

**ARCHIVAL EDUCATION  
AND KNOWLEDGE**



## *Chapter 11*

### **THE HISTORY OF ARCHIVAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA: WHAT'S NEXT?**

**Alison Langmead**

#### **Abstract**

Since the birth of the archival profession in the United States in 1936, there have been two distinct generations of leaders in the field of archival education. The first of these cohorts consisted of the American archival pioneers who, while trained as historians, claimed their right to the front of the classroom through their direct experience with the practice of keeping archives. The second generation of educators, currently at the helm, consists in large part of practitioners who entirely left the archives in order to become full-time academics. There is now a third cohort of archival educators preparing to take over the leadership of the field. This group is the first to be able to earn a Ph.D. in the independent academic discipline of “archival studies.” In this moment of transition, it is worth looking back over the priorities and measures of success presented by the first two generations of archival educators in order to decide which are still appropriate, and which might be profitably rethought given the current environment surrounding the field(s) of archival education and archival studies.

## Introduction

In a 2001 report produced for the Kellogg ALISE Information Professions and Education Reform (KALIPER) Project, a team of highly-esteemed archival researchers identified three different cohorts, or “generations,” of archival educators produced in the United States between the birth of the archival profession in 1936 and the end of the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> These generations, the report found, could be distinguished from one another both by differences in their academic training and their shifting relationship to professional archival practice. While the first generation drew their expertise about archives from their work in professional practice, their academic credentials, by and large, were in the field of history. The second—and the majority of the authors of the KALIPER report belonged to this group—were archival practitioners who, “slowly drifted towards LIS doctoral programs and wrote dissertations on archival topics with little or no archival faculty or curricular support.”<sup>2</sup> Only with the third generation that emerged in the 1990s, the report stated proudly, had it been possible for archival educators to study with archival faculty, take doctoral-level courses specifically targeted to archival issues, and participate in archival research projects.<sup>3</sup> Even more critically, the report went on to observe, “some members of this third generation have little professional archival experience and have moved into doctoral programs straight from a master’s program or with only minimal archival experience.”<sup>4</sup>

The KALIPER report thus noted that within the span of three generations, the members of the field of archival education had undergone a dramatic shift in both academic and professional priorities, with each cohort demonstrating a move towards greater academic professionalization and reduced ties to archival practice. Initially led by Ph.D.s in history who struck out from their home discipline to form a new field of professional practice, and whose efforts to train successive generations were made above and beyond their professional duties, the KALIPER team reported that archival education was now, through the efforts of their own generation, fully professionalizing within the academy.

Because of this shift, archivists could now lay claim to their own field of academic expertise called “archival studies,” and having such an academic foundation, they argued, was a critical component of any healthy profession. This second cohort may have come from practice, but they left that behind in order to join the ranks of the academy because they believed strongly that it was the best way to move the archival profession forward. However, in so doing they fashioned a path to becoming an archival educator that could be traced solely through the academy, and so the up-and-coming generations have had no cause to begin their careers as practitioners, and they have, by and large, ended up with little to no experience in professional archival practice. The home profession of the third group of archival educators can now truly be said to be that of the academy alone.

That these three cohorts of archival educators, past and present, were correctly identified by the KALIPER report is without question. However, their vision of archival education’s past, present, and future was highly embedded in the particular measures of success that they championed. Principal among these priorities was that the field of archival education needed to create an independent field of academic inquiry worthy of dignity, honor, and respect in order to progress and thrive. But this was not the same measure of success that concerned the first cohort, and it also need not necessarily be the one held by the third. At the current historical moment, this second generation who fought so tirelessly to found the independent discipline of archival studies is on the verge of retirement, and the third is preparing to take the leadership of the field.<sup>5</sup> This study asks what these new leaders can learn from a critical investigation of the differing priorities and measures of success held by the previous two. The concerns and achievements of the first generation clearly informed the concerns and achievements of the second, and it is natural for the concerns and achievements of both previous groups to inform the work of the third. It therefore behooves the current cohort of archival educators to proactively decide which aspects of their predecessors’ work it will carry forward into the future,

and which need to be left behind because of their own changing priorities and measures of success.

### **The First Generation: The Profession Needs Trained Practitioners**

The first cohort of archival educators—or archival trainers, as they tended to call themselves—served from 1936 through the early 1970s, and was produced under circumstances that called for inventiveness and expertise. It consisted mainly of those historians, often bearing Ph.D.s, who had taken part in the creation of the archival profession from within the incubator of the American Historical Association.<sup>6</sup> These groundbreakers not only originated the standards of archival practice in the United States, they were also responsible for developing the theoretical and methodological foundations of educating successive generations of practicing archivists. They were driven to teach by the knowledge that the archival profession could not succeed without the continuous creation of new, highly-trained practitioners, and they also recognized that the only group with the expertise needed to teach the new recruits were the pioneers themselves. They stood at the front of the classroom as practitioners, practitioners who also developed theories and new ways of practice. Any claim that they had to expertise in the field, and it was a strong claim, came directly from their work in the field and their very construction of the principles of theory, methodology, and practice that, it so happens, archivists still use today. Their measure of success as educators was the production of a sufficient number of well-trained archivists so that the profession could continue to thrive. They were committed to maintaining the standards of the profession that they had created, and were working tirelessly to keep the field fully staffed.

Without repeating the in-depth research presented by many past studies on the history of archival education in North America, it is worth offering a brief overview of the way archival education was administered between 1938 and 1972, in order to begin providing context for interpreting the work of the first generation of archival educators. The first

course ever taught on archival practice was presented by Solon J. Buck at the Columbia University Graduate School in the fall of 1938. It was a two-hour course entitled, "Archives and Historical Manuscripts," and a number of such one-off courses, or sometimes two-term sequences, would spring up in the following decades. Summer institutes were also another outstanding feature of professional archival training between 1945 and the early 1970s. Ernst Posner, the prominent archival educator, began this tradition of running summer institutes for archival professionals in 1945 through the American University, and they would continue to be regularly offered there until his retirement in 1961.<sup>7</sup> Many other summer institutes on this model would be presented across the country during this period. H. G. Jones, the renowned archivist and archival thinker, would provide a concise and cogent contemporary summary of the overall shape of archival education in 1968:

[There are] four universities offering in their liberal arts curriculum full-year courses in archival administration, four library schools and one extension division giving shorter courses during the regular year, and about a half dozen institutions offering summer institutes of varying length and depth.<sup>8</sup>

Thus, near the end of the first generation's leadership, the majority of the training for archival practitioners would take place either in summer institutes that lasted between two and six weeks, or in one- to two-term courses taking place at scattershot intervals, mainly in history departments and schools of library science or library service. All of these curricula consisted of a heavy dose of in-service learning, often using the instructor's own repository as a sort of "laboratory" where students could learn and practice. Of the two methods of delivery, the summer institutes actually seemed to have had a greater educational impact on the profession; as noted by Jones, "A sure sign of the young professional archivist today is his announcement, 'I attended Posner's [or Schellenberg's or Holmes' or Evans'] institute.' No other formal training activity has equaled these summer institutes in influencing archivists in the United States."<sup>9</sup>

In 1972, Robert Warner produced a survey of the field of archival education for the Society of American Archivists (SAA), and in so doing provided a bit of quantitative data on the educational backgrounds and employment situations of the trainers staffing these courses and institutes.<sup>10</sup> According to Warner's work, while all fifteen of the faculty respondents to his survey held at least a master's degree, usually in history, less than half of them held a Ph.D.<sup>11</sup> As for the jobs that they claimed to hold, "Of the group, three were employed full-time as library science instructors, seven as archival administrators, four as practicing archivists, and for one information was not available."<sup>12</sup> Only one-fifth of this sample, therefore, consisted of full-time educators, and all of those were employed in library science programs. The remainder would have been responsible for performing their educational work in addition to their practice, and were only sometimes paid an amount in addition to their salary. Indeed, Warner could only confirm that six of the fifteen faculty respondents received additional pay. Of the others, three were full-time educators who were naturally paid for their work as a part of their job, one respondent folded his work as an educator into his university position receiving no extra pay, and the remaining five did not supply salary information. Indeed, so critical did the task of archival education seem to Jones that he argued that practitioners should teach for free out of professional obligation if necessary: "Because these courses will be a justifiable service offered by the archival agency, the archivist teaching them should be willing to contribute his time and effort without additional pay. So much the better if the university wishes to compensate him."<sup>13</sup>

The names and faces of this cohort of exceptional educators are not unknown to the archival profession today. Prominent archivists working during this period include F. Gerald Ham, State Archivist and head of the Division of Archives and Manuscripts at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Maynard Brichford, University Archivist at the University of Illinois, Philip Mason, University Archivist and Director of the Labor History Archives, Dolores Renze, State Archivist of Colorado,



and of course, Theodore Schellenberg, who would pass away in 1970, but who had previously served as a highly influential archivist at the National Archives and was one of the most influential educators of the first generation, or indeed perhaps of any generation of archival educators to date.

