and staffs become more professional.

There is a great deal that we do not know about foundations. Building a body of information about them to enhance their capacity to recognize their common political interests and, subsequently, to frame those interests in the language and concerns of contemporary public policy, has come slowly, painfully, and—almost invariably—only after the occurrence of outbursts of regulatory enthusiasm.[16] Although surveys of foundation archival practices reveal a distressingly widespread indifference to the usefulness of such records, there are encouraging signs, especially among the larger and better managed foundations, of a willingness to forearm themselves against internal and external crises, recognizing that their resolution will be profoundly shaped by the comprehensiveness and accessibility of the records they have kept.

Author's Note: The research on which this essay is based was made possible by the generous support of the Lilly Endowment and the Program on Non-Profit Organizations, Yale University. I am grateful to Sara Engelhardt, Richard Magat, Ken Rose, James Smith, Darwin Stapleton, Melissa Middleton Stone and Miriam Wood for their comments on various drafts of this essay and to D. Susan Wisely and Robert W. Lynn for acquainting me with the problems of foundation self-evaluation.

NOTES

[1]Tables in the 11th Edition of the *Foundation Directory* show that of the 5,148 Directory foundations established before 1986, 3,959 were established after 1950. *Foundation Directory*, 11th ed. (New York: The Foundation Center, 1987), p. viii.

[2]On the strains which maturation puts on the ability of organizations to define their missions and goals, see Dennis N.T. Perkins, et al., *Managing Creation: The Challenge of Building a New Organization* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984); Walter W. Powell and Rebecca Friedkin, "Organizational Change in Nonprofit Organizations," in W.W. Powell, ed., *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), pp. 180–194; and Miriam M. Wood, *The Governing Board's Existential Quandry*, Working Paper #143, Program on Non-Profit Organizations, Yale University (1989).

[3]Elizabeth T. Boris and Deborah Brody, *1988 Foundation Management Report* (Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundations, 1988), p. 74. See also Teresa Jean Odendahl, Elizabeth Trocolli Boris and Arlene Daniels, *Working in Foundations* (New York: The Foundation Center, 1985).

[4]No foundation has reflected more conscientiously on the problem of self-evaluation than the Lilly Endowment. See Lilly Endowment, Inc., *Evaluation Notebook* (Indianapolis: Lilly Endowment, Inc., 1989). I am grateful to D. Susan Wisely for sharing this important document with me, as well as two important background memoranda relating to the Endowment's own self-evaluation process, "Invitation to Reflection" and "An Introduction to Foundation Evaluation." Lilly's unique approach to this problem owes a great deal to the business tradition of self-assessment, which is grounded in the critical management literature. Robert Greenleaf, who, as a consultant, played a key role in shaping Lilly's policies, had been head of personnel management at AT&T. AT&T's executive cadre in the days when Greenleaf was active there included Chester Barnard, whose *Functions of the Executive* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938) is generally regarded as the basis of modern organization and management theory.

[5]See Kanter and Sommers, in W.W. Powell, *op. cit.*, pp. 154–166.

[6]On the analysis of organizations as information systems, see Richard L. Daft and Karl E. Weick, "Toward a Model of Organizations as Interpretation Systems," *Academy of Management Review* 9: 2 (1984) and Jeffrey Pfeffer and Gerald Salancik, *The External Control of Organizations* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), particularly their chapter entitled "The Organizational Environment and How It Is Known," pp. 62–91.

[7]On planning as an interpretive and essentially political process, see Jane Covey and L. David Brown, "Beyond Strategic Planning: Strategic Decisions in Nonprofit Organizations," Working Paper #5, Institute for Development Research, Boston (1985) and Melissa Middleton, "Planning as Strategy: The Logic, Symbol, and Politics of Planning in Nonprofit Organizations" (unpublished dissertation, School of Organization and Management, Yale University, 1989). Another valuable set of insights on this is John W. Meyer and W. Richard Scott, *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983).

[8]On the role which historical issues played in the Buck Trust case, see *University of San Francisco Law Review* 21: 4 (Summer 1989), pp. 585–762.

[9]On the significance of records and recordkeeping formats on the internal politics of organizations, see David J. Cooper, David Hayes, and Frank Wolfe, "Accounting in Organized Anarchies: Understanding and Designing Accounting Systems in Ambiguous Situtations," *Accounting, Organizations, and Society* 6: 3 (1981); Regina Herzlinger, "Advantages of Fund Accounting in Nonprofits," *Harvard Business Review* (May/June 1980); and M. Lynne Markus and Jeffrey Pfeffer, "Power and the Design and Implementation of Accounting and Control Systems," *Accounting, Organizations, and Society* 8: 2/3 (1983).

[10]Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974), pp. 214–215.

[11]On the politics of information and its role in shaping the politics of governing boards, see Clayton Alderfer, "The Invisible Director on Corporate Boards," *Harvard Business Review* (November/December, 1986) and Peter Dobkin Hall, "Conflicting Managerial Cultures in Nonprofit Organizations," *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* (forthcoming).

[12]F. Emerson Andrews, *Foundation Watcher* (Lancaster, Pa.: Franklin & Marshall College, 1973), p. 134.

[13]Elizabeth McCormack, "Looking Back to Look Forward," keynote address delivered at the annual meeting of Independent Sector, Houston, Texas, October 23, 1988. I am grateful to Ms. McCormack for providing me with her text.

[14]Kenneth W. Rose, "The State of Foundation Archives: Results from the Rockefeller Archive Center's Survey of the Thousand Largest American Foundations," paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists, St. Louis, October 18, 1989. See also Paul Ylvisaker, "Today's Administrative Memo Is Tomorrow's Historical Document," *Foundation News* (March/April, 1978) and Charles T. Morrissey, "Ideas and Creative Philanthropy: Does Grant Making Have a Life of the Mind?" *Foundation News* (March/April, 1979).

[15]See Clifford T. Honicker, "The Hidden Files," *New York Times Magazine* (November 19, 1989).

[16]Recent congressional inquiries into the procedures of scientific research, as well as recent court decisions on the confidentiality of university tenure decisions, suggest that governmental interest in organizational processes is likely to increase in the near future.

II
Experiences in Creating Foundation Archives

The State of Foundation Archives: Results From the Rockefeller Archive Center's Survey

By Kenneth W. Rose

During the past fifteen years, both scholars and people working in what has become known as the "third sector" have become increasingly interested in the role and history of philanthropy and nonprofit institutions in American life. This interest is manifest in the growing number of publications in the field; in the development of centers for the study of philanthropy at such academic institutions as the City University of New York, Indiana University, Case Western Reserve University and Duke University; and by the appearance of *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, a newspaper serving the philanthropic community. Along with this growing interest in the history of philanthropy has developed, albeit more slowly, an interest and concern with preserving foundation records, necessary for accurately documenting the role and impact of philanthropy.

The Historical Value of Foundation Records

Foundations are a unique part of the nonprofit world, providing the money needed to maintain and support many institutions, including research centers in science and public policy, organizational advocates for particular causes and issues, social service agencies, hospitals, symphony orchestras, universities, libraries, museums, and, on occasion, archives. Foundation records often contain not only information about the internal workings of the foundation itself, but also important and often difficult to find information about a variety of other institutions and organizations, many of which wither away in a few year's time without leaving any paper trail of their own. Since applicants for financial support have to explain their backgrounds and needs to funders, foundation records are often rich in the details of the histories of other organizations.

James A. Smith, a leading historian of the nonprofit sector and public policy, recently described three areas in which he finds foundation records to be of value. First, foundation archives "are virtually the only repository of material about the most fragile and ephemeral organizations that comprise the nation's nonprofit sector, the movements and causes that have not succeeded or that once flourished briefly and have faded from the scene." Secondly, the exchanges between nonprofit organizations and foundation staff collected in foundation archives document "how strategies for effecting social change have evolved."

Thirdly, "to the extent that foundations have encouraged research and professional training, their records are also a place where policy ideas and initiatives (and the people who will bring them about) can often first be glimpsed."[1]

Dr. Smith's categories illustrate the usefulness of the records of foundations active at the national level. Yet most foundations operate more regionally or locally, and at this level philanthropy and foundations play perhaps an even greater role in policy development and institutional support. As an editor of the *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (1987) and the author of a doctoral dissertation about race relations and social reform in Cleveland after World War II, I have found philanthropic records of double value in studying the history of the Cleveland community. First, both local and national foundations have made grants to Cleveland-area organizations, and the records of these grants in these foundations' archives provided documentation of the development of particular institutions, many of which we often take for granted, such as nursing homes and cultural organizations, and for which other documentation was scant. Secondly, the internal correspondence, reports and meeting notes in these foundations' archives greatly enhanced my understanding of how local civic leaders and foundation officials used philanthropy to try to cope with social changes during the 1950s and 1960s.[2]

The Rockefeller Archive Center Survey

The largest and richest single gathering of foundation records is located at the Rockefeller Archive Center in North Tarrytown, New York, which was founded as a division of The Rockefeller University in 1974 to bring together the archives of the Rockefeller family, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and The Rockefeller University. In recent years the records of two notable non-Rockefeller philanthropies have been donated to the Archive Center, giving the Center the archives of seven of the nation's leading foundations. In addition to the archives of its founding institutions—the Rockefeller Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund—the Archive Center now houses the archives of the Commonwealth Fund, the China Medical Board of New York, the Russell Sage Foundation, Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc. and the Rockefeller Family Fund.

Because of its position as the major repository of foundation records and the presence on its Governing Council of historians and foundation officials who are leaders in the promotion of philanthropic history, the Archive Center has sought to encourage other foundations to preserve their records and make them available to researchers. In 1987–1988, the Center undertook a survey of the thousand largest American foundations to assess to what extent foundations were preserving their records and granting access to scholars.[3] The survey revealed the not-so-surprising fact that only a limited number of foundations have deposited their records in archives or have established on-site archives, as the Ford Foundation and the MacArthur Foundation have done. More surprising, however, given all that we had been told prior to our survey about how secretive foundations are, many foundations expressed a willingness to make material available to researchers.

Survey Methods and Results

In early 1988, the Archive Center sent a five-page questionnaire to the thousand largest foundations according to the Foundation Center's 1987 ranking by assets. This group included private foundations active nationally and internationally, corporate foundations, community foundations, and small foundations active in restricted local communities. The largest foundation surveyed was the nation's largest, the Ford Foundation, with $4.76 billion in assets and total giving in 1986 of $169.7 million. The smallest foundations included in our survey had assets of $10.7 million. For purposes of comparison, the foundations in the middle of the Foundation Center's 1987 ranking had assets of about $23.2 million.[4]

The first mailing, sent out in January 1988, produced 256 responses, and a second mailing to nonrespondents in July 1988 eventually increased the total number of responses to the survey to 394, or 39.4 percent. As one might expect, the largest foundations responded in greater numbers than did those with small or no staff. Of the top 500 foundations, 225 responded (45 percent rate of return; 57.1 percent of all respondents), and 169 of the second tier of 500 responded (33.8 percent rate of return; 42.9 percent of all respondents). (See Table 1 for a summary of the results of the survey, and Table 2 for a tabulation of responses by foundation size.)

Not all respondents completed the survey, however; some chose to reply with letters, which we culled for applicable information and have included in the totals that follow. These letters sometimes were form letters declining to participate in the survey, but others were more substantive. Indeed, many of the letters offered insight into and explanations of the kinds of responses we received to survey questions, revealing the ideas, attitudes and practices of foundation officials who have responsibility for their organization's records.

The survey questionnaire first asked respondents to tell us a little about the foundation's history—its founding date, its historical areas of funding, its geographic service area and any particularly important funding restrictions—which we thought would be important to researchers using *The Availability of Foundation Records: A Guide for Researchers*, which includes the responses we were granted permission to publish.[5] These questions were followed by the heart of the survey, a series of questions about the records and researcher access.

Archival Issues

Of the 394 respondents, only 43 (10.9 percent) had deposited their records in a library or archives or had established their own archives on site. By far the largest number of these—32 (74.4 percent)—were among the largest 500 foundations and 14 of them were among the top 100. Twenty-three foundations reported that they were considering a future deposit of their materials. In terms of managing their records, however, the responses were somewhat more encouraging. More than a third of the respondents (140, or 35.5 percent) reported that they had archival or records management policies and procedures in place, and another 42 (10.6 percent) had such measures under consideration. Again, more than half (84, or 60 percent) of the foundations with formal policies for handling their records were among the top 500 foundations. But only 50 foundations employed someone who was trained in archival practice, records management or library science. By and large then, the fate of these records is in the hands of staff who lack professional training in this area.

Despite the lack of professional records management or archival training by foundation staff, an encouragingly significant number of foundations were able to describe clearly the types of records maintained by the foundation. More than 300 of the 394 responding foundations completed a table indicating what records existed in the office files, indicating an awareness of the variety of records maintained and an ability to gain access to them (See Table 3). Not surprisingly, some foundations were able to complete the table in more detail than were others.

Alarming Reports on Preservation

While the figures themselves on records management and archival policies might be encouraging, the correspondence from foundation officials describing their policies and practices was most alarming. It often revealed an emphasis on the most negative side of records management: the wholesale destruction of files according to perceived current needs, the requirements of law and IRS regulations, with an eye always on the budget. "We only keep subject files for three years," wrote the executive director of one of the top 100 foundations. "We strive to keep paperwork to a minimum at all times," wrote the leader of a foundation ranked in the 500s, "and we review and strip our files annually following the Internal Revenue Service Records Retention Guidelines. Our goal is to concentrate on the current operation and support worthy grant requests as we are able." Another foundation distinguished between "significant long term grantees," whose files are kept "for an indefinite period," and other grantees, whose "detailed" files are "consolidat[ed], cull[ed], and eliminat[ed] . . . four years after the termination of the most recent grant." The president of a mid-size corporate foundation noted that his organization does "not keep detailed data beyond the three years required and many of the requests are never filed if we do not expect to need the data at a later time."

Most revealing was a letter from the president of a 40 year old family foundation active in funding environmental projects, who reported:

> We keep our financial records for whatever length of time the regulatory authorities require, at which point we dispose of them. Other records are kept for three or four years and then are disposed of.
>
> On those odd occasions when we may want to refer to something further back than that, we will go to one of our grant recipients to see if they have the material we are looking for in their files and if not, we just forget it.
>
> I can't honestly say that this has ever inconvenienced us or those that we have supported.

If this operating procedure and the attitudes behind it are widespread in the foundation community, a precious record of philanthropic activity is being irretrievably lost. Those of us concerned with promoting the orderly preservation of philanthropic records clearly have a great deal to do to educate major segments of the foundation world about the value and importance of archives.

