REPORT OF THE CUSTER COMMITTEE
Submitted by Michele M. Lavoie
October 13, 2011

The Custer Awards Committee is pleased to announce the 2011 award recipients.

The Arline Custer Memorial Award for Books goes to Douglas L. Frost for his book, *MICA: Making History / Making Art.*

Published by the school in summer 2010, this book chronicles the history of the Maryland Institute College of Art from its founding through the present day. Drawing heavily from the school's archival resources and community, the volume combines historical narrative and vignettes from faculty and alumni with hundreds of images to illustrate nearly two hundred years of this Baltimore institution.

The Custer Award for Articles goes to Mary Beth Corrigan for her article ""'Whether they be ours or no, they may be heirs of the kingdom': The Pursuit of Family Ties among Enslaved People in the District of Columbia," published in *In the Shadow of Freedom* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, spring 2011).

The article utilizes statistical analysis and observations gleaned from contemporary accounts, census data, and other archival records to document the trials and tribulations of the District's slave population as they battle to maintain family ties and gain their freedom.

The C. Herbert Finch Award goes to Columbia University's Butler Library for the web site "1968: Columbia in Crisis" (https://ldpd.lamp.columbia.edu/omeka/exhibits/show/1968).

Based upon a physical exhibition of the same name which was on display in the Rare Book and Manuscript Library from March 17 to August 1, 2008, this online exhibit was published in May 2011. The site masterfully combines narrative with a variety of media from Columbia's archives to chronicle those fateful months over 40 years ago.

The Committee received four nominations for the Custer Award, and ten nominations for the Finch Award. The increase in Finch submissions may be a result of the increased period of eligibility. The committee will continue to research publicity venues for the award announcements. In addition, the committee recommends that non-winning submissions for the Finch Award be highlighted in MARAC's 'Site of the Month' feature on the website's homepage.

While none of this year's book entries were part of a series in which a volume follows a predetermined format, such as the Vault series by Whitman Publishing, the Committee suggests that a slight change be made to the Custer Award guidelines to avoid such submissions in the future. The following sentence (in italics) should be added to the "Eligibility" section of the submission guidelines:

Works under consideration include, but are not limited to, monographs, popular narratives, reference works and exhibition catalogs using archival sources. *Works that follow a predetermined format as part of a series are not eligible.*

To assist each year's award cycle and to ensure a smooth transition between chairs, the Committee continues to work on the handbook. This document includes the submission guidelines, a general timeline for the award cycle (varying slightly as the date of the fall conference changes), a list of the resources for making calls for submissions, and evaluation aids. One such tool is an Excel spreadsheet developed by the current chair to assist in tabulating scores for each submission based on the existing criteria. The Committee experimented with the spreadsheet in scoring this year's submissions, and in general it was found to be a useful tool. The Committee is also experimenting with Google Groups and Documents to share information, with mixed results.

TO: MARAC STEERING COMMITTEE

FROM: MARIANNE KASICA, CHAIR DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

RE: DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT – OCTOBER 13, 2011

The committee worked on the Disaster Assistance Fund appeal to Vendors. It was agreed that this took some priority over working on the 40th Anniversary appeal.

As of this report we have one vendor donation and many individual donations from our members. Donations have exceeded $2000 thereby doubling the fund's balance.

MARAC
Distinguished Service Award Committee Report
Steering Committee Meeting
Bethlehem, PA
October 20, 2011

Membership
- Danna Bell-Russel, Chair
- Lauren Brown, MARAC Archivist
- Jennie Levine Knies
- Catherine OBrion

Progress
- The Distinguished Service Award will be presented at the spring meeting in Cape May, New Jersey. The deadline for nominations is February 16, 2012.
- The committee discussed the process of obtaining nominations and will work on a procedural guide to be used with future committees
- Nominations will be accepted any time up until the deadline.
- We will put an article in the next issue of the Mid-Atlantic Archivist and will also send announcements via the MARAC e-list. We would appreciate it if the Caucus Representatives would take a few minutes at their meetings to promote the award.

