

Iowa State University

---

From the Selected Works of Kimberly D. Anderson

---

Spring 2011

## Educating for the Archival Multiverse

The Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI), Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG), *The Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI), Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG)*

Kimberly D. Anderson, *University of California, Los Angeles*

Joel A. Blanco-Rivera, *University of Pittsburgh*

Snowden Becker, *University of Texas at Austin*

Michelle Caswell, et al.



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/kimberly\\_anderson/1/](https://works.bepress.com/kimberly_anderson/1/)

# Educating for the Archival Multiverse

The Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI), Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG)

## Abstract

Diversity addresses issues of inclusivity and the systemic nature of exclusivity in various settings, including the role of archival education in preparing new generations of archival practitioners, educators, and researchers. This article discusses why pluralist approaches might help to achieve greater diversity and cultural sensitivity in practice and scholarship. It addresses three key components of such approaches: identifying ways in which dominant cultural paradigms narrow archival pedagogy and practice; envisioning and exploring alternatives to these paradigms; and developing an archival educational framework to promote a critique of professional and societal norms and include diverse perspectives on archival theory and practice. The article calls for a broader conversation on these issues engaging archival academics and students, professional associations, roundtables and caucuses, accrediting bodies, archival employers, funding agencies, and the diverse communities who create, manage, and use records.

© The Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI), Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG).

Group members: Kim Anderson, UCLA; Snowden Becker, University of Texas at Austin; Joel A. Blanco-Rivera, University of Pittsburgh; Michelle Caswell, University of Wisconsin-Madison; I-Ting Emily Chu, UCLA; Morgan Daniels, University of Michigan; Shannon Faulkhead, Monash University; Anne Gilliland, UCLA (AERI workshop leader); Amy Greer, Simmons College; Francesca Guerra, University of California, Santa Cruz; Tyrone Howard, UCLA (AERI workshop leader); Trond Jacobsen, University of Michigan; David Kim, UCLA; Allison Krebs, University of Washington; Andrew J. Lau, UCLA; Sue McKemmish, Monash University; Ellen Pearlstein, UCLA; Liladhar R. Pendse, UCLA; Ricardo Punzalan, University of Michigan; Elizabeth Shepherd, University College London; Joanna Steele, University of Michigan; Kelvin L. White, University of Oklahoma; Mirna Willer, University of Zadar; Vivian Wong, UCLA.

The authors would like to acknowledge the generous support of the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) that funded AERI 2009 as part of the Building the Future of Archival Education and Research Project (<http://aeri.gseis.ucla.edu/>), grant number 02/08/0008/08.

In recent years, archival educators in North America, Europe, and Australia have discussed how to make the archival field more diverse, culturally sensitive, and responsive to the interests of the many communities and identities that make up humanity today.<sup>1</sup> The discussion has not resulted in measurable progress, however, toward reaching consensus about actions to be taken, or about significant change in the profession, the academy, or society. Nor has the discussion addressed the question of whether archival ideas and practices developed over centuries in response to the needs and modalities of large and powerful bureaucracies and scholarly repositories are relevant or effective when applied in other cultural and organizational contexts; for example, those that are grassroots, Indigenous, transnational, or emergent. Moreover, the notion of *diversity* itself has been insufficiently explored, given its complexities and implications.<sup>2</sup> More often than not, the archival profession, archival organizations, and archival education programs conceive of diversifying the field in terms of attracting greater numbers of individuals from minority racial and ethnic groups into the profession and ensuring that they are represented in forums such as institutional and professional association committees and councils. This paper argues that such an approach, while important, overlooks the systemic nature of the problems it seeks to address, that diversifying the student population without expanding pedagogy and practice perpetuates a lack of awareness and consideration of the perspectives, behaviors, and needs of many different communities.

As the initial point where many future archivists are introduced to the field, and where the foundations of the ethics, conceptualizations, and practices of the field are instilled, graduate archival education has a crucial role to play in addressing the current homogeneity of the archival field, both through recruitment and through professional curricula.<sup>3</sup> Graduate archival education is also the locus of doctoral programs that prepare future academic educators and researchers essential to the promulgation and investigation of plural perspectives on and for archives and recordkeeping.

This article reports the experiences, self-critiques, and recommendations of current and prospective educators and scholars who participated in a workshop

<sup>1</sup> For example, symposia were held at UCLA and Monash University in 2007; forums and panel discussions at SAA Annual Meetings in 2007, 2008, and 2009; the International Council on Archives Conference in Malaysia, the Association of Library and Information Science Educators, and the Society of California Archivists in 2008; and the iSchools Conference in 2009.

<sup>2</sup> See Maurice B. Wheeler, ed., *Unfinished Business: Race, Equity, and Diversity Library and Information Science Education* (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2005).

<sup>3</sup> The archival field, including archivists and archival educators in many countries, does not adequately reflect the racial and ethnic backgrounds of the broader societies in which it is situated as evidenced, for example, by the results of the Society of American Archivists A\*CENSUS; see Elizabeth Adkins, "Our Journey Toward Diversity and a Call to (More) Action," *American Archivist* 71 (Spring/Summer 2008): 21–49.

entitled *Developing Culturally Sensitive Archival Curricula*. It then addresses three key components of pluralist approaches in curricula and pedagogy:

- identifying ways in which dominant cultural paradigms permeate archival pedagogy, theory, and practice;
- envisioning and exploring alternatives to these paradigms; and
- developing an archival educational framework that can promote the critique of professional and societal norms and include and reflect upon diverse perspectives on archival theory and practice.

### **The Workshop on Developing Culturally Sensitive Archival Curricula**

In July 2009, the Institute for Museum and Library Services funded the first annual Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI<sup>4</sup> 2009) attended by seventy-five archival educators and doctoral students from across the United States and around the world. AERI marks a significant milestone in the development of the archival field as the first ongoing global forum convening individuals engaged in academic education and research programs in archival studies with the mandate to discuss and address programmatic, pedagogical, curricular, mentoring, methodological, and infrastructure-building issues relating to archival education. It is the largest and most diverse working group of academics in archival studies ever convened. Not only does it encompass participants from North America, Europe, Australia, and Asia, including those from Indigenous and postcolonial communities and communities addressing long histories of ethnic strife, but the participants come from a spectrum of personal backgrounds, ages, and experiences.

At AERI 2009, Tyrone Howard, a scholar in the development of culturally sensitive pedagogy, and Anne Gilliland, a member of AERI, led a group of faculty and doctoral students in a day-long workshop that provided a forum for debating questions about diversity and culturally sensitive archival education. The group comprised about a third of those attending AERI 2009, and participants had self-identified as being interested in this topic. The group, which subsequently formalized its status as an ongoing AERI working group under the title *Pluralizing the Archival Curriculum Group (PACG)*, began the workshop with a critical discussion of participants' educational experiences and pedagogical practices. This critique sought to elicit how participants variously articulated key concepts, defined local and transnational motivations, and identified institutional and scholarly obstacles to pluralizing efforts in graduate archival education. This discussion was an effort to generate experientially-based data,

<sup>4</sup> See the AERI website at <http://aeri.gseis.ucla.edu/>, accessed 10 August 2010.

anecdotal evidence, and terminology that could be brought to bear in discussing potential strategies for promoting richer diversity in archival education. Strikingly, while participants themselves brought a broad range of experiences and contexts to the discussion, they widely agreed about both the need for and the challenges to developing archival curricula that are more culturally sensitive and aware.

Workshop participants also grappled with the language of plurality and the meanings of key terms, discussed current debates in other fields such as ethnic and gender studies, and determined that the term *pluralism*, not *diversity*, more accurately reflects an approach beneficial to archival studies.

*Diversity* as a concept, along with its supporting rhetoric and policy of multiculturalism, tends to play into “us” and “them” ways of thinking, emphasizing the differences between mainstream and minority or marginalized communities or groups. The consensus of workshop participants was that diversity is often used too simplistically as well as reductively and is overused to describe characteristics that are not culturally or socially substantive.<sup>5</sup> Such conceptions of diversity emphasize “pre-given cultural contents and customs,” while claiming to represent “...the separation of totalized cultures that live unsullied by the intertextuality of their historical locations, safe in the Utopianism of a mythic memory of a unique collective identity.”<sup>6</sup> The discourse on diversity simplistically construes minority or marginalized groups as groups unto themselves, without acknowledging the hybridity, complexity, and intersectionality of cultures and communities.

In contrast, *pluralism* does not privilege any one community or group. It acknowledges that considerable “messiness” and nuance need to be exposed, addressed, and engaged. Additionally, use of this term over others that are frequently employed in such discourse strives to give equal footing to the range of perspectives explored, encompassing such considerations as culture, race, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic standing, gender, gender identity, sexuality, disability, and citizenship status, as well as to recognize the intersections among them. Participants similarly preferred the term *archival studies* over *archival science* or *archival administration*, since it encompasses the fullest range of archival practice, ideas, and research from multiple professional, community, and disciplinary perspectives.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The same sentiment can also be found in literature on the topic. See, for example, Larry Ortiz and Jayshree Jani, “Critical Race Theory: A Transformational Model for Teaching Diversity,” *Journal of Social Work Education* (Spring/Summer 2010): 175–93.

<sup>6</sup> Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 50.

