

# Breaking New Ground in Fostering Preservation: The Society of American Archivists' Preservation Management Training Program

Tyler O. Walters

*In 1991 the Society of American Archivists (SAA) received a \$600,609 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Division of Preservation and Access to launch the SAA Preservation Management Training Program (PMTP). This is the largest grant the NEH has awarded to a professional association for continuing education programming. The PMTP was a three-year nationwide program in which forty-four archival administrators were trained in establishing and maintaining comprehensive archival preservation management programs. The program's pioneering aspects are significant to the future of preservation education and training. The curriculum advocates integrating preservation administration into all facets of the management of archives. Moving archival preservation away from ad hoc decisions to well-planned management strategies is the program's underlying philosophy. The training assignments are also designed to build elements of a functioning, tailor-made archival preservation program for the student's employing institution prior to graduation. The SAA Preservation Management Training Program is unique in professional education and training for library and archives management, and has created a benchmark for future training programs in both fields.*

**C**ontinuing education for information professionals in the area of preservation is receiving a great deal of attention today, and is resulting in the growth of new workshops, institutes, and university-based programs, as well as a new base of literature. One of several recent efforts to educate and train preservation administrators

has resulted in the NEH-funded Preservation Intensive Institute, a one-week program of courses aimed at the mid-career preservation administrator. The first such institute was conducted in the summer of 1992 at the University of Pittsburgh and addressed not just library preservation needs but those belonging to the

---

TYLER O. WALTERS is University Archivist, Iowa State University. The author thanks Evelyn Frangakis, Paul Conway, Teresa Brinati, and the Iowa State University Library for its continued support. The author's commentary offered at the 1994 SAA Annual Meeting formed the basis for this article. Manuscript received December 16, 1994; accepted for publication June 15, 1995.

field of archives, as well (Hart 1993). It represented a rare opportunity for the few true archival preservation administrators working in the United States today. Herein lies the problem. While the common estimate of the proportion of libraries that are actively preserving their collections is 30%, the proportion of archives engaged in a similar level of preservation activity is thought to be far lower (Jensen and Hart 1993, 3). As new methods, understandings, and technological applications rapidly develop for use in modern preservation, very few archivists possess enough experience and training, gained through operating preservation programs, to assimilate these methods and knowledge.

Early indications of the low intensity of archival preservation activity were recognized after the Society of American Archivists (SAA) completed its basic conservation workshops. These workshops, conducted from 1980 to 1987, stressed basic training in conservation techniques and did not devote much time to preservation planning. Subsequently, while 544 individuals registered for the basic conservation workshops, very few comprehensive preservation programs developed in archives as a result (Conway 1990). In fact, very few archives possess the financial resources to contract with preservation consultants on an ongoing basis or to maintain a preservation administrator.

Based on this experience, SAA determined that its future educational efforts should foster complete archival preservation programs led by archival administrators (Conway 1990, 210, 221). By the late 1980s, SAA began investigating the means to train archivists in contemporary archival preservation management, while at the same time ensuring the birth and maturation of archival preservation programs across the country. This quest resulted in the most ambitious continuing preservation education and training program ever undertaken in the United States—the SAA Preservation Management Training Program (PMTP), conducted from 1992 to 1994.

Archival preservation planning, with less emphasis on conservation treatments, was addressed by SAA prior to the PMTP.

The Preservation Management Institute (PMI), held in 1987 and cosponsored by SAA and the Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC), was a two-week intensive training program for midlevel archival administrators who also had responsibilities for preservation. Fifteen archivists attended the PMI (conducted at Simmons College in Boston, Massachusetts), which was focused on basic concepts rather than the preservation of archives. Many of the instructors were experts in library preservation, but were not archivists themselves. Consequently, the archival context was missing from the curriculum. Translation of library preservation administration concepts for use in archival preservation management did not occur, nor was a comparison of preservation in libraries and archives provided (Conway 1989a, 10–11; Morris 1990, 246). The PMI's results were mixed. The number of archival administrators involved was too small to move the nation's archives from ad hoc conservation activities to coordinated preservation management. A unique nationwide initiative was required to impart the modern concepts of archival preservation management to archivists. The idea for the PMTP evolved from the outcomes of both the basic conservation workshops and the PMI.

