Principles of Archival Inventory Construction

RICHARD C. BERNER *and* ULI HALLER

Abstract: This paper presents a systematic method of progressively arranging and describing archival and manuscript accessions using inventory-style description. Description is based on arrangement. The inventory links these two aspects of intellectual control by being structured to reflect, for each accession, both the physical arrangement of record series and the natural descriptors that govern the order of the file units within them.

The inventory serves as the controlled source for all index/catalog terms. Index entries are derived from the inventory and are cumulated to link all inventories, as was recommended by the Society of American Archivists Finding Aids Committee in 1978. Additional terms brought out by more refined processing of an accession are incorporated in the internal structure of the original inventory. Rules for proper form of name entry are employed as an authority control. Topical subject access is by structured language and is keyed to primary subject matter. Natural language terms can be derived as index terms from original file unit descriptors and, if used, would provide topical access to the file unit level.

*About the authors: Richard C. Berner received his B.A. in economics from the University of Washington and his M.A. in history and his M.L.S. from the University of California. He was Curator of Manuscripts at the University of Washington Libraries from 1958 to 1967. In the latter year he became head of the University Archives and Manuscripts Division at the University of Washington. His most recent, and probably most notable, publication is **Archival Theory and Practice in the United States: A Historical Analysis,** published by the University of Washington Press in 1983. He has also completed two editions of **Manual for Accessioning, Arrangement and Description of Manuscripts and Archives.** In addition, he has published articles in the American Archivist, Drexel Library Quarterly, Library Resources and Technical Services, and Journal of Education for Librarianship.*

Uli Haller received his B.A. in history from Stanford and his M.L.S. from the University of Washington. He was a Manuscript Processor at the University of Washington Archives from 1980 until 1982, when he became Assistant Archivist at the Rosenberg Library in Galveston, Texas.

This article is a revised version of the paper Uli Haller presented at the 46th annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, 22 October 1982, in Boston, Massachusetts.

Arrangement and description of archives and manuscript collections tend to be treated as independent processes. Although it is often acknowledged that they are two aspects of a linked process, previous authors writing about them nevertheless have focused on one or the other. Furthermore, description has been dealt with in terms of the individual characteristics of the different kinds of finding aids rather than the actual and potential relationships among them. No author has yet proposed having a controlled information source for cataloging or indexing. Having such a source of information would indicate where cataloging/indexing stopped and the point from which it can be resumed or expanded. The information source should also be capable of incorporating expansions and modifications within its internal structure.

From a 1969 survey of about fifty repositories it is evident that few archival institutions consciously used their catalogs as the primary means of access to their entire holdings. In other words, the catalog performed no integrative role like that exercised by a union catalog. Rather, it simply was considered to be just another finding aid. Some respondents discovered incidentally, in the course of filling out the questionnaire, that the catalog could provide a single point of access to all their holdings.[1]

During the 1960s and 1970s lip service was paid in the literature to the relationship between arrangement and description, but only one author articulated that relationship. He demonstrated how controls established in the arrangement process can be translated into a coherent descriptive program.[2] With two partial exceptions—the Massachusetts Institute of Technology archives' processing manual by Karen T. Lynch and Helen W. Slotkin and *The Preparation of Inventories*, published by the National Archives and Records Service[3]—only the University of Washington has produced such a coherent descriptive program. One of the crucial differences between the practices of the University of Washington and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is that inventories at the latter are not constructed with indexing in mind. Instead, indexes are prepared as a supplementary access device. At M.I.T. a separate card catalog is also produced from information distilled from the inventory but not keyed to it.[4] These observations illustrate the fragmentation of finding aid relationships and the separation of description from arrangement. The NARS manual is discussed below.

There is authoritative precedent in the writings of Theodore R. Schellenberg for fragmentation and treating description as a fully or quasi-independent process. Schellenberg suggested "different types of finding aids are needed by different classes of searchers," and "an archivist should adapt his descriptive program to facilitate the special uses to which particular record groups may be put." For private papers he recommended an inventory for large accessions "followed by a catalog of each collec-

[1]Richard C. Berner, "Manuscript Catalogs and Other Finding Aids: What Are Their Relationships?" *American Archivist* 34 (October 1971): 367–72.

[2]Mary Jo Pugh supports this contention in "The Illusion of Omniscience: Subject Access and the Reference Archivist," *American Archivist* 45 (Winter 1982): 42–43.

[3]Edward E. Hill, *The Preparation of Inventories*, National Archives and Records Service, Staff Information Paper 14 (Washington, D.C., 1982).

[4]Karen T. Lynch and Helen W. Slotkin, *Processing Manual for the Institute Archives and Special Collections M.I.T. Libraries* (Boston, 1981).

tion, and that by a guide to the holdings of a repository. Thereafter special finding aids should be produced to meet specific needs. These should be in the form of indexes, or catalogs and lists of record items.'' Schellenberg did not relate the indexes or catalogs to the inventory. He wrote about them as different kinds of finding aids. For public records he recommended following the inventory with a guide instead of a catalog and then producing special finding aids.[5] He did not indicate clearly, in his treatment of catalogs and indexes, whether the documents themselves or the inventories should be indexed or cataloged, but he seems to have tended toward the documents.[6] His ambiguity is further illustrated by his contention that, at the national level, "A catalog is the only type of finding aid that facilitates a pooling of information about the documentary resources of a nation,"[7] whereas, at the repository level, he saw no comparable role for the catalog or an index. In general, Schellenberg did not explore the relationships among finding aids and potential relationships that might be developed for them.

