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Contemporary archives often face a common set of challenges no matter the size of their institution, program, or scope. These challenges may include a wealth of collections without a way to effectively expose them to researchers; collections with common origins or subject matter that are dispersed across states, regions, or the nation; or a lack of full-time staff or staff who have so many responsibilities that not all basic archival functions can be addressed. Surrounding these issues are budget challenges and the need to find new ways of accomplishing goals. One of the ways to address many of the challenges listed above is to share short-term staff across institutions, a method that has been used with great success on a number of projects.  

In the past three years, two projects in the Pacific Northwest received grants to fund shared personnel to accomplish a multitude of goals ranging from processing papers to establishing archives administrative procedures and best practices. In addition to building archival programs deemed worthy of long-term support by their parent institutions, these grants sought to expose the hidden collections held by these institutions and to enable their use by researchers. Both projects hired short-term shared personnel who traveled to each institution. The projects were the Emergent Archival Programs NHPRC grant, administered by the Orbis Cascade Alliance, and the Oregon Governors Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) grant, administered by Western Oregon University.
The first project is the Emergent Archival Programs (hereafter EAP) grant. The Orbis Cascade Alliance is a consortium of academic libraries in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho that strengthens member libraries through collaboration. Northwest Digital Archives (NWDA) is one of its programs and facilitates end-user access to archives and special collections in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska. In 2010, NWDA received a grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) to fund “Supporting and Building Emergent Archival Programs in the Northwest,” which provided assistance to seven programs at small, private liberal arts colleges in the region that had collections but no way to expose them and no full-time archival staff. Although the grant had collection processing and exposure as one of its goals, the foremost goal was to ensure that this wasn’t a project where the grant ended and nothing further happened with the collections. Therefore, the focus was to build demand for the archival program so that the parent institutions would support it. We were also realistic and acknowledged that no matter the effects of advocacy work, most of the participating institutions do not and may never have a full-time professional archivist. By providing a consulting archivist to each institution for the term of the grant, the project was an opportunity for the program and its participating institutions to explore the advantages and limitations of centralized shared staff and for each institution to thoughtfully approach how to staff its program in the long term. The project was administered through the University of Oregon (which managed grants for the Alliance at the time), and NWDA program manager Jodi Allison-Bunnell served as principal investigator for the grant.

The second project is the Oregon Governors Papers Implementation Grant (hereafter Oregon Governors project). In 2012, a group of Oregon public and private university libraries (Western Oregon University, Portland State University, Pacific University, and Willamette University) received a LSTA grant from the Oregon State Library to process the nonofficial, gubernatorial personal papers located outside of the Oregon State Archives. The grant was administered through Western Oregon University (WOU), where archivist Erin Paschel-Stoddart served as project manager; archivists Eva Guggemos at Pacific University (Pacific) and Cristine Paschil at Portland State University (PSU) oversaw the processing of their individual collections; and Willamette University (Willamette) archivist Mary McRobinson provided expertise in processing political papers. The intent of the grant was to maximize and leverage staffing, budget, collection management, processing, creation of access points, and potential digitization for three small archives at separate institutions, each with varying levels of inventories and processing. Goals included hiring a project archivist to process three gubernatorial personal collections, create finding aids to be uploaded into the database of EAD finding aids that NWDA administers, identifying potential materials suitable for
digitization, providing assistance in other access tools such as digital and physical exhibits, and creating a web portal to direct researchers to the collections and highlight connections between collections dispersed throughout the state. Participating institutions shared other characteristics: small staffs, small budgets, and (in two cases) split responsibilities within the library, providing less time to work on large processing projects.

The EAP and Oregon Governors grants shared similar benefits and challenges of embracing traveling, shared archives personnel. This case study considers the experiences of the EAP and the Oregon Governors projects, the feasibility and sustainability of these efforts, and how consortia such as the Orbis Cascade Alliance may play a future role in leading the way with shared personnel.

