

PROJECT NARRATIVE FOR
GUIDELINES FOR MANAGING CONGRESSIONAL PAPERS

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	Page 2
Question 1: Project Purpose and Goals	
A: The Donor/Repository Dilemma.....	Page 6
B: Scope and Relevance.....	Page 9
C: Stakeholders and Possible Reviewers.....	Page 10
Question 2: Significance of Project to NHPRC’s Programs and Goals.....	Page 11
Question 3: Plan of Work.....	Page 12
Question 4: Products Produced	
A: Intended Audience and Potential Market.....	Page 13
B: Executive Summary Format.....	Page 14
C: The Need for Print and Electronic Versions.....	Page 14
D: Bridging Gaps in the Literature.....	Page 15
Question 5: Qualifications of Personnel.....	Page 15
Question 6: Performance Objectives.....	Page 20

PROJECT NARRATIVE FOR
GUIDELINES FOR MANAGING CONGRESSIONAL PAPERS

Introduction

The Congressional Papers Roundtable (CPR) of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) is composed of members of the Society and others who work with or have an interest in the personal papers of members of the United States Congress and the official records of Congress. The Roundtable provides a forum for news, for discussion of issues and developments, and for setting standards and advocating action in the preservation and management of congressional papers and records. The Congressional Papers Roundtable was formally established in 1986, two years after twelve congressional archivists gathered informally at an archival conference “to share common concerns and get acquainted.”

The vital network of colleagues in the Roundtable who share their expertise on congressional collections management with each other now numbers more than two hundred. Strong professional bonds have been formed as archivists new to congressional collections seek advice from experienced Roundtable members, are encouraged to report on progress with their collections, are invited to serve on projects such as this guidelines task force, and continue to learn about issues such as knowledge management in congressional offices or trends in congressional scholarship. Though most members of the Congressional Papers Roundtable are not exclusively congressional papers archivists, they faithfully attend CPR meetings and continue to benefit from discussion and exploration of broad-based archival issues. The Congressional Papers Roundtable fosters professional leadership by undertaking meaningful projects such as this *Guidelines for Managing Congressional Papers* initiative. In addition to conferences highlighted in the attached chronology or mentioned in more detail below, Roundtable members have individually and collectively published a bibliography of key sources

for congressional archives, a bibliographic essay on reference works for congressional papers repositories, an Internet list of congressional collections at archival repositories, and contributed several essays to a recent newsletter of the Legislative Studies Section of the American Political Science Association. All of these projects are available from the Roundtable's Website.

<http://archivists.org/saagroups/cpr/>

In the history of the Roundtable, including its precursor interest groups and the establishment of a later affiliate organization, there have been several truly significant national conferences, publications, projects, and special forums that reflect the professionalism and passion of archivists who are honored to work with such complex and challenging collections.

The first conference that caused a stir amongst the records creators, archivists, and scholars was the Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers (Washington, D.C., 1978). The published proceedings from that conference continue to hold a critical place in our professional literature because they emphasize one of the unique characteristics of congressional collections: there is a stimulating records management dialog between the congressional staffs who generate the records and the archivists at repositories who collect them. There are also exciting, engaging outreach exchanges with scholars and other end users of congressional collections. Congressional records and papers afford archivists this opportunity to explore issues related to the entire archival life cycle, which is certainly not always the case with other archival sources in repositories.

The nature of the archival material of interest to the Congressional Papers Roundtable, too, is intellectually invigorating, inherently historic, and vitally important as its preservation ensures an understanding of our democratic government and how the institution of Congress works. As Congress is a representative body, constituents appeal to their congressional members

on all types of issues. The voices of the American people, then, as well as the historic events of any period, are captured in these collections. The personal papers of members of Congress are generated by dynamic individuals who choose very public, political lives. It is not surprising that the papers generate “politics” of their own as high-level institutional administrators become involved in acquiring these high profile collections for their archives and special collections.