<sup>7</sup> For a fuller discussion on the scope of *archival studies* as opposed to *archival science*, see Kelvin White and Anne Gilliland, “Promoting Reflexivity and Inclusivity in Archival Education, Research and Practice,” *Library Quarterly* (July 2010): 231–48.

The participants agreed that the term *archival multiverse* is particularly resonant and encompasses the pluralism of evidentiary texts,<sup>8</sup> memory-keeping practices and institutions, bureaucratic and personal motivations, community perspectives and needs, and cultural and legal constructs with which archival professionals and academics must be prepared, through graduate education, to engage. Originally coined in 1895 by philosopher and psychologist William James, the term *multiverse* is used today to refer to the hypothetical set of multiple possible universes.<sup>9</sup> It has been explored in the context of many different disciplines, including cosmology, physics, astronomy, psychology, cultural studies, and literature.<sup>10</sup>

The overarching question is: How do we move from an archival universe dominated by one cultural paradigm to an archival multiverse; from a world constructed in terms of “the one” and “the other” to a world of multiple ways of knowing and practicing, of multiple narratives co-existing in one space? An important related question is: How do we accept that there may be incommensurable ontologies and epistemologies between communities that surface in differing cultural expressions and notions of cultural property and find ways to accept and work within that reality?

### Motivations and Goals

Recent research by professional archival organizations and scholars notes (and laments) the ethnic and sociocultural homogeneity of the archival profession.<sup>11</sup> In the past in the United States, men predominated in the profession, but today women predominate, with larger numbers of female than male archivists graduating from educational programs in library and information

<sup>8</sup> We have used the term *evidentiary texts* here to be inclusive of records as they exist in multiple cultural contexts because the term *records* could be read as pertaining only to institutional/bureaucratic forms of recordkeeping.

<sup>9</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. “multiverse,” <http://www.oed.com>, accessed 15 January, 2011.

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, Rajni Kothari, D. L. Sheth, and Ashis Nandy, eds., *The Multiverse of Democracy: Essays in Honour of Rajni Kothari* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1996); Ananta Kumar Giri, “Cosmopolitanism and Beyond: Towards a Multiverse of Transformations,” *Development and Change* 37, no. 6 (November 2006): 1277–92; and Helge Kragh, “Contemporary History of Cosmology and the Controversy over the Multiverse,” *Annals of Science* 66, no. 4 (October 2009): 529–51.

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, Society of American Archivists, *A\* Census Diversity Report* (2005), <http://www.archivists.org/a-census/reports/Banks-ACENSUS.pdf>; Adkins, “Our Journey Toward Diversity—and a Call to (More) Action”; White and Gilliland, “Promoting Reflexivity and Inclusivity in Archival Education, Research and Practice”; Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish, Zhang Bin, Kelvin White, Yang Lu, and Andrew Lau, “Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm: Can Archival Education in Pacific Rim Communities Address the Challenge?,” *American Archivist* (Spring/Summer 2008): 84–114; Anne J. Gilliland, Andrew Lau, Yang Lu, Sue McKemmish, Shilpa Rele, and Kelvin White, “Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm: Critical Discussions Around the Pacific Rim,” *Archives and Manuscripts* 35, no. 2 (November 2007): 10–39; and Anne Gilliland and Kelvin White, “Perpetuating and Extending the Archival Paradigm: The Historical and Contemporary Roles of Professional Education and Pedagogy,” *InterActions* 5, no. 1 (2009), <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/7wp1q908>, accessed 15 January, 2011.

science and *iSchools*, and, in general, a higher proportion of women than men entering higher education in fields that tend to feed into archival studies.<sup>12</sup> Some heartening evidence from demographic statistics kept by archival education programs and also by the Association for Library and Information Science Education suggests an increasingly ethnically and racially diverse student population is beginning to enter graduate archival studies and library and information science programs in the United States at least, thanks in part to initiatives undertaken by certain universities, professional associations, and federal funding agencies.<sup>13</sup> In the United Kingdom, programs to encourage people from diverse backgrounds in terms of culture, race, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic standing, gender, gender identity, sexuality, disability, and citizenship status to work in archives have had some limited success.<sup>14</sup>

This diversification, while still fledgling, has already begun to pressure the “one-size-fits-all” approach to both archival education and archival practice.<sup>15</sup> For example, educators at the workshop talked about their challenges of teaching an increasingly diverse student body, such as identifying culturally resonant case studies and examples, locating diverse practica sites, working with non-dominant language communities, and integrating oral traditions more fully, as well as a range of record types and media. Doctoral participants expressed the need to build educational experiences that are respectful of and relevant to the many cultural and community heritages of students in archival programs. Educators and students expressed a desire to work in closer and more equitable research partnerships with a wide range of communities external to existing institutional archival structures and who create, cocreate, or are the users of records. Many participants wanted to explore how to mobilize the archives to reclaim the past, preserve cultural memory, and address issues related to social justice, the digital divide, human rights, activism, and advocacy. All participants

<sup>12</sup> Adkins, “Our Journey Toward Diversity—and a Call to (More) Action,” 26. See also Linda J. Sax, *The Gender Gap in College: Maximizing the Developmental Potential of Women and Men* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008).

<sup>13</sup> For example, the 2002–2003 IMLS-funded PRAXIS Initiative, “Practice, Reflection, Advocacy, eXcellence, Inquiry, Solutions: A Pre-Doctoral and Recruitment Program for Tomorrow’s Culturally Diverse Information Studies Faculty and Leaders at UCLA,” <http://polaris.gseis.ucla.edu/cchu/praxis/about.htm>, accessed 15 January 2011; the IMLS-funded Spectrum Doctoral Fellowships (2007 and 2008); the ongoing IMLS-funded Building the Future of Archival Education and Research Project that involves a coalition of eight schools offering doctoral education in archival studies (Simmons College, UCLA, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of Pittsburgh, University of Texas at Austin, and University of Wisconsin at Madison), see <http://aeri.gseis.ucla.edu/index.htm>, accessed 15 January 2011; and the American Library Association Spectrum (implemented in 1997), Society of American Archivists Mosaic (implemented in 2009), and Midwest Archives Conference Archie Motley Memorial (implemented in 2004) Scholarships.

<sup>14</sup> For example, a Diversity Internship scheme between University College London (UCL) and the National Archives (TNA) ran for three years, from 2005 through 2008, combining a year at TNA and a year of study at UCL leading to a master’s qualification.

<sup>15</sup> Elizabeth Yakel, “The Future of the Past: A Survey of Graduates of Master’s-Level Archival Education Programs in the United States,” *American Archivist* 63, no. 2 (2000): 301–21.

wanted to explore ways to develop culturally sensitive curricula, pedagogies, and curricular initiatives that will provide educational and research support for archival work with and within communities. While there are many different kinds of communities (after all, both the archival profession and the academy are examples of different types of communities), the term *community* is used here in the context of other initiatives with which academics in many archival programs are likely to be familiar, such as community informatics, community-based research, student-community engagement, and community-university collaborations. The use of the term in these contexts reflects the desire, increasingly promoted by academic institutions, to engage in meaningful, mutually beneficial, and equitable interactions between the university and the social and cultural communities in which it is embedded or to which it is committed. While one can identify various excellent organizationally sponsored initiatives, there is no evidence that the archival field as a whole has contemplated the implications of working in such partnerships with communities. For example, what might be involved in engaging more directly with the individuals, perspectives, practices, and hierarchies that comprise communities that create, cocreate, or use records, as opposed to engaging with specific organizations within communities? Such partnerships might even lead to local and global revisions of such professional mainstays as best practices, technical standards, codes of ethics, archives laws, and the social and legal status of archival institutions.<sup>16</sup> One clear exception is found within appraisal theory and practice, which has been augmented since the 1970s by the application of various collecting and documentation strategies,<sup>17</sup> in an ongoing effort to contemplate the power relations inherent in determining value and identifying materials for collection or acquisition.

Workshop participants linked their motivations and goals in exploring ways to diversify the archival profession and pluralize archival education to concerns about being inclusive of multiple ways of knowing, and differing evidence and memory paradigms. Participants acknowledged that some individual archival educators are striving to rethink how and what they teach in light of a more diverse range of students in their classrooms and urgings from practitioners and

<sup>16</sup> While there are numerous individual cases of engagement with communities, overall we are still struggling to get a grasp on the day-to-day needs of our profession and have not routinely allotted time or resources to contemplating and solving the more difficult issues, such as development of day-to-day practices that do incorporate a pluralistic perspective. For a discussion of some of the implications of work with communities for professional archivists and archival scholars, see Andrew Flinn, "An Attack on Professionalism and Scholarship?": Democratising Archives and the Production of Knowledge," *Ariadne* 62 (2010), <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue62/flinn/>, accessed 15 January 2011.