PLANNING

One of the first steps in the EAP grant was to determine interest and the most pressing needs that the project might address. In 2008–2009, John Helmer (the Alliance’s executive director) and Jodi contacted all of the Orbis Cascade Alliance members known to have some special collections but who were not creating access to them through the NWDA program to determine levels of interest and a possible scope and structure for a grant-funded project. The Alliance wanted to experiment with a shared archivist for the smaller programs among the Alliance membership and to make NWDA program participation possible for a broader spectrum of institutions, making more collections accessible to researchers. Through those conversations, we found that those same institutions either had only part-time archival staff or had no staffing for their archives program at all, and that they were extremely interested in a project that could bring them some short-term staff. Prior to this project, most of the participating institutions had either not done grant-funded projects at all or had only completed small, locally funded grants. They were excited to join this project and placed a great deal of trust in the Alliance’s experience with and ability to develop and administer grant-funded projects. Once the contacts were completed and project parameters established, the participants included seven institutions in Washington and Oregon, all small, private liberal arts colleges, and all with collections relating to their religious founders and other collections of significance: George Fox University, University of Puget Sound, Seattle University, Seattle Pacific University, Linfield College, Concordia University, and Pacific University (see figure 12.1). We crafted a proposal to NHRPC in 2009 for a 15-month project beginning in July 2010 that would include six-week visits to each institution by a consulting archivist to work with the staff on collection description, policy development, and doing effective advocacy
to inspire long-term institutional support. Jodi was responsible for supervising the consulting archivist, and ultimately for the project’s outcomes.

When we began planning for the Oregon Governors project in 2011, one of the participating libraries (Pacific) was already involved with the EAP project. And, as with the EAP project, all the institutions were Alliance members with established working relationships. Decision making and project planning took place mostly among the four institutional archivists, including the basic infrastructure of the project, which was then communicated to library administrations during the writing of the grant. We knew we wanted to follow a similar approach in hiring a project archivist to work with collections at different repositories, but for this project we considered two different approaches: Should the project archivist travel between the three institutions or should the collections travel to one location? We ultimately chose to have the person—and not the collections—travel for a number of reasons: The collections had different levels of preparedness and donor and accession information, and
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some had previous inventories already created. Also, since these gubernatorial personal collections were considered the largest or the flagship collection at some institutions, institutional archivists wanted to be as involved as possible with processing and have the chance to talk through procedures and expectations with the project archivist. Each institution also provided processing supplies as part of their cost share, and if we centralized processing, supplies would need to be brought to the centralized location, potentially on an as-needed basis, which was an extra layer of complication. Concerns were also raised that by having the collections moved to one location, communication would be more difficult. Since two of the institutional archivists have split positions, finding large amounts of time to travel and visit with the project archivist could potentially slow down the progress of the grant. Therefore, we decided that the grant would be easier if the collections stayed put and the project archivist traveled to each location, working at each institution for approximately two to four months. This would allow for direct, in-person communication and time to work with each archivist, allowing each institution to have control over its collection and the operations around processing it. The institutional archivists recognized that hiring a professional and requiring him or her to travel for a year was not optimal but that it would hopefully produce a fruitful, satisfying experience—learning about librarianship and archives at four different public and private institutions, gaining multiple references, and having a varied set of responsibilities that would help in a very competitive job market. For this reason, we offered the option of a flexible schedule, where the project archivist could either choose to live in one location for the entire year and make accommodations for shorter weeks and fuller days, or move with each appointment.

Other planning for the Oregon Governors project included meeting with all four institutional archivists to draft a schedule for the year, to determine how we would communicate in a timely manner with each other, to craft requirements and preferences for the traveling archivist job description, and to create a timeline for hiring the project archivist. We also held an in-person meeting to flush out centralized agreements on what standards and best practices to use for processing modern political collections, agreeing to endorse a “More Product, Less Processing (MPLP)” approach across all collections to aid in similar processing plans and finding aids.

