

CONGRESSIONAL PAPERS FORUM:

THE THIRD REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS

August 29, 2001

PROCEEDINGS

Sponsored by the Society of American Archivists
Congressional Papers Roundtable

Project Director
Karen D. Paul
Archivist, United States Senate

March 2002

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Executive Summary	3
Welcoming Remarks	5
<i>Cynthia Miller, Chair, Congressional Papers Roundtable</i>	5
<i>Richard Baker, Senate Historian</i>	6
<i>Timothy Johnson, Advisory Committee Member</i>	7
<i>Michael Kurtz, Assistant Archivist, National Archives</i>	8
Briefing: The <i>Third Report</i> of the Advisory Committee and Purpose of the Forum	
<i>Karen Paul, Senate Archivist</i>	10
Panel I: Improving Archival Practices on Capitol Hill	12
<i>Chair: Naomi Nelson, Curator for Southern History, Emory University</i>	12
<i>Nancy Briani, Office Manager (ret.), Senator Sessions</i>	12
<i>Juliette Arai, Archivist, Senator Stevens</i>	14
<i>Margo Rushing, Office Manager, Senator Burns</i>	16
<i>Kevin Wilson, Legislative Assistant (ret.), Senator Pell and Representative Weygand</i>	18
<i>Robin Van Fleet, Archival Specialist, House Office of Legislative Services</i>	20
Panel II: Developing Public Policy Research Centers	26
<i>Chair: Frank Mackaman, Director, The Dirksen Congressional Center</i>	26
<i>William Crowe, Spencer Librarian, University of Kansas</i>	27
<i>Jeff Suchanek, Archivist, Wendell Ford Research Center and Public Policy Archives</i>	30
<i>Connell Gallagher, Director, Research Collections, University of Vermont</i>	34
<i>Herbert Hartsook, Curator, Modern Political Collections, University of South Carolina</i>	37
Focus Group Panel I	
<i>Chair: Sheryl Vogt, Director, Richard Russell Library for Political Research and Studies</i>	42
Focus Group Panel II	
<i>Chair: Raymond Smock, Historical Consultant</i>	44
Biographies	46

INTRODUCTION

The *Third Report* of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress (S. Pub. 106-52) identifies three major trends that threaten the integrity of the records of Congress. They are:

- the volume and complexity of congressional members' papers.
- the revolution in electronic communications and record keeping.
- the random dispersal of members' papers impeding efforts to organize strong, state-based public service resource centers.

The Society of American Archivists Congressional Papers Roundtable scheduled this Congressional Papers Forum to explore ways to mitigate the ill effects of these trends. Eighty-five people from around the country gathered together on August 29, 2001 for an intense afternoon of focused discussion. Two formally structured panel discussions were followed by two focus groups comprised of members of the audience. The panelists' presentations and the focus groups' summaries were recorded and transcribed.

This edited transcription captures what participants felt to be a uniquely productive meeting. The recommendations of the forum build on those of the *Third Report*. They are herein reproduced and offered to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress and to the national archival community to help chart future congressional documentation goals and activities.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Institutions are there to advance scholarship and research, but they are also there to advance the causes of society . . .

— William Crowe on congressional research centers

These proceedings provide a first-hand account of the creators and keepers of legislative documentation as they grapple with two of the most persistent problems affecting the quality and usefulness of public policy documentation, namely, the weakness of archival records management in congressional offices and the lack of a strong national network of congressional resource centers. Responding to a series of questions posed by the panel leaders, recognized experts described the extent and ramifications of these problems and offered solutions. An eighty-five-member audience, also comprised of specialists in the field, then debated these points and drew conclusions.

The recommendations derived from this concentration of expertise represent the best current thinking of the archival/curatorial world. The transcript also offers rich background information and data. The recommendations are offered to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress as a response and follow-up to the Advisory Committee's *Third Report* to Congress. Recognizing the committee's past success in improving preservation of the historical records of the legislative branch, the forum participants hope that this report will support the Advisory Committee's efforts to improve the process whereby members' collections are preserved and become part of our country's archival and cultural heritage.

To improve the preservation of an adequate and usable historical record as contained in the papers of members of Congress, the forum makes the following recommendations to the Advisory Committee.

First, facilitate significant improvements in archival/records management by:

- promoting the addition of a professional archivist or records manager to a member's staff either full time or part time, as appropriate. Only in this way will the recurring problems of poorly managed records be solved.
- providing members with a sample job description to facilitate their hiring such a professional.
- enlisting the support of members who have personal staff archivists to garner interest among other members.

- promulgating records management baseline criteria in the form of a checklist that offices can use to evaluate their effectiveness level. The criteria should include particular guidance for electronic records and special media.
- endorsing records management briefings for new offices.
- urging members to designate a repository early in their careers in order to begin a cooperative venture that strengthens records management and produces a more valuable permanent record.

Second, promote an understanding of the vital role that public policy centers play in making congressional collections available for public research and providing public programs at the local, state, national, and even international levels by:

- developing a working definition of "public policy center" to provide guidance to members and states that need to create them. The definition should describe the cost effectiveness of centers, their goals and policies, and the types of public programs undertaken by successful centers.
- overseeing the compilation of an official roster of public policy centers and publicizing it to encourage members to designate their centers early in their careers.
- enlisting the help of state historical records advisory boards to encourage the development of centers in states that lack them.
- promulgating a pamphlet for new members that explains their role and responsibilities in preserving their records and in working with the congressional centers that will hold their papers.
- creating a task force to explore and report on ways to fund the preservation of congressional and public policy documentation either through traditional sources such as grant giving agencies, a central campaign finance based fund, or some other designated fund, in order to create a more systematic method than currently exists for preserving this vital national documentation. For competitive funding sources, evaluation criteria could incorporate an assessment of the quality of records management as evidenced by the quality of the collection and an evaluation of the appropriateness of the archival institution to serve as a public policy center.

WELCOMING REMARKS

Cynthia Miller, Chair, Congressional Papers Roundtable

I am Cynthia Miller, Chair of the Congressional Papers Roundtable. It is a great pleasure to welcome all of you to Washington and to this special forum of the Congressional Papers Roundtable.

When Karen Paul and I started planning this event last September we wondered if anyone would come. We had sent out a notice to the roundtable asking for any interest and three people replied. One of our more confident members said, "Go ahead and plan it, people will come." Last week Karen and I started worrying about whether this room was going to be big enough, and we actually had to turn people away. So it is just terrific to see such an interest in this topic and those of you willing to take part of your busy afternoon to participate in this meeting.

I particularly want to thank Karen Paul for the work that she has done planning this meeting, her attention to absolutely every little detail. On behalf of the roundtable, Karen, I'm very grateful for your herculean efforts on our behalf. Also thanks to Dick Baker, the Senate Historian, and everyone in the Senate Historical Office for their cooperation with planning this event.

The Center for Legislative Archives at the National Archives has graciously agreed to tape the panel presentations and the reports of the focus groups so that we will have a record of these proceedings. Our thanks to Mike Gillette and his staff for doing that for us.

The publication of the *Third Report* of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress last December, so close in time to this meeting in Washington of the Society of American Archivists [SAA], has presented us with an excellent opportunity to explore some of the current concerns of congressional collections in more depth. Periodically, those of us involved with congressional papers feel the need to step back and assess what the current status is, what the current issues are, how technology is affecting our work, how things have changed, and what priorities should be. This is the fifth of such gatherings, beginning twenty-three years ago in September of 1978 with the Conference on the Research, Use and Disposition of Senate Papers. It is very gratifying to see here today some of the people who attended that conference and some people who participated in subsequent conferences, providing us with a continuity to this ongoing dialogue.

In 1985, a group of congressional archivists convened at Harpers Ferry for a meeting sponsored by the Dirksen Center and National Historical Publication and Records Commission [NHPRC] and produced the Congressional Papers Project Report. Most notably this report laid down the criteria that members should use in selecting a repository and guidelines for repositories in deciding which members' papers to collect.

In 1989, meeting in conjunction with a bicentennial symposium on Understanding Congress, a task force of roundtable members undertook a multi-year documentation project on Congress. The resulting report, entitled The Documentation of Congress, was edited by Karen Paul and published in 1992.

Our last conference, the last opportunity we had to get together, was seven years ago, again in September, in Portland, Maine, sponsored by Northwood University and Margaret Chase Smith Library to examine and discuss the preservation, use, and accessibility of members' papers. Each of these meetings has contributed to our knowledge and our ability to handle this complex business of congressional papers.

The size of this gathering demonstrates that there is a continued and growing concern about congressional collections. Today, we will focus on two aspects of the Third Report of the Advisory Committee: records management in members' offices and the development of public policy resource centers. I am confident that the results of our discussion will again advance our work. I really thank you all for coming.

It is now my great pleasure to introduce Dick Baker, the Senate Historian. Dick, I know, needs no introduction to most of you. Dick has been a strong advocate for congressional papers since the beginning of the Senate Historical Office and I, again, thank him for all of the work of him and his office in making this meeting happen today. Thank you, Dick.

Richard Baker, Senate Historian, representing the Secretary of the Senate

Thank you, Cynthia. I bring greetings on behalf of the Secretary of the Senate.

Ten years ago Jeri Thomson was Assistant Secretary of the Senate. At that time she had an idea about creating the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress as part of a package of other changes to improve the use of the records of Congress and its members. Now she serves as the co-chair of the Advisory Committee. We could not ask for a more energized or determined advocate for

the work that we in this room do in common. I have no doubt that Jeri will serve as a vigorous advocate for implementing any consensus that comes out of the meetings today.