Another fundamental impetus for a new and comprehensive training program in archival preservation management unfolded over the course of the 1980s. Archivists, along with librarians, were broadening their conceptions of preservation to understand and promote its impact on all areas of library and archives management. A major characteristic of this trend was each field's respective move away from ad hoc treatments of materials already in an advanced stage of deterioration to planned programs encompassing preventive measures. Today, preservation management as a component of archival management involves planning and implementing policies and procedures that either prevent further deterioration or restore the accessibility of archival materials. The common features of an archival preservation program include policies on: environmental monitoring and manage-

ment, storage, selection for preservation, condition assessment, format-specific care and use requirements, holdings maintenance, handling and use, micro-reproduction and reformatting, exhibition, disaster preparedness, security, and conservation treatment. In this perspective, administrators recognize that preservation is an integral part of archival functions and is not considered a separate program element in the same way that reference or collection development is.

A major catalyst for founding the PMTP came from SAA's leaders. In 1987, when SAA requested additional funds from NEH to continue the basic conservation workshops, NEH declined the request and asked SAA to evaluate its past preservation education programs with respect to their impact on the archives field. SAA followed through with a two-year NEH grant to conduct a formal evaluation and hired Paul Conway as the SAA preservation officer for 1988–89 to carry out this task (Conway 1991). As part of the two-year NEH grant project, Conway organized a seminar on archival preservation given at the University of Pittsburgh, and invited the leadership of SAA as well as selected archivists, librarians, and preservation specialists. On September 25–27, 1989, the fifteen seminar attendees and three observers convened in Pittsburgh to review and evaluate the data gathered in Conway's study, made recommendations for future actions, and began drafting a nationwide preservation strategy. One education-related recommendation outlined a program consisting of three tiers of instructional components combined with an institutional commitment to act on the instruction and perform preservation management functions. This proved to be an important new way to conduct preservation education and resonated with the creators of the PMTP (Conway 1994).

The work on a nationwide preservation strategy stemmed from a draft written by Conway and circulated among the seminar attendees (Conway 1989b). John Fleckner, who was SAA president during 1989–90, and who participated in the seminar, formed the SAA Task Force on

Preservation. Its purpose was to expand upon Conway's early draft and the related seminar discussions to articulate profession-wide goals and objectives in meeting the preservation challenge confronting archives in the United States. Conway's draft laid the foundation for the SAA Task Force on Preservation's treatise, *Preserving History's Future: Nationwide Goals for the Preservation and Use of the Archival Record* (1993), in which the task force recognized the need for a unique and ambitious preservation education program. One of the four underlying assumptions in the report is

that the archival profession must move beyond traditional approaches that focus on physical treatment of materials to incorporate preservation management as a basic component of archival management. (p. 2)

To make this move, the task force recommended that "effective preservation education programs are essential" (p. 2). It also recommended that curricula should be developed

for multitier workshop/seminar programs for archivists with preservation management responsibility as a means of ensuring the reinforcement and practical application of lessons learned at each level of training. (p. 3)

The PMTP was taking shape from changes in professional practice, from the outcomes of earlier education programs, from research conducted by the SAA preservation officer, and through the task force's recommendations.