IMPLEMENTATION

The EAP project was notified that it received NHPRC funding in spring 2010, contingent on extending the project from 15 months to 24. The project began in July 2010 with basic contracting and project management
tasks, including advertising for a consulting archivist. Jodi conducted site visits to all seven institutions involved in the project in October 2010 to assess conditions, meet with staff, ensure that participating institutions understood grant reporting requirements and reporting lines, and begin to rework the schedule of consulting archivist visits to fit with local realities, including retirements, building projects, and other priorities that affected the project’s scheduling and outcomes. After considering a number of applicants, she hired two consulting archivists instead of one: Elizabeth Stiles Knight of Seattle, who worked with the three Seattle-area institutions, and Linda Morton-Keithley of Melba, Idaho, who worked with the four Portland-area institutions. In January 2011, Jodi, Linda, and Elizabeth met to thoroughly review the project and Jodi’s observations from site visits to ensure that everyone was absolutely clear on the big and small-picture aims and objectives of the project. The consulting archivists began site visits early that year and continued with both initial and follow-up visits through the end of the project in July 2012. The schedule of their visits was based on their availability, staff changes and availability at participating institutions, and the logistics and costs of travel. In some cases, the schedule was a neatly bounded initial four-week visit followed by a two-week follow-up visit; in others, visits were much more scattered across the calendar. In most cases, the consulting archivists worked 35 hours with the institution they were visiting and reserved five hours a week for pre- and post-visit contacts with the other institutions they were working with and other project matters. Throughout each visit, regardless of length, Jodi met weekly with the consulting archivist and institution staff to track progress, ensure adherence to grant priorities, and discuss any issues that might have arisen. Linda and Elizabeth posted summaries of their week’s work each Friday at the project’s WordPress blog, http://nwdaroundrobin.wordpress.com.

At each institution, the consulting archivists completed a collection survey, basic policy documents (policy and procedure manual), and an advocacy plan; and described or helped staff describe between 20 and 100 collections. In nearly all cases, the consulting archivists set up Archivists’ Toolkit instances at each institution to facilitate collection management work. Staff from each institution participated in NWDA’s online training in finding aid creation, EAD, and program participation. All project participants became NWDA members in July 2011 and exposed their collection finding aids to the world through the NWDA database. All participants, the consultants, and other archivists known in the region for their effective approaches to advocacy came together in March 2012 for an advocacy workshop to discuss their work to date, sharpen key advocacy skills, and to complete the project in June 2012 with renewed energy to carry on their work after the grant ended.

When implementing the Oregon Governors project, we advertised for the project archivist position in April 2012, in time for it to be distributed
at the Northwest Archivists annual meeting. The project hired Katrina Windon, a recent archives graduate with previous experience working with political papers. She moved to Oregon in time to begin working in July 2012. Her preference was to relocate halfway between Forest Grove and Portland for the first six months of the grant and to later move closer to Monmouth for the remaining six months to avoid long driving distances at either end of the grant (see figure 12.2).

The four institutional archivists on the governors' papers project determined the work before hiring the project archivist. Factors such as size...
of collection, previous work completed, and personal work schedules determined the order for the year: three months at Portland State University, three months at Pacific University, and six months at Western Oregon University. Willamette’s archivist participated in the grant in an advisory role, as she has extensive experience in processing Oregon (and other) political papers and was on hand to assist the traveling archivist with any broad processing issues throughout the year. In addition to working at each individual institution, a few in-person meetings were held with all the archivists to keep communication open and talk about issues facing the grant. One such meeting was with staff at the Oregon State Archives to discuss gubernatorial record retention schedules and public records laws in Oregon. Communication was improved through the use of a private WordPress blog, where weekly progress and reports could be shared in one space that everyone could easily return to throughout the grant. Once at each institution, the project archivist met with the lead archivist to identify reading materials related to the governor and political history. The traveling archivist created an initial processing plan that could be easily readjusted for each institution’s collection. Each institution provided time for the institutional archivist, space for the project archivist to work, a computer, archival supplies, and collection management software (either Archon or Archivists’ Toolkit depending on what each institution used). Brief training on NWDA and best practices for NWDA finding aids took place throughout the grant. Overall grant administration (payroll, time cards, supervision) was through WOU, although some administrative services such as collection supervision took place at each participating institution.