However, large contemporary congressional collections come with a price often not taken into account by donors and institutional administrators. The management issues of staff resources and expertise, supporting research and outreach services, and the existence of complementary research collections are important to the archival repositories that house congressional collections as well as to the scholars who use them. The CPR forum held in Washington, D.C., prior to the 2001 SAA Annual Conference raised these issues and the topic of connecting potential donors with “suitable” repositories. One course of action resulting from that forum was the establishment of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress. A mission statement for this organization is available from their website.

<http://www.congresscenters.org>

Discussion of these issues continued at the CPR meeting during the 2002 SAA Annual Conference in Birmingham, resulting in a second course of action: the formation of a “guidelines” task force chaired by Jeff Suchanek (chair, CPR, 2002-2003). The Birmingham discussion led to a call for practical advice on management “standards” that could be used by repositories in deciding whether to accept congressional collections, and by donors who might also use them in identifying repositories equipped to deal with their papers. Several individuals at that meeting expressed concern about “unfair competition”: any guidelines might direct prospective donors to larger institutions and might exclude the “small shop” repositories. With

these concerns in mind, over the next year the 2002 task force attempted to draft a set of guidelines as a committee. The product produced reflected the difficulties involved in the communal writing and editing of a document utilizing long-distance communications. Although an admirable start, members of the task force realized the guidelines draft required major revisions under the hand of a single author.

This realization of the need for a single author reflected the sage plans for a guidelines on congressional papers as laid out in the 1986 *Congressional Papers Project Report* (known as the “Harpers Ferry Report”) resulting from a 1985 conference in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, co-sponsored by the Dirksen Congressional Center and the NHPRC (Grant No. 85-110). This seminal conference led to the establishment of the CPR and prescribed plans for several other projects, such as the subsequently published records management handbook for senators and their repositories. The Harpers Ferry Report included as an appendix a separate report by the 1983 Ad Hoc Planning Group on a Manual for Congressional Papers (William W. Moss, Patricia Aronsson, and David Wigdor, p. 42). The Ad Hoc Planning Group’s notable report contains an outline of the enduring issues that should be addressed in a manual “designed to help archivists have confidence in the decisions and procedures required to manage collections of congressional papers donated to their institutions ...” (p. 43). The very first of the procedural guidelines given in the report was, “The manual should be prepared by one person and not by a committee.” (p. 44). The Ad Hoc Planning Group prescribed a schedule, a budget, an “essay in definition” of congressional papers, and management questions to consider in the content of the manual.

With this history as a foundation, the CPR Steering Committee appointed a second Guidelines Task Force at their meeting during the 2006 SAA Annual Conference. The

committee charged the task force to work with SAA to seek grant funding to hire an author to write *Guidelines for Managing Congressional Papers* and to cover the costs of publication.

Question 1: Project Purpose and Goals

A. The Donor/Repository Dilemma

Maintaining the primary sources documenting the history of the United States Congress is a two-fold endeavor. The National Archives and Records Administration through its Center for Legislative Archives houses the official records of Congress. The other half (some would say majority) of the history of Congress is located in the records, or personal papers, generated by individual senators and representatives. These congressional papers are the private property of each member of Congress; members are free to dispose of their records as they choose during or after their time in office. The increasing trend during the last few decades is the placement of congressional collections in an archival repository with the view of making the records available to scholars, students, and the general research public. This trend is laudable in that it enhances public understanding about the activities of the legislative branch of the federal government. However, these typically large-volume collections pose a number of challenges for archivists, many of whom lack the knowledge and resources to adequately manage what are often high-profile acquisitions for their repositories.

Congressional collections epitomize every management problem associated with twentieth and twenty-first century records. As indicated in the attached chronology and bibliography, archivists and repository administrators have been grappling with how to properly manage the special needs of congressional collections for decades. The Harpers Ferry Report (noted in the Introduction to this proposal) remains a basic resource for archivists working with

congressional collections even though the report is currently out of print. Buried within one section of the report is a listing of minimum standards for archival repositories working with congressional papers. These standards need to be updated and made newly visible. One of the recommendations in the report was a call for the publication of a basic set of guidelines on the acquisition, appraisal, processing, description, and use by researchers of congressional collections. The report delineated the need for such guidelines to assist archivists who work with congressional collections, to offer advice to institutional administrators who decide whether or not to acquire or accept a congressional collection, and to help members of Congress make the decision as to where to place his or her collection.