Further precedent for fragmentation and independence of description exists at the Library of Congress, where each finding aid stands by itself and where the unstructured scope and contents note section, instead of the container list section of its registers, is used as the source of cataloging information. In other words, by not cataloging from the container list—the sequential listing of file unit headings—description (cataloging,

in this case) is isolated from the arrangement and is not keyed to it. The descriptive program at the Library of Congress is the model followed by M.I.T. and some other major manuscript repositories. Not only is description divorced from arrangement as recorded in the container list; but the descriptive program is fragmented and is, in effect, bifurcated due to the absence of a comprehensive, integrative role for the catalog or index.

The most extreme illustration of the isolation of description from arrangement is that of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules II*, in which it is recommended that the source of cataloging information be the "whole collection."[8] In other words, cataloging is to be done from the actual manuscripts, not from one or more finding aids. What is produced in such a process is an impressionistic scope and contents note from which added entries can be made. The model for these rules is the set of rules issued by the Library of Congress in 1954, which have been used in the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections*.[9]

Similar criticisms, with some qualifications, can be made of the writings of Oliver W. Holmes, Frank B. Evans, David B. Gracy II, Ruth Bordin and Robert Warner, and Kenneth Duckett. All either neglected description while addressing problems of arrangement or treated description as an independent process, not as the culmination of a linked procedure for intellectual control that begins with accessioning and ends with description. Only Lucile Kane con-

---

[5]Theodore R. Schellenberg, *The Management of Archives* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1965), pp. 113–15.

[6]Ibid., 268–82.

[7]Ibid., 270.

[8]*Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1978), p. 111.

[9]United States Library of Congress, *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress Manuscripts Division. Preprint of the Rules for Collections of Manuscripts* (Washington, D.C., 1954).

sidered description as the final step of the process of control. Unfortunately, Kane never refined her thinking about the process; consequently she concluded her discussion by recommending a bifurcated system like those of her contemporaries.[10] Kenneth Duckett is an apparent exception because he recommended that description should begin with the taking of content notes while arranging papers; but his technique is random in character and is not based on the actual arrangement sequence. In his discussion of inventorying, Duckett failed to relate the procedure to the arrangement; and he neglected to develop some principles of container listing that are appropriate. The result is fragmentation, not integration.[11]

Ruth Bordin and Robert Warner recommended inventories for large accessions coupled with an index for each inventory, but they stopped short of recommending the cumulation of these individual indexes. They considered the general catalog to be the "most efficient finding aid" for most manuscript libraries, provided it is supplemented by calendars and inventories. Catalog entries are made from notes compiled in the course of processing—in other words, from the actual manuscripts.[12]

David Gracy also stopped short of developing an integrated model, although he seems to have recognized

that an index can function as the integrator. While considering the inventory as the "basic control document" he followed the pattern of the register system of the Library of Congress and did not realize that the container list is the heart of the control document. Consequently, when he discussed indexing he did so in terms of special indexes that are constructed from both the inventory and the actual manuscripts.[13] Where is the control in this procedure?

Both Oliver W. Holmes and Frank Evans[14] concentrated on arrangement, apparently satisfied that the finding aids apparatus of the National Archives was either adequate or perhaps too diverting to discuss. Each made a major contribution to our understanding of the basic elements of arrangement that should serve as the basis for the National Archives' descriptive program. In his article on archival arrangement, Holmes carefully indicated that "all series are assigned to record groups and subgroups so that the boundaries of these are finally certain." In other words, every series has a parent. If this recognition were to be applied also to arrangement of personal papers, levels of control would become easier to articulate at both the repository and national levels. Unfortunately, subgroups in personal papers are normally submerged in general series. Holmes considered arrangement

---

[10]Lucile M. Kane, *A Guide to the Care and Administration of Manuscripts* (Madison, Wis.: American Association for State and Local History, 1960), pp. 374–75.

[11]Kenneth W. Duckett, *Modern Manuscripts: A Practical Manual for Their Management, Care and Use* (Nashville, Tenn.: American Association for State and Local History, 1975), pp. 121–24, 128–29, 135–36.

[12]Ruth B. Bordin and Robert M. Warner, *The Modern Manuscript Library* (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1966), pp. 53–56.

[13]David B. Gracy, II, *Archives & Manuscripts: Arrangement and Description.* Society of American Archivists Basic Manual Series, (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1977), pp. 19–27, 33.

[14]Frank B. Evans, "Modern Methods of Arrangement of Archives in the United States," *American Archivist* 29 (April 1966): 241–63. Evans provided the setting in the National Archives out of which the concept of record levels became explicit and through which classification emerged as arrangement in archival practice.

to be the "basic integral activity of the archival establishment" and concluded that "presenting that arrangement in writing afterwards is a subsidiary activity."[15] He saw no role for inventory indexes, nor for their cumulation. Such a role is, however, envisioned by the author of the 1982 revision of *The Preparation of Inventories*.

Holmes's recommendation is followed in part when the author notes that "series normally should be described with reference to the administrative units that created them. Under an organizational method, the series are grouped to reflect the hierarchical levels within the agency." Series also may be subgrouped by function, chronology, geography, record type, or by a combination of all these methods. The author did not state whether the inventory should be an outline of the actual arrangement sequence, but he gave the impression that it may or may not. The critical point is only implied: that the inventory should be clearly organized even if the records are not. In it, "every element is assigned a control number that identifies its location in the inventory."[16] The control number is essential for producing inventories for the NARS A-1 computer system. In a letter of 20 April 1983, Edward E. Hill noted that this computer system has no capacity for indexing, although index terms can be input and retrieved just like any other element. Hill noted in this letter that NARS is experimenting with the MARC format under the inspiration of the National Information Systems Task Force; and if the MARC format is adopted, there will be a capacity for indexing.[17] The author of SIP 14 provided no clear guidelines for indexes except to recommend that they "should be prepared only for larger, more complicated inventories" and that "series descriptions should be indexed by entry number."[18] On balance, it appears that the author of SIP 14 stops short of integrating arrangement and description and sees no comprehensive role for indexes. The inventory is not prepared with indexing in mind. It seems fair to conclude that description at NARS continues largely as an independent process.

