This paper explores the ways in which archivists at academic archives can create meaningful relationships with under-documented donor communities. In the form of a multi-case study, three projects at three separate institutions were chosen for research: collecting feminist of faith materials at the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture at Duke University, the initiative to document conservative women at the Schlesinger Library at the Radcliffe Institute at Harvard University, and the collaborative partnership between the June L. Mazer Lesbian Archives and the University of California-Los Angeles Library. From the multi-case study, the researcher was able to identify four outreach strategies that were successful for all institutions: programming held at the archives involving donor communities, attending programming by donor communities, teaching archival literacy, and having a member of the donor community serve as liaison with the archives. Archivists at other institutions may adapt these strategies in their own donor relations practices.
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Introduction

In the last two decades of the 20th century, developing documentation strategies that involve collecting the papers of under-documented populations was an idea in its nascent stages in academic archives. Today, this is a common and established set of practices. However, due to the sometimes unapproachable nature of academia, it may not always be easy for members of these populations to access the materials that they donated. That is to say, academic institutions tend to have a largely homogeneous population with respect to gender, race, and class, and employ jargon and practices that are not easily understood by non-academicians. Therefore, when an academic institution chooses to document populations whose demographics are different from those represented within their ranks or their own history, they may have substantial financial and archival resources to offer but are unable or unsure of how to cultivate a relationship with the donor community that extends beyond the acquisition of material and engages donors in an ongoing, active, and mutually beneficial collaboration.

The literature suggests that there are archives that seek to reach out to the under-documented populations they collect from in order to create a welcoming and even at times collaborative atmosphere. This approach signifies a move toward greater and more productive relationships between archives and donors that extend beyond the initial acquisition process to processing, description, access, and outreach. This study seeks to conduct case studies with a selection of these archives in order to discern patterns and glean solutions that can contribute to the creation of a framework for best practices useful to the profession more broadly.
Literature Review

Foundations of Archival Appraisal

Over the history of the archival profession, the role of the archivist and the ways in which archivists are expected to relate to their collections has changed. In the early part of the 20th century, Sir Hilary Jenkinson (1922), a British archival theorist, enumerated what he believed to be an archivist's duties. He believed an archivist's primary duty is to maintain the safety of the records and that the secondary duty should be to provide for the needs of researchers but that those two priorities should never be reversed (Jenkinson, 1922, p. 15). When describing the role archives play in society, he believed:

A document which may be said to belong to the class of Archives is one which was drawn up or used in the course of an administrative or executive transaction (whether public or private) of which itself formed a part; and subsequently preserved in their own custody for their own information by the person or persons responsible for that transaction and their legitimate successors. (Jenkinson, 1922, p. 11)

What Jenkinson argues for here is that archivists position themselves as passive keepers of the record. Ensuring that documents are well-preserved and in secure holdings trumps patron access, and it is the duty of the record's creator to instill the document with meaning. He did not believe that interpreting or being at all selective about records should be within an archivist's purview:

It is not his business to deal with questions of policy—to decide whether twenty thousand pounds, or one thousand or nothing should be spent on printing transcripts of his Archives; whether the student would be best served by having the Archives in a Metropolis, or in the Provinces; at what date modern 'confidential' Archives should be thrown open to the public. He will doubtless take an intelligent interest in these subjects, but as an Archivist he is not concerned with them: they are questions for Historians, Politicians, Administrators; whom, at most, he may advise (Jenkinson, 1922, pp. 15-16).

In Jenkinson's perspective, archivists should not be charged with any tasks other than keeping records secure and making sure scholars have access to their materials. By
saying that archivists should “not concern themselves” with how their institutions are run or what types of records they should collect, Jenkinson places all responsibility in the hands of external entities and therefore ensures that archivists will be custodians only, with no say in how history is shaped. In their passivity, archivists maintain the dominant historical narrative wherein those in power are the ones whose stories are preserved. Those who are oppressed may have their stories preserved, but they will be told through the lens of those in power.

It is important to know that Jenkinson was the Deputy Keeper of the British Public Records Office and that he was maintaining the national archives of Britain. By maintaining Jenkinson's model of recordkeeping, archivists would accept only records that were donated without soliciting any type of records that may fall outside the mainstream. In doing so, they were ensuring that historical records would only document the most wealthy and powerful leaders.

By the mid-20th century, American archival theorist T. R. Schellenberg (1956) addressed a new belief about the place of archives in society:

> those records of any public or private institution which are adjudged worthy of permanent preservation for reference and research purposes and which have been deposited or have been selected for deposit in an archival institution. (Schellenberg, 1956, p. 16)

By describing the records as “adjuged worthy,” Schellenberg implies that archivists are engaging in an appraisal process that the Jenkinson model did not account for. Whereas in the past, archivists were expected to accept and protect any records they received, Schellenberg argues for a selection process that allows archivists to have some agency as far as the types of records they collect.

**Activism in Appraisal**
During the 1960s and 1970s in the United States, social movements, namely those of African-Americans, labor workers, women, and lesbians and gay men gained prominence as they began to document their own histories and demand to take their place in the American historical narrative. Prominent historian Howard Zinn gave an address to the Society of American Archivists in 1970 (Zinn, 2001, p. 176), which is the most influential professional organization in the archival profession. In this address he charged archivists with two main proposals:

One, that they engage in a campaign to open all government documents to the public…And two, that they take the trouble to compile a whole new world of documentary material, about the lives, desires, needs, of ordinary people. Both of these proposals are in keeping with the spirit of democracy, which demands that the population know what the government is doing, and that the condition, the grievances the will of the under-classes become a force in the nation (Zinn, 2001, p. 176).

Zinn's address stands in opposition to Jenkinson's early ideas of archivists as passive custodians who uphold the traditional historical narrative. Whereas Jenkinson believed that historians and politicians should be the ones to decide what documents could be open to the public and decide whose records are worthy of preservation, Zinn, himself a historian and not an archivist, believed that archivists should be the direct arbiters of these things. Zinn charged archivists with collecting the records of “ordinary people,” (Zinn, 2001, p. 176) rather than government officials, military leaders, and members of the wealthy class. The existing records he discusses focus on “the past over the present; on the antiquarian over the contemporary; on the non-controversial over the controversial; the hot over the cold” (Zinn, 2001, pp. 171-172). He also believed it was not enough to document important leaders who lead revolutionary movements, but that those who participated in the movements should have their history recorded as well. For example, he wonders, “[I]f Boston University, proud that it holds the papers of Martin
Luther King, has recorded the experience of students who were clubbed by police at the student union last year?” (Zinn, 2001, p. 171). This represented a shift in historical studies from the acts and lives of elite figures, to those of the under-documented and under-represented populations.

Zinn's words resonated with many archivists. F. Gerald Ham (1975), the president of the Society of American Archivists at the time, wrote that the “most important and intellectually demanding task [for] archivists is to make an informed selection of information that will provide the future with a representative record of human experience in our time.” (Ham, 1975, p. 5) Ham takes on Schellenberg's proposal that archivists be selective about what they accession, and stands with Zinn's perspective against Jenkinson's ideas that archivists take no action in collecting records:

> the archivist must realize that he can no longer abdicate his role in this demanding intellectual process of documenting culture. By his training and by his continuing intellectual growth, he must become the research community's Renaissance man. He must know that the scope, quality, and direction of research in an open-ended future depends upon the soundness of his judgment and the keenness of his perceptions about scholarly inquiry. But if he is passive, uninformed, with a limited view of what constitutes the archival record, the collections that he acquires will never hold up a mirror for mankind. And if we are not holding up that mirror, if we are not helping people understand the world they live in, and if this is not what archives is all about, then I do not know what it is we are doing that is all that important. (Ham, 1975, p. 13)

In charging archivists with the responsibility of collecting records that “hold up a mirror for mankind,” (Ham, 1975, p. 13) Ham pushed archivists to begin thinking about their collecting policies in terms of filling holes in history, rather than maintaining the dominant narrative.