## **The Academic Context**

Because the context of archival education is so different today, it is worth paying close attention to the fact that all of this educational apparatus was certainly situated within academia—whether in departments of history or in library schools—but lived there almost in the academy’s interstices. The faculty was working on a contingent basis, and their courses sort of squatted within those departments whose expertise bore most directly on the practice of keeping archives in the United States. The courses were also geared towards the professional training of practicing archivists, and so they took place on a schedule, that is in short courses and summer institutes, that could accommodate both the students and the instructors who were often also working in archival practice.<sup>14</sup> Thus, even though the training was taking place in the university context, the system was set up for practitioners to be able to both teach and learn, and that did not happen on a traditional full-time (or even part-time) academic schedule. This somewhat awkward situation begs the question of why these courses were being offered in the academy at all.

The answer is clear and three-fold. First, because of the particular circumstances of creation of the archival profession, many of the early leaders in the field were Ph.D.-bearing members of the academic profession prior to becoming “career changers” and moving to the archives. Their original home therefore was the academy, and it made sense to them to offer training there. Indeed, it was probably directly because of their prior academic credentials that they were welcomed. As Jones noted, again in 1968:

I dare predict that almost any graduate school of history will welcome such [archival training] courses into its curriculum, provided that the archivist proposing to teach them has (1) academic qualifications for adjunct appointment to the faculty and (2) facilities and holdings adequate for competent instruction.<sup>15</sup>

While the archival educators in the first cohort fully expected to work in adjunct appointments, combining their “holdings” with their experience to produce curricula, they also recognized that even adjunct appointments require academic qualifications, which the first generation of American archivists tended to have because of their background in the field of history. A second reason that these courses were held in the academy was that the earliest American archivists were defining themselves within and against the model of the European archival tradition, and that model assumed the Ph.D. in history as well.<sup>16</sup> Both of these first two motives also reveal that the educators were relying on the prestige of the academy to bestow a certain amount of prestige on their work. But the third and most critically influential reason that archival training was held in the academy was that the first generation of educators in the United States steadfastly believed that a training in history was essential to the work of a practicing archivist, and history was taught in the academy. These men and women knew firsthand the impact that the discipline of history had on incubating the archival profession in the United States, and were well aware of their daily use of the historical method. Even Theodore Schellenberg, who in 1968 would argue that library schools were a more amenable home to archival training than history departments, stated that, “The best basic training that an archivist can have, in my opinion, is thorough training in history.”<sup>17</sup>

In fact, the article in which Schellenberg made this pronouncement was produced at that critical moment in the history of the field of archival education when the first generation of archival educators was making way for the second. The paper was originally presented at the 1966 Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists in a session entitled, “Different Approaches to Archival Training.” In this session, the two eminent archivist-scholars, Schellenberg and H. G. Jones—whose work in this session has already been quoted above—both presented

their visions of the present and future of archival training. Schellenberg and Jones were both very clear that historical training was one of the key features, if not the absolute bedrock, of archival training. Jones makes this point quite forcefully, “I submit that there are no unimportant professional positions in archival agency, that consequently every archivist must be a historian, and that, most of all, he must be thoroughly familiar with the historical method and the general subject field covered by his holdings.”<sup>18</sup>

Schellenberg would go on to unpack no fewer than three distinct ways in which historical training served as the critical foundation for all archival knowledge. First, since it was assumed throughout both of these men’s presentations that the materials being stewarded by the archivists of the time would pertain mainly to the history of the United States, a solid background in American history would provide the necessary subject expertise needed to help these professionals evaluate their records properly. Second, a training in historical research, “will teach [the archivist] to look into the origin, development, and working of human institutions.”<sup>19</sup> In this way, the historical method would assist the archivists in the arrangement and description of archival records, as it would train them to think clearly and systematically about the past processes that must have taken place to produce the records in their care. This knowledge would then allow them to perform their archival duties to the highest possible standards.

Finally, and most crucially for the current analysis, Schellenberg believed that the study of history “will lead [the archivist] to appreciate the value of archives and manuscripts, for they are the source material used in producing historical monographs.”<sup>20</sup> That is to say, the study of history would serve to introduce archivists to the ways in which their then-assumed primary user base—historians—would use the materials entrusted to their care. This point cannot be underemphasized. For Schellenberg, the study of history for mid-twentieth-century American archivists was not only about acquiring a subject expertise in the assumed contents of their archives, it was also a form of ethnographic research undertaken to better understand the needs of their assumed primary

user group. Archivists were enjoined both to learn the content offered by the historical profession, but they were also encouraged to study the workings of history so as to better serve the needs of historians. It might even be said that the “theory” of the newly-formed archival profession was that of the practice of history. But, an archival training in history was not quite the same as a complete training in history—archival work was viewed almost as a form of *applied* history.

That these programs were offered in academia also appeared to afford the first generation of archival educators one other circumstantial advantage: namely, that advancing archival curricula within this larger community of knowledge might also serve as a form of professional advocacy. On increasing the number of training courses at universities in the United States, Jones noted, “A hundred or so scholars each year will be taught the fundamentals of archival administration, and, vicariously, hundreds more will hear about the courses from the enrolled students... [a] few enrollees will enter the profession.”<sup>21</sup> Schellenberg would also go on to make a similar point about the benefits of introducing the entire profession of librarians to archival principles in library schools.

### **But History Wasn’t Everything**

For his part, Schellenberg listed historical training as only the first of three critical components of any archival education: historical training, methodological training, and technical training. Jones would agree with this triumvirate in his presentation, even if he did not use those precise terms.<sup>22</sup> Along with training in history, there must also be a focus on the particular practices and techniques employed by archivists on a daily basis in the field. This methodological training, according to Schellenberg, would build upon the foundation provided by the historical method to provide the archivist-in-training with daily know-how. He provides a quite extensive list of topics in this category, most of which are central to the practice of archival education today: the techniques of surveying records, principles for the evaluation of records, principles and techniques of archival description, archival interests in the management of current

records, reference service policies and practices, and microfilming and other reproductive techniques.<sup>23</sup> Even if his terminology is a bit antiquated, a contemporary archivist can still recognize the importance of courses on archival appraisal, courses on archival representation, courses on active information management, courses on archival reference and outreach, and courses on reproducing records—which in this day and age, usually equates to digitization.

The third component of an archival education was technical training. Schellenberg described this component mainly as conservation and preservation techniques, or “cleaning, repairing and reproducing documents” and “the physical facilities for maintaining documents.”<sup>24</sup> This hands-on approach to maintaining the documentation of American history may not correspond exactly to the notion of practice in the field today, but it certainly highlights a part of this curricular system that persists to the present day—that it is not possible to simply think about theory and method to become an archival practitioner, one also has to get one’s hands dirty. Jones would even go so far as to proactively argue that a period of in-service training was critical, reflecting the long-standing tradition of including this type of practice within an archival training curriculum.

### **Originary Interdisciplinarity**

This complex, multi-faceted commitment to the triumvirate of history, methodology, and practice had important consequences for the field, as it meant that an archival training program needed to be led either by more than one person, each representing a different skill set, or by only a few truly exceptionally situated individuals. History was the domain of the historians, while methodology and practice were the domain of the archivists (or perhaps somewhat to the librarians, if Schellenberg were to have his way). His emphasis on methodological training seemed to serve as a critical support for his argument that the best place to house archival training programs was inside schools of library science. Schellenberg felt that situating archival training programs

in history departments risked skewing archival training towards the study of archival content rather than archival administration, and since, in his view, librarians were principally concerned in their own profession with methodology, he argued that they were ideal candidates to develop this aspect of archival education.