It's appropriate that we're meeting in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Room of the Capitol. LBJ knew the political value of prime real estate in the Capitol Building. When he became Senate majority leader in 1955 he obtained a master key to this wing and went around late at night opening doors, looking in to see who had the best hideaway office because he wanted it. Well, he found this room. Unfortunately, it was occupied by a committee, the Committee on the District of Columbia, and they'd been here for a good fifty years. But there were plans to build a brand new office building, the Dirksen Building, which was designed to house committees, to get the committees out of the Capitol. So he became a fervent advocate of completing that building. As soon as the District of Columbia Committee moved out in 1958, he moved in. This room, because of its ornate trappings, became known and was then known as the Senate's Taj Mahal. He loved it. When he became vice president of the United States he refused to leave this space. It was supposed to go to the majority leader at that point, thanks to his initiative. So he kept it and the rooms just behind us. Those rooms are still used by the staff of the vice president.

This room is currently used for two important purposes. Every Tuesday at twelve-thirty the Senate Democrats and Senator James Jeffords gather here for a weekly policy luncheon where lots of interesting decisions are made. This room is also used on a semi-annual basis by the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress when the Advisory Committee is chaired by the secretary of senate in alternating congresses. We've had some very good meetings over the last ten years and I'm sure that the results of this meeting will be front and center on the committee's agenda when it next meets early in December.

It is now my pleasure to introduce a fellow Advisory Committee member, Tim Johnson, Curator of Special Collections and Rare Books at the University of Minnesota. Tim.

Timothy Johnson, Advisory Committee Member and representing the Clerk of the House

It's my pleasure to welcome you on behalf of Jeff Trandahl, the Clerk of the House and on behalf of the members of the Advisory Committee.

By way of introduction, there are two things I would like to just comment on as an advisory member, one of the appointed mem-

bers. First is to reflect on a comment that Gary Sisco made when I first came on board the committee. He made the observation here in this room that it was the first time within the life of the committee that most of the appointed members were professional archivists. He hoped that we would take advantage of that fact in our work over the next two years. I think we did. I think the Third Report that the committee issued in December is evidence of that professional interest and professional commitment.

So, on behalf of Jim Lloyd from Tennessee, Elizabeth Scott from South Dakota, and the rest of the gang, I want to thank them and thank Karen for the chance that we have as archivists, both camps—librarian and archivist—to be able to participate in that process.

The second comment I want to make in way of introduction, again, is a reflection on the report. When Cynthia and Karen asked me at the last Advisory Committee meeting to be a part of this afternoon's session I said yes, but I also explained that I was going to be out of the country. So I changed my travel plans a bit. I'm going to hang on as long as I can today but my body is still on Athens time having been there just yesterday.

Personally for me it's a sense of my own commitment and the value that I place on the work that we did and the report that was written and, again, I think a reflection of all the members of the committee in what we did. I'm very, very pleased to be a part of this afternoon's session and to be representing the Clerk in this opening introduction.

It is now my pleasure and privilege to introduce the Assistant Archivist at the National Archives, Michael Kurtz.

Michael Kurtz, representing the Archivist of the United States

Good afternoon. I'm here to give greetings from John Carlin, the Archivist of the United States. The Archivist is back at College Park awaiting busloads of SAA members who are going to be taking a tour later this afternoon. He did want me to send his greetings. And it's an opportunity also to express the commitment of the National Archives to the important work of the Advisory Committee and to pay tribute to Mike Gillette and his excellent staff at the center for all the work that they've done and to express our truly genuine appreciation to Dick Baker and Karen Paul and Ken Kato and those who work on the House side for all the work that we've been able to do over the last number of years to build a strong program of protecting and preserving the legislative records, and making them available. So this symposium is really a very important agenda item for us. Mike Gillette serves as the executive secre-

tary for the committee and does a great deal of work for the committee. So this meeting is a very important one. We look forward to receiving the results. I'm glad we're going to record everything in order to be able to mine everything that's said and proposed here today as part of our contribution on members' papers and all aspects related to the records of Congress.

It is my pleasure to introduce Karen Paul. I've known Karen for a long time, a friend and a colleague and someone we enjoy working with very much. I'm glad to turn the podium over to her.

BRIEFING: THE THIRD REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND PURPOSE OF THE FORUM

Karen Paul, Senate Archivist

I want to set the framework for today's meeting. There have been two previous Advisory Committee reports. They focused on congressional committee records and records of congressional support agencies and they were responsible for some notable progress in those areas.

The *Third Report* is the first to focus on members, the papers of members which contain, in fact, half of the documentation of Congress and the legislative branch. It makes three recommendations that relate to the preservation of members' collections.

First, the report endorses the implementation of preservation criteria or baseline actions—this is within members' offices—for use by members as a guide to preserving their collections. It is also the hope of the committee that these criteria will be useful to grant-giving agencies as a benchmark in their evaluation of congressional papers preservation grants. This sets up a "carrot and a stick." It says, "If you employ and execute these guidelines, then your collection is going to be more competitive down the road when it comes time to apply for grants for preservation purposes."

Second, it recommends that members, after six years or prior to retirement, whichever is sooner, devote specific staff resources to improving records management and establishing preliminary intellectual controls over their collections prior to their transfer to an archival repository, i.e. they ought to be employing professional archival or records management help or training someone on their staff.

Third, it endorses the development of public policy research centers that include a strong archives component for the purposes of centralizing public policy documentation, for maximizing the use of specialized resources which these collections require, and for strengthening overall the preservation of congressional documentation.

You see from the agenda that the first half of the forum is the "informative part" consisting of two forty-five-minute panels that are designed to help find ways to achieve the three goals. Those familiar with congressional office records management know that

while there has been a lot of progress in some instances there still is need for substantial improvements across the board. Just today I received a letter from John Brademas, president emeritus of New York University, who is very interested in establishing a congressional center there. I happened to share with him a 1978 article by Richard Baker on the status of record keeping in the Senate. So Dr. Brademas wrote back, "From what I can gather"—and he's been researching this—"the comment that not much has changed since then is right on target."

Panel I, then, is chaired by Naomi Nelson of Emory University who was very instrumental in helping to straighten out the Sam Nunn office several years ago. She is going to lead a discussion of the issues and highlight some successful practices currently in use. It is designed to help us think of some possible solutions.

This is followed by another panel led by Frank Mackaman of the Dirksen Congressional Center. His discussion is going to cover the goals, programs, and benefits of public policy centers. Just yesterday I had a phone call from the head of libraries at Mississippi State University and she said, "We are expanding our political collections. We are expanding our reference services vis-à-vis these collections. We are expanding our educational and public policy outreach activities." Her question to me was, "How can we connect to a congressional network similar to that of presidential libraries? How can we connect to other centers? We have a lot of potential and we are building that. How can we realize this potential and how can we do it better?"

So this is today's challenge, to try to find some answers. We encourage you to take some notes and raise your points at the end of each panel as time permits and in the focus sessions.

There will be a fifteen-minute break at 3:30. After the break, Sheryl Vogt of the Richard Russell Center will chair a focus group on records management and Raymond Smock, a historical consultant, will chair the group on the development of centers.

This is a working forum and we ask you to participate actively by offering your recommendations. The panels and the final focus group recommendations will be taped, transcribed, and submitted to the Advisory Committee at its December meeting and, of course, to all forum participants. This is a great opportunity to improve congressional documentation. Let's take advantage of it. Naomi.

PANEL I: IMPROVING ARCHIVAL PRACTICES ON CAPITOL HILL

Chair: Naomi Nelson

Panelists: Juliette Arai, Nancy Briani, Margo Rushing, Kevin Wilson, and Robin Van Fleet

Naomi Nelson

Good afternoon. Our panelists today represent a body of collective wisdom on the workings of Congress and congressional offices. I will pose a specific question to each panelist who will then take five minutes to answer it. Then, at the end, after all the panelists have spoken, we'll have some time for your comments and thoughts. Remember that our purpose here today is not to identify problems but to work to solve them. So let's focus on possible solutions to some of the common problems we all face.

Our first panelist is Nancy Briani. Nancy worked for many years as an office manager for Senators Nancy Kassebaum and Jeff Sessions. Nancy, your question is: What are some of the elements of good records management in a member's office?

Nancy Briani

First, I feel like I'm preaching to the church choir because being archivists and librarians you're familiar with what is good practice. The Senate offices are a little different. I was fortunate to have spent twenty-four years in various offices in different capacities and know what people want. I will share a few things that I think are very important.

One is that the record-keeping system must be very logical because there is so much staff turnover on the Hill. In my office, we started off with twenty-four people and four years later, only six of the original staff remained. The system must be easy enough for new staff to learn quickly and maintain. It should support fast retrieval. If it takes more than half an hour to find something from six years ago, there's something wrong with the system.

Consistency is achieved through use of a filing vocabulary. With the staff turnover and with so many projects going on at once, you can't have one aide filing something in "transportation" and another

er one doing it in "highways" and another doing it in "aviation." You have to set up a system from the beginning that's consistent, where everybody on the staff knows what the goals are and how to get to that goal.

One of the most important aspects of good records management and the hardest to achieve is adequate staff education. When senators are first elected, the last thing on their minds is the archival practices of an office. They wonder, do I need a personal secretary, an office manager? When and if they do finally focus on their papers—as in my case, I was not hired to do the archival work—the job usually goes to a person who loves to file, if there is such a person.

Most office managers are people right out of college (okay, she can pay the bills) and records management becomes just a side job. Some do it excellently, while others kind of "wing it" and don't worry about it until the senator is getting ready to retire. Then they say, "Oh my gosh, what are we going to do with all these papers?" They do not even think about the electronic records. So you have to educate staff about the importance of the documents they are dealing with and how the system works so that all work toward keeping a good record of the senator's time in the Senate.

The last thing that I think is very important is good documentation of your system. I worked for Senator Kassebaum for eighteen years and achieved great consistency. At the end, we had a little notebook that explained where every piece of paper was in every box. It was divided topically. I gave that to the archival repository so if they had to find something they could quickly read the "road map," the notebook, and find what they were looking for.

If I had to do it over, I would definitely make some changes. I would make sure that road map was given to four or five different people because I've gotten calls since then saying, "Okay, Nancy. Where do we go to look for . . . ?" And I say, "Well, you've got to go to the notebook," and I didn't have it. So it's nice to always kind of spread the wealth so that more than one person has that documentation.