**Post-Custodialism and Documentation Strategies as Archival Activism**

The ideas that came out of archival literature in the 1970s pushed archivists to move away from the view of their position as noble custodians of the historical record to
one that was “post-custodial,” and more active in terms of how archivists would decide what to document. In 1981, Gerald Ham wrote that

the current revolution in information processing is inexorably changing our world and our work, pushing us into a new period in archival history, a period I call the post-custodial era. Our effectiveness as archivists in this new era depends on our ability to alter our past behavior and to fashion strategies to cope with both the opportunities and the problems created by this revolution. (Ham, 1981, p. 207)

The influx of institutional holdings that was created by newly emerging electronic records, as well as records from previously under-documented populations resulted in a critical mass that archivists needed to find new ways of dealing with. At a meeting of the Society of American Archivists in 1984, Helen Samuels, an archivist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, introduced the idea of documentation strategies. She later defined documentation strategies in *The American Archivist* as:

a plan formulated to assure the documentation of an ongoing issue, activity, or geographic area. The strategy is ordinarily designed, promoted, and in part implemented by an ongoing mechanism involving records creators, administrators (including archivists), and users. The documentation strategy is carried out through the mutual efforts of many institutions and individuals influencing both the creation of the records and the archival retention of a portion of them. The strategy is refined in response to changing conditions and viewpoint. (Samuels, Orwell, & Clarke, 1986, p. 115)

Samuels went on to explain that documentation strategies would not push archivists to acquire records beyond their institution's collection policy, but that they would instead serve as a “form of analysis that promotes the coordination of the activities of many separate archives” (Samuels et al., 1986, p. 123). Samuels believed that any archivist at any institution could develop documentation strategies, and that they should do more than simply benefit one particular institution. She believed that “archival collections may have roots in one institution, but their limbs reach out and touch others. A common soil and water source enriches and binds collections together. Archivists
should offer the future not individual trees, but a forest” (Samuels et al., 1986, pp. 123-124).

While Samuels' ideas about documentation strategies have been criticized for inflicting archivists' bias onto the historical record, Randall Jimerson (2009) points out that “the question is not whether the archivist imposes her or his personal interpretation, but whether the action is taken consciously and documented openly” (Jimerson, 2009, p. 302). In his view, archivists have a responsibility to document history in a way that ensures that all different kinds of people are included, not only the elite. If the archivist's job is to be an effective documentarian, then the archivist must “[go] beyond their custodial role […] to ensure that documentation is created where it is missing, and to address the needs of those outside the societal power structures” (Jimerson, 2009, p. 303). The question of how archivists can help to create records of those living outside societal power structures requires archivists to collaborate with the communities they are documenting in order to ensure an accurate record.

**Participatory Appraisal in Action**

Shilton and Srinivasan (2007) introduced the idea of “participatory appraisal”, where donor communities would collaborate with archives to “facilitate the preservation of representative, empowered narratives” (Shilton & Srinivasan, 2007, p. 90) alongside archivists. They believed that in order for an archivist who is not a member of an under-documented group to be able to document that population with any sincerity or mutual trust, the archivist must work closely with the donor all throughout the life cycle of the document: from acquisition, to arrangement and description, to public programming. The idea of participatory appraisal “positions [donors] as designers of their own systems”
(Shilton & Srinivasan, 2007, p. 98). By empowering users in this way, archivists may “not only create representative archives, but also to move beyond objectification and aid understanding of local knowledge and marginalized narratives” (Shilton & Srinivasan, 2007, pp. 90-91)

Shilton and Srinivasan were innovative in their approach to mutually beneficial outreach to under-documented populations, but they were not without their critics. Dominique Daniel (2010) points out that Shilton and Srinivasan identify one objective of participatory appraisal as “obtaining the records and collections that truly reflect the cultures of their creators, “as the community understands them”, but that “there is no such thing as a monolithic ethnic or cultural community; more than one understanding of the past and culture exists within any such community; and choosing specific individuals to participate in the appraisal and arrangement of archival materials will inevitably eliminate others who might have acted differently” (Daniel, 2010, p. 99)

She also suggests that since Shilton and Srinivasan base their concept of participatory appraisal on race- and ethnicity-based collections, social scientists have found the boundaries of those identities to be difficult to define (Daniel, 2010, p. 99). Both these criticisms are well-founded and indeed, it is impossible to be able to represent all members of a particular population at one time. However, Daniel points out that Shilton and Srinivasan define “representativeness” as a situation wherein members of a minority or under-documented community set the terms of what types of records they want preserved (Daniel, 2010, p. 99). While any collection of any community will not be wholly representative of that entire community, it is still important for the archivist to try to incorporate as many
different experiences from the community as possible and to ensure that the collection is by the community rather than about the community.

Participatory appraisal has been implemented successfully (or at least with partial success) by a number of archives and archivists. One well-documented example of this is the move to document Native Americans. Native American records have a history of being appropriated by White European settlers who remove them from their original context and owners. Archives and museums created by Native Americans do exist, but they often lack funding necessary to process a backlog of collections, or the resources to reach out to their communities in order to make their research value known. The Society of American Archivists identified this problem and established a Native American Archives Roundtable in 2005 that meets to discuss issues in Native American archives (“Native American Archives Roundtable,” n.d.). In 2006, the Society of American Archivists issued Protocols for Native American Archival Materials. These protocols were created by leaders from Native American communities as well as archivists who do not belong to these communities. Together, they develop statements of best practice for archives that collect Native American materials but are not curated by members of Native American communities. Said protocols address:

- The recognition of the sovereign governments and associated rights of Native American communities.
- Issues in the collection, ownership, preservation, handling, access, and use of American Indian archival resources.
- The importance of building relationships, balancing different approaches to knowledge management, and mutual respect.
- The need to expand the nature of the information professions to include Native American perspectives and knowledge. (Underhill, 2006, p. 4)

It should be noted that “building relationships, balancing different approaches to knowledge management, and mutual respect” (Underhill, 2006, p. 4) are a key piece of
these best practices. The protocols recommend that non-native Americans consult with tribal leaders, as well as existing tribal cultural centers, libraries, archives, or a cultural preservation office (Underhill, 2006, p. 5). They also recommend that archivists inform Native American communities of relevant collections or materials in their holdings, and ensure equitable agreements in contract negotiations. The protocols also advise:

Appreciate that in most instances it will take years for institutions and staff to develop essential trust relationships with a community. Weeks, months, or longer may be required to gain an understanding of Native American perspectives on issues and to work through solutions and approaches to problems, in consultation with communities. (Underhill, 2006, p. 6)

These protocols support ideas that were previously unheard of in the field of archives: outreach and meaningful collaborations with donors must be implemented at all points of the life cycle of the document—not just prior to acquisition—in order for archives to develop relationships based on mutual trust with under-documented populations. The Protocols for Native American Archival Materials recommend that archivists work closely with donor communities during processing, preservation, public outreach, and while soliciting new donors. If an archives has a reputation for being sensitive to the needs of its donor communities, donors may share this with other potential donors and increase the archives' profile.

A similar theme is explored in Lila Theresa Church's (2008) dissertation, “Documenting African American Community Heritage: Archival Strategies and Practices in the United States.” She studied how community outreach and trust-building between donors and archivists is done for African-American collections at both African-American and White repositories. Her findings show that “White male and female archivists at White repositories faced the greatest challenges of all in gaining donors’ trust” and that
they relied on the assistance of members of their advisory boards as well as cultivating personal relationships with community members (Church, 2008, p. 172). Church notes that they used similar strategies when documenting the papers of other ethnic groups as well.