More recently, the 2001 Congressional Papers Forum held in Washington, D.C., sponsored by the Congressional Papers Roundtable of the Society of American Archivists, reiterated the call for such guidelines. The forum noted the special need for this publication today given the changing nature of congressional collections in an increasingly electronic world. (The Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress published the proceeding of the forum in March 2002 as S. Pub. 107-42.) This grant proposal is submitted as an effort to fulfill a twenty-three year goal of congressional archivists by finally writing, publishing, and distributing *Guidelines for Managing Congressional Papers*.

Along with the Harpers Ferry Report identified above, there exist two other publications to consider as to how they relate to the proposed Guidelines project. The first, *Records Management Handbook for U.S. Senators and their Archival Repositories*, by Karen Dawley Paul, was first published in 1985 and is now available in its sixth edition. This handbook evolved from yet another recommendation of the 1985 Harpers Ferry conference and is invaluable for congressional archivists in helping to identify record series and suggesting

retention schedules. However, this publication is targeted toward the records creators in congressional offices, who may or may not follow its recommendations. Furthermore, there is no comparable handbook for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Congressional Papers Management: Collecting, Appraising, Arranging and Describing Documentation of United States Senators, Representatives, Related Individuals and Organizations, by Faye Phillips (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1996) offers case-based essays drawn from the author's extensive experience working with congressional collections. Although Phillips does include additional information about the policies and practices used by other institutions, her volume is not a how-to manual on congressional papers. Written for archivists, *Congressional Papers Management* begins with the presumption that any repository acquiring congressional papers has already made the commitment of resources necessary to support these collections. Though well-written and still useful to archivists, much of the content in the book needs to be updated to reflect the changing nature of the records produced by twenty-first century congressional offices and the accelerated rate at which they are being acquired.

As planned, the guidelines publication will not be similar to the case-driven essays in *Congressional Papers Management*, nor will it duplicate the records management advice found in Paul's *Handbook*. It will complement and enhance the information found in both of these resources. *Guidelines* as envisioned will be a practical, decision-making management tool for administrators, archivists, and donors that will address key problems and bring together issues and potential solutions in a compact, executive style format. It will distill the collective wisdom of the CPR and will offer the best practices available to archivists in managing congressional collections. It also will be a helpful assessment tool that institutional administrators and members of Congress can quickly digest and use in evaluating the resources required by a

repository to properly manage congressional collections. Moreover, institutional administrators will be able to strengthen future grant funding appeals by adhering to a set of guidelines compiled by the CPR, distributed by the SAA, in a publication funded by the NHPRC. Lastly, *Guidelines* will be useful to teachers and students in archival education programs as a case study on the management of large, complex twentieth and twenty-first century manuscript collections.

B. Scope and Relevance

Congressional collections complement the official records of Congress and have emerged as beacons of transparency for the democratic process. Increased awareness over the last two decades of the value of congressional papers for understanding the workings of Congress has encouraged more active solicitation of papers and more interest by members in placing their papers in repositories.

However, these collections are difficult to manage and are poorly understood by donor and repository alike. They require adequate planning and resources. The average senator generates more than 100 linear feet of files per year in office. Contemporary multi-term senatorial collections upon donation typically range from 1800 to 2500 linear feet. Processing these collections often falls to the least experienced and supervised, i.e. entry-level project archivists and graduate students. Researchers have complained about the delayed access they frequently encounter due to unprocessed collections. In addition, poor arrangement and description, and the overall difficulty in navigating the sheer bulk of these collections often results in decreased use of the material.

Because the records and memorabilia generated by congressional offices are the private property of the individual member of Congress, departing members choose their repositories for a wide range of personal reasons. As stated previously, the repository's ability to adequately

manage the collection is frequently not a primary consideration. Consequently, there is often a significant gap between donor expectations and the repository's ability to meet them. Given this environment, congressional collections typically generate a political environment of their own for which the average archivist is ill prepared. This publication will directly address these issues by offering a set of guidelines, with institutional implementation options ranging from minimum standards to best practices.