Jones took issue with what was, in fact, an unstated assumption on Schellenberg's part that library educators were already fit to take over the job of training archivists in archival methodology. A historian to the core, he instead argued that it would be best for archival science to be taught in graduate schools of history. Even so, Jones also appeared eager to appease those who wanted to place archival training within library schools, going so far as to proactively endorse the development of such programs, but he is quick to add:

Let it not be implied that such training as an elective course provides all the necessary foundation for a librarian to become an archivist. And above all, let these courses be taught by archivists with the maturity that comes only through experience. Archival training can never be just a textbook course; archival work is a state of mind, and anywhere the training must transmit that state of mind.<sup>25</sup>

Nevertheless, with all that, Jones steadfastly concluded his arguments by stating that archival training programs would do best by remaining in departments of history, not because he believed that historians could better train archivists in methodological principles, but because of his unshaken belief that, between the two principles of historical training and methodological training, historical training was the more important.

Even though these men would end up falling on different sides of the debate concerning the proper academic home for archival training in the late 1960s, they both had put their finger on a form of originary interdisciplinarity that continues to affect the archives field to this day. As Schellenberg noted, "While archival courses will always have to be the exclusive responsibility of one department in a school, they will always require the active collaboration of several departments." The history department would always be needed to "provide the basic training on which specialized training should be superimposed."<sup>26</sup> The

manuscripts division of a repository would always be called into action to demonstrate principles of archival arrangement and description using their holdings. The librarians could offer their experience in methodology. Even the department of public administration could help with any needed records management offerings. They all must work together to produce the highest-quality archivist possible. Jones quite clearly also expressed that library school might be a perfectly appropriate place to house archival training, if all of the varying facets entailed in the job of keeping archives could be covered there: "A combination of library and historical education, coupled with formal training in archives administration, would be ideal preparation for an archival position."<sup>27</sup>

Such debates about the placement of archival training in history departments or library schools would continue well into the second generation of archival education.<sup>28</sup> So long did the professional deliberation wear on, in fact, that by 1990 many members of the second cohort was more than ready to see the debate between history and library science put to bed.<sup>29</sup> As James O'Toole would note, "On the whole, the 1980s were reasonably good years for archival education...Some of the particularly pointless disputes of the past—most notably the history vs. library science debate over the proper administrative setting for archival education—were muted."<sup>30</sup> Indeed, according to the KALIPER report, the definitive shift towards placing archival education in schools of library science took place between 1980 and 1999, and it remains the case today that the vast majority of graduate archival education is taking place in LIS programs, which are themselves now often situated in iSchools.<sup>31</sup> However, even though the dispute now seems decided, the second generation of archival educators would identify a more critical type of damage inflicted on the field by this argument, one that was more serious than just worn nerves. The KALIPER researchers argued that the continued debate over the correct placement of archival education programs had had the more deleterious effect of being a "bifurcation" that "has made it difficult for archival education to establish a separate identity."<sup>32</sup> However, looking back with a critical eye towards the differing generational priorities and differing measures of success suggests

that it may not have been the bifurcation of archival education between these two academic programs that caused the difficulty; instead it may have been the very nature of the archival discipline—its originary interdisciplinarity—that made such a separate identity tricky to establish.

### **The Second Generation: A Separate Identity, Devoutly to be Wished**

In fact, the instantiation of just such a distinct disciplinary identity for the archival field, one worthy of its own dignity, honor, and respect, would become the battle cry of the second generation of archival educators. Against the backdrop of the priorities set by the first generation of archival educators, this principal objective of the second can be more easily understood as not just a shift, but a transformation of the field of archival education. Unlike their predecessors, the second cohort were more often than not archival practitioners who would choose to leave their practice entirely and join academia full-time. As one of their number, James O'Toole, would describe it, "Freed from the responsibility of managing archival collections of their own while also teaching 'on the side,' these educators represented a more serious commitment to archival education on the part of their schools than had previously been common."<sup>33</sup>

This group would gain the credentials needed to become full-time graduate-level educators largely by earning their Ph.D.s in Library and Information Science programs. This cohort was asked out of necessity to earn these academic credentials without the benefit of any focused doctoral-level archival curriculum, for there was no such thing as an "archival faculty" at the time. And, indeed, this state of affairs was a direct result of the priorities and measures of success set and promulgated by the first generation of educators. This earlier cohort was not at all concerned with joining academia; the members were instead principally concerned with filling the profession with well-trained recruits. In fact, a number of them had consciously left the academy in order to form/join the archival profession.<sup>34</sup> The theories, methodologies, and



practices of the pioneers—and even their emphasis on this triumvirate framework for an archival education—were passed down to the next generation through the educational infrastructure and publications they had set up for practitioners. That is to say, since so many of the second generation of archival educators had been practitioners before joining the academy, the theories, methods, and practices of the first cohort were taught to them in courses on professional practice, as well as in the writings produced in journals such as *The American Archivist*.

O'Toole would go on to note that his generation did not take up the mantle of this responsibility lightly, and moreover, that the new group of leaders planned to implement a great deal of change, stating:

Actuarially, the archival profession remains a relatively young one, but each of us is personally aware (sometimes painfully so) that time is passing and that a new professional generation is replacing an older one. It is a new generation that has chosen archives as a career more deliberately than most of their elders by consciously seeking out formal archival education in a graduate school. The archivists who will replace us will be the product of the professional educational system we develop. What do we want our successors to be? What do we want them to know that we did not? What kinds of education that we lacked would be helpful to them?<sup>35</sup>

The change that they effected was the construction of a system of archival education that held markedly reduced ties to archival practice and an equally marked increase in embeddedness within the academy.<sup>36</sup> This move was seen as both a correction in the course of the field of archival education as well as an effort to bolster the archival profession as a whole. As Paul Conway argued in 1988, “The lack of a sufficient number of full-time faculty is the weakest aspect of the current system of education for archivists [...] Today’s archival education system is a drag on the development of the archival profession, because it is tied too closely to the very practitioners it serves. Simply put, the archival profession needs a larger corps of full-time faculty committed to a career of teaching, research, and service.”<sup>37</sup>

And in this they succeeded. By the end of the 1970s, there were seven full-time archival educators in the United States, three in LIS programs

and four in history. By the end of the 1980s, there were twenty-two full-time archival educators in North America, twelve in LIS and nine in history. By the end of the 1990s, there were thirty-six full time archival educators in North America, twenty-six in LIS and ten in history. Although the last two statistics cover all of North America and not just the United States, these numbers demonstrate both the dramatic growth in the number of full-time faculty devoted to archival education, and also the definitive shift towards offering such education within library and information science programs.<sup>38</sup> Moreover, by the turn of the millennium, the MLIS/MIS had also become the de facto credential for working in archival practice, and so archival programs situated within the library schools of North American universities were becoming even more essential to the profession as a whole.<sup>39</sup>

### **Archival Theologians**

This remarkable transformation of archival education—the creation of an entire set of disciplinary resources to support a new breed of research faculty and a fortified educational structure within the academy—was something that the second generation accomplished with an almost laser-like focus, so important did they believe that it was for the archival profession. Again, O’Toole served as a most eloquent spokesperson for this point of view when he stated that, “there was near unanimity of opinion that having such ‘archival theologians’ as a supplement to the ranks of ‘archival parish priests’ was a good thing.”<sup>40</sup> Having a strong research faculty in an independent field of inquiry was seen as the pre-eminent measure of prestige, strength, and distinction by the second generation of educators. When speaking on the needs of the field of archival education in the late-twentieth century, almost every educator would mention the importance of being able to garner respect for the theoretical foundations of the archival profession as a reason to situate archival training within the context of a program in archival studies. Conway would also add that these “theologians” would serve as, “intermediaries between a scholarly community, which has

the resources and intellectual orientation to tackle complex problems comprehensively, and professional practitioners, who have specialized approaches to problem solving, knowledge, and skills. It is this intermediary role that allows faculty to make large contributions to professional development.”<sup>41</sup> A move toward the academy, in this way, was not envisioned as a move away from archival practice. It was to serve as a support for all that might happen in the field, and would also make space for tackling larger theoretical problems than day-to-day archival practice would otherwise allow.