Northeastern University has worked on a project to document the gay and lesbian, Latino, African-American, and Chinese communities of Boston, Massachusetts for over 15 years. These populations were selected because at the time, they were the largest minority groups in Boston, and each of those groups had grassroots political organizations that dated back 30-50 years in Boston (Krizack, 2007, p. 126). Joan Krizack, who was the archivist at Northeastern University at the time, said that the best way to begin documenting these communities was to create an advisory group for each one, with a team leader who already had a connection to the community as well as to Northeastern (Krizack, 2007, p. 127). Krizack points out that the value of an advisory group “should not be under-estimated” and noted that not only should they have a connection to both Northeastern and the community they work with, but that they should represent a variety of viewpoints (Krizack, 2007, p. 130). One of the reasons for this was that the advisory groups realized that there was a great deal of diversity within each community. Krizack mentions that:

We realized early on that we were cavalierly referring to African American, Chinese, Latino, and gay and lesbian communities as though each one was a homogeneous entity. This is, obviously, not the case. The more we began to learn about each group, the more we began to understand that each of them comprises, for example, multiple points of view regarding politics and religion, and multiple customs and traditions. It is critical to keep this in mind as we continue the documentation project. (Krizack, 2007, p. 129)

Like Daniel's (2010) article on the development of ethnic and immigrant archives in the United States, Krizack notes the importance of documenting diversity beyond a
general population and emphasizing the differences among members of an under-documented population. Fear that a given community would feel misrepresented by Northeastern's archives was expressed early on in the project. Krizack believed that members of any of the four groups documented by Northeastern would be happy to have their records arranged, described, preserved and made available to scholars, but discovered quickly that “some were suspicious of the University and would prefer to place their records with an institution that was run by and dedicated to their particular group” (Krizack, 2007, p. 128). They found that the most effective way to solicit collections from any of the groups was to present the donation to the archives as a collaborative partnership between the community and the University:

We wanted to convey to them that donating their records to Northeastern was a mutually beneficial situation: their historical records would be organized, preserved in a secure, temperature- and humidity-controlled environment, and made available for research without any cost to them; the space that the records had occupied while at the organization would be freed for another use; and Northeastern would increase its research resources at the same time it provided a community service. Before we adopted this approach, some donors feared that the University was trying to take something away from the community. (Krizack, 2007, p. 130)

Krizack found that the critical components to create a relationship based on mutual trust between the Northeastern archives and the communities they document are having advocates who have a demonstrated commitment to the community in question to the university, and to preserving and making the records accessible to a larger audience. Once the archivists at Northeastern proved themselves to be trustworthy, they were able to acquire the records of and collaborate with more individuals and organizations (Krizack, 2007, p. 131).

Like Church and Krizack, McDonald (2008) found that archivists who collect the papers of non-profit organizations do best at working with such organizations when they take special care to serve that population's specific needs: “as archivists pay increased
attention to the records of these organizations, organizations will develop a stronger sense of the value—and the need to preserve—their records” (McDonald, 2008, p. 69). A study by Angela DiVeglia (2010) of archivists who collect papers from Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) communities, as well as current and potential donors from these communities, showed similar results. DiVeglia also found that many members of the LGBT community felt distrustful of academic archives because they view them as oppressive institutions that take resources away from marginalized groups. One respondent in her study went so far as to describe this phenomenon as the academy saying “Gimme, gimme, gimme, we're collecting history!” (DiVeglia, 2010, p. 90).

More than one respondent said that it was important for archivists to build trust and show a true commitment to the community; when asked what this commitment looks like, respondents said that the archivists respond to their specific needs, and forge an ongoing relationship with the archivist in order to demonstrate that their collection was being documented in the most honest, sincere, and thorough way (DiVeglia, 2010, p. 92).

DiVeglia's findings prompt a number of questions: Do other under-documented communities respond to these trust-building strategies? If an archivist at a formal, institutional archives is not a member of an under-documented donor community, how can they reach out to potential donors in a meaningful way? How can they maintain relationships with donor communities beyond acquiring their papers? This study seeks to examine outreach strategies with under-documented donor populations at three different academic archives and offer a set of best practices that archivists may incorporate into their collection and outreach initiatives.
Methodology

This study seeks to find commonalities in collaborative outreach methods between academic archives and under-documented populations and develop a set of best practices. It will also discuss areas for growth and challenges that must be overcome in order for archivists to develop collaborative relationships with donors from under-documented populations that extend beyond the acquisition of collections. In order to assess these areas, research took the form of multiple case studies of initiatives at three institutions: the feminists of faith collecting area at the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture, Duke University; the initiative to collect the papers of politically conservative women at the Schlesinger Library at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University; and the partnership between University of California-Los Angeles Libraries and the June L. Mazer Lesbian Archives in West Hollywood, California. All of the cases focus on women's collections, though that was not part of the criteria for selection. Case studies were carried out in the form of semi-structured interviews with archivists at each institution who worked directly with the donor community. Interviews were transcribed and analyzed for patterns of what archivists found to be effective outreach methods.

Selection of Institutions.

Feminists of Faith at the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture, Duke University.

The Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture was selected because it is one of the most well-known repositories for women's history in the United States. The Women's Collections Roundtable of the Society of American Archivists lists
it as one of three broad-based women's history archives in the country, along with the Sophia Smith Collection at Smith College and the Schlesinger Library at Harvard University (“Women’s Collections Roundtable,” 2011). It began in 1988 when Duke University hired its first Women's History Archivist. A women's history center was endowed in 1993 and officially became the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture in 1999 (“About the Center,” 2009). Their mission is to “acquire, preserve and make available to a large population of researchers published and unpublished materials that reflect the public and private lives of women, past and present” (“About the Center,” 2009). The Sallie Bingham Center is unique as far as academic archives go because it is dedicated solely to collecting the papers of women. While women are an under-documented population in archives in general, there is even less documentation on women who identify as feminists of faith because of the disparity between the values of feminism and the tenets of most Western religions (at the time of the study, most of the feminists of faith represented at the Bingham Center were Methodist or other types of Protestant women, due to Duke University's past affiliation to the Methodist Church and its location in the Southeastern United States where Protestant religions are the most prevalent).

*Conservative Women at the Schlesinger Library at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University.*

The Schlesinger Library is the Library of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard University. The Radcliffe Institute was developed in 1999 when Radcliffe College, one of the original all-women's Seven Sisters colleges, merged with Harvard University (“History of Harvard College,” 2011). Its mission is to honor its
“continuing commitment to the study of women, gender and society,” and to serve as an
“interdisciplinary center where leading scholars can promote learning and scholarship
across a broad array of academic and professional fields within the setting of a major
adopted a plan to “diversify collections” and Curator of Manuscripts, Kathy Jacob, began
“collaborative groups that focused on areas designated for growth” (Dunn, 2006).
Among these groups were African-American women, Asian-American women, Latinas,
immigrant women, low-income women, and conservative women. Conservative women
were identified as the focus of this particular study, because of the interesting potential
challenges of collecting from conservative women at an East-coast university that has a
reputation for being politically liberal and at an archival repository that houses the papers
of many feminists, abortion rights activists, and activists who campaigned for the Equal
Rights Amendment. The Schlesinger Library was founded in 1943 when Maud Wood
Park, a Radcliffe College alumna who had been a leader in the woman suffrage
movement, donated her “collection of books, papers, and memorabilia on women
reformers” to the school (“About the Library - Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study –
Harvard University,” 2011). This developed into a research library which was known as
the Woman's Archives, and was named for Arthur M. and Elizabeth Bancroft Schlesinger
in 1965. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, collections at Schlesinger Library flourished
as feminist activists saw the importance in documenting their histories. Feminist
activism grows out of left-wing politics, which is diametrically opposed to the beliefs of
conservatives. While conservative women may not be the most difficult community for
the Schlesinger Library to document, the mission of the library is in direct conflict with
conservative philosophies, which makes Schlesinger Library's efforts to collect these materials in interesting prospect. This initiative was identified by Laura Micham at the Sallie Bingham Center as a potentially interesting case study for this research.