There appears to be a general verbal agreement that arrangement is the foundation of description. If this is so, the arrangement must be articulated in the accession description according to its own descriptive components and file terms. What is needed is a conscious integration of arrangement and description in which they are linked in a step-by-step fashion through each successive level of control. Arrangement by record levels must be consciously tailored to capitalize on the natural descriptive elements found in an accession. By incorporating the natural descriptors in their context, one can systematically utilize what is given by the arrangement. The descriptors become access points to the accession; and when they are cumulated with those from other accessions, they provide a single access point for the entire holdings of the archives. In addition, if the context of each catalog entry or index term is preserved, physical retrieval can be comparably precise.

The authors of the *Manual for Accessioning, Arrangement, and Description*

---

[15]Oliver W. Holmes, "Archival Arrangement—Five Different Operations and Five Different Levels," *American Archivist* 27 (January 1964): 21–41.

[16]Hill, *Preparation of Inventories*, pp. 2, 18.

[17]Hill to Richard C. Berner, 20 April 1983.

[18]Hill, *Preparation of Inventories*, p. 21.

of Manuscripts and Archives of the University of Washington Libraries have attempted to do this. They also have implemented the recommendation of the Society of American Archivists Finding Aids Committee in 1978. In his report as chair of the Finding Aids Relationships Subcommittee, Charles Palm recommended that the inventory be made the primary finding aid and that cumulative indexes provide access to them. This article contains an expansion of those sections of the manual devoted to the principles of inventory construction. To understand these principles fully, readers should consult the manual.

The principles of inventory construction are based on the following assumptions: (1) The inventory is to be the information source for index or catalog entries. (2) The inventory is to register the level of control that has been achieved in the arrangement process. (3) There are to be proportionately more index/catalog terms as each successive level of control is achieved.

It follows, therefore, that: (1) Arrangement and description are inescapably linked as a single process of control, with arrangement serving as the foundation for description. (2) The inventory must be structured to allow inclusion of more index terms at each successive level. (3) Indexing will be under control at all times. It is possible to know precisely where indexing stopped and from what point it can be resumed. Each new index term simply adds detail to previously established terms.

Although record levels have been recognized in the United States since the early 1940s and were formalized in Staff Information Papers of the National Archives in 1950 and 1951,[19] to our knowledge no system except that of the University of Washington has been devised in which arrangement and description are clearly linked by successive levels on an accession-by-accession basis. No other system, to our knowlege, provides a single point of access to the entire holdings of a repository. All else about the system should be familiar territory for the archivist or manuscript librarian, although several concepts are unconventionally treated. The subgroup concept is an example. Subgrouping in the University of Washington is done solely in recognition that every series has a parent; it is not done on the basis of function, geography, or subject content. By subgrouping only on the basis of parentage—i.e., on the basis of provenance[20]—the inventory will make unmistakably clear what the components are if the inventory is structured to follow arrangement.

---

[19]Theodore R. Schellenberg, *The Control of Records at the Record Group Level*, National Archives and Records Service Staff Information Paper 15 (Washington, D.C., 1950); *The Preparation of Lists of Records*, National Archives and Records Service Staff Information Paper 17 (Washington, D.C., 1951); *Principles of Arrangement*, National Archives and Records Service Staff Information Paper 18 (Washington, D.C., 1951).

[20]Record generating agency is the sole basis of provenance. In the traditional record level hierarchy, the record group and subgroup levels are linked with provenance, while the other levels are not. This recognition is consistent with Holmes's differentiation between upper and lower levels in the hierarchy. (Holmes, "Archival Arrangement," pp. 22–23). If any other basis of subgrouping is chosen, it is not possible to establish progressively refined controls. For the latter procedure to take place, any rearrangement must be physically done. If it is done only on paper, it will be impossible to determine what already has been indexed.

In their recent writings about the principle of provenance and original order, Australian archivists are making the most challenging and thoughtful contributions. Their writing, however, lacks a statement of their special premises. Presumably the setting is one based on a registry system in which series are under control at all times. See P.J. Scott, C.D. Smith, and G. Finlay, "Archives and Administrative Change—Some Methods and Approaches," *Archives and Manuscripts*, Part 1, 7 (August 1978) 115–27; Part 2, 7 (April 1979) 151–65; Part 3, 8 (April 1980) 41–54; Part 4, 8 (December 1980) 51–69; Part 5, 9 (September 1981) 3–18.

If the original filing scheme does not clearly reflect provenance so that all series of the originating agency/agent are grouped together, the filing scheme should be adjusted to do so. Provenance takes precedence over original order in this context. In addition, evidential values will be more clearly identified when records are grouped by the actions that led to their origin rather than by a filing scheme that does not show this. The inventory also should appear familiar; it is a container list. It is deliberately structured, however, to reflect the record level at which control is established; and the file unit descriptions carry indexable terms that may be either the original terms or adjusted ones devised by the archives staff.