<sup>17</sup> Hans Booms, "Society and the Formation of a Documentary Heritage: Issues in the Appraisal of Archival Sources," *Archivaria* 24 (1987): 69–107; Helen Samuels, "Who Controls the Past?," *American Archivist* 49 (1986): 109–24; Andrew Hinding, "Inventing a Concept of Documentation," *Journal of American History* 80, no. 1 (June 1993): 168–78; Larry J. Hackman and Joan Warnow-Blewett, "The Documentation Strategy Process: A Model and Case Study," *American Archivist* 50 (1987): 12–29.

particular minority groups.<sup>18</sup> But they noted that there has been no systematic, proactive, collective attempt by archival educators or archival education guidelines and accreditation requirements to support further diversification of the student body or to contemplate the implications of such diversification for the nature and scope of archival education, practice, and scholarship. A recent exception to this lack of systematic approaches and accountability for diversity in graduate archival education is the current review of course accreditation guidelines by the Australian Society of Archivists. The review findings are not yet finalized, but one of its guiding principles is the need to specify the requirements of more inclusive, culturally sensitive archival education. Findings from projects in Australia and the United States also support the development of a set of principles relating to inclusive, pluralistic, and culturally aware record-keeping education and training to inform the future development of educational programs, course recognition/accreditation processes, and the expectations set by employers and professional associations for ongoing professional development.<sup>19</sup>

Workshop participants also identified imperatives to address these concerns from the perspective of the needs, practices, and beliefs of Indigenous information ecologies around the world.<sup>20</sup> Information ecology draws upon the concepts and language of ecology to contemplate the interacting relationships, influences, and impacts of information, information technology, information creation and access, and knowledge structures. These interactions affect each of the phenomena above as well as economic, social, cultural, and geographical development, and popular movements and communities. Recent events, developments, and research findings highlight areas that need to be addressed and the often stark differences in worldviews and power structures relating to information and knowledge management and memory-keeping between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities. The United Nations Declaration on

<sup>18</sup> For example, see the website of the Diversity Recruitment Summit for the Information Professions held at UCLA, 18 September 2006, <http://isdiversity.gseis.ucla.edu/summit06/>, accessed 13 August 2010.

<sup>19</sup> This development drew upon the outcomes of the Australian Research Council Project, Trust and Technology: Building Archival Systems for Oral Memory (with research partners Monash University, the Public Record Office Victoria, the Koorie Heritage Trust, the Koorie Records Taskforce, and the Indigenous Issues Special Interest Group of the Australian Society of Archivists), and the UCLA-Monash-Renmin PacRim Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm Through Education Project. Gilliland et al., "Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm," 10–39; Monash University Trust and Technology Project, *Koorie Archiving: Trust and Technology Final Report* (Outcome 7) and *Statement of Principles on Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives* (Principle 6), <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/centres/cosi/projects/trust/deliverables/>, accessed 15 January 2011.

<sup>20</sup> For further discussion of information ecologies, see Rafael Capurro, "Towards an Information Ecology," in *Information and Quality*, ed. Irene Wormell (London: Taylor Graham, 1990); Thomas H. Davenport and Laurence Prusak, *Information Ecology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); Tim Finin, Anupam Joshi, Pranam Kolari, Akshay Java, Anubav Kale, and Amit Krandikar, "The Information Ecology of Social Media and Online Communities," *AI Magazine* 28, no. 3 (2007): 77–92; and John Seely Brown and Paul Duguid, *The Social Life of Information* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press, 2007).

Indigenous Rights in 2007,<sup>21</sup> in particular clauses 11,<sup>22</sup> 13,<sup>23</sup> and 31,<sup>24</sup> deals with Indigenous rights related to cultural traditions, customs, and knowledge that have implications for all archival institutions that hold records that contain Indigenous knowledge. Other significant developments include the development of Indigenous protocols such as the *Native American Protocols for Archival Materials* and the *Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islanders Library and Information Resources Network Protocols*;<sup>25</sup> the release of the *Statement of Principles Relating to Australian Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives*, designed to guide future archival practice, research, and education, and of the *Exposure Draft Position Statement on Human Rights, Indigenous Communities in Australia and the Archives*;<sup>26</sup> and the establishment of various archives, library, and museum working groups to address differences in traditional cultural expressions (TCE) and in ideas about

<sup>21</sup> United Nations General Assembly, *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, adopted by General Assembly Resolution 61/295, 13 September 2007, <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/drip.html>, accessed 13 August 2010. Of 147 nations, only Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States failed to support the declaration. Australia subsequently endorsed it in 2009.

<sup>22</sup> UN Declaration, Article 11:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to practise and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature.
2. States shall provide redress through effective mechanisms, which may include restitution, developed in conjunction with indigenous peoples, with respect to their cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free, prior and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs.

<sup>23</sup> UN Declaration, Article 13:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons.
2. States shall take effective measures to ensure that this right is protected and also to ensure that indigenous peoples can understand and be understood in political, legal and administrative proceedings, where necessary through the provision of interpretation or by other appropriate means.

<sup>24</sup> UN Declaration, Article 31:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions.
2. In conjunction with indigenous peoples, States shall take effective measures to recognize and protect the exercise of these rights.

<sup>25</sup> For example, First Circle Archivists, *Native American Protocols for Archival Materials* (2007), <http://www2.nau.edu/libnap-p/index.html>, 15 January 2011; and ATSILIRN, *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Library and Information Resources Network Protocols*, <http://www1.aiatsis.gov.au/atsilirn/protocols.atsilirn.asn.au/indexebd.html>, accessed 15 January 2011.

<sup>26</sup> Monash University Trust and Technology Project, *Koorie Archiving: Final Report, Statement of Principles, and Position Statement*.

cultural property. Workshop participants argued that addressing high-priority needs and exploring ways in which different worldviews might be accommodated or acknowledged as incommensurate, as has been demonstrated in research with Indigenous communities in Australia and in debates surrounding the *Native American Protocols* in the United States, are matters of urgency for both archival education and practice.<sup>27</sup>

### **Diversity, Pluralism, and Cultural Sensitivity—and Why They Matter to Archival Studies**

The workshop participants discussed the central roles of the record/the archive—in connecting people to their knowledge; in identity, accountability, and memory; and through the power of the archive—what is privileged, whose voices are heard, and whose voices are silenced. They argued that pluralist perspectives in archival education should acknowledge the roles of cultural and social contexts in defining and shaping the creation, preservation, and uses of records and archives. Pluralism also acknowledges that students will likely have differing experiential and cultural backgrounds as well as career motivations and goals. Specific topics to be addressed in a more pluralist delivery of archival education include the challenges of place within distance learning, the role of records in human rights disputes, and the need for students working in communities to appreciate different ways of knowing.

The rapid expansion of online archival studies programs and distance education has created a national and even international classroom environment in which students and faculty have very different needs and expectations. In this context, a pluralist perspective reflects a globalization of the archival curriculum that parallels the increasing proliferation of records creation, dissemination,

<sup>27</sup> A start in this endeavor has already been made. See the following: James Morrison, "Archives and Native Claims," *Archivaria* 9 (1979): 15–32; Chuck Hill, "Holding Onto the Past: Tribal Archives Preserve a People's History," *Tribal College* 1, no. 4 (1990): 16–19; Shauna McRanor, "Maintaining the Reliability of Aboriginal Oral Records and Their Material Manifestations: Implications for Archival Practice," *Archivaria* 43 (1997): 64–88; Margaret Durin, "Native American Imagemaking and the Spurious Canon of the 'Of-and-By,'" *Visual Anthropology Review* 15, no. 1 (1999): 70–74; Chris Hurley, "Parallel Provenance: If These Are Your Records, Where Are Your Stories?," *Records Continuum Research Group Publications* (2005), <http://www.sims.monash.edu.au/research/rcrg/publications/parallel-provenance-combined.pdf>, accessed 15 January 2011; Matthew Kurtz, "A Postcolonial Archive? On the Paradox of Practice in a Northwest Alaska Project," *Archivaria* 61 (2006): 63–90; Jacki Thompson Rand, "Why I Can't Visit the National Museum of the American Indian," *Common-Place* 7, no. 4 (July 2007), <http://www.common-place.org/vol-07/no-04/rand/>, accessed 15 January 2011; Fiona Ross, Sue McKemmish, and Shannon Faulkhead, "Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Designing Trusted Archival Systems for Koorie Communities," *Archives and Manuscripts* 34, no. 2 (2006): 112–51, <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/centres/cosi/projects/trust/rmf2006.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2010; Lynette Russell, "Indigenous Records and Archives: Mutual Obligations and Building Trust," *Archives and Manuscripts* 34, no. 1 (2006): 32–43; Sue McKemmish, Shannon Faulkhead, Livia Iacovino, and Kirsten Thorpe, "Australian Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Embracing Multiple Ways of Knowing and Keeping," *Archives and Manuscripts* 38, no. 1 (2010).

and use among networked global publics. Simultaneously, this approach seeks to ground students in their own local communities and contexts. For example, culturally aware distance education programs have the potential to make a major positive impact in remote areas where individuals and communities could not previously access formal archival education programs despite an immense need. However, distance education programs and programs that educate international or Indigenous students run the risk of exporting archival paradigms and practices, curricula, and pedagogies that are not sensitive to cultural, legal, and other differences. A course taught simultaneously by an Australian university in Australia and in Singapore, or a course taught by a British university that reaches students from a number of African and Asian countries, presents challenges that merit consideration from the archival field and from archival educators across different regions of the world.

In both the local and global contexts, pluralism emphasizes understanding the records of local, minority, and marginalized communities and community expectations of archives and archival professionals, as well as understanding of records and associated expectations of governments, corporations, academic institutions, and other large bureaucracies. The pluralist approach emphasizes issues such as the role that records and archives could and do play in creating and preserving cultural memory, and the role of records in truth and reconciliation commissions, in community recovery from human rights abuses, and in promulgating and addressing ethnic strife and political and social injustices. Such an approach implies that an examination of issues of power, domination, oppression, trust, equity, and representation as they relate to archives and records is infused across the archival curriculum and not merely covered briefly in ethics units that often come at the end of introductory courses.