**Partnership between the June L. Mazer Lesbian Archives and the University of California-Los Angeles Library.**

The June L. Mazer Lesbian Archives is a community archives that was founded in 1981 as the West Coast Lesbian Collections in Oakland, CA. They moved to Los Angeles in 1989, where they earned nonprofit status and received donated space from the city of West Hollywood, CA (Setzer, 2009). Their mission is to “collect, preserve and make accessible lesbian, feminist and women's queer history as a means of providing a link among all generations of lesbians; to develop social activities, educational events, opportunities and programs that promote historical awareness; and to provide research and resource facilities” (Setzer, 2009).

UCLA Library is one of the top 10 research libraries in the United States (Setzer, 2009). The Center for the Study of Women at UCLA had wanted to apply for a grant for UCLA to collaborate with a local grassroots organization, and chose the Mazer Archives. While the Mazer Archives had collected years of rich and rare collections, they were run entirely by volunteers who did not have archival training. UCLA Library had the resources to process and create finding aids for the Mazer Archives' backlog. After a year of negotiations, which were on the Mazer Archives' own terms, UCLA and the Mazer Archives were able to agree on a mutually beneficial partnership in which the Mazer Archives would be able to serve the lesbian research community, and UCLA would be able to process their collections and make them fully accessible to the general
public. This partnership was chosen for study because of a presentation the researcher saw at the 2010 Society of American Archivists annual meeting about the collaborative work between the Mazer Archives and UCLA Library. It is a partnership that is of particular interest due to the nature of relationships between the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) community and formal institutional archives. DiVeglia (2010) discusses reasons that some LGBT persons may not want to place their materials in institutional archives. Archives can be “seen as enforcing the status quo in terms of representation, oppression, visibility, access, and the like” and archivists wield the power to deem certain materials, such as those relating to sexuality, “controversial” and keep them from being publicly available (p. 12).

Another potential deterrent is that the collections of under-documented populations that appear in archives are often “not in their own voices, but rather through the lens of the powerful: records from census collectors, missionaries, and government agencies” (p. 15). One way the LGBT community has reacted to the lack of archives that house collections in their own voices is by creating community archives. Community archives are “spaces where historical documents (either primary or secondary sources or a combination of both, and often including ephemera or museum objects) are housed within the community that created them” and they are often “designed, run, and staffed by the same group whose history is documented within” (p. 16). The Mazer Lesbian Archives is considered a community archives by this definition, and it may be assumed that many of its donors gave their collections to the archives in the spirit of solidarity. This makes the Mazer Archives' collaboration with UCLA Library, which is a part of the academy and as a state institution, a particularly interesting case study.
Implementation of Multiple Case Studies.

The multiple case study is an ideal method for this type of research because it allows for identification of common problems and solutions across different circumstances. Robert Stake (2009) defines the “object or phenomenon or condition to be studied” in a multiple case study as a quintain (p.6). The common problems and solutions of academic archivists who collect from under-documented populations are the quintain of this study.

Once the participants were identified as previously mentioned, they were contacted via email with initial recruitment information about the study (see Appendices A-C). Once they had agreed to participate, interviews were scheduled and took place during March 2011. The interview with the archivist from the Bingham Center was conducted in person, while the interviews with the archivists from Schlesinger Library and the Mazer Archives were conducted over the phone for geographical reasons. There are some limitations to using these two different methods. Phone interviews do not allow the interviewer and the interviewee to read facial cues and body language, as an in-person interview provides. However, given that all interviews are designed to be the same length and ask similar questions, there should not have been a great variance in the interviewee's answers. All interviews lasted around 30 minutes, and were audio recorded and transcribed.

The archivists from the Bingham Center and Schlesinger Library were interviewed using the same interview protocol (see Appendix D). The semi-structured interview questions centered on initial contact with donors, the challenges and successes of partnering with their respective donor communities, and their outreach strategies. The
semi-structured interview protocol for the archivist at the Mazer Lesbian Archives (see Appendix E). These questions revolved around the challenges and successes of collaborating with UCLA Library and the ways in which the collaboration has impacted the Mazer Archives' relationship with its donors.

Due to the public nature of these archivists' roles, they are identified by name (with their permission) in this study. As the institutions and documentation initiatives described in this study are unique and generally well-known projects within their fields, it would not be feasible to obscure the identities of either the institutions or the participants.

**Analysis.**

All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. Nvivo 9.0 qualitative analytic software was used to code transcripts to find patterns of challenges and solutions in performing collaborative outreach with members of under-documented communities. Codes were created to identify challenges, implementation of strategies, instances of collaboration, and success as defined by the interviewee. These codes were then further analyzed in order to find patterns of common concerns and solutions.

This study seeks to find recommendations and best practices that archivists may use if they want to reach out to under-documented donor populations whose papers they are collecting. These findings are meant to be transferrable to other situations that come up in archival practice. The case study is significant in its “attention to the local situation, not in how it represents other cases in general” (Stake, 2006, p. 8). Although these cases will not necessarily represent other cases that may come up, archivists may glean solutions to challenges they face in collaborating with donors in order to create meaningful partnerships.
Findings

The findings of this multi-case study are based on thirty-minute interviews with each of the participants. Participants are identified by name, due to the public nature of each of their roles. Unless otherwise cited, the quotes in the findings come directly from the interviewees.

“Not Your Grandmother's Church Lady”: Feminists of Faith at the Sallie Bingham Center

Laura Micham is the Director at the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture at Duke University. The Sallie Bingham Center has been developing a broad-based women's history archives for close to twenty-five years. Feminists of faith are one of the Bingham Center's many collecting areas and they have been collecting feminist of faith papers since the center's inception. Ginny Daley, the previous director began to collect the papers of women, who, “either lay or ordained […] engaging in social justice activities around these specific topics from ERA, choice, civil rights, or labor.” One of the first donors who Daley reached out to was a woman named Jeanette Stokes, who is an alumna of Duke Divinity School, as well as the founder and director of the Resource Center for Women in Ministry in the South. Jeanette Stokes was pleased to hear that Duke had created the Women's History Archives (which was its name before the Sallie Bingham Center), as a graduate of the Divinity School and as a student who had “struggled as a feminist at Duke in the 1970s.” She donated her papers shortly thereafter and the archives continued to seek out papers that document “the intersection of lay and ordained church women and social justice activity.” When Micham became the director of the Sallie Bingham Center, Stokes approached her saying that she was interested in working together to document feminists of faith.
Micham considers Stokes to be a partner as well as a donor in collecting feminist of faith materials. While Jeanette Stokes may not be the only link to feminist of faith communities, she is “definitely the main link” for the Bingham Center. Micham estimates that Stokes is associated with approximately 90 percent of the feminist of faith collections the Bingham Center receives. Because Stokes feels deeply invested in the documentation of this community, she has “gone out of her way […] and connected [Laura Micham] to people all over the state, all over the South.” She has had prior relationships with most of the organizations she puts the Bingham Center in contact with, though she has not necessarily been a member of them. Micham describes members of these populations as “mostly people in their 50's to their 90's who are somehow […] associated with a church but who are also doing social justice work.”