Researcher Access

The survey results demonstrate that policies for researcher access to foundation records vary widely. Materials at the Rockefeller Archive Center are generally open to qualified scholars, although some limitations have been defined by the donors. Rockefeller Foundation records are open after twenty years, for example, and Rockefeller Brothers Fund grant files are open after ten years. Our survey showed that only 46 foundations (11.7 percent), including those whose records are at the Archive Center, reported that their records are open to researchers. Nearly twice as many—86 (21.8 percent)—reported that their records are closed to researchers. Significantly, more than half of the respondents—203 (51.5 percent)—said they would be willing to make material available to researchers on a case-by-case basis. While this admittedly gives foundations a great deal of latitude in deciding who gets access and who does not, this was one of the surprises of the survey. Taken together with those foundations with open records, it means that nearly two-thirds of the respondents (249 or 63.2 percent) will provide some access to researchers. Along similar lines, when we asked whether the foundation staff was willing to help researchers answer questions about the foundation, 289 (73.3 percent) said they were.

Reasons for Restricted Access

In explaining refusals or reluctance to grant access to researchers, foundation officials repeated several themes. One was the small size of the staff and the necessary limitations this imposed on the foundation's ability to provide assistance and access to researchers. One foundation ranked in the 600s noted that, "to preserve the maximum dollars for charity," it operated without a fulltime staff, and the two trustees who handle its grantmaking and administration "feel under a heavy duty to focus [their] time . . . for charitable purposes." Many foundations cited the small size of staffs—if, in fact, there is any staff at all—as the reason why material was not available to scholars. Even foundations willing to provide access on a case-by-case basis argued that the amount of staff time required to help the researcher would determine which researchers would be given access.

Another reason given for not providing access regarded the youthful age of the foundation. "We are only a four-year-old community foundation" with small assets, wrote one official. "Our information is not very extensive as of yet" and "we have yet to develop a policy on preservation of our records." Indeed, there is reason to believe that there is a natural evolution that occurs within some foundations that gradually promotes the development of records management policies and, perhaps ultimately, archival policies. One of the ten largest foundations maintains good "working files," according to one official, but these have not yet "taken on the majesty of an archives." This official indicated that the "archivization" of its records was a step that would be taken at some future date. Wrote another foundation president, "We would prefer to reach at least our twenty-fifth year before opening what archival material is now in the file."

Other foundations deny access to researchers because of their desire to avoid publicity. "Our trustees prefer that we do not publicize or discuss the foundation methods or practices in grantmaking," wrote the executive director of one the nation's top 100 foundations. This inclination to work behind the scenes with little or no publicity is probably representative of many of the foundations that did not respond to our survey.

Some foundations have a reasoned argument for denying access, believing their records to be confidential contracts with individual recipients of aid. Many foundations that provide fellowships to researchers or scholarships to students consider material related to this support to be confidential. The president of a foundation devoted to providing scholarships for women mentioned "the confidentiality of our case files," but recognized that this was only one aspect—albeit a major one—of the organization's records. One of the top 200 foundations, whose grants consist solely of fellowships, considers all of its material confidential, but will permit scholars to look at particular files "if they obtain permission from the persons involved (or their heirs or executors)."

A Perception of Insignificance

The responses which indicated a perception that the foundation's records are insignificant present more of a problem for both historians and archivists to address. Some foundation officials were rather disparaging toward the value of their records, and, apparently, of the importance of their own work. "I do not believe the foundation's records would be sufficiently noteworthy for your purposes," wrote an official of a foundation in the top 900. The phrase "sufficiently noteworthy" was repeated in several letters. An official of a foundation ranked among the top 200 argued that his foundation's records "are so limited as to be of little interest or use to . . . researchers." Occasionally this perception of insignificance stemmed from the fact that files are routinely discarded. The executive director of one of the top 100 foundations noted that his organization keeps its subject files for only three years, and understandably added, "I doubt that historians would find much here of interest."

Waiting for Clio

While a significant number of foundation officials indicated their own view that their records were not important, responses to our survey also showed that the foundation community for the most part has yet to receive any indication from the scholarly community that these materials are important, useful or valuable. When asked about policies on researcher access, many foundations responded that they had never received an inquiry about access to their records and had not established a policy relative to this issue. "We've never been asked," was a common response. "In the 21 years I have been handling the foundation's records," wrote the president of one corporate foundation ranked in the 400s, "the only requests for access have been from the IRS and they were not scholarly." This lack of scholarly interest in these records is most dangerous at the local and regional level, where limited staff for administrative recordkeeping and the present-mindedness of foundation officials are most likely to lead to the destruction of records. Where financial resources for administration and staff are viewed as extremely limited, scholarly interest could serve as a countervailing force to prevent destruction of records.

Conclusion

Various pressures on larger, national foundations, including requests from scholars and the concerns of historically-minded colleagues in the philanthropic community, will help promote systematic recordkeeping and preservation of records. But it is with those foundations closely tied to a corporation, a family or a single individual, active in one locality or a region, that historians, archivists and members of the foundation community interested in preserving the rich history of American philanthropy must be most active to promote preservation. For these foundations, especially in their early years when the institutional memory is not an item of concern, we should undertake educational and promotional efforts so that future executive directors will not report, as one did to us, "our records of past grants are spotty at best and in a great many cases nonexistent."

Since 1987, when planning began for the Archive Center's survey, there have seen signs that such educational and promotional efforts are beginning, especially within the foundation community among such organizations as the Council on Foundations and the Foundation Center. Indeed, an increasing number of foundations have expressed an interest in depositing their records in archives. When the Field Foundation went out of existence, for example, its records went to the University of Texas at Austin, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York recently deposited its archives at Columbia University. One result of our survey has been that several foundations have consulted the Archive Center staff for advice about the deposition of their records, and several more have asked for information about the records management practices of other foundations. We hope that the results of our survey will promote a larger and more systematic campaign within the foundation community and among historians to promote the orderly maintenance, preservation and use of foundation records.

NOTES

[1]James A. Smith, "Resident Scholar's Report: A Year to Marinate," *Rockefeller Archive Center Newsletter*, Summer 1989, p. 4.

[2]David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987); and Kenneth W. Rose, "The Politics of Social Reform in Cleveland, 1945–1967: Civil Rights, Welfare Rights, and the Response of Civic Leaders," Ph.D. dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1988.

[3]The Archive Center's 1987–1988 survey built upon two earlier surveys by the pioneers in the promotion of foundation archives. The first, conducted by Frank Wolling, Manager of Records Management and Library Services at The Rockefeller Foundation, surveyed recordkeeping practices in 25 foundations in 1977. The second survey, in 1985, assessed records preservation and researcher access to the records of the top 100 foundations in the U.S. Conducted by the Rockefeller Archive Center's Director Joseph W. Ernst and Associate Director J. William Hess, in association with Frank Wolling, this effort led to the conception and design of the expanded survey in 1987–1988.

[4]The Foundation Center, "1,000 Largest Foundations by Assets, 1987," Comsearch Printouts number 301 (New York: The Foundation Center, 1987), and *The Foundation Directory* 11th edition (New York: The Foundation Center, 1987.)

[5]*The Availability of Foundation Records: A Guide for Researchers* (North Tarrytown, New York: The Rockefeller Archive Center, 1990). The Center received permission to publish the responses of 196 foundations.

Table 1
Statistical Summary of Survey Results

Results from the Rockefeller Archive Center Survey

Responses

Total respondents: 394

From top 500 foundations: 225 (45.0% rate of return; 57.1% of all responses)

From 501–1000 foundations: 169 (33.8% rate of return; 42.9% of all responses)

Question	Number	% of All Respondents
Records on deposit		
Records in an archives:	43*	10.9
Among top 500:	32	
Among top 100:	14	
Considering deposit:	23	5.8
Researcher access to records		
Records open to researchers:	46	11.7
Available on a case-by-case basis:	203	51.5
Closed to researchers:	86	21.8
Staff will assist researchers:	289	73.3
Records management/archival policies		
Such policies in place:	140	35.5
No such policies:	196	50.1
Such policies under consideration:	42	10.6
Professional in this field on staff:	50	12.7
Other		
A written history of foundation:	55	13.9
Scholarly material published:	80	20.3
Studies of service area & needs:	44	11.2
Foundations whose founders/officers' papers are deposited in archives:	42	10.6

*Although 51 foundations reported that their records have been deposited in an archives or library, some apparently did not understand the intent of the question or exactly what the question meant by "records." Eight of these 51 foundations answered that they regularly send their annual reports to public libraries, to the Foundation Center, or to similar institutions. The figure here has been adjusted accordingly.

Table 2
Distribution of Responses to Rockefeller Archive Center Survey

Responses by Foundation Ranking (by Assets)

1–100	59
101–200	52
201–300	45
301–400	43
401–500	26
501–600	41
601–700	28
701–800	37
801–900	29
901–1000	34
Total	394

Table 3
Records Kept By Foundations

Results from the Rockefeller Archive Center Survey

Total survey respondents:	394	
Completed the table describing records in foundation custody:	302	(76.7%)
Respondents not completing table:	92	(23.3%)

Records Kept By Foundations	**Number**	**% of Those Completing Table**
Annual reports	258	85.4
Meeting agendas/Minutes		
Trustees meetings	286	94.7
Officers meetings	166	54.9
Committee meetings	135	44.7
Administration (program & policy)	204	67.5
Financial records	280	92.7
Correspondence		
Related to grants	277	91.7
Declinations	224	74.1
General, non-grant	155	51.3
Other correspondence	34	11.2
Reports by staff & consultants	146	48.3
Photographs	96	31.7
Sound recordings	32	10.6
Films and video tapes	70	23.1
Public relations	114	37.7
Clippings	115	38.0
Diaries	12	3.9
Other	16	5.2

Archives as a Foundation Management Issue

By Sara L. Engelhardt

My perspective on foundation archives is not that of an historian or a manager of records systems but rather as a foundation manager. I became involved in the issue by dint of having been corporate secretary at Carnegie Corporation of New York during a significant transition period in its history. Thus, I approach the topic not by assuming that foundation archives are inherently important or valuable but by asking where they fit into the overall goals and operations of the foundation.

My experience with archives as a management issue includes not just Carnegie but an opportunity I had to get a brief look at a smaller, younger foundation and my two years at the Foundation Center, which is also struggling with archival questions. Based on this experience, I believe, that as foundations age demographically, the archives issue will become an increasingly pressing management concern for the field. Foundation managers will need not just persuasion but assistance, as well, if the bulk of the historical record of the field is not to be lost during the final decade of this century.

In reviewing my own untutored encounters with foundation archive issues, I believe I can identify some common errors, misconceptions and pressure points that other foundation managers might encounter. These also provide the keys to helping future generations of managers avoid the pitfalls and make a balanced contribution to the history of the field—our history.

When I first arrived at Carnegie Corporation in the mid-1960s, it had institutional files extending back to 1920 and microfilmed correspondence on grants for public library buildings and church organs going back to the late 1800s, before the Corporation was established, when Andrew Carnegie himself was dispensing the funds. Andrew Carnegie's own papers, which had been part of the estate received by the Corporation upon his death, had been deposited with the Library of Congress, but the Corporation still held the literary rights and had to give permission to quote from them. One significant step we took in my tenure as secretary was to put those literary rights in the public domain. The Corporation's current files were kept in one long bank of cabinets; files from three to fifteen or so years old were kept separately in the central files; and older files were stored in file cabinets in the basement. Florence Anderson, who was corporate secretary at that time, was the administrative head of the files division, which had two staff members.

In my earlier years at the Corporation, I was not aware of much use of the basement files, except by staff preparing historical memos on program development or Corporation management. There were frequent requests for copies of the microfilmed correspondence on Carnegie libraries, however. Often, the community wanted to establish who owned the building and whether there were restrictions on how it could be used; increasingly, as many of them celebrated anniversaries, the requests were for historical research. Occasionally, a doctoral student would ask for copies of documents on groups of libraries as part of a dissertation.

The microfilming had been done for ease of access and preservation, not to make space in the files. The original documents had been discarded by mistake, so we had to send the film out to be copied onto paper if the researcher was unable to use the film in our offices. Access was certainly not enhanced by this system, and in addition, some of the items had been filmed out of order, making them harder to find than they would have been on paper. Over time the film became quite brittle, so microfilming was clearly not the ultimate preservation answer either.

The Corporation had good, clear "files cleaning" policies, so that by the time the files went to the basement, they were in pretty good order. Florence Anderson herself made most of the tough calls about what to keep, since she had been at the foundation since the mid-1930s and was closely involved with virtually all that went on. She also dealt with the researchers who wanted to use the materials, since she could provide context for the files, could remove any sensitive material before the researcher saw it, and could assist the researchers in finding other sources of interest. It was highly labor intensive, but the requests were intermittent and the Corporation placed high priority on this aspect of its charter for "the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding." The Corporation had a strong sense of its own history and a long history of support for libraries and library training, so providing access to the files came fairly naturally to its staff.

By the mid-1970s, requests by researchers to use the Corporation's files had accelerated to the point where we devised a form, based on one used at the Rockefeller Foundation, that all "searchers" filled out. This helped us screen out the requests of dubious motivation and hold those who used the files to standards of quotation and acknowledgment. We could also find them later, if necessary.

One of the most time-consuming tasks was screening requests to quote from the files. We took the position, on the advice of counsel, that only the papers written as part of a paid Corporation assignment (usually by staff) were our property. We spent a lot of time helping researchers track down grantees and others, or their heirs, to get permission to quote. In addition, research for several weighty books and articles relied heavily on Carnegie files, as research on the field in general heated up and the Carnegie files were among the few that were accessible. Stanley Katz and Barry Karl, for example, spent a lot of time reviewing the Corporation's archives during the early 1970s for their work on the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations. Ellen Lagemann also made extensive use of Carnegie records for her studies of Carnegie philanthropy, *Private Power for the Public Good: A History of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (1983) and *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy* (1989).

Fortunately, Florence Anderson, who was planning to retire in 1975, was able to continue working for the Corporation on a part-time basis. Her sole task was to turn the Corporation's old files into "archives." Because the old files had been cleared and reviewed at several previous points, she was by no means starting from scratch, but still it took her five years to archive about 50 years of files. As she worked, she updated the searching tool, which was a fairly simple card catalog with some cross-referencing. She removed several blocks of files and sent them to other archives that she felt would be more appropriate sites. She also worked with virtually all of the researchers during that period, leaving me, who had succeeded her as secretary, free of that burden.

Andy's *real* retirement and subsequent death left the Corporation with an archive, but no archivist. Our institutional memory had been captured about as well as it could, but there was no one with the time and inclination to tend it. The job of secretary had expanded to the point of explosion. The head of files, who now had two and a half people working for her, had her hands full with the current paper. When I hired my successor, Dorothy Knapp, one of the first tasks I gave her was to deal with the archive issue. This assignment gained urgency when the Corporation began to make plans to move to larger quarters.

The pivotal questions of staffing and space were up for grabs. Should the Corporation hire an archivist? Should it include archival space in its new location? Given the juncture at which the Corporation found itself, the answers were probably predictable: it decided to give its archives to an institution and, after a couple of years of exploration and negotiation, chose Columbia University.