The elements of the University of Washington integrated system are simple. They proceed from the principle of provenance and the corollary concept of establishing progressively refined controls by record levels over each accession in the manuscript collection and institutional archives. To do this, the subgroup levels are established first, where they exist. Otherwise, subgroups will be scattered among general series and the process of establishing hierarchical controls will be impeded. Furthermore, instead of tailoring different types of finding aids for different classes of users as Schellenberg advocated, we design every inventory to record the files in their hierarchical context and sequential order, which are determined during the arrangement process. The folder headings themselves—provided they reflect folder contents—are the primary source for the descriptive terms used. This procedure makes it possible for the inventory to reflect whatever level of control has been established in the arrangement process. If only accession level control has been established, only the accession name and some other

primary characteristics will be noted. If subgroups are established, then the subgroup names will also be recorded in the inventory. If the series within a subgroup are arranged in an orderly fashion using existing file unit headings, then file unit level control is recorded by listing the file unit headings. In effect, these file unit headings are the detail for the series just as the series headings are the detail for the subgroups and the subgroup names are the detail for the accession name. Occasionally an inventory preparer goes beyond this analysis of provenance and analyzes the documents within the file folders to derive index or catalog terms. Such content analysis may indeed be needed where the provenancial terms are too vague.

In the University of Washington system, the inventory is designed to take maximum advantage of the provenance method of control. Not until full use of this method has been made is data extracted from the text of the documents themselves. To employ content analysis before using provenancial information would introduce a random element into the control process. In addition, justification for doing content analysis cannot be made until provenancial information has first been exhausted. In other words, there must be a demonstrated need for content analysis.

The first step here is to describe the arrangement as it is, using existing folder descriptors and their supplementation as needed. The emphasis here is on acceptance of all natural descriptors if they are accurate. Folder contents are scanned during the arrangement process, for it is only by examining folder contents that one can determine the provenance and the proper place of that folder in the overall arrangement. Its provenancial context will imply a great deal about the contents of the folder. Additional explicit content information

Edward W. Allen Papers

Box

1	BIOGRAPHICAL FEATURES
2	Subgroups
	International Fisheries Commission, 1937-42, 1947
	General correspondence, chronologically arranged
	1937-1938 (March
3	1938-1939
4	1940-1941 (February 5)
5	1941-1942
6	1947

International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, 1937-1950
General correspondence

6	1937-1942 (June)
7	1942-1945 (July)
8	1945-1950
8A-9	Miscellaneous documents (Minutes, reports, unsorted)
9	Hell's Gate Items

International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, 1954-1973
Incoming Letters
Outgoing Letters
General correspondence, chronologically arranged

10	1954-1959
11	1960-1963, 1965, 1971-73
	Miscellaneous reports, minutes, etc., unsorted
12	Miscellaneous
13	Miscellaneous

American Bar Association, International and Comparative Law Section, 1941-1973

14	General correspondence, 1941-44
15	General correspondence, 1946, 1947, 1952-68
16	General correspondence, 1968-73

17	American Bar Association, Law of the Sea Committee, 1963-66
	General correspondence, 1963-65
	General correspondence, 1966

American Bar Association, Oceanography Committee
General correspondence, 1967-68

American Bar Association, Peace and Law Committee
Correspondence, reports, and related items, 1952-53

American Bar Association, World Peace Through Law Committee
General correspondence, 1966-68

American Bar Association, Commerce Committee
General correspondence, 1946

Illustration 1

can be added to the internal structure of the inventory if it is necessary or desired. By adding it to the internal structure of the inventory, the inventory is made more effective as the controlled information source for indexing/cataloging. This approach is very similar to that followed in standard monographic cataloging where basic description precedes, and is separated from, subject analysis. Unlike a monograph received by a library, an archival or manuscript collection does not arrive in a ready-made package bearing the natural descriptors of author, title, publisher, or chapter headings. Instead, the organic components of an accession—the record levels—must first be established through arrangement. As the folder headings become associated with record levels, the subgroup, series, and file unit names that are identified become the collection's natural descriptors.

This process is best explained through illustrations that show how these principles of inventory construction are implemented through successive processing steps. Illustration 1 is of the Edward W. Allen Papers and is an example of subgroup-level control. Each subgroup is represented as a discrete unit in Allen's papers; the arrangement restored his original filing scheme, which had become disjointed. The respective series of the subgroups are listed, though the series titles are too generic to provide enough detail for what normally would be considered series-level control. This is as far as the Allen Papers have been processed. All that is known about the Allen Papers at this time is that they divide into these subgroups, which are largely composed of correspondence, presumably on topics that are the focus of the named bodies. The cumulative name index would lead any researcher interested

	W.U.* Comptroller	
Box	Administrative Office	Dates
1-3	Interdepartmental Correspondence	1931-60
4	General Correspondence	1932-54
5-6	Buildings and Construction	1933-61
7	Bonds	1958-66
8	Reports (including annual reports)	1948-60
9-10	Subject Series	
11	Subgroups	
	W.U. Metropolitan Center	
	General Correspondence	1948-57
	Reports	1922-57
12	National Association of College & University Business Officers	1961
	Students' Cooperative Association	1945-59
	W.U. Adult Education Committee	1943-48
	W.U. Applied Physics Laboratory Supervisory Board	1951-60
13	W.U. Associated Students of the University of Washington Activities	1951-60

*The "W.U." prefix is an in-house convention. Under University of Washington corporate entry rules, all agency titles are normalized to provide consistent corporate entries. "W.U." stands for "Washington. University." Inverting the common order of these words causes "University of Washington" entries to file together with those of other state agency names. Because the inventories used as illustrations throughout this articles are intended to reflect actual practice, the corporate name inversion convention is retained in the examples.

Illustration 2

in the work of any of these bodies to the Allen Papers. During the next stage of processing, details of the correspondence series (such as correspondents' names) would be refined. The correspondents' names would simply be added under their respective series.

The records of the University of Washington comptroller's office (Illustration 2) show how much descriptive expansion is handled. The initial inventory for the records was prepared only to the subgroup and general series level. The general series, contained in the first ten boxes, do not fall under any particular subgroup but instead reflect the general administration of the comptroller's office. They are, in effect, residual series. As with the Allen Papers, only minimal detail is provided at this stage. For the Metropolitan Center subgroup, for example, only the generic series titles are listed.