As both academic and archival institutions increasingly create partnerships with diverse community groups for educational and research purposes, these new relationships should be mutually beneficial and equitable. For example, archival student internships or fieldwork placements within grassroots community organizations need to be flexible enough to meet the needs and fit in with the structures of the host organization while providing students with meaningful and useful educational experiences. While this is true for any kind of practicum experience, small and grassroots organizations often present particular challenges. They are often run by volunteers, open limited hours, and might even operate out of a community member's garage or basement. They might not have the kinds of equipment and supplies found in more mainstream archival organizations. Archival educators need to be prepared to address questions that arise "on the fly" when students are engaged in fieldwork and service learning and to elucidate and address ethical concerns that take on another dimension when they arise within and across multiple cultural communities.

Workshop participants expressed the belief that a pluralistic approach means that archivists should avoid imposing professional values as dogma on communities that might place value elsewhere. As Barbara Craig has argued in regard to archival appraisal, archivists and archival educators must recognize the effects of social norms on our decisions and the role that a formal concept of rationality plays in our approach to recordkeeping.<sup>28</sup> Educators need to examine closely with students kinds of values encoded within both professional and other value and belief statements, codes of ethics, and protocols to understand the intellectual lineage, assumptions, and practices behind them and the degree to which they are commensurate or incommensurate with each other. For example, faculty might ask students to review the *SAA Code of Ethics*, SAA's current strategic goals, and the *Native American Protocols for Archival Materials* to identify the ways in which each reinforces or fails to reinforce the other.

Pluralized education necessitates a strong critical, historical, and epistemological approach that delineates the lineage of different archival and memory-keeping traditions and exposes, defines, and debates the theoretical principles, key concepts, and ontological views they represent. Archival educators must acknowledge that nontextual materials may function as records in particular circumstances and address the essential roles of and management practices for those records within diverse communities. For example, many communities, such as Indigenous communities, conduct a large amount of their business and transfer their collective memories orally through rituals, performances, dances, songs, stories, imagery, and artifacts. Home movies and digital video are forms of nontextual records that document communities, personal lives, and political and activist movements in many different settings that increasingly find their way into special collections.<sup>29</sup> However, such acknowledgment and awareness does not necessarily mean that consensus can always be reached about whether or not certain materials or transactions constitute or create records. Inclusive archival education needs to accept the possibility of some incommensurability between pluralist perspectives—in other words, different ways of looking at the same phenomena cannot always be fully reconciled because they are simply different in some fundamental way. Such education needs to explore how to facilitate negotiation of common ground on which to build without assimilation into, or complete agreement with, the dominant perspective.

<sup>28</sup> Barbara L. Craig, "The Acts of the Appraisers: The Context, the Plan, and the Record," *Archivaria* 34 (1992): 175–80, 178.

<sup>29</sup> For example, see South Side Home Movie Project at the University of Chicago, [http://blackfilm.uchicago.edu/research\\_projects/south\\_side\\_project.shtml](http://blackfilm.uchicago.edu/research_projects/south_side_project.shtml), accessed 10 August 2010.

### What Is Culture?

Unpacking the concept of *culture* proved particularly challenging. Workshop leaders posed several questions: What is culture? What are the dominant cultural norms in current academic and archival worlds? Do these norms respect all forms of scholarship equally? And what might be alternatives to these norms? These questions underscored that, in addition to addressing national cultures, cultures integral to minority and marginalized groups, and professional archival culture, it is also essential to acknowledge that academia has its own set of principles, mores, and assumptions that set parameters for education and research and that can create barriers or limitations to pluralization of those activities.<sup>30</sup>

Participants argued that the archival field works with a very limited notion of *culture* in that archival practices themselves are not usually recognized as culturally embedded in the way that, for example, museum curatorship and conservation practices have been so recognized.<sup>31</sup> Defining *culture* in any kind of rigorous and comprehensive way was an exercise beyond the capacity of this workshop. In a brainstorming exercise, four groups of participants each created wide-ranging and differing lists that identified several facets of the concept of culture that bears upon archival practices, ideas, and community perspectives:

Group 1: Language, arts, meaning, state of mind, religion

Group 2: Heritage, collective knowledge, tradition, identity, community

Group 3: Spirituality, institutionalization, dynamism, education/learning

Group 4: People, rights, place, values, relationships

Participants also observed that Native American archivists at the 2008 Society of American Archivists Native American Roundtable meeting argued that the formation, ongoing care, and use of archives engages four dimensions—intellectual, physical, emotional, and spiritual—and not just the intellectual and the physical dimensions enshrined in the moral and physical defense of the archive as articulated by Jenkinson and embodied in archival practices such as arrangement and description. Similarly, Scott Cline argues that “archival being” consists of faith, radical self-understanding, intention, and integrity.<sup>32</sup> Drawing upon Native American spiritual traditions, Indigenous participants in the group suggested that a richer model might invoke the Medicine Wheel, which different peoples use to represent harmony and connections between peoples and

<sup>30</sup> For a discussion of the increasingly corporate culture of academia and its implications for archival education and advocacy, see Richard J. Cox, “Unpleasant Things: Teaching Advocacy in Archival Education Programs,” *InterActions* 5, no. 1 (2009), <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0408w1dv>, accessed 10 August 2010.

<sup>31</sup> Even if individual archivists are conscious of this embeddedness, it is often difficult to affect change in their places of employment.

<sup>32</sup> Scott Cline, “‘To the Limits of Our Integrity’: Reflections on Archival Being,” *American Archivist* 72, no. 2 (2009): 331–43.

ways.<sup>33</sup> Such models help to elucidate the complex of cultural considerations within which archivists operate and are used in some archival research and education programs, for example at the University of Washington and Oklahoma University, which emphasize working with Indigenous students and communities.

Workshop participants also identified dominant cultural paradigms in academia in general. In the academy, pervasive notions that rigorous scholarship is objective, value neutral, and/or apolitical reflect a dominant (and, arguably, insular) paradigm that can be problematic in a pluralist environment. The academy has been slow to acknowledge or incorporate the voices of “others” within its research methodologies, including Indigenous ways of knowing<sup>34</sup> and research methodologies.<sup>35</sup> Indigenous research methodologies include the community and community members as research partners rather than research subjects; use participatory research models that engage community partners in planning, designing, and implementing all aspects of the research; adhere to the view that the premise and intention enshrined in academic research ethics of doing no harm, physical or emotional, to research subjects can best be realized by engaging them as partners in the research; and aim to produce outcomes that directly benefit the community as well as the academic research

<sup>33</sup> Information-seeking research has examined the role played by affective and emotional aspects on users and on information research. See, for example, Carol Kuhlthau, “Inside the Search Process: Information Seeking from the User’s Perspective,” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 42, no. 5 (1991): 361–71 and “A Principle of Uncertainty for Information Seeking,” *Journal of Documentation* 49, no. 4 (1993): 339–55; Diane Nahl and Dania Bilal, eds., *Information and Emotion: The Emergent Affective Paradigm in Information Behavior Research and Theory* (Medford, N.J.: Information Today, 2007). Marcia H. Chappell explores how the “ethical and metaphysical premises characteristic of Hinduism are reflected in Ranganathan’s conception of the social and cosmic purpose of the library and of reference service as the basic means of fulfilling that purpose” in “The Place of Reference Service in Ranganathan’s Theory of Librarianship,” *Library Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (1976): 378. In “Good Intentions: Remembering through Framing Photographs in English Homes,” *Ethos* 71, no. 1 (2007): 51–76, Adam Drazin and David Frohlich report on an ethnographic study on the emotional and social aspects of selecting some family images for framing and how selecting and framing images acts as a “flag of good intentions” between the selector and the person in the photo, providing a pointer to how the affective and emotional might come into play in appraisal and acquisition activities. Archival research has yet to consider the possible impact of the affective and emotional on records creation, archives formation, preservation, and use, or indeed on archival research itself. One exception is Shannon Faulkhead’s PhD thesis, *Narratives of Koorie Victoria* (Faculty of Arts, Monash University, December 2008), which examines the use of Koorie oral records and institutional archival records in the creation of narratives, and the physical and emotional effects of the relationships between the two cultural discourses—those of the dominant Australian community and the Koorie community—captured in those narratives. It also explores the emotional dimension of conducting community-centered archival research.

<sup>34</sup> The term *Indigenous ways of knowing* encompasses but is not limited to “traditional knowledge,” which can be understood as the content and systems of knowledge of Indigenous peoples. See Ulia Popova-Gosart, “Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Indigenous Peoples,” in *Traditional Knowledge and Indigenous Peoples*, ed. Ulia Popova-Gosart (Geneva: L’auravet! an Information and Education Network of Indigenous Peoples and the World Intellectual Property Organization, WIPO Publication no. 1014E/R, 2009), 18.