I think that you know what makes a good system. It's just in a Senate office things are very different from a law firm or a business. In some ways it's very connected but in other ways it's very disjointed. With everybody going off and doing their own little projects, no one has time to worry whether the senator's statements are kept where they should be, or that the voting record is maintained, not just how he voted but why he voted that way. It takes someone who hates to hunt for papers to get in there and keep it running.

When I retired, I left feeling fairly good because if you wanted to you could go back and find every statement the senator made since assuming office. But I've since learned that the system is not being maintained. So, it is essential to find somebody who is willing to pick up and carry on.

Naomi Nelson

Our next speaker is Juliette Arai. Juliette is the Archivist in the office of Senator Ted Stevens. Juliette, what are some of the greatest challenges when trying to set office records policy?

Juliette Arai

Good afternoon. One of the greatest challenges in trying to set an office records policy is the pace of records creation when the Senate is in session. Amidst this paper explosion, record keeping either doesn't happen or people use the "pile method"—this pile for forestry issues, this for trade, this one for fisheries, and so on. Everything is just there in a pile.

I think one of the main reasons for not filing or for not organizing records is lack of time. Most people wait until recess figuring that they can catch up then. For some this works fine. For our legislative assistants, this doesn't always work as they most likely will be on a trip to the state with the senator, or on vacation recuperating from the session. So the filing gets pushed off until the next recess or until adjournment and finally gets done when they've run out of space in their cubicle and they can't even move.

Another reason for poor filing habits is ignorance. Some people just don't know how to file. This notion seems odd to me and probably to a lot of people here. It is something that I was very surprised to find, but I don't take it for granted anymore. People just don't know how to do it.

Now, all that said, our office isn't totally chaotic. In terms of record keeping, we have a combination of centralized and decentralized filing systems. There are centralized systems for correspondence, internal memos, speeches, scheduling, and press files. These all work wonderfully. These systems are records management at its best. Normally, one person is in charge, and he or she strictly follows a certain procedure that has been followed over a long period of time and has survived staff turnover. It is something that has become ingrained in the office culture. It's second nature.

Decentralized filing is where all the problems reside and unfortunately this includes all of the LA files. Basically, staffers are respon-

sible for their own files. I give as much guidance as I can and they follow some or all of it, but they're really on their own.

At this point, you're probably wondering what my job entails. I wear many hats in the office. I'm archivist, records manager, museum curator, reference archivist, and librarian, just to name a few things. I don't have time to hold people's hands when it comes to filing. What I did do when I started in the office was to meet with everyone. I asked each staffer what they did, what kinds of documents they created, how they dealt with their electronic records. I did this mainly to gauge the status of record keeping in the office but also to get people to see me as someone they should consult when they had questions about records.

Once I met with everyone I compiled a records management memo for the staff. I wanted to get across three points. First, that everything that they created in the senator's name belonged to the senator. In the past we've had problems with staffers taking their files with them when they left the senator's employ. That was a big problem.

Second, I emphasized that their work is part of the historical record. I stressed that while the staff member might leave, the work still goes on. We refer to older files all the time. By taking the files from the office, the staffer was doing the senator and the constituency a disservice. On the third and final point, the memo served as a "how to file" manual for people. Files need to be housed, the housing needs to be labeled and everything needs to be organized in some sequence.

My work doesn't stop there. I keep prodding people along and guiding them because they're just not going to do it by themselves. I periodically send out reminder memos or do a briefing in a staff meeting near the end of a session or at the beginning of a new Congress. "This is what you want to keep in mind when you're filing or you're setting up a new system."

Overall, I think I've been pretty successful and I think I've slowly made an impression. For example, people are putting dates on things they send to the senator. That was a new concept to a lot of people. I've got staffers putting documents into folders. That, again, was something new for some people. People are coming up and telling me to watch out for certain memos so I can put them into the internal files or they're asking me whether something is historically important or not. Staffers are also giving me copies of speeches without my having to nag them, which I do, however, on a weekly basis. That's not to say there are no problems. People are still piling paper on the floor but it is not staying there so long.

In conclusion, I'd like to say that setting up a successful office records policy doesn't happen overnight. It's work that doesn't ever really stop. You're constantly at it and constantly trying to get people to file and to help them. But it is something that can be done. Thank you.

Naomi Nelson

Our next speaker is Margo Rushing. She is the Office Manager for Senator Conrad Burns and she will talk about how identifying and working with a repository while the senator or House member is still in office can benefit the office staff.

Margo Rushing

I think the most important thing an office manager can do during the first months of a new term is to pick a repository and begin working with that institution to set up an archival system that will work for both the senatorial office and the repository.

I was fortunate when I started working for Senator Burns that one of the universities in Montana came to D.C. during the first couple months of his term and offered their services. That doesn't always happen. It usually is up to the office manager to go out and knock on doors and look at the different options in the state to find out which repository, institution, or university would be the very best one for the senator. But because of the hectic schedule in a new office when you have very few people, you're working twelve hours a day, and the senator is trying to learn the ropes, it's the last thing you think of and it should be one of the first.

I think the most important element in this big picture though is a consistent overall plan and this can only happen if the office manager works very closely with a repository. I think it's important for the institution to send an archivist to the member's office to let staff know how important it is to the state to keep good records. At this point, the staff gets involved and when they do they feel like they "own" it, they understand why it's important.

This joint plan establishes a working relationship with the institution and it identifies what is expected of the staff. Many procedures for archiving can be established early on, setting up a routine for the staff to follow. It's an ongoing effort for the office and the institution. I try periodically to send copies of the papers from our files notebook so they see what we have and what may be coming their way. I've often thought that institutions should not be shy in working with an office and letting them know what looks good to

them or what they think they would like to see. So there's a conversation going back and forth. Basically it's costly to maintain these records and it's their cost and not ours. My thought is that we should be accommodating to as great a degree as possible.

Here's a story of what happened to a senator who served for twenty-four years in the Senate and six years in the House. I knew his office manager really well and her boss and mine were both up for reelection. I wasn't out in the state for that election but I was watching the news that night. Her boss was a very high-profile senator and was expected to win no problem. Mine was targeted to lose. They actually both lost. She didn't expect him to lose. They did not have a repository and basically they had seven weeks to go through thirty years of papers. So Karen Paul, I know you know that nightmare. I'm sure that offices are much better now in choosing repositories than they were in the past because it is one of the most important things you can do particularly because of electronic records.

I was thinking today of what might help improve the situation in the Senate. I thought that senators might consider appropriating money specifically for an archivist. I know that each office might try to work around that. But if that person was on the payroll for a certain salary and that salary could not be used for anything else, maybe that would encourage offices to employ an archivist.

I just wanted to list the benefits of identifying your repository. They include establishing a systematic records management procedure in the office, informing the entire office staff about the importance that the senator puts on archiving, and encouraging proper records disposition and description in the office notebook. A working relationship helps define the contents of the collection and incorporates the documentation needs of the archives. I think the more you engage an institution in this process the better the outcome.

Naomi Nelson

Our fourth speaker is Kevin Wilson. Kevin has worked in the offices of Senator Pell and Representative Weygand and is now doing things off the Hill. Kevin, what are the greatest challenges faced by staff when they transfer electronic records to a repository, a challenge we all face?

Kevin Wilson

Let me echo what Nancy said about the reluctance of staff to discuss archiving at the very beginning of a career. Archiving is equated with either the member's defeat or his retirement. For staff, it means you're unemployed. So with all the time demands, and time is the problem, you have no incentive to want to do the archiving because it's something that you don't want to think about.

I saw this very clearly in my position with Congressman Bob Weygand. After having put thirty-six years of files together for Claiborne Pell, I said to myself, "I don't want to do this again. I have experience with it." I talked to my new chief of staff and he agreed that we should talk with a university. We should really set up an archive. That was the last that was ever said about it until a few weeks before we had to leave our office. The congressman's wife discovered how many boxes were going to be put in her cellar. [Laughter] When she did not agree with that, we had about three weeks to establish an archives.

My experience, and I would not have done it without Karen's help, was to handle about sixteen years of computer files for a member of the Senate who served thirty-six years. Before we started that year-long closing process, we had been sending our constituent mail, the hard copies of the letters, to the University of Rhode Island. Senator Pell's tenure is a good history lesson in that regard. The first twenty years of his career every letter that went out was typed with the letterhead and five sheets of carbon paper. The incoming letter was then attached to the light color and that was your official record for the constituent mail. There was also green, pink, yellow. There was a blue. I know pink was chronological. I don't know what the other ones were. Luckily, by the time I got there we had started—we were one of the first ten offices in the Senate to use the big new computer systems.

By 1996, we had ten years of big disks from those mainframe computers and also about seven years of floppy disks from a LAN system. We had to merge all of those together. Thanks to Karen's help and the Senate Computer Center and a really stiff shoulder from clicking the mouse, we merged all Senator Pell's computer files into one system contained on two floppy disks. Those two floppy disks represent legislative files and a good number of casework files for about sixteen years.

You can't talk about managing an office's computer files without talking about managing the paper file system. You will always be missing the paper copy of a speech that you can find on the computer. For some reason there will always be the letter from the con-

stituent and the reply that you can't find in the computer. I don't know why that happens. You need the two of them together. For that reason, you have to think about the two systems together. You can't set up a paper system one way and the computer system another.

I also feel a need to defend the legislative staff, having been one. It is very important to have a system, both a computer system and a paper system. That should be a framework. It can't be too rigid. You have to recognize not only the time constraints but also that individuals think differently. I filed documents by the issue. I would have a housing file and within that I would have statements, memos, and constituent letters. There are other people who think the reverse way. To force a staffer to think a way that they don't think takes time. What you will end up with is documents titled "Memo to the Senator," hundreds of memos to the senator, or "Talking Points for Tuesday's Lunch." What year? What topic? And the biggest reason those titles get to be put on documents is because the senator is on the phone going "Where are my talking points?" And you're going, "Just a minute, Senator. I'm just about finished with it," and you have to go out the door. That's the reality of the Hill.