More recently, I consulted on the operations of a foundation that became active in the 1940s or 1950s and has about $50 million in assets. The archives question was not part of the assignment, but it became part of my report because it was so clearly an urgent issue: the foundation has a small office and it ran out of space. The administrative staff had bought a microfilm camera and filmed everything in the wall of filing cabinets to make room for future paper. The microfilmed paper included, among other things, every proposal the foundation had ever received. No finding tools were in place for the files, and none were developed for the microfilm. In my report, I recommended that the foundation hire a consultant to help it develop a records management policy. I suggested that a record be kept of declinations but that the declined proposals themselves be discarded after they are no longer needed by the staff. Interestingly, the reason given by the staff for keeping everything was not for history's sake but an unfounded fear of legal action if they did not.

My Foundation Center experience offers a slightly different perspective on the foundation archives issue. Because the Center's institutional history is part and parcel of the history of the foundation field, its own records should be retained as an archive. We have the raw materials for such an archive, but a variety of competing priorities make it difficult to predict when this will be accomplished.

The Center serves another potentially vital archival role because so many foundations have not seen to their own archives. First, we have a file of foundation tax returns dating back to the 1960s. The IRS has a limited retention schedule and no longer has these records. Many foundations have discarded their own copies. Research on philanthropic history from the 1960s onward, therefore, will have to rely on the Center's collection. A second special Center collection is that of foundation annual reports. Again, some foundations have not archived even these important historical research tools. We are taking actions to preserve both of these collections so that they will be accessible for historical research.

The pragmatic approach of asking where foundation archives fit into the overall goals and operations of a foundation leads to a few key questions that must be answered before a good foundation manager will buy into the idea that archives are indeed good management.

Why should a foundation establish an archive?

A number of reasons for having an archive are regularly advanced by the proponents of foundation archives: for internal use, for the use of scholars and to advance understanding of the foundation's geographic or institutional community. I would like to add three more perspectives, if not full-fledged reasons.

First, the establishment and maintenance of a foundation archive, as opposed to files, constitutes a philanthropic endeavor in its own right. It is therefore a proper and appropriate undertaking for a foundation, not just another administrative expense. It entails the creation of a resource for scholars and the delivery of a public service in giving access to the archives. While most foundations do not approach the archive issue from a programmatic direction, many of those that are candidates for archives have a significant grant commitment to research or scholarship. Persuading foundations that archiving their historical records is both feasible and affordable would be easier if assistance could be offered in structuring this effort as a direct charitable activity or even a grant.

A second reason is plain old self-interest: It is hard to make the case that foundations have had a significant impact on society if there is very little record of what they did. While good scholars will find plenty in foundation archives that does not cast a good light on the field, the very fact that foundations more than many other nonprofit institutions can afford archives probably means that the historical record uses their perspective to tell many important stories.

Finally, again because of the foundations' ability to afford an archive, the foundation record of many institutions and movements may be the only surviving one in many important instances. This was certainly true in the case of many of the Carnegie files. Even in my time there, grantees asked for copies of old proposals or reports they had not kept. Because of the interdependent relationship between foundations and other institutions, foundation archives are much more than the record of the grantmaking institutions.

What models are there to choose from in setting up an archive?

Three different models come to mind: The Ford Foundation has its own in-house archive; the Rockefeller Foundation is closely associated with an archive; and Carnegie Corporation chose to deposit its archives at a free-standing institution. While few foundations are as large and old as these three, they represent the range of choice.

How do you get from wherever you are to an archive?

The naive manager is apt to assume that turning paper into microfilm is the major step in creating an archive, especially if the precipitating event is running out of space. The major prerequisite, in my view, is a records management system for *current* materials. Such a system must include standards for what is saved, a reliable means of finding it, a schedule for clearing old materials, and staff who give priority to this process (or some other mechanism to control quality and to assure that the job gets done). Most foundations will not have an archivist on staff, so a consultant will often be a vital part of the process.

Another naive assumption often made by foundation managers is that giving the archival materials to a university or historical society is the inexpensive solution. Foundations will have to spend a significant sum of money in terms of their administrative—and sometimes also their grants—budget, no matter which model is chosen. The need for foundation commitment may not come at an opportune time, so foundation managers should not postpone consideration of the archives issue until a space or staffing crisis forces it. After all, long-range planning is the hallmark of good management.

Managing a Foundation Archive in the Real World

By Ann Clifford Newhall

Running a foundation's archives is a tricky business. Operating against the archivist are two factors: first, the archives' staff are non-grantmakers in a grantmaking organization; and second, the archives is an operation concerned with the past functioning within a present- and future-oriented institution. And we know what that means: whenever any money has to be pruned from the foundation's budget, the first place to cut is the archives.

And it seems as though outside the archives the rest of the foundation's staff consists of two kinds of people: those who feel the archives has no value at all and any record over five years old not required to be retained by the IRS ought to be destroyed; and those who feel that the foundation's records are all so incredibly valuable that nothing should ever be thrown away or microfilmed and that the lowly archivist cannot be trusted to decide who ought to be granted access.

I have tried to look over some of my notes and files from my days as archivist of the Ford Foundation and distill some of the lessons I have learned—often after much trial and many errors.

Most importantly, as the foundation's archivist you need to get to know your organization. Learn the nature of its records, how the granting process works, the kinds of records it produces, and how rich and how sensitive these records are. The archivist should know the subject areas covered by the foundation's grantmaking activities and the research being conducted in these areas. In an organization with a broad range of interests, this can be a challenge, but it is a necessary one. Arrange to have representative journals routed past your desk. Notify journals and bibliographic databases of the contents of your holdings.

Foundation records generally fall into two categories: those resulting from its philanthropic activities, such as grant files, reports by staff and by consultants, program officers' files, departmental files for the various programs, board of trustee minutes and dockets and, field office files; and those records that document the business of running a foundation, such as personnel files, office of the secretary and general counsel, travel and shipping and investments.

It is also important that you know your archives. Nothing can replace good intellectual control. Know the location and the physical condition of your holdings. Develop a dialogue with your researchers about the informational content of the files with which they work.

Chat with them from time to time and always try to have an exit interview. This can be a wonderful way to learn where the riches are within your archives.

Have a good, flexible, written access policy approved by as high an authority as possible, preferably your board of trustees. Enforce it consistently. Remember: the road to hell is paved with exceptions to the access policy. Be mindful that you have to maintain a tension between arguing for the rights of scholars and the protection of your institution's interests.

Special care must be taken by those whose foundations have records that have the capacity for placing people in physical jeopardy. Foundation archives are among the few in this country for which this is true. Be mindful of changes in the political climate of those parts of the world in which your foundation operates and take the time to re-examine your holdings in light of them. The more obvious areas of sensitivity are human rights activities or opposition to a faction which is now in power. Not all opposition is bad, but in a volatile situation, particularly if power was seized, not ceded, caution is indicated. Please note that in cases where violent reprisals have been reported, even the most ordinary financial or social connection with the targets of that reprisal may place someone in danger.

Know your research constituencies, both within the foundation and outside it, and let them know you. The archives should be a part of the orientation tour for new staff so that you can tell them yourself how essential it is to use the archives in order to do their job well. Make sure they understand the importance of working with the archives if they want to make foundation records available to friends or colleagues outside the foundation. And explain the consequences of any confidentiality agreements they may enter into with grantees.

We developed a "travelling road show" in which we would meet with all the program officers from a given program—and with our representatives who headed offices abroad when they were in town—to explain what our holdings were and what kind of assistance we would provide. This gave us an entree to veteran program officers who did not come to us through orientation. If the archives is not a part of the orientation, develop a short guide to the archives and make it available to all staff.

I am a great believer in "elevator diplomacy." This was an essential tool in our efforts to increase the archives' visibility and the level of service it provided to the foundation. For example, if any of the archives' staff were on the elevator (or in the cafeteria or library) and overheard someone say, "I wonder where we would find records about X," then we would go back to the archives, find the answer and call the person and say something like, "I couldn't help overhearing your question." And then we would tell her where the information was located.

The field officers had used the archives as simply a dumping ground for closed grants. By making use of the various forms of communication that had been established with them—telexes, pouches delivered weekly by courier services, telephone calls in a few emergency cases and, more recently, electronic mail communication—we were able to establish a reference service for them.

Outsiders use a foundation's archives as well. The staffs of other foundations came with many of the same questions and concerns as our staff. They also "lifted"—with the Ford Foundation's blessing—forms and procedures developed by the Ford Foundation. Potential grantees like to look at successful grant applications to get ideas for their own grant applications. Government figures from all levels of government in the United States and foreign embassies sought material in the archives. Print journalists and network news staff also sought information and material. By piecing together the cryptic requests from government figures and the media, we were often able to have at least a hint of stories that would soon burst on the world.

By far the largest outside user group comes from the scholarly community, who are discovering in ever-growing numbers the riches buried in foundation archives. Their topics include, of course, the history of the Ford Foundation itself and the history of philanthropy. But others are researching the topics addressed by foundations in their grantmaking activities.

Forge alliances within the foundation. Each year at the Ford Foundation I was the only professional-level officer who attended the maintenance department's Christmas party. This contact proved useful. The procedure at that time was for the personnel department to notify the archivist whenever a program officer was terminating his or her employment. I then contacted the departing officers about their files. However, during the foundation's massive reorganization in the early 1980s, many program officers who had been let go took their accumulated vacation time to come and clean out their offices. They then notified personnel that they were leaving for good, and when personnel called me, I would find empty file drawers and totally stripped offices. To get around this problem, I arranged for my contacts in the maintenance department to notify me anytime anyone—but particularly someone who was leaving the foundation—requested a large trash bin. In time I was able to civilize this situation somewhat by announcing that the archives would give ten free Paige boxes to departing staff. So I became the first one they called!

Use the advantages available to you. When I was unable to persuade the Ford Foundation to budget the money necessary to microfilm our grant files, my boss and I applied for a "DAP," a kind of internal grant that the foundation could give itself. Since it was for several hundred thousand dollars, we had to obtain the approval of the board of trustees. The foundation administrators were *very* nervous about the project and looked over my shoulder every inch of the way. In the process, they learned a great deal about the archives and the value of its contribution to the foundation. And, since we finished on time and within the budget, it won us an enormous amount of credibility for future requests.

In utilizing the advantages available to you, be pragmatic. Automation was one of my dearest goals. Every time I went to an archives meeting, I returned full of ideas and with lengthy shopping lists of equipment and software. Because my equipment "wish list" was regularly eliminated from my budget, I looked carefully at what was already in place within the foundation: an IBM System 38 computer with a database created for the financial administration of the grants. Each grant had identifiers: the name of the grantee, the purpose of the grant, the dollars involved, the subject of the project, the geographical area, etc. Clearly they would have wonderful applications for reference.

The foundation's manager of computer services was eager to involve as many people as possible with the computer, and it was easy to persuade him to arrange for me and some of my staff to be trained on the System 38. When I was unable to get budget approval for the installation of a terminal in the archives, he uttered the fatal words, "You can use one of ours." We were underfoot in his computer room so often that, to get us out of his hair, he gave us one of his terminals. It remained in the archives, but on his budget for two years until the foundation recognized the inevitable and gave it to us. Eventually we were able to adapt the System 38 and, later, the Wang word processing and office systems for a number of uses in reference, processing, and retention scheduling.

Be able to recognize when a disadvantageous situation can benefit you. We think of gravity as a force pulling us downward, slamming us back to earth. Yet someone at NASA figured out a way to use each planet's gravity to somehow catapult Voyager II from Jupiter to Saturn to Uranus to Neptune and on out of this solar system. This principle can work for you. The greatest boost the Ford Foundation archives received was the event which at first threatened to sink it.

In the spring of 1981 the foundation's board of trustees initiated a massive reorganization, which one of the foundation's vice presidents dubbed the "Mother's Day Massacre." Most of the program officers were informed that their contracts would not be renewed. For the archives, the immediate consequence was an incredible deluge of material. In fact, our holdings nearly doubled. At the same time, our reference activities took off. For the first time the archives began to function as the foundation's true institutional memory. Former program officers began calling. Many who had moved to other foundations requested copies of documents they felt would be useful in their new positions. Others had accepted professorships at a variety of universities and began referring their students and new colleagues to the archives.

The work increased dramatically, but the size of the archives' staff remained the same. After my initial request for more staff was rebuffed with the observation that the point of the reorganization was to cut back on administration, I wrote a memorandum to the vice president for organization and management, via everybody in-between. My memo spelled out the dimensions of the problem the archive faced. I compared the statistics of a normal three-month period with the figures for the current ninety days. Then I put forth a three-pronged list of requests.

Part one of my memo was the immediate, non-negotiable, "give-it-to-us-or-we-sink-without-a-trace" section, in which I asked for a batallion of temporary employees to help inventory the material we had just accessioned. This was essential in order to maintain even minimal intellectual control. And this we got.

Part two of the memo concerned pressing, but not emergency, needs that fell into the categories of better working conditions, more staff and automation. It took us five years, but we got these, too.

The final section was a discussion of the role that I felt the archives could play in the reorganized foundation.

It is very important to know how things are funded within your organization. I had learned that the board of trustees had set up a special fund to handle the expenses of the reorganization, and my memo suggested that this fund be used to pay for the things I had requested.

It is also important to develop a multi-year, multi-phase plan for the archives. Give it a great deal of thought and circulate it among your colleagues within the foundation and within the archival profession for comments and changes. Once it is in place, the plan will be hard to change.

In all that you do, your goal should be to educate your foundation to the fact that the archives constitutes the final stage of the granting process: that you take the information that was gained from each grant and make it available to internal staff, to outside researchers, for posterity. *Over time* it is the archives that makes the value of the foundation's contribution truly lasting.

When the late archivist Herman Kahn spoke to the staff of the Yale University archives, he said, "If an archivist does his job right, his work will remain valuable for approximately two hundred years." My experience at the Ford Foundation makes me quite certain that foundation archives will prove to be among the richest sources for historians studying the issues and events of the twentieth century. If *you* do *your* job right!

Thoughts on Establishing Foundation Archives

By Richard J. Kaplan

Creating an archive for a foundation, or any other type of business institution, is an exercise in molding the archival ideal to institutional reality. Literature about correct archival procedures exists in abundance, describing how an ideal archive should look and how it ought to operate. Reconciling that conception to reality, however, requires abandoning the archival ideal and staking claim to a middle ground.

In this paper I examine issues and problems surrounding the design and implementation of an archive for a private, independent, nonprofit, grantmaking foundation. The focus is on the inherent conflict between theory and praxis, between what is desirable and what is possible. It analyzes instances where the ideal succumbs to reality and proffers some ideas about the effects of compromising the archival ideal.