Jeanette Stokes' role in this partnership is the initial approach of potential donors. She describes the feminists of faith collecting area at the Bingham Center in terms of the legacy it will leave and works to convince donors that “we should all be on the same shelves.” Potential donors are often very enthusiastic after talking to Stokes and if they are interested in learning more about the Bingham Center, she will introduce them to Laura Micham. This is usually done via an introductory email. Micham usually follows this up with an “expanded rendition of what we do and how we do it and my desire to meet with them or speak with them on the phone […] and then, generally speaking, it results in the acquisition of a collection.”

Occasionally, the feminist of faith collecting project is met with challenges. Some potential donors decide to give their materials to an institution connected with a college or university that they attended, or a staff member of an organization has ties to another
collecting institution. Another challenge is the fact that Duke University is home to a prestigious Divinity School, and while Duke Divinity School is well-regarded, it is seen by some feminists of faith as traditional and non-progressive, and they may have concerns about being affiliated with such a conservative institution. Micham shared an account of one potential donor who expressed hesitation at donating her papers for this reason; when Micham tried to convince the donor that her papers would present a contrasting voice to many of the voices of the Divinity School, the donor replied with, “Oh no, you don't get it. I'm not here to contrast, I'm here to transform.” Micham was eventually able to convince her to donate after all, but the donor's comments gave her pause and offered some perspective into the values of feminists of faith. “It's not your grandmother's church lady,” Micham said:

Contrast is not good enough. I think what it taught me was the depth of their spirituality and their commitment to their activism, that they want nothing less than revolution and that, superficially, researchers, archivists, others who would come in contact with the Bingham Center would imagine, or might jump to the conclusion that our quote-unquote "second wave feminist" collections -- our Robin Morgan, our Kate Millett -- are the people who are most dedicated to, engaged in revolution. They are, it's amazing, but not any more so than these women, just differently.

The Bingham Center's documentation strategy for feminists of faith functions to fulfill a gap in the historical record. As such, Micham has said that they generally “focus [their] efforts on people who are older, or people who are otherwise downsizing, these people who really need, for logistical and practical reasons to make decisions [about donating their papers].” Additionally, the Bingham Center has tended to focus on collecting the papers of Protestant women; they originally began with Methodist women because of Duke's former affiliation with the Methodist church and have since collected the papers of Presbyterian and Baptist women. Micham mentioned an interest in collecting the papers of “women rabbis and women Zen Buddhist priests” but wants to
have a “more coherent body of material from Protestant women” before branching out to build feminist of faith collections across other religions.

Laura Micham has developed a number of effective outreach strategies to reach feminists of faith. Most of these strategies involve Jeanette Stokes' influence with different groups of potential donors. Stokes has invited Micham to the North Carolina Council of Churches, as well as to events for the Resource Center for Women in Ministry in the South. She has even attended a 90th birthday party for one of the women from the Resource Center, at Stokes' invitation. Micham mentioned feeling like she was “invading a very personal space” by attending that party but she “also trust[s] Jeanette's judgment completely.” The women at the party were very receptive and welcoming to Micham's presence and “are so glad and grateful that Duke is committed” to documenting communities of feminists of faith.

Another strategy Micham has found to be very effective is attending what Bingham Center staff members refer to as “subject conferences,” or conferences held by donor communities that tend to overlap with the Bingham Center's collecting areas. Library workers at academic institutions are encouraged to attend professional conferences such as the American Library Association and the Society of American Archivists, but are not generally encouraged to attend other types of conferences. Another librarian who works in Special Collections at Duke once suggested that if cuts were made to the budget, archivist should attend conferences on the groups and subjects they want to collect from, rather than professional librarian or archivist conferences. Micham has said there is a “significant yield” from subject conferences. She described a case in which a fellow Bingham Center staff member presented a paper at a women's
studies conference and made a number of contacts with people who were interested in
 donating to the Bingham Center. Micham believes this to be “worth the price of
 admission” and makes sure that she budgets for subject conferences in the Bingham
 Center's discretionary funds.

 One of the key pieces to Laura Micham and Jeanette Stokes' partnership is the
definition of the parameters of their roles. Each of them has a stake in the feminist of
 faith community, but both arrive at it from different background. Jeanette Stokes, as a
donor and member of this community, wants to “make sure that all of the amazing
contributions all of these women made are not lost.” Laura Micham, as an archivist,
believes that her role is to “be able to understand who are the major history makers, who
are the more quotidian everyday people who were involved who might have saved
documentation, what are the liberation struggles that we're most interested in.” Both
women want “to make sure that the causes to which these women made contributions,
when they are studied by people include the fact that there were people of faith
involved.” Micham has stressed the importance of having regular meetings in order to
make sure that they both are communicating clearly and have defined goals. She
mentions the need to “think in terms of stewardship and really seeking and accepting the
collections that are the richest, to make the most sense within the project” and to
“carefully and thoughtfully continue to educate Jeanette on what that means so that when
she speaks on our behalf she's being helpful.”

 The fact that Laura Micham has been inundated with interest from prospective
donors indicates a tremendous amount of success for documenting feminists of faith.
Micham has identified several measures of success she has had creating and collaborating
with the feminists of faith collections. She cites heavy use of the collections by researchers as one measure of success. She also believes that the project has been a success because individual donors have been talking amongst themselves and “sending me in the direction of other people—that they themselves have been so happy with their experience that they are connecting me with other people and that happens at least once a month.” Micham described an event that the Bingham Center hosted in August 2010 that honored feminist of faith donors. The event involved a speaking engagement three recent donors to the Bingham Center, as well as a progressive professor from Duke Divinity School. This event was well-attended, not only by Duke affiliates, but also “local and regional people in this community that we are trying to document.” Micham said that after the event “people came up to me afterwards to hug me and congratulate me and tell me how excited they were that I literally lost track and ran out of business cards.” The affective response of the donor community is a positive sign that the Bingham Center is succeeding in collaborating with the feminist of faith community to document their history.

**Collaborative Collecting and Conservative Women at the Schlesinger Library**

Kathy Jacob is the Curator of Manuscripts at Schlesinger Library. In 2007, Schlesinger Library developed a strategic plan in which one of the initiatives was to “diversify [their] collections to represent the broad range of women in America.” As part of this plan, Schlesinger Library identified “core groups” that consisted of “African-American women, Asian-American women, Latinas, immigrant women, low-income women and conservative women.” Jacob's role is to build collections to fulfill the library's mission.
In response to this initiative, Jacob and her staff developed a model which they call “collaborative collecting.” This model is the same for each of the collecting groups covered under the strategic plan, but this case study focuses specifically on the conservative women collecting group.

The first step of collaborative collecting is that the Schlesinger Library staff is sorted into groups of three or four members. Members may work in any department of the library, and are welcome to sign up for a group that most interests them. Once groups are chosen, members of the groups are charged with researching conservative women whose papers would suit Schlesinger Library's mission. Members may search the web for high-profile conservative women. They may also search for speakers or conservative conferences that are coming to town.

Occasionally, the group will come together for meetings and members may “nominate” a conservative woman to pursue as a donor. If the group decides to pursue a “nominee”, the member who suggested that nominee researches contact information for that person and crafts an email or letter contact. The letter is signed by Kathy Jacob because she is curator, but when a collection is acquired, the group member who initiated contact is the first to interact with the collection. Jacob said that collaborative collecting has been “a way for [staff members] to learn a little bit more about how we acquire material.”