RESULTS

The overall results for both grants were outstanding; the EAP project resulted in 4,414 linear feet of collections surveyed, 286 finding aids created and made available through the NWDA database (http://nwda.orbiscascade.org/), and 309 MARC records added to local catalogs and WorldCat. Other documents completed during the course of the project—including policy and procedure manuals, processing guides, and advocacy plans—are available through the NWDA database. The Oregon Governors project was similarly successful, completing all tasks outlined in the grant application. The three gubernatorial personal collections were fully processed using similar processing plans and consistently applied processing standards, which our grant peer evaluation noted as “a tremendous asset to researchers who want to search across the collections of multiple repositories.” A DACS-compliant finding aid was created using Archon or Archivists’ Toolkit for each of the three gubernatorial personal collections; all are hosted and are full-text searchable through
the NWDA database. Since the project archivist completed the majority of the tasks slightly ahead of schedule, she processed and created finding aids for three additional small manuscript collections related to the Straub collection at WOU.

In addition to processing the physical collections, the project archivist also worked on digital projects. At Pacific University, she created a small digital exhibit about former governor Victor Atiyeh’s personal and professional life. Materials were selected, digitized according to best practices agreed upon by the four institutions, and assigned Dublin Core metadata. She later worked off site to apply descriptive metadata to hundreds of additional photographs added by student workers, which have been incorporated into their Omeka exhibit. At WOU, the project archivist digitized, described, and uploaded materials to supplement the existing Straub Oregon Beaches Digital Collection. And finally, the project archivist created a web portal as a way to direct researchers to the gubernatorial personal collections and to highlight connections between collections dispersed throughout the state. The portal includes biographical and related collection information, photographs, and a timeline of Oregon governors since World War II; the portal is now publicly accessible.

Although different projects in some ways, these grants had very similar overall goals and results. First, institutions in both grants saw notable effects from expanded and more effective advocacy and outreach. For the EAP project, this included getting programs on the radar of administration, increasing requests for materials and other support on and off campus, expanding roles in the classroom, and overall integration into the day-to-day work of the libraries. For the Oregon Governors project, this included more outreach and publicity around the gubernatorial papers processed; all three institutions held or are in the process of planning public events related to the gubernatorial personal collections (book readings and exhibitions), which could not have taken place without the LSTA grant. Every institution in the EAP project expanded or established staff responsibilities for archives and special collections as a result of the grant activities: hiring the institution’s first part-time or full-time archivist (Linfield College, University of Puget Sound), expanding full-time equivalent (FTE) position available for archives in an existing staff position (Pacific University), validation of an existing staff member’s role in the archives (Seattle Pacific University, Concordia University, George Fox University), and adoption of formally recognized team-based management of archives and special collections (Seattle University).

Second, both grants provided the infrastructure that gives legitimacy to these archival programs. In the Oregon Governors project, the final report acknowledged that the grant “provided an opportunity to increase knowledge and understanding of archives among librarians, ensuring a lasting dialog about the integration of primary sources into instruction and research support throughout the library.” Being a part of a project
that crossed institutional borders brought a sense of legitimacy and authority to less-robust archival programs and provided the opportunity for public and private universities to work together on a project. As outlined by the peer reviewer for the Oregon Governors project, an important outcome of this project is “the lasting connection developed between the partner repositories. This connection, and willingness to work together for efficiency and a common cross-institution goal, was listed as being a great asset to the state.” It also provided a gateway for smaller, lone-arranger shops to develop lasting relationships with other nearby professionals and gain experience with grant administration.