So you have to set up a system that is flexible and that becomes part of the culture of the office. From the beginning, if everyone realizes that there is a system that they have to work within, it will be easier. In my office on the House side, we had a system of legislative notebooks. Any time we signed a "Dear Colleague" letter, a copy of that "Dear Colleague" letter went in the notebook. It was great because the congressman saw that his staff was organized. We all knew where we could go to see them and when the office closed, I took those four or five notebooks and just put them into boxes, labeled them, and sent them to the archives.

I have to say that one of the things that surprised me the most when I was working with the Pell computer files is that, believe it or not—this was in 1997—Congress actually may have been ahead of the archival community. I mean that in this way. When the University of Rhode Island archivists came in to talk with us—you remember that—they looked around the office and were absolutely amazed at all the papers we had and everything and the volumes of computer files we had. Honestly they said, "Why don't you just print out all the computer files and we'll microfiche them when we get to Rhode Island?" It was just impractical.

But what they also went on to explain to me is the computer technology doesn't fit with your demands. I never knew until that time that within CD-ROMs there are tiny sheets of metal that will cor-

rode over time. So while we were a bit ahead of what we can offer we also aren't yet to the point where we can provide you with documentation and media that totally serve your needs. The University of Rhode Island now has CD-ROMs, floppy disks, and two types of electronic tape, magnetic tape, that make up the computer versions of Pell's files, just in case something happens. I also have my own copies of those.

Let me put one more plug in for something else and that's the importance of constituent mail files. A lot of times, because of the volume of mail that comes in and the space requirements in an office, constituent mail is often overlooked. I don't know whether anyone has read the Tip O'Neill biography but the biography is a perfect example of why constituent mail—and I mean the hard copies, not the computer replies; the incoming mail—why those files are important for history. At the point in the book where Tip O'Neill is changing his impressions of the Vietnam War, the author uses constituent mail to illustrate how and when Tip O'Neill changed his opinion over a period of time in response to the changing views of the constituents. From the Hill point of view, we all know that the first formulation of policy, the first time you take a crack at changing policy, is documented in a letter to a constituent. A good archives has to have constituent mail. Thank you very much.

Naomi Nelson

The final speaker in this panel is Robin Van Fleet who is in the House Office of Legislative Services. Her question is: What can we do to encourage members to implement records management programs in their offices?

Robin Van Fleet

Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here. I'm fairly new to the Hill and to the Office of the Clerk, Historical Services Division of the Legislative Resource Center. Our current manual for when an office closes and for records management is this, *Closing a Congressional Office*. When advising congressional staff about records management, we tell them to keep the material that tells the story of the member. The manual does list categories of records typically kept in a congressional office and it gives suggestions on what to do with the materials. We also provide information to the offices on courtesy storage facilities available at National Archives. Once a revised

manual and brochures are published, we're hoping to distribute them to all the offices as well as put them on the Clerk's Web site.

We do some records management consultations. We encourage the staff to get the records in order now so that they don't have to do all this at the end when the office is closing. It is a challenge implementing records management especially because of the staff turnover. It's hard to keep that consistency.

None of the members' offices I'm aware of on the House side have archivists because this would mean taking away a staff position. But more offices are becoming aware of the services our office provides and they're trying to get a better handle on their situation.

Even though we are a fairly new division, we are making ourselves known and hopefully these publications will help in the process. Thank you.

Naomi Nelson

We have a few minutes left, so now is the time for any questions or comments that you might like to add. Yes?

Audience

Just a suggestion, for what it's worth. I have previously worked as the archivist and records manager for a United Nations humanitarian organization where there is frequent junior staff turnover, frequent crises somewhere in the world, and records needed to be found because sometimes lives depend on it. So we set up a system. A couple things that we learned might be useful to you.

One is that the manuals and the filing code system are great but they are obsolete the minute they are printed because there are always changes and new ideas and new types of issues that come up. So we used to post ours—we have an intranet system. I don't know if the Senate or the House has anything like that. But we would post the filing codes, the filing plan on the intranet system and it was available to all our offices worldwide. We took a lot of criticisms from the office staff. They felt it didn't really work and we adjusted accordingly. We tried to give them terms that could be commonly used for certain types of issues that came up in every office. It was updated at least weekly so that people could just go in.

One of the advantages—the carrot and the stick—one of the carrots was that if an office utilized this sort of general plan, then we would offer to help them in times of crisis, whatever kind of problem might come up where they had filing backlogs or there was an

urgent need to find a lot of material quickly. We would arrange to get them staff from other offices to go in and help them out because the general plan was the same. If they were using the general plan, then anybody could come in and quickly help out, learn the specifics of what they needed. This was very, very useful, especially since we also had staff that did not all speak the same language. There are five languages in the United Nations.

Naomi Nelson

Thank you. So having a common filing plan that's easily updatable on-line and——

Audience

And the other thing was that we strongly recommend that there be parallel filing systems. That if they were filing papers a certain way that they tried to use the same kind of general folder system and makeup in filing their electronic documents. So if you knew it was filed in a folder marked "Talking Points, Thursday, June 1998" that there would also be an electronic folder using a similar title. Having that one decision to try to have paper files titles the same titles of the electronic files saved us years of staff time every week.

Naomi Nelson

Thank you. Yes?

Audience

I can't speak for all Senate offices but I think most of them follow the practice of having computer files match the hard copy files and mainly because of the excellent book that Karen Paul passed out to us on records management where she stresses that they do that with the correspondence. Most offices also have a system that's available to everybody on the staff so that you can see every file from your own computer. You can look there and then go to the hard copy. We are doing a little bit of that already I think in most offices.

Audience

Nancy's comment when she spoke at the very beginning caused me to wonder what happens when you don't have one of those

good systems? Where do staff go to get the advice? Probably from Karen Paul's office to get a correct filing system, a better filing system. Does the House have comparable kind of help?

Naomi Nelson

Robin?

Robin Van Fleet

Well, our office gives advice on basically—we don't have filing schemes per se that we give out but we will go in and talk to the staff, look at their records and say, "Who does the filing? What are the problems?" and try to work with them on that as well as this manual that we are trying to get ready to distribute.

Audience

I have a question for Margo Rushing. Do the office managers have a filing scheme that they share with new offices? I always thought they called you the first week. [Laughter] I do have one but I just wondered if there was another one going around.

Margo Rushing

I think what we've done in the past—and I think the Democrats do the same; I'm kind of the oldest of the Republicans—is we set up kind of a buddy system initially and the newer office managers will team up with an older, more experienced one. So as part of that orientation we try to help them get established. Once again, there is so much that you're trying to do and you're trying to teach so many people the ropes and get the work done and answer the mail and the phones and get equipment that sometimes, once again, that's one of the last things that comes to fruition. Whatever help we can get I think is always appreciated.

I just wanted to state one thing about the comment you had regarding setting up files. The Library of Congress is a good resource as well. I know a lot of new offices may call the Library of Congress to come in and try to help them get started before you get too far away from the initial organization of an office. They are happy to do that for the House and the Senate. That's something that we kind of lean on, if they find the need.

Audience

They actually used to have those guidelines published.

Audience

In some degree a filing system will naturally occur. The real question is the quality of the system and how well it is maintained.

Audience

Right.

Audience

The computer people will naturally establish some sort of computer files. Believe it or not, LA's actually will try and do some form of filing on their own. Stuff that comes in from either the Senate or the House, vote sheets of how members voted will come in literally all ready to go into a notebook. So there are the makings of a system. It literally is just the quality of it that is important.

Audience

Are there any modern examples that could be added as appendices to your manual? Is there a way to put them on the Web somewhere, to hone in on them?

Audience

I think that's difficult because of the variety of differences in focus among offices. May I just ask Juliette and Kevin: If you were to go about setting up a system for your electronic filing, do you think it should be in one person's control or do you think you should distribute that responsibility among the staff? Juliette, how do you do that? Do you check to see what folders people are using?

Juliette Arai

Most staff print out everything. I can't really check to see if they're doing the folders.

Kevin Wilson

I actually was a huge fan of the mainframe systems that were here for a while because for one reason it forced a system onto the staff. They really only had one choice. That was the choice that the systems administrator had established. Really what it comes down to with paper and computer files is you give legislative staff choices and God knows what you'll get. You'll get things like the piling system. So therefore, the more that you can control and limit them, the better you are at the end of the day. The ten years of our old, clunky mainframe in Pell's office was much better organized than the six years of the new high-tech LAN system. In all honesty, we were one of the last in the Senate to get a LAN because I knew what we were leaving.

Naomi Nelson

I am afraid that we are over time at this point but this conversation will continue in the focus group. So please bring your questions and your comments and your ideas to that and contribute them there. Please join me in thanking our panelists.

PANEL II: DEVELOPING PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH CENTERS

Chair: Frank Mackaman

**Panelists: William Crowe, Jeffrey Suchanek, Connell Gallagher,
and Herbert Hartsook**

Frank Mackaman

I am the panel's moderator, Frank Mackaman, of the Dirksen Congressional Center. You know that all must be right with the world if someone who works at the Everett McKinley Dirksen Congressional Leadership Research Center is able to participate in a meeting on Capitol Hill in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Room. All must be right with the world.

I want to offer my thanks to the roundtable for organizing this session and a special thanks to Cynthia for not calling those of us who were here in 1978 old. [Laughter]

Joining me on the panel this afternoon are Bill Crowe, representing the Robert J. Dole Institute for Public Service and Public Policy at the University of Kansas, Connie Gallagher, who is the Director for Research Collections at the University of Vermont Libraries, Herb Hartsook, who is the Curator of Modern Political Collections at the South Carolina Library, and Jeff Suchanek, who is the Senior Archivist at the Wendell H. Ford Research Center and Public Policy Archive at the University of Kentucky.