<sup>35</sup> See Faulkhead, *Narratives of Koorie Victoria*, for an extended discussion of Indigenous research methods and protocols.

partners. Such community involvement in research is a form of decolonization. Various methods of data collection and analysis are applied within Indigenous research methodologies, depending on the research undertaken. Indigenous methodologies respect the community, individuals, and their knowledge throughout the research, and they emphasize shared outcomes. These methodologies can include, but are not limited to, participants' approval of the information they have provided (e.g., transcripts returned for changes, additions, and deletions), holding workshops to discuss and validate the findings, and providing plain English and/or community versions of the findings. Researchers who are not used to participatory, partnership-based approaches can find this form of research at odds with the research paradigms in which they were trained, and they may view it as problematic within an academic setting because it challenges mainstream views of research data ownership and intellectual property, as well as conventions relating to publication of research findings and authorship of research papers.

Indigenous research methodologies reject Western academic research paradigms that privilege the researcher as the expert in the research context and represent communities and their members as "sources" to be studied, the objects and subjects of research. Indigenous peoples (and others) have often been treated as repositories, and researchers recognize little or no responsibility to them after extracting their research data. Researchers typically are not expected to seek or provide extensive feedback on their results, and they do not always consult their sources if the information is to be used for another purpose. The research data collected tend to become the researchers' or their universities' intellectual property, and researchers are able to do what they like with such data within the restraints of their ethical constructs. Many Indigenous peoples worldwide do not view these transactions in the same way as do researchers. They may view the sharing of their knowledge with researchers as a method of educating others but believe their knowledge still belongs to them, not to the researcher. Many also view research as inclusive, with consultation continuing beyond the information-gathering stage into the final outcomes of the research.

The tenure system and evaluations of research outputs in the social sciences privilege sole-authored, peer-refereed scholarship over an inclusive, group-created, community-driven, consensus-based approach and nonscholarly forms of publication that may include joint authorship with whole communities. (And, of course, nonacademic community members do not have direct input in promotion and tenure processes.) University structures militate against and undervalue multidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity through the processes of tenure and publication, despite prevalent rhetoric to the contrary. Competition and strict tenure schedules have repeatedly been criticized as prejudicial to the success of women and other minorities who are often juggling competing family

and community demands with those of academia.<sup>36</sup> Workshop participants also criticized academic hierarchies for reinforcing rather than challenging who has the right to speak and who gets silenced, thus re-inscribing gender, race, class, and sexuality-based inequalities.

The dominant cultural paradigm for archival education determines and perpetuates accepted definitions of the record and the archive, privileging a Eurocentric emphasis on the fixed (especially the written and the textual) and the chronological over oral, performative, and multidimensional forms of recordkeeping. The types of materials treated as records, the kinds of entities considered to be archives, and the intellectual lineage and rationales for the archival principles and practices that comprise the internationally understood archival paradigm do not fully reflect or take into account the diversity of many contemporary societies. Diana Taylor describes embodied memory in terms of performance as acts of cultural transmission, a conception of the record that fundamentally subverts the prototype of the textual document as the form of the record. The performative record's challenge to the mainstream archival epistemology elides the concept of "authenticity" and the notion of the record itself, with the medium and permanence of the record.<sup>37</sup> Terry Cook describes the postcustodial view of archival activity from "product-focused to a process-oriented activity, from matter to mind."<sup>38</sup> Recordkeeping classification schemes developed by creators for current records and descriptive standards implemented for archival records frequently reflect a hegemonic Western worldview entirely foreign to the communities being described and discussed.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>36</sup> See, for example, Uma Jayakumar, Tyrone Howard, Walter Allen, and June Han, "Racial Privilege in the Professoriate: An Exploration of Campus Climate, Retention, and Satisfaction," *Journal of Higher Education* (2009). This article addresses issues relating both to women and racial minorities and also includes a good literature review for those interested in reading further.

<sup>37</sup> Diane Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003).

<sup>38</sup> Terry Cook, "What Is Past Is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas from 1898 to the Future Paradigm Shift," *Archivaria* 43 (1997): 48; see also Terry Cook and Joan M. Schwartz, "Archives, Records, and Power: From (Postmodern) Theory to (Archival) Performance," *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 171–85.

<sup>39</sup> Yakel uses the term "archival representation" to include arrangement, description, processing, and archival cataloging, but also extends it to refer to the systems that contain surrogates of archival materials. She offers an important insight that the practice of creating (and indeed, perpetuating and revising) representations of archival materials is a "fluid, evolving, and socially constructed practice (p. 1)." While archivists may not "classify" in the sense that librarians do using Library of Congress Classification or Dewey Decimal Classification, the very construction of the finding aid as an authoritative index to a collection is predicated on a particular ontology. For example, the Houghton Library at Harvard University employs a system of shelf marks to categorize manuscript collections. Other concurrent representational systems include accession numbers (denoting the yearly growth of a collection), storage numbers (used to indicate collections that have not been completely processed), call numbers (to integrate the manuscripts collections into the larger library system), among others. See Elizabeth Yakel, "Archival Representation," *Archival Science* 3, no. 1 (2003): 1–25. An example of a revamped vocabulary developed for a museum collection catalog can be found in Janine Bowe chop and Patricia Pierce Erikson, "Forging Indigenous Methodologies on Cape Flattery: The Makah Museum as a Center of Collaborative Research," *American Indian Quarterly* 29, nos. 1 and 2 (Winter/Spring 2005): 263–73.

Predominant Western notions of provenance privilege the singular creator of records—the person or organization that sets the records aside—and treat all other parties to the transaction as subjects, rather than cocreators, of the records. These notions can be juxtaposed to emerging ideas about simultaneous multiple provenance, parallel provenance, and cocreatorship in postcolonial settings.<sup>40</sup> They have large implications for archival theory and practice as they challenge existing constructs of the archive itself, as well as ownership and other rights in records. They point to the needs to account for the multiple perspectives and requirements of the cocreators of records in appraisal decisions; to capture their multiple perspectives and contexts in archival description; and to reflect and to negotiate a matrix of mutual rights and obligations in archival policy making and in the development of professional codes of ethics.

Workshop participants challenged prevailing cultural norms and expressed the need for personal self-examination and professional reflexivity to expose cultural and institutional hierarchies operating, often quite transparently, in academia in general and archival studies programs in particular. Central to this reflexivity is acknowledgment of the many ways in which the self interacts with the dominant cultural paradigm when engaged in archival education, research, or practice. The professional self also tends to be born of one particular archival tradition and may well lack awareness of how archival traditions vary across nations, jurisdictions, and communities. For example, the InterPARES research projects<sup>41</sup> developed terminologies and detailed definitions to account for the variant terms and conceptualizations of different archival traditions as well as those of other disciplines and media fields. Participating archival researchers from North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia recognized considerable variance in understandings not only of technological, but also of key archival terms, such as *record*, *document*, and *appraisal*. As more archival academics collaborate with international colleagues, move to other countries to work, or encounter cohorts of students from a variety of communities, their perspectives on the “givens” of their academic and professional cultures may well evolve.

### **Alternatives to Dominant Cultural Paradigms**

Workshop participants discussed paradigms that challenge those dominant in professional culture, academic culture, and community culture and that go beyond the broadening of the cultural makeup of students and faculty to include different cultures and acknowledge diverse epistemologies and ontologies. They looked to a future in which boundaries between students and professors

<sup>40</sup> Chris Hurley, “Parallel Provenance,” at <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/groups/rcrg/publications/parallel-provenance-combined.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2010.

<sup>41</sup> See the InterPARES Projects website, <http://www.interpares.org>, accessed 17 August 2010.

are increasingly eroded, so that the professor is no longer the sole authority in the classroom, community teachers such as Elders can be included, and students are empowered to inform the learning and teaching process. Similarly, they pointed to research methodologies in which the relationships between researcher and “subject” are reconfigured, and pioneering participatory research models in which “research subjects” are redefined as partners in research. For example, in the United Kingdom, researchers used ethnographic methods, including participant observation, to explore various forms of engagement between mainstream, publicly funded archives and independent “community archives.”<sup>42</sup> Research outputs included co-authored work, the fostering of shared memories in the archive, and the idea of archives as social processes. In Australia, two Australian Research Council-funded projects, *Trust and Technology: Building Archival Systems for Indigenous Oral Memory*<sup>43</sup> and *Holding Gunditjmarra Knowledge: People and Records Working Together*, epitomize this approach. Research in these projects is based on a participatory model, avoiding approaches that involve a recolonization or misappropriation of Indigenous knowledge by researchers. The Trust and Technology Project research team calls this kind of partnership research “reconciling research” as it involves a collaborative, cocreative journey that engages Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers, Indigenous and archival communities, stakeholders in government, and the general community. Partnership research acknowledges multiple sources of knowledge and promotes the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination of knowledge.<sup>44</sup>

### Curricular and Pedagogical Strategies

Finally, workshop participants addressed questions about building culturally sensitive curricula and teaching and learning methods. In academia generally, curricula could reflect and engage multiple worldviews more integrally and

<sup>42</sup> Mary Stevens, Andrew Flinn, and Elizabeth Shepherd, “New Frameworks for Community Engagement in the Archives Sector: From Handing Over to Handing On,” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16, nos. 1–2 (2010): 59–76; University College London, “Community Archives and Identities Research Project,” <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/infostudies/research/icarus/community-archives/>, accessed 3 August 2010; and X. Ajamu, Topher Campbell, and Mary Stevens, “Love and Lubrication in the Archives, or Rukus!: A Black Queer Archive for the United Kingdom,” *Archivaria* 68 (2010).