The EAP project saw similar results: A year later, all institutions report that the project laid a foundation of advocacy, policy, and description that has allowed them to move forward with outreach, collecting, and other activities knowing what they have and that they have the infrastructure in place to provide access and care for their collections. All institutions have retained the level of program staffing established during the program. Four out of seven continued to process collections and add finding aids to the NWDA database; the others have collections in process but have not yet completed the finding aids. All reported steady or greatly increased demand for classroom instruction. At Pacific University, for instance, archives instruction has been integrated into other library instruction and at least one fourth of the professors have requested primary source-based instruction. At the University of Puget Sound, where the library is pursuing a formal role in campus records management, the ability to show that a well-grounded archives program is already in place plays a crucial role in those conversations. At Seattle Pacific University, a new university president and provost see the archives as the go-to source for crucial information about the people, events, and past practices of the institution as they shape their own administration. And at Linfield College, the fastest-growing program in this project, the library director has not only increased the archivist position from half time to full time but has also deployed additional staff to support students and processing in the archives so that the archivist can focus on even more outreach and collecting.

LESSONS LEARNED

A number of lessons learned apply to both projects. First, how shared staff is scheduled can make or break a project, particularly when the people they are working with at the library have split responsibilities. Large blocks of time for visits are logistically attractive and sometimes necessary to reduce travel times and costs, but when permanent staff have to either set aside other responsibilities to focus on the project (and therefore have them piled up at the end of the archivist’s visit) or are
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unable to make the time to meet, project tasks can languish. This was part of the reason why the Oregon Governors project had the project archivist travel to the collections: For a permanent staff with split responsibilities, making multiple timely trips over a number of months was not going to work well. Depending on the institution, small blocks of time may in the end be more effective if part of the aim is to increase the institution's capacity to continue work after the end of the project.

A second lesson learned was that structure for the supervision of shared staff is crucially important. For the EAP project, the NWDA program manager's role in supervising the consulting archivists was both a great advantage and sometimes in need of clarification. Unlike most staff at project participant libraries, the program manager had fewer competing responsibilities and no ties to any particular institution, so it was easier for her to give project supervision the necessary time and to manage time and resources impartially. For the library directors, the centralized management meant that the consulting archivist was working in their building, but they were not the direct supervisor. Instead, the program manager was the supervisor and the person ultimately responsible for the grant outcomes. This occasionally meant gentle clarification on priorities and could have been better addressed during the initial site visits. For the Oregon Governors project, adapting to the role of temporary, traveling personnel meant understanding the formality of their role in the library. Since the project archivist's role was different from that of other staff (no committee work, no tenure requirements, etc.), professional integration with other library staff was difficult at times. WOU provided an office near staff in other areas of the library and invited the project archivist to participate in weekly staff meetings, allowing for more interaction with permanent staff and a better understanding of the library's priorities, while PSU's working space included student workers, which helped avoid isolation.

Third, and not surprisingly, good communication practices and infrastructures were crucial. For the EAP project, the site visits, initial meeting between Jodi and the consulting archivists, the subsequent weekly check-ins with each project site, and the weekly public blog entries provided an essential venue for tracking the large and small details of the project and meant that nothing in the project went seriously “off the rails.” For the Oregon Governors project, initial in-person meetings during the first few months helped people become familiar with one another and created an open dialogue and camaraderie that was emphasized throughout the LSTA grant.\textsuperscript{13} Wanting to encourage ongoing communication and a method for all participants to keep up to date on the project, the use of a private WordPress blog provided a space where the project archivist could give weekly updates on her progress. Institutional archivists could log in to the blog and read updates at their leisure and have access to all
information in one location. We also used GoogleDocs for our work, which allowed for better and more efficient sharing of information.

Fourth, the fact that institutions in each project were part of NWDA meant that they had a preexisting relationship and access to the program's infrastructure. For the Oregon Governors project, the three institutions could train and upload finding aids based on the same set of NWDA best practices for finding aid construction and EAD encoding. For the EAP project, that infrastructure meant that not only could the program manager provide administrative support, but she also addressed DACS and EAD training, Archivist's Toolkit support, and provided the NWDA database to host finding aids and expose them to researchers. Consortia can provide essential support to this type of project.