Submitted by
Danna Bell-Russel

MARAC Education Committee Report
October 13, 2011
Submitted by Brian Keough, Chair

New Committee Member
Laurie Rizzo, Assistant Librarian, Special Collections, University of Delaware Library.

Off-conference Workshops
During the last two years, the committee has piloted a program for offering workshops at times and locations other than the spring and fall meetings.. We are now ready to deliver a full curriculum of off-conference workshops. We are planning for 6 to 8 workshops in the calendar year 2012. If any institution is interested in hosting a workshop, please contact the chair of the education committee. Workshop topics being planned for 2012 include: basic EAD and advanced EAD; managing electronic records; arrangement, description and MPLP; conservation and preservation; outreach and exhibits; and teaching with primary sources.

Leonard Rapport Modern Archives Institute (MAI) Scholarship
The deadline to apply for the Winter 2012 MAI scholarships is November 15. For application procedures please see: http://www.marac.info/mc/page.do?sitePageId=92118

Fall 2011 conference travel awards
Travel scholarships to the Bethlehem conference were awarded to the following individuals:

- Sara Lichtenfeld, photography archivist, Smith School of Business, University of Maryland - $400

- Molly Tighe, archivist, Mattress Factory Museum of Contemporary Art - $250

- Natalie Baur, project cataloger, Delaware Historical Society - free conference registration

October 12, 2011

TO: MARAC STEERING COMMITTEE

FROM: ARIAN D. RAVANBAKHSH, CHAIR, ELECTRONIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE

RE: ELECTRONIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE REPORT – FALL 2011

Submitted to the Steering Committee at the spring meeting on Thursday, October 20, 2011 in Bethlehem, PA.

Committee Membership

Membership of the Electronic Resources Committee has remained stable since the last report.

Work of the ERC

The ERC has the following items to report.

1) The chair of the ERC worked with the chair of the Outreach Committee and the MARAC Webmaster to reestablish the MARAC blog (see: http://maracarchivesmonth.blogspot.com/) that was originally developed for Archives Month 2010. Procedures for posting to the blog have been developed by the chairs of both Outreach and ERC. We expect that posts to the blog will resume very shortly.
2) The chair has been in contact with the MARAC Archivist and the Secretary about ensuring that a complete and accurate version of the MARAC bylaws is posted on the website. This work is ongoing.

Issues for Steering

None at this time.

Finding Aids Committee Report
MARAC Steering Committee Meeting
Bethlehem, PA
October 20, 2011

Activities

The committee is nearing completion of revised instruments and judging guidelines for the Finding Aid awards, with a submission checklist, judging forms and judging guidelines currently in draft. In putting together the proposed changes, the committee has looked at the materials made available by SAA and other archival organizations, professional literature concerning how researchers use finding aids and what they find useful, and some of the general literature available concerning judging processes and instruments.

The following are the major changes that we envision as we work toward putting out a call for submissions by the end of the month:

1) We envision judging finding aids not only on their content, but for the quality of their design and for their originality. This is not strictly speaking "new", since all of these would have previously factored into judges' decisions, but they have not been specifically identified as separate areas of concern nor formally weighted.

   In judging submissions, the committee envisions basing 40% of any overall score on content, 40% on design, and 20% on whether the finding aid contains elements original to the institution or the profession at large. The committee has found that most submissions have quite good content, but that the quality of design has differed significantly, and that many institutions are not taking advantage of the design capabilities offered by placing their finding aids on the internet. The committee also wished to have a way to formally recognize institutional and professional innovation, even when it is not entirely successful.

2) In addition to the finding aid itself, the committee is going to require that all submissions include a nomination letter. Again, this is not entirely "new", as even the briefest email is a letter, but the extent of the letter has differed significantly between entries. We would like to ensure that all those submitting nominations have a level playing field, and that the committee has input on a number of points that would otherwise be difficult to judge. We therefore envision suggesting that the following points be addressed in the nomination letter:

   - What standards (other than DACS) were used in creating the finding aid?