We are here to address that portion of the *Third Report* of the Advisory Committee which endorses the development of statewide public policy centers that include a strong archival component. These centers would focus on political and policy documentation. Let me read from the report: "The purpose is to encourage within each state research facilities that approximate what a presidential library offers in terms of resources and collections that relate to each other. Centralizing similar collections and dedicated repositories will make it possible to share the extensive resources needed to preserve such materials. The collections will also be more accessible to scholars who will need to visit only one or two places as opposed to ten or twenty."

The panelists' collective experience with congressional archives/public policy centers suggests how desirable and realistic the development of statewide public policy centers might be. That

is why we are here. The format we will follow is the same as the first session. I will ask each presenter a lead-off question and they will have five to ten minutes to respond. Think of this as a series of case studies.

I'm going to pose the first question to Bill Crowe. He is here representing the newest of the centers. I would like to know what is unique about the Dole Archive and the Dole Institute and perhaps what have you learned from the experiences of the others. Thank you. Bill?

William Crowe

Thanks, Frank. As a nod to truth in packaging, I'm not the Dole Archivist. Unfortunately, our archivist resigned just recently for personal reasons, but elsewhere in the room is Jean Bischoff, Assistant Dole Archivist, who was trained and prepared beautifully at South Carolina. We owe much to the good work being done in archival education at South Carolina.

"Unique" is a dangerous word. I was around when the Dole Institute was conceived. In those days I was the university librarian. I remember when Senator Dole was thinking about not running for reelection, in 1991–1992. He had some surgery and wasn't certain about going ahead. He had sent out his archivist to visit several places in the state, doing the right thing: to see what institution might be the right repository, which institution would best take care of his papers. The papers are extensive, now past four thousand cubic feet and counting, because he keeps generating material and it keeps coming.

When the moment came, after the 1996 election, to ask Senator Dole for the papers, we of course needed to discern his interests. When our chancellor called Senator Dole to say that we wanted to house the papers, which was not a surprise to him because we'd been talking for almost ten years, the chancellor reports Senator Dole as having said that he was interested—"so long as it's not some damn monument." He wanted something that would be built around the papers, something that was going to be useful; and I think that's a common theme of all of these institutes.

When the Dole Institute finally came to be named, "public service" came before "public policy," not that one is less important, but because the university wanted to emphasize the service component and its roots in Kansas traditions. As one who is not an archivist, but a librarian, what strikes me, having listened to people like many of you and having read much about these institutes and archives around the country, is that the best ones take on the character of the

person, as well as of the place and the times associated with that individual.

In that vein, Senator Dole—and I'm a Democrat in Kansas who actually has voted for him!—is one of those public figures who, like many people in Congress, came from the very grass roots. He has been a county attorney and state legislator, a member of the House and a senator, but also Republican national chairman and a candidate for the vice presidency in 1976. He ran three times for president, once getting the GOP nomination. And, among many other things now, he's a pitch man, something he does not for commercial gain but to use funds to support good causes. In all these roles, the institute will be the reflection of his character.

As many of you may know, Richard Norton Smith has just agreed to head the institute. He's leaving the Ford Enterprise in Michigan and coming to Kansas. He's been associated with the Doles, both Senator Dole and Mrs. Dole, for quite some time. We're excited because of his capacity to initiate programming—in connection to a community that is very much "Kansas"—and to put Bob Dole's life of service in context. The institute will indeed not be a "damn monument." In part because the University of Kansas is not a land-grant institution, we have a significant challenge often of somehow being seen as "liberal and elite," especially for Kansas. However, service to society has always been part of our mission, and the Dole Institute is one way to reinforce that.

The special strengths of the papers and of the institute are in the diversity of the resources on hand and planned. I think it is safe to say that Senator Dole does not seem to have thrown anything away. What I have seen in the papers, which isn't a lot—Jean can testify to some of this because she's just started their processing—is exceptional, because he didn't throw things away. He had good staff, people who were really were taking very good care of the records. The papers are very well organized, until the 1996 campaign anyway, when they had to close up shop fast. We have a big challenge with that body of papers.

Too, we have many advantages in our location, just down the road from Harry S. Truman Library and Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, and not too far—Texas is not that far—from the Lyndon B. Johnson Library and the Bush Presidential Library, soon to be two Bush libraries I expect, as well as the Carl Albert Center in Oklahoma and soon the Bill Clinton Library. We're in a part of the country, from Minnesota to Texas, where scholars and students may congregate somewhat naturally, up and down the heartland. We also have an exceptional set of alliances in the region with places like Command and General Staff Center at Fort Leavenworth, with

enterprises that I think would be exceptionally strong as far as international relations because of our international institutes at the university and across a landscape of major research universities.

The notion of programming—and this is where I think Rick Smith is going to make a big difference for us—is to breathe public service into the papers, not simply to have the papers for scholars and serious students, although they'll certainly be used for that purpose for decades, for centuries, I hope. They are rich in telling the story of the last fifty years of this country, especially from a heartland perspective. The programming is going to have impact in the state and across the country, and internationally, and is going to be what makes this institute "unique." I think it will be done with a special flair.

The pledge is that we will have the institute building open on Senator Dole's eightieth birthday in 2003 and that we will launch a series of aggressive programs regionally and nationally that highlight the kinds of values that he's always stood for and that people in Kansas especially know him well.

As someone who came late to the state and got to know Senator Dole only a little bit, and mostly in formal settings, I have begun to appreciate more fully his contributions, in talking with and listening to people across the state and in looking at bits and pieces of the correspondence. I know how much the papers will breathe life into the institute's understanding of his career. That personal connection to people may be now almost of a past era—his politics were very personal, at home and in the Congress.

Having seen Senator Dole in action in a small state—there are only 2.5 million of us scattered over 800 square miles—is to watch that personal interaction with people and to know that it has gone on for over a half century, not only in Kansas, but also in a national and international context. The letters to and from Richard Nixon are intermingled, as it were, with letters from Kansas farmers. This goes a long way toward telling the story of how public policy and public service are done in this country when they're done well.

Whether we agree with Senator Dole's policies or not, I think everybody who understands the man knows that he's given a tremendous amount of his life—literally—for the country and that his life tells a good story about public service. I think we're going to get a generation of young people exposed for the first time to the many attributes of public service because we have the papers, and because we have somebody like Rick Smith to help us explain the resources of the university, embedded in the community.

In the end, these institutes are there to advance scholarship and research, but they are there also to advance the causes of this society.

That's the thing that makes me very excited as a librarian who is responsible for the Dole Archives and will be recruiting a new Dole archivist very soon, by the way. So watch for the ads. The notion of being responsible, in partnership with people like Rick Smith and our faculty and the state's political leadership, is exciting. The bipartisan leadership has been very excited about this, to the point that Kansas has appropriated several million dollars for the institute, which is not a small issue in a very fiscally constrained state. I think that the uniqueness of the mixing of the international, national, and local over that long a period of time in so rich a collection is at once a daunting challenge and prospectively a great deal of fun.

I'm looking forward to the focus groups later in the gathering because I think the work that the committee did here to explain the need to think about the beginning of such collections with the end in mind is vital. It is too late to think about these things when you're closing congressional offices. Senator Dole and his staff certainly understood that point. We're very grateful to him and them for that.

Questions at the end?

Frank Mackaman

Yes. We'll have questions after all the panel presentations. Thank you, Bill.

We want to give the Democrats equal time so Jeff is going to talk to us about the challenges of creating a public policy institute and naming it for a partisan politician. I guess all politicians are partisan. Jeff?

Jeff Suchanek

The University of Kentucky Library began an archives program in the late 1930s. It began as an institutional archives but it expanded into modern archives and special collections in the 1940s to provide primary research opportunities for the newly created doctoral programs. Today, UK's special collections and archives consists of institutional archives, general manuscript holdings, rare books and Kentucky related books, a nationally recognized oral history program, an audio/visual archives and, of course, our political manuscript holdings. Our political holdings trace their roots to material pertaining to Henry Clay and other prominent nineteenth-century Kentuckians. In the early 1960s the papers of Vice President Alben Barkley formed a basis for establishing a modern political archives. In the early 1970s and through the mid-1980s the modern political

archives flourished as political collections were accessioned, including the papers of U.S. Chief Justice Fred Vinson, Supreme Court Justice Stanley Reed, Republican Senator and U.S. Ambassador John Sherman Cooper, Democratic Senate Majority Leader Earle C. Clements, and Senator and Republican National Committee Chairman Thurston B. Morton, to name just a few.

Additionally, the papers of every Kentucky governor save one from 1935 to 1974 came to UK. The modern political archives was truly bipartisan. However, the acquisition of these large collections brought staffing, processing, and preservation challenges. During the late 1990s the political archives operation floundered. Staff and budget cutbacks and other emphasis within both the general library and within special collections and archives created a situation where existing staff became discouraged. Outside funding from federal agencies, such as the NHPRC, for processing political collections was difficult if not impossible to obtain with the result that real work on the collections virtually stopped.

When I took over responsibility for the modern political archives in 1994 a colleague and I decided that progress had to be made in arrangement and description, preservation, and Internet visibility. We believed that more students needed to be utilized in processing the backlog of unprocessed collections and that part-time staff needed to be hired using soft money wherever we could obtain it. We also utilized student help to increase our Internet visibility. As we expected, a little progress in all of these areas brought us immediate positive attention from the library administration but, alas, not an increase in funding.

We knew that any real progress could only be made in raising money from private sources. We had worked on schemes to build an endowment several times. Several of the trial balloons never got off the ground and in other cases we were simply too late in asking private individuals who had either already designated their gifts elsewhere or died before we could make the request. In 1998, Senator Wendell H. Ford, the longest serving United States senator in Kentucky's history, announced his decision to retire from office. Before going to the Senate he had been a popular governor of Kentucky and one of the hardest-fighting partisan politicians in the state's history. The Democratic headquarters building located in the state capital is named in his honor. Senator Ford had decided to donate his papers to the University of Kentucky several years earlier.