The thoughts under discussion here come from my experience in setting up an archive for the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. The foundation has been in existence since 1978 and is generally ranked as the third or fourth largest in terms of its assets. In 1988, its assets approached $3 billion, and it disbursed over $167 million in grants. The staff consists of about 100 people in Chicago and another 20 in Palm Beach, Florida. The foundation has programs in the following areas: health; MacArthur fellows; peace and international cooperation; world environment and resources; special grants; general, matching and land grants; education; and world population. In addition, the foundation has departments in real estate; legal; finance; investment; information systems; research and information services; and administration. The archive is part of research and information services. The foundation is governed by its board of directors which meets ten times a year.

Before 1987, the foundation had no archive or library. Active corporate records were shelved in a central file room. Library services consisted of a piece of furniture placed in the vestibule by the elevators. The foundation's archival records were retained by programs and departments according to their own filing systems, which ranged in complexity from the mnemonic to the excessively sophisticated to the hopelessly incomprehensible. Inactive records were stored in what was described as a fireproof safe located in the basement. Finding aids were composed of some container lists for material stored in various locations. Archival procedures consisted of an annual event called "paper-purge day," and the *ad hoc* transfer of material from one location to another was occasioned by lack of storage space. Care of the foundation's paper record had degraded to a point where an award was given each year to the program or department that generated the heftiest amount of disposable records on "paper-purge day."

In spite of the foundation's self-proclaimed war against bureaucratic entrenchment, the administration recognized the need for expert help to manage its inactive yet essential records. In 1987, the foundation hired its first archivist/information specialist to impose order out of the chaos.

Creating an archive from scratch brings one face-to-face with fundamental archival issues. It is here where one senses the conflict between what is desirable and what is possible. And it is here where one realizes that limits exist, even for an institution with pockets as deep as the MacArthur Foundation's.

What are the issues confronting archivists building new archives? The fundamental issue is, "Why an archive?" Why not increase the size of the file room, instead? Why not donate the foundation's records to an existing archive? The Rockefeller Archive Center in North Tarrytown, New York, the Western Reserve Historical Society in Cleveland and the Chicago Historical Society all count foundation records among their holdings. In other words, why should the MacArthur Foundation, or any foundation for that matter, create its own archive?

Two reasons leap out: proprietary interests and convenience. Analyzing the less complicated issue first, what could be more convenient for an organization than having its inactive yet essential records housed and maintained on its premises? Going to the archive to retrieve a document becomes routine. Papers can be transferred when it is convenient rather than when it is necessary. Access to historical documents is immediate rather than conditional. In addition to such prosaic managerial concerns, having an archive on site provides concrete evidence to support the abstract notion than institutions make history.

The real driving force behind a decision to create an archive, however, is the protection of the institution's proprietary interests. Nothing else takes precedence. A young foundation with enormous assets needs assurance that records it considers proprietary or confidential receive the most discreet treatment possible. Among the examples one could cite in support of this idea are the following: records concerning the divestiture and transfer of foundation assets; frank discussions taking place among its board of directors; and basic studies formulating the foundation's philosophy and directions. These records remain protected and confidential until their public release no longer affects personal reputation or the foundation's fiduciary responsibility.

This idea—some would argue that it is a rationalization—runs counter to conventional archival wisdom about open access policies and perhaps offends some archivists by impugning their professionalism. But bear in mind that archives have always guaranteed confidentiality for certain collections. Public access to some documents, even entire collections, is routinely denied or restricted. Most archivists discuss these issues during negotiations with potential donors. By the very nature of their craft, archivists must provide and deny access to documents under their control. A foundation archive is no less an archive than a public one. It has the same duty and responsibility to protect the confidentiality of its papers. An archive exists to serve someone or some entity. Sometimes it serves the general public, although more often its clientele consists of an elite group of scholars. Foundation archives exist to serve the interests of their foundations.

Once a foundation resolves to have an archive, other, more pedestrian issues need to be pursued. Among these is, what has been playing the role of the archive? And as a corollary to this issue, how attached is the staff to the substitute? Inertia is a powerful force and bureaucracies use it creatively to buttress the *status quo*. Before embarking on a plan to create an archive, one should examine the system that has been performing some of an archive's functions. Two reasons exist for doing this. First, the existing system probably provided good archival service to some staff members. These elements of service probably should be retained, even if they contradict standard archival operating procedures. A working procedure that makes sense need not be eliminated simply because it is not "archival." The key to staff acceptance is to adapt what works into new archive procedures. The other reason for taking a look at what preceded the archive is to differentiate between the entities. While it is important to adapt working portions of the old to the new, it is even more important that the new archive be distinct in function and form from what previously had existed. Open files and uncontrolled access are characteristic of a file room, not an archive. For an archive within a foundation to be successful, it must provide a distinct service. It should not compete with other functional entities, like the central file, department files or the library. It is paramount for a new archive to establish its own institutional and functional identity.

Another fundamental issue is what should be saved in the archive. Almost everyone agrees that papers having significant historical value should be stored in the archive. However, getting agreement on what constitutes significant historical value is more difficult. Each program or department in a foundation has its own conception of what is worth saving and what is not. Handbooks on archival procedures and records management offer general guidance and usually a hierarchically arranged litany of significant record types. But the real challenge comes from defining a policy that meets the foundation's requirements and satisfies the archivist's criteria of what is historically significant. Often the conception of what is worth saving is inversely proportional to the available storage space. Archivists by their nature prefer storing almost anything to having almost nothing to store. This tendency needs to be resisted.

Closely related, perhaps inextricably, to the previous issue is the archive's physical requirements. How much space, what kind of space and where the space is to be located are central issues. Space allocations derive from the sum of two products: money and clout. Money often dictates the size of the archive and clout usually determines where the facility will be located. Three billion dollars will buy a lot of archival space. An archive's clout within a foundation, however, tempers grandiose archival visions and plans. The allocation of space is similar to the art of juggling. The first object tossed into the air is what the archivist wants. The second is the archive's place or clout within the institutional hierachy and the third object is compromise. Keeping two objects aloft is no great feat. The artistry of juggling comes from the ability to keep three objects in motion at once. Successfully negotiating for space requires the ability to keep the desirable outcome a possible outcome and a compromise position simultaneously in play.

As a rule, an archive's governing institution will make sure that a new facility is not allocated excessive space. The archivist, on the other hand, works to ensure that adequate space is provided. This leads to another issue: identifying which departments' records will fill the archive. The best way to accomplish this is to poll each department. The survey should identify the types and amounts of records produced. It should also provide information about the life cycle of different types of records. To plan for space, one needs to know when documents undergo the transformation from working papers to papers ready for archival storage. No set rules exist for determing when records should be transferred to an archive. And, I am not sure that rigid policies governing the transfer of records are necessarily a good thing. A more useful approach accommodates the needs of the records' producer and the archive.

At some point during the creation of a foundation archive, the issue of automation needs to be addressed. A good place to start is to ask yourself why the archive needs to be automated. For automation to be effective it needs to save time and effort. That is the bottom line. Excessive automation is probably more common than inadequately automated archival application. To pay for itself, automated applications must increase efficiency. Serious thought and analysis should be brought to bear on questions about what to automate and whether automation can be accomplished in-house or purchased from a vender.

The issue of whether a foundation archive need participate in an union list of archival holdings is closely related to automation and merits serious consideration. A realistic analysis of the issue reveals the pitfalls and benefits of a shared archival listing. For example, is the foundation's interest served by listing restricted collections? And is the level of descriptive cataloging required by most on-line bibliographic archival subsystems really worth the time and effort? Or is there an alternative system that differentiates among records, acts as a finding aid, and furnishes location? The cataloging of materials and the preparation of finding aids for a foundation archive are only useful insofar as they augment the retrieval of records. The rest, I have come to realize, is the equivalent of archival scholasticism foisted on the profession by a cadre of tenure-pressured archivists.

Another fundamental issue concerns staffing. Who is going to work in the archive and what degree of minimum proficiency will be expected of them? An experienced archivist is needed to supervise the planning and implementation for a new archive. In the case of the MacArthur Foundation, the archivist plays several roles. It is not unreasonable to expect one person to cover the closely aligned professional duties associated with running a library, an archive and a records management system. This is especially true for foundations with small, functionally integrated staffs. Professional expertise is required to ensure that the design meets the test of archival reality. Staffing other positions in the archive is more problematic. Having professionally trained people is usually beneficial. But professionally trained people require professional level tasks in their daily work. Otherwise morale suffers, discontent sets in, and before too long, the archive looses a potentially valuable employee. When planning for new positions it is imperative to give serious thought to the position's duties and authorities. It is more important to match a person's ability to the responsibilities than it is to hire a professional for the sake of professionalism.

The remaining issues concern archival policy and procedures. Are written policy and procedure statements useful to foundation archives? Are they worth the effort? Are policy and procedure statements written to be observed or violated? It is one thing to sit down at a desk, pull out one's archival textbooks and manuals from the Society of American Archivists, and begin drafting rules governing the operation of the archive. It is another thing to cite a passage from the archive's policy and procedure manual to the chairman of the board as the explanation for why he is prohibited from checking out a file from a Hollinger box. Because rules, policies and procedures are written only to be broken, they need to be composed in a manner that encourages adherence and does not invite exceptions. This managerial heresy evolved from my notion that each person in a bureaucracy has a limited amount of personal and professional goodwill. Spending that goodwill to enforce what is perceived as fussy archival procedures is a waste of personal and professional capital. Archive policies on accessions, access, retention and copying should reflect the foundation's interest first, then the archive's.

What are some of the unusual problems associated with building a foundation's archive? Chief among them is the introduction of an alien idea into a corporate culture. I think business archivists would muster more empathy for this idea than perhaps a university or historical society archivist. The idea stems from my experience that archival functions are the antithesis of corporate culture. An archive produces nothing of value. It stores material at great expense. Its operation is governed by a different set of priorities. Its staff is highly educated yet not especially well paid. At times, the archivist is on equal footing with corporate vice presidents and clerical staff. All of these characteristics clash with prevailing corporate culture and produce ambivalence among the staff about the archive and its place in the corporate hierarchy.

Another problem concerns the distinction between corporate papers and personal papers. This problem stems from a trend in corporate culture where executives blend their professional and private lives into one persona. Legal opinions offer some guidance as to where the boundaries should be drawn. Compliance, however, depends on the individuals involved. Negotiating for the transfer of potentially sensitive papers for the archive requires diplomatic skills. It is an important undertaking, though, because it protects the institution from shotgun searches of its files caused by litigation.

It merits repeating that it is difficult for people unfamiliar with an archive to differentiate between it and a file room. Both entities appear engaged in the same function. Staff members require an explanation of the differences between the two or else they will think of the archive as a rarefied file room. If that perception takes hold, the two functions will likely merge.

I think archival idealism needs to be recast into the mold of institutional realism. My argument to this point seems one-sided. In cases where standard archival practices inhibit foundation operations, I have argued that the practices ought to be amended. In general terms I am arguing that institutional priorities take precedence over archival ones. But what are the effects of subjugating archival ideals to institutional realities? More generally, to what extent does this philosophy affect the archival profession?

The obvious effect of archival pragmatism is that the archive turns out to be something less than what most of us in the profession would identify as "a real archive." The correlative effect is that the foundation staff's conception of what an archive is and how it functions is at odds with the way the vast majority of archives operate. The former result is only slightly more disturbing to me than the latter's inconsequential effect. What matters in the MacArthur Foundation's archival universe is that their records are protected and retrievable.

A foundation's attitude about archival services is based on its ignorance of standard archival procedures combined with its desire for its archive to meet the foundation's conception of special storage requirements for its records. Attempting to penetrate that reality armed only with bromides about the importance of maintaining irrelevant archival standards results in frustration, alienation, and ultimately, the archive's trivialization.

What effect does this philosophy of archival pragmatism have on the profession? First of all, I think archival pragmatism is widely practiced but rarely acknowledged. Second, diversity of methods and practices represents a healthy trend in the profession. Dogmatic ideas and practices are meant to be challenged when they no longer fit into reality. A profession that adopts and codifies its operating procedures to the exclusion of outside realities risks intellectual stagnation. And finally, archival pragmatism serves to recognize the diversity characterizing the profession, the diversity that gives the profession intellectual vitality and relevancy.

Mr. Kaplan's remarks are his own and do not necessarily reflect those of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

corporate vice presidents and clerical staff. All of these characteristics clash with prevailing corporate culture and produce ambivalence among the staff about the archive and its place in the corporate hierarchy.

Another problem concerns the distinction between corporate papers and personal papers. This problem stems from a trend in corporate culture where executives blend their professional and private lives into one persona. Legal opinions offer some guidance as to where the boundaries should be drawn. Compliance, however, depends on the individuals involved. Negotiating for the transfer of potentially sensitive papers for the archive requires diplomatic skills. It is an important undertaking, though, because it protects the institution from shotgun searches of its files caused by litigation.

It merits repeating that it is difficult for people unfamiliar with an archive to differentiate between it and a file room. Both entities appear engaged in the same function. Staff members require an explanation of the differences between the two or else they will think of the archive as a rarefied file room. If that perception takes hold, the two functions will likely merge.

I think archival idealism needs to be recast into the mold of institutional realism. My argument to this point seems one sided. In cases where standard archival practices inhibit foundation operations, I have argued that the practices ought to be amended. In general terms I am arguing that institutional priorities take precedence over archival ones. But what are the effects of subjugating archival ideals to institutional realities? More generally, to what extent does this philosophy affect the archival profession?

The obvious effect of archival pragmatism is that the archive turns out to be something less than what most of us in the profession would identify as "a real archive." The correlative effect is that the foundation staff's conception of what an archive is and how it functions is at odds with the way the vast majority of archives operate. The former result is only slightly more disturbing to me than the latter's inconsequential effect. What matters to the MacArthur Foundation's archival universe is that their records are protected and retrievable.

A foundation's attitude about archival services is a function of its ignorance of standard archival procedures combined with its desire for its archive to meet the foundation's conception of special storage requirements for its records. Attempting to penetrate that reality armed only with platitudes about the importance of maintaining irrelevant archival standards results in frustration all around and ultimately, the archive's marginalization.

What effect does this philosophy of archival pragmatism might have on the profession? First of all, I think archival pragmatism is widely practiced but rarely acknowledged. Second, diversity of methods and practices represents a healthy trend in the profession. Dogmatic rules and practices are meant to be abandoned when they no longer fit the reality. A profession that adopts and codifies its operating procedures to the exclusion of outside realities risks marginalization. Ultimately, archival pragmatism serves to recognize the diversity and to refocus the profession on the diversity that keeps the profession intellectually alert and relevant.

Mr. Kaplan's remarks are his own and do not necessarily reflect those of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

Parochial But Potent: Local Foundation Records at The Western Reserve Historical Society

By John J. Grabowski

In the past two decades, the field of local history has gained respectability in the eyes of the historical profession. Historical inquiry at the "micro" level is now seen as an important test of general syntheses and as a necessary first step to the creation of new theories in subject areas as diverse as business history and ethnic history. Attention now being given to the somewhat broader categories of regional history and comparative history has also added to the legitimacy of local historical inquiry. Local history is now viewed as a servant of Clio rather than merely one of her country cousins, a development which is seen as a vindication by many people engaged in the study of local history, particularly by the curators and archivists responsible for its preservation. But it also becomes more incumbent upon archivists to view their collections and collection policies in this new light. These collection policies should include the records of local foundations. In an era characterized by voluntarism and private initiative, foundation records are acquiring a broad historical significance. Their preservation at both the local and national levels has enormous consequence for the future understanding of much of this century's American experience.