C. Stakeholders and Possible Reviewers

A wide variety of individuals located within the federal government, academia, and archival institutions hold a stake in the publication of *Guidelines for the Management of Congressional Papers*. Foremost are the former, current, and future members of the U.S. Congress who produce these important collections. Interest in the proper management of these private papers also extends to the federal agencies who oversee the official records of Congress, such as the Center for Legislative Archives, the U.S. Senate History Office, and the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Likewise, the administrators and archivists at the repositories that preserve these collections and make them available for research are vitally concerned about the best practices to utilize when dealing with these complex collections. The Association of Centers for the Study of Congress (<http://www.congresscenters.org/>) represents many of the larger institutions in the country housing congressional collections. However, congressional collections are located in a diverse array of institutions including state historical societies, public libraries, and colleges and universities both large and small. "Congressional Collections at Archival Institutions" (<http://www.archives.gov/legislative/repository-collections/>) provides a detailed, though not complete, listing of these repositories. The information within the *Guidelines* also will be useful to the archival profession in general as a case study on the

management of multifaceted twentieth and twenty-first century manuscript collections and as a tool to use in continuing education workshops. Students and educators at universities offering graduate programs in archival and information science will use the *Guidelines* for the same reasons. The Society of American Archivists maintains a listing of many of these programs at <http://www.archivists.org/prof-education/edd-index.asp>. Lastly, the *Guidelines* will be used as a benchmark by institutions applying for grants and funding agencies evaluating grant proposals pertaining to congressional collections.

Question 2: Significance of Project to NHPRC's programs and goals

This project to write *Guidelines for Managing Congressional Papers* directly fulfills several goals of the NHPRC and indirectly fulfills all the larger NHPRC objectives. The *Guidelines* will facilitate the use of historical records found in congressional collections held by nearly 600 archives and repositories. The *Guidelines* will help assure the long-term preservation of historical records found in congressional collections by providing best practices for effective archival management. The *Guidelines* project will develop a decision-making tool for managing congressional collections that may be used by the archival profession as a model for other collection types. The *Guidelines* will support professional education activities by contributing an important management paradigm to the professional literature. The *Guidelines* project will develop a standardized tool that will improve access to historically important but difficult-to-navigate collections. The *Guidelines* will advance the work of archivists and records managers by defining management standards, by creating a repository-donor tool for use from negotiation to delivery, and by providing options to assist the decision-making process during appraisal and

processing. The *Guidelines* will disseminate information about the specialized resources available to archivists working with congressional collections.

The *Guidelines* also will finally fulfill a goal first established at an NHPRC sponsored program – the Harpers Ferry conference of twenty years ago. Furthermore, the publication will provide a set of guidelines for institutions to follow when applying for future grant funding and for NHPRC to use when evaluating grant proposals pertaining to congressional papers.

Question 3: Plan of Work

Significant preparation has been completed as evidenced by the bibliography, the clear twenty-eight-year chronology of issues, meetings, reports, and recommendations, and by the publication's Table of Contents as outlined in August 2006 (See Project Summary).

The author will generate drafts of the sections of *Guidelines for Managing Congressional Papers* at specific intervals as outlined in the performance objectives below. The CPR Task Force on Guidelines for Congressional Papers Repositories, chaired by Jeff Thomas (Ohio State University), also includes Jean B. Bischoff (University of Kansas), Alan H. Haeberle, (Office of Senator Orrin Hatch), L. Rebecca Johnson Melvin (University of Delaware), Linda A. Whitaker (Arizona Historical Foundation), and Kate Cruikshank (Indiana University). (See Question 5 - Qualifications of Personnel for more information about these individuals.) The Task Force prepared this grant proposal and reports to the steering committee of the Congressional Papers Roundtable. The Task Force will submit reports to the Project Director, SAA Executive Director Nancy P. Beaumont, who will forward the reports as required to the funding agency. The Task Force will respond to requests from the contracted author, submit suggestions, and provide editorial review of the publication. The Task Force will meet together, in person, with the

contracted author for one full day at the 2007 annual SAA conference in Chicago to assess progress on the publication, discuss revisions, and plan any further steps necessary to complete the final draft. Representatives from the Society of American Archivists will join in these discussions and be included in any subsequent dialog until the completion of a final draft.