Conservative women may be put off by the fact that Schlesinger Library houses many collections with a “feminist bent”. East Coast universities are often viewed by political conservatives as liberal havens. Jacob mentions that when potential conservative donors realize that Schlesinger Library is the home of the Betty Friedan
Papers, it is “a nail in the coffin.” However, in spite of the challenges, the Schlesinger Library has had success with collecting conservative women's papers. As part of the collaborative collecting model, potential donors are invited to the library. Jacob says that having a conversation with a potential donor is the most effective way to express the importance of their contribution to the Schlesinger's archival holdings. Moreover, what is more important is that conservative women donate to any archival repository:

We tend to make it less about the Schlesinger Library than "choose a repository." If it's not going to be us, that's fine. I think we'd be a very good home for them, given our commitment to documenting the lives of women in America, and that means all kinds of women, all kinds of views on different topics. But think about saving your records and making sure they're accessible, no matter where the repository might be.

That's an important message. It's often one that they haven't thought of, and sometimes it might result in a collection coming here or at least the beginning of a conversation about a collection coming here.

But it might result in them thinking about this and finding a university or a historical society or a religious archives closer to them [geographically], or closer to them philosophically, or thinking about hiring an archivist to keep an in-house archives. I think we're trying to take a broader view than "we just want to get this collection here at the Schlesinger Library."

Jacob also says that educating potential donors about what archives do is key to helping them decide to donate their papers. While Jacob says this problem is “not unique to conservative women,” conservative women do have concerns that the archive will purge collections or “that we would take the material and then we would throw away everything that we don't like, or that an individual might be assigned to work on the collection has his or her own take on an issue and they would skew the collection by the decisions they make on what to keep and what to jettison.” In this case, Jacob explains that archivists follow a code of ethics and that “no matter what our personal philosophy [...] might be, there are professional standards, there are standard practices, best practices, and that's what we follow.”
When potential donors are brought to Schlesinger Library, they are taught how the archives is run. Jacob and her staff show them the reading room and the vaults where material is kept. They also introduce them to processing archivists who will be working with their collections. Jacob also mentions that all potential donors “like hearing about acid-neutral folders” because they enjoy hearing that their valuable materials will be treated with the utmost care.

It is essential for potential donors to understand the process their records will go through as they are ingested into the archives. Jacob points out that it is necessary to explain what archival processing is and what a donor agreement looks like. If a potential donor agrees to donate their materials to Schlesinger Library, they sign a donor agreement that explains that the donor is the one who sets the terms of access and that Schlesinger Library will not weed items from the collection without the donor's approval.

Once a donor has agreed to place their materials at Schlesinger Library, the Library makes an effort to keep in touch with the donor and collaborate with them on future projects. Jacob may ask donors if they know of sister organizations or other conservative women who may be interested in donating her papers.

Donors are also placed on Schlesinger Library's mailing lists, so that they receive Schlesinger’s electronic newsletter and Radcliffe Magazine. When a new collection from a conservative woman (or any new collection that is part of the strategic plan) is received, they are often featured in both of these publications. In addition, the public services staff at Schlesinger Library will often make announcements to other departments that a new collection has come in. When significant collections come in,
public services will usually notify women's studies and history departments or post the announcement on H-Net, which is an online organization of humanities and social science scholars.

While the strategic plan initiative is still new, Schlesinger Library has had success with collaborative collecting. Jacob says that the Library has been recognized by other women's organizations with awards for their work; for example, the Gloucester Fishermen's Wives Association presented them with an award and a seafood dinner for the work they did to preserve the organization's stories.

“We Got Exactly What We Wanted”: Outreach and Collection-Building Partnership between the Mazer Lesbian Archives and UCLA Library

Angela Brinskele is the Director of Communications at the June L. Mazer Lesbian Archives in West Hollywood, California. The Mazer Archives was founded in 1981 as a community archives for lesbians on the West Coast. In 2008, the Center for the Study of Women at UCLA, which is a research center for gender, sexuality, and women's issues, wanted to submit a grant proposal for UCLA to collaborate with a local grassroots organization. A graduate student who worked at the Center for the Study of Women (CSW), who had previously volunteered at the Mazer Archives suggested that the Mazer Archives be one of the beneficiaries of this grant. CSW did receive the grant, and graduate students who worked there completed processing for five Mazer Archives collections. Once the collections had been processed, it was assumed that they would be housed at the Mazer Archives until a board member of the Mazer Archives suggested they collaborate with UCLA Library. This collaboration would go beyond “just processing, where we could maybe have a section of our archives at UCLA.” When the
board explored this possibility with CSW, they referred them to administrators at UCLA Library.

Once UCLA Library and the Mazer Archives agreed to collaborate, the two organizations participated in twelve months of negotiations. Due to distance and availability of committee members, negotiations took place once per month. By the last few months of negotiations, Brinskele said, “we were literally going there and changing one sentence and then coming back next time and checking on that. So by the very end, we were really doing some details, little details that had to be perfected.”

With negotiations being so detail-oriented and the fact that “grassroots people and academic people don't always speak the same language”, it would seem that there would be many challenges to developing a collaboration between a grassroots community archives and a university library. However, as Brinskele put it,

What I think is that this doesn't happen very much before from everything I've been told. So I think that this is a very amicable agreement, and I think the key essential piece to it that made it work was that both sides wanted this to happen so badly that we were willing to make some compromises. The truth is at the very beginning we had some core things that we bumped heads with. For example, a really major issue was that we did not want to give up ownership of our collection and the UCLA library said they could not take or do any processing on any collections they did not own. So when we had that first initial meeting we actually left going, "Maybe this isn't going to work." But we didn't give up. Both sides, UCLA Library and the Mazer, we really wanted to make it work so we literally did do the work to make this work by going back every month and negotiating and changing the contract however we wanted it.

Neither UCLA nor the Mazer Archives were willing to give up ownership of their collections. However, after the negotiations, both institutions came to a compromise where Mazer collections that had been worked on by UCLA Library would carry both institutions’ names.

While the Mazer Archives was willing to make compromises, they came out of negotiations having achieved all of the goals they had hoped to attain. UCLA Library agreed to help the Mazer Archives digitize their collections and to make sure that their
materials would not be “swallowed up by other holdings” (UCLA Library welcomes the Mazer Archive at UCLA, 2009). They agreed that unwanted materials would be returned to the Mazer Archives, and that the Mazer Archives would have access to their collections at UCLA whenever they needed them. They also agreed that all Mazer collections had to be open to everyone, not just scholars, and that if collections could not at any point be used by the general public, that they would all revert back to the Mazer Archives.

Donors to the Mazer Archives were not notified of the agreement with UCLA Library until the negotiations were final and legal documents had been signed. It was important to be able to show supporters of the Mazer Archives a complete agreement that “we were actually really proud of […] because we worked so hard to get exactly what we wanted, and we did get what we wanted in the end.” Brinskele said that they thought they “may have a little bit of negative reaction from our supporters and from the community,” but in actuality the Mazer Archives received mostly support and positive responses from their stakeholders. Brinskele mentioned that one of the only challenges the Mazer Archives faced with donors after the agreement with UCLA was the fact that some of their lesbian separatist collections had restrictions that did not comply with the contract. Lesbian separatists did not want men to look at or touch the materials in their collections, so it was expected that some donors would object to putting their materials in a repository where access is free to all. However, this situation was remedied by the Mazer Archives keeping those collections in the Mazer's physical holding space.

Stakeholders at the Mazer Archives believe that “we've received collections since then we wouldn't have gotten if we had not made this collaboration.” One example
Brinskele mentioned was the Beverly Hickok Papers. Beverly Hickok was a librarian for roughly 40 years at the Transportation Library in Berkley, California. She had always been a supporter of the Mazer Archives, but when she turned 90 and read about the agreement with UCLA Libraries, she decided that she would donate her entire collection to them. Her collection was the first Mazer collection to go straight into UCLA’s Young Library.