Last, allowing adequate lead times for administrative tasks is essential. The EAP project was fortunate that NHRPC awarded the grant contingent on extending the project from 15 to 24 months; with the inevitable delays around grant administration and contracts for the consulting archivists, two years was just adequate to complete the project. Likewise for the Oregon Governors project, seemingly simple tasks like getting passwords and keys took far longer than anticipated at some institutions; a major holdup came with the project archivist not having access to web servers to create the web portal. Overall, the project would have benefited from a time cushion to account for these realities. We also learned that it is oftentimes difficult to anticipate how long projects will take; it is worth identifying backup projects or tasks that can be dropped in case projects move along faster or slower than expected.

While many lessons were shared among the two grant projects, each faced its own set of challenges. For the Oregon Governors project, providing some travel relief for the project archivist through some off-site work was a benefit that could be afforded once in a while. During specific times of the grant, certain tasks could be worked on from home, offering some commute relief. In retrospect, more of these opportunities could have been provided with more planning upfront.

The EAP project learned three lessons unique to its situation. First, grant administration was more difficult than anticipated. We knew as we wrote the grant that most of the institutions involved had little or no grant experience. Small, liberal arts colleges tend to have less robust grant administration infrastructure and far fewer procedures around functions like travel. Once the grant started, helping institutions understand and comply with requirements for cost share reporting, reimbursement requests for travel administered through a large public institution, and narrative reports that generated the numbers necessary to report progress on objectives to NHRPC was time-consuming for the project director. However, the process of working on these things also meant that institutions not familiar with these processes got valuable and supported experience with grant administration.
Second, the consulting archivists were outside voices with considerable knowledge in the field able to help gain the attention of administrators. A consultant’s recommendations, when paired with effective work from within the institution, often carried more weight than institution personnel only.

Last, it was the groundwork that institutions laid before, alongside, and after the grant project that created the best long-term success. Linfield College is perhaps the best success story, going from a few collections with little associated activity in 2008 to the creation of the Oregon Wine History Archive. Linfield hired a full-time archivist who is engaged in a full suite of instruction and outreach activities, which has led to increased support for student projects. The EAP project helped provide an infrastructure to support that program, but it was ultimately just one of many factors that helped inspire integration and sustainable institutional support; ultimate credit goes to the staff of Linfield College for their sustained, patient work.

CONCLUSION

Based on our experiences, part-time archivists, shared responsibilities, and consortially managed archivists bring many advantages and should be more widely considered for both short-term grants and as a permanent staffing option. Many of us probably don’t think of this when we consider staffing and automatically think that every institution needs a permanent, full-time professional archivist, but this may not be the best solution for all situations. Part-time archives responsibilities are the reality for a number, possibly a majority, of archivists according to a recent article by Mary Manning and Judy Silva. Inevitably this leaves some tasks and functions for which there are simply not enough hours in the day —tasks that may be addressed well by shared staff.

The EAP and Oregon Governors projects show just how shared personnel can fill these gaps, not only freeing up institution personnel to do tasks that require permanent staff but also creating the foundation that supports outreach and teaching. Some projects embracing shared personnel are better candidates than others: Processing, digitization, and foundational projects worked particularly well using this model and would benefit from being employed outside a grant model, which can place constraints on salaries and flexibility of project timing. This combination of infrastructure and institutional commitment is one factor that can create effective, important, and well-supported archives programs even in a difficult economy. However, some tasks are so dependent on building relationships at an institution and in a community that they are better done by permanent staff: outreach, instruction, sustained advocacy, and collection development.
For the Orbis Cascade Alliance, these projects may become pilot projects for shared human resources at the consortium level. The Alliance is currently deploying a shared integrated library system for its 37 members, which brings with it an expanded commitment to combined collections and deep collaboration, shared workflows, and a strong interest in shared human resources. During recent strategic planning sessions, this was further expressed as a commitment to efficient collaboration. The details of shared human resources are still to be worked out but will continue to emerge both with a finalized strategic agenda and with its implementation over the next five years. Many libraries are moving more of what used to be their core activities—collection development, cataloging, and materials circulation—to outside services, “to the network.” Shared human resources (shared archivists in particular) can and should inform an essential part of that trend, letting institutions receive more “bang” for their continually stretched budgets.