Illustration 3 is an excerpt of the more refined inventory of the comptroller's records that shows the series detail added later to the Metropolitan Center subgroup. Notice how the file unit headings serve as the descriptors for this particular subgroup and, by extension, for the whole accession. The file unit names, and even the generic series title, give some idea of the topics documented by these records. Notice also that in some cases supplemental terms such as "architects" and "auditors" have been added to clarify names. Scope notes in prose style were not provided for any of the folders because no content analysis was undertaken beyond that needed to place each folder in logical sequence and to verify the representativeness of the file unit title. A heading such as "Reports for the Regents' Board" may seem nondescript. Were it standing alone, a brief contents note might be in order. In this context, however, one can infer that the reports deal with the comptroller's ad-

ministration of the Metropolitan Center.

Few papers arrive at the archives as neatly ordered as these of the comptroller. The records of the vice provost for academic affairs provide a more typical example of processing work flow. The fourth illustration shows further the efficacy of subgrouping and how that process is reflected in the inventory. The original sequence, seen in the left column (Illustration 4A), may fairly be characterized as random alphabetical—that is, all folders were filed in a single alphabetical sequence without differentiation into subgroups and series. (The Marine Studies Council is an earlier accession of the office that was merged into VPAA records during processing.) The right column shows the same files rearranged according to the subgroup and series relationships evident in the records. The rearrangement and subsequent hierarchical listing provide the provenancial context for each file unit heading, a context not discernible from the initial listing. For example, the subgrouping process has shown the Racial Justice in Education Task Force and the Academic Affairs Council to be units with which the vice provost corresponded, not committees on which the vice provost served. A researcher can tell from the inventory that the substantive proceedings of the bodies will not be found in these records. Knowing this, the researcher may not need to search through this accession.

If desired, the items included in each folder can be detailed beneath each respective file unit heading. This was later done with the correspondence of the Marine Studies Council, when the correspondents were listed (Illustration 4B). Similarly, information derived from content analysis has been added in parentheses or brackets wherever appropriate to help identify a file unit or

W.U. Comptroller, 72-30
Inventory (page 9)

Box	Subgroup	Date
11	Metropolitan Center	
	General Correspondence	1948-50, 55-57, 63-65
	Nickum, Lamont and Fey (Architects)	1954-57
	Seattle Olympic Hotel Co.--Insurance	1952-57
	Touche, Niven, Bailey and Smart (Auditors)	1954-60, 68
	University Properties, Inc.	1954-56
	General Correspondence--Modernization	
	General	1955-57
	New Douglas Building	1955-57
	Olympic Hotel	1956-57
	Olympic Hotel Metropolitan Theatre	1955-56
	Post Office Site and Building	1955-57
	Regents' Authorizations	1955
	Teaching Hospital Metropolitan Tract Bonds	[1952], 56-57
	Tenants Alterations	1954-57
	Reports	
	Financial Reports	1948, 55-64
	Metropolitan Building Company	1922-38
	Metropolitan Company (and subsidiary companies)	1930-38
	Audit Reports	
	Olympic Hotel Modernization and Improvement Program	1956-57
	Seattle Olympic Hotel Company Percentage Rental Statements	1957
	Seattle Olympic Hotel Company-- Lease Provisions Compliance	1959, 63-64, 69
	University Properties, Inc.--Lease	1955-57, 63-64, 69
	Regents' Board Minutes and Reports	1954-56
	Reports for Regents' Board	1953-56
	Reports for Regents' Board	1957-65
	Reports to Legislature from Regents'	1955,57,58,60,62,64

The series title "General correspondence--Modernization" was the original file unit designator and it was deemed advisable to retain the original term.

Illustration 3

Vice Provost for Academic Affairs*

Original Order (Abstract)

Academic Affairs Council
Academic Personnel Office
Academic Planning Council
Academic Program Review
American Bar Association
Applied Physics Laboratory
Bakke
Criminal Justice Graduate
   Education
Faculty Council on Community
   Service
Final Examination Policy
Graduate and Professional
   Student Senate
Human Rights Commission
Humanities Council
Kresge Foundation
Marine Studies Council
Minority Faculty Affairs
National Association of Univer-
   sity and Land Grant Colleges
Operation Crossroads Africa
Post Secondary Education
Proposal to Establish a Chicano
   Counseling Center
Provost
Social Theory Program
Task Force on Racial Justice in
   Education
Tuition Waiver

Administrative Office Series
   General correspondence (reverse chronological
     order)
   General correspondence (alphabetical arrange-
     ment)
     American Bar Association
     National Assoc. of University & Land Grant
       Colleges
     Operations Crossroads Africa
     Racial Justice in Education Task Force
     Washington Post Secondary Education Council
Intra-university correspondence
   W.U. Academic Affairs Council
   W.U. Academic Personnel Office
   W.U. Graduate and Professional Student Senate
   W.U. Provost
Subject Series
   Academic program review
   Bakke decision impact
   Chicano Counseling Center proposal
   Faculty Council on Community Service
   Final examination policy
   Minority faculty affairs
   Tuition waiver
SUBGROUPS
   W.U. Academic Planning Council
   W.U. Criminal Justice Education
   W.U. Human Rights Commission
   W.U. Humanities Council
   W.U. Marine Studies Council
     Historical features (background information
      and statements relating to the proposed
      College of Marine Studies)
     General Correspondence
     Kresge Foundation
     W.U. Applied Physics Laboratory
   W.U. Social Theory Program

*The parallel lists above are a truncated version of the actual inventory.