The collaboration between the Mazer Archives and UCLA Library is mutually beneficial for both institutions. UCLA provides Mazer collections with “the stability and security and the state-of-the-art facility to store our collections and, hopefully, more accessibility because we're open one day a week.” The Mazer Archives provides UCLA with grassroots women's collections that they never would have received otherwise.

**Limitations to this Study**

This study did not collect any quantitative data, and did not attempt to be generalizable to a large population of archivists or of donors to archives. Therefore, generalizability or validity cannot be taken into account. However, this study has transferrable findings, so that other archivists may incorporate the strategies discussed here into their own work if they so choose.

While the study attempts to be transferrable to a wide range of populations, there will inevitably be differences in how different donor communities respond to different archival institutions. It is worth mentioning that all of the archives explored in this study are women's archival collections. Ethnic and racial barriers were not taken into account in this study, and though the researcher hopes that the findings of this study could be transferrable to other populations, there may be specific needs that have not been taken
into account here. Additionally, while this study strove to incorporate different geographical areas of the United States (southeast, northeast, west coast), there are certainly parts of the country that were not included and their geographical location may have some bearing on perceptions of relationships between archives and donor communities.

Another important limitation is that due to scheduling conflicts, representatives from UCLA Library and the Center for the Study of Women at UCLA were not available for an interview at the time of the study. As such, the response from the Mazer Archives that is included in this study represents only one side of the collaboration. Speaking with representatives from UCLA would offer richer and more complex perspectives on the challenges and successes of collaborations between academic and community archives.

Finally, there was no anonymity for the archivists involved in this study. While it would have been impossible to afford them complete anonymity, and while the archivists agreed to be identified by name in this study, the lack of anonymity automatically put the archivists in a position as representatives of their institutions. Therefore, the archivists may have engaged in some self-censoring so as not to present a negative view of their current or potential donors, co-workers, or any process they engage in as collectors of records.
Best Practices

Several strategies for collaborative and mutually beneficial outreach between academic archives and under-documented donor populations surfaced as a result of this study. Across all three cases, there were similar themes that appeared and related directly to the successful collaborative outreach methods of each institution. These methods led not only to the acquisition of collections, but to a meaningful relationship beyond acquisition that was mutually beneficial for both the archives and the donor. The following constitutes a list of best practices that other archivists may incorporate when documenting and working with under-represented populations in archives.

Programming Held at the Archives Involving Donor Communities

Archivists from each of the institutions in the study have employed strategies for creating relationships with under-documented communities whose work they intend to collect. Many of these strategies often begin with bringing potential donors into the archives to show them the facilities and explain what archivists do. Kathy Jacob from the Schlesinger Library discussed inviting potential donors to the library for a lunch event when they were speaking or attending a convention in town and using that as an opportunity to explain the archives' mission to document women's history. Laura Micham from the Sallie Bingham Center described a public program held at Duke Libraries for feminist of faith donors to the Bingham Center that both showed appreciation for current donors and also raised the interest of new donors. This particular event illustrates the importance of bringing donors to the archives even after their papers have been collected. Making donors feel welcome in the repository where their collections are held is essential to maintaining a relationship after the point of acquisition.
The Mazer Lesbian Archives did not seek approval from its own donors when agreeing to collaborate with UCLA Library, but has since held events for their donors to celebrate the partnership. An event was held in November 2009 to celebrate the launch of the June L. Mazer Lesbian Archives at UCLA. At this event, Lillian Faderman, a lesbian academic who had donated her papers to the Mazer Archives, discussed the positive outcomes of the partnership (UCLA Library welcomes the Mazer Archive at UCLA, 2009). This event was well-attended by stakeholders from the Mazer Lesbian Archives as well as from UCLA and may have contributed to the influx of interest in donating to the Mazer Archives. Bringing potential donors into the space where their collections will be held is one step to building trust between potential donors and the archives.

**Attending Programming by Donor Communities**

Both archivists from the Bingham Center and Schlesinger Library mentioned attending, or having other staff members attend, conferences and events held by their respective donor communities. Attending such conferences can educate archivists on the issues facing their donor communities. It can also allow them to explain what they do and how it might be of interest to potential donors, as well as build valuable contacts.

The Mazer Lesbian Archives has taken on an innovative project where, in May 2011, it will host the Archives, Libraries, Museums and Special Collections 2011 International LGBT Conference (“Welcome to the June Mazer Lesbian Archives,” 2011). This conference exists for both archivists (as well as other cultural heritage professionals) and grassroots LGBT activists to share ideas about documenting LGBT history. This is an opportunity for the Mazer Archives to bring together potential donors from both
academic and grassroots communities and raise awareness about their partnership with UCLA Libraries. There is great potential here for other community and academic archives to learn from the Mazer-UCLA model and create meaningful collaborations that result in the arrangement, description, and preservation of valuable contributions to the historical record.

**Teaching Archival Literacy**

Kathy Jacob of the Schlesinger Library explains the details of acid-neutral folders and temperature controls in archival storage to potential donors. She also mentioned explaining the archival code of ethics to potential donors so that they would know their materials were not being discarded because archivists did not agree with their politics. Her goal is to ensure that potential donors give their papers to some archival institution, even if it is not the Schlesinger Library, because they have valuable contributions to make to the historical record. Laura Micham of the Bingham Center discusses the mission of the Bingham Center in her emails to potential donors and explains how their stories will strengthen the historical record. At the 2009 event where Lillian Faderman spoke about the history of the Mazer Archives, she mentioned that the original mission of the archives was to collect anything that a lesbian ever touched (*UCLA Library welcomes the Mazer Archive at UCLA*, 2009). However, as the partnership with UCLA Library developed, library workers were processing the papers of Mazer donors and more standardized appraisal and processing strategies were put into place, making management of the collections more feasible. Teaching potential donors about how archives work and why the preservation of their materials is essential in building trust between the donor community and the archival community.
Member of the Donor Community as Liaison with the Archives

Kathy Jacob of Schlesinger Library, in addition to inviting staff members to serve as allies to the communities in their strategic collecting plan, asks scholars on conservative women and new conservative woman donors about other individuals or organizations they feel should be documented. Laura Micham of the Bingham Center has developed a collaborative relationship with Jeanette Stokes, who has been an effective and dedicated partner in the Bingham Center's efforts to collect materials from the feminist of faith community. The Mazer Archives, due to its origins as a community archives, has a built-in ambassadorship between the lesbian donor community and the academic library it is partnered with.

Archivists at academic archives may not be members of the under-documented communities whose histories they hope to preserve. However, by building collaborative partnerships with members of these communities, both parties can begin to fill gaps in the historical record. In the process, they will educate scholars and researchers on communities and subcultures that might otherwise be lost to time, and ensure that members of the donor communities will have access and agency in their contributions to history.
Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the ways in which archivists at academic archives can create meaningful relationships with under-documented donor communities. The study was carried out in the form of a multi-case study and researched documentation projects at three institutions: collecting feminist of faith materials at the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture at Duke University, an initiative to document conservative women at the Schlesinger Library at the Radcliffe Institute at Harvard University, and the collaborative partnership between the June L. Mazer Lesbian Archives and the University of California-Los Angeles Library. Case studies consisted of semi-structured interviews with archivists at the Bingham Center and at Schlesinger Library, and with the Director of Communications at the Mazer Archives. All interviews were analyzed for common themes. The researcher found that effective methods for collaborative outreach with under-documented populations that were included by each of these institutions were: holding programs for donors and potential donors at the archives, attending programming hosted by members of the donor community, teaching archival literacy to potential donors, and having current donors serve as liaisons between the archives and the donor community. It is hoped that archivists at formal, institutional archives will be able to adapt these strategies to their own outreach with potential donors and have great success in broadening collections and making under-represented voices heard in the historical record.
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Dear Ms. Micham,

My name is Alexandra Krensky, and I am a master's student in library science at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill. I am writing to request your participation in an interview as part of a research study about academic archives that collect papers from under-documented populations.