At the end of 1989, SAA submitted an NEH grant proposal that combined a program very similar to the PMTP with the continuation of the position of the SAA preservation officer, who would carry out a diverse agenda of preservation research and awareness activities broadly covered in *Preserving History's Future*. In May 1990, the NEH notified SAA of the proposal's rejection. The NEH reported that the grant was too ambitious because of its combined approach and suggested stripping it down to the educational program component alone. Because SAA no longer employed a preservation officer upon the expiration of Conway's term in December 1989, SAA contracted Margaret Child to

revise the NEH grant proposal by focusing on the educational program component. A committee of prominent SAA Preservation Section members, which included Lisa Fox (consultant, formerly of SOLINET, and former chair of the SAA Preservation Section), Karen Garlick (formerly of the National Archives and Records Administration and former chair of the SAA Preservation Section), Anne Kenney (Cornell University and president of SAA, 1992–93), and Christine Ward (New York State Archives and Records Administration, cochair of the SAA Task Force on Preservation and former chair of the SAA Preservation Section), assisted Child in rewriting the grant.

The SAA PMTP was proposed in the revamped grant. The NEH Division of Preservation and Access awarded the grant in 1991. The grant included \$600,609 in outright funds from NEH and a total budget of \$750,000. This is the largest grant the NEH Division of Preservation and Access has awarded to a professional association for a preservation education and training program. The plan for the PMTP was built on library training program models from the University of California-Berkeley and the Commission on Preservation and Access/College Libraries Committee, in cooperation with SOLINET (Conway 1989a, 5; Frangakis 1992). In 1992, SAA launched this NEH-funded training program. It was a three-year nationwide program that trained forty-four archival administrators (fifty applicants were accepted into the program) in establishing and maintaining fully functional archival preservation programs.

Today the PMTP stands as the nation's most unique and complete continuing preservation education and training program. There have been several other excellent programs available to collections managers in libraries and archives. Among these are the Commission on Preservation and Access' Preservation Management for College Libraries workshops, the NEDCC preservation microfilming workshop program, the Preservation Intensive Institute, the Rutgers University School of Communication Information and Li-

brary Studies' preservation certificate program, the SAA/NEDCC Preservation Management Institute, the SAA basic conservation workshops, the University of California Preservation Implementation Project, and the University of Texas-Austin Graduate School of Library and Information Science certificate in preservation administration. None of these programs, however, has combined the range of training program elements that have been incorporated into the PMTP. These include: student assignments, hands-on exercises, commitment from the students' institutions, the length of time required, and the nationwide body of students. What is significant and unique about PMTP is that the program's designers succeeded in combining all these elements into one continuing education program.

The SAA PMTP was conducted through four regional series—North-eastern, Midwestern, Western, and South-eastern. Each series met independently for three one-week institutes spread over a one-year period. The participants were selected competitively within their region; in addition, the sponsoring institution had to recognize the need to plan, initiate, and support an archival preservation program and be willing to commit formally to doing so. Preference was given to institutions with at least three FTEs who were performing archival functions and to applicants who had received prior training in the basic elements of preservation and had a minimum of three years of experience managing some aspect of an archival program. Applicants had to have official responsibility for managing preservation activities at their institutions at least 25% of the time and they had to possess the ability to initiate institutional change. The program's intended audience was midcareer archival administrators and sought to integrate preservation planning and implementation into management perspectives (Conway 1990, 206–9).

The task of making the PMTP a reality was assigned to Evelyn Frangakis and a select cadre of faculty members. Frangakis, the PMTP director and principal faculty

member, is a preservation administrator with archival experience. She attended the D.L.S. program at the Columbia University School of Library Service, concentrating in preservation administration, and received her certificate in preservation administration from Conservation Education Programs. Frangakis has taught preservation administration and has consulted with many institutions on this topic. The faculty included: Diana Alper (National Archives and Records Administration), Brenda Banks (Georgia Department of Archives and History and president of SAA, 1995–96), John Dean (Cornell University), Anne Diffendal (consultant and former executive director of the Society of American Archivists), Judith Fortson (Hoover Institution, Stanford University), Karen Garlick (Smithsonian Institution—American Museum of Natural History), Maria Holden (New York State Archives and Records Administration), Hilary Kaplan (Georgia Department of Archives and History), Anne Kenney (Cornell University), Jane Klinger (National Archives and Records Administration—San Bruno, Calif.), Kathy Ludwig (Minnesota Historical Society), Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler (National Archives and Records Administration), and Christine Ward (New York State Archives and Records Administration). These preservation administrators represent the cutting edge in the field of archival preservation. Each has developed mature preservation programs at their respective institutions and has helped lead SAA through many of its preservation-related initiatives. Through the PMTP they focused their energies on improving the level of professional practice in archival institutions across the country.