   - What, if any, elements represent new undertakings for the institution?

   - Which elements have proved most useful to researchers?

We also wish to give those making nominations the opportunity to submit:

- A limited number of publications/presentations about the creation or use of the finding aid

- Limited examples of promotional materials

- A list of places where the finding aid has been made available

Comments from members of Steering on the proposed changes would be heartily welcomed. We realize there is a fine line here between discouraging submissions and encouraging MARAC members to innovate. Attached are the previous judging guidelines and the draft materials that are in the works.

Respectfully submitted,
Dorthea Sartain, Chair

MARAC Finding Aids Awards Committee Worksheet

Basic Elements Checklist

1. <u>Includes basic information about records or papers?</u>

__Name of Collection
__Date Range
__Collection Size
__Creator of Collection
__Provenance
__Name and Location of Repository/Contact information
__Access Information/Restrictions
__Reproductions & Copyright Information
__Processing Information
__Biographical/Historical Note or Timeline
__Scope & Content Note
__Arrangement
__Physical Formats
__Series Descriptions
__Container List

2. <u>Includes additional elements to assist user and applies them effectively?</u>

__Table of Contents
__Abstract
__Related Publications
__Subject/Name Headings
__Appendices

__Instructions for Use
__Related Archival Materials
__Other Available Copies
__Index

3. <u>Prepared in appropriate style</u>

__Clear and pleasing design
__Simple, understandable English
errors
__Quick access

__Clear organization
__Without offensive typographical

__Without irrelevant excess matter

4. <u>Other considerations</u>

__Encourages use across disciplines
__Provides subject access
__Provides guidance to strengths, weaknesses, and potential uses of materials

__Easy to use without archivist
__Includes all relevant information

5. <u>Additional criteria for online finding aids</u>

__Easy to navigate and remain oriented
__Easy to view with different browsers and monitors

__Easy to search
__Image display optional

General Evaluation

1. Appropriate to institution and collections?

2. Significant assistance to researchers?

3. Useful innovation?

Comments

Finding Aid Checklist for Submissions

Submissions

Necessary Elements

Finding Aid

Nomination Letter (1 page)

Author(s) of the letter may wish to take this opportunity to address the following items:

- Which standards other than DACS (if any) were used in processing the archival materials and creating the finding aid.
- What elements in the finding aid represent a departure for the institution or for descriptive practice more generally, and why they were instituted.
- Which elements of the finding aid have proved most useful to researchers, as evidenced by user studies, user statistics, anecdotes or other forms of feedback.

Optional Elements

Copies of, or hyperlinks to, up to three publications/presentations about the process of creating the finding aid or its subsequent use.

Examples of promotional materials created to publicize the finding aid (not to exceed five examples). These may include messages to listserves, press releases, articles in newsletters or magazines, website announcements, etc.

A list of places where researchers may access the finding aid. Many institutions, for instance, create a MARC record at the time of processing as well as an EAD instance, providing access through both their general library catalog and special collections website. Institutions often also make their MARC records available through OCLC, and increasingly make the finding aids themselves available through multi-repository gateways such as the Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries (PACSCL) finding aid site.

Finding Aid Checklist of Minimal Descriptive Elements

All finding aids should, at a minimum, adhere to the mandatory requirements of the DACS standard. This means that the following elements should be part of, or easily accessible from, each description in the finding aid, whether it is description of an item or digital object, a folder, a series, a collection, etc.