At the same time that Senator Ford announced his intention to retire, the state legislature, in an effort to raise the University of Kentucky to a top twenty research institution nationally, initiated

the Research Challenge Trust Fund, popularly known as the bucks for brains program, whereby the state would match dollar for dollar money raised for research initiatives. We saw Senator Ford's announcement and the state funding initiative as a possible answer to our funding needs.

Simultaneous with our funding idea, we learned that UK's nationally recognized Martin School for Public Administration and Public Policy also planned to raise an endowment for a Wendell Ford chair. After discussing our idea with UK's special development office about renaming the modern political archives the Wendell H. Ford Research Center and Public Policy Archives and raising private money for an endowment, it was agreed that the political archives and the Martin School would combine efforts in developing an endowment for both initiatives. The arrangement with the Martin School has certainly benefitted the political archives and has allowed us to progress further than we could have alone.

We knew that naming the modern political archives after one of the most partisan politicians in Kentucky's modern political era carried with it considerable risk. However, we strongly believe that the processing and preservation challenges facing the modern political archives and the opportunity to take advantage of this naming and fund-raising opportunity outweighed the negatives. We are confident that the partisan feelings about Senator Ford will dissipate over time and that he will ultimately be remembered as an effective as well as a powerful Kentucky politician.

Now that the Ford Center is established many challenges remain. Number one, we must continue to build an endowment that will provide the funding needed to meet the challenges of these large political and public policy collections. Our endowment for the center now totals \$.5 million on which the interest provides roughly \$22,000 a year. Our goal is to increase the endowment to \$1 million over the next five years.

Number two, we utilize students and part-time temporary staff effectively and will continue to do so. However, permanent staff are vital because training students to process a political collection takes time and continuity in processing procedures is a crucial element in producing a usable finding aid. We have just recently added one full-time staff person. Processing a large political collection is costly. To process a 300-cubic-foot collection today, which is small by today's average political collection, costs over \$10,000 in just archival materials alone and over \$135,000 in human resources.

Number three, preservation challenges face us throughout the holdings. Collections processed years ago contain "preservation

time bombs" that are expensive to correct. Newspaper clippings, onionskin carbons, and thermal faxes now decades old are in need of photocopying. Sixteen-millimeter film stored in their original cans now exude a strong odor of ammonia, a sure sign of the pending irreversible deterioration. To clean, restore, make a preservation film copy and a VHS user copy of just one two-hour sixteen-millimeter film costs \$5,000. In the Ford Center we have over sixty such films.

Number four, we must continue to push for reformatting in both microfilm and digital formats. There will undoubtedly be resistance to the idea of regional political archives on the part of individual repositories. To offset this resistance and still provide greater access to political collections, digital efforts must continue to provide additional information about and from the collections on the Internet. The future of access to these collections is via the Internet and political and public policy archives must put resources and efforts to make it a reality. We are fortunate in Kentucky to have a statewide effort to build a virtual university library that has a large component.

In closing, I'd like to say our political archives have flourished and waned the same way the political history generally has. Politics and its history will always be a source of fascination to historians, scholars in general, and the public at large. We will have continued success if we build our collections to represent the broader issues and questions in American politics and public policy. We must move to acquire collections that reach beyond standard elections and public office to the grassroots and community organizations that continually change the American political landscape. Be it race, gender, ethnicity, the environment, healthcare, aging, or another issue, it should be our archives that provide the primary documentation for in-depth historical analysis of these issues.

Frank Mackaman

Thank you, Jeff. Well, what if we were to develop these statewide public policy centers based on archival holdings and nobody came? Connie Gallagher has assembled a statewide collection of congressional materials and people have come. I hope that he will share with us some of his secrets for encouraging the use of these historical materials. In a sense, what is our responsibility if not to make sure that those materials are shared and use is made of them? Connie.

Connell Gallagher

It was interesting to get to hear Jeff mention those financial figures. I noticed everybody in the audience started writing. A little earlier when Bill mentioned Senator Dole, I remember the one and only time that I met Senator Dole. I was working as an archivist for Senator Bob Stafford. I used to go off with Senator Stafford to committee meetings and hearings just to see how he functioned and how a committee meeting was run, that kind of thing. He used to take me into the senators' elevator. We were in the senators' elevator one day and Senator Dole got on. He just kind of looked at me. I obviously wasn't a senator. And then Stafford kind of shouldered up to him and said, "Bob, I'd like you to meet my archivist, Connie Gallagher." So we shook hands and such. Years later, Brian Culp, who was Senator Dole's archivist, told me that shortly after that Dole came back to the office and said, "I'm the majority leader. Stafford's got an archivist." [Laughter]

The University of Vermont is not really—well, I guess Vermont is really unique. Somebody said their institution wasn't unique. Vermont is really unique because our senior senator is a Democrat, our junior senator is an Independent, and our one representative is a Progressive. Many people in Vermont refer to him as a socialist. So we have quite an interesting delegation.

We have over a dozen senators and about a dozen House members in the collection. So it's a huge collection. This wasn't through any great planning that we've done. This is pretty much out of default. The University of Vermont is the only institution in the state that can handle these collections. By handle I mean house them. We don't have the staff to really do a lot with them. We do what we can with them but there's nobody else in the state who can touch any of these collections. So it's almost automatic that when a senator or a congressman leaves office that the papers will come to the University of Vermont.

We have a good relationship with our congressional delegation. I think since 1989 when I was on sabbatical—I worked six months for Senator Stafford to help pack him up, send his papers back to the University of Vermont. While I was there Senator Leahy heard about me and asked if I would come over and work with his staff for a semester and set up an archival program at his office, which I did.

Since then Leahy has always had an archivist, a part-time archivist. So we're confident that his collection will come in fairly good shape, at least much better shape than Senator George Aiken's papers came in 1974. A trailer-truck load pulled up to the library

building with I think seventy-five wooden crates, each crate holding four file drawers of papers. We had to unload the truck and do something with it. So I think we're in a little better shape than that. In terms of good relationships, Senator Jeffords deposits papers about every two years with us. Nothing from Congressman Bernie Sanders yet but we have his mayoral papers. So I'm sure that the congressional papers will come.

It's funny though, shortly after Jeffords switched parties a few months ago, I think three or four weeks went by and I got a call from one of his staff members asking me to come over to Montpelier to meet with the state staff just to answer some questions about what they should do with all of these requests they're getting for materials and to go over again what are the important records to keep, the best way to keep them, and the best way to deposit them at the University of Vermont. That relationship is solid. Then I think probably in the next year I'll come down to Washington and meet with his staff here as well. We've established a nice relationship.

I'm in a university library setting and the name of the game in universities is use. The student is king and you've got to really work hard to figure out ways to get all of your materials used. We spend a lot of time discussing congressional papers, business records, all the kinds of things we have in a repository and how to get faculty to use these materials within their classes. In addition, we have three faculty members in the special collections department and a number of us do co-teaching with teaching faculty in history and political science.

When I came back from Washington I convinced the historian to offer a seminar on Stafford and we co-taught that. We invited Stafford to come as a special guest a number of times and a number of his staff to come talk to the classes. We followed that up with a seminar at Deacon. Then we taught a seminar on Vermont since 1920 and we encouraged, because I was a part of it, students to use congressional papers as the basis for papers and projects that they were going to do.

We have a very strong Vermont history collection and when students come over with projects and environmental issues, water resources, Lake Champlain, just about any issue they can think of, we try to encourage them to use congressional papers as well even though their topic is not a political one. I discovered, as most of you know, that most congressional papers have a lot of state and local history in them. So we try to utilize that part of the collection even though the students are not working on the congressman or the senator.

Each of these collections has tremendous local files. Every senator has a Vermont section in his papers, usually kept by the state office. So you can call any state office with any issue going on in Vermont and they will answer it for you in some way or other. Well, those research files came to us with the collections and we use those research files in our Vermont work on a daily basis. That's one of the places we look for answers to all kinds of questions.

One of the nice things about our center, it's not really a policy center. As I said, it was created through default. We're not set up as a policy center but we provide a great context for these collections. I mentioned that we have a strong Vermont history collection. That includes Vermont state documents as part of special collections. So we have all the Vermont state documents right at hand. We've built a records collection around congressional papers. We have many of the guides. We're down the hall from a 90-percent U.S. government documents depository. So we have good relations with them. And we index the local newspaper. So we have tremendous reference resources for people doing any work on congressional papers right there.

In addition to our manuscript collections, politics is probably our strongest area. We started collecting in 1960. The historical society had already taken care of the nineteenth century so we decided to focus on the twentieth century. We have papers of governors, state cabinet officials, state legislators, political organizations, lobbying groups, pressure groups and policy centers. So we have a tremendous amount of information surrounding these collections that the student may use as well.

Let me just close with mentioning one kind of special thing that happened. When Aiken retired, and actually when Aiken died, his widow went out and raised funds to build an endowment for an annual Aiken lecture series. The board on that series picks out a public policy issue—it's usually something that Aiken had something to do with—and they focus on that issue every year. We use that as an opportunity—we create an exhibit for the series. So we use it as an opportunity to focus some of our energies on that issue. This year it's campaign finance. So it's a hot one. We work with political scientists and historians to help students get wrapped around those topics. So every year we have a special political topic that we focus on. That sort of helps us keep on target in terms of getting these collections used. I serve on the board of that Aiken lecture series. I'm a lifetime member. So I make sure that the topics relate to the things we have in the collections.

In closing, let me say that his widow also created a package of money to do some oral history for Aiken. So we have the Aiken oral

history project. These are just some of the ways that we try to get these collections used. Thank you.

Frank Mackaman

Thanks, Connie. I suspect that the synergy that's achieved in this particular case is part of the reason why the public policy center on a statewide basis is attractive to the Advisory Committee. I hope in the focus groups we get to talk about what factors make that happen. Geography, obviously, is a factor and lack of competition in that particular case.

Resources, resources, resources. At some point the committee endorsement for statewide centers runs up against the resource question and you'll notice Herb's name is sprinkled throughout the report as a model that helped frame the discussion. So he's here in person to talk about his experience with Modern Political Collections.