Question 4: Products Produced

A. Intended Audience and Potential Market

The intended audience and potential market for *Guidelines for Managing Congressional Papers* includes every administrator of every repository with congressional collections, or those soliciting these collections; congressional papers archivists; and potential donors (whether in or out of office) and their families. Also using this publication will be archival educators and students; those attending continuing education seminars and workshops who will use the guidelines as a supporting text; and researchers new to congressional collections who will use the guidelines as a navigational tool to understand the material they are exploring.

Significantly, we believe the market for this publication extends beyond the archival profession. There is a network of professional and civic organizations, academic administrators and scholars, not to mention the 100 Senators and 435 Representatives in the U.S. Congress likely to benefit from this publication. The published guidelines will make the professional standards transparent. It establishes common ground along a continuum starting from the donor's intentions and expectations to the end user's search for new knowledge from archival sources.

B. Executive Summary Format

The *Guidelines* will contain forty to sixty pages of text written in an executive summary format, plus appendices. This format is intended to quickly engage repository administrators and decision makers – often the presidents, provosts, regents, and boards of directors of cultural institutions. Successful solicitation of congressional papers carries significant obligations. *The Guidelines* will emphasize the formality and planning during the acquisition process as well as the resources needed to sustain these collections. It will also allow for quick reference by incorporating an easy-to-use design and layout. The publication will feature expert typographic design for effective presentation and readability. The layout will include clear headers and section titles, generous space, and the use of bullets and lists. Expanded narratives will allow the archivist or the student an overview of options and best practices in order to make informed practical decisions. It will meet the demand by congressional papers archivists for a highly portable publication in print format, but also may be accessed as an electronic publication through the SAA Web site. It should be noted that processing of these large collections may occur offsite in locations without internet access.

C. The Need for Print and Electronic Versions

High-profile donors (U.S. Senators, U.S. Representatives, and their families) as well as top-level administrators want and need a “report in hand,” not merely a link to an electronic publication. Portability, ready access, and the impression of expert advice from an official report bearing the SAA and NHPRC imprimatur are important considerations for these donors and administrators. Hard copy delivers on these fronts, and first impressions really matter in donor negotiations and administrative commitments. The *Guidelines* may be viewed as a prospectus for a business transaction – it will be used at the initial presentation of a difficult topic that is

often ignored during a congressional career and may be new to institutional administrators. It sets the stage for decision making and lays out the key management issues that will need to be addressed during negotiations between donors and repositories. Given the potentially broad audience for this publication, varied formats in print and electronic publications are appropriate. A printed version of the publication is required to emphasize its importance to donors and administrators. An electronic publication available via the SAA Web site will reach educators and practicing archivists. In short, maximum flexibility and accessibility require both formats.

D. Bridging Gaps in the Literature

This publication will be a significant addition to the professional literature. It guides decision-making processes based on the latest and best practices used by congressional papers archivists; enables the archivist to proceed with confidence based on successful field strategies; provides the basis for a realistic dialog between donors, institutions, and repositories; provides direction for repositories regarding their acquisition practices; formalizes processes and helps insure consistency for repetitive tasks; provides guidelines for cost predictions and sustainability; provides a reference baseline and benchmarking for outcomes; saves the repository staff time and costs during collection appraisal and processing; provides orientation for archivists new to the field; supports preserving the archival record of members of Congress in readily accessible collections; and establishes a practice-based standard that begins to normalize congressional collections for researchers in predictable, systemic ways.

Question 5: Qualifications of Personnel

Nancy Perkin Beaumont is Executive Director of the Society of American Archivists and will serve as project director for the Guidelines Project. As project director she will act as the liaison

between the CPR Task Force and the NHPRC and will oversee SAA staff involved in the publication of *Guidelines for Managing Congressional Papers*.