The first year of the three-year grant was focused on devising a curriculum that used an active learning approach. The faculty met as a group for several days in Chicago with faculty trainer Jack Prostko, associate director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, Stanford University. The faculty concentrated on developing their instructional methods for interactive adult learning environments by drawing on the wealth of training materials pro-

duced by the center at Stanford and on other recent literature in this area (e.g., Macincovich 1989; Adams 1986; Bookfield 1991; Pike 1989). Evelyn Frangakis also prepared a set of guidelines for the PMTP faculty (Frangakis 1992).

The Chicago meetings between the faculty and Professor Prostko resulted in three weeks of curricula that would stimulate the program participants to seek out extensive knowledge about preservation, while they also thought about how this knowledge could be built into a more extensive preservation agenda at their respective institutions. The PMTP consisted of simulated work situations, role playing exercises, break-out group activities and discussions, and audio-visuals with lectures and group discussions intermixed. This interactive approach was based on previously successful applications by educators and trainers involved with adult learning. These educational approaches were implemented in all components of the curriculum by Frangakis and the faculty.

The instructional components of the PMTP were designed to instill knowledge and foster confidence in each of the fifty participating archivists so that they would complete the required interworkshop assignments. These assignments resulted in the construction of portions of an institutionally-based archival preservation program. The training assignments were derived from the following topics covered during the workshops:

#### *Workshop 1*

##### *Preservation Planning*

- Nature of archival materials
- Collection survey methodology techniques
- Environmental control
- Disaster preparedness and recovery

#### *Workshop 2*

##### *Care and Handling of Archival Materials*

- Holdings maintenance
- Selection for preservation
- Conservation
- Reformatting
- Exhibits

*Workshop 3**Integrating Preservation into Archival Functions*

- Translating planning into operational programming
- Management tools and techniques
- Resource allocation and funding
- Grantsmanship
- Sources of outside funding
- Funding opportunities
- National initiatives

The training program began with a summary review of specialized preservation needs of audio, visual, magnetic, and electronic media, as well as paper-based materials. A thorough review of methods and techniques regarding all aspects of preservation management and conservation were the focus of the second institute. Finally, participants worked with the faculty to pull together all the component parts of the training program, addressing them through planning, policy making, and funding, and integrating preservation into the overall program of the archival institution. A heavy emphasis was placed on incorporating preservation functions into the archives' regular policies, procedures, functions, and programs. Ideally, preservation should take on a transparent, yet prominent character. It should not be separate from nor added to archives. Instead, it should become so interwoven into the daily practices that preservation issues are no longer seen solely as "preservation issues," but rather as "archival" issues. The result is to make the archival administrator into a preservation administrator or, in other words, to assimilate the world of the preservation administrator with that of the archival administrator (Ritzenthaler 1993, vii-ix, 1-8, 101).

The goal of planners was that when participants finished the training portion of the program, several building blocks necessary for implementing archival preservation programs would be in place. These major assignments were spread across the workshops. Before the first workshop began, participants completed a preprogram questionnaire about their archives preservation activities, the physical environment in which they worked,

and the archives' propensity to support sound preservation management practices. By the end of the third and final workshop the participants were drafting five-year plans for their archival preservation programs.