Herbert Hartsook

Modern Political Collections was formed in 1991 so we're relatively new. Our mission is to collect, preserve, and encourage research in private papers documenting South Carolinians and their government at the national and state levels since 1945. We are actively developing both holdings and private support. We currently hold fifty collections totaling approximately three thousand linear feet of material. Thirty-five of those are open for study. The majority of the remainder are processed but closed because of restrictions in the deed of gift. We hold papers of members of Congress, cabinet officers, leading state legislators, both the Republican and Democratic state party, the League of Women Voters and others that impact on government and politics in the state of South Carolina, even including editorial cartoonists. We easily fit the description of a public policy center as described in the Advisory Committee's report as does the Special Collections Department at Clemson University. Unlike Connie's situation, there is active competition even in a small state like South Carolina.

Over half of our donors of papers have contributed toward the processing of those collections. We currently have four endowments that total just over \$381,000. We also have pledges of an additional \$343,000. All of that has been raised since December of 1995. We anticipate that these numbers will change dramatically over the next few months. We've also received moneys that were exhausted rather than endowed. Our endowments are relatively modest right

now but they provide us with important support chiefly by funding three graduate assistantships for work in our division as well as a fairly new research awards program that will help encourage the use of our holdings.

Our success in raising money has improved our visibility notably within the university administration—a nice little side benefit of raising money. We're certainly small potatoes compared to some of our larger counterparts but in what is a terrible fiscal year for our university amid layoffs across state government, our endowments ensure an expanded graduate assistantship program and budget and the expectation of funding a full-time temporary professional some time in the coming twelve months.

What we have done can be replicated both on smaller and larger scales. In the legislative papers workshop that Cynthia and I developed we state that the congressional collections is a growth area within the archival profession. I think everything that we've heard today, everything you see in the Advisory Committee report proves that to be true.

The rising number of research centers focusing on legislative collections can be attributed at least partly to the potentials of such programs to help fund themselves while generating important scholarly work and significant goodwill for the institution. There are basic tenants of development work. If you don't ask, you won't receive. You must have a compelling mandate and be able to share your excitement over that mandate. Building relationships takes time, energy, and money. Always deliver on your promises and never promise what you can't deliver. And success breeds success.

That you have to ask to receive seems obvious but it's key. When we solicit a collection from a person of means or influence, we will routinely seek financial support to underwrite our work with that collection. Our solicitations generally stress two things: first, the fit of the collection within our collecting theme and, second, the services that we offer to our donors in preserving, arranging, referencing, and encouraging research into the collection. We typically seek an amount equal to the costs that we anticipate in personnel, time, and supplies to process the collection. Most of our donors recognize that the services that we're offering them do add value to them. As I noted earlier, over half of our donors have given money as well as papers.

You need a compelling mandate and you have to be able to share your excitement about what you do to be successful in raising money. Your pool of potential contributors are people of affluence and influence who do have some interest in what you do. People

give money if they are convinced that what you are doing is exciting and something with which they want to be associated.

Building relationships takes time, energy, and money. It's rare to receive a major gift. The definition of that varies depending on your institution. To us, we think \$10,000 or more is a major gift. Some other institutions, it may be \$100,000. For us, it's \$10,000. It's rare to get that kind of gift without an investment by your time, your energy, or your efforts. You do that by wining and dining prospects, visiting them in their home, their business, updating them regularly with news you think they might find of interest, sending them a variety of literature, some of which may have been designed chiefly as a development tool. Several of our contributions have come after five years or more of development. In fact, five years just seems to be kind of a magical number. We've had a couple within the last year or two that have come in their fifth year.

If you're lucky you'll have a development officer at your institution that will work with you. I also highly recommend two books to you. One is *Becoming a Fundraiser, The Principles and Practice of Library Development*. It was published in 1992 and written by Victoria Steele who spoke at the Society of American Archivists annual meeting, I believe it was in San Diego. The author stresses that you must evaluate your success on the basis of both the total dollars received and the utility of those gifts to your organization. A minor gift to a discretionary fund may be much more valuable to you than a major gift that binds you down to hosting a symposium every year or publishing some work that the donor wants to have published.

As a fund raiser you also have to be attuned to people's ability to make a gift. *The Millionaire Next Door* by Tom Stanley and William Danko is a popular book of great utility, opening our eyes to opportunities and prospects we might otherwise ignore. It points out that the wealthy are all around us and indeed often look like us, shunning the trappings of wealth such as fancy homes and cars.

Always deliver on promises and don't promise what you can't deliver. People note when you keep and fail to meet your commitments and the reputation that you develop among your donors is critically important to you in development work as donors form your most likely source for future donations. If you please those donors, they will continue to support your program.

That leads us to the final tenet, success breeds success. People want to be associated with successful programs and success is usually measured in terms of growth and recognition. We were featured in a very positive way in this most recent report and we wrote all of our donors and all of our prospective donors. And if we

thought they'd read it, we sent them the entire report. We've gotten a lot of nice feedback from those donors. They are really pleased and proud to see the kind of recognition that we're getting mainly because of the help they've provided us over the years. So we write any time we receive any important recognition because we want our supporters to see that our holdings receive the best care possible and that our program is recognized as a good one.

Success breeds success in another way because past contributors form the pool of potential development volunteers, people who can help you in seeking collections and contributions. Two of our most important collections have been received through the good offices of one of our early donors. It's easy for somebody who is a major player on the state stage to ignore a letter from the archivist at the University of South Carolina. It's much harder to ignore the phone call from a United States senator or a member of Congress or a former governor. It's been really exciting for us to see how involved some of our donors are willing to get in reaching out to people to help us. It's just impossible to overestimate the help that you can receive from your donors.

We work in an era when most institutions are striving to expand their scopes and budgets and are also engaged in aggressive fund raising. The library and university administrations note success in developing close relationships with major players on the political scene, including individuals who impact the state's budget. The acquisition of major collections insures positive publicity for the university. Gifts of money bring the university closer to its fund-raising goals and establishes ties with major players.

Congressional collections are faced with many challenges due to the materials' complexity, the variety of record types, and sheer volume. Grant agencies provide another source of important funding and they typically favor proposals with just the kind of cutting edge issues that we deal with all the time: electronic records, digitization, and cooperative projects. The benefits of fund raising to the institution are obvious. The benefits to the archivist may be less so, but no less important. Development has been a key aspect of my work over the last five years. The satisfaction from receiving a major contribution will never compare with the excitement you have when you bring in a great collection. But the rewards of a successful development effort are terrific. Endowment income can support staff positions, student and part-time help, research awards programs stimulating interest in your holdings, costly preservation, and even staff development such as attendance at SAA. And, almost as important, you broaden your universe of friends and supporters and that's just invaluable.

It's important, I think, to develop statewide and/or regional public policy centers and I believe that significant financial help is available to those who commit to that kind of endeavor. Thank you.

Frank Mackaman

Thank you. Join me in giving a round of applause to our panelists.

I'm going to give Karen a chance to correct me but I think in the interest of time, we'll save the questions for the group discussion. It's break time.

(The focus groups met and filed the following reports.)

FOCUS GROUP PANEL I: IMPROVING ARCHIVAL PRACTICES ON CAPITOL HILL

Chair: Sheryl Vogt, Richard Russell Center

I would like to say that if we had had good archival practices on Capitol Hill twenty-some years ago we would not have had forty-five tons of Richard Russell's papers. [Laughter]

This is the report of the focus group for Panel I which was Improving Archival Practices on Capitol Hill. Our assignment was to discuss adopting and promoting preservation criteria, archivists' roles, congressional staff roles, and an evaluation of available resources, and to make recommendations to preserve a complete and meaningful record of a member's contributions to the legislative process.

Our recommendations for the Advisory Committee from these discussions are that the Advisory Committee promote an environment in which all individual members of Congress are aware of their responsibility for ensuring the preservation of their personal papers. This activity is strongly encouraged and is essential to the success of any recommendations that we make. We had quite a discussion about this and some felt that we emulate Connie Gallagher's story about Senator Dole, that you "show off" your archivist.

The Advisory Committee should also develop records management baseline criteria or a checklist for congressional offices. The checklist would be used by offices to measure their records management effectiveness. The checklist should include particular emphasis on electronic records management and special media preservation.

The Advisory Committee should recommend that an archives/records management briefing be included in the orientation for all new members, new chiefs of staff, and office managers. Sound records management practices should be built into the job descriptions of office staff. The position of archivist should actually be included on the Congressional Accountability Act list where all the positions for Congress are listed.

The Advisory Committee should encourage each member to select a qualified repository for his or her papers early in his service. Each member should have an archivist on staff after the first

term for senators or six years for representatives. The congressional office should be working in close cooperation with the designated repository. Selection of a repository is sound planning and records management. It is not a suggestion of impending retirement. The member's office and the repository should also be in regular contact. A briefing should underscore the potential need for a member's assistance with fund raising to acquire the resources necessary to preserve the collection.

The Advisory Committee should really be active in investigating the status of the use of XML with the correspondence management systems used in members' offices in order to facilitate preservation of this form of electronic records. There really needs to be some kind of standard format throughout congressional offices that meets archival preservation criteria.

We were just beginning to discuss available funding resources. We recognize that some repositories have had success in gaining members' support and in fund raising for special projects, but we think there is a great need for more traditional sources. We mentioned this, and Ann Newhall confirmed that the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) grant program is not focused on congressional collections. However, this does not mean that the need for grants does not exist, especially for older collections, when people are no longer serving and therefore lack a constituency that can be solicited for funds. If a donor is deceased and the collection is significant, the collection should be competitive for a grant. Curators should be able to turn to NHPRC and NEH [National Endowment for the Humanities] to find monies there.

One question that we were examining when we had to stop discussions was establishing a sort of centralized campaign finance reform fund (or other designated fund) that we could turn to when all else fails. We recommend that the Advisory Committee investigate possible solutions to provide adequate funding.