But joining ranks with the academy still resulted in a very real separation between the researchers (“theologians”) and the practitioners (“parish priests”). Where once the ties between practice and education were critically important, there was now a shift towards building a theoretical foundation for the field that did not spring from practice, but was instead created in the university context. Indeed, there was even a transformation in the way that the second cohort spoke of their predecessors’ practice-focused, skill-based educational programs. Such training-focused courses were now seen as “workshops” so as to differentiate them from university-level courses.<sup>42</sup> The new group of educators believed that archival education needed to move away from a “workshop mentality” and towards the inculcation of an “archival mindset,” as Luciana Duranti would call it.<sup>43</sup> The KALIPER researchers also happily noted that their generation had moved away from an, “apprenticeship model based on a how-to approach and toward more of a problem-solving analytical emphasis.”<sup>44</sup> This shift was more than just a new way of doing things, as O’Toole would observe, it was a distinct move in the right direction: “In archival education, we have striven principally to communicate to students how to do it when it comes to archives. We have been less interested in teaching students to think like archivists than we have in getting them to act like archivists.”<sup>45</sup> The time had come to think more before acting.

Creating a strong theoretical basis for archival education that allowed for a move away from offering practical “workshops” was the most often stated reason for increasing the number of full-time archival faculty,

but the second generation also saw in the academy a path away from the reliance on the shorter curricula usually staffed only by one educator that dominated earlier archival education. As the KALIPER report states succinctly, “Institutionalization and moving away from a tight correspondence between the educator and the program is critical for the development of strong archival programs.”<sup>46</sup> Robert Warner, in his 1972 survey, had also gestured towards this growing concern, when he noted that the quality of the particular educator would also strongly affect the nature of the training offered, as there was rarely more than one teacher working at a given institution.<sup>47</sup> While the best archival trainers at the end of the first generation had some combination of academic education and experience in the field, they mainly relied on the quality of the academic department that housed them for their disciplinary prestige. The second generation of archival educators worked tirelessly and rapidly to change this situation and to solidify their place in the academy by fully joining its ranks and steadfastly constructing the independent discipline of “archival studies” designed to support multiple archival educators in one school. They wished for such rapid change and succeeded so quickly that O’Toole was able to make the light-hearted jest that asking for a second archival faculty member might elicit the following response, “‘What do you mean we need another archivist?’ history department chairs and library school deans will ask; ‘we just hired you, didn’t we?’”<sup>48</sup>

Becoming an independent discipline would have yet one further critical advantage for the second generation of archival educators. Once archival studies was established as an independent field of inquiry, no longer would it be necessary to shoehorn this field into other academic departments. Given the contemporary reality that graduate-level archival education programs are almost all situated within schools of library and information science, this effort may not appear entirely successful. However, the authors of the KALIPER report made it abundantly clear that they hoped even this situation would resolve itself when a separate master’s degree—the Masters in Archival Studies (MAS), distinct from the MLIS/MIS—would be created.<sup>49</sup> They recognized that archival

education tended to be offered as a “track” within a library program, but also noted that, “. . .with the increasing number of faculty and courses available, archives is looking less and less like a minor specialization and more and more like a major field of inquiry.”<sup>50</sup> They had a stated belief that archives was a separate field, and they saw every reason to assume that they were headed on a path towards an independent degree. The implementation of a Master’s in Archival Studies has become a reality in only a very few places, and one could even argue that the continued drive toward a separate archival master’s degree remains a standing challenge presented by the second generation of archival educators to the third—the cohort trained solely within this academic infrastructure.

Having solidified their gains within the academy during their own generation, the second cohort of archival educators has more recently turned its attention towards succession planning. Tenure-stream academics have, as one of their primary responsibilities, the education and production of the next generation of tenure-stream academics, and those in archival studies have recently been taking stock of their progress and have been making plans for the future. The KALIPER report found eight LIS schools that could support doctoral studies in archival science at the end of the millennium, and noted that the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Michigan had produced seven of the sixteen new archival educators hired since 1990, all of whom had performed doctoral research that bore directly on the field of archival studies.<sup>51</sup> The large A\*Census effort led by SAA in 2004 did not directly collect data on graduate education, but Elizabeth Yakel and Jeannette Bastian have studied what little information could be gleaned from the survey.<sup>52</sup> So far as they could determine, the crisis at hand for the field of archival education was that the MLIS/MIS degree had become, more than ever, the standard, entry-level credential expected by employers. This was creating a strong demand, and in order to meet it, the academically-situated archival educators needed to stabilize or increase, especially in the face of upcoming retirements. The field of archival education moved quickly to address this issue, most notably through the creation of the Archival Education and Research Initiative, a program begun in

2009 that, “represents a collaborative effort amongst nine U.S. academic institutions to stimulate the growth of a new generation of academics in archival education who are versed in contemporary issues and knowledgeable of the work being conducted by colleagues.”<sup>53</sup> Spearheaded by the most prominent researchers in the field of archival studies working today, the AERI project stands as the most impressive example of proactive succession planning yet in the domain of archival education.

### **From Practicing Archivists to Tenured Academics**

Now in 2014, “archival studies” has indeed established itself as a separate field of inquiry from both history and library science, something that was not even thinkable in 1936—indeed it was not apparently even thinkable in 1972. This feat of transformation was remarkable and has bestowed an important gift onto the third generation of archival educators. Archival studies is now an established social science focused on the investigation of the creation, stewardship, preservation, maintenance, and use of archives and records.<sup>54</sup> This successful late-twentieth-century drive for a separate identity, however, has put the field of archival education in a dramatically new context from the one established by the first cohort. Archival educators are now fully a part of the academy, and they must not only address the educational needs of the community of practicing archivists, they must also successfully negotiate the demands of the contemporary higher-education establishment. When the first cohort taught as adjuncts, their positioning left them without much power, but it also allowed them to keep their roles quite clear. They were practitioner-trainers who were taking advantage of the long-standing relationship between the archival profession and the history profession, as well as their prior academic credentials, to give their curricula dignity, to maintain its scholarly lineage, and to take advantage of the academy’s administrative infrastructure. The second generation, however, threw their lot in with academia entirely, and in so doing picked up a weighty responsibility to the academy in addition to their responsibilities to the field of archival practice.

The KALIPER researchers fully recognized that their decision had resulted in additional duties, and they felt that this shift was beneficial for both the educators and the practitioners for strong reasons: “Creating tenure-stream lines explicitly for archival educators has had two effects. First, it has given archival education a greater voice in LIS schools than ever before. Second, it has established a large group of individuals who must do research and publish in order to remain in academia. These two factors have done much to strengthen the place of archival science in academia as well as to strengthen the profession as a whole.”<sup>55</sup> And, without a doubt, they were right. Having a strong research literature is critical to any profession, and the stability of having an independent field of study, complete with tenured professors, has allowed archival faculty to speak with forcefulness and impact when it comes to setting the direction of their academic program. But it is also true that joining the academy in the tenure stream has asked the second generation of archival educators—and they are certainly now educators and not trainers—to modify the professional priorities of the field of archival education substantially.

In North America, all full-time faculty members are assessed on three main categories of effort: teaching, research, and service.<sup>56</sup> One’s status within the academy may shift the balance of importance among these criteria, but this triumvirate still stands as the measure against which all faculty work is judged. The relative importance of these three criteria is inculcated into every aspiring academic during their doctoral education. The doctoral degree focuses almost exclusively on developing the research skills necessary to produce a doctoral thesis, a highly-specialized form of writing that emphasizes the assimilation of past research and the production of new research. While it is not unheard of for the new knowledge produced in the process of earning a doctorate to be put to good use in the field, it is not on the basis of its practicality that new research is praised, promoted or credentialed. And, although some doctoral training programs provide occasion for their students to teach—teaching being a practice that might be considered a form of academic outreach—such opportunities are not always available. Moreover, it is

never on the basis of teaching that a student is awarded a doctorate.<sup>57</sup> Even those doctoral candidates who strive to become the best teachers that they can be, even those who have as their main career objective to work at a teaching-focused institution, do not receive their degree based on their ability to teach. They are still credentialed primarily on the basis of their ability to research and produce narrative texts that present the results of their research. These professional priorities, once set, continue to be even more plainly visible on the quest for tenure at the faculty level.