The initial program assignments at the close of the first workshop were focused on gathering extensive information about participating institutions for future planning purposes. First, participants returned to their archives and conducted a major preservation survey using *The Conservation Assessment* by the Getty Conservation Institute. This comprehensive survey covers physical facility conditions and departmental policies and procedures regarding the use, handling, and storage of archival materials. The data so gathered laid the groundwork for much of the policy development conducted throughout the training institutes and provided a base of issues to be addressed in the five-year preservation plan. Second, an environmental monitoring program assessment was performed and a report written on its findings. This assignment was a corollary to the larger survey and focused explicitly on the archives' needs to mount a thorough monitoring program. It gathered vital information about the archives' environmental control systems and identified potential mechanical and structural adjustments. Third, participants drafted a disaster preparedness and response plan. This last assignment gave participants a break from the rigorous data gathering and report writing so that they could begin honing their planning skills.

The assignments after the second workshop addressed preservation selection and the exhibition of archival materials, as well as the care and handling of such materials. Participants reviewed three archival collections or record series using the then newly drafted preservation priority worksheet by the Commission on Preservation and Access. Although this tool was new and untested, it introduced participants to the application of a body of criteria for establishing priorities in collections for preservation attention. There were two assignments related to exhibition: critique a major historical exhibit

with regard to preservation concerns, and draft policies on internal practices and the loaning of archival holdings for exhibition. In addition, participants wrote reference room rules for users of the archival materials and drafted a teaching packet to form the core of a staff training session on the handling and use of archival materials. All of these completed assignments were mailed to the PMTP director prior to the final workshop and were returned to participants with written faculty comments. In the final workshop, so that participants could benefit from their individual innovations and challenges, participants shared both their experiences in completing the assignments and faculty comments they had received.

There were also assignments to complete for preservation program elements constructed during the third and final week-long workshop. Participants were required to review their budgets with their supervisors and other relevant financial officers. The purpose was to identify areas of flexibility in the budget or the potential to shift resources to current preservation activities. Budget strategies were developed by the participants in conjunction with the faculty. Additionally, numerous existing policies regarding collection development, acquisitions, deaccessioning, and other issues were brought to this institute and considered. The penultimate assignment began during the third workshop. Preliminary drafts of the five-year archival preservation plans required by SAA from the participating institutions were initiated. Much of the earlier exercises in data gathering, planning, and policy development served as the foundation for this long-range plan. SAA requested that the five-year plans be submitted to the society one year after completing the training workshops. Subsequent annual progress reports during the five-year period were required and will be filed with SAA to provide accountability for preservation program developments.

Utilizing the assignments for the dual purpose of learning as well as creating actual preservation programs makes the PMTP unique in professional education and training for libraries and archives

management, and creates a benchmark for future training programs in both fields for years to come. These assignments, coupled with the thorough review of and training in all the elements of a modern archival preservation management program, instilled two important ingredients in each participant. First, the archivists developed the requisite skills and confidence to devise the elements of their preservation program. Second, they acquired a broad base of professional knowledge through the expansive topical coverage accomplished by the program.

Molding archival administrators into preservation administrators was just one of the major characteristics of the PMTP. Overall, the program elevated preservation for future access into a major institutional priority and trained its participants in how to initiate institutional change. Approaching the need for institutional change usually means placing preservation into a broader operational context. Archival administrators have to balance preservation with programs of acquisitions and appraisal, physical arrangement, description and automated access, and reference and outreach, among others. Participants were taught not to establish preservation as a program that competes with these others, but rather to integrate preservation concerns into each of these areas so that their institution best achieves its mission of preserving *and* making available significant historical materials. Archival administrators learned how to tackle the institutional priorities of the day and accomplish them with well-balanced, preservation-minded strategies.

Advancing the institution's strategic plans into operational programming received much attention in the PMTP. Another round of role playing, break-out group assignments, and directed discussions assisted the participants to address further their own institution's circumstances. Participants were given time during the last workshop to ponder and establish priority areas. They were also introduced to classical and contemporary management literature that addresses the managerial concerns of archivists. Funding opportunities through granting

agencies, private sources, institutional programs, and other avenues were all explored in an effort to identify necessary resources to implement preservation priorities. Throughout this process, participants were encouraged to seek creative, individual solutions to the challenges at their institutions.