Erin Passehl-Stoddart is university archivist and digital collections librarian at Western Oregon University. Jodi Allison-Bunnell is Northwest digital archives program manager at Orbis Cascade Alliance.

NOTES

1. See, for instance, the Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries (PACSLCL) 2009 consortial survey, overview available at http://pacslclsurvey.org/. In 2000–2001, NHPRC funded a traveling archivist project for the Montana State Historical Records Advisory Board with $57,746 of NHPRC support and $57,979 of matching funds and in-kind contributions. That project provided on-site support to 10 small institutions over the course of a year by providing a traveling professional archivist and was far more effective in the short and long term than sending staff from those institutions to workshops.

2. Two Oregon LSTA grants have been awarded to Western Oregon University and its partners: Portland State University, Pacific University, and Willamette University. In 2011, the Oregon State Library awarded the “Cooperative Governors’ Papers Project: A Planning Grant,” made up of a group of three public and private higher education libraries (Willamette University, Portland State University, and Western Oregon University) to cooperatively identify, solicit for donation, and preserve the nonofficial and personal papers of the 13 Oregon governors since World War II. The scope of the proposal involved all archival materials other than those official records collected by the Oregon State Archives in Salem. The initial project was an identification and proof-of-concept phase that included the Robert W. Straub papers at WOU and the Barbara Roberts papers at FSU; Pacific University was added to the second project awarded in 2012 after receiving the Victor Atiyeh papers. The 2012 implementation grant hired a traveling shared archivist to process the three identified collections, create finding aids, select materials for possible digitization projects, and create a web portal used to bring together the collections for improved searchability and access.

3. Two talks that relate to the topics of job availability and accessibility of new archives professionals discuss a number of issues that surfaced when the four institutional archivists met to discuss the job description for the Oregon LSTA traveling archivist position: Rebecca Goldman, “Breaking In and Breaking Out: Job Satisfaction
and Quality of Life among Recent Archives Grads," presentation at the Society of
American Archivists annual meeting, San Diego, California, August 9, 2012, http://
digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/libraryconf/4/; and Jackie Dooley, "Feeding Our Young,"
presidential address at the Society of American Archivists meeting, New Orleans,
Louisiana, August 17, 2013, http://www2.archivists.org/history/leaders/jackie-m-
dooley/2013-saa-presidential-address-by-jackie-dooley.
5. One of Willamette University Archives’ collecting areas is congressional and
political papers. For more information, see Willamette University, "Congressional and
Political Papers."
6. Normandy Helmer, "LSTA Grant Project Evaluation: Cooperative Governors’
7. For purposes of the Oregon LSTA grant, we modeled digitization best practices
from the 2011 Oregon LSTA grant-funded project "Washington County Digital Library." Information on this grant can be viewed at http://www.oregon.gov/osl/LD/
exhibits.lib.pacificu.edu/exhibits/show/atiyeh.
9. Western Oregon University, "Robert W. Straub Oregon Beaches Digital Collection,"
10. Western Oregon University, "Portal to the Personal Papers of Oregon Governors,"
13. As noted in the peer evaluation of the grant, "the archivists clearly formed a
remarkably efficient and commendably cooperative team." Helmer, "LSTA Grant Pro-
14. Mary Manning and Judy Silva, "Dual Archivists/Librarians: Balancing the Bene-
fits and Challenges of Diverse Responsibilities." College & Research Libraries 73
(March 2012): 164–75.
15. See the Orbis Cascade Alliance’s website, http://orbiscascade.org/, for more in-
formation on the Strategic Agenda, which is in draft form as of this writing.