In Cleveland, Ohio, at the library of the Western Reserve Historical Society, a regionally-focused institution, foundation records have become an integral part of the archival collections program. Since its establishment in 1867, the Society has been the principal repository for primary source materials relating to the history of northeastern Ohio and particularly Cleveland. In the mid-1960s, with over 2,000 manuscript collections already in its stacks, the Society's library responded to the demands of the "new history" and began extensive acquisition programs in a number of subject areas that related to the urban development of Cleveland, Ohio.[1] The task upon which the Society set out was enormous: preserving the records relating to the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries in a community of more than one million people, with a reputation for turn-of-the-century progressive reform, a vast philanthropic and charitable network and with a myriad of civic organizations. The choices, in terms of the potential selection of records and papers for preservation, were therefore also enormous. What should be collected? Would the records of the multitude of local foundations (over 35 foundations are listed in the *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* alone) be of interest?[2] When beginning its expanded collecting program the Society knew that at least one set of foundation records would be of critical importance.

In the early 1900s, Frederick H. Goff, banker, lawyer and sometime politician from Cleveland, became increasingly concerned about the problem of trusts and charitable bequests. In one instance in Cleveland, three separate bequests had been made to establish an art museum. With none of the three sufficient for the purpose, civic leaders sat, somewhat chagrined, without a museum to testify to the urban progress of their city, while lawyers sought to find a way to combine the bequests. Eventually, the problem was solved and the Cleveland Museum of Art was established. Such unplanned, inefficient bequests troubled people like Goff.[3] Goff was even more concerned about what Sir Arthur Hobhouse had characterized as the "dead hand of the past," by which legacies and trusts were restricted to purposes that could not only be outdated but, given changing values, socially unattractive. To remedy the problem, Goff created the Cleveland Foundation in 1914, the nation's first community trust. Guided by a public/private distribution committee, it evolved into a major philanthropic organization in Cleveland. More important still, the Cleveland Foundation has, particularly in its formative years, sponsored landmark surveys regarding local activity, such as recreation, the legal system and education, that not only helped it plan for its own distribution of funds, but which have greatly influenced the subsequent local development of these areas.

The records of this one foundation were therefore of great interest to the Society and it succeeded in securing the records in 1973. Within two years, the collection served as the basis for a doctoral dissertation, "Businessmen, Pedagogues, and Progressive Reform: The Cleveland Foundation's 1915 School Survey" by Edward Miggins, a student at Case Western Reserve University.[4] The Society's judgment in this matter seemed vindicated. The collection has since seen further use as a source for the *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, the basis of the foundation's own seventy-fifth anniversary history, and, most recently, as a supporting source for a dissertation on the PACE Association, an educational reform group founded in Cleveland in 1962. Preservation of this collection has thus had an impact not only in the academic community, but has also served the institution's "historical" needs and, by virtue of the publication of the Encyclopedia, those of the community in general.

Although their role in initiating community studies does not match that of the Cleveland Foundation, other local foundations also have provided substantial funding for charitable and cultural activities in Cleveland. Many were the creations of leading industrial figures and families in Cleveland, and their philanthropic goals often mirrored the world view of their creators. Given this, the library's curatorial staff soon began to consider their records as possible acquisitions. In the sixteen years since receipt of the Cleveland Foundation records, the Society has acquired the records of more than a half-dozen additional foundations, including those of the George Gund Foundation, the Kulas Foundation, the Bascomb Little Fund and the Murphy Foundation. In one instance we acquired the records of a foundation headquartered outside of Cleveland. The Payne Fund of New York was established by Frances Payne Bolton of Cleveland in 1927. It funded pathbreaking investigations of the effects of movies and radio on American youth, and Bolton herself became one of the first female members of the U.S. House of Representatives.[5] The records of the Payne Fund, like those of the Cleveland Foundation, had an obvious historical importance because of this investigatory work. This collection was fully processed and made available for research in 1989 and has already generated great interest among historians studying the media and communications. The Society's current holdings of foundation records now exceed those for any similar repository, a fact of which the institution is justifiably proud.

With nearly two hundred linear feet of foundation records now in its stacks, the Society is, nevertheless, still confronted with the issue of utility and purpose. Will all of the foundation collections have the same importance as the Cleveland Foundation and Payne Fund records? What is the historical utility of local foundation records such as those held by the Western Reserve Historical Society? If a foundation is not a pathbreaking agency such as the Cleveland Foundation or Payne Fund, what interest does its records hold for researchers? To answer this, it is important to describe the contents of a typical local foundation collection.

Generally, such collections consist of two main bodies of material: administrative records and grant files. The administrative records usually contain the minutes and deliberations of the governing body and, in some instances, the files of an executive officer or executive staff members. The grant files consist largely of the grant proposals—notes and memoranda from the foundation concerning decisions about proposals—correspondence, and a large variety of supporting material (publications, photographs, etc.) submitted by the grant requestor.

Perhaps the most practical use for these records lies in the potential they hold for grantseekers, not historians (not that the two are mutually exclusive). The grant files provide endless examples of how to or how not to prepare a proposal, and the administrative records reflect the thoughts, attitudes and social outlook of the foundation's administrators and board members. These files are a gold mine of useful information for writing a grant proposal. This potential for misuse was of concern to both the Western Reserve Historical Society and the foundations when the Society solicited their records. To guard against any misuse of the archives only non-current records are accepted and, in several instances, the foundations are allowed to retain access approval. The suggestion for access control was, in some instances, requested by the donor, and, in at least two instances, suggested as prudent by the Society. In cases of access control, scholars wishing to use the records must make application to the foundation and in doing so fully inform the foundation of the purposes of their research.

If one neglects this mercenary appeal, the question still remains: what is the actual historical utility of such records? That utility can be divided into two distinct categories, one which cleaves to the needs of "local" history, while the second has broader analytical potential.

In the case of, perhaps, strictly local utility, the individual grant files within foundation records are often unexcelled. The proposals from area organizations and individuals often contain a synoptic narrative history of the grant requestor as well as publications, flyers and brochures outlining the agency's background and purpose. Lists of trustees, histories of past grants and other details provide an almost encyclopedic overview of arts agencies, schools, historical societies, and even more exotic entities. These files are, in many cases, as rich as the local history data files compiled for many American cities by the WPA in the 1930s.

Surpassing this local utility is the evidence that foundation records can provide concerning developing social trends, cultural evolution and general community history. Taken as a whole, the grant proposals submitted to any foundation over time mirror movements in society in general. Often these proposals antedate the "popular" development of these movements as organizations and individuals applied for funds to carry out what would, at that time, be experimental programs—programs for which there was no history of standard funding. For instance, the development of the alternative school movement in cities such as Cleveland can be traced, before its full-fledged emergence in the late 1960s, through the proposals submitted to agencies such as the George Gund Foundation. The AHS Foundation of Cleveland was also involved in such endeavors and, additionally, supported a variety of other programs that grew out of the civil rights movement. The Kulas Foundation of Cleveland, whose special interests are in music and the arts, maintains grant files that readily chronicle the growth in community theater, modern dance and other artistic endeavors during the 1960s and 1970s when, spurred by possible funding from the National Endowment for the Arts, nascent cultural groups in Cleveland looked to Kulas for supporting or matching funding.

The question remains open, of course, as to whether the archival maintenance of grant files is necessary to trace such trends. Would not a list of grants serve the same purpose? Such a list would, of course, destroy the local utility of the files as noted earlier, and greatly hinder the historian's ability to trace general trends. The actual substance of the grant file does not consist of simply a chronicle of who submitted the grant, for what purpose, for what amount and upon what date, but lies in the structuring of the grant. An analysis of the argument of any proposal is necessary to fully understand its purpose. Indeed, what may, on the surface, appear to be a proposal to establish a new musical ensemble may turn out, on analysis, to be a proposal to redress racial or gender imbalance in the arts. Proposals cannot be judged by their covers.

Of course, the ultimate judgment of trends does not lie in the proposals submitted, but which are funded. In this instance the contents of the proposal file become even more crucial, as do the administrative files of the foundation. In cities such as Cleveland, grant funding can lead to important changes in civic life. Foundation grants have, for instance, made possible the rehabilitation of a major theatrical center—Playhouse Square—in downtown Cleveland. Seemingly not important in itself, this foundation funding was eventually coupled with other private and governmental funding. Most critically, this combination signaled an interest in not only rehabilitating old theatrical structures, but in moving the new service economy more firmly into the city's central business district. The arguments made in the grant proposals for this project as well as the basis of the foundations' decisions to provide funds offer a unique insight into this important change that occurred not only in Cleveland, but throughout urban America in the 1970s and 1980s.

This then raises the issue of the broader historical importance of local foundation records. Will they serve the new trends now general in the historical profession? Can they find usefulness outside of the parochial confines of local history? The answer is unequivocally yes, for the movements, societal shifts and philanthropic growth detailed in the records of local foundations such as those in Cleveland are probably testified to in a slightly different fashion by the records of local foundations in St. Paul, Chicago and New York. Used comparatively or in concert, such bodies of local material are critical to understanding trends not only in philanthropy, but in education, the arts and social reform in America during the twentieth century. The preservation of such sources on a broad scale is therefore necessary to the eventual development of new, major historical syntheses.

In the final analysis, then, the foundation records held by the Western Reserve Historical Society may, at one and the same time, serve the needs of local historians as well as national researchers better than many of its library's other archival holdings. It is therefore incumbent upon archival agencies, both local and national, to consider carefully the preservation of foundation records not only to serve the needs of local inquiry but to help build toward a better understanding of a number of facets of twentieth-century American life in general.

NOTES

[1]For basic background on the history of the Western Reserve Historical Society library and the development of its library collecting programs, see Kermit J. Pike, "Western Reserve Historical Society," *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science* (New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1982), vol. 33, pp. 131-136; and John J. Grabowski, "Fragments or Components: Theme Collections in a Local Setting," *American Archivist*, 48: 3 (Summer 1985), pp. 304–314.

[2]David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987).

[3]Goff was not directly involved in combining the three bequests, made by Hinman Hurlbut, John Huntington and Horace Kelley, but as an active civic and financial leader in Cleveland at the time of the museum's creation he would have been well aware of the efforts involved in unifying these legacies. The actual combination of the bequests was accomplished by William B. Sanders, a corporate lawyer and a founding partner of the law firm Squire, Sanders and Dempsey.

[4]Edward M. Miggins, "Businessmen, Pedagogues, and Progressive Reform: The Cleveland Foundation's 1915 School Survey" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1975).

[5]For a general description of the Payne Fund records, see *An Introduction to the Frances Payne Bolton Papers and the Frances Payne Bolton Audio-Visual Collection, Payne Fund Records, Chester Castle Bolton Papers in the Library of the Western Reserve Historical Society* (Cleveland Western Reserve Historical Society, 1989).

III
Steps Toward Establishing Foundation Archives

Providing Researchers Access to Your Archives

By Emily J. Oakhill

Researchers study and interpret your foundation using the documents the foundation created. Providing access to the records is an important function of the foundation's communications program, since the documents are what the researcher will use to interpret the institution.

Archivists believe in equality of access to information. An institution can ethically decide which groups will be allowed access, but there should be no individual distinctions within those groups. If any material is to be restricted (medical records of fellows, for example), it must be restricted to all outside researchers. Policies regarding access and reference use of the archives should be clearly stated for anyone requesting permission to use the archives. This statement should be included in all publicity which describes the archives.

In some cases it may be necessary to delay or deny access. There are legitimate reasons for this, such as preserving or protecting potentially sensitive materials. These restrictions should be explained to the researcher at the onset and included in the finding aids.

In establishing policies for access to the material, there should be an evaluation of who your researchers are likely to be and what kind of questions they are likely to ask. A program officer needs information of a different nature than an historian. A foundation's records usually include information in a raw form that certain groups of researchers are not prepared to assess or evaluate.

Reference

The initial contact an archives has with a researcher is usually a reference letter or telephone call. A reply which outlines specific material, hours of the office and access policies should be adequate.

Most researchers ask questions that are specific and can be handled quickly: for example, "Is there any documentation of grants to agricultural institutions in the Netherlands in the 1930s?" Some questions are imprecise and require additional dialogue: "I am interested in tracing the introduction of western medicine to China." It is often necessary for the archivist to ask additional questions to determine the researcher's specific interest.

The relationship between the archivist and the researcher is a cooperative one. The researcher must supply information regarding his purpose and qualifications. The archivist can expect (and get) a clear definition of scholarly needs. If the scholar has a clear idea of what is necessary to complete a study (not documents to prove a prejudice), it saves the archivist guesswork which consumes valuable time and effort.

Archivists should provide reasonable assistance. Researchers should not expect archivists to interpret the documents or do in-depth research for them. The goal of the archivist is to help the researcher identify materials that are relevant to the topic, and then to provide the researcher access to that material.

Researcher Control

Creating and maintaining records regarding your researchers is an important part of the access process. These records should include a log of telephone calls received, a file of correspondence with researchers and a record of the topics researchers have worked on using archival materials.

You should interview the researchers who visit the archives to determine that the question you were asked last week on the telephone is still the question that interests the researcher; often additional research in the interim has helped researchers sharpen or alter their focus. Interviews also will help you determine their experience in conducting research and learn something about their work, and will familiarize them with the facility and its rules. Researchers should fill out a form including their name, title, institution and topic, as well as their signature attesting to their understanding of and agreement to abide by the rules governing the use of your archives.

At the end of a research visit, conduct an exit interview with the researcher. This gives you the opportunity to ensure that the researcher is satisfied that he has seen what he needs to, within the bounds permitted by your institution. Morover, this is also an educational opportunity for the archivist, since the researchers have the freshest view of the documents and can describe the content of groups of records which you have not been able to examine.

Photocopying

Most repositories have some procedure for making photocopies for researchers. Researchers should not expect an archives to comply with a blanket request for photocopies. This takes an extraordinary amount of time on the part of the archivist, depletes the uniqueness of the material by permitting its wide circulation, and diffuses the responsibility of the institution for its records. It is also best to limit photocopying for mail requests, since each time an archivist selects documents to photocopy for a researcher and sends them off, the archivist is essentially doing the research. The researcher may have a simple answer to the question asked, but the context of the entire file of information is missing.

Help Available

To help develop access policies and reference practices for your foundation's archives you can talk to similar institutions, to internal counsel (for specific legal restrictions which may be necessary), and to the professional archivists' organizations formed on local, regional or national levels. The telephone numbers and addresses of useful professional organizations are included at the end of this book.