Participants did not solve their institutions' problems alone, however. In fact, quite the opposite happened. During discussions all participants shared their institutions' challenges and the solutions they produced. This led to a brainstorming session in which participants assisted each other in seeking solutions. Participants learned that orchestrated group decision-making works better than isolated contemplation. After the training they continued this valuable lesson by networking with each other and with other archivists and preservation specialists.

Preservation-related literature was also introduced and discussed. Personal networking and awareness of relevant published information are essential to support both ongoing learning and the acquisition of the latest information necessary to reach informed decisions. The forty-four graduates of the PMTP returned to their institutions armed with the latest information and techniques to make state-of-the-art archival preservation management a reality in their institutions. By the fall of 1994 the training was completed and the forty-four institutions embarked on this evolving process.

The challenges of incorporating preservation into the range of archival functions as well as effecting broad-based change lie ahead for the institutions that participated in the PMTP. Each will search for the means to rise to these challenges and make preservation a major consideration in daily activity, in budget allocation, and in strategic planning. One participating institution, the Iowa State University Library Special Collections Department, is beginning the process of erecting its archival preservation program. It is networking with a natural ally in the battle to make preservation a top institutional priority—the library's preservation department. Both departments col-

laborated on a five-year preservation plan and are beginning to investigate ways to realize its recommendations. Interdepartmental work on the five-year plan began formally after completion of the training, with the support of a working group comprised of the library's assistant director for collections, head of the special collections department, head of the preservation department, and the participant in the PMTP—the university archivist, who serves as the special collections department's preservation officer. The plan identifies preservation program elements, describes their purpose, states objectives to fulfill the purpose, and describes actions that will bring the department closer to achieving a planned preservation program that emphasizes the prevention of materials deterioration. This plan was submitted to SAA in January 1995, and annual progress reports will be subsequently filed with SAA for 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999.

The five-year preservation plan outlines several areas of archival preservation program responsibility that are being coordinated between the special collections department and the preservation department. The five-year plan focuses on eight preservation program elements: environmental management and monitoring; research use and preservation considerations; staff handling, training, and staffing resource needs assessment; disaster preparedness and response; collections housing, storage facilities, and workspace; reformatting; exhibition; and conservation treatments. The preservation department has a direct responsibility for meeting plan objectives, while in other areas it serves as a consultant to the special collections department, providing input for the archival preservation program. In many cases objectives have been assigned to the preservation department because they represent an expansion of the department's existing library preservation program. It is integrally involved in areas such as environmental monitoring, reformatting, conservation treatment, and policy review. The special collections department retains primary responsibility for program areas such as research use poli-

cies, staff training, collections housing, storage facilities, workspace and supplies, and policy development.

Environmental monitoring and management is one of several examples of how the two departments have assigned preservation functions. This is a case where the preservation department augmented its existing library monitoring program to cover extensively the special collections department. The preservation department purchased and mounted dataloggers to record temperature and humidity levels in several storage areas belonging to special collections. The dataloggers' measurements are downloaded to a preservation department computer, which stores them in the dataloggers' software. Charts interpreting the data can be produced from the software. The findings can then be discussed with both the library and university facilities staff to address any necessary adjustments or improvements in the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system. With previous monitoring data, the special collections department identified those areas posing the greatest risk to collections preservation. The department then began lobbying for the resources to make changes such as adding ultra-violet filtering film for windows and to ensure that adequate environmental controls be installed in a proposed library storage facility. The department has already completed many of these and other physical facility improvements, which are aimed at achieving a better preservation environment.