In the last two decades of the 20th century, developing documentation strategies that involve collecting the papers of under-documented populations was an idea in its nascent stages in academic archives. Today, this is a common and established set of practices. However, due to the sometimes unapproachable nature of academia, it may not always be easy for members of these populations to access the materials that they donated. That is to say, academic institutions tend to have a largely homogeneous population with respect to gender, race, and class, and employ jargon and practices that are not easily understood by non-academicians. Therefore, when an academic institution chooses to document populations whose demographics are different from those represented within their ranks or their own history, they may have substantial financial resources to offer but are unable or unsure of how to cultivate a relationship with the donor community that extends beyond the acquisition of material and engages donors in an ongoing, active, and mutually beneficial collaboration.

The literature suggests that there are archives that seek to reach out to under-documented populations they collect from in order to create a welcoming and even at times collaborative atmosphere. This approach signifies a move toward greater and more productive relationships between archives and donors that extend beyond the initial acquisition process to processing, description, access, and outreach. This paper seeks to conduct case studies with a selection of these archives in order to discern patterns and glean solutions that can contribute to the creation of a framework for best practices useful to the profession more broadly.

This research study is my master's paper. Research will take place through a series of interviews: three with academic archivists who work with the papers of under-documented populations, and one research center director.

Phone interviews will last approximately 30 to 60 minutes, and will take place at a time that is convenient for you.

If you are interested in participating in this research study, please call or email me and I can provide further information, including details of the study's goals, methodology, and means for protecting your rights and privacy. I can be reached at 508-864-1554 or at krensky@email.unc.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Jeffrey Pomerantz at 919-962-8064 or by email at pomerantz.unc.edu. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board with the IRB Study #11-0188 at CB 7097 Medical School Building 52 105 Mason Farm Road Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7097 or call them at 919-966-3113.

Sincerely,

Alexandra J. Krensky
MSLS Student
APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT LETTER, SCHLESINGER LIBRARY ARCHIVIST

Dear Ms. Jacob,

My name is Alexandra Krensky, and I am a master's student in library science at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill. I am writing to request your participation in an interview as part of a research study about academic archives that collect papers from under-documented populations. I obtained your name and contact information through Laura Micham, Director of the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture at Duke University.

In the last two decades of the 20th century, developing documentation strategies that involve collecting the papers of under-documented populations was an idea in its nascent stages in academic archives. Today, this is a common and established set of practices. However, due to the sometimes unapproachable nature of academia, it may not always be easy for members of these populations to access the materials that they donated. That is to say, academic institutions tend to have a largely homogeneous population with respect to gender, race, and class, and employ jargon and practices that are not easily understood by non-academicians. Therefore, when an academic institution chooses to document populations whose demographics are different from those represented within their ranks or their own history, they may have substantial financial resources to offer but are unable or unsure of how to cultivate a relationship with the donor community that extends beyond the acquisition of material and engages donors in an ongoing, active, and mutually beneficial collaboration.

The literature suggests that there are archives that seek to reach out to under-documented populations they collect from in order to create a welcoming and even at times collaborative atmosphere. This approach signifies a move toward greater and more productive relationships between archives and donors that extend beyond the initial acquisition process to processing, description, access, and outreach. This paper seeks to conduct case studies with a selection of these archives in order to discern patterns and glean solutions that can contribute to the creation of a framework for best practices useful to the profession more broadly.

This research study is my master's paper. Research will take place through a series of interviews: three with academic archivists who work with the papers of under-documented populations, and one research center director.

Phone interviews will last approximately 30 to 60 minutes, and will take place at a time that is convenient for you.

If you are interested in participating in this research study, please call or email me and I can provide further information, including details of the study's goals, methodology, and means for protecting your rights and privacy. I can be reached at 508-864-1554 or at krensky@email.unc.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Jeffrey Pomerantz at 919-962-8064 or by email at pomerantz.unc.edu. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board with the IRB Study #11-0188 at CB 7097 Medical School Building 52 105 Mason Farm Road Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7097 or call them at 919-966-3113.

Sincerely,

Alexandra J. Krensky
MSLS Student
APPENDIX C: RECRUITMENT LETTER, MAZER ARCHIVES DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS

Dear Ms. Brinskele,

My name is Alexandra Krensky, and I am a master's student in library science at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill. I am writing to request your participation in an interview as part of a research study about academic archives that collect papers from under-documented populations. I obtained your name and contact information through T-Kay Sangwand.

In the last two decades of the 20th century, developing documentation strategies that involve collecting the papers of under-documented populations was an idea in its nascent stages in academic archives. Today, this is a common and established set of practices. However, due to the sometimes unapproachable nature of academia, it may not always be easy for members of these populations to access the materials that they donated. That is to say, academic institutions tend to have a largely homogeneous population with respect to gender, race, and class, and employ jargon and practices that are not easily understood by non-academicians. Therefore, when an academic institution chooses to document populations whose demographics are different from those represented within their ranks or their own history, they may have substantial financial resources to offer but are unable or unsure of how to cultivate a relationship with the donor community that extends beyond the acquisition of material and engages donors in an ongoing, active, and mutually beneficial collaboration.

The literature suggests that there are archives that seek to reach out to under-documented populations they collect from in order to create a welcoming and even at times collaborative atmosphere. This approach signifies a move toward greater and more productive relationships between archives and donors that extend beyond the initial acquisition process to processing, description, access, and outreach. This paper seeks to conduct case studies with a selection of these archives in order to discern patterns and glean solutions that can contribute to the creation of a framework for best practices useful to the profession more broadly.

This research study is my master's paper. Research will take place through a series of interviews: three with academic archivists who work with the papers of under-documented populations, and one research center director.

Phone interviews will last approximately 30 to 60 minutes, and will take place at a time that is convenient for you.

If you are interested in participating in this research study, please call or email me and I can provide further information, including details of the study's goals, methodology, and means for protecting your rights and privacy. I can be reached at 508-864-1554 or at krensky@email.unc.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Jeffrey Pomerantz at 919-962-8064 or by email at pomerantz.unc.edu. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board with the IRB Study #11-0188 at CB 7097 Medical School Building 52 105 Mason Farm Road Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7097 or call them at 919-966-3113.

Sincerely,

Alexandra J. Krensky
MSLS Student
APPENDIX D: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR ARCHIVISTS AT THE BINGHAM CENTER AND SCHLESINGER LIBRARY

How did you become involved with [Conservative Women/Feminists of Faith]?

How do the requirements of your position influence the role you play with regard to this specific project?

Did you approach the donor(s) or did they approach you?

Did you have any challenges getting the donor(s) to consider donating to your repository? If so, how did you overcome them?

In what ways do you feel this specific project has succeeded?

What goals or objectives are you working towards with this specific project?

How have you continued to reach out to the donor community since acquiring their papers?

Would you use the same outreach strategies for other donors or donor communities?
Has your collection policy evolved since starting this specific project? If so, how?
APPENDIX E: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR MAZER ARCHIVES
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS

How did you become involved with the Center for the Study of Women?

How did you become involved with UCLA Libraries?

How do the requirements of your position influence the role you play with regard to this specific project?

Did you have any challenges when announcing to your donor(s) that you were becoming affiliated with UCLA?

In what ways do you feel this specific project has succeeded?

What goals or objectives are you working towards with this specific project?

How have you continued to collaborate with UCLA?

How, if at all, have your relationships with donors changed since collaborating with UCLA?
Has your collection policy evolved since starting this specific project? If so, how?