From Office File to Archival Folder

By Erwin Levold

Inactive foundation files do not become viable archival collections just because they have been transferred from an organization's storage room to the climate-controlled vaults of an archival institution. The important steps in this process are organizing the files, reviewing the paper with an eye towards preservation and creating indexes to facilitate the location and retrieval of information. While these steps are most effectively carried out by a trained records manager or archivist, sound office practices and recordkeeping procedures can greatly enhance the transformation of old files into institutionally-accessible records and useable historical collections.

Foundation office managers, grants officers and records managers can speed up the transformation process by instituting a number of simple practices. Wise recordkeeping not only simplifies day-to-day operations, but also reduces the time and cost of establishing archival control over a collection by reducing the time archivists need to spend taking routine steps to physically preserve the paper and arranging the collection into record groups and series to establish intellectual control.

Office Steps for Physical Preservation

The purpose of an archives is to preserve documents indefinitely and to disseminate information. Office staff can ensure a long life for documents by instituting a number of archival practices which prevent damage to the records:

- Always use stainless steel paper clips or staples.
- Copies to be filed permanently should always be on bond paper.
- Newspaper clippings or poor-quality photocopies should be copied onto bond paper.
- Rubber bands should not be used.
- Photographs should be stored separately from the paper records and the original photograph should be replaced in the file by a bond photocopy.
- If you want to keep torn documents, it is better to photocopy the document and discard it than to place a tape-coated item into the files, except for rare or monetarily valuable documents. Generally speaking, archival documents are kept for their information, not their signatures.

Office Steps For Intellectual Control

Know what you want to retain. Determine which files are needed for daily administration or operation, which records are of historical importance and which documents can be discarded at regular intervals. If you are unsure about the status of the records, seek advice from archivists or historians familiar with philanthropic records.

When the actual transfer of the records to an archives occurs, clearly mark on the boxes the office or program of origin. Record groups or series should have consecutively numbered boxes and a preliminary box or series list should be developed for the material. Also, a list of file titles should be included with each box. Avoid transferring the records in transfiles or book boxes. Standard one-cubic-foot archival (Paige) boxes are better for handling and storage.

By following these simple steps, a foundation will ease the transfer of inactive records and enhance their archival and research value.

What Do We Keep?

By Lee R. Hiltzik

The central question in establishing an archives is, "What do we save?" Matters of organization, storage, conservation and researcher access all hinge upon the answer to this question.

The decision to keep records has to be based on an estimation of the material's significance. In archival terms, this process of evaluating records is called "appraisal," although the monetary value of material is not an issue (and is usually negligible). Instead, the appraisal process weighs both the uniqueness of the material and the needs of the institution against the limitations of the archival storage area and the institution's budgetary and personnel constraints.

Generally, records should be placed in an archives because: (1) they will be used in the future operation of the foundation; (2) they need to be preserved for legal protection of the institution; or (3) they have historical value because they contain the only detailed information about the beginnings of the foundation, its officers and staff and its programs.

The following list includes the most commonly retained records in foundation archives. (Asterisked sub-categories contain the most vital information.)

(1) Records of administrative significance: Materials that document many of the daily activities of the foundation and its decisionmakers, including:

- Minutes of the board of trustees*
- Decisions recorded in office memoranda*
- Policy papers*
- Outgoing and incoming correspondence*
- Grant-related files*
- Reports generated from committee work
- Minutes of staff meetings
- Office subject files

(2) Materials preserved for legal protection: These include:

- Personnel files*
- Employee health office files*
- Grant declinations

(3) Materials of historical value: Other historically significant material that documents the activities of the foundation and its officers include:

- Annual reports*
- Personal papers of key officers of the foundation*

- Photographs
- Audio/visual material

These categories are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, many records kept initially for legal purposes or administrative use will be historically significant in the long term.

At first glance, the above list of material to preserve appears quite comprehensive and may seem to argue that everything should be kept. Yet a good records management policy helps identify material that can be safely discarded. Materials that are not unique to a particular organization often are not necessary to retain. Many foundations hold materials which are not unique to their operation, such as files of magazines or newspapers, or files of clippings and reprints, all of which probably can be found at major research libraries and therefore may not be worth retaining. Also, duplicate files may be discarded. It is not necessary, for example, to keep unannotated copies of the same committee reports, public relations brochures and staff memoranda in the archival files of every foundation officer.

Deciding what should be saved in an archive is not an easy task, but everything produced by a foundation cannot be saved. In these days of massive photocopying and word processor output, even an archive with large storage capacity can be quickly overwhelmed. At the other extreme, without an archive, many institutions are destroying the records of their activities and accomplishments and cannot learn and build from their mistakes.

The Organization and Storage of Archival Material

By Harold Oakhill

Proper organization and storage of archival material are crucial to the success of any archival program. The former provides ready access to the information that the material holds, while the latter ensures that the material is preserved for as long as possible.

Organization

The organization of archival material is maintained on two levels, the intellectual and the physical. The intellectual organization, or control, involves recording and describing the type and range of information included in the material, such as names, subjects, dates, type of record (financial, correspondence, reports) and type of document (photographs, computer tapes, video tapes). Physical control involves recording the storage location of each group of records and the box number of each file so that they may be easily retrieved. As we will see, the intellectual control eventually merges with the physical control. When the archive has been properly organized, a user will be able to determine that a particular piece of information exists in a particular file (intellectual control) and that that file can be found in a particular box on a particular shelf (physical control).

Arrangement

Archivists adhere to two standards when developing intellectual control over a body of material: *Respect des fonds* and maintain original order. *Respect des fonds* refers to the respect given to the office of origin, or provenance, of a group of records. The records of one institution, division or office should not be intermingled with those of another. The original order in which the documents are arranged should also be maintained. The filing system by which the records were organized should be left intact and the names of files and folders titles left unchanged. In general, the organization of the material should be altered as little as possible.

There are two reasons for following these principles. One is purely practical: "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Each body of records will show some degree of organization and some sense of a filing system. If such a system already exists, there is no need to develop another one. This is especially true in developing an archive for an existing institution. The arrangement of records in the archives should be essentially identical to their arrangement in the filing department. There will be a continuous flow of older, inactive records from the filing department to the archive, and having identical filing systems will make this transfer easier.

The second reason for leaving the original order of records intact is to preserve the evidential information it bears. Much can be learned about an organization simply by looking at the manner in which its records were preserved and organized. By reading a list of file titles and by noting what was saved and what was not saved, a researcher can quickly learn what the staff of the organization thought was important, what the fields of interest were, what projects or activities were supported, what the perceived purpose or mandate of the organization was, what the organization's goals were and how it achieved (or attempted to achieve) those goals. If the records of the organization were drastically rearranged, these insights would be lost.

To gain further control over the material and to facilitate the merging of the intellectual control with the physical control, a standard archival hierarchy of record groups and series is developed from the existing organization. All of the records created or collected by an institution constitute its archive. The archive is made up of record groups, which are materials of a similar provenance (source) or generic makeup, such as the records from different departments or offices. Record groups are made up of series, which are groups of files relating to a particular subject or theme. For example, in the archive of a philanthropy the Project Files record group would be made up of series which reflect the various programs or divisions. Remember that the original filing system and organization of the files should suggest these record groups and series. Series are made up of individual files, which are collections of documents bearing on a specific subject. Each file is made up of individual documents, or items, which are the lowest unit of archival control. A document can be a one-page letter, a one-hundred-page report or a computer tape.

Description

Finding aids, or registers, should be developed next to describe the organization of the records. There should be a general description of each record group that includes important themes or issues covered by the material, the types of documents included, the quality of the documentation, inclusive dates, the physical size of the record group (expressed in shelf footage or number of boxes) and its provenance. A list of the series in that record group should also be included. Each series should be described, followed by a list of file titles in the series, listed in the same order as the material is arranged physically. Archival material is generally stored in boxes (see below) and the number of the box each file is stored in is listed here, too. Since the series description also serves as a box list, it is here that the intellectual and physical control of the material meet. At the least, the series register should include the full title of each file, the inclusive dates of the material in that file, and its box number. The most detailed registers also include a description of the contents of each file. Numbering the folders consecutively and noting the numbers in the register adds another level of control over the material.

Many institutions have a central index where the names of individuals, institutions, subjects and dates derived from the incoming and outgoing correspondence are recorded along with the file title where that piece of correspondence can be found. If such an index does not exist, the list of file titles becomes even more important, since it is the only access point to the material. In this case, one of the archivist's first priorities after creating a finding aid would be to work up a rudimentary index of the most important or most commonly requested subjects, names and documents.

Once the material has been arranged on shelves the creation of a shelf list index completes the picture. The index is an alphabetical list of the record groups and series noting the physical location of each.

Storage

A proper storage area and storage policies are crucial to the long-term survival of archival material. A secure, clean, climate-controlled area free from the risks of fire, flood, theft and sunlight must be appropriated or created.

Documents should be stored in boxes, never stacked loosely on shelves. Boxes help keep the material clean, reduce their exposure to harmful lighting and make handling the material easier. Record cartons or archive storage cases made of acid-free materials should be used. Virtually all paper manufactured since the mid-nineteenth century contains acid, some more than others. Acid causes the paper to become yellow and brittle; newsprint, for example, is very acidic. Since acid migrates from an area of high acidity to an area of low acidity, acid-free containers will draw some of the acid out of the documents. Files should also be refoldered in acid-free folders to further stabilize the material.

Steel shelving with baked enamel paint is best. Wood shelving should be avoided since it is combustible. Treated lumber, even when painted or stained, gives off formaldehyde which will discolor and even damage paper over an extended period of time. Archival material should never be stored on the floor.

Ideally an archive storage vault should be of fire-proof construction such as re-enforced masonry. There should be no unnecessary pipes, ducts or electrical junction boxes in or running through the vault. Pipes represent a potential for water damage; junction boxes, a potential fire source. Moreover, all of these fixtures will require maintenance and repair, which will in turn bring debris, disruption and security problems.

The temperature and humidity of a storage area should be carefully controlled and monitored. A temperature of 68°F and 50 percent relative humidity is best, although a temperature between 60°F and 70°F is acceptable. The most important factor is consistency. Pick a temperature that can be most easily and efficiently maintained and stick to it. Constant changes in temperature and humidity are what cause a document to deteriorate.

There should be no windows in the storage area, since prolonged exposure to sunlight is extremely harmful to all types of documents. Ground floor windows also represent a security liability. Windows that open can also play havoc with the climate of a vault and provide access to all sorts of harmful items, including dirt, pollutants, fungi, insects and other forms of wildlife: I have seen pigeons in other archival stack areas, and another archivist found a squirrel in improperly stored materials that were being transferred to the Archive Center.

For fire protection, the storage area should have smoke detectors and fire extinguishers. A sprinkler or non-toxic gas discharge system is desirable. The system should be capable of being activated both manually and automatically through heat sensors.

Archival material should be stored in its own secure room with a door and a lock. The room, or vault, should not be used for any other purpose or activity. Archive staff work areas and the reading area should be outside the vault. Access to the room should be limited to the archive staff, if possible, to prevent theft, unauthorized access, and to keep the material in order. It is standard archival policy not to let users wander through the stacks, picking out their own material as in a library. Misfiled folders and documents would be virtually impossible to find again.

Finally, limited access to the vault helps the archivist monitor the use of the archive. Material should be charged out to users, and the archivist should record the user's name, the name of the file(s) and the date, to ensure the timely return of the material. The archivist should also make every effort to record the number of users and requests, the types of information being sought and the files that were used. Archives which are heavily used are perceived as being more valuable than those which get little use. Therefore, these statistics are the only means by which an archive department can justify its existence. Unrecorded use of the archive can, in the long run, be damaging to an archival program.

Conclusion

Most well run organizations have a records management policy and a staff to implement that policy. A records management department is the best place in which to install an archival program. The archivist should work closely with the records management staff to learn how the records are filed and organized. As we have seen, the well-organized archives makes use of the same indices that are used to locate information in active files. The archives then becomes an integral part of the records management service ensuring that staff requests for older information are filled quickly and accurately. Preserving important non-current information and providing timely access to it are the primary goals of an institutional archives.

Hiring An Archival Consultant

By Thomas Rosenbaum

The services of a consultant may prove beneficial to an organization considering the creation of a records management or archival program.

From a consultation, those who oversee the records and archives project should derive a general sense of the existing historical record of the organization—the story documented and the types of documentation. What kind of story do the records tell and how fully? What do the records show of the organization's beginning, of developments during periods of relative quiet and during periods of change? What are the possible reasons for scant documentation of certain periods? To what extent do the records document the individuals who participated in the development of the organization, and to what extent do the records offer documentation of policies and programs and successes and failures, relatively unleavened by a sense of individual actors?

A consultant can best assist with evaluating the character of the historical record by surveying the documents and reporting on their subject matter, and by suggesting what kind of history might be reconstructed and written from the records. The consultant may also offer suggestions as to the documentation's significance for telling a story or stories beyond the history of the organization. A consultant can help organization officials determine whether using the historical documentation will be useful in formulating policy and program—whether history may become a tool of administration. In general, neither a consultant nor an archivist will propose additions to the historical record, with the possible exception of preparing an oral history program. Oral history can supplement and complement the written record. In addition, conducting interviews with individuals currently and recently active may serve to emphasize staff awareness of a records management or archives program.

A consultant should also assess the volume of records for archival storage, as well as the rate at which records are likely to be transferred to archival storage. A storage cost per cubic foot should be calculated. In appraising the physical condition of the records, a consultant should consider the level of processing the records should receive.

The consultant should, to the extent feasible, identify records needing special attention, such as deteriorating paper which should be photocopied, placed in mylar sleeves, or in extreme cases, fumigated. A consultant also should consider whether any records should be microfilmed. Filming is costly, but it permits enormous savings of space. Material most suitable for filming is usually that which must be retained over a long period either because it is of historical value or because it is needed to meet legal requirements. To be filmed, records should be in consistent order and should be legible.

A consultant should, insofar as is possible, have experience in both archival management and historical research. It may be appropriate to consult both an archivist, who may have less than optimal experience in historical research, and a historian, who may lack experience in archival administration. The professional association to which most archivists belong is the Society of American Archivists, while many American historians belong to the Organization of American Historians. The addresses and telephone numbers of these and other useful organizations are listed at the end of this book.

In addition to the professional organizations, many local libraries, historical societies, museums and business corporations which have started records management or archives programs may also help identify potential consultants. Departments of history at local universities may also constitute a source either of consultants or advice on locating consultants.

Preserving Photographs, Films, Tapes and Scrapbooks

By Melissa A. Smith

Foundation records are rarely limited to paper documents. Other formats, including photographs, films, magnetic tapes and scrapbooks, augment the written record. Each of these formats has unique qualities and preservation needs.