To receive tenure, one must excel in research, be able to teach, and perform some sort of service to the university. This is true both in the great research universities and in the smaller teaching-focused colleges of North America. While the vast majority of academic institutions represented at the AERI conferences are research-intensive universities, a number of teaching-focused colleges also participate.<sup>58</sup> Both types of schools play an essential role in the production of the next generation of practicing archivists, and they both actively take part in the conversation about the future of archival education.<sup>59</sup> However, regardless of the teaching or research priorities of these two types of academic institutions, they both run on tenure and the triad of research, teaching, and service. At R1 universities, as entirely befits the mission of an organization steadfastly focused on producing research knowledge, tenure-stream faculty are largely tenured and promoted based on their research productivity. Their ability to teach and their willingness to contribute to the university community (service work), may be honest factors in their promotion, but the impact of these latter two criteria pales in importance to that of one's research output. Even at the smaller teaching-focused institutions, where teaching productivity certainly has greater impact on the process of tenure and promotion, faculty members do not receive tenure solely on the basis of their teaching. Service work always follows last in importance.

This is all to say that training to become an academic—that is, training to be in the profession of professors—and then serving as a tenure-stream faculty member requires modern-day archival educators to adopt



a set of professional priorities that is quite different from that of the previous generation. As noted above, Jones once argued that serving the archival profession through teaching was so critical that professionals should be willing to do it for free. Ridiculous as his suggestion may have been, and certainly as ridiculous as it seems now, his comment revealed a set of priorities that has certainly changed over time. The core faculty that ran the great archival education programs in the early twenty-first century are now academics striving for tenure, not devoted practitioners striving to kick start short courses in the interstices of academe. No longer do archival educators work solely in service to the archival profession. Their primary professional obligation is now to the academy, and as such, they must first and foremost work to uphold the professional priorities of the academy—priorities that are not only different from their predecessors, they are also now quite different from the archival practitioners they educate.

Providing access to records, not research, is central to archival practice. It is a profession that strives, in its current incarnation, to uphold the values of access and use, accountability, advocacy, diversity, history and memory, preservation, professionalism, responsible custody, selection, service, and social responsibility.<sup>60</sup> Archivists-in-training will most likely meet these “Core Values of Archivists,” as adopted by the Society of American Archivists, during their archival education. These values heavily emphasize social and ethical responsibility to both the records in possession of the profession, and, even more importantly, to the audience in whose service these records are safeguarded. Archivists are enjoined to use their knowledge to participate in a field that serves others.

Indeed, values and services like these have been critical components of archival practice since the beginning of the profession. In his 1968 paper, Schellenberg even noted that one of the critical reasons that he wanted to locate archival education within library programs was due to the librarians’ commitment to service, “In regard to their holdings, [librarians] have emphasized use, not possession. In their profession they have emphasized cooperation, not competition.”<sup>61</sup> Indeed, Luciana Duranti noted that even since the time of the first generation archivist-scholar

Waldo Gifford Leland, archivists have found the service-orientation of librarians attractive.<sup>62</sup> Jones too emphasized the critical importance of an archivist's service in this way:

Almost any good historian can be a teacher. But to be an archivist that historian has to be a special sort of person. He has to be willing to spend his days working at the bottom of the shaft, digging, sorting, arranging, preserving, and loading the cars with ore to be carried to the surface, where researchers may sit in comfort and extract the nuggets that are refined into history for the education and enjoyment of mankind.<sup>63</sup>

In his metaphor, the first generation of archival educators were archival miners, working tirelessly deep in the ground, and their curricula certainly reflected a focus on craft-like training—now “workshops”—that directly addressed the needs of the field, probably to the exclusion of almost all but the most basic theoretical principles coming in from the field of history. The second cohort may have once served in Jones' mines, but they now do their work in the light of the academy. The third generation of archival educators has often never even worked underground for any length of time at all. But what does it mean for these new archival educators to be educated and trained in one profession—academics—and yet be responsible for training others in a different profession—archival practice?

There is no standing rule, of course, that the priorities of any profession's educators need to directly correspond with those of their students, but such discrepancies might very well be expected to cause tensions. The students might, for example, crave the experience of learning directly from the sort of colleague that they might work with in the field, while the educators may find that the students are clamoring to learn things other than the theory and research that are the bread-and-butter of a tenure-stream academic. Through the granting of the MLIS/MIS degree—still currently the credential of entry preferred by the archival profession—it has nevertheless become the job of academic researchers to help the next generation of archival professionals begin work in a field that they, themselves, may have never experienced directly. This is a radical shift from the professional priorities and measures of

success promulgated by the first generation. Its impact has not been swept under the rug by the assessments of archival education in North America produced at the end of the twentieth century, but many of its complexities remain to be explored.

Between about 1980 and the present, the ability to train, retain, and enlarge the ranks of tenure-stream and tenured professors who actively study archives as their main area of scholarly inquiry was steadfastly the primary marker of success for the field of archival education. Considering the ways in which the academic environment has changed in the last ten years, it might be worth considering that this focus was not necessarily the best measure of success for archival education—insofar as that field has the responsibility to produce the next generation of well-trained archival practitioners. It was, on the other hand, a fantastic measure of success for the new discipline of archival studies within the demands of the academy. There is no doubt that the leading archival researchers of today (whether in the second or third cohort) are at the top of their field, contributing important findings and perspectives to the practice of keeping archives, but they are, in the end, primarily trained now as academics and social scientists, not as archivists, and their primary responsibilities are to the academy in the form of performing research and training doctoral students.

### **Twenty-First Century Concerns**

Here in the second decade of the twenty-first century then, the third generation of archival educators stands ready to assume leadership of the field. The infrastructure that has been built by the previous cohorts is spectacular, and archival studies is poised to take an important place within the transdisciplinary work of the modern university environment. This situation has proven very beneficial to the archival academic, but it has also created a certain amount of tension at the level of the professional master's. The MIS/MLIS is a professional degree, and as such, students must be exposed both to the theories and methodologies of the classroom and also the archival profession as it is put into practice

in the field. There was a time when the trainers themselves could serve as both the connection to practice as well as the curriculum designers. Nowadays, because of the deeply-focused academic training of the core faculty in archival studies, experience both from the field and in the field has to come into the lives of up-and-coming archivists in other ways. Of course, all professional education could be said to suffer from the same conundrum. Medical schools must support both medical research and the training of new medical professionals, and the same goes for law and business. As Conway argued in his 1988 assessment of archival education, all professional education must contain, “three complementary components: professional associations, practitioners in the field, and faculty in academic settings.”<sup>64</sup> And there is much merit in this argument. However, two observations about the particularities of archival education 26 years after Conway’s pronouncement might also mitigate its comprehensiveness. Both of these observations center around the ways in which contemporary archival education, with its focus on the “archival mindset,” presently integrates student exposure to practice in the field within MLIS/MIS programs.

## **Volunteerism**

First, as has been the case throughout the history of archival education, student-archivists are currently offered the opportunity to participate in internships, in-service learning, and fieldwork placements as a critical practical component of their training. Since the very first course offerings at Columbia and the American University, participating in internships and working at local historical societies have been a part of the archival educational system. Often, the trainers would even work with materials from their own repositories with their students. And there is much to be said today for continuing this combination of in-class learning and out-of-the-classroom hands-on experience. However, as more and more students proactively decide to pursue graduate education in hopes of becoming archival practitioners, the number of available interns has skyrocketed and has basically created an entire

labor force available to work in practice for very little money, or even for free. Given that many American archives operate on what could only generously be described as a shoestring budget, this help is often eagerly welcomed by those repositories lucky enough to be near an archival education program. But this state of affairs has resulted in something that outgoing 2013 SAA President Jackie Dooley correctly identified as the issue of “volunteerism.”<sup>65</sup> The interns from the academy are, for the most part, “rewarded” with course credit and/or small stipends, but even this form of compensation is not always available. And yet, the students are still eager to work because most employers require some form of on-the-job experience when hiring new professional archivists. In-service training—whether or not it is paid, whether or not it comes with course credit (credit that the students are often actually paying *for*), or whether or not it is a true, independent volunteer experience—can often be the only opportunity aspiring young archivists have to gain that critical practical preparation.<sup>66</sup>

Unfortunately, the work that these interns and volunteers perform can (and does) allow archives to forestall hiring professional archivists at a living wage.<sup>67</sup> This is to say, the very system designed to help provide early experience to burgeoning professionals is keeping the field from creating jobs that would then be filled by these very same people. It has become a vicious cycle that is, for the most part, recent. The first generation of archival educators, in fact, seemed to have the opposite problem. They were actively looking for new recruits with their training programs. They were happy to propose their courses within history departments or library science departments in part because they might be able to attract new archivists to the field. There were not an infinite number of jobs at the time, to be sure, but the number of job aspirants was certainly more closely aligned with the number of jobs available. Now, as more and more archives students flood into the field to gain practical experience outside of the academy, they sometimes devour their own professional prospects.