Reference Code

Name and Location of Repository

Title

Date

Extent

Name of Creator(s)

Scope and Content

System of Arrangement

Conditions Governing Access

Languages and Scripts of the Material

Finding Aid Evaluation – Items to Consider

Content

Does the finding aid:

- Incorporate accepted archival descriptive standards (i.e., DACS) and – when applicable – accepted schema/standards for online finding aids and digital objects such as EAD, EAC, METS, Dublin Core, etc.?
- Incorporate descriptive practices appropriate to the the medium of the materials being described? Audiovisual materials, maps, works of art and digital objects all have special descriptive needs, for instance.
- Provide access to all or part of the materials in the collection online?
- Provide easy access to help pages or facilities from any point in the finding aid? These might include an explanation of what a finding aid is, FAQs about using finding aids, or information about contacting the archives. Online finding aids might offer things like an online reference service.
- Provide sufficient information to understand the context of the description being viewed? For instance, if it is an item level description, is their easy access to information about the overall collection? If a collection description, easy access to tools that place the collection in context such as biographies or administrative histories, lists of related collections, etc.
- Describe materials that in themselves are culturally, historically or otherwise significant? Or alternately, does it increase public access to, and understanding of, significant aspects of our cultural heritage by bringing together disparate materials in a unique way?

Design

Is the finding aid:

- Well-written and well-formatted? Are descriptions clear and concise, with correct spelling, grammar and punctuation. Do they fit the page or the screen, avoiding excessively long blocks of text? Are there visual cues to help the reader identify particularly important pieces of information?
- Easy to navigate? Does formatting facilitate browsing, so that it is clear where you are in the finding aid and/or the hierarchy of the collection? In general, are navigation tools appropriate and easy to use. For print finding aids, are there tools such as a table of contents, colored tabs to indicate new series, etc. For finding aids on the web, are there tools such as links to related materials, scroll bars, etc. Are menus effectively and efficiently used?
- Easy to search? For print finding aids, are there tools such as an index or cross-references? For finding aids on the web, search boxes that allow you to search within the finding aid or across finding aids. Are search results provided in context, and does the researcher have the ability to refine a search or search within a set of search results?
- Technologically proficient? Do web finding aids make use use of Web 2.0 or other technology to make them more useful? Do they use multimedia effectively?

Originality

Did the insitution incorporate into the finding aid:

- features not previously used by the institution that enable researchers to more effectively understand, navigate and/or utilize the collection being described?
- features rarely or never seen that represent solutions to significant challenges facing the archival profession, add significantly to users ability to access information, and/or present a fundamentally new way to arrange, describe or use collections?

Finding Aid Submission Review Sheet

Title of Finding Aid:	
Author(s):	
Institutional Affiliation:	
Nominated by:	

Judges should rate each criterion on a scale of 1 to 4, taking into consideration the finding aid, cover letter and any other submitted materials in making their determination. Other publicly available information (e.g., from web or literature searches) should not be used to support decisions.

1 = poor; 2 = adequate; 3 = good; 4 = exceptional.

Content (40%)	1	2	3	4
In evaluating content, judges may wish to consider: whether materials have been described properly, using appropriate and relevant standards; whether descriptions are clear, concise and well-written; whether researchers have been given sufficient context to understand the materials described; whether the materials described have cultural, historical or other significance; and whether all or part of the material described has been made available to researchers as part of the finding aid.				
Judges Notes/Comments:				

Design (40%)	1	2	3	4
In evaluating design, judges may wish to consider: whether the finding aid has been formatted appropriately for the medium in which it is presented; whether navigation tools are appropriate and easy to use; whether it is easy to search within the finding aid or across finding aids; and whether the finding aid effectively uses available technologies.				
Judges Notes/Comments:				

Originality (20%)	1	2	3	4
In evaluating originality, judges will wish to consider whether the finding aid contains features rarely or never seen in other finding aids, as well as whether it contains features not previously adopted by the institution.				
Judges Notes/Comments:				

Membership Committee Report October 13, 2011

Activities

The committee held a conference call in early October made some progress and came up with a lot of ideas to welcome new members and honor members of distinction.

1. After communicating back and forth with Lauren Brown, it was determined that the committee should order about 120 pins for those MARAC members at the 40th anniversary who have been members for more than 10 years or who have made played a key role in MARAC. If the member will not be in attendance at the conference, then the pins can be mailed to them.