It is only through the critical intersection of the member's assumption of responsibility for preserving his or her records, sound records management, cooperation between congressional offices and their repositories, and the establishment of necessary funding sources that success can be realized. These are the key elements: members' ownership, records management, cooperation, and funding. That is the only way we can succeed in preserving the papers of members of Congress. Thank you.

FOCUS GROUP PANEL II: DEVELOPING PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH CENTERS

Chair: Raymond Smock

The Panel II focus group discussed the whole question of public policy centers. We believe that these public policy centers, however and whatever they're called, the title is not so much important as the work that they do, are vital in preserving congressional collections, making them available for research, and providing public programs and outreach at both local, state, national, and even international levels through programs that draw on the resources of these collections. We believe that the center concept offers the most cost-effective way to preserve public policy documentation due to the nature and complexity of these collections and the degree of expertise and resources they require. The idea is to get to the point where we have a better handle on what these centers are doing around the country, the ones that exist now, and encouraging the creation of new ones, especially in states where none exist, and finding ways to better cooperate and coordinate in all these spheres.

Along these lines, we recommend that the Advisory Committee create an official roster of congressional research centers that specialize in collecting, preserving, and making available for research use collections of public policy documentation. The ideal goal would be to have one for every district and when that's not practical, certainly for every region or state, making sure that the ground is covered across the country. These may range from rather complex research facilities at major universities or relatively small centers in relatively isolated places that still can fulfill the role of documenting public policy development by preserving important collections. An official roster would help us to figure out exactly what's out there, define the activities of centers, and determine where there are gaps. It would also serve to encourage members to actively designate a repository early in their career so that the necessary cooperative efforts can begin. We encourage the Advisory Committee to do so. A roster could be publicized on Web sites as well as used to encourage members to select their repository early.

Then we also suggest that the Advisory Committee work with state historical records advisory boards and councils to help develop a list of these centers and to encourage the development of centers in states that lack them.

We also would like to see the Advisory Committee prepare or endorse preparation of a pamphlet for newly elected members that explains their role in preserving their records, the cost of preserving these records, and the sources for fund raising so that they're aware of their obligations going in, so that we can avoid, as Sheryl mentioned, having forty-five tons dropped on you. The pamphlet should stress the importance of pre-processing by qualified individuals prior to their being sent to a repository and perhaps offer advice on the qualifications ideally sought in such individuals. This would be a pamphlet for House and Senate members that would raise their level of their understanding regarding their responsibility for their personal records.

Let's see. We also recommend—this was one where we came across one another in a way, perhaps in a different fashion. Our panel recommends that the Advisory Committee should study and report on ways in which funds could be made available on a competitive basis to preserve congressional collections, perhaps becoming part of the programs of the NEH and NHPRC. Congressional papers have always sort of been off-limits with these traditional sources because there's such a big potential black hole. However, there are legitimate needs for preservation that should allow them to be competitive. So it's a tricky business. But I don't think, having said that and having identified that problem, that we should completely give up on the idea of systematizing in some manner, if not through the NEH or NHPRC, ways that we can have the preservation of collections funded. Right now it's done on an ad hoc basis. Public money does go to these policy centers. Public money does go to process these collections but it's not through any specific program. It's always a case-by-case basis and usually upon the retirement of a well-known member of the House or Senate. So there's plenty of precedent for funding these things but we want to explore new ways that this might be done. That should cover it then.

FORUM BIOGRAPHIES

Congressional Papers Forum Director Karen D. Paul, Senate Archivist

Karen Paul was detailed from the National Archives to the United States Senate in 1982 to organize the transfer of Senate records to the National Archives. In 1984, she became the first Archivist of the Senate and her duties include serving as a staff assistant to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress, administering the transfer of Senate records to the Center for Legislative Archives at the National Archives, and advising members on the management and disposition of their historical papers.

Congressional Papers Roundtable President Cynthia Miller, Archivist, Committee on Finance, United States Senate

Cynthia Miller served for fifteen years successively in the offices of the Bicentennial, the Office of the Historian, and the Legislative Resource Center of the U.S. House of Representatives. In 1999 she served as the Archivist for Senator Moynihan as he closed his office. She currently is Senate Finance Committee Archivist.

Panel I: Improving Archival Practices on the Hill Moderator: Naomi Nelson, Emory University

Naomi Nelson is Curator for Southern History in the Special Collections Department of Emory's Woodruff Library. As part of her work, she oversees five modern congressional collections, including the papers of Senator Sam Nunn. She worked closely with Nunn's staff for five years prior to his retirement in 1996.

Nancy Briani, former Office Manager

Nancy Briani taught elementary school for seven years prior to her work in the Senate. On a whim she went to work on the Hill and ended up staying. She was Legislative Secretary for two years in Senator James Pearson's office, the Office Manager for 18 years in Senator Nancy Kassebaum's office, and the Office Manager for 4 years in Senator Jeff Sessions' office.

Juliette Arai, Archivist

Juliette Arai received her BA in history from the George Washington University and her MLS from the University of Maryland College Park. While at Maryland, she interned with various repositories and government agencies in the D.C. area. Juliette is currently the Archivist for Senator Ted Stevens.

Margo Rushing, Office Manager

Margo Rushing has worked in the Senate since 1973. During that time, she has worked for four senators. She has been the Office Manager for Senators S. I. Hayakawa, Chic Hecht, and Conrad Burns. While working for Senator Hayakawa, she oversaw the conversion of the mail system from a mechanical to a fully computerized system. As part of her current position with Senator Burns, she has spearheaded Republican and Senate-wide pilot programs to increase office efficiency and cost-effectiveness. Her current responsibilities include managing eight district offices.

Kevin Wilson, former Systems Administrator

Between 1985 and 1997, Kevin Wilson worked in various positions on the legislative staff of Senator Claiborne Pell, finally serving as Senior Legislative Assistant responsible for labor and job training issues. During his time with Senator Pell, he also served as Computer Systems Administrator and developed Senator Pell's official library at the University of Rhode Island. Kevin served as Legislative Director for Rep. Bob Weygand (D-RI) from 1997 until Weygand left office in 2001. He was the point person for developing the computer files for Weygand's library which also is housed at the University of Rhode Island. Kevin currently is Director of Public Policy for the American Society for Cell Biology.

Robin Van Fleet, Archival Specialist, House Office of Legislative Services

Robin Van Fleet is Archival Specialist with the U.S. House of Representatives where she has worked since January 2001. She works with the official committee records of the House and provides consultations and guidance to representatives regarding their

papers. Prior to coming to the House, Robin was Assistant Curator of Manuscripts for the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University. Robin also has worked as an archivist for History Associates, Incorporated in Rockville, MD and in the archives of the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C.

Panel II: Developing Public Policy Research Centers

Moderator: Frank Mackaman, The Dirksen Congressional Center

Frank H. Mackaman has worked at The Dirksen Congressional Center, with one hiatus, since its opening in 1976. The Everett McKinley Dirksen Congressional Leadership Research Center is a private, nonpartisan, nonprofit research and educational institution whose mission is to help people better understand the U.S. Congress and its leaders. The center houses the papers of Everett McKinley Dirksen and Robert H. Michel. It may be the only congressional center archive not associated with a larger entity, e.g., a college, university, or historical society.

William J. Crowe, Spencer Librarian, University of Kansas, Dole Archives

William J. Crowe became Spencer Librarian at the University of Kansas in July 1999. He is responsible for the university's rare books, manuscripts, regional history, and archival collections and services in the Kenneth Spencer Research Library, as well as for the Robert J. Dole Archives in the Dole Institute for Public Service and Public Policy. The mission of the Dole Archives is to support teaching and research at the University of Kansas, to administer professional archival care and management of the Dole Papers and ancillary collections, and to invite research and scholarship on the issues richly documented in the archives.

Jeff Suchanek, Senior Archivist, Wendell Ford Research Center and Public Policy Archives, University of Kentucky

Jeff Suchanek has been Senior Archivist at the Wendell H. Ford Research center and Public Policy Archives at the University of Kentucky since 1996. He has also served as Assistant Director of the UK Oral History Program since 1988. Named in honor of Wendell H. Ford, former governor and the longest serving U.S. senator in the tradition-rich political history of Kentucky, the Wendell H. Ford

Research Center and Public Policy Archives preserves the history of Kentucky politics and government.

Connell Gallagher, Director of Research Collections, University of Vermont

Connell ("Connie") B. Gallagher is Director for Research Collections at the University of Vermont Libraries, a repository holding the papers of over a dozen of Vermont's members of Congress. He was one of the first repository archivists to serve as a staff archivist in the U.S. Senate, working for both Robert Stafford and Patrick Leahy. The Wilbur Collection includes some 80,000 books and pamphlets, approximately 200,000 photographs and other pictures, upwards of 7,500 printed and manuscript maps, and more than 8,000 linear feet of Vermont manuscripts. Contemporary Vermont materials, such as legislative records and state agency documents, are acquired on a continuous basis. The department also maintains an extensive reference file of news articles and pamphlets on issues pertaining to Vermont and Vermonters.

Herbert J. Hartsook, Curator of Modern Political Collections, University of South Carolina

Herbert J. Hartsook has served as Curator of Modern Political Collections at the South Caroliniana Library since its inception in 1991. He is responsible for everything from soliciting collections and raising endowment funds to support the division to mounting exhibits and making presentations about the collection's holdings. A division of the University of South Carolina's South Caroliniana Library, Modern Political Collections was established in 1991 to collect, preserve, and encourage research in private papers documenting South Carolinians and the government at the national and state levels in the post-World War II era.

**Focus Group I Moderator
Sheryl Vogt, Richard Russell Library**

Sheryl Vogt is Director of the Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies at the University of Georgia Libraries, a position she has held since 1979. She is a former chair of the Congressional Papers Roundtable and was a member of the Congressional Documentation Task Force. She has served on the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

Focus Group II Moderator
Raymond Smock, Historical Consultant

Raymond Smock served as Historian of the House of Representatives in the House Office of the Bicentennial. He is now a historical consultant.