Illustration 4A

W.U. Marine Studies Council

HISTORICAL FEATURES (background information and state-
ments relating to the proposed College of Marine Sciences
(2 folders)

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE
    Burke, William T.
    Businger, Joost A.
    Donner (William H.) Foundation
    Kresge Foundation
    W.U. Applied Physics Laboratory
    W.U. Atmospheric Sciences Department
    W.U. Friday Harbor Laboratories
    W.U. Graduate School
    W.U. Marine Resources Division
    W.U. Marine Studies Institute
    W.U. Oceanography Department
    W.U. President (Hogness)
    W.U. President (Gerberding)
    W.U. Provost
    W.U. Vice President for Academic Affairs

GRANT AND CONTRACT RECORDS
    Donner (William H.) Foundation
    Kresge Foundation
    Murdock (M.J.) Charitable Trust

REPORTS (15 folders)

MINUTES, AGENDAS (5 folders)
    Handouts distributed at meetings (16 folders)

SUBJECT SERIES
    W.U. Marine Sciences College (proposed)
        Date on Units
        Position Papers
        Program at other institutions
        Texas [A&M] University Visit
        Miscellaneous

SUB-GROUPS
W.U. Marine Studies Council. Curriculum Task Force
W.U. Marine Studies Council. Research Task Force
W.U. Marine Studies Council. Structure, Administration,
   and Governance Task Force

Illustration 4B

item.[21] The crucial point is that the expansion occurs in the context of the inventory and is not made part of another finding aid or simply appended to the inventory. A guide section in narrative style precedes the inventory proper, but that section is not used as a source of index terms.

While each inventory represents a unified description of a particular accession —i.e., a description that, when read from beginning to end, encompasses the whole accession—each of the various terms in the description also has independent value. To enable researchers to effectively utilize terms listed in the inventory, the terms are indexed to present users with direct access to each inventory at a variety of points. With the inventory in hand, the researcher can then see the context in which the terms appear and gauge their relevance more clearly.

Deciding upon the terms to be indexed in this kind of system is relatively simple. The index terms are listed in the inventory. To reduce the indexing workload presented by large inventories, it may be desirable to limit the number of terms indexed by taking only subgroup and major correspondent names. Yet the system is designed potentially to include every inventory term in the cumulative index; hence every term in the inventory is constructed with indexing in mind.

Carrying out the actual indexing is theoretically more complex due to the need to retain context; practically, however, it is just as simple. The context of a term conveys meaning to it. For example, a name appearing as a subgroup name suggests a body of organic records. One appearing as a correspon-

dent name indicates only correspondence between the named parties, while one in a subject series indicates the named part was the subject of interest but probably was not directly involved in an interchange of communication. These connotations need to be preserved in the indexing. This can easily be accomplished by indicating the record level context of a name (subgroup, correspondent, or topical subject) in the cumulative index.

A brief examination of a condensed version of the vice provost inventory (Illustration 5) reveals how the inventory might look were the repetitive elements not suppressed. Again, the file folder headings are placed in the context of the series of each subgroup. For ease of understanding and to facilitate indexing, this full inventory may be considered a series of descriptive strings read horizontally. Each term has been assigned a specific position in the record-level hierarchy. This context must be preserved during indexing if the user is to receive the full informational benefit of the arrangement.

Examples of a full index entry format and of the current University of Washington practices are given in Illustration 6. To derive an entry from a descriptive string, the desired term is pulled to the front and listed with associated terms. We have found the current University of Washington entry format conveys adequate information for most searches. The full format is simply too time consuming to enter in a manual system. We are hopeful that an automated system utilizing efficient entry procedures will soon be developed. The object of the proposed automated program would be

---

[21]Decisions on what level of detail is to be provided are based on processing priorities, the apparent ease or difficulty of extracting the desired descriptive terms, and the apparent utility—for users—of the terms. Such decisions must be made in any processing setting and have nothing to do with the integrated nature of this system. Priorities are affected by anticipated needs of researchers and of administration, but in this system every accession is under some degree of intellectual control from the time it is accessioned.

Acc. Name	Subgroup	Series	Subseries, folder or item	Contents	Dates
W.U. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs		General Corr.	Amer. Academy of Arts & Sciences		1961–64
= =		General Corr.	Amer. Association of Univ. Prof.		1960–65
= =		Interdpt. Corr.			
= =		Interdpt. Corr.	W.U. Academic Person. Office		1960–64
= =		Interdpt. Corr.	W.U. Aging Inst.		1961–63
= =		Subject Series			
= =		Subject Series	Academic Program Review		1961–64
= =		Subject Series	Admissions		1962
= =		Subject Series	Affirmative Action Comm. (Bellevue)		1961
= =	W.U. Academic Planning Council				1959–63
= =	W.U. Marine Studies Council				
= =	W.U. Marine Studies Council	General Corr.			

Acc. Name		Subgroup	Series	Subseries, folder or item	Contents	Dates
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies Council	General Corr.	Burke, William T.		1961–64
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies Council	General Corr.	Kresge Foundation		1961
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies Council	General Corr.	W.U. Atmospheric Sciences Dept.		1961–64
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies Council	General Corr.	W.U. Friday Harbor Laboratories		1961–63
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies Council	Grant & Contract Records			
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies Council	Grant & Contract Records	Donner (William H.) Foundation		1961
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies Council	Grant & Contract Records	Kresge Foundation		1961–62
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies	Subject Series			
=	=	W.U. Marine Studies Council	Subject Series	W.U. Marine Sciences College (proposed)		1964–66

Illustration 5

Full Index Entries--Examples

American Academy of Arts & Sciences   W.U. Vice Provost for Academic
    1961-64   Affairs, General Corr.

W.U. Academic Personnel Office,   W.U. Vice Provost for Academic
    1960-64   Affairs, Interdpt. Corr.