2. The committee discussed buying some items such as coffee mugs, pens, tote bags that can sold at the conferences for those who like swag MARAC logo items.

3. While working with Archivist Lauren Brown and Holly, the committee discussed making certificates for all those members who have joined MARAC. It was impossible to obtain the entire member roster, but Lauren and Holly did send the members who have joined from 2009 to 2011, and it's about 555 (new members). These members would receive a "welcome certificate" and a pin mailed to them.

4. The committed wants to promote MARAC at local historical events and the caucus reps were contacted. The first event will be held in November in D.C. where Derek Gray, will be attending and he will promote MARAC at this event.

5. The NJ caucus rep-Jeff Moy mentioned that it would be possible to have MARAC literature, applications, informational pamphlets at their events to promote the CAPES program, and this would also help get the word out about MARAC.

6. For all those items that we want ordered and also to cover postage for all the mailing I will provide a budget proposal.

7. The committee would like to ask steering for inputs on the logo for the pins, (both new member and distinction pin). Please send me ideas for images

We are continuing our work and will keep steering informed as we progress.
Respectfully submitted,
Carolina Palacios, Chair

MARAC
NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT
FALL 2011

- The new committee is reviewing the revised Nominations and Elections Procedures Manual revised in May 2011 by the outgoing committee.

- The committee chair assisted the MARAC chair in submitting a Nominations and Elections Committee bylaw amendment for publication in Fall *MAA* issue.

- Two of the three committee members will meet during MARAC Bethlehem Fall 2011 to discuss upcoming duties.

--respectfully submitted, Linda Ries, Chair

MARAC
Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference

Delaware • District of Columbia • Maryland • New Jersey
New York • Pennsylvania • Virginia • West Virginia

To: MARAC Steering Committee

From: David Rose; Chair, Outreach Committee

Re: Outreach Committee Report; Bethlehem, PA; October 20, 2011

Respectfully submitted as an attachment to this report is the MARAC Outreach Blog Vision Statement (with revisions by ERC). Many thanks to Arian Ravanbakhsh for his assistance.

The Outreach Committee is currently performing tests on the blog under discussion and will notify the Steering Committee shortly about its availability for use.

We strongly urge all members of Steering to submit one blog post in the coming months to begin to establish the blog as a medium for communication and to give everyone interested a picture of MARAC's diversity. Thanks very much for your help with that. Outreach will make a general announcement to Steering when all is ready.

Outreach Committee Membership

Heidi N. Abbey, Penn State University Harrisburg Library
Natalie Baur, Delaware Historical Society
Barbara Anne Beaucar, The Barnes Foundation
Lori Birrell, University of Rochester
Ed Galloway, ex-officio; University of Pittsburgh
Tammy Hamilton, Hershey Community Archives
Sarah Malcolm, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library
David Rose, chair; March of Dimes
Valerie Wingfield, New York Public Library

October 14, 2011 / David Rose / Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC)

MARAC Outreach Blog

Vision Statement and Submission Guidelines

Originally created for Archives Month 2010, the Outreach Blog will showcase the diversity of archivists and archival issues in and for MARAC and serve as a platform for outreach to MARAC members and the communities we serve. The blog is intended to be engaging, educational, and wide-ranging. All MARAC members are encouraged to participate; they in turn may invite others to participate by making submissions relating to the world of archives.

The primary purpose of the blog is <u>outreach</u>: to show what we do as archivists, to present captivating stories, and to celebrate those who help to preserve history in any medium. A secondary purpose is <u>advocacy</u>: to present issues that matter to local communities, to speak up when archives are in jeopardy, and to present issues of advocacy for wide dissemination and clear understanding.

Guidelines:

<u>Management</u>: The MARAC Outreach Blog will be managed and administered jointly by the Outreach Committee and the Electronic Resources Committee (ERC). The MARAC Steering Committee reserves the right to change or expand the scope of the blog as appropriate to meet MARAC objectives.