<sup>43</sup> Monash University, Information Technology, “Trust and Technology Project,” <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/centres/cosi/projects/trust/>, accessed 10 August 2010.

<sup>44</sup> For explanations of participatory community-based research, see Shannon Faulkhead, Lynette Russell, Diane Singh, and Sue McKemmish, “Is Community Research Possible within the Western Academic Tradition?,” in *Researching with Communities: Grounded Perspectives on Engaging Communities in Research*, eds. A. Williamson and R. DeSouza (Waitakere City, New Zealand: Muddy Creek Press, 2008); Shannon Faulkhead, “Connecting Through Records: Narratives of Koorie Victoria,” *Archives and Manuscripts* 37, no. 2 (2009): 60–88; R. Stoecker, *Research Methods for Community Change: a Project-based Approach* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2005).

substantially by encouraging all participants in the educational process to be more explicit about their own sociocultural viewpoints and cultural baggage. Archival educators could urge their academic departments and tenure committees to acknowledge the contributions of nontextual scholarship and to accept different formats for dissertations. In many major universities, a dissertation still needs to be a textual document as it is still widely believed that this medium best supports academic rigor and widespread communication of the research across time, while training the student in the discursive and public practices needed to be a successful academic. Such regulations, however, necessitate that students who, because of their cultural background or preferred modalities would naturally conduct and present their research orally or using nontextual media, must translate their work into the textual submission required by academia, even if some of its cultural meaning and richness is lost.

Faculty could also better engage communities by formally valuing community knowledge keepers regardless of formal academic qualifications, by challenging the privileging of professional knowledge over community-based approaches, and by enhancing a commitment to public scholarship.<sup>45</sup> Faculty should prioritize the creation of safe spaces for respectful disagreement in their classrooms, encouraging cooperation and creativity, and exploring multidisciplinary and student-centered approaches to learning.

Within archival studies, curricula can be pluralized to reflect the multiplicity of ontologies and epistemologies that can contribute to archival theory and practice. In addition to examining the needs of government, business, and academic institutions, archival education programs could explore other, noninstitutional forms of record-creating and keeping, such as oral traditions,

<sup>45</sup> The University of Minnesota Public Scholarship Committee provides a thoughtful definition of the term:

“At the level of the institution, public scholarship means optimizing the extent to which University research informs and is informed by the public good, maximizes the generation and transfer of knowledge and technology, educates the public about what research the University does, and listens to the public about what research needs to be done. This scholarship contributes to the intellectual and social capital of the University and the State (and larger regions), and includes (but is not limited to) the transfer of knowledge and technology that contributes to improved quality of life for significant portions of the populous.

This definition does not assume that *the public* speaks with a single voice, nor that University faculty and staff must respond to every interest present among diverse voices; rather, this definition suggests that significant portions of the University’s scholarship will be conducted within the context of ongoing interaction with individuals, organizations, and communities beyond the University campus. Similarly, this definition does not relieve the University of responsibility for providing intellectual and artistic leadership in its work; rather, this definition suggests that University faculty, staff, and students will work, whenever possible, to define and implement research and scholarship that respects and reflects the interests and needs of the broader community. Finally, this definition assumes that the University has an affirmative obligation to inform the public about its work—about what faculty, staff and students do, how they do it, and what it might mean. In this way, the very process of academic scholarship—whether in and of itself *public*—contributes to the intellectual capital of our State.” David Hamilton and Scott McConnell, “Reports and References—Public Scholarship Committee” (University of Minnesota, 2005), <http://www1.umn.edu/civic/archives/cholar.html>, accessed 10 August 2010.

performative “records,” and artists’ documentation practices (to name only a few), and involve relevant community stakeholders in the educational process. By acknowledging multiple views of existing concepts, standards, and practices, archivists and archival educators can work together to expand the field to include nondominant views. For example, the inclusion of oral recordkeeping traditions and their differences from oral history practices in curricula moves ideas about the record and the role and practice of recordkeeping in different communities beyond the current emphasis on written documents. A discussion of culturally informed notions of permanence that addresses the place of ephemerality, with concomitant cultural differences in valuing the rights to forget and to decay, challenges mainstream archival notions of preservation and access. Similarly, a classroom discussion on provenance that addresses the concepts of cocreatorship (that is, acknowledging that the subjects or the correspondents of the records have status and rights as cocreators, together with the official records’ creator or creating agency) and other mutual rights in records of multiple, simultaneous, and parallel provenance might raise questions as to whether current archival standards privilege the notion of a sole creator and assign only a limited range of rights to other parties to the transaction or the records, and under what circumstances this might either be appropriate or unacceptable. Such a discussion would ideally also address alternative notions about ownership. Western archival practices developed in association with Western legal frameworks, and thus our practices reflect cultural notions about individual ownership, individual property transfer, and individual use. However, it is also important for archivists and archival educators to consider notions from outside these legal frameworks, such as those expressed by many Indigenous groups around the world, of collective community ownership of certain kinds of “traditional knowledge” and the idea that some knowledge and information should not or cannot be owned.<sup>46</sup> Teaching future archival practitioners to be self-reflexive from the start of their formal education can encourage critical thinking about the profession that can push the field forward. Finally, archival educators should not be paralyzed by questioning current archival thinking but rather inspired to increase their involvement in advocacy and activism as the field expands.

### **Proposing a Model for Pluralizing Archival Education**

Archival studies education programs are conceptualized in strikingly similar ways worldwide,<sup>47</sup> largely because of the overarching bureaucratically—and

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, Popova-Gosart, *Traditional Knowledge and Indigenous Peoples*.

<sup>47</sup> Gilliland et al., “Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm.”

legally-centered paradigms developed and exported from Europe through colonialism, evangelism, mercantilism, and technological developments, and later codified through national and international standards and terminologies, especially those developed by the International Council on Archives (ICA) and the International Standards Organization (ISO).<sup>48</sup> However, archival curricula could be expanded in many ways to better reflect the archival multiverse. Pluralized curricula emerge from pluralized classrooms, from broader engagement in curriculum development, and from partnerships and alliances that bridge the academy and the community (including communities of practice, such as professional archivists).

In contemplating ways to move toward educating for the archival multiverse, workshop participants first reviewed the framework proposed by Kelvin White. His framework lays out six elements:

- *Conceptual expansion*, for example, incorporating different conceptualizations of the record by different communities, particularly those with non-Western epistemologies.
- *Embeddedness*, for example, locating field and service learning experiences within communities to gain a richer understanding of community needs.
- *Collaboration*, for example, partnering with community-based organizations in efforts to cultivate equitable, mutually beneficial, long-term teaching, learning, and research partnerships.
- *Leadership, activism, and ethics*, for example, expanding the archival role in promoting the visibility of underdocumented communities.
- *Sustainability*, for example, planning and developing programs that are sensitive to the community's resources and relevant to its cultural protocols.
- *Reflexivity*, for example, critically examining the body of knowledge comprising archival theory and practice, but also the role and standpoint of the archival instructor, scholar, or professional.<sup>49</sup>

Using White's framework and their own discussions and experiences, workshop participants proposed a pluralization model for consideration by archival educators, archival education programs, and professional bodies that develop archival education guidelines and/or accredit archival education programs and courses. In the United States, the American Library Association accredits library and information science and iSchools, including archival studies specializations. The accreditation program evaluates the extent to which programs meet the educational goals and objectives they have established for

<sup>48</sup> Gilliland and White, "Perpetuating and Extending the Archival Paradigm."

<sup>49</sup> Kelvin L. White, "Mestizaje and Remembering in Afro-Mexican Communities of the Costa Chica: Implications for Archival Education in Mexico," *Archival Science* 9, nos. 1–2 (2009).

themselves. If a program sets goals and objectives related to diversity or pluralization, it will be held accountable for how well it meets them. Diversity assessments have recently been built into the accreditation review process for archival education.

The model is comprised of eight objectives, some of which are most relevant to graduate archival studies programs that have one or more career faculty engaged in both teaching and research, and others that could be undertaken within the context of any archival education venue or individual course or workshop. All probably involve educating the educators, be they full-time academics, adjuncts, or professional workshop instructors, in pluralizing archival education, and PACG intends to address this issue further as its work progresses.

### ***Objective 1: Historicize and Contextualize Archival Theory and Practice***

#### *Rationales*

By providing students with the intellectual lineages of archival ideas and practices, archival educators can contextualize them so that students learn to locate the origins of current archival thinking within a specific historical place and time. Many master's programs already do this, and much of the professional literature provides useful historical analyses of trends in practice and emergent theories. The workshop participants supported these efforts as an important element of archival education as it enables students to see how key concepts are culturally derived and not simply archival givens. Much of the existing literature has focused on understanding dominant professional traditions within our own countries and national traditions, but archival educators should also address the ways in which non-Western, nondominant cultures view important concepts, such as the object, preservation, access, history, and memory, that are key to understanding the perspectives of the creators/participants/stakeholders in the archival multiverse. The multiverse seeks to understand multiple perspectives as equally worthy of consideration and not as mere "alternatives" to the dominant paradigm. These perspectives may address aspects of archival theory and practice that are not commonly taught, including reference to the physical, intellectual, emotional, and spiritual dimensions of archival records.