Reformatting and conservation treatments are two other areas where the preservation department has direct responsibilities in the archival preservation management program. For instance, specialized conservation services for both library and archival materials have been negotiated by the preservation department with NEDCC. Among the services the special collections department will receive are preliminary conservation reviews of items or collections and a variety of conservation treatments that are beyond the capabilities of the library's preservation department. Another possible venture discussed with NEDCC is hiring

a conservation consultant to review conditions throughout the special collections department. This would enhance special collections' own planning and review process with the perspective of an outside expert. In the areas of conservation and reformatting, special collections staff make initial determinations about the need for preservation attention to particular items or collections. The preservation department works on contract specifications with the vendor, shipment of materials to the vendor, and, in the case of microfilming, trains a staff member in the special collections department to prepare the material for filming and to complete the targets. This staff member also conducts a quality review of the microfilm once it is returned by the vendor.

Input from the preservation department on a consultative basis has been worked out in many areas. Comments are solicited from the head of the preservation department on all manner of special collections policies, procedures, and staff training activities. Recent policy review has focused on use policies and reference procedures connected with special collections' move to its new reference room. Another area involves the special collections department's training of new student employees, primarily in dealing with handling procedures during arrangement, description, and reshelving. The preservation department contributes to training procedures by reviewing and commenting on them in the same way it reviews and contributes to other special collections policies and procedures. These are just a few examples of how the library's preservation department has assisted the special collections department with preservation management. This collaborative, interdepartmental relationship has cultivated a combined strategy focused on gaining further resources and revising major library activities to suit both archival and library preservation better.

The NEH-funded PMTP is a vigorous attempt to build model archival preservation programs and lay the groundwork for a network of archival administrators who can assist others in making advancements in archival preservation management. Ar-

chival preservation, just like other areas of the archival enterprise, is undergoing intense scrutiny and change. An agenda for archival preservation management has been declared: to integrate its concerns and contributions into all facets of archival administration and to interweave it into the daily work of all archivists. If the mission of archivists is to identify, preserve, and make available records of enduring value, it is logical to deduce that preservation management is one-third of the archivist's work and deserves a commensurate amount of attention.

The fruit born from the PMTP and its graduates will be harvested for several years to come. Only time will tell whether the PMTP has created the critical mass necessary to shift archives away from ad hoc conservation activities and toward coordinated programs of preservation management. However, through this program the archival profession moves closer to achieving the mission of all information professions—that of preserving our cultural and intellectual resources to meet present and future information needs for all generations.

#### WORKS CITED

- Adams, James L. 1986. *Conceptual blockbusting: Guide to better ideas*. Westport, Conn.: Addison-Wesley.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. 1991. *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conway, Paul. 1989a. Final report: National Endowment for the Humanities grant PS-20144. December 31, 1989.
- . 1989b. Preserving archival futures: A national strategy for the 1990s to enhance the preservation and use of the historical record. Paper presented at a seminar on archival preservation, University of Pittsburgh, School of Library and Information Science. September 25–27, 1989.
- . 1990. Archival preservation practice in a nationwide context. *American archivist* 53: 204–22.
- . 1991. Archival preservation in the United States and the role of information sources. Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.
- . 1994. Telephone conversation (November 15).
- Frangakis, Evelyn. 1992. SAA Archival Preservation Management Training Program. *Midwest Archives Conference Fall Meeting*, November 5.
- Hart, Andrew. 1993. The future of preservation education: Notes from the PI Institute. *The abbey newsletter* 17, no. 4: 47–48, 50.
- Jensen, Kirsten, and Andrew Hart. 1993. The Preservation Intensive Institute: State-of-the-art education for preservation managers. *Library hi tech news* 107 (November): 3.
- Marincovich, Michelle. 1989. *Teaching at Stanford: An introductory handbook for faculty, academic staff/teaching, and teaching assistants*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University.
- Morris, Patricia A. 1990. Educational options for preservation administrators: An afterword on the Preservation Management Institute. *American archivist* 53: 246.
- Pike, Robert. 1989. *Creative training techniques handbook*. Minneapolis: Lakewood Books.
- Preserving history's future: Nationwide goals for the preservation and use of the archival record*. 1993. Chicago: SAA Task Force on Preservation.
- Ritzenthaler, Mary Lynn. 1993. *Preserving archives and manuscripts*. Chicago: The Society of American Archivists.