As for the other professions such as medicine and business, they do not integrate in-service training into their academic programs in this

same way and to this same effect, and it cannot even always be said that they are succeeding with the integration with any more grace. The most obvious parallel professional schools might be medicine, business, and law, but let it be said right up front—professionals in these areas will make salaries that are orders of magnitude higher than those of archivists. Their initial work, even if it is for free, is in the expectation of making salaries that go well beyond a “living wage.” Medicine has an extensive, professionally-supervised apprenticeship process that begins after the first two years of medical school and can last over 12 years beyond the period of classroom-based learning. This grueling process is, perhaps, in its own way untenable, but the balance between classroom work and practical training is geared heavily towards the latter. Students entering business schools tend to do so after a number of years working in the field, and return to get their MBA in order to advance their careers, not to gain their basic training.<sup>68</sup> Indeed, many MBA students retain their job in practice—and maintain the living wage that comes with it—while studying for their degree, thus combining the need to understand theory and practice not through a series of internships and practica, but by doing their actual work in the field.<sup>69</sup> Aspiring lawyers, of course, have the rigorous state bar examinations and moral character screening processes to confirm that the theory and practice of law are well-understood. The archival profession does not, in the end, look much like any of these others. They will have to solve this problem in their own way and on their own terms, and the archival educators have a responsibility to participate in this conversation and help to resolve the predicament.

### **Adjunctification**

The second means by which contemporary MLIS/MIS programs offer their students access to practical experience is by employing current and former practitioners as both adjunct and full-time, non-tenure-stream faculty. This, too, has been a long-tradition in archival education. Indeed, the entire first generation of archival educators all served as

adjunct or part-time faculty, almost to a person.<sup>70</sup> However, the labor culture in higher education has been severely transformed not only since the mid-twentieth century, but even in the 26 years since Conway's observations about the importance of an academic foundation to the profession. While the continued labor practice of hiring practitioners to teach archival courses can often serve both the practitioner and academic communities well, it also plays into the contemporary dialogue surrounding the increasing "adjunctification" of the faculty, which is now one of the most hot-button topics across the academy.<sup>71</sup> Indeed one might even argue that the modern-day academic administrator's preference for hiring adjuncts instead of tenure-stream faculty is having much the same effect on the academic profession that volunteerism is having on the archival profession. Getting and maintaining a tenure-stream job in academia these days is increasingly difficult because of the number of teaching jobs being filled by contingent, adjunct labor. New lines are not being created, and as older faculty members retire, their lines are being closed. Adjuncts are sometimes used to fill the labor gap thus created. In fact, it is currently the case that the new generation of archival educators has to fight just as hard, if not harder, for their jobs than those looking for work in professional archival practice. Ironically enough, the earliest proposals for archival education arising from the Society of American Archivists actually suggested that a Ph.D. in American History might be the best first step for an archival practitioner as, "associating the training of archivists with work for the doctorate in American history will afford to the student some latitude of choice for a later career: after he receives the degree, if he does not prefer to go into archival work...he would still have an avenue of teaching American history open to him, and vice versa."<sup>72</sup> Times have certainly changed since the 1930s.

The KALIPER researchers certainly took note of the presence of this continuing labor practice, even if they could in no way predict that the academy at large would begin to notice more acutely the important balance necessary between tenure-able positions and contingent positions: "it is clear from examining course offerings in conjunction with full-time archival faculty on the staff that many schools rely on adjuncts to teach

the archives courses. Needless to say, adjuncts still outnumber full-time faculty members.”<sup>73</sup> Thus, despite the astronomical growth of full-time archival educators in the academy, a large number of practitioners and other types of educators were still being employed in adjunct roles to offer the number and variety of courses the profession required, and they continue to work in large numbers today. The practitioner-trainers never left the archival classroom, even with the meteoric rise of the academic archival educator. What happened was that they left the role of leadership in the field of archival education. If the second generation’s vision of increasing the number of full-time, tenure-stream positions within the field of archival studies is to develop, it must now do so in spite of the fact—as the KALIPER researchers noted—that archival education programs currently cannot run successfully without the help of adjunct labor. There simply are not enough full-time, tenure-stream academic openings available to support the curricular needs of the field. Not only is this highly problematic for academia in general, it is hugely frustrating for archival education specifically, as the continued reliance on adjuncts perpetuates the very educational arrangement that the second generation of archival educators was trying so hard to escape. Somewhat unwittingly, modern-day archival education has thus become embroiled in two problematic practices, volunteerism and adjunctification, because of the field’s efforts to satisfy both the requirements of the academy and the need to provide practical experience for archivists-in-training.<sup>74</sup>

## **Taking Stock**

Each of the three generations of archival educators in the United States produced to date has had a different academic training, a different relationship to practice, and a different archival and academic environment in which to work. At first glance it might seem that the field of archival education has always been of the academy and taught by academics, but this is actually not the case. Many of the earliest archival educators, such as Solon Buck, H.G. Jones, and Theodore Schellenberg, were trained as Ph.D.-wielding academics. Their Ph.D.s were held in the



study of history, of course, not in archival studies, but they too were trained in the expectations of a full-time, tenure-stream academic of their day. They then chose to leave full-time academic work to become practicing archivists, returning to the academy solely to teach in adjunct roles. But, in the eyes of their successors, by living at the edges of the academy, this approach did not put into place the necessary theoretical foundation that twentieth-century American professions require. The second generation thus felt that it was best to move the profession forward by embedding archival education fully within the academy and creating an independent field of academic inquiry out of which it could be administered. Paul Conway stated in the most forceful terms that the success of the archival profession relied on maintaining a cadre of full-time, tenure-stream researchers housed in academia. The KALIPER report was also unequivocal in its insistence that the archives and records field deserves its own Ph.D., its own master's-level degree (the MAS) and its own separate dignity, honor, and respect. They were surely all correct in their assessment. But these scholars' decisions have had ramifications here in the twenty-first century that the third generation of archival educators, the first cohort trained in the field of archival studies, must attack head-on. Volunteerism in archival practice and adjunctification in the academy are but two such challenges.

There is surely even more insight and inspiration to be gleaned from past decisions, especially once differing contexts of creation are taken into consideration. For example, at the dawn of archival education in the United States, the study of history was seen as imperative not only because it would help archivists become experts on the contents of their holdings (presumably of the United States), but also because it was seen as a form of ethnographic research—a training to think like one's users. The archival profession in the early twenty-first century feels neither the pull to require every practitioner to hold such subject expertise, nor does it focus so exclusively on serving academic researchers, and so learning the historical method either as a form of content acquisition or as a form of user analysis also no longer holds much purchase. Archival professionals today are instead heeding the call to open their doors to

any and all who wish to come in to learn more about the varied, multi-faceted collections in their stewardship. But thinking about their users as “any and all” can also stymie contemporary efforts to provide targeted programming or services to any one particular population. Perhaps the current generation of archival educators could take their cue from the spirit rather than the letter of the traditional historical focus of the past and could usefully extract the idea of proactively teaching ethnographic methods to their students, especially as applied by fields like Science and Technology Studies. STS scholars learn about how scientists do their work by studying them ethnographically, and in so doing they reveal the intricacies of human interactions with both records and tools/instruments.<sup>75</sup> Such approaches could help the next generation of archivists be more proactive and erudite as they locate new target audiences for their holdings, and they also might further open up the conversation about informed advocacy in the early twentieth-century.<sup>76</sup>

In this same vein, James O’Toole mentioned a challenge facing archival education in 1990 that may also inspire curricular ideas in 2014. He was talking about the “workshop mentality” at the time—something that, frankly, may still not have left the field of archival education—but again the spirit rather than the letter of his words holds much potential:

The workshop mentality also trains us to break archival subject matter into discreet [*sic*] blocks: here’s the discussion of appraisal; there’s the discussion of arrangement and description; and so on. The interconnections among archival tasks are too frequently obscured. Should we be talking about constructing finding aids, for example, without simultaneously talking about the reference process that will help archival researchers use those finding aids?<sup>77</sup>

Archival education still tends to do this. But in this day and age when archival jobs are so difficult to find, and in the spirit of producing MLS/MLIS graduates prepared to do more than just work in archives or libraries, O’Toole here gestures to the fact that the different operations within an archives have always been highly interconnected, and function at their best when embedded in a system that can support large amounts of collaboration and communication. As argued above, archival work

has always displayed this type of originary interdisciplinarity. Why not use this historical fact to its advantage, especially now that contemporary academia is demonstrating a drive towards interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary practices? Archival theory and practice has sat in the interstices of a number of disciplines since its inception. A greater acknowledgement and a greater emphasis on the ways in which archives and archivists facilitate and participate in the cross-fertilization between different fields and different professional practices cannot but help prepare a new generation of nimble information professionals to take their place in the field—whether as archivists or otherwise. Such an approach might even be seen as critical given the fact that previous generations of archivists have traditionally struggled, in practice, with implementing these important principles of collaboration and cooperation.

### **What's Next? What Now?**

Given the marked shifts in educational and professional priorities that have been noted in the archives field over the last 78 years, and perhaps even more importantly, given the changes currently taking place within contemporary American institutions of higher education, it is critical to keep in mind where the field of archival studies stands now in relation to both academia and professional archival practice. Since the current generation of archival educators has an entirely new relationship to both archival practice and academic research, new modes of being both scholars and teachers will necessarily need to be negotiated in the upcoming years. How will this cohort confront the “convergence of the information disciplines” and the burgeoning iSchool movement? What about the issues of volunteerism in the field and adjunctification at home? How about the efforts to train students to fill positions that do not necessarily contain the word “archivist?” If it is to integrate the lessons of the past, however, it must do so with a critical awareness of the ways in which the context(s) of archival education have changed over time and with a keen eye towards the priorities and measures of success that respond directly to no other frame of reference than the

twenty-first century working environment.<sup>78</sup> We can study the impact of the choices our predecessors have made, and we can dream of a future for archival education that will always be ahead of us, just out of reach. But, perhaps the most pertinent question at hand is: where do we want to be now? What can we do today?

## Endnotes

1. Richard J. Cox, Elizabeth Yakel, David Wallace, Jeannette A. Bastian, and Jennifer Marshall, "Archival Education in North American Library and Information Science Schools," *Library Quarterly* 71 (April 2001): 141-194.

2. Cox et al., "Archival Education," 185.

3. One member of the study's team, Jennifer Marshall, fell into this group and was, in fact, working on one such archival research project at that very time—the KALIPER report.

4. Cox et al., "Archival Education," 185.

5. There may also be a fourth cohort on the rise—those who are trained in archival studies within the nascent iSchool movement rather than in schools of "Library and Information Science/Studies."

6. In 1909, the first Conference of Archivists was established within the American Historical Association. Members of this group would eventually come together in 1935 to create the "Committee of Ten on the Organization of Archivists." In December of 1936, the Committee would form the independent Society of American Archivists. For a nicely formatted timeline of the history of the archival profession in the United States, albeit with a focus on the National Archives itself, see National Archives, "Milestones of the U.S. Archival Profession and the National Archives, 1800-2011," <http://www.archives.gov/about/history/milestones.html>.

7. As noted often in the pages of *American Archivist*, but most forcefully in Rodney Ross, "Ernst Posner: The Bridge Between the Old World and the New," *American Archivist* 44 (Summer 1983): 304-312, Posner's impact on the field through these summer institutes cannot

be underestimated. Upon Posner's retirement, the summer institutes at American were held infrequently and faltered without his personality behind them. He is also an exceptional archival educator for this period, given that he was a full-time academic (history), and had little training in American archival techniques.

8. H. G. Jones, "Archival Training in American Universities, 1938-68," *American Archivist* 31 (April 1968): 147. Jones also notes here that the collegiate-level archival training programs were found in history departments, the "shorter" programs—here certainly meant derogatorily as will be discussed—were to be found in library schools.

9. Jones, "Archival Training," 142.

10. Robert M. Warner, "Archival Training in the United States and Canada," *American Archivist* 35 (July-October, 1972): 347-358.

11. All but one of these Ph.D.s were in history. The exception held a doctorate in library science and education.

12. Warner, "Archival Training," 356. He also offers a few numbers on adjunct pay in the early seventies. Adjunct instructors in archival education received an average salary per course of \$1,533.00.

13. Jones, "Archival Training," 153.

14. This would have certainly been the case for the large number of federal archivists who were trained at the American University by Posner, Solon Buck, Helen Chatfield, Frank Evans, and all the other instructors who participated in that program, both during the academic year and in the summer.

15. Jones, "Archival Training," 153.

16. Samuel Flagg Bemis, "The Training of Archivists in the United States," *American Archivist* 2 (July 1939): 156.

17. Theodore Schellenberg, "Archival Training in Library Schools," *American Archivist* 31 (April 1938): 158.

18. Jones, "Archival Training," 150.

19. Schellenberg, "Archival Training," 158.

20. Schellenberg, "Archival Training," 158.

21. Jones, "Archival Training," 153.

22. Jones, for his part, expressed a parallel educational framework at the conclusion of his presentation when noting that his ideal three-semester program in “archival administration” would have one semester devoted to the history of recordmaking (history), one semester devoted to “an intensive study of archival procedures and techniques,” (methodology) and a third semester spent out in the field performing “a supervised period of in-service training” in an archival repository (technical practice). Schellenberg does add a fourth facet to this framework, that of auxiliary training. This pertains to the specialized fields of records management and library science, both of which he felt would contribute greatly to the archivist’s understanding of contemporary records creation and organization. The scope of his argument however suggests that this inclusion was more to bolster his argument about the placement of archival training in library schools than from any deep-seated philosophical conviction.

23. Schellenberg, “Archival Training,” 158-159.

24. Schellenberg, “Archival Training,” 159.

25. Jones, “Archival Training,” 151.

26. Schellenberg, “Archival Training,” 160.

27. Jones, “Archival Training,” n. 50, 151.

28. Indeed, this conversation continued into the 1980s. See Jacqueline Goggin, “That We Shall Truly Deserve the Title of ‘Profession:’ The Training and Education of Archivists 1930-1960,” *American Archivist* 47 (Summer 1984): 243-254.

29. Though the KALIPER report (Cox et al., “Archival Education”) notes that, even in the early 1990s, archivists were still stumping heavily for the importance of a history education in the training of new American archivists. See, for example, two articles in the Fall 1993 volume of *American Archivist*: F. Gerald Ham, Frank Boles, Gregory S. Hunter, and James M. O’Toole, “Is the Past Still Prologue?: History and Archival Education,” *American Archivist* 56 (Fall 1993): 718-729 and Edwin Bridges, Gregory S. Hunter, Page Putnam Miller, David Thelen, and Gerhard Weinberg, “Toward Better Documenting and Interpreting of the Past: What History Graduate Programs in the Twenty-first

Century Should Teach About Archival Practices,” *American Archivist* 56 (Fall 1993): 730-749.

30. James O’Toole, “Curriculum Development in Archival Education: A Proposal,” *American Archivist* 53 (Summer 1990): 461.

31. Cox et al., “Archival Education,” 145.

32. Cox et al., “Archival Education,” 149.

33. O’Toole, “Curriculum Development,” 461.

34. Jones proactively notes his choice to leave teaching for practice in Jones, “Archival Training,” 154.

35. O’Toole, “Curriculum Development,” 466.

36. In fact, there had been some discussion of joining the ranks of the academy at the end of the first generation. Jones, for example, mentioned that an affiliation with the university might do something to increase the visibility and thereby the salaries of archivists, stating, “By closely relating our work to that of the universities, personnel departments will see the need for competitive salaries between archivists and academic faculties.” (Jones, “Archival Training,” 154). But the second cohort would choose a number of other reasons to solidify the place of an academic field of expertise called, “archival studies” or “archival science.”