#### *Considerations*

This approach might lead to the rewriting of existing archival paradigms or the introduction of new paradigms. If so, what would be the consequences? Would a new paradigm be broader, more integratively inclusive than, or parallel/

complementary to, what is currently taught? Could it co-exist with other paradigms? Are old and new paradigms reconcilable? Does training future archival practitioners in multiple paradigms make it easier or more difficult for them to work in certain institutional or community contexts?

***Objective 2: Expand Existing Curricula to Focus on Core Archival Concepts and Values as Well as Processes***

*Rationales*

To reflect the plural world in which we teach, learn, and live, archival curricula could be refigured as concept- rather than process-based. Core concepts such as *trust*, *evidence*, *accountability*, *creatorship/cocreatorship*, *ownership*, *authenticity*, *authority*, *access*, and *permanence* can form the bases of curricula rather than archival processes such as appraisal, arrangement, and description around which current, often highly linear, curricular standards and hence programs are structured. This approach could address how these concepts are understood in different cultures and might open up the classrooms to multiple ways of viewing archives. In expanding the current curriculum, educators should consider the impact of timing and sequencing. By including multiple approaches to archives from the very beginning of graduate programs, educators convey that pluralism is iteratively reinforced as an integral and important part of archival education.

*Considerations*

As a framework for pluralism, this approach encourages educators and students to articulate the critical values implicit in archival practice and ideas that characterize the field—for example, its focus on the production and management of documentary evidence; its concern with the passage and use of that evidence across time; and its support of accountability, enterprise, human rights, and preservation and transmission of documentary heritage. What resources are available for educators to draw upon to make archival values explicit? For example, do professional codes of ethics sufficiently articulate those values? How do educators and students come to terms with competing codes of ethics? Educators and students will also have to be held accountable through the disclosure of their own viewpoints, thus creating an opportunity to surface and then negotiate between personal, community, and professional values. Furthermore, who would be qualified to teach about recordkeeping practices in multiple community or cultural settings? How would we prepare educators for this task? On a larger level, to do this well would require a complete

reconceptualization of how archival programs are structured and sequenced—a laborious, expensive, and lengthy process to implement.

### ***Objective 3: Encourage Multidisciplinarity***

#### *Rationales*

One way to expand current archival education is to encourage multidisciplinary approaches that inform archival work. Archival studies students should be encouraged to enroll in courses in other departments, including those outside the areas traditionally regarded as ancillary to archival science, for example ethnic and gender studies, computer science, law, anthropology, and ethnomusicology, both to enhance archival practice with approaches from other fields and to inform other disciplines about how archivists approach their work. Interdisciplinary courses could be cross-listed and cotaught by faculty members across diverse departments. Multidisciplinarity can be built into the mentorship and advising processes so that students are assigned mentors outside the archival studies program in addition to their archival studies advisors. Practicing archivists can continue to work with nonarchivists and report their experiences with multi-institutional or multidiscipline projects as case studies. Within archival studies courses, faculty can employ multiple frameworks such as those developed in cultural studies, postcolonial studies, ethnic studies, gender studies, and critical race studies as lenses through which to examine archives and records-related phenomena. Pluralism and multidisciplinarity can be embedded in the archival curriculum from the start to convey that such issues are central to every aspect of archival theory and practice.

#### *Considerations*

Archival curricula already tend to be overstuffed with topics and courses judged essential or desirable ancillary elements for the professional archivist. Encouraging further multidisciplinarity could add even more requirements into archival curricula. It could also generate logistical problems since archival studies programs usually have little control over the nature and scheduling of course offerings or student admission into courses in other departments. Doctoral students can be encouraged to pursue multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches that often offer extremely fertile, nuanced, and underinvestigated questions for study. While students pursuing interdisciplinary projects may face challenges in terms of the departmental emphasis placed on doctoral committee makeup (for example, UCLA requires that three out of

four members be from the student's home department) and funding sources, such challenges are not insurmountable.

#### ***Objective 4: Strengthen Community Engagement***

##### *Rationales*

Strengthening community engagement is another important component of pluralizing the curriculum. Archival educators can invite speakers representing different perspectives and communities to present in class; creative use of videoconferencing can bring in remote and international speakers to talk about and demonstrate their activities and projects. With their permission, such speakers could be taped and access to their talks could be provided online to include students in other countries who have limited access to print publications. Programs might also utilize formal titles and roles from within the academy, such as visiting artist or senior fellow, to bring community elders and other teachers inside the academy. Developing free “archival and recordkeeping aid” clinics, similar to free legal aid clinics run by law school students, could also engage students and communities. Students and faculty members would volunteer to host “clinics” in community settings, such as community centers, libraries, and churches, where community members could ask records/archives-related questions on topics as diverse as document preservation, genealogical research, historic preservation projects, and photograph and video management. Similarly, archival educators and students could work with student groups on campus to help them preserve their records and document their activities, similar to the student-run Bruin Archives Project at UCLA.<sup>50</sup> By recognizing that students have multiple identities and are themselves members of communities, educators can formalize student involvement in documenting their own communities through credit-granting service learning units. Educators can also solicit input from community members and practitioners on curricula to ensure that theoretical frameworks and skills students are learning accurately reflect community needs. All of these approaches nurture a collaborative learning environment between community and classroom so that learning is located in communities and community members and their interests are brought into classrooms.

##### *Considerations*

Evaluation and reflexivity should be built into all community collaborations so that dialogue, debriefings, and community-wide presentations are integral

<sup>50</sup> Bruin Archives Project, <http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/bap/>, accessed 10 August 2010.

components of service learning projects. While community partnerships present a host of challenges, such as quality control, strategic implementation, and negotiation of power positions, we believe such challenges can be overcome and can ultimately help build long-term relationships.

#### **Objective 5: Promote Service Learning**

##### *Rationales*

Many graduate archival education programs offer internships or practica to provide students with the opportunity to reflect on real-world experience. Workshop attendees thought that service learning, another hands-on approach, should also be provided to students as it can serve the multiple purposes of reaching out to various communities, developing real-world experience, and instilling an ethic of service in future archivists. Service learning combines community service with instruction and reflection so that it is more guided than volunteer work but is more service oriented than an internship. This approach seeks “measurable change in both the recipient and the provider of the service . . . the result [of which] is a radically transformative method of teaching students.”<sup>51</sup> Service learning opportunities have the potential to enhance and expand beyond the typical semester-long fieldwork in a traditional archival setting, potentially spanning the entire duration of the master’s degree, resulting in a more meaningful commitment and comprising a high portion of degree credit earned. Several students can be matched with the same organization—for example, schools, community organizations, faith-based organizations, and charities—for specific projects so that together they make an even greater impact on participating organizations. After these service learning programs have been established for several years, alumni from the archival studies program who completed service learning projects at the same participating organizations can mentor or volunteer to supervise students at service learning to ensure continuity and expertise, especially where no professional supervisor is on site. Notably, some of these efforts extend beyond the widely held perceptions of the domain of archival studies and may provide students with opportunities to engage in a range of information-related activities. For example, several generations of students from UCLA’s Department of Information Studies have developed ongoing volunteer relationships with a local juvenile detention center, a day labor center, several Los Angeles area lesbian-gay-bisexual-transsexual organizations, and campus student groups through their required

<sup>51</sup> National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, <http://www.servicelearning.org>, accessed 15 January 2011.

service learning experiences. At Glendale Community College in Los Angeles, the ongoing New Media Leaders project engages community college students in critical discussions about new media, leadership, and community engagement. The project was (and continues to be) implemented as a course with an integrated service learning component in which students are placed with community organizations to work for the duration of the term. Here, service learning is crucial to the work performed by these organizations and aims to expose and instill a sense of leadership among the students. Such activities range from the immediate concerns of outreach to developing in-house content to support the missions and goals of the organization. While archival concerns for the purposes of this project tend to be overshadowed by the emphasis on new media, students participating in the New Media Leaders project have demonstrated increasing attention to issues of interest to the archival field, such as storage, preservation of, and access to content, and the community organizations' accountability to their stakeholder communities and funders (and what sorts of records can be used for these purposes), among others.

#### *Considerations*

While the logic behind requirements on many campuses that fieldwork and practica be supervised by credentialed individuals is evident, such requirements limit community engagement by allowing students to be situated only at well-established organizations that can afford to hire a professional archivist, preventing sustained service learning projects from taking place at smaller community organizations where student archivists can make a lasting and profound impact and experience alternative recordkeeping and documentary environments and practices. A comprehensive service learning requirement, however, needs to be carefully coordinated between archival studies programs and host sites, and its nature and rationale presented thoughtfully to those sites and to students. Otherwise it might be perceived as unpaid drudge work by either the sites or the students. Additionally, educators must recognize that supervising new workers is very time consuming for site partners. The length of time each student is required to commit must be carefully balanced between the student's scheduling needs and the site's need for effective service.

**Objective 6: Pluralize Doctoral Education***Rationales*

The development of a robust and diverse corpus of educators inside the academy is a component of archival education. Archival studies programs worldwide have burgeoned in both size and number at the same time as academia has tightened its scholarly requirements for full-time faculty. To hold positions in the professoriate today, educators need to hold an earned doctorate and to be integrally engaged in scholarship as well as teaching. Research in higher education also indicates that the personal background of existing faculty members, especially their race and ethnicity, play a key role in attracting students (or not) from underrepresented backgrounds into educational programs.<sup>52</sup> These factors raise considerations about the kind of doctoral education to best prepare future full-time archival educators, how to recruit a more diverse corpus, and how best to integrate practitioner and community educators into an increasingly academic and scholarly education structure.