Photographs

Although there are many types of photographs and negatives, the most common for the past fifty years have been gelatin-emulsion, paper-backed photographs and plastic-based negatives, which often are marked either "safety" or "Estar" on one edge. These are what you are most likely to find in your collection, and the recommendations that follow are for these images. If you have photographs or negatives that are older, were made by another process, or have deteriorated, or if you have any doubts, you should consult an expert.

Separate Images and Documents

A photograph collection should be established apart from the paper records because the storage requirements for each are different. The first step in creating a photograph collection is to establish the origin, or provenance, of each image or set of images. That information can be critical in the future use of an image. If you are separating the image from an accompanying document, prepare cross-reference sheets to both the image and its document. Include a description of the document (title, date, author) to file with the document. Also include the location of both items. If there is no document with the image, note where the image was found and any other information that may help identify it.

Proper Storage and Handling

There are two options for properly storing photographs and negatives. They can be stored individually in transparent envelopes or sleeves made of an inert, uncoated plastic such as polyester (Mylar D), polypropylene, triacetate and polyethylene. They can also be stored individually in side-seamed envelopes made of neutral-pH paper. Color photographs should be placed in unbuffered, neutral-pH paper envelopes.

Each of these methods of storage has advantages and disadvantages. Plastic enclosures are more expensive but allow the image to be seen without removal from the protective enclosure. Paper enclosures are easier to write on, but do not protect the image from the atmosphere as plastic ones do.

If a photograph has a corresponding negative, note this on the back of the photograph or on its envelope. Do not write on photographs in ink or marker—use only lead pencil. Negatives should be similarly cross- referenced to corresponding photographs.

When handling unprotected photographs or negatives, wear white cotton gloves and be careful not to touch the image portion. Do not use tape or other adhesive on photographs or negatives.

Do *not* store photographs or negatives in manila folders or envelopes, kraft paper or glassine envelopes. The impurities in these papers will cause the photographs or negatives to deteriorate. It is best to purchase photograph storage supplies from archival supply houses, which also have experts on hand who can answer your questions about preservation and storage. Local photograph supply companies often are not familiar with archival storage requirements. Once properly enclosed, photos and negatives can be grouped in file folders or in boxes. They should be stored flat, but may be stored upright if securely supported to prevent slumping and curving. Photographs and negatives should be stored in a cool, dry area, away from any source of water (overhead steam and water pipes, open windows, sinks and potted plants).

Films

Films should also be stored in a stable environment, one which is clean, cool and dry. Keep them away from water sources and direct sunlight. Do not store them in a basement or attic.

Films produced before 1950 are often on a nitrate base, while those produced after 1950 are usually on a safety base. Nitrate films are very unstable and can be dangerous in the final stages of decomposition. If you have any pre-1950 films, you should immediately consult an expert to determine the base of the film and if it can be copied to a more stable base.

Film should be stored in noncorrosive cans. They should be kept on cores rather than reels. But when you view the film you will need a split reel for projection. A split reel is one which comes in two parts that screw together. For long-term storage, stack the cans flat, no more than six to eight cans high, to avoid film distortion.

As with photographs, be aware of any documentation that could identify the film's provenance. If this material is not kept with the film, you should make a cross-reference to this documentation so that it can be easily retrieved.

Magnetic Tapes

Magnetic tapes have a brief lifespan and should not be considered archival. Under optimal conditions magnetic tapes can be expected to last 12 to 20 years. Also bear in mind that any machine-readable format is useless unless you have the equipment necessary for reading it.

Store all magnetic tapes away from sunlight and from strong magnetic fields including computers, elevators and generators. Store audio and video tapes in the "tail out" position; that is, play the tape all the way through and do not rewind it. This puts the emulsion side of the tape on the inside of the reel where it is protected. Valuable computer tapes should be printed out, and the printout should then be photocopied, since computer paper is not of an archival grade. If you have a video or audio tape that you want to keep indefinitely, consult an expert about transferring it to a longer-lasting format.

Store audio tape reels vertically in their original boxes and then sealed in the polyethylene bag that usually comes with new reels. When producing audio tapes, use tape cassettes with screw fittings. These are easy to dismantle if repair is necessary.

Scrapbooks

Scrapbooks are a convenient way of keeping newspaper clippings and ephemera in order, but they are not recommended for archival storage. Scrapbook pages are made of acidic paper and the adhesives used to mount the contents, such as rubber cement, scotch tape and glues, will eventually stain the clippings and lose their adherence. (Note: Suitable scrapbooks are available from archival supply houses.)

Because newsprint deteriorates very quickly, turning yellow and brittle in only a few years, newspaper clippings should be photocopied for longevity, rather then mounted in a scrapbook. Use an archival-quality paper for photocopying, such as PermalifeR acid-free, bond paper. Add the city, name and date of the newspaper if it is not on the photocopy.

Ephemera, such as fliers, pamphlets, programs and announcements, are best stored and preserved when placed in acid-free folders or boxes, rather then stapled, taped or pasted into scrapbooks.

If a scrapbook has already been assembled, you can dismantle it and photocopy or store the individual pages as described above. But if the scrapbook has an intrinsic value for display purposes, it should be kept intact. Place a sheet of Permalife paper between each page to help prevent the leaching of discoloration from one page to the facing page.

Framed Documents

For display purposes, documents can be framed in a manner that is archivally sound and safe. Use neutral pH museum board and non-acidic backing material to mount the document. Adhesives should not be used. Place a matte around the document so that the cover glass does not touch its surface. To avoid fading, hang the framed document away from direct sunlight and strong artificial light.

Oral History

By Arthur F. Sniffin

A decision to undertake an oral history program is usually made when records such as minutes, diaries, documents, letters and memoirs have not been preserved. Thus the oral record becomes primary source material for future generations of scholars. Since the gathering of a person's memory on a tape recording is based on recall and the skills of the interviewer, it must be tested for consistency and against other sources.

Preparation

In order to reconstruct a record of historical events that accurately portrays the past, a tape-recorded interview should be part of an extensive research effort. The interviewer should do background research on the person being interviewed and the topics to be discussed.

It is essential to use the best equipment—recorder, microphones and tapes—to insure quality sound recordings. The interviewer should practice with the recorder, perhaps practicing with colleagues or family members as interviewees, until thoroughly familiar with the recorder's operation. An ideal interview situation consists of a team of two workers, one to operate the equipment and one to ask the questions.

As the interviewer, you should visit the proposed interview site to become familiar with the location of electrical outlets and potential sources of noise that might reduce the sound quality and interfere with the interview. This visit also affords the opportunity to submit a list of questions and topics to the respondent prior to the interview.

The Intervieiw

Bring a list of a few broad questions with specific items you wish to discuss during the interview. This insures continuity and keeps the discussion moving. However, questions and remarks should be brief: remember that future researchers will want to hear the interviewee, not you. Allow time for the respondent to answer: don't get impatient and jump in with the next question. Learn to accept long intervals of silence while the interviewee is thinking. Avoid asking questions that can be answered with either "yes" or "no." The interview normally should last no more than two hours, to avoid problems of fatigue.

The Transcript

It is important to obtain copyright for all interviews. Scholarly use of the interview should have as few restrictions as possible. Develop a standard form for the interviewee to sign, transferring access rights to your institution. Listen to the tape to insure that it is complete, and prepare a list of proper names, unusual words and technical terms for the transcriber.

The transcription should be verbatim. After you have proofread the transcription, send a copy to the interviewee for approval and corrections. The final copy should be noted as corrected and approved.

Editorial Note: The next two documents describe records management and the handling of records at the Rockefeller Foundation. The first, "Records and Library Services," is given to new employees of the foundation. It describes the foundation's Records and Library Services (RLS) and discusses how to file and request Rockefeller Foundation (RF) documents. This is followed by the foundation's records retention schedule. The editors wish to thank Meredith Averill of the Rockefeller Foundation for permission to publish edited versions of these documents.

Records and Library Services

The Records and Library Services department is about information: internal and external. Records management organizes, for current use and that of future researchers, our internal records of RF's grantmaking. The library provides external information to assist in the grantmaking process.

Records Management

To document its activities and at the same time centralize the responsibility of records maintenance, the central file concept was adopted by the foundation within ten years of its incorporation. Through a central file, scattering of records is minimized and records of common interest and value to officers and staff are placed under the control and supervision of one unit.

Ultimately all correspondence, memoranda, diaries, trip reports and other reports prepared or received by the officers in conducting the affairs of their division and/or program interest are sent to RLS. All of the RF's current documents are filed in RLS. Inactive records and other archival documents are located at the Rockefeller Archive Center in Pocantico Hills, North Tarrytown, New York.

Asking for Information

The records analysts are responsible for processing material within their program area(s), as well as retrieving material that is requested and for answering general information requests about material in the RF file. Requests for grant material that are explicit are most helpful. Since we file according to grant-in-aid and appropriation/allocation numbers, requesting by number gets you the information fastest.

Project records are classified by the grant-in-aid or the appropriation/allocation number. It is written in the upper right corner of each document in red. Black pencil designates nongrant material (general correspondence and declinations).

Copies of minutes or dockets are available here.

Sending Material to the Central File

1) Pending requests for RF funds stay in the division during the investigatory and negotiation stage. Immediately after an appropriation, allocation, grant-in-aid or fellowship has been approved and the letter of notification has been mailed to the grantee, completed files are sent to RLS.

2) In-coming correspondence originals are sent to the central file.
3) Central file copies (yellow block) of all RF-related outgoing correspondence are prepared and sent to RLS.
4) Mark subsequent grant-related material with the grant number before sending it to RLS.
5) Correspondence of a general nature and/or special interest to an officer should be reviewed at least four times a year and released to the central file if it is inactive.
6) If a proposal is declined, the yellow copy of the declination letter and all background material are sent as a unit to the central files as soon as the letter of declination is mailed.
7) Pending grant requests that become inactive are sent to the central files.
8) The disposition of personal files, i.e. correspondence that has no direct relation to the RF and its interests, is at the office's discretion.

Circulation

A Charge-out system is used so that RLS can locate a record after it has been borrowed from the central files.

1) Material released from the department will have a white routing sheet attached to it. This serves as a reminder that the file is to be returned promptly after it is no longer needed and is not to be removed.
2) The classification number in the upper right corner should never be changed. If there is a question about it, bring it to our attention.
3) When returning folders to RLS, do not place unmarked material into these folders. Either clip these documents to the outside of the folder or send them separately, marking them with the grant number if you know it.
4) If an entire file folder is borrowed but a few pieces of correspondence are kept by the borrower or routed to another RF staff member and the remaining files is returned to RLS, it is the responsibility of the borrower to note on the white routing sheet the dates of the report or document being kept. The material should be sufficiently described and the initials of the new borrower indicated so that the documents can be traced if necessary and identified when they are returned to the department at a later date.
5) File integrity is to everyone's benefit and depends on us all.

Records Retention

Each division and department has received a copy of the *Rockefeller Foundation Records Retention Schedule*. Space economy limits file retention in the department to the following:

1) Appropriations, allocations, grant-in-aid, fellowships and conferences—through termination date of the grant, etc., plus 2 additional years; following this period records are transferred to the Rockefeller Archive Center.
2) Nongrant correspondence—current year plus 2 previous years; then to the archive.
3) Declinations—2 years; following this period declinations are discarded unless longer retention is requested by a division.
4) Program and policy—1980 to the present; earlier years at the Archive.

Routine items, such as employment inquiries or requests for information, are disposed of after a period of time in accordance with the retention schedule.

The Rockefeller Foundation's Records Retention Schedule

Developing the foundation's records retention schedule

The foundation's schedule is developed and updated periodically by the Records and Library Service (RLS) using the following steps:

1) Records and files are inventoried;
2) Records are appraised in terms of the need for retention to meet operating, legal, tax or historical requirements;
3) A proposed schedule is drawn up in consultation with each division or department concerned;
4) The schedule is submitted to Foundation Counsel for review;
5) Upon Counsel approval, the schedule is formally submitted to the secretary and vice president for administration for authorization and signature; and
6) The schedule is then distributed and used to determine file review and retention.

Explanation of terms

Permanent retention of records is synonymous with archival preservation. Almost all records so designated are transferred to the Rockefeller Archive Center in North Tarrytown. When we request materials from the archive, they are delivered within a week; we make special arrangements if speed is critical. In a few instances, permanent records are kept in the offices of origin. These are noted in the schedule.

"Current" is used in the schedule to mean "current year or month to date." Current plus a designated (X) number means records may be discarded "X" years or months after the last day of the current calendar year or month. For example, records completed in 1988, with a retention period of current plus six years may be discarded after 1994, this in 1995.

Implementation of schedule

The responsibility for reviewing, purging and retaining files is delegated to each department whose records are included in the schedule. Because a number of the records of the Comptroller's Office are stored at the Rockefeller Archive Center until their retention period is met, the Records and Library Service prepares a memorandum each year for the Comptroller indicating which records are eligible for disposal. Upon authorization from the Comptroller the appropriate records are discarded.

Considerations of space and efficiency require the foundation to limit file holdings in RLS. Holdings are as follows:

1) Board of Trustees minutes: Full set from 1913 to date
2) Board of Trustees dockets and board committee minutes and dockets: Current plus five years; thereafter transferred to the archives
3) Appropriations, allocations, grant-in-aid, fellowships, Bellagio residencies and conferences: Termination year plus two years; thereafter transferred to the archives
4) Non-grant correspondence: Current plus two years; thereafter transferred to the archives
5) Program and policy: Current president's administration plus preceding president's administration; thereafter transferred to the archives
6) Declinations: Two years; thereafter discarded unless they have been designated by an officer for longer retention.

The retention schedule for the Rockefeller Foundation follows. The retention period follows the identification of the records.

I. Minutes and Dockets

A. Board of Trustees and Executive Committee

1. Minutes, signed original: Permanent—RLS binds two sets, retains one and transfers one to the archives.
2. Summary minutes: Permanent—Secretary's Office sends one copy of each set of summary minutes to RLS and one to the archives.
3. Dockets: Current plus five years (one copy only); thereafter transferred to the archives for disposition at the discretion of the archivist.
4. Activities lists: May be destroyed upon receipt of docket.

B. Board Committees

1. Minutes and dockets: Permanent.
2. Audit Committee: Minutes are bound with the docket of the subsequent meeting. VP Administration sends original directly to the archives; Comptroller's Office sends to RLS: Current plus five years.
3. Budget and Compensation Committee: Minutes are bound with the docket of the subsequent meeting. VP for Administration's office sends dockets minus annual salary review to RLS, retaining the salary review for current plus five years; thereafter transferred to the archives.
4. Finance Committee: Minutes are bound in the subsequent Quarterly Investment Report. Treasurer's Office sends to RLS: Current plus five years; thereafter to the archives.
5. Nominating Committee: Minutes are filed separately or bound with the docket of the subsequent meeting. VP for Administration's office retains for current plus five years; thereafter transferred to the archives.

II. Program and Administration Files

A. Projects (correspondence, reports, etc. regarding appropriation, allocations, grant-in-aid, fellowships and Bellagio conferences and residencies): Permanent—sent by program staff to RLS when the Board approves an appropriation or officers approve an allocation, grant-in-aid or release.