<u>Outreach Committee</u>:

- Submissions to the blog will be sent via email to the Outreach Committee for review by the committee; the Outreach chair at drose@marchofdimes.com will distribute all submissions to the committee for review and response
- Outreach committee will review submissions for appropriateness, accuracy, and editorial correction; corrections and adjustments will be made if necessary
- Upon review and approval by MARAC Outreach, postings will be placed on the blog

<u>Submissions</u>:

- Authors of blog submissions must supply their affiliation(s) and complete contact data
- Submissions will include text not to exceed 500 to 600 words and a maximum of three (3) photographs for illustration
- MARAC reserves the right to decline to post submittals or responses that are inappropriate, offensive, or inconsistent with the purpose of the blog
- It will be stated that blog submittals are not necessarily the view of MARAC and that MARAC does not endorse the views expressed in individual postings

<u>Content</u>: topics appropriate for the MARAC Outreach Blog may include the following:

- Personal testimonies about challenging reference questions
- Celebrate archives heroes," i.e., individuals who have made a difference in promoting archives and preserving collections
- Short informational articles about collections and archival issues
- Archives month events – plans, stories, and activities
- Archives users – stories about those who have been helped by archivists
- National History Day participants and events
- Advocacy issues and news
- Historical information brought to light via archives
- MARAC 40th anniversary plans and events for 2012

- Any topic that is unique, unusual, or interesting to archivists and those in related fields in libraries, museums, academia, government, or historical societies

Electronic Resources Committee:

- The ERC and the MARAC webmaster will provide technical support for the blog
- The ERC will work with Outreach to develop content for the blog as appropriate
- It is acknowledged that the ERC will endeavor to expand the scope of the blog to include a broader scope of content of interest to MARAC members such as information about upcoming meetings, workshops, or general MARAC information.

Miscellaneous:

- The MARAC website will feature a link to the blog
- All Steering Committee members and Outreach Committee members are strongly encouraged to submit at least one blog submittal per year
- Steering Committee and Outreach Committee are also encouraged to invite those outside of MARAC to make submittals to the blog

July 21, 2011 / David Rose / Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC)

Revised September 19, 2011/Arian Ravanbakhsh

Publications Committee Report
Steering Committee Meeting
Bethlehem, PA
October 20, 2011

Mid-Atlantic Archivist
The MAA, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Fall 2011) was issued on September 23, 2011. The deadline for the Winter Issue is December 1.

Technical Leaflets
In September Bill Carpenter (NARA) provided a draft of Technical Leaflet #7.
Mary Mannix is working on Technical Leaflet #12 which is on conducting a reference interview.

The Steering Committee, at the meeting in July, decided to scan the publications for posting on the MARAC's website. Ed Galloway offered his services to undertake the scanning and announced in late September that the scanning project was completed and the publications had been posted online. The Publications Committee, which was not directly involved in the project, then undertook quality inspection of the scanned publications. The Committee, while overall pleased that the leaflets will now be widely accessible, has noted several items requiring adjusting.

Publication Sales
July 1 to September 30

Title	Conference	Other
Documentary Heritage	0	0
Constitutional Issues	0	0
Guidelines in Archives & Ms.	0	1
Technical Leaflet #1 (No longer for sale)	0	0
Technical Leaflet #2 (Computing the Cost)	0	1
Technical Leaflet #3 (Planning for Arch Prog)	0	1
Technical Leaflet #4 (Congressional Collections)	0	1
Technical Leaflet #5 (Exhibits)	0	1
Technical Leaflet #6 (Volunteers)	0	1
Technical Leaflet #7 (No longer for sale)	0	0
Technical Leaflet #8 (Archival Sampling)	0	1
Technical Leaflet #9 (Photograph Preservation)	0	1
Technical Leaflet #10 (Scientific Record-Keeping)	0	1
Technical Leaflet #11 (Architectural Records)	0	1
TOTAL	0	10

Respectfully submitted,
Sharmila Bhatia
Chair, Publications Committee