Doctoral programs can employ strategies such as incorporating courses in diverse research methods and critical frameworks from an array of fields and thinking broadly about what constitutes research in archival studies. Students from diverse backgrounds may wish to research phenomena not traditionally considered to be within the scope of mainstream archival theory and practice but that address perspectives, needs, and situations specific to minority or other marginalized populations. Programs can encourage pluralism in PhD supervision that might be limited within the student's own program by allowing doctoral candidates to have co-advisors from different departments or campuses, both nationally and internationally. As with their professional students, programs can also encourage doctoral students to work with communities outside of the university and recognize that such community work can be an integral and valid part of doctoral studies. An existing model is the Collaborative Doctoral Awards (CDAs) in the United Kingdom, funded by some research councils to encourage cooperation between institutions (for example, national or regional archives or museums) and graduate programs. The university and the partner institution jointly supervise doctoral students, and the partner institutions, in collaboration with the doctoral student initially determine the choice of research project. Such projects generally have an applied or case-study aspect to the data collection, based on work within the partner institution, thus enabling the doctoral student to develop useful work-based skills as well as academic research.

<sup>52</sup> See, for example, National Academy of Engineering Online Ethics Center for Engineering, "The Role Model Argument and Faculty Diversity (Abstract)" (27 July 2006), <http://www.onlineethics.org/Topics/Diversity/DiverseEssays/Abstracts/abstractsindex/fac-diverse.aspx>, accessed 22 October 2010.

Such collaborations help to bridge the technology and knowledge transfer “gap” between the academy and the workplace.<sup>53</sup>

#### *Considerations*

Because of the length of typical doctoral programs and because students tend to enter them, especially those coming out of professional practice, older than those in professional programs, the availability of adequate financial support is essential to attract a varied cohort of students and to promote and a broader and more multidisciplinary range of research. What is more, it is not sufficient to recruit, prepare, and graduate these doctoral students. They also need to be tracked into faculty positions, mentored on an ongoing basis, and be sufficiently rigorous and competitive so that their work will be accepted for publication or presentation in top peer-reviewed venues that might not always be receptive to these new forms and areas of scholarship.

#### **Objective 7: Pluralize The Student Body**

##### *Rationales*

Neither the archival profession nor the student bodies within archival studies programs reflects the plural composition of our societies. As archival educators, we must make targeted efforts to encourage secondary school students and undergraduates from a variety of backgrounds to attend archival graduate programs. For example, by developing an undergraduate minor in an area related to records and recordkeeping, we can begin to educate college students about archival work. Joint graduate degrees with religious, ethnic, gender, and disability studies will also help to draw in students who might otherwise not have thought about pursuing archival work. Other strategies include reaching out to high schools and colleges with historically underrepresented populations, such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in the United States, as well as restructuring current graduate school admissions requirements to explicitly include indicators of strong potential for successful graduate work and careers that might be exhibited by applicants from less traditional backgrounds or for whom limited prior academic opportunities had been available. We must also provide meaningful financial and academic support so that community members and stakeholders in archival work can be empowered to become professional archivists.

<sup>53</sup> See for example, CDA program supported by the U.K. Arts and Humanities Research Council, <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundingOpportunities/Pages/CollaborativeDoctoralAwards.aspx>, accessed 15 January 2011.

*Considerations*

As the student body becomes more diversified, archival educators should acknowledge multiple and complex identities and help prepare students for positions that bridge multiple communities and practices. Archival educators should make it a priority to learn students' backgrounds and acknowledge the wisdom and lived experiences students bring to the educational endeavor. A participatory, student-centered educational approach encourages self-reflexivity, deprivileges the professor as the sole authoritative source of knowledge, and gives students the opportunity to share relevant personal experiences in the classroom. For example, archival educators can stimulate discussion of the ways in which archives are personally relevant to the students and their communities by asking students to define what a record is to them and to discuss their own personal collecting, journaling, archiving, preservation, and use practices.

**Objective 8: Ensure that Pluralism and Inclusivity Are  
Prioritized in Archival Education and Research**

*Rationales*

We must commit to sustaining this energy to pluralize the archival curricula by maintaining a forum to continue this discussion and encouraging others to join. Identifying and building infrastructure are crucial to support projects that explore and promote the archival multiverse, including working with funders and institutional resource allocators to support ongoing efforts at pluralizing archival education. Engaging in continual and public self-reflexivity is also key to ensuring that plurality remains a priority and that archival educators make their values explicit and encourage their students to do the same. Self-reflexivity also holds educators accountable by creating a culture of disclosure in which participants are open and honest about their viewpoints and value systems. Admitting that we, as archival educators, can and should do better at teaching and thinking about the multiverse is an important first step in pluralizing the curriculum.

*Considerations*

If this work is seen to be meaningful, stimulating, and outcomes-oriented, it will continue to attract students and faculty. However, its continued progress and its perceived value would be reinforced if evaluation and accountability mechanisms are developed; for example, if pluralization efforts could be

assessed as part of program accreditation and could be added as a consideration in promotion and tenure actions.

While this model may at first glance seem daunting, its curricular implementation is predominantly about ensuring that sufficient contextualization is provided for any archival topic; that students are versed in the appropriate practical, theoretical, and methodological tools; and that instruction is centered around asking and answering critical questions on the part of both instructors and students, as well as engaging other relevant parties in the discussion (for example, by using guest speakers, site visits, and service learning). Appendix 1 provides an example of a curricular model for professional archival education incorporating the pluralization model and mapped out at the workshop.

### **C o n c l u s i o n**

We have tried to describe, from the perspectives of participants at the Developing Culturally Sensitive Archival Curricula Workshop held at AERI 2009, the characteristics of a pluralized archival curriculum that might more closely reflect the archival multiverse and to demonstrate how it might be implemented. A pluralized curriculum would be one that reflects dialogic action, ongoing mutual education between students and professors, and continuous self-reflexivity. Pluralized archival curricula should locate culturally dominant notions of archival theory and practice in a specific historic location and tradition, enabling students to recognize additional ways of being archival. They should use pragmatic approaches in which students learn through community engagement and collaboration and gain knowledge through experience.

We hope that this discussion and the proposed pluralization model initiates a broader professional and academic conversation on the nature and role of archival education. Some questions for further exploration include: What is the language of plurality and how do we move beyond the terminology of “marginalized communities”? Does such terminology reinforce and codify marginalized status? How do we move from an archival universe dominated by one cultural paradigm to an archival multiverse, from a world constructed in terms of “the one” and “the other,” to a world of multiple ways of knowing, of multiple narratives co-existing in one space? How and when do we acknowledge incommensurable ontologies and epistemologies, and how do we accept and deal with them? How much activism and advocacy can be included in archival education before it becomes too politically or ideologically dominated? How do we address and support the plural identities of our students as they enter and complete our programs?

Despite these and many other important outstanding questions, we cannot afford to procrastinate on pluralizing archival studies education. When we open

archives up to a multiplicity of meanings, we strengthen their power to connect people to knowledge, to create identities, to enforce accountability, and to build community. By challenging the foundations of what we teach, we engage in a process that will transform the nature of archives, archival practice, archival engagement, and archival studies education and research. Although we have critically engaged and challenged many aspects of current archival theory and practice throughout this discussion, we have also reaffirmed both our steadfast belief in the power of archives to tell stories that shape history and the enduring hope that by changing archives and archival practice, we can change the world.

## Appendix I. Example: Teaching about Professional Standards<sup>54</sup>

Know/question where the standards/best practices come from and how they developed:

- Contextualize and historicize the development of the standard in question.
- Which community/communities (professional and other) participated in its development?
- Who represented those communities and how were they chosen?
- What processes (e.g., consultation, negotiation, ratification) were involved in developing the standard?
- What are the assumptions, rationales, and goals underlying the standard?
- What compromises were made in the course of developing the standard?
- What terminology is used in the standard and upon what basis was it adopted?
- What are the discursive and rhetorical stances of the standard?
- Does the standard assume any particular juridical tradition?
- Does the standard address nontextual records and recordkeeping?
- Does the standard interface well with local standards?
- How is the standard promulgated? (e.g., by whom, fee-based or free distribution, in what formats?)
- Who does the standard affect, both intentionally and unintentionally?
- How has the standard come to endure and what is the effect of its enduring presence? (e.g., How has the standard evolved over time? Were there any unexpected consequences of its implementation? Have there been any negative responses to the standard?)

Does the standard work?

- Where is it/is it not implemented? Why?
- If it is working, how and where?
- If not, why not/where not?
- What are the gaps, blind spots, and absences in the standard and how can they best be identified?
- How should the ongoing effectiveness of the standard be evaluated? (e.g., through identification of key indicators, outcomes-based assessment, cultural impact?)
- How should the results of that evaluation be presented to a range of different audiences?
- If a standard is not working for a particular community, are there other ways to achieve the same desirable outcomes?

<sup>54</sup> For example, national and ICA descriptive standards and ISO Records Management Standards.