37. Paul Conway, “Archival Education and the Need for Full-Time Faculty,” *American Archivist* 51 (Summer 1988): 255. Paul Conway, in many ways, stands as the prototypical archival educator of the second cohort, having had a long-standing career in practice including serving as the Preservation Program Officer of the Society of American Archivists before earning his Ph.D. and eventually achieving a tenured post at the University of Michigan School of Information.

38. Data from Cox et al., “Archival Education,” 164-165.

39. Elizabeth Yakel and Jeannette Bastian, “Graduate Archival Education and the A\*CENSUS,” Society of American Archivists, August 19, 2005, <http://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/YakelBastian-ACENSUS.pdf>.

40. O’Toole, “Curriculum Development,” 461.

41. Conway, “Archival Education,” 257-258.

42. O'Toole, "Curriculum Development," 462. Luciana Duranti disagreed a bit with this, stating, "This author thinks that they emphasize continuing education not because they have a 'workshop mentality,' as James O'Toole put it, but because... they do not believe there is enough intellectual substance in archival studies to fill two years of a dedicated master's degree program" (Duranti, "Archival Body of Knowledge," 20).

43. Duranti, "Archival Body of Knowledge," 14. Interestingly enough, this choice of words mirrors a phrase used by Jones above, "...archival work is a state of mind..." (Jones, "Archival Training," 151).

44. Cox et al., "Archival Education," 182

45. O'Toole, "Curriculum Development," 463. Emphasis original.

46. Cox et al., "Archival Education," 171.

47. "The individual faculty member teaching the program is, of course, crucial in determining its quality. If he is well educated, has broad experience in archives and manuscripts, is an articulate and forceful teacher, is involved in the profession, does research, and operates in an institutional framework that is academically solid and distinguished, then the quality of the program should be high" (Warner, "Archival Training," 354).

48. O'Toole, "Curriculum Development," 466.

49. For more on the MAS as proposed in the 1990s, see Richard Cox, "The Master of Archival Studies and American Education Standards: An Argument for the Continued Development of Graduate Archival Education in the United States," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993): 221-231.

50. Cox et al., "Archival Education," 154.

51. Cox et al., "Archival Education," 172 and 179.

52. Yakel and Bastian, "Graduate Archival Education."

53. AERI, "Home Page," University of California, Los Angeles, <http://aeri.gseis.ucla.edu/>.

54. Please see the recent research output of Elizabeth Yakel, Richard Cox, Anne Gilliland, Wendy Duff, and Luciana Duranti—just to name a few prominent archival researchers—for methodological examples.

55. Cox et al., "Archival Education," 167.



56. These categories are currently under much debate. See, for example, David M. Perry, “But Does It Count?” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 23, 2014, <http://chronicle.com/article/But-Does-It-Count-/147199/>.

57. UCLA, for example, does not provide this opportunity for its students.

58. The participant lists from the AERI meetings reflect this emphasis on research institutions. See, for example, the participant list for AERI 2014 at AERI 2014, “Participants’ Bios,” University of Pittsburgh School of Information Sciences, <http://www.ischool.pitt.edu/aeri2014/bio.html>.

59. After this paper was presented during its original panel presentation, in fact, a conversation was had about the role of teaching institutions outside the R1 research agenda. No conclusions were drawn, but the differentiation between these two types of academic institution was reiterated, and differences of opinion about what constitutes “archival education” were aired.

60. Society of American Archivists, “SAA Core Values Statement and Code of Ethics,” <http://www2.archivists.org/statements/saa-core-values-statement-and-code-of-ethics>.

61. Schellenberg, “Archival Training,” 164-165.

62. Duranti, “Archival Body of Knowledge,” 15.

63. Jones, “Archival Training,” 154. In this quote, one can also hear echoes of the long-standing disparagement of the importance of teaching to a practicing academic.

64. Conway, “Archival Education,” 254.

65. Jackie Dooley, “Presidential Address: Feeding our Young,” *American Archivist* 77 (Spring/Summer 2014): 10-22.

66. The program in which I teach here at the University of Pittsburgh even requires a year of archival experience before entering the program—experience which, more often than not, takes the form of volunteer work or college-level internships.

67. Of course, for some of these archives, the work would simply not get done without the help of volunteer/intern labor.

68. This is, in fact, not entirely dissimilar to the first generation of archival students who worked while taking night courses with, for example, Ernst Posner or Helen Chatfield.

69. As of October 2014, for example, Columbia's Business School promotes that the incoming class for 2014 had an average of five years of previous work experience, with 99% of the class having at least one year of experience. See Columbia Business School, "Class Profile," <http://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/programs-admissions/mba/student-life/class-profile>. Stanford reports that their students who began between 2010 and 2013 each had an average of four years of pre-MBA work experience. See Stanford Graduate School of Business, "School Profile," <http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/newsroom/school-profile>. The prestigious Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania reports a five-year mean in this area for this year's incoming class. See Wharton MBA Program, University of Pennsylvania, "Class Profile," <http://www.wharton.upenn.edu/mba/admissions/class-profile.cfm>.

70. The most notable exception remains, of course, Ernst Posner.

71. This conversation has been going on for a number of years. See, for example, Scott Jaschik, "The Adjunctification of English," *Inside Higher Ed*, December 11, 2008, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/12/11/english>, and the report his article summarizes, Modern Language Association, "Education in the Balance: A Report on the Academic Workforce in English," Report of the 2007 ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Staffing, December 10, 2008, [http://www.mla.org/pdf/workforce\\_rpt02.pdf](http://www.mla.org/pdf/workforce_rpt02.pdf). For a more personal, manifesto-based approach see the website "The Adjunct Crisis," <http://adjunctcrisis.com/>.

72. Bemis, "Training of Archivists," 160. This is the famous article in which Bemis suggests that there should be so-called archivists of the "first class" with doctorates and archivists of the "second class" with master's degrees. Goggin also cites SAA archives material supporting these claims in letters between Philip Brooks and Samuel Bemis (Goggin, "That We Shall Truly Deserve," 247). In what might be deemed an irony, the current MLA recommendations for overhauling doctoral programs in modern literature focus on preparing its graduates for more than just

tenure-stream jobs in academia. Twenty-first century doctoral programs are to “validate diverse career outcomes” and “broaden career paths,” recalling Bemis’ argument obliquely. See Modern Language Association, “Report of the Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature (2014),” [http://www.mla.org/report\\_doctoral\\_study\\_2014](http://www.mla.org/report_doctoral_study_2014).

73. Cox et al., “Archival Education,” 165.

74. For my part, I believe that archival educators can begin to address this issue by insisting that all work done in the field for credit must certifiably be *learning* experiences. Sponsoring sites should not be allowed to rely on the pre-existing archival experience of their interns to actually run their shop—such use of professional know-how should be paid work. This is especially critical when established archivists are looking for the next generation to help them with the issues surrounding digital archives and digital archives administration.

75. For two excellent, brief examples of this approach, see John Law, “Making a Mess with Method,” in *The SAGE Handbook of Social Science Methodology*, eds. William Outhwaite and Stephen P. Turner, 595-606 (Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2008) and Chunglin Kwa, “Romantic and Baroque Conceptions of Complex Wholes in the Sciences,” in *Complexities: Social Studies of Knowledge Practices*, eds. John Law and Annemarie Mol, 23-52 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002).

76. See, as a prominent example of this conversation, Randall Jimeron, *Archives Power: Memory, Accountability, and Social Justice* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2009).

77. O’Toole, “Curriculum Development,” 462.

78. At the end of the AERI presentation upon which the current paper is based, I was asked by a member of the audience who holds a tenure-stream job at an R1 university whether or not I, myself, accorded higher value to the job of being an academic or the job of being a practicing archivist. I wish to be clear that I believe this to be beside the point. In presenting my thoughts, I describe some of the tensions that I see quite clearly in my daily life as a non-tenure-stream (with a term-based renewable contract) faculty member at an R1 university, teaching within an archival curriculum. As a point of interest, in terms

of my credentials, I also find that I do not truly belong to any of the generations of archival educators described herein. I hold a Ph.D. in art history and an MLIS with a concentration in archival studies, and have served for years both as a professional academic and as a steward of other people's records, although not at the same time.