Cynthia Pease Miller will be the contracted author of *Guidelines for Managing Congressional Collections*. Ms. Miller is in many regards the dean of congressional archivists, having worked with congressional papers in one form or another for close to thirty years. She has been the archivist for three senators and the Senate Committee on Finance. Prior to her employment with the Senate she served seventeen years as an historian with the U.S. House of Representatives. In addition, she is co-developer and co-instructor of a nationally-offered two-day workshop on legislative papers. Ms. Miller is a founding member of the Congressional Papers Roundtable, and has served as chair of the CPR as well as chair of the Manuscript Repositories Section of SAA. Please see Ms. Miller's two-page vitae in the attachments.

Jeffrey W. Thomas, as 2006/2007 chair of the Congressional Papers Roundtable, also serves as chair of the Task Force on Congressional Papers Guidelines for Archival Repositories. He will play a key role in coordinating the advisory and editorial work of the Task Force members listed below. Mr. Thomas has been the archivist for the John Glenn Archives at The Ohio State University since 1999. Previously, he worked at the Ohio Historical Society Archives-Library in both reference (1987-1989) and manuscript acquisitions (1990-1999). While at the historical society he was responsible for the acquisition and processing of the papers of former Ohio congressmen Clarence "Bud" Brown, Jr. (R-OH, 1965-1982) and Chalmers P. Wylie (R-OH, 1967-1992), and an addendum to the papers of Senator Frank Lausche (D-OH, 1957-1968). A long-term member of the Society of American Archivists, he is also active with the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress. He served on the steering committee of the Congressional Papers Roundtable from 2003-2005, was vice-chair/chair elect in 2005-2006, and currently

chairs the roundtable. Mr. Thomas received an M.A. in archival administration in 1987 from Wright State University and a B.A. in history from the College of Wooster in 1985.

Jean B. Bischoff is vice chair/chair elect of the Congressional Papers Roundtable. She is Senior Archivist at the Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics www.doleinstitute.org. Ms. Bischoff has served as Senior Archivist at the Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics at the University of Kansas since 2002. She came to the Dole Institute in 2001 as the project archivist for the papers of Robert J. Dole (Rep. R-KS, 1961-1968; Sen. R-KS, 1969-1996), leading processing team planning and work activities on the Dole House of Representatives papers. She holds a Bachelors degree from American University and a Masters of Library and Information Science from the University of South Carolina.

Kathleen Cruikshank is Political Papers Specialist at the Lilly Library at Indiana University, focusing on modern congressional collections. She has processed and is curator for papers of Representative Lee H. Hamilton (D-IN, 1965-1989), for which she prepared an extensive online guide, major exhibition, and exhibition catalog. She is currently working on the papers of Senator Birch Bayh (D-IN, 1963-1981). She holds a B.A. in philosophy from Colorado College, an M.A. in Germanic language and literature from the University of Washington, a Ph.D. in curriculum and instruction from the University of Wisconsin, and an M.L.S. from Indiana University, with specialization in rare books and manuscripts and archives. She serves on the Congressional Papers Roundtable steering committee and is a member of the Academy of Certified Archivists.

Alan H. Haeberle was 2005/2006 chair of the Congressional Papers Roundtable. He has been archivist in the Office of Senator Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) since 2001, and during that time has also served as archivist for the U. S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, of which Senator Hatch was

Chairman. In 2000, he was archivist in the Office of Senator Connie Mack, (R-Fla.). As archivist in the personal offices of the senators, he has been responsible for a wide variety of tasks, including advising the senators and their staff on archival and records management issues, preparing records for transfer to temporary storage or to a final repository, and providing reference and access to the records for staff as requested. He has managed large collections of artwork, artifacts, memorabilia, and books; and acted as liaison between the senator, his staff, and representatives of the permanent repository of the records. Before working at the Senate, Mr. Haeberle worked at the National Agricultural Library, 1997-1999, as project archivist in charge of processing the USDA History Collection, the records of the Agricultural and Rural History Section of the USDA Economic Research Service. He also worked at the University of Maryland – National Public Broadcasting Archives/Library of American Broadcasting, 1996 and 1999-2000; The George Meany Memorial Archives of the AFL-CIO, 1995-1996; and the World Bank, 1994-1995. He worked as a consultant for several repositories and collections on Long Island, New York, including work processing additions to the papers of Senator Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) at the State University at Stony Brook, 1991-1993; and was field archivist and editor for the New York Historical Documents Inventory, based at Cornell University, 1980-1984, and 1989-1991. In addition to chair, he has served CPR as co-editor of the newsletter, 2000-2003, and as a member of the steering committee, 2002-2004. He was winner of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC) Frederic M. Miller Finding Aid Award, for his work on the *Guide to the USDA History Collection*, a Web-based finding aid, <http://www.nal.usda.gov/speccoll/collect/history/index.htm>. Mr. Haeberle received an A.B. in English from Cornell University, 1975; and an MLS from the University of Maryland, 1996.