Affirmative Action Comm. (Bellevue)   W.U. Vice Provost for Academic
    1961   Affairs, Subject Series

W.U. Marine Studies Council   W.U. Vice Provost for Academic
                                                         Affairs, Subgroups

W.U. Friday Harbor Laboratories   W.U. Vice Provost for Academic
    1961-63   Affairs, Subgroups, W.U. Marine
                                                         Studies Council, General Corr.

Current University of Washington Index Entries--Examples*

American Academy of Arts &   W.U. Vice Provost for Academic
    Sciences   Affairs

W.U. Academic Personnel Office   W.U. Vice Provost for Academic
                                                         Affairs

Affirmative Action Comm. (Bellevue)

W.U. Marine Studies Council   W.U. Vice Provost for Academic
                                                         Affairs, as subject

W.U. Friday Harbor Laboratories   Subgroup of W.U. Vice Provost
                                                         for Academic Affairs

*Shortened entries are currently used to conserve card space and processing
time. Dates are not included so that entries from several inventories can be
recorded on the same card. Details of the location of a term in an inventory
are omitted or truncated in order to conserve card space. If there is no de-
lineator term such as "subgroup" or "as subject" following the accession
name, the index term refers to a correspondent entry.

Illustration 6

to index directly from the inventory, where the context is given by the very structure of the inventory. This would eliminate the intermediate step of abstracting or rearranging the inventory information into artificial fields, as most present automated programs require.

Index entries are made onto cards. The Friday Harbor Laboratories card (Illustration 7) from the cumulative name index file contains references to all materials in the archives relating to the FHL. Entries two and six refer to separate record group accessions of FHL records, while entry seven refers to a subgroup in another accession. These are the organic administrative records of the laboratories. Friday Harbor Laboratories appears as a correspondent in accessions three, four, five, eight, and nine and as a subject in entry one. Note that the user is referred to the in-

Illustration 7

W.U. Friday Harbor Laboratories

Cumulative Name Index Card

See finding aids to the following:

1* W.U. Friday Harbor Laboratories 78-85	**2** W.U. Arts and Sciences College 77-13	**3**
W.U. Botany Department 73-11 as subject		
4 W.U. President 71-34; 1952-58	**5** W.U. Friday Harbor Laboratories 71-57	**6**
W.U. President 71-34; 1958-73		
7 subgroup of W.U. Oceanography Dept. 71-19	**8** W.U. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs 81-72	**9** W.U. Provost 81-89

*The number in the upper right corner has been supplied for this example; the rectangles are not numbered in practice.

ventory for each accession, not directly to a specific folder or shelf location. Distinction in the index between subgroups, correspondents, and subjects serves to give a general idea of the relevance of particular sets of records. Inventory detail and context give the user an even better idea about which records are most likely to satisfy his or her request. The indexing system also allows a user to quickly locate additional relevant records when other names in the inventories or the accession records are associated with the user's topic during the course of the research. In this manner, the system works much like author and title citations in a standard bibliographic system.

This, then, is a general outline, from accessioning and arrangement through description and indexing, of an inventory-based system of progressively refined control. Two general points must be borne in mind when implementing such a system. First, narrative should be minimized and should serve chiefly to clarify the arrangement where that is not self-evident. When more information about a record level is desired, one should expand the description within the structure of the inventory itself, rather than undertake content research and write a separate narrative description of the level in question.

Progressive arrangement and description yield additional controlled index terms, while narrative description produces only an impressionistic abstract, which must then itself be indexed. Although processors at the University of Washington prepare a narrative guide section to each inventory, they strive to keep that guide short. As much of the information as is known about the accession is placed in the main body of the inventory. Any eccentricities in arrangement and the location of possibly hidden information in the inventory are pointed

out in the guide. Narrative within an inventory is designed to augment, rather than replace, provenancial detail. Even where it is desirable to call attention to some special feature of the records, this is done in the context of the provenance-based information and, if possible, in terms designed for indexing, such as names, keywords, or short phrases, rather than in narrative form.

The second general consideration is that, since the inventory terms are designed to be indexed precisely as written, some form of authority control is necessary, even at the arrangement stage, and becomes crucial at the time of inventory preparation. This further emphasizes the interdependence of arrangement and description. In indexing of personal names, the full name should always be used when known. People with identical names can generally be distinguished from each other by noting the context in which each name occurs in the respective inventories (accession subject focus or span dates). Corporate names present problems. Strict rules for corporate entry are needed to uniquely identify each body; to ensure that the mission of a body is accurately reflected by its head (that whatever administrative hierarchy is presented in the heading is indicative of the function of the named body); and to facilitate retrieval on the substantive terms in a corporate heading. Administrative hierarchy must be treated as a purposeful element of description, not just as an accident of common usage as is done in *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules II*. For manual systems, the rules must be designed to ensure that the most meaningful terms in a corporate title serve as the initial filing elements. Although development of a uniform set of archival corporate entry rules and a reconciliation of such rules with AACRII would be most beneficial to networking efforts,

each repository need not wait for such developments. As long as some rules are followed consistently, the cumulative name index will quickly become an internal authority list. Cross references can be added later if different name forms are adopted. In this system, it is also unnecessary to construct elaborate administrative histories. The interlocking network of names—primarily the subgroup and correspondent names—in the inventories and the accession records contain adequate clues to aid users in finding records of related offices or earlier or later records listed under different names. Extensive personal biographical sketches are likewise unnecessary since the activities in which the individuals have been engaged are detailed in the inventories.

Although detailed histories and biographies are unnecessary, brief ones are written to show origins and primary functions. Any index terms that are in an administrative history or a biographical sketch should be incorporated in the text of the inventory. If it is to be used as

a sound control document, the inventory should contain all the index terms.[22] By labeling records with the current name and listing former names that are discovered during processing in parentheses or brackets, the archivist can ensure that the records of a single body will always be linked through the index and the inventories, even though the name may have been changed several times.