B. Program and policy (correspondence, memoranda and reports pertaining to the development of program interests, policy formulation, administrative procedures and directives, periodic program reviews and appraisals by officers, trustees and external evaluators): Permanent.

C. Counsel opinions: Permanent.

D. General correspondence: Permanent except for the following routine non-grant material, which can be discarded at the discretion of the program staff: letters from search committees; change of address or position notifications; unsolicited brochures, newsletters, press releases, annual reports; letters of congratulation written by RF officers to colleagues in the profession; thank-you-for-lunch or-for-meeting-with-us letters; unsolicited copies of papers or speeches; correspondence with or about people who are thinking of changing their positions and are, in effect, using the RF as an employment agency; invitations extended to RF officers to attend and/or participate in meetings, seminars, workshops, film screenings, performances; and routing responses to inquiries.

E. Declinations: Two years unless designated by an officer for longer retention.

F. Applications for employment (not employed): Current plus one year or transferred to the Personnel Office

III. Comptroller's Office

A. Activities reports, exempt staff (Comptroller's copy): Current plus two years

B. Employee Benefits and Retirement System (security reports for Retirement Plan and Trusteed Savings Plan): Permanent, on-site

C. Audit Committee minutes and dockets: VP Administration, original to archives immediately; RLS, current plus five years

D. Audit, Field office: Current plus 10 years on-site; thereafter to the archives

E. Bank statements: Current plus six years

F. Budgets (Comptroller's copy & Worksheets): Current plus 10 years on-site; thereafter to the archives

G. Canceled checks: Current plus six years

H. Credit memos: Current plus six years

I. Employee benefits files: Current plus five years on-site; thereafter to the archives

J. Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) reports: Permanent, on-site

K. Employee salary history records: Permanent, on-site

L. Federal Income Contributions Act (FICA) reports: Current plus six years

M. Fellowship and payroll registers: Current plus three years

N. Fellowship cards: Termination year plus six years

O. Field directors' bank statements: Current plus six years

P. Financial reports, annual: RLS, current plus five years; thereafter to the archives

Q. Financial reports from field offices: Current plus one year on-site; thereafter to the archives

R. General ledgers (December 31, both cash and accrual): Current plus six years on-site; thereafter to the archives

S. Internal Revenue Service

1. 990-PF reports, Work paper for: Current plus six years
2. Wage and tax statements (Form W2): Current plus six years
3. Statement of miscellaneous income (Form 1099–Misc): Current plus six years

T. Journal entries: Current plus six years: Current plus one years on-site; thereafter to the archives
U. Monthly activity reports (charitable activities): Current plus 10 years
V. Purchase orders, completed (Comptroller's copy): Current plus three years
W. Subsidiary ledgers - grants: Through closed status; thereafter to the archives
X. Trial balances—originals (December 31): Current plus 10 years on-site; thereafter to the archives
Y. U.S. Department of Commerce reports: Current plus two years
Z. Vouchers, New York—alphabetically and numerically filed (includes paid invoices as documentation): Current plus six years; Current plus one year on-site; thereafter to the archives
AA. Vouchers, Field Office: Current plus six years; Current plus one year on-site; thereafter to the archives

IV. Computer Services Department *(These records are computer tapes.)*

A. Appropriations trial balance: Current year's monthly tapes plus six prior year-ends
B. Declinations: Current year's monthly tapes plus two prior year-ends
C. Fellowship history: Permanent
D. Fellowship institutional grants: Current plus prior year-ends
E. Fellowship stipend master file, with expenditures and address labels: Current year's monthly tapes plus six prior year-ends
F. Fellowship trial balance: Current year's monthly tapes plus six prior year-ends
G. General ledger (Computron): Current year's monthly tapes plus six prior year-ends
H. Grants and expenditures—annual: Current plus prior year-end
I. Library routing slips for periodicals: Current year
J. Payroll (Synergy) and benefits files of both active and terminated staff members: Current year's (semi-)monthly tapes plus six prior year-ends
K. Leave policy (Status of leave tape): Current year's monthly tapes plus two years

V. Office Service Department

A. Purchase orders
   1. Completed and cancelled order folders including requisitions, invoices and any shipping documents: Five years after completion or cancellation
   2. Numerical file and alphabetical file by vendor: Current plus one year
B. Claim folders: Current plus six years
C. Conference services requests: Current plus one year
D. Equipment leases and contracts: Six years after expiration or cancellation
E. Inventory records: Current listing to archives
F. Invoices, paid without purchase orders (alphabetical file by vendor): Current plus five years
G. Marine insurance bordereau: Current plus six years
H. Maintenance and repair records: Current plus five years
I. Production records: Current plus one year
J. Shipment folders (post-assignment household goods shipments for field staff): Current plus three years
K. Visitors log: Current plus one year

VI. Personnel Records

A. Staff members except officers, managers and other senior professional staff

1. Personnel folders (includes employment application, references, performance appraisals, salary history): Resignation-year or year-of-death plus five years, held in Personnel Office
2. Activities reports: Current plus two years
3. Personnel change reports: Current plus two years
4. Status of leave reports: Current plus two years

B. Employment applications (not employed): Current plus one year

C. Officers, managers and other senior professional staff
1. Personnel folders (includes employment application, references, performance appraisals, salary history, activities reports): Permanent, held in Secretary's Office of Personnel Office from resignation-year or year-of-death plus five years; thereafter all records except activities reports to the archives

VII. Treasurer's Office

A. Bank statements and cancelled checks: Current plus six years

B. Brokers' confirmations: Year of current tax return plus three years

C. General correspondence: Current plus 10 years on-site; thereafter to the archives, except for the following routine non-grant material, which can be discarded at the discretion of the Treasurer's Office staff: letters from search committees; change of address or position notifications; unsolicited brochures, newsletters, press releases, annual reports; letters of congratulation written by RF officers to colleagues in profession; thank-you-for-lunch or for-meeting-with-us letters; unsolicited copies of papers or speeches; correspondence with or about people who are thinking of changing their positions and are, in effect, using the RF as an employment agency; invitations extended to RF officers to attend and/or participate in meetings, seminar, workshops, film screenings, performances; and routing responses to inquiries

D. Internal Revenue Service Report—990-PF: Permanent, on-site

E. Quarterly Investment Review: Permanent, on-site

F. Securities custodial reports; annual: Current plus five years; thereafter to the archives

G. Trial Balance and general ledger (including ledgers, journals and cash books): Current plus five years; thereafter to the archives

H. Vouchers, numerically filed: Current plus one year

VIII. Bellagio Study and Conference Center *(After designated retention, records shall be destroyed locally unless otherwise noted.)*

A. Accounts and Purchasing: See Comptroller's Office and Office Services Department sections of the schedule

B. Community relations: Permanent, on-site

C. Conference and residency files: five years following conference or residency (Program Office for the Bellagio Center has file)

D. Correspondence
1. Administrator's file to and from Program Office for the Bellagio Center: Current plus three years
2. General: Current plus five years; thereafter to Program Office for the Bellagio Center to be sent to the archives

E. Daily files (chronological): Current plus one year

F. Geologic and topographic map and building plans: Permanent, on-site

G. Guest card file: Permanent, on-site
H. Guest registers: Current plus five years
I. Legal documents
   1. Deeds, National monument designation documents, etc.: Permanent, on-site
   2. Agreements and contracts: Three years after year of expiration
J. Local administration: As long as required for informational, legal or operational purposes
K. Personnel
   1. Field staff
      a. Benefit and tax files: Current plus six years; thereafter to the Program Office for the Bellagio Center to be sent to the archives
      b. Personnel files: As long as needed for institutional and individual purposes; thereafter to the Program Office for the Bellagio Center to be sent to the archives, at the discretion of the staff member
   2. Local staff
      a. Salary, benefit and tax files: Permanent, on-site
      b. Additional personnel files: As long as required for information and/or legal purposes
   3. Applications for employment (not employed): Current plus one year

IX. Nairobi Office *(After designated retention, records shall be destroyed locally unless otherwise noted.)*

A. Accounts and purchasing: See Comptroller's Office and Office Services Department section of the retention schedule
B. General correspondence
   1. To and from New York office: Current plus five years or as long as needed for information
   2. With universities, individuals, ministries, both foreign and local: Current plus five years or as long as needed for information; thereafter to RLS for the archives
   3. Declinations: Current plus one year
   4. Daily file (chronological): Current plus one year
C. Grants and fellowships files: Five years after termination of grant or award (New York office has file)
D. Housing—Properties Trust and rents and taxation: As long as required for informational, legal or operational purposes; thereafter to RLS for the archives
E. Local administration: As long as required for informational, legal or operational purposes
F. Personnel
   1. Field staff
      a. File including benefit and tax files: three years following staff member's reassignment or resignation; thereafter to RLS for the archives
   2. Diaries: As long as required for information (New York office has copy: permanent)
   3. Personal files: At discretion of staff member, to RLS for the archives
G. Local staff, including benefit and tax files: As long as required for information and/or legal purposes; thereafter to RLS for transfer to the archives
H. Applications for employment (not employed): Current plus two years

Organizations to Know and Publications to Read

Section I. Readings in Archives

Selected by Emily J. Oakhill

General Works

Bradsher, James Geogory, ed., *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Duckett, Kenneth W., *Modern Manuscripts*. Nashville, Tennessee: American Association for State and Local History, 1975.

Shellenberg, T.R., *The Management of Archives*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.

Manuals from the Society of Archivists

The following titles are available from the Society of American Archivists, 600 S. Federal, Suite 504, Chicago, IL 60605.

Appraisal and Accessioning
Arrangement and Description
Conservation
Inventories and Registers: A Handbook of Techniques and Examples
Machine-Readable Records
Reference and Access
Surveys

Section II. Useful Organizations

Archives and Records Management

Association of Records Managers and Administrations, Inc.
(ARMA International)
4200 Somerset Drive, Suite 215
Prairie Village, KS 66208
(913) 341-3808

Society of American Archivists
600 S. Federal, Suite 504
Chicago, IL 60605

History

American Association for State and Local History
172 Second Avenue North, Suite 202
Nashville, Tennessee 37201

American Historical Association
400 A Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 544-2422

Organization of American Historians
112 North Bryan Street
Bloomington, IN 47408-4199
(812) 855-7311

Section III. Where to Get Archival Supplies

Compiled by Melissa A. Smith

Archival supply houses specialize in materials that are specifically designed for the safe, long-term preservation of archival records. Their stock includes storage boxes of varying shapes and sizes, document folders, paper and board of different weights for mounting and preserving, and paper and plastic sleeves for documents and photographs. They also offer specialty items ranging from conservation glues and paper to custom-designed storage units.

The supply houses also have staff members on hand to answer your technical questions regarding archival storage and preservation. The customer service phone numbers listed below will put you in touch with these experts.

The Hollinger Corporation
P.O. Box 8360
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
703-898-7300 (customer service)
1-800-634-0491 (for orders)
Fax—703-898-8073 (for orders)

TALAS
213 West 35th Street
New York, NY 10001-1996
212-736-7744 (for orders and customer service)

University Products, Inc.
517 Main Street, P.O. Box 101
Holyoke, MA 01041-0101
1-800-762-1165 (customer service)
In Massachusetts 1-800-336-4847
1-800-628-1912 (for orders)
Fax—413-532-9281 (for orders)

Photograph Supplies

Light Impressions
439 Monroe Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607-3717
1-800-828-6216 (for orders and customer service)
In New York, 1-800-828-9629
Fax—716-442-7318

About the Contributors

SARA L. ENGELHARDT served as the corporate secretary of the Carnegie Corporation from 1975 until 1987, when she became executive vice president of the Foundation Center. She will succeed Thomas Buckman as president of the Foundation Center in July, 1991.

JOHN J. GRABOWSKI has served the Western Reserve Historical Society in various capacities since 1969, and has been its curator of manuscripts since 1985. He also served as the managing editor of *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (1987) and co-editor of *Cleveland: A Tradition of Reform* (1986).

PETER DOBKIN HALL, the author of *The Organization of American Culture, 1700–1900: Private Institutions, Elites, and the Origins of American Nationality* (1982), is one of the most prolific students of nonprofit organizations in America. Associated with the Yale Program on Nonprofit Organizations since 1978, he served as Scholar-in-Residence at the Rockefeller Archive Center in the fall of 1989.

LEE R. HILTZIK is an archivist at the Rockefeller Archive Center in North Tarrytown, New York, where he is responsible for the maintenance and preservation of the records of The Rockefeller University.

RICHARD J. KAPLAN joined the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation as its archivist/information specialist in July 1987. In October 1990 he became the foundation's director of research and information services.

ERWIN LEVOLD is an archivist at the Rockefeller Archive Center, where he has processed the Commonwealth Fund papers and the Mexico field office records of the Rockefeller Foundation.

ANN C. NEWHALL served as the archivist for the Ford Foundation, 1980–1987, and was largely responsible for the creation of its archives. Since 1987, she has been a freelance consulting archivist. Active in several professional archivists' associations, she is the co-author, with William P. Newhall, of *Building and Renovating Archival Facilities*, which will be published by the Society of American Archivists in 1991.

EMILY J. OAKHILL, an archivist at the Rockefeller Archive Center, has processed portions of the Rockefeller Foundation records and related collections. She also serves as the Center's specialist on electronic records and its liaison to the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), an on-line union catalog of bibliographic and archival records.

HAROLD OAKHILL is the managing archivist at the Rockefeller Archive Center. His responsibilities include accessioning additions to the collections and general oversight of the storage facilities, including the addition of moveable shelving to stack areas.

KENNETH W. ROSE joined the Rockefeller Archive Center as assistant to the director in July 1987. He is the compiler and editor of *The Availability of Foundation Records: A Researcher's Guide* (1990).

THOMAS E. ROSENBAUM has been an archivist at the Rockefeller Archive Center since 1976. A specialist in Asian history, he is the author of *The Archives of the China Medical Board and the Peking Union Medical College: Some Sources on the Transfer of Western Science, Medicine, and Technology to China During the Republican Period* (1989).

JAMES A. SMITH, the author of *The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite* (1991), served as Scholar-in-Residence at the Rockefeller Archive Center during 1988–1989. He was a project director and program officer at the Twentieth Century Fund (1979–1987) before joining the New School for Social Research as an adjunct professor in 1987.

MELISSA A. SMITH is an archivist at the Rockefeller Archive Center, where she processed the records of the Russell Sage Foundation. She is also responsible for the preservation and maintenance of the Archive Center's collection of photographs and, with Emily J. Oakhill, the film collection.

ARTHUR F. SNIFFIN, currently the Long Island regional archivist for the State of New York, served in 1989–1990 as the archivist at the Rockefeller Archive Center's office on the campus of The Rockefeller University.

DARWIN H. STAPLETON has served as the director of the Rockefeller Archive Center in North Tarrytown, New York since 1986.