L. Rebecca Johnson Melvin is associate librarian and coordinator of the manuscripts unit, Special Collections, University of Delaware Library. She was project archivist for the papers of Senator John J. Williams (R-Del., 1947-1970), 1988-1990, for which she published a collection guide. She supervised two other congressional papers processing projects – the papers of Senator J. Allen Frear, Jr. (D-Del., 1949-1960) and Representative Thomas R. Carper (D-Del., 1983-1993) – as well as numerous other personal papers and archival collections related to policy and politics at the University of Delaware. She has been a member of the Congressional Papers Roundtable since 1988, serving on the steering committee for two separate terms, as newsletter editor for three years, and CPR chair in 2003-2004. In the early days of the Internet, Ms. Johnson Melvin created an online list of “Congressional Collections at Archival Repositories,” which is now maintained by the Center for Legislative Archives at NARA. She is author of “Appraisal of Senator John Williams’s Papers,” (*Provenance: Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists*, 1992) and “The End of an Era in Delaware: The Practical Politics of Willard Saulsbury, Jr.” (with Gregory Franseth and Shiela Pardee, in *Collections*, [University of Delaware], 2003). She is a co-editor of *A Political Papers Reader* (Scarecrow, forthcoming). Ms. Johnson Melvin received an M.I.L.S. with a concentration in archival administration from the University of Michigan in 1988 and a B.A. in French from Wake Forest University in 1979.

Linda A. Whitaker is a certified archivist and librarian at Arizona Historical Foundation www.ahfweb.org, located in the Hayden Library at the Arizona State University. The Arizona Historical Foundation is an active member of the Association of the Centers for the Study of Congress. Prior to entering the archives and library field, she served as head nurse at several major teaching hospitals. She served as co-chair of the Western regional workshop “Archives of Epic Proportions: A Problem-Solving Approach to Managing Congressional Collections” in

2003. She has served as secretary of the Conference of Intermountain Archivists, 2003-2005, and was co-chair of the program committee in 2006. She was selected as the ALA intern to the joint ALA/SAA/AAM Committee 2004-2006. She chaired the panel “Users Talk Back” at the Western Round-up Super Regional meeting in 2005. Ms. Whitaker currently serves as chair of the Arizona Library Association-School of Information Resources and Library Science Committee and is a member of the Congressional Papers Roundtable steering committee. Her political papers experience includes processing the papers of senators Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ, 1977-1994) and Barry M. Goldwater (R-AZ, 1953-1964, 1969-1986); retro-conversion of the finding aids into EAD for the collections of congressmen Morris K. Udall (D-AZ, 1961-1992) and Stewart Udall (D-AZ, 1955-1962); and field collecting and collection development for Arizona political papers. Ms. Whitaker received a B.A. in English Literature from the University of Arizona in 1974. She graduated from the University of Arizona School with an M.A. in Information Resources and Library Science in 2002.

Question 6: Performance Objectives

June 1 - August 24, 2007 (240 hours)

- Develop format for publication and draft of text; circulate to task force members before SAA when the group meets for review and discussion

August 27 - September 1, 2007 (16 hours)

- Author, task force, and SAA publications representatives meet at SAA annual meeting in Chicago to review planned format and draft of text

September 3 – through end of December 2007 (110 hours)

- Address changes discussed by task force and SAA; prepare final draft of text; prepare final draft of appendices
- Submit to committee for review
- Submit to SAA for publication

2008 – Publication date