The treatment of topical subject terms is more complex and less well developed. In general, each subject term ought to be constructed with indexing in mind, since it would be possible to enter all the topical subject terms in an inventory into a cumulative subject index. For example, all of the file folder headings listed under subject series in the inventory of the vice provost's records could be entered.[23] These terms would then provide a subject approach to accessions. Due to limitations on staff time, in the past these subject terms were not entered in the University of Washington index. Instead, only a few artificial headings drawn from a thesaurus were applied to

---

[22]Short administrative histories and personal biographical sketches are indeed included in the guide section of most inventories. Since such sketches do not serve as a source of index terms, however, the sketches are more limited than those commonly developed by other archivists. They are meant to give the users only a brief overview; more details on persons or agencies mentioned are presented in the body of the inventory and in the accession records.

[23]The full list of subject series headings is as follows: Academic Program Review; Admissions; Affirmative Action Committee (Bellevue); Audit, Legislative Budget Committee; Bakke Decision Impact; Chicano Counseling Center Proposal; Class Size; Competitive Offers; Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Consulting Activities; Copyright Law Revision; Copyright Protections of Student Papers; Criminal Justice Seminar, April 1979; Curriculum—Science & Technology; Dedicated Funds; Denny, Brewster Fund; Elderhostel & Access Programs; Endowment Funds; Enrollment—Black Students; Exchange Agreements; Exempt Staff Personnel Program; Extension Credit; Faculty Career Planning; Faculty Council on Community Service; Faculty Renewal; Faculty Utilization Analysis; Final Examination Policy; Grade Distribution; Graduate Opportunities Program; Grievance Procedures; Henry Gallery; Instructional Support; Interdisciplinary Studies and Research; Investment Responsibility; Justice Forum; Lawsuit—Dawson vs. Raskens, Garfinkel ("Omaha Four"); Legislative Bills; Legislative Contact; Legislative Correspondence; Manpower Study, 1978; Minority Faculty Affairs; Northwest Center for Native American Development; Post-secondary education; Racial Justice in Education Task Force, Seattle; Society of Fellows (University of Michigan); Teaching Incentive Recognition Program; Technology Assessment; Tuition Waiver; University Professorship; Visiting Committees—Indian Members; Visiting Minority Faculty Fund; Washington. Post-secondary Education Council; *Waterman Award* (NSF); Weyerhaeuser Foundation Project; WICHE Proposals; Women's Studies; Youth Advocacy Program.

each accession to indicate primary subject content of the records.[24] At this time, natural language terms from selected inventories are being included in the cumulative index in the manner suggested above.

Since archival subject access methods generally remain to be systematically tested, we are not certain of the efficacy of the current approach. It appears, however, that an artificial language alone misses many readily available subject access points. While the natural language method mentioned here holds great promise, we must remember that topical file folder headings generally consist of relatively specific terms. It seems likely that any natural language method will have to be supplemented by an artificial language of broader or more general terms, at least at the record group level. Where processing is completed only to the subgroup level and those subgroups include only generic series, the use of supplied subject terms may also be desirable. Further development of repository thersauri seems well warranted.

In summary, the following points need to be stressed:

1. Arrangement and description are a linked process for establishing control over archival and manuscript collections.

2. Arrangement is the basis for description, in fact the description is of the arrangement; hence, the file units that comprise series need to bear accurate and useful designations. Attention should be paid in this process to proper form of entry for both personal and corporate names, including names as subjects.

3. In the development of topical subject terms, some thought must be given to their determination. This means a system of scope notes should, at the very least, be included in an artificial language approach. For a natural language approach, a set of guidelines for checking the validity of terms against folder contents needs to be developed. Most importantly, both types of subject terms—natural and artificial—need to be placed in provenancial context, i.e., following the specific subgroups, series, file unit, or item name to which they pertain, rather than just be attached to a general accession description. This provenancial context must be preserved in the index.

One last observation seems appropriate. There is agreement among archivists that record levels exist and that progressively refined controls should be established, yet there is a vagueness about how the concept of controls should be applied. Should it be uniform—by level throughout a repository, as the National Archives has done for its series descriptions—or should it be done on an accession-by-accession basis and within each accession? In the former case, every series is considered to be worth describing in narrative form. In the latter case, some series—and the accession

---

[24]Topical subject indexing has been done to the subgroup level on the basis of artificial language by using fourteen primary terms (agriculture, art, commerce, education, industry, international relations, labor relations, literature, politics and government, population, religion, science, travel, and war). These primary terms are subdivided at least once, sometimes twice, for greater specificity. Scope notes govern their invention and use. Because content indexing of subject matter does not proceed below the subgroup level, only the primary subject matter is indicated. To provide access to secondary subject matter, indexing can be done by using the topical terms employed by the record creator as listed in note 23. These latter terms are natural language terms and are not part of the structured artificial language that is employed to indicate primary subject content.

and subgroup to which those series belong—are considered to be sufficiently important to merit further description, while other less important ones are merely listed. This mere listing is considered adequate for the time being. Also at issue in this problem is the form the description should take. Should it be a narrative form or a more classical inventory format? In this article, we have attempted to implement the 1978 recommendations of the SAA Finding Aids Committee: that the inventory be the main finding aid and the cumulative index provide access to the inventories. No other attempt to do this is known to us. We hope this article will provide a basis for developing a consensus on finding aids beyond the confines of the committee.

The basic procedure outlined above is designed to establish the foundation for methods of associating all index terms with their respective context, thereby enhancing their utility as access points. By building upon this basis, archival descriptive efforts, whether manual or automated, can be utilized most effectively and, in the coming years, perhaps in ways not yet imagined.